

INFORMATION TO USERS

The negative microfilm copy of this dissertation was prepared and inspected by the school granting the degree. We are using this film without further inspection or change. If there are any questions about the content, please write directly to the school. The quality of this reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original material.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

U·M·I Dissertation
Information Service

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Order Number 9422854

Deixis in Homeric verbs of motion: The homecoming theme

Gruber, Franz J., Ph.D.

Cornell University, 1994

Copyright ©1994 by Gruber, Franz J. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

DEIXIS IN HOMERIC VERBS OF MOTION:
THE HOMECOMING THEME

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Franz J. Gruber

May 1994

© Franz J. Gruber 1994

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Franz J. Gruber was educated at the elementary schools in Günching and Lengenfeld and at the humanistisches Willibald-Gymnasium in Eichstätt. He obtained a first taste of Latin as an altar boy and began the study of the Latin and Greek languages at the Willibald-Gymnasium where he earned his Abitur. After the military service he continued the studies of the Greek and Latin languages and literatures and enrolled at the Universität Regensburg (where he obtained the equivalent of a B.A.) and at the Freie Universität Berlin. He received a doctoral degree in Classics from Cornell University in 1994.

s.l.m. gewidmet.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the Graduate School of Cornell University for funding my Graduate Studies for two years with a Lane Cooper Fellowship, and the Classics Department of Cornell University for granting me a Townsend Scholarship and three Teaching Assistantships. I express my gratitude to Prof. Ginsburg who, initially, guided me through the graduate program. Special thanks to my committee, Professors Mankin, Mitsis and Nussbaum and, in particular, to my committee chair Professor Pelliccia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter one: Introduction1

Chapter two: Place Deixis, Coming and Homecoming ...25

Chapter three: The Homecoming Theme in the Odyssey ...68

Chapter four: The Homecoming Theme in the Iliad94

 Part I:
 Homecoming and μήνις 96

 Part II:
 Do Trojans Have a Homecoming?119

Chapter five: The Dancer in Chains: Metrical
 Considerations on
 Phrases which Denote
 a Return Home146

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

βῆ δ' ἐξ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον.
ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν αἴξῃ νόος ἀνέρος, ὅς τ' ἐπὶ πολλὴν
γαίαν ἐληλουθῶς φρεσὶ πευκαλίμησι νοήσῃ
ἔνθ' εἶπν ἢ ἔνθα, μενοιγήσῃ τε πολλά,
ὡς κραϊπνῶς μεμαυῖα διέπτατό πότνια Ἥρη·

But [she (sc. Hera)] went back to tall
Olympos from the mountains of Ida. / As
the thought flashes in the mind of a
man who, traversing / much territory,
thinks of things in the mind's
awareness, / 'I wish I were here,
or there', and imagines many things; /
so rapidly in her eagerness winged
Hera, a goddess. [079-83; transl.
Lattimore, modified.]

Since the publication of Friedrich August Wolf's Prolegomena in 1795¹ scholars have been arguing whether "Homer" has been one (the unitarian position) or many (the analytic position): what has become known as "The Homeric Question". The debate was intensified by the publication of Milman Parry's thesis on the traditional epithet in Homer, first published in 1928.² The theory

¹ Wolf, F. A. Prolegomena to Homer. 1795. Trans. Grafton, A., Most, G., W. and J., E., G. Zetzler. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985. Trans. of Prolegomena ad Homerum; sive, De operum Homericorum prisca et genuina forma varisque mutationibus et probabili ratione emendandi. Vol.1. Halle, 1795.

² Parry, M. L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère. Essai sur une problème de style homérique. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928. For a collection of Milman Parry's work see Parry, M. The Making

of oral poetry was not welcomed by the analytic position although it explains decisively the participation of several if not many poets in the genesis of the Homeric epics. Reinhardt remarks on the discomfort of the concept of oral poetry for both the analytic and unitarian position:

Zwischen beide Parteien ist in jüngster Zeit eine dritte getreten ... Würde man meinen, das müßten die Analytiker willkommen heißen, weil damit die Beteiligung mehrerer Dichter erwiesen wäre ... so sähe man sich getäuscht: denn jede philologische Analyse setzt einen niedergeschriebenen Text voraus ... Andererseits wird auch den Unitariern nicht damit gedient. Die Einheit, die sie suchen, statt wie Athene dem Haupt des Zeus zu entspringen, wird zur zufälligen Erstarrung in dem Augenblick der schriftlichen Fixierung. Mochten redaktionelle Eingriffe ein übriges tun. Der Dichter der Ilias löst sich auf.³

The analytic position loses its text. For the unitarian position unity becomes rigidity by chance at the moment of text fixation. The poet of the Homeric epics dissolves. Such statements reflect not only the attitude of those who adhere to the analytic or unitarian position but Reinhardt's own discomfort with the theory of oral poetry. He states that his own book would better never

of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

³ Reinhardt, K. Die Ilias und ihr Dichter. Ed. U. Hölscher. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961. 13.

have been written if repetitions came from "einer Art von allgemeiner Vorratskammer ("oral tradition")":

Ich kann dieses Buch nicht beginnen, ohne zuvor darauf hinzuweisen, daß jene Auffassung darin nicht geteilt wird. Besteht sie zu recht, so wäre diesem Buche besser, daß es nie geschrieben worden wäre.⁴

Despite Reinhardt's influential book, it is by now the communis opinio that an oral tradition has preceded the poems of our Iliad and Odyssey. How the transition from oral to written text precisely came about - whether through dictation by an oral singer for written record (Lord)⁵ or through a complex centrifugal and centripetal process of 'composition in performance' motivated by the process of panhellenism (Nagy)⁶ - we may never know for certain.

It does not matter for this thesis (which examines *Deixis* and Homeric verbs of motion, in particular those verbs and verbal phrases which denote homecoming) whether the Iliad and the Odyssey were composed by one singer, composer, aidos, rhapsode, performer, poet. Regardless how many singers there were the narrator is only one character among the multiplicity of the others. They all have view-points or "eyes". The eyes of the omniscient

⁴ Ibid. 16.

⁵ Lord, A.B. "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts." TAPA 84 (1953): 124-134. Repr. Lord, A.B. Epic Singers and Oral Tradition. Ithaca: Ithaca UP, 1991.

⁶ Nagy, G. "Homeric Quaestiones." TAPA 122 (1992): 17-60.

narrator, however, we hardly ever see. For he, unlike the other characters, is almost invisible, pointing only very rarely to his own self by, e.g., saying "I" (see B184; A218) or "you" (see П693).

The concept of *Deixis* (pointing, and making reference, to a person or thing outside the linguistic context), which was discovered by Apollonius Dyscolus, a grammarian in the second century A.D., has been revived in recent criticism.⁷ *Deictic* expressions (or *deictics* for short) are "those linguistic elements whose interpretation in simple sentences makes essential reference to properties of the extralinguistic context of the utterance in which they occur."⁸ *Deictics* are, therefore, common in speech, not in narrative. The Homeric narrator is in general self-effacing and does not establish contact with the addressee (audience) in an utterance-like fashion. Person *deictics* like "I" or "you", although not shunned, are nevertheless rare in narrative. Place *deictics* like "over here" or "over there" are never used by the narrator apparently because the referent of these expressions can only be determined

⁷ A detailed diachronical survey of the development of this concept will be given in the next chapter.

⁸ Anderson, S. R. and E. L. Keenan. "Deixis." Language Typology and Syntactic Description. 3 vols. Ed. T. Shopen. Vol.3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. 259. See also Ducrot, O. and T. Todorov. Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language. Trans. Porter, C. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins UP, 1979. 252.

with respect to the interlocutors.

Since verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming have, in the Homeric epics, a tendency to be acted out in direct speech, it is argued that these expressions are a residue from a proto-language in which they were *deictics*. It is suggested that the postpositive *-δε* in *οἴκαδε* (whose distribution in direct speech : narrative = 74 : 3) reflects this development and is the same *-δε* as that in the *deictic* *ὄδε* or *δεῦρο*. Since, however, verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming do occur in narrative (marked usage), *Place Deixis* alone does not (or no longer) account for such a distribution. It is demonstrated that there are additional reasons for the phenomenon that the homecoming theme is represented in direct speech much more often than in narrative.

Although the literature on *Deixis* in the personal and demonstrative pronouns is immense⁹ not much has been said on *Deixis* in relation to (Greek) verbs. The literature on homecoming is, naturally, also immense

⁹ Much work has been done by linguists in all fields. I refer to the extensive literature given in the grammar of Schwyzler, E. Griechische Grammatik. 3 vols. 1939-52. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Vol. I. 1939. 610 and Vol. II. 1950. 207-8. and mention only some very important works: Brugmann, K. Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprache. Leipzig, 1904. Jakobson, R. Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb. Selected Writings II. The Hague: Mouton, 1971. 130-147. Benveniste, E. Problemes in General Linguistics. Trans. Meek, M. E. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971. 217-222.

since it is one of the main themes of the Iliad (homecomings are viewed and narrated in the context of Akhaians, Trojans and Trojan allies) and the dominant theme of the Odyssey. Yet, hardly anything has been said on *Deixis* in relation to the homecoming theme.

The only exception is Létoublon.¹⁰ But she discusses homecoming only in the context of *Gehen/Kommen Deixis* ("rapprochement par rapport à ici" and "éloignement par rapport à ici"), which is a subcategory of *Place Deixis*, and does not examine the homecoming theme in relation to the more general concept of *Place Deixis*.

Bloch's dissertation on the history of suppletive verbs in Greek also examines whether defective verbs like εἶμι, ἔρχομαι and the root *eleuth- are viewed as motions which lead toward the onlooker (*kommen*) or away from him (*gehen*).¹¹ He does not, however, use the term *Gehen/Kommen Deixis*, and we will see why.

Verbs of motion like εἶμι, ἔρχομαι and the root *eleuth- belong to the class of verba suppletiva. These verbs are defective by their very nature, i.e. their different tense systems are formed by different bases or roots which have different Aktionsarten. It is not

¹⁰ Létoublon, F. Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: suppletisme et aspect verbal. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985. Hereafter quoted as Létoublon.

¹¹ Bloch, A. Zur Geschichte einiger suppletiver Verba im Griechischen. Diss. Basel, 1940. Hereafter quoted as Bloch.

without significance that this so called "suppletivism" occurs throughout with concepts which are essential to the self of the speaker and "die dem seelischen Interesse des sprechenden Menschen näher liegende Vorstellungsobjekte sind":¹² e.g. 'to be/grow/become',¹³ 'to see',¹⁴ 'to eat',¹⁵ 'to sleep',¹⁶ 'to run'¹⁷ and so on.¹⁸

Bloch gives a good diachronic overview of the history of scholarship on verba suppletiva and I follow him closely here. According to him it was Delbrück who first tried to explain the defectivity and suppletivism of the Indo-European verb (Bloch. 6). There has been disagreement on what caused the suppletivism (Bloch. 11). Delbrück and Meillet saw in the Aktionsart of the root the primary cause of the process. Suppletivism, thus, was considered a compromise between a state where the Aktionsart was solely defined by the root and the new principle of full paradigms with one root forming all tenses. Wackernagel, on the other hand, did not consider suppletivism as something secondary to the defective nature of action-sensitive roots. He saw in the preserved paradigms of verba suppletiva rather "einen

¹² Osthoff, H. Vom Suppletivwesen der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Heidelberg, 1900. 41.

¹³ εἶμι, φῦ (ἔφυ)/γενόμεν, πέφυκα/γέγονα, ἔσ(σ)ομαι.

¹⁴ ὀράω, εἶδον, ὄπωπα, ὄψομαι.

¹⁵ ἔδω/ἔσθίω, φάγον, βέβρωκα, ἔδομαι.

¹⁶ εὔδω, κατέδραθον.

¹⁷ θέω/τρέχω, ἔδραμον.

¹⁸ See Schwyzer, E. and A. Debrunner. Ibid. Vol. II. 258.

Restbestand aus älterer Zeit" when the suppletivism was wider spread. (Bloch. 18).

Bloch's thesis itself examines diachronically defective verbs like 'beating', 'seeing' and 'moving' (and their suppletive paradigms) of which I discuss here only the category of the verbs of motion. Bloch offers a suppletive paradigm which is a departure from that of Delbrück, who had suggested that in Greek it is not ἔβη but ἦλθον and, insofar as εἶμι is future, ἔρχομαι which form the supplement to the root *ei-. Bloch (ibid. 62) instead offers this suppletive paradigm for "kommen, gelangen" and for "gehen":

	kommen, gelangen
present tense	ἀφικνέομαι, ἔρχομαι
future	ἀφίξομαι, ἐλεύσομαι, ἦξω
aorist	ἀφικόμην, ἦλθον
perfect	ἐλήλυθα, ἀφίγμαι, ἦκω
	gehen
present tense	ἔρχομαι
future	εἶμι
aorist	---
perfect	οἶχομαι

Bloch leaves out the form of 'gehen' for the aorist in the paradigm because his final choice (ἔβη) is problematic: its concrete meaning is "to put one's feet on something" rather than "to go" (ibid. 62 ff.). Yet since βαίνω has of course also the abstract meaning "to

go" Bloch later on maintains that the suppletivism for "gehen" is ἔρχομαι, εἶμι, ἔβην, οἴχομαι, finding a parallel suppletivism of εἶμι - ἔβην in Sanskrit: "Der Aorist ἔβην ... in der nicht anschaulichen Bedeutung "ging" ist also bei Homer Aorist zu εἶμι, ἔρχομαι, genau wie das mit ἔβην identische ai. agām Aorist zu dem mit gr. εἶμι identischen emi "ich gehe" ist. Dazu kommt noch die Übereinstimmung des Lettischen, wo gāju "ich ging", eine Umbildung des in ai. agāt und gr. ἔβην vorliegenden athematischen Aoriststammes, das Präteritum zu iet "gehen" ist ...
*Damit darf ein grundsprachliches Paradigma *eimi - *eg^wâm als gesichert gelten.*" (ibid. 66)

It would at first sight appear that Bloch, although not using the word *Deixis*, tries - with examples from Latvian and Sanskrit, which, according to him, point to a common suppletivism in the Indo-European "Grundsprache" - to find (and prove the validity of) suppletive paradigms on the basis of "Gehen *Deixis*" and "Kommen *Deixis*" with Gehen *Deixis* pointing away from and Kommen *Deixis* pointing toward the speech participants. But Bloch does not really try to establish suppletive paradigms in accordance with Gehen/Kommen *Deixis*. The way he uses "kommen" and "gelangen" shows clearly that he treats "kommen" and "gelangen" *deictically* as opposites (see Bloch. 43). Bloch throughout uses "kommen" where he actually means "hierher kommen" and "hier ankommen", and "gelangen" where he actually means "dorthin gehen" and

"dorthin gelangen, dorthin ankommen" (for the combination infective-confective Aktionsart see Schwyzer II 252) and "gehen" where he actually means "losgehen" and "auf dem Wege sein" (infective Aktionsart). In short, Bloch's terms (kommen, gelangen, gehen) are distinguished from one another - defined - on the basis of aspectual character, not *Deixis*.

Létoublon does not recognize that. Her critique of Bloch misrepresents Bloch's categorization. She suggests that Bloch systematized verbs of motion under the category of the *Gehen / Kommen* opposition pure and simple (Létoublon. 31). She thus omits the important fact that Bloch added to "kommen" the verb "gelangen" which he clearly uses for a motion which leads away from the viewer to a point where the motion comes to its goal.

Létoublon's initial argument that a neat distinction of *Gehen Deixis* ("éloignement par rapport à ici") and *Kommen Deixis* ("rapprochement par rapport à ici") cannot be made for the verbs of motion in Homer does not, thus, actually break any new ground. Her suggestion of a suppletive paradigm along the lines of "rapprochement par rapport à ici" and "éloignement par rapport à ici" appears only somewhat later, somewhat to the reader's surprise. Létoublon suggests the following suppletive paradigms (Létoublon. 109):

rapprochement par rapport à ici ("Kommen-Deixis")

présent vrai	ἔρχομαι	non orienté déictiquement
présent modalisé		εἶσι est neutralisable à la troisième personne
présent d'état	---	
aoriste	ἦλθον	normalement centripète
futur	ἐλεύσομαι	normalement centripète
parfait	ἐιλήλουθα	non neutralisable

éloignement par rapport à ici ("Gehen-Deixis")

présent vrai	---	
présent modalisé	εἶμι	"je vais" (tout de suite ou plus tard)
présent d'état	οἴχεται	
aoriste	ἦλθον	L' aoriste centrifuge n'existe pas en principe; mais l' orientation de ἦλθον est neutralisable
futur	εἴσομαι	
parfait	---	

This categorization does not essentially differ from Bloch's. Bloch did not deny that **ἦλθον**, although often centripetal, can also be centrifugal ("gelangen"). The only real difference of Bloch's and Létoublon's suppletive paradigms is the omission of **ἔβην** in Létoublon's suppletive paradigm for Gehen Deixis. This is because Létoublon takes, in contrast to Bloch (who focuses on the abstract meaning of **βαίνω**), the compounds (and hence the concrete meaning) of **βαίνω** into account. Létoublon argues that because the syntactic uses of e.g. **ἀπιέναι** and **ἀπελθεῖν** are similar to one another and

different from that of ἀποβαίνω (which is used generally in the concrete meaning "to descend" in combinations like "to dismount from a horse, disembark from a ship etc."), βαίνω is to be treated altogether separately (Létoublon. 31-32 and 123ff.). But here we must remember that Bloch had used ἔβην only with caution. Hence, both of the two scholars seem to say something of value about βαίνω. Yet, with Létoublon's suppletive paradigm of εἶμι - ἦλθον we seem to go back full circle to Delbrück's suggestion that in Greek it is not ἔβην but ἦλθον and, insofar as εἶμι is used as future, ἔρχομαι which form the supplement to the root *ei- (see above).

A reexamination of those verbs of motion which are defective and which belong to the class of verba suppletiva will show that ἔρχομαι, εἶμι, forms of *eleuth-, ἔβην and ἰκάνω cannot be exhaustively accounted for in terms of *Gehen Deixis* and *Kommen Deixis* alone. I shall maintain that it is not plausible to assume, e.g., *Kommen Deixis* for ἦλθον but to allow that *Kommen Deixis* can be neutralized and used in *Gehen Deixis*. ἦλθον is not "neutralisable" but neutral (see in more detail the following chapter).

Since these verba suppletiva are important for denoting (with and without spatial markers) the idea "homecoming" I shall test them in terms of *Gehen Deixis* and *Kommen Deixis*, giving particular attention to the

homecoming theme. There the discussion will be very complex because we tend to view motions to our or someone else's home in *Kommen Deixis* although the motion leads away from the speaker (e.g. "I'll come over to your house tonight."). We shall see why we view this motion in *Kommen Deixis* and not in *Gehen Deixis*, regardless of where the utterance is made and regardless of whether the addressee is home at the time of the utterance or at the time the utterance refers to. The conclusion will be that, in the context of homecoming, the verba suppletiva do not fit in the categories of *Gehen / Kommen Deixis* either. Bloch's conclusion that these verbs should be arranged according to aspectual characteristics will be confirmed.

This is one part of my thesis. Another treats the question of the distribution of the homecoming theme "in character-text" and in "narrator-text". The terms character-text and narrator-text have been developed by Irene de Jong¹⁹ and will prove useful:

In simple narrator-text the narrator presents events and characters through his own "eye";

In complex narrator-text the narrator presents events and characters through the eye of a character, embedding the character's point of view in the narrator-text;

¹⁹ de Jong, I. Narrators and Focalizers. The presentation of the story in the Iliad. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Pub. Co., 1987. Hereafter quoted as de Jong.

In character-text the narrator presents a character who reveals his own point of view through direct speech.

We shall observe that the homecoming theme occurs in character-text and complex narrator-text much more often than in simple narrator-text. Why the narrator tends to avoid the homecoming theme by presenting it through the eye of a character (embedded focalization in complex narrator-text), or by presenting a character who views it through his own eyes in direct speech (character-text), is the central question I ask.

I shall maintain that certain verbal, adverbial and traditional phrases which denote homecoming (e.g. οἰκόνδε, οἴκαδε, Φθίηνδε, δόμονδε, (φίλην ἐς) πατρίδα γαίαν, ἐλθών, ἦλθε, (ἀπο)νέεσθαι, ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν) have a similar *deictic* "nature" as e.g. δεῦρο and κείσε. δεῦρο is necessarily deictic. Its *Deixis* points to the "I" of a speaker (who addresses some addressee) or to (the location of) both speaker and addressee ("We ... hither ..."). The adverb κείσε is not necessarily deictic and, hence, does not necessarily point away from the location of a speaker. In fact, although κείσε in Homer is throughout used in character-text (and not in narrator-text) *the motion "thither" often does not start from the point of the speaker.*²⁰ When Menelaos says to Helen ἦλθες κείσε (δ274)

²⁰ This is regularly so when the time of the utterance refers to the past (cf. K289, α260, δ619 = ο119, ζ164, ω115).

he does not, of course, refer to a motion from Sparta (the location of the present speech event) to the location of the Trojan horse situated outside the wall of Troy (point B) but to a motion from point A (with A being not the here of the speaker but the place of the subject of ἦλθες, i.e. Helen inside Troy) to point B (with B being the Trojan horse which was just mentioned (δ272)).

Menelaos' eye behaves like the narrator's. It looks from the horse to Troy and from Troy to the horse; i.e.

Menelaos uses κείσε in a way which resembles the narrator's omniscient view. Yet, κείσε never occurs in the narrator-text where it, theoretically, could occur as an anaphoric or proleptic. In practice, κείσε in Homer is always part of a speech event with the speaker, perhaps, accompanying his utterance with an emphatic gesture (for a more thorough discussion of Place Deixis I refer to chapter two).

Similarly, οἰκόνδε or οἴκαδε (1) may coincide with δεῦρο of the speaker who, then, is at home, or with κείσε which (2a) may point to a motion *from the speaker's location* to whoever's house or home it is the speaker refers to, or (2b) *from any location A to location B* (with A being different from the speaker's location and B being the home the speaker refers to). For (1) I refer to the passage in which Odysseus reveals his identity to the suitors after he killed Antinoos and before he is

about to slaughter the others (for other passages cf.

Ω287, π463, φ211):

τοὺς δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 "ὦ κύνες, οὐ μ' ἔτ' ἐφάσκεθ' ὑπότροπον οἴκαδε νεῖσθαι
 δήμου ἄπο Τρώων ... (χ34-36a).

The location of this utterance is Ithaca, the speaker's (Odysseus') home. It is evident that, theoretically, the speaker (Odysseus and any character who talks about Odysseus' homecoming) could say: "He will come home" or "I came home" *anywhere* (even if the speaker who refers to his or someone else's homecoming is far away from Ithaca). In such a case the usage of οἴκαδε would be identical either with 2a (if the motion home referred to is thought of as beginning from the speaker's location) or 2b (if the motion home referred to is thought of as beginning from point A to B with locations A and B being away from the speaker's location).²¹ For (2a) I refer to Akhilleus' famous speech right at the beginning of the Iliad:

²¹ In the passage just quoted Odysseus "focalizes" the view - point of the suitors. If we had the suitors' utterance in direct speech the passage would belong to the category 2b (even if the utterance were made in Ithaca) unless the utterance were made by a suitor whose home *is* Ithaca. If, finally, the utterance were made by a suitor whose home *is* Ithaca it would, nevertheless, belong to the category 2b if the reference of οἴκαδε is not Ithaca but, exclusively, Odysseus' οἶκος.

νῦν δ' εἶμι Φθίην δ', ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερόν ἐστιν
οἴκαδ' ἴμεν σὺν νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν. (A169-170)

For (2b) I refer to Hera addressing Athene and urging Athene to stop the Akhaians from fleeing home at the beginning of B :

οὔτω δὴ οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν
'Αργεῖοι φεύξονται ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης. (B158-59)

As Menelaos' ἤλθεσ κείσε (δ274) does not point to Helen's motion from Sparta (i.e. from the location of the present speech event) to the Trojan horse so Hera's usage of the adverb οἰκόνδε does not point to a motion which starts from the location of the speaker. Both Hera and Athena are at the time of this utterance on Olympos (B167) and, very much like the narrator, observers of events on the Trojan plain. This shows that adverbs like οἰκόνδε or οἴκαδε could be used in the narrator-text where they indeed are used. The question is why, e.g. οἴκαδε so disproportionately often occurs in character-text (in the Iliad the occurrences of οἴκαδε in character-text : narrator-text = 22 : 1; in the Odyssey the occurrences in character-text : narrator-text = 52 : 2).²² Such distribution could simply be chance or the work of metrical necessity or else it might suggest some *deictic* nature of οἴκαδε which points to a location relative to

²² The passages of οἴκαδε in narrator-text are B154, β343 and v121. For discussion of these passages, see the following chapter.

that of a speech event; i.e. οἴκαδε points to a speaker who, perhaps, accompanies his utterance with an emphatic gesture (for a detailed discussion of the postpositive -δε in οἴκαδε / οἴκόνδε I refer also to the following chapter).

I shall argue that Place *Deixis* is perhaps the decisive factor in determining why the homecoming theme is much more common in the character-text than in narrator-text. Since, however the narrator himself does narrate homecomings (see M16; v70-121; o285-295 + 495-99 and Arend. Typische Scenen 79-81;²³ see also motions of gods to Olympos) the concept of *Deixis* alone is not sufficient to explain this phenomenon. There must be additional reasons.

I shall argue that the placing of the homecoming theme in character-text points to the speaker's more or less emphatic involvement, his emotions and perhaps his manipulations. Nestor does not show much emotion during or after his speech about the homecomings of the Akhaians (γ102ff.). Menelaos, on the other hand, is very emotional, and so is his audience (δ183ff.).

Another example may illustrate the emotional involvement of the speaker, the speaker's yearning for homecoming. The verbal form of ἦλθε in a time phrase like

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, (α16)

or

²³ Arend, W. Die Typische Scenen bei Homer. Berlin: Weidmann, 1933, 21975.

τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἔσπερος ἦλθε· (α423 = σ306)

does not point to the "speaker" who in the given passages is identical with the omniscient but quite invisible narrator. We commonly translate ἦλθε here with "the year came" rather than "the year went (and arrived there)". We do not nevertheless draw any conclusions about the situation of the narrator other than that he is removed from the events he is describing. Moreover, these expressions seem formulaic: they are said this way because one says them this way (cf. the convention for time and *Gehen Deixis* (or is it rather in *Kommen Deixis*?) in Homeric Greek # ἤδη γὰρ τρίτον ἐστὶν ἔτος, τάχα δ' εἰσι τέταρτον# (β89) and in High German "das so und so vielte Jahr ging in's Land"). The motion (and arrival) of night time is expressed in *Kommen Deixis* in this traditional phrase:

δόρπον θ' ὀπλισάμεσθ' ἐπὶ τ' ἦλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ.
(δ429 = 574; cf. η284-85a)

This phrase, however, does not necessarily tell us anything about Menelaos' or Odysseus' (*deictic*) perception of time nor about Menelaos' or Odysseus' feelings concerning time. We generally do not think that the phrase "the evening came" betrays any emotional involvement on part of the narrator, particularly when we think less of a narrator of say a love story, or

confession, but of the Homeric narrator. In contrast to the narrator in say Nabokov's Lolita (who addresses very emphatically the jury and the reader while awaiting his trial in jail) the Homeric narrator has a tendency to be self-effacing, uninvolved, unemotional.

ἦλθε when used in a time phrase does not tell us much about the location of the narrator or that of a character, nor does it point to a character's feelings concerning time. ἦλθε in the Odyssey with the meaning "He came home" is different. ἦλθε denoting "Odysseus came home" is in character-text (ψ7, 27, 55; cf. ε40 = v138). In ψ7, 27, 55 the verbal form ἦλθε clearly reveals *Kommen Deixis*. And it clearly conveys more than the simple message "He came home": it points to the speaker's emotion (see the euphoric speech act (outcry?) of Eurykleia in ψ7, 27, 55 with the overdetermined markers οἶκον ικάνεται + ὀπέ περ ἔλθῶν in ψ7, οἶκον ικάνεται + ὡς ἀγορεύω in ψ27 and αὐτὸς ζῶς ἐφέστιος + εὔρε δὲ καὶ σὲ in ψ55).

I shall argue that in the (few) cases where we do find verbal, adverbial and traditional phrases like e.g. οἰκόνδε or οἶκαδε, δόμονδε, πατρίδα γαῖαν, (ἀπο)νέεσθαι in narrator-text the narrator-text is either complex with embedded focalization or marked.

The following is a summary of the verbs of motion used in Homer: ἀγείρομαι, αἴσσω, ἀλάομαι, ἀλεείνω, ἀλῆναι (εἴλω / εἰλέω), ἄλλομαι, ἀλύσκω, (παρ)αμείβομαι, ἀντάω,

ἀντιάω, (ἀπ)ανύω, βαίνω, (συσμ)βάλλομαι, (ἀντι)βολέω,
 γίγνομαι, δραμεῖν, δρομάω, δύ(ν)ω, (κατ)εἶβομαι, εἶμι,
 (ἐξ)εἶρομαι, ἐλαύνω (intr.), (μεθ)έπω, ἔπομαι, ἐρπύζω, ἔρω,
 ἔρω, ἔρχομαι, ἐσχέω, εὐρίσκω, ἔχω, ἤκω, θαμίζω, θέω,
 θρώ(ι)σκω, θύνω, ἴεμαι, ἰθύω, ἰκάνω, ἰκνέομαι, ἴκω,
 (ἀν)ίσταμαι, κελαρύζω, (ἐπι)κέλλω, κίω, κιχάνω, κλίνω,
 λιάζομαι, μετεκίαθον, μετρέω, μίσγομαι, μολῶν (βλώσκω),
 ναυτίλλομαι, (ἀπο)νέομαι, νέω, νίσσομαι, (ἀπο)νοστέω, ὀδεύω,
 οἰμάω, οἰχνέω, οἴχομαι, ὀμιλέω, ὀρμάομαι, ὄρνυμαι, ὀρούω,
 περάω, πηδάω, πέτομαι, πίπτω, πλανάομαι, πλάζομαι, πλίσσομαι,
 πλέω / πλώω, ποιπνύω, ποντοπορέ(ύ)ω, πωλέομαι, ῥέω, ῥώομαι,
 σαόομαι, σεύομαι, σκίδναμαι, σκιρτάω, (ἐπι)σπέρχω, σπέρχομαι,
 σπεύδομαι, στείχω, στιχάω, τανύομαι, τετμεῖν (τέμω),
 (προ)τρέπομαι, τρέχω, (ὑπο)τρέω, τροχάω, τρωχάω,
 (προ)φανήναι, φεύγω, φοιτάω, (ἀνα)χάζομαι, (προ)χέομαι,
 (ἀνα)χωρέω.

I shall single out those verbs which are used to express homecoming, particularly the verba defectiva and examine these verbs in terms of their aspectual characteristics and in terms of *Deixis*. It will be obvious that, first, an a priori arrangement of these verbs in *Gehen / Kommen Deixis* is not helpful and that, second, the notion of homebase is only applicable when it is suggested overtly by each context. It will be shown that Bloch's arrangement of the verba defectiva into inflective (*losgehen*) and confective verbs (*kommen, gelangen*) is a better description of the Homeric usage of

these verbs also in the context of homecoming. It will, finally, be suggested that the distribution of an adverb like οἴκαδε in relation to character-text : narrator-text is best explained when seen in light of a Place Deixis. It is assumed that the postpositive -δε in οἴκαδε is the same deictic -δε as in ὄδε, and points to a speech event with the speaker perhaps accompanying his utterance with an emphatic gesture pointing to the "hier und da" or to "da, dort" (chapter two).

Next I shall focus on the Odyssey. I shall argue that, in addition to Place Deixis, there are other factors which make it attractive for the Homeric singer to view homecoming in character-text. Vividness and immediacy are two of these factors. Another is that the device of putting the homecoming theme in character-text enables the narrator to describe how the return of the heroes (in particular of Odysseus) is experienced in the minds of the characters, and acted out in the form of speech events. I shall argue that particularly the usage of the participle ἐλθών and the verb ἀπονέεσθαι (meaning "to go"? or "to return home"?) by Odysseus in disguise and by other characters in relation to the beggar (who we know is Odysseus) opens up possibilities in the character-text (ambiguity, irony) which the narrator-text could hardly match (chapter three).

Next I will focus on the Iliad. In the first part I

shall argue that, in the context of the Akhaians, the homecoming theme is described through speech events and utilized to highlight the manipulative intentions of different characters / speakers. Particular attention will be given to how the homecoming theme and the μῆνις motif are interwoven and how Akhilleus uses the issue of homecoming as a representation of his μῆνις.

In the second part the focus is on motions of Trojans to Troy and of Akhaians to their camp. Because descriptions of the withdrawal of heroes from the battlefield are common in the simple narrator-text even if at the uttermost the withdrawal extends as far back as the Akhaian camp or the city of Troy I shall ask whether these returns of Trojans from the battlefield back to their city are to be considered homecomings at all. I shall argue that certain motions of Trojans to Troy and of Akhaians to their camp, which are viewed in character-text and narrator-text, are strikingly similar to Akhaian homecomings. This will be demonstrated in 1. μὴ πρίν ... πρίν clauses, 2. flee/stay debates / μερμηρίζειν monologues and 3. (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses (chapter four).

Finally, I shall investigate the degree in which metrical factors impose restraints on the narrator and characters. A detailed metrical analysis of all those phrases which express homecoming will be the starting-point. I will show that the system of phrases expressing

homecoming is economical overall. I will single out for discussion those phrases which seemingly violate the principle of economy. I will show that even in metrically identical phrases like ἀπονέεσθαι and οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι nuances of difference can easily be discovered. I shall argue that because it is more apt to regard word choice as a matter of style and meaning rather than a violation of economy it is plausible to assume poetic reasons also for phrases which do not violate the principle of economy. In short, I shall argue that it is more fruitful to imagine both narrator and character gesturing freely than bound "in Ketten" (chapter five).

CHAPTER TWO

PLACE DEIXIS, COMING AND HOMECOMING

The goal of this chapter is first to scrutinize the grammatical concept of *Gehen / Kommen* Deixis (which is a subcategory of Place Deixis) in Homeric epic. On the basis of a variety of examples I will point out the difficulty of one-to-one lexical identification of Gehen and Kommen in English (go, come) and Homeric Greek verbs. It will become clear at once that a connection of *Gehen / Kommen* with the adverb "home" complicates the problem of *Gehen / Kommen* Deixis rather than simplifying it. I hope that the disadvantage of focusing on verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming is easily overcome by the result we obtain when we retreat one step and look at the homecoming theme in terms of Place Deixis in general.

I have briefly mentioned Deixis in the Introduction and pointed out that it has to do with pointing to a person or thing outside the immediate linguistic context. Here a more precise definition is attempted. The grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus (see RE nr.81), who lived during the second century A.D. and was born and died in Alexandria, is apparently (as far as we can tell from the extant Greek literature) the first to use the term

Deixis. In the second book of his Syntax, in which he discusses the syntax of the pronouns, he states that the pronoun fills the place of a noun either with Deixis or Anaphora (II. 16). An anaphoric expression substitutes for a noun and refers back to it while a deictic points to a person in sight (II. 11; 16).²⁴

K. Brugmann at the beginning of the 20th century revived the notion of Deixis. Subsequent studies followed, with E. Benveniste opposing the first and second person of the pronoun to the third (non personne) and with Roman Jakobson discussing what O. Jerspersen called "shifters".²⁵ Other studies on Deixis include Fillmore,²⁶ Lyons²⁷ and Levinson.²⁸ The only two studies which discuss Deixis in relation to Homeric verbs of motions are A. Bloch (who does not use the word Deixis) and F. Létoublon to whom I referred in the introduction.

Deixis and deictic expressions (deictics) are

²⁴ The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus. transl. and with commentary by F. W. Householder. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V, 1981.

²⁵ For bibliographical reference of Brugmann, Jakobson and Benveniste, see note 9.

²⁶ Fillmore, J.C. Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis 1971. Bloomington: Mimeo, Indiana University Linguistics Club, 1975.

²⁷ Lyons, J. Semantics. Vol.II. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977. 636-718.

²⁸ Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 54-96.

commonly defined in the following way: deictics are expressions which make reference to a speech event, i.e. whose referent can only be determined with respect to the speech participants. Specifically, person deictics are expressions which necessarily refer to a speaker ("I") or his addressee ("You") and spatial deictics are those expressions which designate a location relative to that of a speech event. *Gehen / Kommen Deixis* is a subcategory of *Place Deixis*. This is the general definition of *Deixis*.

Now, it is evident that the third person of the personal pronoun does not necessarily refer to a location in relation to that of the speaker or addressee. He did it could be either in character-text (speech event) or in narrator-text. He did it may be an emphatic statement by a speaker who may reinforce his statement with a gesture pointing out to the addressee this third person (marked third person). Or the third person refers to a person already mentioned or known (unmarked third person) in a speech event or in narrative. In short, the third person has weak *Person Deixis* since it is either deictic or anaphoric. This one here, however, is necessarily deictic.

The Homeric language has several ways of expressing third person: ὄδε, οὗτος, αὐτός, κείνος, ὅ in its pronominal function and the third person of the verb. αὐτός and ὅ

have virtually no Person Deixis and are more purely anaphoric. οὗτος and κείνος have a higher degree, and ὅδε a very high degree, of Person Deixis.

There is also a degree of Place Deixis in these pronouns, with κείνος pointing to a person (or thing) distant from the speaker, οὗτος pointing to a person (or thing) near the addressee (similar to iste in Latin) and ὅδε pointing to a person near the speaker. We may conclude: these pronouns can be used as either anaphorics or deictics; when they point to a location relative to that of a speech event they are person deictics as much as spatial deictics.

There are no other deictics which share the properties of Person Deixis and Place Deixis. The spatial deictic δεῦρο may also be considered a person deictic in that it usually refers to the "I" of the speaker. Yet, the deictic δεῦρο does not necessarily do that; the location δεῦρο points to may include the addressee and hence the whole location where person A addresses person B ("We"; cf. B138 κτλ.). In other cases δεῦρο is perhaps neither deictic nor anaphoric, i.e. when used with imperative (cf. K97 κτλ.).

We expect that - in contrast to "He" - the English pronouns "I" and "You" always have Person Deixis, i.e. refer always to a speech event. But even that may not be so: in English "You" is used sometimes for the impersonal

"one", and then non-deictic. In Homeric epic both "I" and "You" are, albeit seldom, used in narrator-text. In these cases boundaries between deictic and non-deictic are blurred. "I" and "You" in Homeric narrator-text are clearly marked since the Homeric narrator is normally self-effacing.

We recall that Apollonius Dyskolus' assumption was that one and the same expression may be either deictic or anaphoric. But let us consider the following statement:

I was born in London and have lived there ever since.²⁹

Is there anaphoric (as in: It was there where it always was.) or deictic (as in: Put it there and not there.)? Clearly there refers back to London; but it refers also to what London refers to, a place where I, the speaker, am not at the time of this statement: there is in contrast to the here of the speech event. In this example there is both deictic and anaphoric. In contrast to Apollonius we now say: a pronoun may be both deictic and anaphoric.

Lyons argues not only that deictics can at the same time be anaphorics but that Deixis in principal is prior to Anaphora. Lyons makes this argument in the context of a child's language acquisition but seems to extend his thesis to the grammatical and semantic processes of language in general.³⁰ I will return to this point when

²⁹ Levinson 67.

I discuss the postpositive $-\delta\epsilon$. First I will discuss the problem of *Gehen / Kommen Deixis*, especially in the context of verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming.

Place Deixis and Coming

The English verbs "go" and "come" denote a location relative to that of a speech event. "Look, he is going" denotes a location that leads away from the location of the speaker of that statement (*Gehen Deixis*); "Look, he is coming" denotes a location that leads toward the speaker (*Kommen Deixis*). Since a speech event consists generally of speaker and addressee "come" may also be glossed as motion toward the addressee (as is necessarily the case in "I am coming."). Therefore "go" (and "come") can be glossed as motion either away from (or toward) the speech participants at the time of the speech event (what is generally referred to as coding time).³¹ Let us look at another example:

- (1) When I am in London, you can come to see me.
- (2) When I was in London, you came to see me.

³⁰ Lyons, J. "Deixis and Anaphora." The Development of Conversation and Discourse. Ed. T. Myers. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1979. 88.

³¹ Fillmore 38ff.; Levinson 73ff.

Here the motion described with the verb "come" does not have the speaker as its end of motion at *the time of the speech event*. Yet, it would not be correct English if I used the verb "go" instead of "come". "Come" is obviously used when it can be glossed as motion toward the location of the speech participants either at coding time or at time referred to in the statement (which in (1) is subsequent, in (2) prior, to time of speech event).

It is evident that "go / come" are not restricted to a speech event (character-text). They are used in narrator-text as well. Numerous examples could be quoted from Homer. This is an example from the Catalogue of Ships:

ἔνθά τε Μοῦσαι
 ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα παῦσαν ἀοιδῆς
 Οἰχαλίθην ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος·

where the Muses / encountering Thamyras the Thracian stopped him from singing / as he came from Oichalia and Oichalian Eurytos

[B594-96]

Thamyras' motion does not denote a motion either to speaker or to addressee since there is none. The participle ἰόντα is not part of a speech event. Obviously, we can "view" -θεν ἰόντα as coming from or as going from. In the translation I, nevertheless, use coming and not going because I adopt the standpoint of

the Muses who are the grammatical subject of the clause. That is to say, I take $\theta\epsilon\nu\ \iota\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ relative to the location of the protagonists (which here is the location of the Muses).³² Levinson comments on come in narrator-text thus: "In narrative, we ... us[e] *come* relative to the locations of protagonists rather than [sc. speech] participants, but this non-deictic usage we shall ignore."³³ It is easy to ignore what is hard to explain. After a brief survey on $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ I shall return to the problem of (non-deictic?) *come* in narrator-text.³⁴

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ in Homer often simply means "gehen", "to go one's way", "take one's way", "proceed", "depart", "set out".³⁵ In character-text it often has "Gehen Deixis." Its aspect is ingressive or durative rather than terminative (cf. the juxtaposition with forms of $\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ in B8/9, K394/395 $\kappa\tau\lambda.$ and the juxtaposition with forms of $\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ in K325-326a and N329).³⁶

³² The English language does not really allow a choice of viewpoint: in English, I am told, it is conventional to say: to go from x to y whereas to come from x.

³³ Ibid. 84.

³⁴ Any narrative is, almost necessarily, permeated with egocentric elements of language.

³⁵ See Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 2 vols. to date. Ed. B. Snell. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955- . ad $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ B. Hereafter quoted as LfgrE; Cunliffe, R. J. A Lexikon of the Homeric Dialect. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1924, 21963. ad $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ (1) and (3). Hereafter quoted as Cunliffe.

³⁶ Cf. also $\epsilon 57, \lambda 22, \delta 274/276, 401/403$ $\kappa\tau\lambda.$ and LfgrE ad $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\iota$ B.

But εἶμι also denotes a motion toward speaker or protagonist (in which case we translate it with "to come"). But it does not mean "come" in the terminative sense of ἐλθεῖν or ἰκέσθαι = "to come and reach a certain onlooker". εἶμι denotes rather the (durative) process of "coming".³⁷ Moreover, the simplex εἶμι means "to come" = "to draw near", "to approach a speaker or protagonist" only rarely in the indicative forms (cf. P202, β89, τ571)³⁸, more so in forms outside the indicative (cf. A27, B596, Γ130, K356, Π87, γ257, δ670 κτλ.).³⁹ All forms of εἶμι with the suitable adverbs (cf. δεῦρο, -θεν) and all compounds (here also regular indicative forms) with the suitable preverbs (especially ἐπί and πρός) can be regularly translated with "to come", in character-text and narrator-text.⁴⁰

In the example from the Catalogue of Ships we did not speak of Kommen Deixis because it is in narrator-text (we recall that Deixis points to someone / something outside the linguistic context the reference of which can

³⁷ See Bloch: " ... ist nie das Eintreffen beim Betrachter, sondern nur eine Bewegung auf den Betrachter zu gemeint." Ibid. 45.

³⁸ See LfgrE 1ca, last three entries and Cunliffe (8).

³⁹ See Cunliffe, ad εἶμι (6).

⁴⁰ See Bloch: "Altererbt wird aber auch sein, daß wenigstens die infiniten Formen von ienai in Verbindung mit geeigneten Richtungsadverbien und alle Formen in Komposition mit geeigneten Präverbien den Sinn eines deutschen "kommen" haben können ...". Ibid.44.

be determined only relative to speech participants). Yet, there is something between narrator-text and character-text - what de Jong calls complex narrator-text (see Introduction). Perhaps we should not speak of a focalized Kommen Deixis in the passage from the Catalogue of Ships, but simply of a motion toward the protagonists. But there are examples which drive home the notion of focalized Kommen Deixis very clearly:

ἔλπετο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀποστρέψοντας ἑταίρους
ἐκ Τρώων ἰέναι πάλιν Ἴκτορος ὀτρύναντος.

He thought in his heart there would be friends from among the Trojans / to turn him back, and that Hektor had sped them to summon him again.

[K355-356]

Lattimore (unless he takes ἰέναι for εἶναι or ἔμεναι for which there is no variant in the tradition of the text) omits the verb of motion in "there would be ... from among the Trojans". But clearly the idea in ἐκ Τρώων ἰέναι is "come", not "go" as we see in Schadewaldt's translation: "Denn er hoffte im Mute , es kämen Gefährten von den Troern, / Ihn umkehren zu lassen, weil Hektor ihn zurückbeordert." Strictly speaking, there is no Deixis given that deictics refer to a location relative to that of a speech event. Speech events, however, are either direct or indirect. ἔλπετο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν introduces indirect speech: the action (motion of Trojans from Troy) must be viewed not only as a motion toward the

protagonist in the narrative; the motion is viewed by the protagonist.

A similar example in which a form of εἶμι is viewed by a protagonist in narrator-text occurs a hundred lines later:

“Ὡς ἄρ’ ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψὸς ἀείρας
θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρικήν· δέελον δ’ ἐπὶ σῆμά τ’ ἔθηκε
συμάρψας δόνακας μυρικής τ’ ἐριθηλέας ὄζους,
μὴ λάθοι αὐτίς ἰόντε θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν.

So he (sc. Odysseus) spoke, and lifting the spoils high from him he placed them / upon a tamarisk bush, and piled a clear landmark beside them / pulling reeds together and the long branches of tamarisk / that they (sc. Odysseus and Diomedes) might not miss them on their way back through the swift-running black night.

[K465-68; transl. Lattimore, modified]

Regardless how we translate αὐτίς ἰόντε, it is clearly a motion viewed by Odysseus toward the location he occupies at the time of the thought expressed in the purpose clause. Although the passage is in narrator-text we may nevertheless speak of Kommen Deixis, albeit of focalized Kommen Deixis.

It seems that the Homeric singers shared our “Sprachgefühl” in viewing motions in Gehen Deixis and Kommen Deixis. But did they also have a specific verb or verbs to denote these ideas as there is “gehen” and “kommen” in German or “go” and “come” in English?

As we have seen above (cf. introduction), Létoublon

seems to accept such a Sprachgefühl also on the level of vocabulary. She attributes *Gehen* Deixis for εἶμι. Since there are examples of εἶμι even in the indicative (third person; cf. LfgrE ad εἶμι1α and also α176) where εἶμι is likely to be taken in *Kommen* Deixis Létoublon resorts to a highly speculative argument: she maintains that *Gehen* Deixis of εἶμι can be neutralized (i.e. εἶμι is "neutralisable").

Besides the fact that such a reasoning neglects the non-finite forms, it also distorts the picture by putting Deixis before aspect. That is, when we translate εἶμι with "go" we may not put it first and foremost in contrast with "come" but should think of a beginning of a motion ("losgehen") or the prosecution of a piece of traveling, having in mind rather a contrast with "kommen" in the sense of "ankommen", "arrive". I argue that Place Deixis of εἶμι (in the sense of *Gehen* / *Kommen* Deixis) depends exclusively on the context and is hence accidental. In short, as regards *Gehen* / *Kommen* Deixis εἶμι is a priori neutral.

ἔρχομαι is another verb which we translate either with "go" or "come". It is different from εἶμι in that it has in general present meaning.⁴¹ Also, ἔρχομαι (in

⁴¹ For a good discussion see: Mutzbauer, C. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der Homerische Tempusgebrauch. Ein Beitrag zur Historischen Syntax der Griechischen Sprache. Strassburg. 1893. 272ff.

contrast to εἶμι) can be iterative (cf. A168). But the following passage shows that both verbs are, to a great degree, synonymous:⁴²

εἶμι γὰρ ὀψομένης	Ξ200
τοὺς εἶμ' ὀψομένης	Ξ205
and	
ἔρχομαι ὀψομένης	Ξ301
τοὺς εἶμ' ὀψομένης	Ξ304.

Both verbs of motion (εἶμι and ἔρχομαι) are here in *Gehen* Deixis. Sometimes it is difficult to decide whether ἔρχομαι is viewed in *Gehen* or *Kommen* Deixis. The following example is a case in point:

δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχον προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·	390
"Τηλέμαχ', εἰ δ' ἄγε μοι κάλεσον τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν,	
... ..	
κινήσας δὲ θύρην προσέφη τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν·	
"δεῦρο δὴ ὄρσο, γρηὺ παλαιγενές	395
... ..	
ἔρχεο· κικλήσκει σε πατήρ ἐμός, ὄφρα τι εἴπη."	
ὡς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος,	
ᾧξεν δὲ θύρας μεγάρων εὐ ναιεταόντων,	
βῆ δ' ἴμεν· αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος πρόσθ' ἠγεμόνευεν.	400

Then at last resourceful Odysseus said to Telemachos: / 'Telemachos, come now, summon in the nurse, Eurykleia He (sc. Telemachos) opened the door and called out to the nurse Eurykleia: / 'Rise and come here (Come on, rise?), aged woman Come here (Go in?). My father calls you. He has something to tell you.' / So he spoke, and she had

⁴² εἶμι and ἔρχομαι are perhaps not completely synonymous here either since εἶμι is spoken before Hera set out while ἔρχομαι is spoken with Hera en route.

no winged word for an answer, / but she opened the doors
of the strong built great hall, and went / on inside, but
Telemachos went ahead, leading her.

[χ390-400; transl. Lattimore, modified]

In *δεῦρο δὴ ὄρσο* (395) the adverb *δεῦρο* suggests that Telemakhos, who acts as messenger for Odysseus, imagines himself still inside the hall near Odysseus (unless we assume that the adverb with imperative lost any *Kommen Deixis*). And surely, Telemakhos after receiving the command from Odysseus to summon Eurykleia only opens the door of the hall and calls upon Eurykleia without actually going to her. The absolute *ἔρχεο* (397), consequently, may be viewed by Telemakhos as if it were *δεῦρ' ἔρχεο*, resuming *δεῦρο δὴ ὄρσο* (*Kommen Deixis*).

But the narrator is clearly outside taking his stand from Eurykleia's perspective when he describes Eurykleia's actual entering the hall. *βῆ δ' ἴμεν* which the narrator chooses to use to describe Eurykleia's motion into the hall (400) is used so regularly for "s/he rose his/her foot to go" that there is no way of taking it from a point of view other than Eurykleia's own. Since the narrator takes Eurykleia's perspective it is plausible that in *ἔρχεο* Telemakhos imagines himself also to be with Eurykleia outside the hall. If that is so he views *ἔρχεο* in *Gehen Deixis*.⁴³

ἔρχομαι has only few instances where it is to be

⁴³ See Bloch 45.

viewed unambiguously as Kommen Deixis: see ἤέτιν' ἀγγελίην στρατοῦ ἔκλυεν ἐρχομένοιο (β30 ~ 42): regardless whether we take ἔρχομαι in the meaning "attack" or "return" it is viewed by the speaker as a motion toward him;⁴⁴ see also ἤέτιν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο (varia lectio οἰχομένοιο) α408;⁴⁵ see θ40b-42a: we view this motion as Kommen Deixis although the motion leads toward a place (the speaker's home) where he is not, neither at coding-time nor at reference-time (I will discuss the complexities of normative place (home-base) and Kommen Deixis further below); see ο513-514a: this is also a motion to one's home with speaker not at home either at coding-time or at reference-time; cf. υ367b-368a, K85. ἔρχομαι also has Kommen Deixis in all instances with indication of "unde" (-θεν/prepositional object of παρά + genitive), cf.

ἡ δὲ νέον παρὰ πατρὸς ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος
ἐρχομένη κατ' ἄρ' ἔζεθ'· [θ289-290a]

⁴⁴ "auf dem (=im An-)Marsch ist" in: LfgrE ad ἔρχομαι I 1a. Heubeck, A., S. West and J.B. Hainsworth take it as "attack" A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. 3 vols. 1988-92. Vol.I. Bks. 1-8. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1988. ad loc. against Merry, W. W. and J. Riddell who take it as "return" referring it to the nostos of the Akhaians. Homer's Odyssey. Vol.I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876. Ad loc. Ameis-Hentze favor also the view of an Ithacan detachment returning from Troy. Anhang zu Homer's Odyssey. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1879. 48-49; cf. similarly Stanford, W. B. The Odyssey of Homer. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959². Ad β30.

⁴⁵ "is coming (sc. home)." LfgrE, *ibid.*

Bloch prefers here the rare terminative meaning "ankommen" to "kommen" and, thus, avoids having to take the action of the participle prior to the action of the main verb ("vorzeitig") which would also be very rare.⁴⁶ For other instances of ἔρχομαι with indication of "unde" (-θεν / präpositional object of παρά + genitive), cf. ο156b-159a,⁴⁷ ο428, ω55-56a,⁴⁸ B88.⁴⁹ For ἔρχομαι with indication of "unde" ("to come", "to draw near") note also the compound ἐπ(ι)-έρχομαι, "herkommen".⁵⁰

It is, thus, obvious that ἔρχομαι when marked with certain adverbs and preverbs of direction corresponds to English "come". But in other passages it is clearly used in contrast to that meaning (cf. the opposite meaning of ἐλθεῖν and ἔρχομαι in Γ392b-394a). In other words, ἔρχομαι (like εἶμι) cannot be said to have, a priori, either Gehen

⁴⁶ See p260. Bloch, *ibid.* 51.

⁴⁷ ἔρχομαι has here according to Bloch. 51 also the rare terminative meaning of "ankommen, eintreffen." He takes it in this terminative meaning obviously because of the aorist νοστήσας (ο157). Cf. instead LfgrE ad ἔρχομαι I 5 "komme".

⁴⁸ Cf. before: μήτηρ δ' ἐξ ἁλός ἦλθε ω47.

⁴⁹ See LfgrE ad ἔρχομαι I 1 - I 5. B88 is in narrator-text. There is, strictly speaking, no Deixis since a deictic has as reference a speech situation. In addition, the narrator's eye may be thought of as being inside the hollow rock, watching the bees leaving (*going out*) *from inside*.

⁵⁰ See LfgrE II 5.

Deixis or Kommen Deixis. The way it is viewed depends on each passage.

Let us consider forms of ἐλθεῖν. Verbs with the root *eleuth- mostly have a punctual aspect since the root *eleuth- is an aorist root. It signifies either a motion towards and arrival at the position of an onlooker (speaker, protagonist; "beim Betrachter eintreffen") or a motion away from and arrival at a destination away from the onlooker ("irgendwohin gelangen").⁵¹

Létoublon maintains, however, that ἐλθεῖν denotes a motion toward the onlooker (Kommen Deixis), and has Gehen Deixis only after the Kommen Deixis has been neutralized. Again, such reasoning neglects forms outside the indicative. I quote here a variety of passages, all in character-text and all suggesting that we take ἐλθεῖν in Gehen Deixis:

- (1) οὐ δὲ θάσσον Ἀθηναίη ἐπιτεῖλαι
ἐλθεῖν ἐς Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπιν αἰνῆν Δ64-65
- (2) αἶψα μάλ' ἐς στρατὸν ἐλθὲ μετὰ Τρώας καὶ Ἀχαιούς Δ70
- (3) ὦ φίλοι οὐκ ἂν δὴ τις ἀνὴρ πεπίθοιθ' ἐφ' αὐτοῦ
θυμῷ τολμήεντι μετὰ Τρώας μεγαθύμους
ἐλθεῖν K204-206a
- (4) ἔρχεο νῦν μετὰ φύλα θεῶν, καὶ δεῦρο κάλεσσον
Ἴριν τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα κλυτότοξον,
ὄφρ' ἢ μὲν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
ἔλθῃ⁵² O54-57a

⁵¹ Bloch 52-56.

⁵² Here the context suggests that we take ἔλθῃ in Gehen Deixis

- (5) κείνον μὲν δὴ νηυσὶν ἐπιπροέηκα θοῆσιν
ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀχιλλῆα πόδας ταχύν· οὐδέ μιν οἴω
νῦν ἰέναι μάλα περ κεχολωμένον Ἕκτορι δίῳ: P708-710
- (6) πῶς ἐθέλεις ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἐλθέμεν οἶος Ω203
- (7) πρῶτα μὲν ἐς Πύλον ἐλθὲ καὶ εἴρεο Νέστορα δῖον,
κεῖθεν δὲ Σπάρτηνδε παρὰ ξανθὸν Μενέλαον· α284-285
- (8) νῦν δ' ὅτε δὴ μέγας εἰμί, καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἀκούων
πυνθάνομαι, καὶ δὴ μοι ἀέξεται ἔνδοθι θυμός,
πειρήσω, ὥς κ' ὕμμι κακὰς ἐπὶ κῆρας ἰήλω,
ἢ Πύλονδ' ἐλθὼν ἢ αὐτοῦ τῷδ' ἐνὶ δήμῳ. β314-317
- (9) ἢ καὶ εἰς Ἐφύρην ἐθέλει, πείρασαν ἄρουραν,
ἐλθεῖν β328-29a
- (10) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηὶ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖσ' ἐτάροισιν
ἐλθὼν τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν πειρήσομαι, οἳ τινὲς εἰσιν, ι173-74
- (11a) μερμήριξα δ' ἔπειτα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν
ἐλθεῖν ἢ δὲ πυθέσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἴθοπα καπνόν.
- (11b) ὧδε δέ μοι φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι,
πρῶτ' ἐλθόντ' ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θίνα θαλάσσης
δεῖπνον ἐταίροισιν δόμεναι προέμεν τε πυθέσθαι. κ151-155
- (12) ἀλλὰ καὶ ὦρη
εὔδειν, ἢ ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν ἐλθόντ' ἐς ἐταίρους
ἢ αὐτοῦ λ330b-332a
- (13) καὶ κ' ἐλθὼν πρὸς δώματ' Ὀδυσσεύος θείοιο
ἀγγελίην εἵποιμι περίφρονι Πηνελοπείῃ ο313-14
- (14) καὶ δὴ μ' ἀρᾶται πάλιν ἐλθέμεν ἐκ μεγάροιο τ533
- (15) ἀθρόοι, εἴ κέ μιν οὐδοῦ ἀπώσομεν ἢ δὲ θυράων,
ἐλθόμεν δ' ἀνὰ ἄστρῳ, βοῆ δ' ὄκιστα γένηται· χ76-77⁵³

but ἐλθέμεναι in Kommen Deixis.

Lattimore translates these forms of ἐλθεῖν in all but the examples (1), (11a) and (12) with the verb "go". (1), (11a) and (12) also suggest *Gehen Deixis* with the motion leading away from the speaker. In (11a) and (12) Lattimore simply omits a verb of motion; his translation of ἐλθεῖν in (1) ("visit") is neutral in English as regards *Gehen / Kommen Deixis*. Particularly interesting in terms of *Deixis* and ἐλθεῖν is (5):

κεῖνον μὲν δὴ νηυσὶν ἐπιπροέηκα θοῆσιν
 ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἄχιλλῆα πόδας ταχύν· οὐδέ μιν οἴω
 νῦν ἰέναι μάλα περ κεχολωμένον Ἔκτορι δίῳ:

Now I have sent the man you spoke of (sc. Antilokhos) back to the fast ships / on his way to swift-footed Achilles, yet think not even / he can come now, for all his great anger with Hektor the brilliant.

[P708-710]

ἐλθεῖν in P709 is viewed in *Gehen Deixis* ("on his way to") and εἴμι in the following line in *Kommen Deixis*. This shows that any attempt to categorize Homeric verbs of motion in *Gehen / Kommen Deixis* is a tricky affair. As the examples (1) - (15) above show, it is necessary to examine each occurrence of the verb in its context, examining how it is viewed there by the speaker in character-text or protagonist in complex narrator-text or by the narrator in simple narrator-text. A limitation of

⁵³ See LfgrE ad ἐλθεῖν I.

the verbal material to the indicative forms is arbitrary and not helpful.

Cases like δεῦρ' ἦλυθες (δ810) or δεῦρ' ἐλθέμεν (ε99) on the one hand and κείσ' ἐλθών (ν423, σ339) on the other suggest that forms of *eleuth- acquire either Gehen Deixis or Kommen Deixis depending on each singular context, i.e. these forms are best considered neutral as regards their Gehen / Kommen Deixis. For Létoublon's hypothesis that a verb has one Deixis (either Gehen or Kommen) and is "neutralisable" as regards the other I know no evidence.

It is obvious that an English verb that is neutral in its Deixis but confective in its aspectual character like "arrive" describes ἐλθεῖν better since a phrase like "I arrived there" is clearly seen in Gehen Deixis as is κείσ' ἐλθών while "I came there" is not. Bloch divides εἶμι and ἐλθεῖν along the lines of aspectual character (gehen - kommen, gelangen) rather than along the lines of Gehen / Kommen Deixis. This is simple and convincing.

Place Deixis and Homecoming

Let us now turn to Deixis and Homeric verbs of motion which denote the idea of homecoming. In the introduction I compiled a quite long list of (intransitive) verbs of motion used in Homeric epic. It is likely that this list is incomplete, though negligibly

for present purposes. The first verb of the list is ἀγείρομαι. ἀγείρω in active voice denotes the bringing together of people: "to cause to assemble", in middle and passive voice "to assemble", "to come together".⁵⁴ It also denotes the bringing together of things: "to collect" including the (immaterial?) θυμός.⁵⁵ There is no such phrase as ἀγείρομαι οἴκαδε, ἀγείρομαι πατρίδα γαῖαν etc. which would suggest a homecoming. ἀγείρομαι is, therefore, not relevant for the further discussion on Deixis and the verbs of motion which denote homecoming.

The next verb of the list is αἴσσω. It means "sich aus eigenem Antrieb, eilig, heftig, schnell bewegen", "dahineilen", "stürmen", "to jump", "rush", "fly", "dart" of persons, animals or things.⁵⁶ I found one passage in which a form of αἴσσω might express something resembling the idea of homecoming:

ὄσσάκι δ' ὀρμήσειε πυλάων Δαρδανιάων
 ἀντίον αἴζασθαι εὐδμήτους ὑπὸ πύργους,
 εἶ πως οἱ καθύπερθεν ἀλάλκοιεν βελέεσσι,
 τοσσάκι μιν προπάροιθεν ἀποστρέψασκε παραφθᾶς
 πρὸς πεδίον· αὐτὸς δὲ ποτὶ πτόλιος πέτετ' αἰεὶ.

If ever he (sc. Hektor) made a dash right on for the gates of Dardanos / to get quickly under the strong-built bastions, endeavouring / that they from above with missiles thrown might somehow defend him, / each time

⁵⁴ See LfgrE ad ἀγείρω I and II.

⁵⁵ See LfgrE ad ἀγείρω III a) 1.

⁵⁶ See LfgrE and Cunliffe ad αἴσσω.

Achilleus would get in front and force him to turn back / into the plain, and himself kept his flying course along the city side.

[transl. Lattimore, modified; X194-198]

This passage is in simple narrator-text. There is no Deixis. Whether Hektor's attempt to reach the gates of Troy should be interpreted in terms of homecoming (parallel to the way we view the homecoming of the Akhaians or their discussions concerning homecoming) is a question to which I shall return.

There are many verbs of motion which have no relevance whatsoever for the homecoming theme. Therefore I will not go through each single verb of the compiled list. Only a small fraction of these verbs is used in connection with adverbs (e.g. οἴκαδε, οἴκόνδε, ἐνθάδε, δεῦρο), prepositional phrases (e.g. φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν) or absolutely to denote homecoming. Obviously the bard(s) felt no need for a vast pool of verbs to express this idea. These are the most common verbs in the Iliad to convey the idea of homecoming:

βαίνω:	cf. A221; H413; M16 etc. ⁵⁷
φεύγω:	cf. B140 = I27; B159; 175 etc.
εἶμι:	cf. A170 = P155; A179; B348 etc.
ικάνω:	cf. A19 = Ω287; Δ171; I363; 414 etc.
<u>(ἀπο)νοστήω</u>	cf. A60; B253; E157; Θ499=M115; P207 etc.

⁵⁷ There are 346 occurrences of this verb in the Iliad. Of these only a tiny fraction is relevant for the homecoming theme. Cf. LfgrE ad loc.

(ἀπο)νέεσθαι: cf. B290 = 354 = 357 = Γ390 = Δ397 = Φ229;
B453-454 = Λ13-14; Γ313 = Ω330 etc.⁵⁸

There are some more verbs.⁵⁹ These are, however, not common to convey the idea of homecoming. The list of verbs which denote the idea of homecoming in the Odyssey looks similar to that of the Iliad. The main differences are these:

1. βαίνω⁶⁰ only twice denotes the idea of homecoming (ε107-108; ξ241-242). The passages where the verb is used with a marker like οἰκόνδε⁶¹ do not point to the homecoming-theme. There is a difference between

⁵⁸ All but one instances of the compound ἀπονέομαι in Homeric epic (ο308 is discussed in chapter three) have the meaning "go back". It is used with overt specification (i.e. with spatial deictic markers) for motions back to Troy and to the Akhaian camp, never for Akhaians to go to Akhaia. Whether ἀπονέομαι used with destination only implied (i.e. used without any spatial markers) refers (in the context of Akhaians) to "homecoming" or to return to the ships / camp is a delicate question dealt with in detail in chapters four and five.

⁵⁹ ἀλύσκω (K348), ἀποπλείω (which is "singulāres Iteratum" [see Ramersdorfer, H. Singuläre Iterata der Ilias. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, Vol. 137. Königstein/Ts.: Hain, 1981.] (I418=685), ἔπομαι (I428=691), ἔρχομαι (Z86; 187; X56), οἴχομαι (H460=O499), πίπτω (Z82), (ἀνα)χωρέω (K210=411; N724) and some verbal forms of the root *eleuth- (Γ393; Z254; 365; H415; 416; Ξ504; Φ46; 62; 81; Ω556).

⁶⁰ There are 318 instances of this verb in the Odyssey. See LfgrE ad loc.

⁶¹ α360=φ354; α424; γ396=η229=v17; ψ292.

"homecoming" and "going home", i.e. going into the house (οἶκος) to bed. In all these passages of βαίνω + οἶκόνδε "home" is used in the meaning "house". And all these passages are in narrator-text (for a detailed discussion of these passages see further below).

2. Verbal forms of the root *eleuth-⁶² are, in contrast to the Iliad, very commonly used in the Odyssey to convey the idea of homecoming. Of special importance is the future ἐλεύσ-⁶³, the aorist system⁶⁴ and the perfect system.⁶⁵ In the Iliad there are relatively few passages where verbal forms of the root *eleuth- convey the idea of homecoming. In the Odyssey there are many, and often these are used absolutely, i.e. without any spatial marker.⁶⁶

In the remainder of this chapter I will, first, clarify how we can be sure that a verb when used

⁶² There are 349 instances of ἐλθεῖν in the Iliad and 463 in the Odyssey. see LfgrE ad loc.

⁶³ See LfgrE I 1.

⁶⁴ LfgrE ad ἐλθεῖν I 3. Cf. the formula ἦλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν (π206=τ484=φ208=ω321). Cf. also the traditional phrase ἀποτείσεται ἐλθών which is used for Odysseus' homecoming (and revenge) in γ216b=ε24b=λ118b=π255b=ω480.

⁶⁵ See LfgrE ad ἐλθεῖν I 2.

⁶⁶ Like the adverb οἶκαδε or some other prepositional phrase indicating homecoming. Strictly speaking the notion "used absolutely" does of course not apply for the verbs (of motion) in character-text since such a verb although used absolutely is related (and points) to the speaker. Nevertheless, I use the term "used absolutely" as it is conventionally used.

absolutely denotes the idea of homecoming. Then, I will resume the discussion of *Gehen / Kommen Deixis*. I will introduce the term "normative location" (i.e. "home-base") and show that this concept (like that of *Gehen / Kommen Deixis*) is not simply transferable onto Homeric Greek either. Then I will retreat one step from the problematic *Gehen / Kommen* debate and show the importance of *Place Deixis* in general for the homecoming theme in the stories of the Homeric epics.

Come is Come Home

If the speech participants are on Ithaca and the subject matter is Odysseus a verb of motion with confective aspectual character (like *ἔλθειν*) alone (i.e. without any spatial marker) very likely refers to Odysseus' arrival (i.e. homecoming). The following example shows this very clearly:

"ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ δὴ πάμπαν ἀναίνεαι οὐδ' ἔτι φῆσθα
κείνον ἐλεύσεσθαι, θυμὸς δέ τοι αἰὲν ἄπιστος·

Dear friend, since you are altogether full of denial, / you do not think he will come, and your heart is ever untrusting.

[ξ149-50]

The speech event is on Ithaca; the still unrecognized beggar (Odysseus) is the speaker, Eumaios the addressee.

With κείνον referring to Odysseus ἐλεύσεσθαι is anchored clearly enough. In addition, all of Eumaios' previous speech expressed doubt about Odysseus' homecoming. The force of the aspect, the speech situation (suggesting Kommen Deixis) and the larger context all help to anchor firmly the destination in the absolutely used ἐλεύσεσθαι. In addition, almost all forms of the future of *eleuth- (infinitive ἐλεύσεσθαι and indicative ἐλεύσεται) refer to homecoming and the vast majority of those to Odysseus' homecoming.⁶⁷

ἐλθεῖν is - in contrast to ἰκέσθαι⁶⁸ - often used without any destination overtly specified (i.e. without any spatial marker), not only in the future system but also in the perfect (cf. χ45, τ549)⁶⁹ and aorist system (cf. for indicative ψ7=27^{in.}, ψ55; for subjunctive α76b-77a, τ84; for optative α403, ι534, ξ56, ξ171b-172a, π100b-101a κτλ.; for infinitive σ402, ρ509; for participle α255 ~ σ254^{in.} = τ127 κτλ.)⁷⁰ All these examples are from the Odyssey and almost all about the nostos of Odysseus.⁷¹

⁶⁷ The traditional phrase νόστον θ', ὡς ἐπὶ πόντον ἐλεύσομαι ἰχθυόεντα and its modification νόστον θ', ὡς ἐπὶ πόντον ἐλεύσεται ἰχθυόεντα is used for Menelaos (cf. δ380; 390=424; 470). It is also used once for Odysseus: κ540 (=δ390=424). Almost all the other occurrences of the future ἐλεύσ- are used with and without spatial marker to convey Odysseus' homecoming (cf. for future infinitive α168; β176; ν132; ξ150 κτλ., and for third person singular ξ161=τ306; ξ167 κτλ.).

⁶⁸ See LfgrE ad ἰκάνω B.

⁶⁹ See also γ318 of Menelaos' nostos and LfgrE I 1.

⁷⁰ LfgrE ad ἐλθεῖν I 3.

Most of these passages with *eleuth- denoting homecoming are in character-text (i.e. homecoming is not acted out in terms of motion but takes place in speech).⁷²

ικάνω / ικέσθαι is - in contrast to ἐλθεῖν - only infrequently used absolutely, i.e. without any overt destination. I cite here the few cases: A 166, I 197, K 118, K 142, Λ 610, Σ 532, ε 448, ζ 136, λ 104, μ 66, ο 201, ψ 151.⁷³

Three of these passages imply a homecoming:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| (1) ἀλλ' ἔτι μὲν κε καὶ ὦς, κακά περ πάσχοντες, ἴκοισθε | λ 104 |
| (2) ἐμὲ δὲ χρεῶ θᾶσσον ικέσθαι | ο 201b |
| (3) εἶος ἴκοιτο. | ψ 151b |

The first is from Teiresias' speech in the underworld. The speech itself is a short version of the Odyssey. Teiresias tells a nostos as he makes clear with the first word of his speech (λ 100). It is therefore not difficult to take ἴκοισθε in λ 104 in the meaning "to reach home" especially in view of the repetition of the verb with the destination overtly specified (εἰς Ἴθάκην ... ἴκοισθε in λ 111).

The second is in a speech in which Telemakhos addresses Peisistratos, Nestor's son, before their parting in Elis.

⁷¹ The exceptions are only very few, cf. γ 188 / 190 (nostos of the Myrmidons and Philoktetes), γ 194 (nostos of Agamemnon), γ 318 (nostos of Menelaos); γ 234 (of a nostos generally).

⁷² The two which are not (α 115 and ω 237) are in complex narrator-text with focalized Kommen Deixis.

⁷³ Many of these passages describe figuratively the "arriving of compulsion" (χρεῖώ / χρεῶ); see A 166; K 118; K 142; Λ 610; ζ 136.

Cunliffe translates *ικέσθαι* in ο201b as "to be off" taking it in an ingressive aspect.⁷⁴ Nothing prevents us from taking *ικέσθαι* here rather in a meaning ("reach home") which correlates with its confective aspect. Book 15 of the *Odyssey* treats the issue of Telemakhos' homecoming from the beginning (cf. νόστου ὑπομνήσουσα καὶ ὀτρυνέουσα νέεσθαι. ο3; cf. ἤδη γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐέλδεται οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι. ο66; cf. ἰέμενον νόστοιο· ο69a; cf. βούλομαι ἤδη νείσθαι ἐφ' ἡμέτερ'· ο88; cf. Τηλέμαχ', ἦ τοι νόστον, ὅπως φρεσὶ σῆσι μενοινᾶς, / ὡς τοι Ζεὺς τελέσειεν ο111-112a and αἶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὡς / νοστήσας Ἰθάκηνδε κυχῶν Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ / εἵποιμ', ὡς παρὰ σεῖο τυχῶν φιλότητος ἀπάσης / ἔρχομαι ο156b-159a). The confective *ικέσθαι* fits right in this series of verbal expressions conveying the idea of Telemakhos' return home. It is thus no problem to understand *θάσσον ἰκέσθαι* here as a brachylogical expression for *ικέσθαι* + spatial marker denoting homecoming. The omission of spatial marker is nevertheless exceptional since the destination of *ικέσθαι* is regularly overtly specified.⁷⁵

In the third, *ἴκοιτο* is used absolutely. This is again in character-text, an utterance by some Ithacan outside

⁷⁴ Ad *ικνέομαι* (1) (a).

⁷⁵ Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. 3 vols. 1988-92. Vol.II. Books IX-XVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. remark ad ο201: "*ικέσθαι*: the omission of *οἴκαδε* is unusual and suggests haste on the part of Telemachus ...".

Odysseus' palace after he hears music from within:

ἦ μάλα δὴ τις ἔγημε πολυμνήστην βασίλειαν·
 σχετλίη, οὐδ' ἔτλη πόσιος οὐ κουριδίου
 εἶρυσθαι μέγα δῶμα διαμπερές, εἰὸς ἵκοιτο.

Surely now someone has married our much-sought-after /
 queen; hard-hearted, she had no patience to keep the
 great house / for her own wedded lord to the end, till he
 came back to her.

[ψ149-151]

As ἔτλη echoes σχετλίη so ἵκοιτο recalls δῶμα . Because of
 the juxtaposition of δῶμα and ἵκοιτο the meaning of
 (Odysseus') homecoming is easily conveyed despite the
 absolute usage of ἰκέσθαι. These are the only instances
 where forms of ἰκάνω / ἰκέσθαι convey the idea of homecoming
 when used absolutely. Otherwise these verbs carry the
 meaning "homecoming" with the destination overtly
 specified.⁷⁶

We may conclude: verbal forms of ἰκέσθαι, when used
 absolutely, are understood to convey the meaning
 homecoming because they are firmly anchored in a context
 which points to the very idea. The context is each time
 character-text: λ104 and ο201 are part of a speech event
 away from Ithaca, ψ151 is part of an utterance in Ithaca.
 The passages with *eleuth- denoting homecoming (without
 any spatial marker) are also almost all in character-

⁷⁶ Among "overtly specified" I count also cases like, e.g., the
 dative of the personal pronoun (ὡς σφῶν ἐλδομένοισιν ἰκάνω# φ209).

text: homecoming is not acted out in terms of motion but takes place in speech.

Gehen / Kommen Deixis and Home Base

Most of the speech events where forms of *eleuth- denote homecoming are on Ithaca but not all (cf. ε24=ω480, ι534, κ522, λ118; cf. also for ικέσθαι without spatial marker λ104 and ο201; for examples of ικέσθαι + spatial marker outside Akhaia (i.e. before Troy) cf. A19, Δ171 κτλ.). In English all of these examples (including those where the speech event takes place somewhere away from Ithaca) are probably best described with the verb "come (home)" which suggests Kommen Deixis.

But why should we assume that, e.g., Teiresias (λ100ff.) or Polephemos (ι528ff.) view Odysseus' motion home from Ithaca (Kommen Deixis) and not from their present location toward Ithaca (Gehen Deixis)? I argued before that the assumption of Kommen Deixis is a safe assumption only when the context points to it. There is no such indicator in, e.g., Polyphemos' prayer:

ἀλλ' εἴ οἱ μοῖρ' ἐστὶ φίλους τ' ἰδέειν καὶ ἰκέσθαι
οἶκον ἐκτίμενον καὶ ἐὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
ὄψε' κακῶς ἔλθοι, ὀλέσας ἅπο πάντας ἐταίρους,
νηὸς ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίας, εὖροι δ' ἐν πῆματα οἴκῳ.'

But if it is decided that he shall see his own people, / and reach his strong-founded house and his own country, /

let him arrive late, in bad case, with the loss of all his companions, / in someone else's ship, and find trouble in his household.

[1532-35; transl. Lattimore, modified]

There is no danger that we lose sight of Polyphemos' location when he utters this prayer to Poseidon: he stands there on the edge of his island observing how Odysseus and his companions manage to get away. He mentions Ithaca, Odysseus' "normal" location, but without adding that person x on Ithaca expects Odysseus' coming (i.e. without adapting another fellow's point of view). He focuses on the homeward journey, on the loss of Odysseus' companions and his arrival on someone else's ship. All this points to a motion which leads away from the speaker (Gehen Deixis).

We recall that we glossed "come" as motion toward the speaker's or addressee's location at either coding time or reference time. But this is still incomplete. There is a deictic usage of "come" which is not based on the speech participants' actual location but on their normative location what is also referred to as home base.⁷⁷ One can use "come" in English in the following statement:

I came over to your house several times but you were never there.

⁷⁷ See Fillmore 67. Levinson 84.

Here neither speaker nor addressee are at the addressee's house, neither at the time this statement is made (coding time, time of speech event) nor at the time this statement refers to (reference time). They are not at the house at coding time since *there* contrasts with the *here* of the speech participants, locating the utterance away from the addressee's house. They were not at the house at reference time either. The addressee was not at the house since he *was never there*. The speaker was not at the house since he *came*. He is unlikely to be there and come, or arrive, there at the same time.

I doubt that (as with Kommen Deixis) the notion of home base can be imposed wholesale on Homeric Greek. I just quoted speech events in which forms of *ικέσθαι* or *ἔλθειν* are used to denote homecoming with the speech event away from Odysseus' (or the Akhaians') home. If we adopt the notion of home base we should take all these as examples of Kommen Deixis. I think this is not necessary, since such reasoning neglects the force of the aspect. When we translate (*οἶκαδ' ἰκέσθαι*) with "to reach home", "to come home" we do not necessarily stress Kommen Deixis versus Gehen Deixis but the confective aspect ("ankommen") versus the infective ("losgehen").

The same is valid for forms of **eleuth-*. There is no reason to assume different Deixis in, e.g., ε220 and Z365 simply on the basis of English or German Sprachgebrauch. Why should we assume that Odysseus' home

is his home base whereas Hektor's house is not? I think it is only logical to see both the motion in ε219-220 (ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἐθέλω καὶ ἐέλδομαι ἥματα πάντα / οἴκαδέ τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἦμαρ ιδέσθαι) and Z365-66 (καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν οἶκόνδε ἐλεύσομαι⁷⁸ ὄφρα ἴδωμαι / οἰκῆας ἄλοχόν τε φίλην καὶ νήπιον υἱόν.) in *Gehen Deixis*.⁷⁹

The notion of home base (like that of deictic center) makes sense if it is suggested by context. The other fellow's point of view and focalized *Kommen Deixis* is clearly suggested in an example like this:

ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νοστήσαντα
δέξεται ἐν μεγάροισι γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς
οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα κατέξει.

since I (sc. Akhilleus) shall never come home, and my father, / Peleus the aged rider, will not welcome me in his great house, / nor Thetis my mother, but in this place the earth will receive me.

[Σ330b-332]

Here the motion is seen (focalized) by Akhilleus' parents as a motion toward them and their location (*Kommen Deixis*) rather than by Akhilleus as a motion away from his present location.⁸⁰

A mixture of *Gehen Deixis* and *Kommen Deixis* is suggested in the following example:

⁷⁸ The vulgate reads οἶκον ἐσελεύσομαι.

⁷⁹ Contra Létoublon 74.

⁸⁰ For other (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses, see chapter four.

Σπερχεΐ' ἄλλως σοί γε πατήρ ἠρήσατο Πηλεὺς
 κείσέ με νοστήσαντα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν
 σοί τε κόμην κερέειν ρέξειν θ' ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην ...

Spercheios, it was vain that Peleus my father vowed to
 you / that there, when I had won home to the beloved land
 of my fathers, / I would cut my hair for you and make you
 a grand and holy / sacrifice ...

[Ψ144-46]

Here the river Sperkheios is the addressee. Akhilleus' motion home is focalized by Peleus (and Sperkheios?) in Kommen Deixis. At the same time, κείσέ in κείσέ με νοστήσαντα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν points to a motion which is viewed by Akhilleus in Gehen Deixis.

In conclusion it is fair to assume that it is not the notion of deictic center or home base which the verbs ἰκάνω, ἔλθειν and νοστεῖν have in common when denoting homecoming. All three verbs allow the motion they describe to be interpreted as both Gehen Deixis and Kommen Deixis. What these verbs have in common (and what is always part of their Gehen/Kommen Deixis) is that the motion they describe includes arrival. In short, what these verbs have in common is their confective aspectual character.

Place Deixis and Postpositive -δε

In the last part of this chapter I wish to retreat from *Gehen/Kommen* Deixis one step and look at the larger picture of Place Deixis in general. We recall that spatial deictics denote a location which is relative to that of a speech event. My observation is that in Homer verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming have a tendency to be in character-text. My hypothesis is that in Homer verbs and verbal expressions which denote homecoming have a tendency to be spatial deictics. Let us first look at the following three examples in English:

(1) I came home.

(2) You came home.

(3) She came home.

"I" and "You" are (Person) deictics. Statements (1) and (2) are (unless the narrator addresses the reader directly, and unless "You" stands for "one") necessarily in character-text. Example (3) could also be an utterance made by a speaker, or it could be part of a narrator-text provided that "She" has been mentioned before or is otherwise known (unstressed she). "She" in (3) acquires Person Deixis if it is stressed by a speaker (stressed she). The expression "came home" (like the unstressed "she") does not give any information which would contribute to the speech situation, i.e. to the

location of the speech participants, in (1), (2) or stressed (3). The statements (1), (2) and stressed (3) could be made *anywhere*. If home itself, however, is accompanied by a gesture, i.e. if home refers not only to what each subject of (1), (2) or (3) refers to but also to a place which the speaker points to (with the speaker being at home or away from home) home is both anaphoric (reflexive) and deictic (Place Deixis), as we earlier saw that "there" is both anaphoric and deictic in the sentence "I was born in London and have lived there ever since" (p.29).

οἰκόνδε or οἴκαδε in Homeric epic tend to be spatial deictics, perhaps a residue from a proto-language in which presumably these utterances were deictics. Hooker is clearly not right when he denies any deictic function for adverbs like οἰκόνδε.⁸¹ Hooker tries to find reasons to discredit the view held by, among others, Schwyzer and Frisk that postpositive -δε in, e.g., οἰκόνδε and ὄδε might be identical.⁸² One argument Hooker uses to prove an

⁸¹ Hooker, J.T. "Postpositive -δε". Indogermanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik and allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. 70 (1965): 165.

⁸² "ὄδε ... mit 'Ich' - Deixis ist bezeugt seit Homer in den meisten Dialekten (nicht im Thessalischen). Das enklitische -δε erinnert an οἰκόνδε u. ä., bei denen die Richtungsbedeutung schon im Kasus lag, -δε vielleicht 'hier', nicht 'hin' bedeutete. Schwyzer, *ibid.* Vol. I. 611-12. "-δε lokale (deiktische) Postposition mit richtungsbezeichnendem Akkusativ, ursprünglich -δέ akzentuiert, dann zum Unterschied von -δε 'aber' als Enklitikon behandelt."

independent "lative -δε" ("marker of direction") versus a "deictic -δε" ("emphatic particle") is his claim that οἰκόνδε is never deictic, ὄδε always. But it is evident that οἰκόνδε can be deictic when stressed, i.e. it is very likely that (in a speech event) the speaker accompanies his utterance with an emphatic gesture. And ὄδε, although very often pointing to a location relative to that of a speaker, is (contra Hooker) not always part of a speech event. In O699 (τοῖσι δὲ μαρναμένοισιν ὄδ' ἦν νόος·) and B5=K17=Ξ161 (ἦδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή) τοῖσι and ἦδε are in narrator-text, hence non-deictic but proleptic or anaphoric in the sense that they refer to another word in the sentence.⁸³ This does not, of course, pose any problem since - as we saw - the same word can be both deictic and anaphoric (non-deictic).

Chantraine, although grouping nouns with postpositive -δὲ (such as ἄλλα δὲ, νῆα δὲ, οἴκαδε κτλ.) under the heading "Au sens latif", remarks on the adverbs ἐνθαδε

Frisk, H. Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. 2 vols. 1960-1970. Vol.I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1960. ad -δε.

⁸³ The Latin word "demonstrative pronoun" is, strictly speaking, inaccurate. "The Greek Grammarians divided the Pronouns (ἀντωνυμῖαι) into δεικτικαί 'pointing' and ἀναφορικαί 'referring' or 'repeating.' These words have given us, through the Roman grammarians, the modern terms Demonstrative and Relative; but the meaning, as often happens in such cases, has undergone a considerable change." Monro, D. B. A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect. Philadelphia: William H. Allen · Bookseller, 21992. 215.

[sic] and ἔνθενδε [sic]: "Les adverbes ἔνθαδε et ἔνθενδε <<ici>> et <<d'ici>>, à coté de ἔνθα et ἔνθεν sont homériques. On serait tenté d'y voir le -δε latif, mais -δε γ est en réalité une particule démonstrative."⁸⁴

Chantraine's statement that -δε in ἔνθαδε and ἔνθενδε is "in reality" demonstrative means that it (always) points to a location relative to the location of speech participants; i.e -δε in ἔνθαδε and ἔνθενδε is (always) deictic. This is a clear example which proves not only that lative -δε and deictic -δε may (in certain instances) be considered identical but also that, e.g., Chantraine's grouping of οἴκαδε under the heading "Au sens latif" is pretty arbitrary.

I hold that the ratio of οἴκαδε between character-text and narrator-text (74:3) is not merely accidental. The identity of postpositive -δε in ὄδε and οἴκαδε would explain such a distribution. It suggests that οἴκαδε denotes a location relative to the location of a speech event, with οἴκαδε pointing either to a motion which leads toward one or all speech participants ("da, hierher, hither, to this place"), or to a motion which leads away from one or all speech participants ("da, dorthin, thither, to that place") or to a motion from point A to B with both A and B away from the location of the speech

⁸⁴ Chantraine, P. Grammaire Homérique. 2 vols. 1948-53. Vol. I. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948. 247.

participants ("von da nach dorthin, from that place to that place").

οἴκαδε in narrator-text must, then, be regarded marked. The passages where *οἴκαδε* is in narrator-text are β343; v121; B154. β343 is in complex narrator-text representing Telemakhos' point of view about Odysseus' homecoming.⁸⁵ B154 is similar.⁸⁶ But v121 is clearly in simple narrator-text. It is the narrator's description of Odysseus' actual (physical) homecoming from Skheria to Ithaca.⁸⁷ This passage would suggest that *οἴκαδε* here has no Place Deixis. But perhaps *οἴκαδε* is used here unconventionally by the narrator (in narrator-text) because it points to the narrator not being on Ithaca and expecting the homecoming of Odysseus (Kommen Deixis) but "going" with Odysseus (Gehen Deixis).

The ratio for *οἰκόνδε* in character-text : narrator-text = 20:15. This proportion does not seem nearly as

⁸⁵ ὁ δ' [sc. Telemakhos] ὑπόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσεται πατρός,
εὐρύν, ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο
ἑσθῆς τ' ἐν χηλοῖσιν ἄλις τ' εὐῶδες ἔλαιον.
ἐν δὲ πίθοι οἴνοιο παλαιοῦ ἠδυπότοιο
ἔστασαν, ἄκρητον θεῖον ποτὸν ἐντὸς ἔχοντες,
ἔξείης ποτὶ τοῖχον ἀρηρότες, εἴ ποτ' Ὀδυσσεὺς
οἴκαδε νοστήσειε καὶ ἄλγεα πολλὰ μογήσας. [β337-43]

⁸⁶ B152-56 will be discussed in detail in chapter four.

⁸⁷ οἱ δ' [sc. the Phaiacians] ἐκ νηὸς βάντες ἐνζύγου ἠπειρόνδε
πρῶτον Ὀδυσσῆα γλαφυρῆς ἐκ νηὸς ἄειραν
αὐτῷ σύν τε λίνῳ καὶ ῥήγῃ σιγαλόεντι,
καὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ ψαμάθῳ ἔθεσαν δεδημένον ὕπνῳ,
ἐκ δὲ κτήματ' ἄειραν, ἃ οἱ Φαίηκες ἀγαυοὶ
ᾤπασαν οἴκαδ' ἰόντι διὰ μεγάθυμον Ἀθήνην. [v116-121]

cogent as that of οἴκαδε. Considering the passages in narrator-text, however, we see that they refer to a motion home to go to bed or to do other things in the house: cf.

οἱ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος	A606=γ396=η229
	=ν17-α424
ἄλοχος δὲ φίλη οἰκόνδε βεβήκει	Z495
ἡ μὲν θαμβήσασα πάλιν οἰκόνδε βεβήκει	α360=φ354
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἄρ' ἔμελλε πάλιν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι	ζ110
γρηῦς μὲν κείουσα πάλιν οἰκόνδε βεβήκει	ψ292

It seems that the notion of homecoming is to be distinguished from a motion home to do things in the house (like going to bed). Consequently, I somewhat modify my thesis: I submit that οἰκόνδε, οἴκαδε and any other expression in Homeric epic when denoting homecoming tend to be spatial deictics.

Let us look at the other five instances of οἰκόνδε in narrator-text. The passages are: Ψ229, Ω581, α17, ν125, ω418:

Ψ229: the narrator describes the homecoming of Boreas and Zephyros after they lit Patroklos' pyre. The narrator in general describes the homecoming of the gods: although such motions are often "viewed" by the gods themselves⁸⁸ and even by mortals⁸⁹ it is the narrator

⁸⁸ See A425; E360; Θ12 κτλ.

⁸⁹ But not with verbs in a past tense describing an actual motion of gods. Motions of gods to Olympos are either "imagined"

who describes (actual) motions of gods to Olympos, using a past tense.⁹⁰ It is also the narrator who depicts the gods' retirement (when they go home to go to sleep).⁹¹

Ω581: this line refers to a motion of Priam from Akhilleus' hut back to Troy. Now, whether motions of Trojans from the battlefield or the Akhaian camp back to Troy should be regarded as homecomings is a delicate question which I discuss in detail in chapter four. Common sense perhaps tells us that all of the Troad (including the area of the battlefield and the Akhaian camp) belongs to the Trojans; hence that any motions of Trojans from there back to the city should not be viewed (and are not viewed) in terms of homecoming but similarly to motions back home to do things in the house. Lack of a (deictic) spatial marker like (φίλην ἐς) πατρίδα γαίαν, which is never used for motions of Trojans back to Troy, would confirm such a view. On the other hand, the similar usage of vocabulary and traditional phrases for Akhaian and Trojan motions home (cf. οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι (A19; Ω287) or μή πρίν...πρίν clauses (B354-56; Ξ45-47) which suggest a return home only after total destruction of the city by mortals to take place in the (near) future (A394) or the gods' discourse on such activity has "somehow" become common knowledge (see Agamemnon's focalization of Zeus' oath that Ate never return to Olympos in T128-129).

⁹⁰ See A494; 532; E367; 868; Θ410; 439 κτλ.

⁹¹ See A606.

enemy) intimate that the motions of both Akhaians and Trojans back home should be viewed in terms of homecoming.

The other three passages in simple narrator-text (α17, v125, ω418) refer apparently to homecoming. That is why we can only speak of a tendency to Place Deixis in relation to the homecoming theme. The instances of οἰκόνδε or οἴκαδε in simple narrator-text are marked (see α17 which is part of the prooimion of the Odyssey in which the narrator's "I" is prominent (α1)).

In closing this chapter I wish to consider briefly why it is that not only οἰκόνδε or οἴκαδε with postpositive -δε (cf. Φθίηνδε, δόμονδε κτλ.) tend to be in character-text but likewise also most expressions denoting homecoming ((φίλην ἐς) πατρίδα γαῖαν κτλ.). A possible diachronic scenario might be this: οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι is a phrase very common in the Iliadic tradition to denote homecoming. Since νέεσθαι is used in Homer simply with the meaning "to go" (cf. ξ261, σ186=χ434=496) οἰκόνδε in οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι is best regarded the nucleus of the phrase with νέεσθαι being a peripheral supplement.⁹² οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι became so

⁹² The expressions nucleus and periphery have been introduced in some new studies on versification which elaborate and improve Parry's notion of generative formula: cf. Visser, E. "Formulae or single words? Towards a new Theory in Homeric Verse-Making." Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft. NS 14 (1988): 21-37; Bakker, E.J. and F. Fabbricotti. "Peripheral and nuclear semantics in homeric diction. The case of dative expressions for

familiar an expression in the oral tradition that *véσθαι* on its own sufficed to denote the idea of homecoming (as is reflected in B291, 298 κτλ.). In short, *véσθαι* became nuclear but kept its Place Deixis (denoting homecoming relative to a speech event). It may, then, have been extended to the compound *ἀπονέεσθαι* and other forms of the root *nos/nes.⁹³

'spear'." *Mnemosyne* 44 (1991): 63-84; Bakker, E.J. and N. van den Houten. "Aspects of synonymy in homeric diction." *Classical Philology* 87 (1992): 1-13.

⁹³ Hoekstra assumes that *ἀπο* in *ἀπονέεσθαι* developed from the epithet *αἰπύ* and explains the lengthening of *α* in *ἀπονέεσθαι* diachronically thus: from *πρὸτὶ Ἴλιον αἰπὺ δῖεσθαι* and **πρὸτὶ Ἴλιον αἰπὺ νέεσθαι* > *πρὸτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι*. Hoekstra, A. "Metrical Lengthening and Epic Diction." *Mnemosyne*. 31 (1978): 15-23. For Wyatt, W. F. Jr. *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1969. 84-87. explaining the lengthening of *α* in *ἀπονέεσθαι* as a result of (long) *α*-privativum + *πονέεσθαι*, I refer to chapter five.

CHAPTER THREE

THE HOMECOMING THEME IN THE ODYSSEY

Die Heimkehr des Odysseus
(Wilamowitz)

In the previous chapter the observation was that the homecoming theme appears much more often in character-text than narrator-text; that is, the homecoming theme is much more often acted out in speech than merely described as an event in narrative. The hypothesis was that expressions with postpositive $-\delta\epsilon$, in particular those denoting homecoming, are a residue from a proto-language in which these expressions were perhaps exclusively deictic and developed for communication between speaker and addressee.

In this chapter the focus is on the homecoming theme in the Odyssey. The goal is to find additional reasons for the phenomenon that the homecoming theme is represented in face-to-face communication of characters (character-text) much more often than in narrator-text. Obviously, expressions with, e.g., οἴκαδε are not (or no

longer) considered exclusively deictic since they do occur in narrator-text (where οἴκαδε is marked).⁹⁴

The Homeric singer / narrator had obviously the choice of presenting the homecoming theme either in character-text or in narrator-text. I shall argue that the device of putting it in character-text enables the narrator to describe how the return of the heroes (in particular the return of Odysseus) is experienced in the minds of different characters and acted out in direct speech. The narrator could, of course, represent this experience of the characters by simply describing what is going on in their minds. After all, we are not in the genre of tragedy where everything is in character-text. But he does not. And we should ask why.

The representation of the homecoming theme through the "eye" of characters who give their point of view in direct speech has several advantages to a (possible) representation in (simple) narrator-text:

1. topographical accounts become more vivid.
2. the homecoming theme tends to be emotional and points to the emotions of the speech participants. In character-text the Homeric (narrator and) singer (who tends to be self-effacing, unemotional, objective) can simply "let go".
3. the homecoming theme points to "zero degree emotion" and, hence, to ambiguity and irony.

⁹⁴ On markedness, see the discussion in the previous chapter.

Vividness of Topographical Account

In 121-27 Odysseus describes Ithaca, his hometown/island to Alkinoos and the other Phaiacians who listen to his story:

ναιετάω δ' Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον· ἐν δ' ὄρος αὐτῆ,
 Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἀριπρεπές· ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι
 πολλαὶ ναιετάουσι μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλησι,
 Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος.
 αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλὴ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἀλὶ κεῖται
 πρὸς ζόφον, αἰ δέ τ' ἄνευθε πρὸς ἥω τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
 τρηχεῖ', ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος·

I am at home at sunny Ithaca. There is a mountain /
 there that stands tall, leaf-trembling Neritos, and there
 are islands / settled around it, lying one very close to
 another. / There is Doulichion and Same, wooded
 Zakynthos, / but my island lies low, furthest out to sea,
 / toward the dark (west), with the rest below facing east
 and sunshine, / a rugged place, but a good nurse of men.

[121-27; transl. Lattimore, modified]

The islands in the Ionian sea west of the Greek coast are
 (from north to south) Leukas, Ithaca, (northeast of)
Cephalenia and Zakynthos. If we identify Odysseus'
Ithaca and Zakynthos difficulties emerge:

- there is no island Same and no Doulichion. Same
 is a town on the island Cephalenia, Doulichion is not
 identified. West supposes that both names are parts of
Cephalenia.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Ibid. Vol.1. 63.

- Odysseus says that Ithaca "lies low" and furthest west of the islands. But Odysseus just mentioned the mountain Neritos on Ithaca, an island which is generally mountainous and with steep coasts (cf. the standard epithets of Odysseus' homeland in the Odyssey itself which are τρηχῆια,⁹⁶ παιπαλόεσσα⁹⁷ and κραναή⁹⁸). And Ithaca lies not furthest west but on a line with Leukas and Zakynthos and east/northeast of Cephalenia.

But only a local or a learned geographer like Strabo⁹⁹ (and the perhaps too learned modern commentaries) would challenge Odysseus' description of Ithaca and its surrounding islands. Most importantly, since it is not the poet (ὁ ποιητής) as Strabo maintains, but Odysseus who gives this topographical account (in character-text) it becomes vivid and immediate, captivating and credible despite its faults.

It becomes as immediate as the νόστος (ι37) which Odysseus begins right after his description of Ithaca (ι37-μ450). Odysseus' jumping from Ithaca to Troy (ι38, 39) resembles a technique of the narrator (see Hera's motion to Olympus in a νόος - like swiftness in narrator-text; 080-83). But νόστοι, homecomings and stories on homecoming, generally tend to be in character-text.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ ι27; κ417 κτλ.

⁹⁷ λ480.

⁹⁸ α247=π124 κτλ.

⁹⁹ Geography C 454; see West, *ibid.*

This has already been seen by A. Thornton: "In the tales of the Achaeans' homecomings Homer has aimed at ... immediacy of presentation by putting the most detailed and intense descriptions of events into the mouths of those who experienced them themselves."¹⁰¹

The Homecoming Theme and the Emotive Function of Language

Perhaps the most decisive factor why the homecoming theme is in character-text much more than in narrator-text is that it points to the emotions of the speech participants (see the reaction of speaker and audience (δ183-186) after Menelaos said of Odysseus that he is ἀνόστιμος (δ182). Helen's soothing pharmakon (δ220) also points to the extraordinary involvement of both speaker and audience).

The narrator focuses as much on the speaker as on the message of the speaker when the subject matter is that of homecoming. I suggest that emotions like pleasure, excitement, bewildering astonishment, fear,

¹⁰⁰ The noun νόστος occurs 67 times in Homeric epic (seven times in the Iliad, 60 times in the Odyssey). It is 59 times in character-text, nine times in narrator-text (for νόστος in narrator-text, see B155, I622, α5, 13, 326, ε153, ζ14 = θ9, ο3).

¹⁰¹ Thornton, A. Peoples and Themes in Homer's Odyssey. London/Dunedin: Methuen & Co. in association with University of Otago Press, 1970. 15. Repr. Homer's The Odyssey. Ed. Bloom, H. New York, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988.47.

anxiety, worry, suffering, tears, hatred, lust for revenge etc. are an essential part of the language of homecoming.

I could quote many examples (and characters) from the Odyssey to illustrate this: Telemakhos, Penelope, Peisistratos, Menelaos, Helen, Agamemnon etc. Obviously some characters are emotionally more involved than others. Nestor, for example, is (much) calmer than Menelaos when he tells of the Akhaians' homecomings. Nestor never breaks out in tears whereas Menelaos does (compare γ102, 210, 253, 329, 345, 374 etc. with δ185). And this although Nestor lost a son in Troy (Antilokhos; see γ111-12 and δ186-88) whereas Menelaos successfully retrieved his wife. Yet, the very passage, in which Nestor reports the death of Ajax, Akhilleus, Patroklos and his son Antilokhos (γ109-12), is heavily marked by the deictic quintuple ἔνθα. It is likely that, in oral performances, the singers accompanied each mentioning of ἔνθα with emphatic gestures, depicting Nestor's emotional involvement - and grief. Teiresias or, more specifically, Teiresias' psukhe, seems calm when telling Odysseus his nostos (λ99) whereas Odysseus' mother (or, again, rather her soul) weeps (λ154) when she sees Odysseus and inquires about his homecoming. Antikleia's and Odysseus' emotional involvement (see also λ85-87) does not require any lengthy and detailed analysis. Loss

of a parent or son is usually met with grief and not with joy. Antikleia died because of her longing for her son, as she tells Odysseus (λ202-3). She informs Odysseus of Penelope's weeping (λ183) and of Laertes grieving and longing for (Odysseus') homecoming (λ195-96). Agamemnon, whose soul is ἀχνυμένη (λ388) even before it is aware of Odysseus, cries bitterly (λ391) when he recognizes Odysseus. And so does Odysseus when he sees Agamemnon (λ395).

I choose only two characters to illustrate their emotional involvement and their acting out, performing, homecoming verbally, Eurykleia and Odysseus.¹⁰² They represent, at first sight, two extreme positions: Eurykleia's performance is an apparent mirror of her emotional involvement, Odysseus' seems a mirror of his coolness and unaffectedness. I will show that Odysseus' behaviour is best described in terms of zero degree emotion, which is different from lack of any emotion.¹⁰³

¹⁰² The recognition - scenes of Odysseus - Telemakhos, Odysseus - Eumaios / Philoitios and Odysseus - Laertes will be also commented upon, but only briefly. Penelope would merit a chapter on her own. I refer here only to a recent study which analyzes female power in the Odyssey, in particular Penelope in relation to Clytaemnestra: Wohl, V. J. "Standing by the Stathmos: Sexual Ideology in the Odyssey." Arethusa 26 (1993) 19-50.

¹⁰³ The term zero degree is from Barthes, R. Writing Degree Zero. Printed together with Elements of Semiology and transl. Lavers, A. and C. Smith. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970. See also Peradotto, J. Man in the Middle Voice. Name and Narrative in the Odyssey. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990. 88: "The "zero-degree" of

reaction (Odysseus grasping her by the throat)¹⁰⁴ which is not only a reaction to Eurykleia's attempt to establish contact with Penelope (in order to tell her of Odysseus' presence)¹⁰⁵ but also to her overall outburst of emotion. For an instant we also sense Odysseus' emotional involvement, and distress.

While still violently restraining her Odysseus declares to Eurykleia his homecoming: ἤλυθον εἰκοστῷ ἔτει ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν. (τ484)¹⁰⁶ The verb ἤλυθον would have sufficed to convey "I have come" (see previous chapter ad *eleuth-). The superabundance of markers associated with the homecoming-theme¹⁰⁷ seems somewhat not befitting the context. This line is apparently aimed as much at the actual audience (who is perhaps supposed to recognize the allusion to the other revelation-scenes)¹⁰⁸ as it is at

¹⁰⁴ He is obviously choking her (τ480).

¹⁰⁵ τ476-477.

¹⁰⁶ This is a (marked) traditional phrase with π206 = τ484 (Odysseus reveals his true self to Telemakhos); φ208 = τ484 (Odysseus reveals his true self to Eumaios and Philoitios); ω321 = τ484 (Odysseus reveals his true self to his father Laertes).

¹⁰⁷ The temporal marker εἰκοστῷ ἔτει and the spatial (deictic) marker ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν.

¹⁰⁸ I do not know of a parallel. However, the narrator addresses not only characters like Menelaos, Patroklos and Eumaios but also the actual audience (cf. Δ223-225; 429-431; E85-86; O697-698; P366-367; cf. Edwards (1987) 37-38 and Richardson, S. The Homeric Narrator. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1990. 77, 223 note 18 and 174-77). Since in an oral performance the "singer" addresses an actual audience directly, the actual audience is always a potential addressee of both narrator-text and character-text.

Eurykleia. The imperative σίγα (τ486) is more apt: it befits the violent situation of Odysseus' speech act.

Odysseus' physical action and his verbal action (his command of her to be silent and his threat that, unless she obeys, he will kill her) must have impressed Eurykleia. She holds back her voice and does not establish contact with Penelope until after the slaughter of the suitors (bks.τ-ψ). After Odysseus has killed off the suitors Eurykleia's emotions are described again:

ἦ δ' ὡς οὖν νέκυάς τε καὶ ἄσπετον εἶσιδεν αἶμα,
 ἴθυσέν ῥ' ὀλολύξαι, ἐπεὶ μέγα εἶσιδεν ἔργον·
 ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσεὺς κατέρυκε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἰεμένην περ
 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 "ἐν θυμῷ, γρηῦ, χαῖρε καὶ ἴσχεο μῆδ' ὀλόλυξε·
 οὐχ ὅσῃ κταμένοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάσθαι.

She, when she saw the dead men and the endless blood, began then / to raise the cry of triumph, having seen it was monstrous / work, but Odysseus checked her and held her, for all her eagerness, / and spoke to her and addressed her in winged words, saying: / "Keep your joy in your heart, old dame; stop, do not raise up / the cry. It is not piety to taunt slain men.

[χ407-412; transl. Lattimore; modified]

The narrator describes Eurykleia's emotional outburst with an aorist form of the verb ὀλολύζω (χ408). This verb points to a discourse of ecstasy which is the domain of women only.¹⁰⁹ Odysseus' description ("focalization")

¹⁰⁹ The usage of the verb in γ450 and δ767 points to an "ecstatic shout of women at a religious ceremony" (see Cunliffe, ad loc.). The noun ὀλολυγή (hapax in homeric epic; Z301) points also to such an "ecstatic religious shout of women" (see Cunliffe, ad loc.). h.

of Eurykleia's outburst is (initially) identical with the narrator's (χ408 and 411). Yet, only one line later Odysseus' "focalization" of Eurykleia's emotional outburst is utterly different.¹¹⁰

The verbal combination εὐχομαι / εὐχετάομαι + ἐπί + dative is used to "focalize" male heroes' behaviour, namely to "taunt" the just slain, particularly in the Iliad.¹¹¹ There must be a reason why Odysseus changes the tone of his voice suggesting that (the female) Eurykleia behaves as crazy as the (male) hero who (after having slaughtered) "taunts" his enemy. This obviously points to Eurykleia's increasing rather than decreasing emotional outburst. It seems that Odysseus in order to check Eurykleia's violent outburst takes recourse to a discourse which is normally used for the violent male

Ven. 18-19 (καὶ γὰρ τῆι [sc. Artemis] ἄδε τόξα καὶ οὖρσαι θήρας ἐναίρειν, / φόρμιγγές τε χοροὶ τε διαπρύσιοί τ' ὄλολυγαι) shows that ὄλολυγή refers not only to cries of anguish but also to cries of joy (see Ebeling, H. Lexikon Homericum. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880-85. ad ὄλολυγή " ... 2) [sc. ululatus] laetus chorearum ...").

¹¹⁰ Therefore it is very likely that a "good" performer who knew what he was singing paused between χ411 and 412.

¹¹¹ Personal communication with Hayden Pelliccia. See also his forthcoming book on Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and in Pindar. Hypomnemata. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. He translates εὐχομαι in such passages with the English verb "taunt" rather than "vaunt" presumably because the former points to a communication with the "corpse" as if the corpse were alive (and so to speak in communication with the speaker). For the term "vaunt", see Edwards 93-94.

hero who utters taunts as a rule over victims of his own violence and not, like Eurykleia, of someone else's.¹¹²

Eurykleia obviously has difficulty in heeding Odysseus' command, i.e. "to keep her joy in her heart" (χ411).¹¹³ After suggesting that twelve of the fifty maidens behaved "shamelessly" (χ424) she says she would go to Penelope.¹¹⁴ Odysseus restrains her again ("not yet" χ431) presumably in a calmer voice. Only somewhat later Eurykleia establishes contact with Penelope (ψ5) but not until Odysseus explicitly tells her to fetch her (χ482-483).

Finally, Eurykleia pours forth not just her voice but also her emotions:

"ἔγρεο, Πηνελόπεια, φίλον τέκος, ὄφρα ἴδῃαι
ὀφθαλμοῖσι τεοῖσι τά τ' ἔλδεαι ἤματα πάντα.
ἦλθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ οἶκον ἰκάνεται, ὄψέ περ ἔλθῶν·

¹¹² There is a parallel: in the Iliad the Akhaians taunt over slain Hektor, a victim not of their own violence but of Akhilleus':

ἄλλοι δὲ περὶ δραμον υἴες Ἀχαιῶν,
οἳ καὶ θηήσαντο φυὴν καὶ εἶδος ἀγητὸν
Ἔκτορος· οὐδ' ἄρα οἳ τις ἀνουτητί γε παρέστη.
ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον·
ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ μαλακώτερος ἀμφοφάασθαι
Ἔκτωρ ἦ ὅτε νῆας ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέφ.

"Ὡς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς. (X369-375)

Here, however, the εὐχομαι / εὐχετάομαι + ἐπί + dative formula is not used. I am indebted to Hayden Pelliccia for this suggestion.

¹¹³ For "silent speeches", I refer to Pelliccia, *ibid*.

¹¹⁴ See χ420-429.

μνηστήρας δ' ἔκτεινεν ἀγήνορας, οἳ θ' ἔδον οἶκον
κῆδεσκον καὶ κτήματ' ἔδον βιώωντό τε παῖδα."

Wake, Penelope, dear child, so that with your own eyes, /
you can see what all your days you have been longing for,
/ Odysseus has come, he is in the house, though late in
his coming; / and he has killed the haughty suitors, who
were afflicting / his house, and using force on his son,
and eating his property.

[ψ5-9; transl. Lattimore; modified]

The narrator describes Eurykleia's utterance simply as καί
μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (ψ4). We have little information
whether the singers who performed Homeric epic changed
their voices in character-text and narrator-text.
Plato's Ion describes the enthusiasm ("Vergötterung",
ἐνθουσιάζω) and trance of singer and audience in a live-
performance of Homeric epic (533E-534E). Ion tells
Sokrates that his eyes are filled with tears when he
relates a tale which arouses pity (ἐλεεινόν τι), his hair
stands upright and his heart leaps when the tale is
dreadful (φοβερόν) or awesome (δεινόν) (535C). According
to Ion the rhapsodes produce this effect on most of the
audience also (535D-E).

There is a discussion in Plato's Republic on the
question whether "Homer" imitates the old priest Khryses
(as well as the other characters) in character-text
(ῥῆσις) with his voice (φωνή) and with his body-language
(σχῆμα).¹¹⁵ Regardless of the "nature" of actual

¹¹⁵ Plato, Republic. Bk3 393b-c; cf. M. Edwards: "The singer must
have been tempted to impersonate the characters whose direct speech

performances Plato's discussion of performer imitating characters points at least to the fact that (for Plato) such a mimesis was considered possible.¹¹⁶

One cannot interpret Eurykleia's speech as an utterance made in a "matter-of-fact statement". Penelope's response may as much point to the "craziness" of Eurykleia's utterance ("Odysseus came ...") as to "crazy" Eurykleia:

μαῖα φίλη, μάργην σε θεοὶ θέσαν, οἳ τε δύνανται
ἄφρονα ποιῆσαι καὶ ἐπίφρονά περ μάλ' ἔοντα,
καὶ τε χαλιφρονέοντα σαοφροσύνης ἐπέβησαν·
οἳ σέ περ ἔβλαψαν· πρὶν δὲ φρένας αἰσίμη ἦσθα.

Dear nurse, the gods have driven you crazy. They are both able / to change a very sensible person into a senseless / one, and to set the light-wit on the way of discretion. / They have set you awry; before now your thoughts were orderly.

[ψ11-14; transl. Lattimore]

Eurykleia's "crazy" behaviour is squelched by a threat:

εἰ γὰρ τίς μ' ἄλλη γε γυναικῶν, αἶ μοι ἔασι,
ταῦτ' ἔλθοῦσ' ἤγγειλε καὶ ἐξ ὕπνου ἀνέγειρε,
τῶ κε τάχα στυγερῶς μιν ἐγὼν ἀπέπεμψα νέεσθαι
αὐτίς ἔσω μέγαρον· σὲ δὲ τοῦτό γε γῆρας ὀνήσει.

If any of those other women, who are here with me, / had come with a message like yours, and wakened me from my slumber, / I would have sent her back on the way to the hall in a hateful / fashion for doing it. It shall be your age that saves you.

[ψ21-24; transl. Lattimore]

he was repeating; one wonders, frivolously, what the voice of Xanthus the horse sounded like (19.408ff)." *ibid.* 21.

¹¹⁶ On Plato, I have profited from discussions with James Barrett.

Penelope's threat may halt the crazy behaviour but not Eurykleia's ability to speak. She repeats almost verbatim the same line:

compare ψ7 ἦλθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ οἶκον ἰκάνεται, ὄψέ περ ἔλθῶν

with ψ27 ἦλθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ οἶκον ἰκάνεται, ὡς ἀγορεύω,
ψ28 ὁ ξείνος ...¹¹⁷

The context does not provide any clues as to whether ψ27 is again shouted out in a crazy outburst or said calmly. Lines ψ55-56a in which Eurykleia stresses again that Odysseus has come back and is alive point at the least to her obstinacy.

Homecoming and Zero Degree Emotion

A motion home is likely to stir up emotion.¹¹⁸ The emotion a motion home (of a Homeric hero) stirs up might not be a constructive one (joy) but be purely destructive (see Agamemnon's murder at his homecoming and Orestes' revenge as recalled by Zeus right at the beginning of the

¹¹⁷ See also Eurykleia's similar assertion in ψ55-56a: ἦλθε μὲν αὐτὸς ζωὸς ἐφέστιος, εὔρε δὲ καὶ σὲ / καὶ παῖδ' ἐν μεγάροισι.

¹¹⁸ Not any motion home may stir up emotion. A simple motion home to go to bed or to have supper might not. For the distinction of homecoming and motions home to do things in the house (like going to bed), I refer to the discussion of οἰκόνδε in the previous chapter.

Odyssey; α32-43). Obviously, emotions like hatred or lust for revenge are as much part of the language of homecoming as are pleasure and excitement.

This "universal truth" about homecoming is familiar to the characters of the Homeric epic. Priam tells Akhilleus of the joy of Peleus when he hears that his son is alive and he expects that Peleus, Akhilleus' father, is eagerly awaiting the return of his son (Ω490-492).¹¹⁹ Menelaos knows of the joy the homecoming of a hero provides for his wife and children (P27-28).¹²⁰ Dione knows of children gathering round the knees of their father after his homecoming from war and calling him "dear papa" (E408-409).¹²¹ Peneleos expects that the wife of a hero takes delight in the homecoming of her husband (E503-505).¹²² And so do Leokritos (β249-250a),¹²³ Circe (μ42-43)¹²⁴ and the narrator (or perhaps better Eurykleia;

¹¹⁹ ἀλλ' ἦτοι κείνός γε σέθεν ζώντος ἀκούων
χαίρει τ' ἐν θυμῷ, ἐπὶ τ' ἔλπεται ἤματα πάντα
ὄψεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν ἀπὸ Τροίηθεν ἰόντα·

¹²⁰ οὐδέ ἔφημι πόδεσσί γε οἴσι κίοντα
εὐφρῆναι ἄλοχόν τε φίλην κεδνούς τε τοκῆας.

¹²¹ οὐδέ τί μιν παῖδες ποτὶ γούνασι παππάζουσιν
ἐλθόντ' ἐκ πολέμοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δηϊοτήτος.

¹²² οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦ Προμάχοιο δάμαρ Ἀλεγνορίδαο
ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἐλθόντι γανύσσεται, ὅπποτε κεν δὴ
ἐκ Τροίης σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν.

¹²³ οὐ κέν οἱ κεχάροιτο γυνή, μάλα περ χατέουσα,
ἐλθόντ'...

¹²⁴ τῷ δ' οὐ τι γυνή καὶ νήπια τέκνα
οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάνυνται...

τ462-463).¹²⁵ All these scenes point to the emotive function of language in the context of the homecoming theme.

And yet, we think of Odysseus as the cool hero who is cold, calculating and in control. When Odysseus, finally, reveals his return (and his scar) to his father, Laertes is stirred up (ω345-348). In this recognition scene it is, again, Odysseus' apparent lack of emotion which catches the reader by surprise.¹²⁶ When Odysseus reveals his identity to his father he does not break down. He is depicted as calm and composed (ω357ff.) as he is calm and composed almost throughout his disguise as beggar. The here seemingly cool and manipulative Odysseus, however, points to a character with zero degree emotion, not to a character with no emotional involvement.

Zero degree emotion is different from having no emotion: it denotes no total absence but a *significant absence*. A character with zero degree emotion shows no emotion because he suppresses his feelings. There is explicit evidence that Odysseus' emotions are significantly absent. Athene who, according to Zeus, is

¹²⁵ τῷ μὲν ῥα πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
χαῖρον νοστήσαντι καὶ ἐξερέεινον ἕκαστα...

According to de Jong (1987) the story of Odysseus' scar and Autolykos is embedded focalization.

¹²⁶ Compare this scene with the recognition scene of Eurykleia above.

very much the one who has contrived Odysseus' method of action (homecoming and revenge)¹²⁷ is satisfied (μείδησεν)¹²⁸ with Odysseus' first "performance" on Ithaca, a speech (v256-286) by means of which Odysseus had tried to fool her, and gives Odysseus the highest marks:

αιεί τοι τοιοῦτον ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόημα·
 τῷ σε καὶ οὐ δύναμαι προλιπεῖν δύστηνον ἔοντα,
 οὐνεκ' ἐπητής ἐσσι καὶ ἀγχίνοος καὶ ἐχέφρων.
 ἀσπασίως γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἔλθων
 ἴετ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισ' ἰδέειν παῖδάς τ' ἄλοχόν τε·
 σοὶ δ' οὐ πω φίλον ἐστὶ δαήμεναι οὐδὲ πυθέσθαι,
 πρὶν γ' ἔτι σῆς ἀλόχου πειρήσεται

Always you are the same, and such is the mind within you,
 / and so I cannot abandon you when you are unhappy, /
 because you are fluent, and reason clearly, and keep your
 head always. / Anyone else come home from wandering would
 have run happily / off to see his children and wife in
 his halls; but it is not / your pleasure to investigate
 and ask questions, not till / you have made trial of your
 wife.

[v330-336]

The passage speaks for itself. Odysseus does not what we would expect of a father after a long absence from his wife and children: rather than running to see his children and wife he puts Penelope to the proof (v336), in regard to her fidelity we may add.

In another passage, which also reveals explicitly that Odysseus suppresses his feelings, Odysseus, the

¹²⁷ οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτον μὲν ἐβούλευσας νόον αὐτή,

ὡς ἦ τοι κείνους Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀποτείσεται ἔλθων; ε23-24 = ω479-480.

¹²⁸ v287.

beggar, tells (and lies to) the swineherd that Odysseus went to Dodona, the oracle of Zeus:

τὸν δ' ἐς Δωδώνην φάτο βήμεναι, ὄφρα θεοῖο
ἐκ δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο Διὸς βουλὴν ἐπακούσαι,
ὅπως νοστήσει Ἰθάκης ἐς πῖονα δῆμον,
ἤδη δὴν ἀπεῶν, ἧ ἄμφαδὸν ἦε κρυφιδόν.

But he said Odysseus had gone to Dodona, to listen / to the will of Zeus, out of the holy deep-leaved oak tree, / for how he could come back to the rich countryside of Ithaka, in secret or openly, having been by now long absent.

[ξ327-330]

This is a lying tale. Odysseus did not (as far as the Odyssey reflects the Odyssean tradition) go to Dodona. On the question whether to return home openly or in disguise (ἧ ἄμφαδὸν ἦε κρυφιδόν), Odysseus was advised by Agamemnon.¹²⁹

There are two more passages which clearly show that Odysseus is not the cool hero but is a character who generally suppresses his feelings: passages in which he obviously succumbs to turbulent emotions. When he reveals his identity to his son, Telemakhos cannot hold back: he weeps (π214-15). And so does Odysseus: father

¹²⁹ κρύβδην, μηδ' ἀναφανδά, φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν / νῆα κατισχέμεναι, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι πιστὰ γυναιξίν. (λ454-56). Teiresias, on the other hand, left it to Odysseus to decide whether he should return home openly or in disguise (cf. his prophecy on Odysseus' homecoming with Odysseus as the addressee, in particular the phrase [ἐπὶν μνηστῆρας] κτείνης ἠὲ δόλω ἧ ἄμφαδὸν ὀξεί χαλκῷ (λ120).

and son weep in loud tones (π216). The narrator adds that both would have continued weeping until sunset if Telemakhos (!) had not addressed his father ... (π220-221). And Eumaios and Philoitios (and Odysseus) are equally stirred up when Odysseus, the beggar, reveals his "true" identity - and his scar (φ222-226).

In the remaining part of this chapter I shall discuss Odysseus and his zero degree emotion. I shall argue that the beggar manipulates (and teases) his addressee whenever he talks about going to Odysseus' home and going to Penelope. Verbs indicating motion (the present infinitive ἀπονέεσθαι and in particular verbal forms of the root *eleuth-) are used by the beggar Odysseus as signs with a hidden meaning (with the referent either a *simple motion* (to go) or *homecoming* (to go / come home). In short, verbal signs like ἀπονέεσθαι and ἐλθών, when used by the beggar (Odysseus), point to Odysseus' zero degree emotion.

I will not go through all passages where verbal forms of the root *eleuth are used in character-text by character A addressing character B, with the beggar (Odysseus) being either the speaker or the addressee. I analyse the passage with Eumaios in detail (ο301 ff.) and refer to other passages only in passing.¹³⁰

¹³⁰ For other passages I refer to Odysseus addressing Telemakhos (ξ56; notice the pun on ἐλθοι and ὄλεθ' in ξ68); cf. Eumaios' complaint that the wanderers in need of a handout always come and lie (ξ122-125); cf. Melanthios addressing Eumaios (and the beggar

At the beginning of ο Athene admonishes Telemakhos to think of his homecoming (ο1ff.). He leaves Menelaos and Sparta, comes back to Pylos where he says goodbye to Peisistratos (ο195ff.), bypasses Nestor's palace, meets Theoklymenos (ο223ff.), embarks on his ship together with Theoklymenos (ο284-286) and sails off with destination Ithaca (ο294-300; 495b ff.).¹³¹ The narrator changes his viewpoint, leaving Telemakhos' sailing ship and focusing (again)¹³² on the beggar (Odysseus) and Eumaios (ο301ff.).

[Odysseus] (ρ230); cf. Athene (in disguise) addressing Odysseus ("the stranger" (v237); cf. Philoitios addressing Eumaios (in Odysseus presence; see v183-184) inquiring about the stranger (v190-191); cf. the suitors addressing each other (ρ368) in Odysseus' presence (see ρ361-366); this is embedded speech (complex narrator-text); cf. also σ401-402 (Odysseus is present but hiding "toward the knees" of Amphinomos; see σ395); here is perhaps also a wordplay on ἄλλοθ', ὀλέσθαι" and ἐλθεῖν; cf. Eurymakhos addressing Penelope in Odysseus' presence who is about to string the bow (φ327); the participle ἐλθών is in character-text within Eurymakhos' speech; cf. Laertes addressing Odysseus who is not recognized by his father (ω300); cf. also Penelope addressing the stranger (τ509) and telling him about her dream and the bird who came ... (τ538) and came again (τ544) with the bird directly addressing her (τ549); this is again a character-text within a character-text.

¹³¹ The *homecoming motif* tends to be acted out in speech whereas the *actual homecomings* of both Telemakhos and Odysseus are described by the narrator. On the description of Odysseus' actual homecoming in narrator-text, see v70ff. For the typology of shiplanding-scenes, see Arend, W. Die Typischen Szenen bei Homer. Berlin: Weidmann, ¹1933; ²1975. 80-81 ("Landung") and table 5.

¹³² Resuming the story of Odysseus and Eumaios which he left at

They just had dinner (o302f.) when Odysseus says to Eumaios (and the other swineherds):

"κέκλυθι νῦν, Εὐμαίε, καὶ ἄλλοι πάντες ἐταῖροι·
ἦῶθεν προτὶ ἄστυ λιλαίομαι ἀπονέεσθα·
πτωχεύσων, ἵνα μὴ σε κατατρώω καὶ ἐταίρους.

...

καί κ' ἔλθὼν πρὸς δώματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
ἀγγελίην εἶποιμι περίφρονι Πηνελοπείῃ

Hear me now, Eumaios, and all you other companions, / I am very eager to make my way at dawn to the city / and beg there, so I will not wear you out, and your men ... Then I would go into the house of godlike Odysseus / with a message for circumspect Penelope, to tell her;

[o307-314]

The meaning of the participle ἔλθων in o313 seems, at first, obvious: having gone / come into the house of Odysseus... But forms of the root *eleuth are ambiguous in the context of Odysseus' disguise.¹³³ The participle ἔλθων, which in masculine, nominative, singular occurs 42 times in the *Odyssey*, refers 18 times explicitly and unambiguously to homecoming, 15 times (out of these 18 instances) to Odysseus' homecoming.¹³⁴ One time (out of these 18 instances) it is in (complex) narrator-text, with Telemakhos viewing his father's homecoming.¹³⁵ The

the end of ξ.

¹³³ On the ambiguity of verbal forms of ἐλθεῖν, see the examples in note 130.

¹³⁴ The other three instances where the participle ἔλθων in masculine, nominative, singular denotes homecoming refer to Athene / Mentor (γ234), some unspecified man (ν333) and Telemakhos (ο24).

¹³⁵ τὴν δὲ πολὺ πρῶτος ἶδε Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής·

other 17 instances of ἐλθών are in character-text (with and without spatial markers): α255, γ216, 234, ε24 = ω480, κ522 = λ30, λ118, 450, ν333, ο24, π255, σ254 = τ127, υ224, ψ7, ω429.¹³⁶ The usage of the participle ἐλθών in Odysseus', the beggar's, utterance (ο313) alludes to speech events in which ἐλθών refers explicitly to Odysseus' homecoming and revenge.¹³⁷

Moreover, Odysseus' usage of ἀπονέεσθαι (ο308) is peculiar. This verb occurs 20 times (14 times in the Iliad and six times in the Odyssey). ἀπονέεσθαι means in all these passages either to go back (O295, 305, P415, ε27, π467) or to go back home (cf. β195, ι451, σ260, B113 = 288 = 716 = I20, Γ313, M73, Ξ46 κτλ.).¹³⁸ It is only here that ἀπονέεσθαι apparently means to go. Eumaios (who does not know that Odysseus is Odysseus) cannot know that Odysseus, in his desire to go to town (ἤῶθεν προτὶ ἄστὺ λιλαιόμαι ἀπονέεσθαι), expresses his wish to have a homecoming. Only the reader/audience, who knows all

ἦστο γὰρ ἐν μνηστῆρσι φίλον τετιμημένος ἦτορ,
 ὀσσομένος πατέρ' ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, εἴ ποθεν ἐλθὼν
 μνηστῆρων τῶν μὲν σκέδασι κατὰ δώματα θείη,
 τιμὴν δ' αὐτὸς ἔχει καὶ κτήμασιν οἷσιν ἀνάσσει. (α113-17)

¹³⁶ See also τ544.

¹³⁷ For the phrase ἀποτίσε(τ)αι ἐλθών, see γ216, ε24, λ118, π255, ω480. For Odysseus' homecoming (i.e. ἐλθών) and revenge, see also α255-266, υ224-25, ω429.

¹³⁸ Often it is unclear whether ἀπονέεσθαι denotes return or homecoming, cf. Π252, Υ212 and also B113 = E716 = I20 and discussion in chapters four and five.

along that the beggar is Odysseus, recognizes the irony in *λιλαίομαι ἀπονέεσθαι*, and Odysseus' zero degree emotion.

The Iliadic passages of *ἀπονέεσθαι* will be discussed in detail in the next chapter. Of the Odyssean passages a comparison with ι451 is particularly relevant since the combination *λιλαίομαι (λιλαίειαι) ἀπονέεσθαι* occurs only twice in all of Homer: ι451b and ο308b. In ι451 the expression *λιλαίειαι ἀπονέεσθαι* is part of a speech in which the cyclops Polyphemos addresses his ram:

πρῶτος δὲ σταθμόνδε λιλαίειαι ἀπονέεσθαι
ἐσπέριος, νῦν αὖτε πανύστατος.

and you are eager always to lead the way first back to \ the sheepfold / at evening. Now you are last of all.
[ι451-52; transl. Lattimore, modified]

The comparison of Odysseus with a ram (as implicitly suggested by the parallel of *λιλαίομαι ἀπονέεσθαι* and *λιλαίειαι ἀπονέεσθαι*) is explicitly suggested by Priam who likens the appearance of Odysseus to a ram (Γ197). Other features in Polyphemos' address allude to Odysseus: the issue of the ram normally leaving and returning to the cave first but now leaving (and returning?) as the last¹³⁹, Odysseus' hiding under the ram as he hides his identity upon his homecoming in Ithaca. Eumaios does not know of Odysseus' adventure with Polyphemos. He does not

¹³⁹ The issue of first and last recalls passages which indicate that Odysseus comes home as the last of the Akhaians; see α11-18; γ132 and 180-200; δ555-560.

know of Polyphemos' ram who is eager to return first (πρῶτος ... λιλαίεαι ἀπονέεσθαι). He does not know of Odysseus who is eager to go to the city (and in doing so comes home from Troy as the last of the Akhaians). Eumaios does not know that Odysseus' language of disguise (λιλαίομαι ἀπονέεσθαι ... ἔλθὼν ...) points to Odysseus' zero degree emotion.

Conclusion: Place Deixis seems a contributing factor in why the homecoming theme tends to be much more common in character-text than narrator-text (see chapter one). But there are additional factors. One is that the poetic device of putting the homecoming theme in character-text removes the medium of narrative and stresses the immediacy of interplay between speaker and addressee. The homecoming theme becomes vivid. The device of having the characters acting out this theme in speech has another advantage: it informs the addressee and the audience in general how the homecoming theme is viewed by the speaker who tends to be involved emotionally. The Homeric singers in their enthusiasm are likely to have acted out and imitated the gestures and voices of the characters in their live performances, especially during those emotionally charged passages which deal with Odysseus' homecoming. Yet, the master himself consistently tones down and restrains his expression; most typically, he displays zero degree emotion on the subject of his homecoming. In particular,

the usage of the participle ἐλθὼν and the infinitive ἀπονέεσθαι in character-text opens up possibilities (ambiguity, irony) which could not be matched in narrator-text as the narrator-text is controlled by a narrator who is reliable.

How the homecoming theme is utilized as a rhetorical device to manipulate the addressee(s) is what will be examined further in the Iliad.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HOMECOMING THEME IN THE ILLIAD

- Du sagst ja immer fort
dasselbe!
- Mehr noch! Es geht auch
immer um dasselbe.
(Schadewaldt)

In the previous chapter the observation was that the representation of the homecoming of Odysseus, Telemakhos (and other Akhaians) is much more common in character-text than (simple) narrator-text. The argument was that besides Place Deixis, which might be the decisive factor for such a distribution, there are likely to be other reasons: immediacy, vividness and emotional involvement of the speaker and addressee, and the narrator's tendency to be both self-effacing and reliable, make it attractive for the Homeric singer to act out the homecoming theme as a speech event, imitating the speakers / characters and their more or less emotional involvement, in direct speech (ῥῆσις).

In this chapter I focus on the representation of the homecoming theme in the Iliad. In the first part (Homecoming and μῆνις) I shall argue that (in the context

of the Akhaians) the homecoming theme is put into effect by quite a few speakers as a rhetorical device that allows the poet to highlight how different speakers manipulate their addressee(s). In particular, I will show how the homecoming and μῆνις theme are interwoven and how Akhilleus uses the very issue of homecoming as a representation of his wrath.

In the second part (Do Trojans Have a Homecoming?) I shall ask whether movements of Trojans back to Troy and their discussions thereof are to be seen in terms of homecoming (parallel to the homecoming, or discussions of homecoming, of the Akhaians) or in terms of battle withdrawals (parallel to Akhaian returns from the battlefield to their camp).

The homecoming theme in the Iliad has not been treated as a study on its own. Some interesting work, however, has been done on specific issues.¹⁴⁰ D. Frame addresses also only a small detail concerning the

¹⁴⁰ On prophecies and the homecoming theme I refer to Führer, R. Formprobleme - Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der Frühgriechischen Lyrik. Zetemata. Heft 44. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967. 112-116; for obituaries and the homecoming theme in the Iliad to Griffin, J. "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity." in: CQ 26 (1976): 161-187; cf. also Griffin, J. Homer on Life and Death. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980. Andronikos, M. "Totenkult" (Archaeologica Homerica vol. IIIW. Ed. F. Matz and H. G. Buchholz. Göttingen: 1968) contains interesting remarks on the question of burial and transport of the dead from abroad to their homecountry; see particularly 31-32.

homecoming theme in Homer.¹⁴¹ His thesis consists in showing that νόστος/νέομαι, νόος/νοέω and ἄσμενος are from the same root.

Part I: Homecoming and μῆνις

The main theme of the Odyssey is a man and his homecoming after the sack of Troy and after his many wanderings (α1-2).¹⁴² The main theme of the Iliad is not homecoming. It is the wrath of Akhilleus and the destruction this wrath brought upon the other Akhaians (Alff.). Other themes (e.g. status,¹⁴³ supplication)¹⁴⁴ are less central than, but are nevertheless significant for, Akhilleus' wrath and its devastation for the Akhaians. So is the homecoming-theme: it is perhaps

¹⁴¹ Frame, D. The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1978.

¹⁴² Other themes like revenge, recognition or supplication and type-scenes like hospitality, visit, sleep, prayer, oath, prophecy, dream, μεμπερίζων-scenes, departure and arrival are all closely associated with the theme of homecoming in the Odyssey. For most of these type scenes, see Arend. passim.

¹⁴³ See Nagy, G. The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek poetry. Baltimore: The John Hopkins UP, 1979. passim; Goldhill, S. The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991..69ff.; see in particular 93ff.

¹⁴⁴ On supplication, see among others Lohmann, D. Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970. 227-282. Hereafter quoted as Lohmann.

less central than, but nevertheless crucial for, the theme of μῆνις in the Iliad.

The homecoming theme is raised briefly at the outset of the Iliad: the Akhaian army is struck for nine days by a plague (A53); on the tenth day Akhilleus summons the Akhaians to the agora (A54). He raises briefly the possibility of departure and return home (Ἄτρείδη νῦν ἄμμε παλιμπλαγχθέντας οἴω / ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν, εἴ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν / εἰ δὴ ὁμοῦ πόλεμός τε δαμᾶ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιοῦς· (A59-61). But he drops this idea instantly (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ...A62). That is, the issue of homecoming seems to be an option but one so unattractive that any other solution seems better. Akhilleus suggests asking a seer, a priest or an interpreter of dreams (A62-63) to tell them the reason of Apollo's anger so as to remedy it (A64-67). Akhilleus' suggestion that they go home is a rhetorical device (hyperbole), obviously employed to draw attention to the current crisis.

Only somewhat later the homecoming theme is raised again, again by Akhilleus: νῦν δ' εἶμι Φθίην δ', ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερόν ἐστιν / οἴκαδ' ἴμεν σὺν νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν (A169-170). Homecoming suddenly becomes a means for Akhilleus to express his anger: he announces his departure and return home, intending to split from the other Akhaians. But again, his threat to sail home and Agamemnon's challenging of him to do so (φεῦγε μάλ' εἴ τοι θυμὸς ἐπέσσεται

A173)¹⁴⁵ are not put into effect. Akhilleus and his Myrmidons withdraw from the fighting but not from the Trojan plain (cf. A488-492 and B769-779). Akhilleus' proposal to sail home is (again in the form of a hyperbole) a representation of his μῆνις and serves as a prelude to the embassy episode in I.

Now I shall focus on B and I, two books of the Iliad in which the issue of homecoming is very much in the foreground and acted out in speech.¹⁴⁶ I wish to reiterate Wilamowitz's position for B. It is hoped that a critical assessment of his view will show how interwoven the themes of homecoming and μῆνις are.

Wilamowitz states in his book on the Iliad that B does not belong to A.¹⁴⁷ He maintains that we may not think of a wrathful Akhilleus in B ("An den grollenden Achilles dürfen wir überhaupt nicht denken. Den gibt es nur wenn B mit A verbunden ist)."¹⁴⁸ Wilamowitz states the reason for his assumption very concisely:

Der Stil (sc. of B) ist völlig anders. Hier herrscht eine mehr als reichliche Gleichnisfülle,

¹⁴⁵ Agamemnon addresses Akhilleus only. But it is understood that Akhilleus would return home with all his ships and all his people (see A179).

¹⁴⁶ This theme or motif is more or less present (and essential) throughout the Iliad, particularly in Σ, X and Ω.

¹⁴⁷ von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. Die Ilias und Homer. Berlin: Weidmann, ²1920. 260. Hereafter quoted as Wilamowitz.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid. 270.

hier wird mit den Massen gerechnet, hier wird mit Behagen auch eine typische Handlung ausgeführt, das Mahl bei Agamemnon. Die Kunst eines anderen Dichters ist unverkennbar. Dieser Dichter würde die Leiden der Achäer unter der Pest, ihre Freude nach der Befreiung geschildert haben, den Krüppel Hephaistos beschrieben, ein typisches Bild der Sühnopfer vorgeführt haben. Auch dem kann man sich nicht verschließen, daß der Traum zwar als Bindeglied unentbehrlich ist, weiter aber keinen Zweck hat, denn er ist überhaupt vergessen.¹⁴⁹

Wilamowitz's reason why B does not belong to A is a stylistic one (in contrast to A book B contains many similes, a broad description of a meal and it emphasizes the masses) and a narratological one (the dream in B is without purpose because it is not further mentioned). Wilamowitz assumes that without B1-86, 143, 194 (i.e. dream and boulê) and without those passages which mention Akhilleus' μηνις explicitly (B239-42, 377-78) we can see in B an older poem which has lost its beginning (pp.266-67). And this lost beginning contained, according to Wilamowitz, a reference to the lousy mood of the soldiery that would motivate Agamemnon's peira (p.270).

The unitarian position uses the very passages which Wilamowitz eliminates to underline the unity of the poem. Latacz stresses very elegantly the presence of the μηνις motif which flashes briefly here and there in the books between A and I:

¹⁴⁹ Ibid. 260-61.

So konnte die strukturelle Wirksamkeit (>Energie<) dieses Grundmotivs der Iliashandlung auch in *den* Handlungsteilen nicht in Vergessenheit geraten, die sonst vielleicht als lose Episoden hätten erscheinen können. Der Kunstgriff der Rezidivierungstechnik hatte vielmehr zur Folge, daß die scheinbaren Episoden sich als Handlungsteile enthüllten, die nur deshalb überhaupt möglich waren, weil Achilleus grollte.¹⁵⁰

For more references to the $\mu\eta\nu\iota\varsigma$ theme between B and I I refer to B769ff. (ship catalogue), Δ512ff. (Hera encourages the Akhaians), Z99 (Helenos speaks to Hektor and mentions Akhilleus) and H228ff. (Ajax threatens Hektor).¹⁵¹

Agamemnon's peira need not (contra Wilamowitz) be motivated at all by a low morale within the soldiery. Agamemnon might simply have hoped that his suggestion to leave for home would stir on his soldiers even more to fighting. Agamemnon, however, must have had at least some idea of a (momentary?) low morale of the Akhaians, caused perhaps or intensified by his quarrel with Akhilleus. His command to the leaders to check the army each from a different place (B75) points to that. But he did certainly not expect that they could not restrain the Akhaians:

¹⁵⁰ Latacz, J. Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlandes. München und Zürich: Artemis, 1989. 157. Hereafter quoted as Latacz.

¹⁵¹ See also Latacz 155-58.

ἀϋτὴ δ' οὐρανὸν ἴκεν
 οἴκαδε ἰεμένων· ὑπὸ δ' ἦρεον ἔρματα νηῶν.
 Ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος¹⁵² ἐτύχθη
 εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·

and their cries hit skyward / as they made for home and
 snatched the props from under the vessels. / Then for the
 Argives a homecoming beyond fate might have / been
 accomplished, had not Hera spoken a word to Athene:

[B152-156]

The actual departure of Akhaians from Troy and their
 homecoming is mentioned only once in the Iliad (in simple
 narrator-text): Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔβησαν (M16).
 Importantly, this homecoming of Akhaians is represented
 as taking place after the destruction of Troy "in the
 tenth year" (cf. M15) and is hence unique in its temporal
 perspective. νόστος¹⁵³ + irrealis κεν ... ἐτύχθη (B155)
 comes closest of all passages which deal with Akhaian
 homecomings in the Iliad to a real homecoming of Akhaians
 before the destruction of Troy. The protasis εἰ μὴ...

¹⁵² For the marked οἴκαδε and νόστος which are here in narrative,
 see below note 171. οἴκαδε may well be the narrator's focalization
 of what the Akhaians shout while they run to the ships.

¹⁵³ For νόστος denoting both "homecoming" and "the epic tradition
 that tells homecoming stories", cf. Nagy (1979) 40. The noun νόστος
 occurs 7x in the Iliad; 5x in character-text, 2x in narrator-text
 (B155; I622). In the latter passage it is likely Akhilleus'
 "focalization". For the former, cf. above note and the prooimion
 of the Odyssey (α5; α13); cf. also νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ which out of 15x
 occurs only once in narrator-text: α9.

directs the story away from an homecoming (B156).¹⁵⁴
 Hera's action is necessary to reverse the steps taken by
 the Akhaians (B156ff.).¹⁵⁵

In the following I wish to turn to several speeches in B and I (Agamemnon's peira, Thersites', Odysseus' and Nestor's speeches, Agamemnon's speech at the beginning of I and Diomedes' and Nestor's responses there) and examine how the issue of homecoming is employed by each speaker, and to what end. The first part of this chapter began with Akhilleus and will end with an assessment of Akhilleus' utterances on the issue of homecoming during the embassy episode.

Agamemnon in his peira (B110-41) uses a language typical of homecoming, reminding his audience of their wives and children who are eagerly awaiting them (B136-137a) before he closes his speech with the challenge to flee and leave for home (B139-141). Regardless of what motivates Agamemnon's peira one thing is obvious: Agamemnon does not mean what he says. Already the ancient scholiasts refer to the ambivalence of his speech

¹⁵⁴ For εἰμῆ - situations, I refer to de Jong 81 and Richardson, S. The Homeric Narrator. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1990. 88-190 and 242 n.53. Henceforth quoted as Richardson.

¹⁵⁵ On the possibility of an early departure for the Akhaians and the reversal passage in B155-6, see Morrison, J. V. "Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the Iliad." TAPA 122 (1992): 61.

(BT-Scholia). It is full of propositions which call for a challenging reply.¹⁵⁶

Agamemnon refers to Zeus' promise of a homecoming after the sacking of Troy (B112-13) and stresses, despite Zeus' seeming lack of assistance, the greatness of Zeus (B111). He refers to the fact that the Akhaians outnumber the Trojans by far (B119-33). His reference to the nine years of great Zeus, i.e. those years which Zeus promised,¹⁵⁷ which have now gone by (B134), and to the work which is unaccomplished (B137-38), all this indicates that Agamemnon expects that now, in the tenth year, they will finally achieve their goal. But instead, he concludes his speech with the challenge:

φεύγωμεν σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν·
οὐ γὰρ ἔτι Τροίην αἰρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν.

let us / run away with our ships to the beloved land of
our fathers / since no longer now shall we capture Troy
of the wide ways.

[B139-41]

Agamemnon uses the issue of homecoming as a rhetorical strategy.¹⁵⁸ The prospect of returning to Argos without having taken Troy represents a kind of *nec plus ultra* of failure and despair: it seems so shameful that it is not

¹⁵⁶ Wilamowitz 268-69.

¹⁵⁷ Lohmann 51.

¹⁵⁸ For the combination of parallel structure and ring structure, see Lohmann 49-51.

an option, as we saw with Akhilleus. Yet, the hyperbole does not work: the Akhaians take Agamemnon at his word and storm to the ships.

The Thersites episode ensues with Thersites' speech (B225-42). The speech of Thersites and Odysseus' response (B246-51) are modelled on the Redepaar of Akhilleus and Agamemnon in A (A149-78).¹⁵⁹ In contrast to Akhilleus, however, who does not mean it when he suggests that he would leave and go home, Thersites means it. He wants to go home at all costs. Thersites' speech begins with blame directed against Agamemnon who himself had just made the suggestion to go home.¹⁶⁰ Thersites must, therefore, know that Agamemnon did not mean it either when he suggested that the Greeks go home (peira). Thersites was either one of the Akhaian leaders who were present at the boulê gerontôn where Agamemnon indicated that he would try the Akhaians; or Thersites concludes from Odysseus' and the other leaders' action (who suddenly hold back the Akhaian host) that it is Agamemnon's contriving which does not allow the Akhaians to go home after all.¹⁶¹

Thersites speaks, according to Wilamowitz (*ibid.*),

¹⁵⁹ There is a detailed outline of these speeches in Lohmann 174-78.

¹⁶⁰ Wilamowitz 269.

¹⁶¹ See Kirk ad B233-4: "...It is not entirely clear what Agamemnon is being blamed for - for the plague, and the quarrel according to bT, but also, certainly, for keeping them all at Troy."

for the soldiery which obviously is sick and tired to labour for Agamemnon. But, then, his address to the soldiery at the center of his speech is at least clumsy:

ὦ πέπωνες κάκ' ἐλέγγε' Ἀχαιίδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοὶ .
οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ' ἔωμεν
αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ γέρα πεσσέμεν, ὄφρα ἴδῃται
ἢ ρά τί οἱ χῆμεῖς προσαμόνομεν ἦε καὶ οὐκί·

My good fools, poor abuses, you women, not men, of Akhaia, / let us go back home in our ships, and leave this man here / by himself in Troy to mull his prizes of honour / that he may find whether or not we others are helping him.

[B235-238]

The nucleus of his speech (which starts out and ends in ring composition with blame for Agamemnon) contains the homecoming theme and is addressed to the Akhaians, not to Agamemnon. And even here his speech expresses some form of blame (B235).¹⁶²

Why is it that of all Akhaians it is Thersites, the ugliest¹⁶³ man (B216), lame on one foot (B217) etc. who speaks first in the assembly? An extreme position (homecoming) is represented by a man of superlatives on the negative side. Odysseus' reaction seems justified:

¹⁶² πέπων is used in courteous or affectionate address (cf. E1(9)); but here it clearly points to speech of blame; cf. κάκ' ἐλέγγε' and Ἀχαιίδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοὶ; see Ebeling ad πέπων "1) sg. de laude..." and "2) pl., vituperationi est...B235...sch. BL. ἐνταῦθα, ἐπὶ ψόγου, cf. N120."

¹⁶³ See Kirk, comm. ad loc.

an angry counterspeech (B245ff.) accompanied by non verbal action (he beats Thersites up; B265-66). The verbal reaction of the other Akhaians is similarly hostile (B270-277). Suddenly they laugh at Thersites (B270b) and the suggestion of homecoming seems to be ridiculous.¹⁶⁴

The complete line of B270 (οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀχνύμενοί περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἠδὺ γέλασαν) is somewhat difficult to understand because ἀχνύμενοί and γέλασαν seem to exclude each other.¹⁶⁵ ἀχνύμενοί either does not refer to the present time of the narrative (with Odysseus beating up Thersites) but to Thersites' speech which still has an effect on the Akhaian host (i.e. they are still disgruntled because he suggested homecoming) or it refers to the present situation: Thersites was indeed the spokesman for the soldiery who wants to go home. His speech alone alienates the Akhaians because of the way he addresses them. And when Odysseus beats Thersites up they laugh

¹⁶⁴ See Wilamowitz 263: "...dazu ist die Thersitesszene da, in der Odysseus die Lacher auf seine Seite bringt."

¹⁶⁵ On lack of "scalarity" (superlativeness) of καί...περ, I refer to Bakker, E. J. Linguistics and Formulas in Homer. Scalarity and the Description of the Particle Per. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1988. 123: "Of course, the participle phrase lends salience to the nuclear predication ... the Greeks' laughing while they are *akhnumenoi* is more remarkable than when they are not."

and applaud although they are disgruntled (i.e. seeing their case of homecoming slip away).

The mere fact that Thersites is the first who speaks in the assembly with a speech whose nucleus contains the motif of homecoming framed in ring composition with abuse of Agamemnon and the other Akhaians indicates, again, the device of hyperbole in relation to the homecoming theme. But it is here not a rhetorical device in the sense that the speaker uses this motif to advance an exaggerated position (Thersites' speech is straightforward; he means it) but a device on the level of narrative: the ugliest man speaks first; and what he says is the extreme solution to a current crisis; and the way he says it alienates everyone.

Odysseus' speech is first addressed to Agamemnon alone (B284-98), then to the whole assembly (B299-332). At the beginning of the speech he skillfully phrases the subject matter of homecoming as if it were the soldiery who was about to desert their king:¹⁶⁶

Ἄτρείδῃ νῦν δὴ σε ἄναξ ἐθέλουσιν Ἀχαιοὶ
 πᾶσιν ἐλέγχιστον θέμεναι μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν,
 οὐδέ τοι ἐκτελέουσιν ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέσταν
 ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱποβότοιο
 Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι.
 ὥς τε γὰρ ἦ παῖδες νεαροὶ χῆραὶ τε γυναῖκες
 ἀλλήλοισιν ὀδύρονται οἶκον δὲ νέεσθαι.

Son of Atreus: now, my lord, the Achaians are trying / to
make you into a thing of reproach in the sight of all

¹⁶⁶ Wilamowitz 269.

mortal / men, and not fulfilling the promise they
 undertook once / as they set forth to come here from
 horse-pasturing Argos, / to go home only after you had
 sacked strong-walled Ilion. / For as if they were young
 children or widowed women / they cry out and complain to
 each other about going homeward.

[B284-90]

It was not the soldiery but Agamemnon, the king himself,
 who first suggested (albeit deceitfully) that they go
 home shamefully. Odysseus' twisting of these matters and
 his blaming the soldiery is a skillful act: it saves
 Agamemnon's face without having to defend Agamemnon's
 action. Agamemnon's dream and his subsequent suggestion
 (and enactment) of a peira are simply omitted and the
 blame of the soldiery mitigated in that Odysseus judges
 their homesickness rather leniently.

Odysseus' line of argument in (B291-292) is
 difficult, especially the γάρ in: ἦ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἐστὶν
 ἀνηθέντα νέεσθαι. / καὶ γάρ τις θ' ἕνα μῆνα μένων ἀπὸ ἧς ἀλόχοιο ...
 Lohmann takes B291 ("it is a πόνος to go home in grief")
 as anticipating the thought in the sententia B298 (αἰσχρόν
 τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι. "Ringkomponenten
 291:298").¹⁶⁷ The particle γάρ he takes not as pointing
 back to πόνος ἐστὶν ... with γάρ giving the reason of the
 πόνος but pointing ahead to τὸ in B296 and thus framing
 the comparison with "sailors away from home":

¹⁶⁷ Lohmann 52 note 90.

καὶ γὰρ τίς θ' ἕνα μῆνα μένων ἀπὸ ἧς ἀλόχοιο
 ἀσχαλάα σὺν νηὶ πολυζύγῳ, ὃν περ ἄελλαι
 χειμέριαι εἰλέωσιν ὀρινομένη τε θάλασσα·
 ἡμῖν δ' εἵνατός ἐστι περιτροπέων ἐνιαυτός
 ἐνθάδε μιμνόντεσσι· τῷ οὐ νεμεσίζομ' Ἀχαιοὺς
 ἀσχαλάαν παρὰ νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν·

Any man who stays away one month from his own wife / with
 his intricate ship is impatient, one whom the storm winds
 / of winter and the sea rising keep back. And for us now
 / this is the ninth of the circling years that we wait
 here. Therefore / I cannot find fault with the Achaians
 for their impatience beside the curved ships;

[B292-297a]

Odysseus' speech is a masterpiece. Its combination of
 parallel and ring composition¹⁶⁸ is the sign of a speaker
 who knows how to address his audience effectively. The
 homecoming theme in character-text points once more to
 the manipulative speaker.

Nestor speaks immediately after Odysseus without
 waiting for Agamemnon to answer Odysseus's speech (B336-
 368). In contrast to Odysseus, he addresses first all
 the Akhaians (B336-343), then Agamemnon by name
 (B344ff.). This ordering may suggest that his challenge
 to the Akhaians that they go home only after having raped
 the Trojan women and avenged¹⁶⁹ Helen (B354-356), and his
 threat that any Akhaian who tries to lay his hands on the
 ships and to go home will be killed (B357-359), are

¹⁶⁸ Lohmann 52-55.

¹⁶⁹ For homecoming and tisis in the Odyssey cf. ε23-24 = ω479-
 480.

perhaps directed as much against Agamemnon as against all the other Akhaians.

Eustathios (ad loc.) noticed that Nestor's speech is - in contrast to Odysseus' - on a higher rhetorical level. It is less rational, full with pathos.¹⁷⁰ This is most obvious in how differently the two refer to the promises and covenants about the issue of homecoming.

1. Odysseus:

οὐδέ τοι ἐκτελέουσιν ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέσταν
ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο
Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι.

and not fulfilling the promise they undertook once / as they set forth to come here from horse-pasturing Argos, / to go home only after you had sacked strong-walled Ilium.

[B286-88]

2. Nestor:

πῆ δὴ συνθεσῖαι τε καὶ ὄρκια βήσεται ἡμῖν;
ἐν πυρὶ δὴ βουλαί τε γενοῖατο μήδεά τ' ἀνδρῶν
σπονδαί τ' ἄκρητοι καὶ δεξιαί, ἧς ἐπέπιθμεν

Where then shall our covenants go, and the oaths we have taken? / Let counsels and the meditations of men be given to the flames then, / with the unmixed wine poured and the right hands we trusted.

[B339-41]

Emotional involvement of the speaker, however, does not necessarily exclude rational calculation. The emotions of the speaker may be more in the foreground in one part of the speech, but in the next it may be his manipulative

¹⁷⁰ Lohmann 56.

strategy which is more in the fore. Emotions may even be part of the manipulative intentions of the speaker.

Nestor refers in his speech to the few (one or two) who were eager to have a homecoming:

τοῦσδε δ' ἕα φθινύθειν ἕνα καὶ δύο, τοί κεν Ἀχαιῶν
νόσφιν βουλεύωσ' - ἄνυσις δ' οὐκ ἔσσειται αὐτῶν -
πρὶν Ἄργος δ' ἰέναι πρὶν καὶ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
γνώμεναι εἴ τε ψεύδος ὑπόσχεσις εἴ τε καὶ οὐκί.

let them go perish, these one or two, who make plans apart from / the rest of the Akhaians - there will be no accomplishment on their part - / to get back again to Argos before ever learning / whether Zeus of the aegis promises false or truly.

[B346-49; transl. Lattimore, modified]

It was not one or two who had wished to go home but most, if not all, of the Akhaian host. Had a goddess not intervened to stop them from going, they would have gone. Nestor's misrepresentation of the event points, again, to the speaker's manipulation in the context of homecoming.

The reaction of the Akhaians after the beating of Thersites (B270-277), after Odysseus' speech (B333-335) and right before they move out into the battlefield

τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων γένητ' ἢ ἐ νέεσθαι
ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῆσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν.

And now battle became sweeter to them than to go back / in their hollow ships to the beloved land of their fathers.

[B453-454]

all point to a positive response on the part of the audience, the Akhaian host. The narrator's marked description in B453-454 of the Akhaians' morale [a marking which is repeated verbatim when the Akhaians move out for battle right in the morning of the third day of battle in the Iliad (A13-14)]¹⁷¹ makes it obvious that these speeches were effective. War became sweeter to the Akhaians than a homecoming.

All this "happens" despite Akhilleus' μῆνις. Why the μῆνις motif is not stressed more to give an explicit motivation for the low morale of the Akhaians and their (momentary) desire to have a homecoming, and why it seems not to impair the Akhaians' morale now at the beginning of the first day of battle, is well worth a thought. Until now there has not been any fighting in the story: the "first day of battle" started with the beginning of B but the actual fighting does not start until the beginning of Γ.¹⁷² It is likely that the Akhaians overestimate their own strength and underestimate the impact of Akhilleus' withdrawal from the fighting especially since they are unaware that Zeus is against them.

Yet, although Akhilleus' μῆνις neither overtly causes

¹⁷¹ The homecoming theme in narrator-text points here clearly to the "programmatic" character of B353-354 = A13-14; cf. B155 and the prooimion of the Odyssey.

¹⁷² Or even more precisely until Δ422.

the initially low morale of the Akhaians (and their momentary desire of homecoming) nor diminishes their quickly restored enthusiasm for war, it has not been absent from the narrative: Akhilleus' quarrel with Agamemnon is acknowledged by Thersites who thinks that Akhilleus let get away Agamemnon much too easily.¹⁷³ Agamemnon also acknowledges the quarrel "he started" (!) (B378) with Akhilleus (B375-378).¹⁷⁴ Agamemnon ends his reflection on this quarrel by turning to the future:

εἰ δέ ποτ' ἔς γε μίαν βουλευόμεν, οὐκέτ' ἔπειτα
 Τρωσὶν ἀνάβλησις κακοῦ ἔσσεται οὐδ' ἠβαιόν.

If ever we can take one single counsel, then no longer / shall there be a respite of evils for the Trojans, not even for a small time.

[B379-380; transl. Lattimore]

Agamemnon's admission here that Akhilleus' withdrawal (his μῆνις) has made a difference is somewhat surprising because in the context of the morale of the army Akhilleus' μῆνις so far has been hardly mentioned (as

¹⁷³ Thersites does not use the word μῆνις. He (unlike the narrator who says that Akhilleus pondered whether he should ... kill Agamemnon or whether he should suppress his χόλος and restrain his θυμός (A189-92)) thinks that Akhilleus' state of mind does not point to any χόλος whatsoever (B241).

¹⁷⁴ Agamemnon rather vaguely talks about ἔριδας and νεῖκεα which he blames on Zeus (B375-376). The absence of the catchwords χόλος and μῆνις may simply indicate that Agamemnon cannot know the inner (suppressed) emotions of Akhilleus, and that he is perhaps only starting to get an idea of the consequence of this quarrel.

Thersites' allusion is the only exception). Does Agamemnon by now doubt the message he received from the dream (B8-15)? Does he, in contrast to Odysseus and Nestor, interpret the temporary low morale of the Akhaians as a direct outcome of Akhilleus' withdrawal? Is he reminded of Akhilleus' μῆνις because Thersites had mentioned Akhilleus and the quarrel? Or is his playful allusion to Atê (Ζεὺς με μέγα Κρονίδης ἄτη ἐνέδησε βαρείη B111) in retrospect a serious recognition of his Zeus-sent infatuation which he by now (B379-380) holds responsible for his quarrel with Akhilleus (and Akhilleus' ensuing μῆνις)?¹⁷⁵

It is Agamemnon who challenges the Akhaians a second time to go home (I17-28) after the catastrophe at the end of "the second day of battle" (I1-8). Agamemnon's speech is a verbatim repetition¹⁷⁶ of his peira with three things

¹⁷⁵ Note Akhilleus' reference to Agamemnon's Atê (A412). It is clear that B111 (Agamemnon's allusion to Atê) itself (and at that point of the story) has as "referent" only the allegedly broken promise of Zeus (σχέτλιος, ὃς πρὶν μὲν μοι ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν / Ἴλιον ἐκπέσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι B112-113) regardless whether this refers to a promise made by Zeus prior to the "dream-scene" (cf. πρὶν in B112) or (in contrast to Kirk, comm. ad loc.) to the dream itself. Agamemnon may indeed playfully refer to the deceitful dream without, at that point of the story, realizing that the dream is a deception on Zeus' part. For B111 = I18 (and for B110-B118 + B139-B141 = I17-28), see below.

¹⁷⁶ The speech in I is much shorter though. Agamemnon omits lines B119-138. Notice also that in I19 Aristarchus reads τότε whereas the vulgate repeats the πρὶν of B112. For a good interpretation,

being different: (1) this speech is not a peira, an attempt by Agamemnon to test his people; (2) Agamemnon's crying like a spring which pours forth its water from the rock (I14-16) indicates his emotional involvement, his seriousness and straightforwardness; (3) the audience remains silent after the speech:

“Ὡς ἔφαθ’, οἳ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.
 δὴν δ’ ἄνεω ἦσαν τετιηότες υἱες Ἀχαιῶν·
 ὄψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·

So he spoke, and all of them stayed stricken to silence.
 / For some time the sons of the Achaians said nothing
being in a state of vexation; / but at long last Diomedes
 of the great war cry addressed them:

[I29-31; transl. Lattimore, modified]

Agamemnon misjudges the mood of the Akhaians a second time. If there was indeed at one moment (before the beginning of the first day of battle) a desire among the Akhaians to go home it has been quenched effectively through the speeches of Thersites, Odysseus and Nestor in B. Not one of the Akhaians rises and runs to the ships. All of them remain seated and mute.¹⁷⁷

see Lohmann 216-217.

¹⁷⁷ The perfect participle of τετιημαι (I30) is translated by Lattimore with "in sorrows". Lynn-George seems to agree with this interpretation, since he quotes Lattimore's translation (Lynn-George, M. Epos: Word, Narrative, and the Iliad. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International, 1988. 83). The Akhaians are indeed "dispirited" [Lattimore, transl. of I13] after they were

Diomedes' response may very well be representative for the point of view of most of the Akhaians:¹⁷⁸ "if your thumos is inclined to go, go! ... and yet the rest of the flowing-haired Achaians will stay here / until we have sacked the city of Troy" [I42-43a and I45-46a]. Although the immediately following remarks of Diomedes are not very flattering to the other Akhaians ("let even these also / run away with their ships to the beloved lands of their fathers, / still we two, Sthenelos and I, will fight till we witness / the end of Ilion; for it was with God that we made our way hither")¹⁷⁹ they marvel at his muthoi (I50-51=H403-404).

Nestor tells Diomedes (and the audience = other Akhaians) that his (and their) "reading" of Agamemnon's speech is wrong:

ἀτὰρ οὐ τέλος ἵκεο μύθων.

but you have not hit the mark = you have spoken beside the point.¹⁸⁰

routed by the Trojans and after they had taken their seats in the agora. They are again "in sorrow" [Lattimore, transl. of I695] when they hear from Odysseus that Phoenix stayed with Akhilleus "so that he might follow him in the ships to the beloved land of his fathers tomorrow / if Phoenix will" [I691-692a; transl. Lattimore, modified]. I submit that despite these parallels the Akhaians are not "in sorrow" but rather "annoyed" with Agamemnon at his renewed suggestion to flee and return home.

¹⁷⁸ Clearly not for Nestor; see below.

¹⁷⁹ I46b-49.

¹⁸⁰ See Ebeling ad τέλος 1): "eventus, finis (Erfüllung, Ziel)." and Cunliffe ad τέλος (6) you "have not said the last word, all that

Diomedes takes Agamemnon's speech literally. Nestor reads it as a sign of Agamemnon's utter despair: in his response to Agamemnon in the boulê¹⁸¹ he does not resume Agamemnon's language of homecoming. He urges him to seek a reconciliation with Akhilleus.¹⁸² Agamemnon's praise of Nestor and his response indicate that Nestor's reading is "correct."¹⁸³

I conclude the first part of the chapter: we saw that the theme homecoming is appropriated by different characters for different rhetorical purposes:

- Agamemnon uses the issue of homecoming (initially) to test the morale of the Akhaians (B110-141);
- Thersites uses the issue of homecoming straightforwardly; but he has the effect of alienating the Akhaians from any desire for homecoming which they had entertained (B225-278);
- Odysseus twists the issue of homecoming and puts

is to be said."

¹⁸¹ Which in B takes place before, and which in I takes place after, the full assembly in the "agora" (I96-113).

¹⁸² I103-113.

¹⁸³ See Agamemnon's reference to Διέ, clearly alluding to his quarrel with Akhilleus:

ἄσάμην, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἀναίνομαι. ἀντί νυ πολλῶν
 λαῶν ἐστὶν ἀνὴρ ὃν τε Ζεὺς κῆρι φιλήσῃ.
 ὥς νῦν τοῦτον ἔτισε, δάμασσε δὲ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν.
 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἄσάμην φρεσὶ λευγαλέησι πιθήσας,
 ἄν ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι δόμεναί τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα (I116-120).

it as if the army was about to desert their king

(B284ff.);

- Nestor appropriates the homecoming motif to depict an army in which there are only one or two grumblers

(B346ff.);

- Agamemnon, finally, expresses his utter despair and suggests that they go home (I17-28).

- Diomedes takes Agamemnon's suggestion of homecoming straightforwardly.

- Nestor reads Agamemnon's suggestion that they go home as a sign of his utter despair.

- Akhilleus' proposal to sail home in A169-170 is (in the form of a hyperbole) a representation of his μῆνις and serves as prelude to the embassy-episode in I: here Akhilleus makes a variety of statements which refer to homecoming. Akhilleus' (contradictory) indication that he will leave and go home,¹⁸⁴ that he will perhaps not go home¹⁸⁵ and that he will indeed stay before Troy but not think of fighting until... (οὐ γὰρ πρὶν ... πρὶν)¹⁸⁶ all suggest

¹⁸⁴ Cf. ἦν γὰρ δὴ με σαῶσι θεοὶ καὶ οἴκαδ' ἴκωμαι, (I393); see also καὶ δ' ἄν τοῖς ἄλλοισιν ἐγὼ παραμυθησαίμην / οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν (I417-418a) and the following passage:

Φοῖνιξ δ' αὖθι παρ' ἄμμι μένων κατακοιμηθήτω,
ὄφρα μοι ἐν νήεσσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔπηται
αὔριον ἦν ἐθέλησιν· ἀνάγκη δ' οὐ τί μιν ἄξω (I427-429).

¹⁸⁵ φρασσόμεθ' ἢ κε νεώμεθ' ἐφ' ἡμέτερ' ἢ κε μένωμεν. (I619).

¹⁸⁶ οὐ γὰρ πρὶν πολέμοιο μεδήσομαι αἱματόεντος
πρὶν γ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο δαΐφρονος Ἴκτορα δῖον
Μυρμιδόνων ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθαι

that Akhilleus uses the theme as a vehicle for representing his μῆνις rhetorically.¹⁸⁷

Part II: Do Trojans Have a Homecoming?

So far I have discussed the homecoming theme in the Akhaian context (in the Iliad and Odyssey). Next I shall examine the homecoming theme in the context of Troy and Trojans. In contrast to Akhaian homecomings "imagined" and "viewed" by Akhaians (or Trojans) in character-text, movements of Trojans (and Trojan allies) from the battlefield to/into Troy are occur as often in narrator-text as in character-text (not unlike the Akhaian motions from the battlefield to the camp). These are the passages which denote movements of Trojans back to Troy with the marker Ἰλίον:¹⁸⁸

in character-text (14x)

Γ305-06; Ζ113; Η82; Θ499; Ξ46; Π159, 163, 337; Σ174, 270; Φ81, 560-61; Χ17; Ω620;

in narrator-text (11x)

Γ313; Ζ73-74; Η413; 429; Μ113-15; Ν657, 723-24; Π193, 319-20, 396; Ω330.

κτείνοντ' Ἀργείους, κατά τε σμῦξαι πυρὶ νῆας. (I650-653).

¹⁸⁷ Akhilleus explicitly connects the homecoming theme and the μῆνις theme in (I426-429); see ἐμεῦ ἀπομνήσαντος (I426).

¹⁸⁸ Other markers which denote the destination Troy overtly are ἄστν, ἄστνδε, πόλιν, πόλινδε, πτόλιν, πύργον, πύργους, τεῖχος, τεῖχεα.

We observed that - in the context of the Akhaians - the homecoming theme tends to be found in character-text much more often than in narrator-text. We noticed that homecomings of Akhaians in narrator-text are marked (cf. B155; M16). We noticed other instances where the narrator presents the homecoming theme with his own voice. Although motions of Olympians to Olympos are "viewed" by the gods themselves¹⁸⁹ and even by mortals¹⁹⁰ it is the narrator who generally describes (actual) movements of gods to Olympos, using a past tense.¹⁹¹ A narrator who "views" movements of gods can be expected to "view" movements of Akhaians home to Akhaia.¹⁹² We expect the narrator to take the "bird's eye view"¹⁹³ and look beyond the Akhaian camp, and even beyond the Trojan

¹⁸⁹ Cf. A425; E360; Θ12 κτλ.

¹⁹⁰ But not with verbs in a past tense describing an actual motion of gods; motions of gods to Olympos are either "imagined" by mortals to take place in the (near) future (cf. A394) or they are a "focalization" of the gods' discourse which "somehow" has become common knowledge (cf. T128-129).

¹⁹¹ Cf. A494; 532; E367; 868; Θ410; 439 κτλ.

¹⁹² See 'Αργεῖοι δ' ἐν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔβησαν (M16); within the Iliad this pointing ahead (or pointing back) of the narrator to a time when the Akhaians had actually gone home occurs only here (cf. α11-12). Otherwise, it is the Akhaians themselves who point to homecoming in the future (or past) in character-text (cf. particularly the speeches held in the Akhaian assembly in Band I; note also Δ180-181).

¹⁹³ Richardson 119.

plain.¹⁹⁴ Since it is not unusual for the narrator to describe movements of gods to Olympos we do not call these motions marked ones.

Since it is, likewise, not unusual for the narrator to describe movements of Trojans back to Troy (cf. τὼ μὲν ἄρ' ἄψορροι προτὶ Ἰλίου ἀπονέοντο· Γ313 ~ Ω330) we do not call these movements marked ones either. Motions of Trojans back to Troy are so common in narrator-text that a description thereof by the narrator is not extraordinary (see above the listing of verbal expressions with the marker Ἰλίου in narrator-text).

The passages which I have just quoted (motions of gods to Olympos and of Trojans back to Troy) portray actual movements "viewed" by the narrator, with the verbs of motion in the past tense (Realis). The narrator also "views" movements of Trojans¹⁹⁵ back to Troy which actually do not take place. These movements of Trojans are expressed in statement contrary to fact (Irrealis).¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ For other motions "home" which are in narrator-text, I refer to the combination of verb (in past tense) + νέεσθαι: κελύω + νέεσθαι in Y6 (the actual motion of the gods which has been commanded is described in Y10) and πέμπω + νέεσθαι in Σ240 (the actual motion of the sun setting is in Σ241) and Φ598 (the description of Apollo sending Agenor from the battlefield is here not followed by a description of Agenor's actual homecoming. It is obviously understood in ἠσύχιον δ' ἄρα μιν πολέμου ἔκπεμπε νέεσθαι.) .

¹⁹⁵ Once the narrator "views" a motion home of Akhaians in a statement contrary to fact (cf. B155 and my comment above).

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Z73-74 = P319-320; N723-724; see also Richardson 87ff.

If the narrator had decided not to reverse the plot these movements would have had a considerable impact on, and hence changed, the story since these are movements of all the Trojan army. The narrator also "views" a motion of a Trojan (character B) to his home which is expected by character A of character B. Yet, character B does not return home (cf. e.g. a negated form of (ὑπο)δέχομαι + verb of motion).¹⁹⁷ The narrator "views" also movements home which are not to take place: οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε / οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλον + (future) infinitive.¹⁹⁸

Why is the narrator whose self-effacement is so striking throughout the Odyssey (when the subject matter is the homecoming theme) and also in the Iliad (when the subject matter is the homecoming of the Akhaians) not more reserved when the subject matter is the "homecoming" of Trojans?

It is taken for granted that the Troad (including the battlefield) is part of Troy. It follows that movements of Trojans back to Troy are perhaps no homecomings at all since the Trojans are at home already. In the remainder of this chapter, however, I will demonstrate that the text itself at least questions such

("Plot Decisions") and 242 note 53 and de Jong 69-81.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. E157 (here Character A (Xanthos and Thoon) obviously do "return" to their father, but as corpses - "not being alive"). For a detailed discussion on (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses see below.

¹⁹⁸ M113-115; P497-498 (with véεσθαι in future sense). There is a discussion on proleptic announcements in Richardson 136.

an assumption. Whereas architectonic features which Troy and the Akhaian camp share reinforce the parallel of Akhaian camp and Troy and the parallel of Akhaian and Trojan returns from the battlefield to the camp and to the city respectively, certain movements of Trojans to Troy and of Akhaians to their camp (which are viewed in character-text and narrator-text) are strikingly similar to the way Akhaian homecomings are viewed in character-text. This will be demonstrated on the basis of 1. μή πρίν ... πρίν clauses, 2. flee/stay debates (μερμηρίζειν monologues) and 3. (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses.

After H432, i.e. after the Trojans and Akhaians burned their dead and returned to camp and city respectively, we would expect the narrator to mention the arrival of evening, a night-meal, retirement to bed, and *only then* the arrival of a new dawn.¹⁹⁹ Instead, dawn has not quite arrived yet (Ἥμος δ' οὔτ' ἄρ' πῶ ἠώς, ἔτι δ' ἀμφιλύκη νύξ)²⁰⁰ when an elected host of Akhaians starts

¹⁹⁹ Compare H433 with this typical scene from the first book of the Iliad:

Ἥμος δ' ἥελιος κατέδου καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθε,

δὴ τότε κοιμήσαντο παρὰ πρυμνήσια νηός·

ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως (A475-477);

A477 = Ω788 = β1 = γ404 = 491 = δ306 κτλ. (This traditional phrase is 20X in the Odyssey alone); cf. for the Iliad B48; Z175b = I707b = Ψ109b κτλ.

²⁰⁰ In all of Homeric epic there is no parallel for dawn not having come yet. For the "untypical about the timing of events" cf. Kirk, comm. ad H433.

work on a grave-mound (H435), a wall (H436), high towers (H437), well-constructed gates (H438) and a broad and deep trench (H440-441). The omission of evening-meal and of going to sleep and the depiction of pre-dawn activity all suggest something extraordinary. The marking of the huts and ships with a wall, high towers, a wide trench and well constructed gates points to a marked passage.²⁰¹

Now, there are obvious characteristics which differentiate Troy from the Akhaian camp: Troy is a city with wives and children in it, old men and women. Troy is a polis for which the epithet sacred is used. The polis is made up of oikoi. There are assemblies, prayers and lamentations of women.²⁰²

There are also assemblies held in the Greek camp.

²⁰¹ See Thornton, A. Homeric's Iliad, its Composition and the Motif of Supplication. Hypomnemata. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984. 51: "The Homeric presentation of the Trojan plain is ... not a description of the actual geographical and topological nature of that plain. We are, therefore, free to assume that it is a poetic construction the landmarks of which have a definite function in the poet's story ... the most important local feature ... is the Achaian wall and its ditch. The building of the wall takes place at the precise point in the sequence of events when the poet needs its existence..." The discussion whether the wall has "actually" been built right at the beginning of the Trojan war (cf. Thuc. I.10.5ff., Page, D.L. History and the Homeric "Iliad". Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959. 315-324 and Kirk, comm. ad H327-43) is here irrelevant.

²⁰² See Hellwig, B. Raum und Zeit im Homerischen Epos. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964. 25-26.

There is an agora.²⁰³ Yet, the camp is not a polis. The epithet ἱερός is never used for e.g. νῆας, the Greek camp.²⁰⁴ There are no wives, only slave women, no lamentations of women, only the lamentation of Briseis in T. In short, it is obvious: the Akhaians are on an expedition, their ships are anchored on the shoreline of the Troad. They are far away from their homeland. When the Akhaians return from the battlefield they return to their ships, when the Trojans return from the battlefield they return to their polis.

Having said that it should also be noticed that there are passages in the Iliad which show that Troy is not simply a polis but betrays certain marks of a camp. There are also passages which point to the Akhaian camp being closer to a polis than it first seems.²⁰⁵ After briefly examining the architectonic features Troy and the Akhaian camp have in common (camp-like polis, polis-like

²⁰³ Which, of course, generally is not taken as marketplace.

²⁰⁴ νῆς in singular denotes a ship; in plural and in context of motion it connotes the Akhaian camp (see Sale, W. "The Formularity of the Place Phrases of the Iliad." TAPA 117 (1987): 24 note 11). From M119 - Ε505 and O305/345 - Π366 the fighting takes place within the Akhaian camp. Motions to the νῆας depicted within these passages are actually motions to the ships, and not to the camp. This is neglected by Sale and is perhaps fit to be neglected because the singers may not have cared. The other word used for Greek camp is στρατός (see Sale. Ibid. 27).

²⁰⁵ Contra Scully, S. Homer and the Sacred City. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990, who stresses throughout the difference of camp and city. Henceforth quoted as Scully.

camp) I shall resume the analysis of grammatical and syntactical parallels of verbs which denote a return to polis and to the camp.

Polis-like Camp: The passage in H which describes the building of the wall and trenches is not the only one which points to a city-like camp. In P735-736 the narrator describes the retreat of the Akhaians trying to carry Patroklos (who has been killed at the end of Π)²⁰⁶ into their camp.²⁰⁷ In P736b-745 are depicted two similes.²⁰⁸ I consider here only the first simile which compares the tight fighting between Akhaians and Trojans with a fire which storms a polis, sets it ablaze and destroys the oikoi in it (P737-739).

Scully quotes this simile within his discussion on Troy-city [sic] and the Trojans (p.109). Right before his discussion on polis, oikos and the Trojans, Scully had stressed the difference between Akhaian aidôs and Trojan aidôs (pp.107-108). We are (rightly) told that Akhaian aidôs has to do with shame of the heroes "each for another" (p.107) whereas Hektor's aidôs shows his concern for "Trojan men and the women of Troy" (p.108). This serves as a transition to a discussion of polis as

²⁰⁶ Π787-864.

²⁰⁷ The vehemence of the Trojan attack is reinforced by the simile of the hunting dogs (P725-730).

²⁰⁸ For long similes illustrating mass movements see Coffey, M. "The Function of the Homeric Simile." *AJP* 78 (1957): 121.

distinct from oikoi and Troy made up of these oikoi: "Defined by its people and perceived as the place of generation where past, present, and future reside (parents, wives, children), Troy, and only Troy as the walled aggregate of oikoi [sic], can offer defense against Achilles" (p.109). In between "Trojan men and the women of Troy" and "(parents, wives, children) Troy, and only Troy ..." Scully quotes this simile which describes the intensity of the fight between (defensive) Akhaians and (offensive) Trojans, thus implying what is not implied, namely some kind of connection between the polis of Troy and that of the simile.

The simile of the (offensive) fire setting ablaze a polis and its oikoi (P737-738) may as much refer to the Akhaians as to the Trojans. In fact, the parallel of offensive Trojans and offensive fire even points to Akhaians who are destroyed like a polis and its oikoi. In short, rather than differentiating between Akhaians who inhabit a camp, not a polis, and Trojans who inhabit a polis, the simile points to Akhaians who inhabit a polis-like camp "as the walled aggregate of oikoi." Other passages which point to the Akhaian huts (κλισίαι) being oikoi are easily found.²⁰⁹ Very striking are also

²⁰⁹ Cf., e.g., the reference to κλισίη in Ψ549 and to "οἶκον" in Ψ558 which obviously both refer to Akhilleus' "hut"; cf. also Ω572 for Akhilleus' oikos. Notice that the arrangements which are made for guests to spend the night are similar in Akhilleus hut, Nestor's palace, Menelaos' palace, and Alkinoos' palace: the guest

bee-similes which point to Akhaians inhabiting oikoi rather than κλισίαι.²¹⁰

Camp-like Polis: As regards Troy it is obvious that it is a polis made up of oikoi. There is, however, also evidence which suggests that Troy is viewed as a city with camp-like features. Dolon is sent during the night of the second and third battle-day to spy on the Akhaians because Hektor is afraid that the Akhaians might abandon their camp (K308-312).²¹¹ When Hermes meets Priam out in the Trojan plain he asks the old man whether the Trojans are abandoning their sacred city (Ω383). Akhilleus suspects also that the Trojans might leave Troy because of Hektor's death (X378-384).

There are more parallels between Troy and the camp. Troy has towers and so does the camp.²¹² Troy has gates and the camp also.²¹³ Troy has walls and so does the camp.²¹⁴ More parallels can be accrued.²¹⁵ All this may sleeps outside but the host sleeps in the innermost part of the lofty hut / house (cf. I663=Ω2675-γ402-δ304-η346). See Arend 102 and table 12 and also Webster, T.B.L. From Mycenae to Homer. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1964. 240. Of interest is also the varia lectio of οίκόνδε : κλισίηνδε (Ψ856).

²¹⁰ M167-172; Π259-267.

²¹¹ The same fear of Hektor is expressed right at the end of the second battle-day (Θ510-515).

²¹² On πύργοι, cf. H437 and Ω443 for the Akhaian camp, Σ278 and X195 for Troy.

²¹³ For the πύλαι of the camp, cf. H438, M175; for those of Troy, cf. B809, Γ145.

intimate that the Trojan city is seen parallel to the Akhaian camp, and that Trojan returns to their city should be viewed parallel to Akhaian returns to their camp. It seems that the Troad (including the battlefield) is part of Troy and, at the same time, that camp-like Troy is part of the battlefield. The initial question whether Trojans have a homecoming seems, in light of the parallel between camp and city, as pointless as if we asked whether Akhaians have a homecoming whenever they withdraw from the battlefield to their camp. The parallel of movements back to camp-like polis and polis-like camp and the syntactical and verbal resemblance of these returns to the language of Akhaian homecomings, however, will prove instructive. I shall focus on the μήπρίν ... πρίν clauses, flee/stay debates (μερμηρίζειν monologues) and (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses.

²¹⁴ For τείχος / τείχεα, cf. Δ34, Z327, 388, H436, 449, Θ177 κτλ.

²¹⁵ Cf. Andromakhe (Z431-439) and Poludamas (Σ254-283) suggesting to defend Troy from the wall whereas the Akhaians do defend their camp from the wall (see M: τειχομαχία); cf. Patroklos' scaling an angle of the Trojan wall (Π702) which parallels the Trojans breaking through the Akhaian wall (M430-471); cf. the Trojan allies whose homeland is not Troy (Sarpedon in E472-484 and E686-688; cf. Glaukos in P144-155; for Pandaros cf. Δ103; also E212-213); cf. Hektor's comment on poor and shabby Troy which cannot stand any comparison with what it once was (Σ285-292); cf. also Akhilleus' speaking of Troy as once a rich city before the arrival of the Akhaians (I402-403).

μὴ πρὶν ... πρὶν clauses

Odysseus' sententia "it is disgraceful to stay long and go home emptyhanded"²¹⁶ points ahead to Nestor's resolve "not to go home until ..."²¹⁷ These scenes are paralleled by Hektor's plan "not to return to Troy until ...",²¹⁸ a resolve which is recalled by Agamemnon when he focalizes Hektor's threatening intention that "he would not return to Troy until ..." (μὴ πρὶν ... πρὶν ...).²¹⁹ Such a parallel of syntactical and verbal structure intimates that motions of Trojans back to Troy are seen in terms of a homecoming. The battlefield seems as little part of Troy as it is part of Akhaia. There is, however, another parallel.

At Patroklos' death Hektor concocts an utterance of

²¹⁶ αἰσχρὸν τοι δηρὸν τε μένειν κενεὸν τε νέεσθαι (B298).

²¹⁷ τὼ μὴ τις πρὶν ἐπειγέσθω οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι
πρὶν τινα πᾶρ Τρώων ἀλόχῳ κατακοιμηθῆναι,
τίσασθαι δ' Ἑλένης ὀρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε (B354-356).

²¹⁸ νῦν ἐφάμην νῆας τ' ὀλέσας καὶ πάντα Ἀχαιοὺς
ᾧψ ἀπονοστήσειν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν (Θ498-499).

The construction is aorist participle ὀλέσας and future infinitive ᾧψ ἀπονοστήσειν which depends on ἐφάμην. Hektor's resolve that he would return after ... is of course equivalent to "return not until ..." (cf. Odysseus' sententia above and the traditional phrase Ἴλιον ἐκπέραντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι in B113 = 288 = E716 = I20).

²¹⁹ δεῖδω μὴ δὴ μοι τελέσῃ ἔπος ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ,
ὥς ποτ' ἐπηπίλησεν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων
μὴ πρὶν πᾶρ νηῶν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι
πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρῆσαι, κτεῖναι δὲ καὶ αὐτούς (Ξ44-47).

Akhilleus and maintains that he without doubt commanded to Patroklos "not to return ... until ...":

ἄ δειλ', οὐδέ τοι ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν χραίσμησεν Ἀχιλλεύς,
 ὅς πού τοι μάλα πολλὰ μένων ἐπετέλλετ' ἰόντι·
 μή μοι πρὶν ἰέναι Πατρόκλεες ἵπποκέλευθε
 νῆας ἔπι γλαφυρὰς πρὶν Ἑκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
 αἰματόεντα χιτῶνα περὶ στήθεσσι δαίξαι.

Wretch! Achilleus, great as he was, could do nothing to help you. / When he stayed behind, and you went, he must have said much to you: / "Patroklos, Lord of horses, see that you do not come back to me / and the hollow ships, until you have torn in blood the tunic / of manslaughtering Hektor about his chest."

[Π837-841]

Hektor's "quotation" of Akhilleus interestingly recalls Akhilleus' language when he allows Patroklos to wear his armour and go to drive back the Trojans:

ἐκ νηῶν ἐλάσας ἰέναι πάλιν·

When you have driven them from the ships, come back;

[Π87]

Hektor's ἰέναι ... νῆας ἔπι γλαφυρὰς recalls Akhilleus' ἰέναι πάλιν but not what Akhilleus had actually said.²²⁰ The parallel of the μὴ πρὶν ... πρὶν phrases (which are used to

²²⁰ Akhilleus' command to Patroklos to return back (sc. to the camp) after he had driven the Trojans from the camp deviates significantly from the other μὴ πρὶν ... πρὶν phrases in that it points to a minimum achievement strategy and not to a maximum achievement strategy which allows a return only after either the sacking of Troy or the burning of the ships.

set forth conditions which are to be met by Akhaians before they can return home to their homeland, by Trojans before they can go back to Troy and - according to Hektor - by Patroklos (and the Akhaians) before they can return to their camp) indicates that Trojan motions back to the city are seen either parallel to Akhaian homecomings or parallel to Akhaian withdrawals from the battlefield to the camp. At the same time, the parallel of (viewed) motions of Akhaians to Akhaia and to the camp (as seen in the parallel of μή πρίν ... πρίν clauses) indicates also that Akhaian withdrawals from the battlefield back to their camp are in certain instances seen in light of a homecoming.²²¹

²²¹ For other μή πρίν ... πρίν clauses, see Akhilleus' decision to bury Patroklos only after he returned from the battlefield with Hektor's weapons and his head (Σ334-35; cf. also Φ224-26 and 294-97). It is perhaps ironic that μή πρίν ... πρίν clauses which point to a return (home) after a maximum of success serve also to remind Hera (and the audience) that Akhilleus' return to the battlefield operates under a strikingly similar pattern: "maximum achievement strategy" means here ultimately the slaying of Akhilleus' alter ego, Patroklos, by Hektor (Θ470-76; cf. also O72-77). Moreover, Akhilleus in his resolve "not to return to the battlefield until ..." (I650-53, Π61b-63) anticipates Hektor's hoped for "big success" (i.e. to kill the Akhaians and set their ships ablaze) without, however, realizing that this includes Patroklos' death. Akhilleus' various "returns" have been convincingly compared with Odysseus' return (see Lord, A.B. The Singer of Tales. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1960. 186-97 and Nagler, M. N. Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. 131-98).

We just saw Hektor's "reading" of Akhilleus' command to Patroklos: "do not return until ..." (Π839-41). Now we will see that the narrator's "reading" of Akhilleus' state of mind points also to a "maximum achievement strategy" and resembles very closely Hektor's "reading". There is a passage before Hektor's confrontation with Patroklos in which the narrator intimates that Akhilleus might have wished for too much. In a prayer to Zeus (Π233-248) Akhilleus asked specifically for a successful combat and a safe return of Patroklos to the ships (Π241-248). The poet tells us that Zeus granted the one but denied the other (Π250). Zeus' denial of Patroklos' return to the camp is "rephrased" (Π252): although the poet could have used Akhilleus' phrase (Π247) in the infinitive (*σόον δ' άνένευσε θοάς επί νήας ικέσθαι) he chooses instead to express the denial of Patroklos' return to the camp with a phrase which may denote a homecoming with the connotation of utter success: σόον δ' άνένευσε μάχης έξ άπονέεσθαι (Π252).

The narrator (somewhat later) portrays in detail Akhilleus' thoughts about Patroklos, his fighting and return to the camp:

τό μιν οϋ ποτε έλπετο θυμῶ
 τεθνάμεν, άλλα ζών ενιχριμφθέντα πύλησιν
 ἄψ άπονοστήσειν, έπει οϋδέ τὸ έλπετο πάμπαν
 έκπέρσειν πτολίεθρον άνευ έθεν, οϋδέ σὺν αὐτῶ·

... and Achilleus had no expectation / that Patroklos was dead, but thought he was alive and close under / the gates, and would come back. He had not thought that Patroklos / would storm the city without himself, nor with himself either.

[P404b-407]

ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν (P406) recalls Hektor's "maximum achievement strategy" of homecoming with "booty" (in his case return to Troy after the destruction of the ships; νῦν ἐφάμην νῆάς τ' ὀλέσας καὶ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς / ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν (Θ498-499). The narrator's "focalization" of Akhilleus' thought (ἔλπετο θυμῷ ... P404b-407) reinforces thus ironically Hektor's (false?) quotation of Akhilleus at the death of Patroklos ("Patroklos, Lord of horses, see that you do not come back to me / and the hollow ships, until you have torn in blood the tunic / of manslaughtering Hektor about his chest"; Π839-841).

Returns in terms of maximum achievement strategy are quite often expressed with a verb of the root *nos/nes. We saw above traditional phrases like αἰσχρὸν τοι δηρὸν τε μένειν κενεὸν τε νέεσθαι (B298) or τὸ μὴ τις πρὶν ἐπειγέσθω οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι / πρὶν ... (B354-355a) or Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι (B113 = 288 = E716 = I20) denoting a return of Akhaians to Akhaia in terms of maximum achievement strategy, and νῦν ἐφάμην νῆάς τ' ὀλέσας καὶ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς / ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν (Θ498-499) and μὴ πρὶν παρ νηῶν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι / πρὶν ... (Ξ46-47a) denoting a

return of Trojans and their allies to Troy in terms of maximum achievement strategy.

Verbal forms of the root *nos/nes are also used to express maximum achievement strategy in terms of the Akhaisians' returning from the battlefield to their camp. These passages explicitly stress that the return of Akhaisians from the battlefield to the camp is viewed by Akhaisians as if these were homecomings with glory, booty, joy and song: cf.

- ὦ φίλοι οὐ μὰν ἡμιν εὐκλεῆς ἀπονέεσθαι / νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς (P415-416a);
- ἡμὲν ὅπως τὸν νεκρὸν ἐρύσσομεν, ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ / χάρμα φίλοις ἐτάροισι γενώμεθα νοστήσαντες, / οἳ που δεῦρ' ὀρώωντες ἀκηχέδατ' (P635-637a);
- νῦν δ' ἄγ' αἰείδοντες παίηονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν / νηυσὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῆσι νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ' ἄγωμεν. / ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος· ἐπέφνομεν Ἴκτορα δῖον, / ᾧ Τρῶες κατὰ ἄστρῳ θεῶ ὡς εὐχετόωντο (X391-394).

Because verbal forms of the root *nos/nes are used to express returns of Akhaisians from the battlefield to the camp as if they were homecomings with glory, booty, joy and song ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν (P406) is likely to also carry the force of maximum achievement strategy (i.e. glorious return after slaying Hektor and after storming Troy). The juxtaposition of ἔλπετο ... ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν with its maximum achievement strategy (P404b-406a) and οὐδὲ τὸ ἔλπετο

πάμπαν / ἐκπέρσειν πτολίεθρον ἄνευ ἕθεν, οὐδὲ σὺν αὐτῷ (P406b-407)

with its minimum achievement strategy may point to Akhilleus ambiguous feelings about Patroklos and his success on the battlefield.

Although Akhilleus seems to know that he will not sack Troy together with Patroklos (οὐδὲ σὺν αὐτῷ (P407b)) he prayed for just that:

αἶ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον
μήτέ τις οὖν Τρώων θάνατον φύγοι ὅσσοι ἔασι,
μήτέ τις Ἀργείων, νῶϊν δ' ἐκδῶμεν ὄλεθρον,
ὄφρ' οἶοι Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα λύωμεν.

Father Zeus, Athene and Apollo, if only / not one of all the Trojans could escape destruction, not one / of the Argives, but you [sc. Patroklos] and I could emerge from the slaughter / so that we two alone could break Troy's hallowed battlements.

[Π97-100; transl. Lattimore, modified]

Akhilleus utters this prayer (which points itself to an extraordinary kind of maximum achievement strategy) immediately after he had commanded Patroklos to drive the Trojans away from the ships and to return thereafter (Π87 which, as we saw, points to a minimum achievement strategy). The question arises whether Akhilleus wishes for something which he knows is impossible or whether he means what he wishes. These are the factors which intimate that Akhilleus does not mean what he wishes, i.e. that his wish is contrary to fact:

- αἶ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίῃ καὶ Ἀπολλῶν is a traditional phrase which occurs altogether 4x in the Iliad: B371, Δ288, Η132, Π97.²²² Agamemnon's wish for 10 Nestors (B371-72) is unattainable. There is only one. It is equally unrealistic for him to wish that all of the Akhaians had a thumos like the two Ajaxes (Δ288-89). Even if this were an attainable wish it would be hard to imagine that Agamemnon would wish this for e.g. Thersites! [On the other hand, Nestor may indeed believe that his wish that he were as vigorous and youthful as when ... (Η132ff.) is attainable. Although it is not conventional in the Homeric epics that characters actually go back in time and become younger, their appearances do change (cf. Hera and Odysseus).]

- We observed already the other reason which intimates that Akhilleus' wish is unattainable: Akhilleus seems to know that he will not sack Troy together with Patroklos (P407b).

These are the factors which corroborate that Akhilleus means what he wishes, i.e. factors which intimate that his wish is an attainable wish:

- αἶ γὰρ + optative in Homer is not necessarily a wish contrary to fact but may well point to a wish the fulfillment of which is eagerly hoped for (cf. Nestor above).²²³

²²² The formula occurs 5x in the Odyssey: δ341 = η311 = ρ132 = σ235 = ω376.

- Any person or character who utters a wish in the form of a prayer (as Akhilleus does in Π97-100) is very likely to believe that the god or gods to whom he or she prays can fulfill the wish unless he or she doubts the almighty power of the divine. There is little reason to assume that Akhilleus considers his wish that no one, either Trojan or Akhaian, escape death, and that he and Patroklos alone sack Troy, impossible.²²⁴

I conclude: the ambiguity of Akhilleus' wish itself corroborates the view that Akhilleus is ambiguous about Patroklos' success on the battlefield. He may seriously hope that Patroklos return in terms of a maximum achievement strategy (μὴ πρίν ... πρίν ...) and simultaneously hold the view that this is impossible.

Flee-Stay Debate (μερμηρίζειν monologues)

One time in the Iliad an Akhaian hero ponders whether he should stay on the battlefield or flee (monologue of Odysseus (Λ404-410));²²⁵ two Trojans also

²²³ On attainable / unattainable wishes and, in particular, αἶψα + optative, see now Pelliccia, H. "Pindarus Homericus: Pythian 3.1-80." HSCP 91 (1987): 59 and Nagy, G. Greek Mythology and Poetics. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1990. 294-301.

²²⁴ Akhilleus' wish that he and Patroklos alone sack Troy recalls Diomedes' conviction that he and Sthenelos alone could take Troy (I48-49). Diomedes "allows", in that case, the other Akhaians to return home while Akhilleus wishes the other Akhaians' death as much as the Trojans'.

ponder whether they should stay on the battlefield or flee back to Troy (Agenor²²⁶ and Hektor):²²⁷ all three monologues are "staged" on the battlefield, all three characters ponder whether they should flee or stay, using the phrase ἀλλὰ τί ἡ μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός; (Λ407 = Φ562 = X122) which leads from one resolve (fleeing) to the other (holding ground).²²⁸

The parallel of Agenor's and Hektor's monologue with that of Odysseus points to a parallel of Akhaian and Trojan motions from the battlefield. Moreover, the parallel of the "flee homeward - stay debate" in the episodes in the Akhaian assembly (B110ff., I20ff) and in Ε65ff.²²⁹ intimates that the movements viewed in these monologues (return to city and, presumably, camp) may be viewed in terms of a homecoming.

²²⁵ I omit here discussion of Menelaos (P91-105) since for him the alternative is not staying or withdrawal from the battlefield but staying or withdrawal back into the host of the other Akhaians on the battlefield (cf. P108-09 and 114-15).

²²⁶ Φ553-570. Agenor's peculiar thought of fleeing further away from the city (Φ556-559) has as parallel Dolon's flight toward the Akhaian ships (K341-48, 364-66), Apollo's flight from Akhilleus (Φ603, X16) and Hektor's flight (X194ff.; see also X456).

²²⁷ X99-130.

²²⁸ Lohmann 37-40.

²²⁹ Arend 110.

(ὕπο)δέχομαι clauses

Expressions with a negated form of (ὕπο)δέχομαι + verb of motion intimate also the parallel of Akhaian motions back to the camp and Trojan motions back to Troy. Since these clauses are traditional also for denoting Akhaian homecomings they are another indicator not only for the parallel of Akhaian motions back to the camp and Trojan motions back to Troy but also for the parallel of these movements and Akhaian homecomings.

The phrase τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὐτίς is used in Σ in the context of Akhilleus' homecoming (cf. τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὐτίς / οἴκαδε νοστήσαντα δόμον Πηληϊῶν εἴσω (Σ59-60=440-41)). The speaker in each of the two passages is Thetis. Lines Σ59-60 are part of a thrēnos, a dirge or funeral song by means of which Thetis and the Nereids respond to Akhilleus' mourning for Patroklos. Lines Σ440-41 are part of Thetis' address to Hephaistos which is again an emotional utterance (cf. κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα Σ428). The verbal exchanges between Akhilleus and Thetis are also filled with pathos and are introduced with participles such as ὀλοφυρομένη (Σ72) and the like (cf. στενάχων (Σ78)). Akhilleus' first address to his mother in this book contains a modification of the τὸν δ' οὐχ ὑποδέξομαι αὐτίς formula: τὸν οὐχ ὑποδέξει αὐτίς / οἴκαδε νοστήσαντ'... (Σ89-90).²³⁰

Now, a δέχομαι clause (or a clause recalling the pattern of a δέχομαι clause) is also used by the poet to indicate that a Trojan parent or spouse or sister will not welcome his / her son / husband / brother upon his return from the battlefield:

- (1) ἔνθ' ὃ γε τοὺς ἐνάριζε, φίλον δ' ἐξαίνυτο θυμὸν
ἀμφοτέρω, πατέρι δὲ γόνον καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ
λεῖπ', ἐπεὶ οὐ ζῶντες μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε
δέξαστο· χηρωσταὶ δὲ διὰ κτήσιν δατέοντο [E155-58]
- (2) ἀτάρ τοι νῦν γε μέγα κράτος ἐγγυαλίξω,
τῶν ποινήν ὃ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι
δέξεται Ἀνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλεΐωνος [P206-208]
- (3) κέκλετο δ' ἀμφιπόλοισιν εὐπλοκάμοις κατὰ δῶμα
ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στήσαι τρίποδα μέγαν, ὄφρα πέλοιτο
Ἕκτορι θερμὰ λοετρὰ μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι
νηπίη, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν ὃ μιν μάλα τῆλε λοετρῶν
χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη [X442-46]
- (4) ὄψεσθε Τρῶες καὶ Τρωάδες Ἕκτορ' ἰόντες,
εἴ ποτε καὶ ζῶντες μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι
χαίρειτ', ἐπεὶ μέγα χάρμα πόλει τ' ἦν παντὶ τε δήμῳ [Ω704-06].

In (1) the narrator comments on Diomedes' killing of Xanthos and Thoon that the Trojan Phainops was not to welcome his sons home, in (2) Zeus remarks that he will (for the moment) give Hektor great strength as compensation for it that Andromakhe will not receive the

²³⁰ See also Akhilleus' address to the Myrmidons where he explicitly mentions that neither parent will welcome him at home:

ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νοστήσαντα
δέξεται ἐν μεγάροισι γέρον ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς
οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ γαῖα καθέξει [Σ330-32].

famous weapons of Patroklos from him upon his return.
 (2) deviates significantly from (1) in that the object of *δέχομαι* is not the spouse or son but the weapons of Patroklos which Andromakhe will not receive. Examples (3) and (4) contain no *δέχομαι* clause. But the focus on the welcoming party (in (3) on Andromakhe and her servants heating the water for Hektor who has been killed already, in (4) on Cassandra when she catches sight of Priam returning with the corpse of Hektor back to Troy) is close enough a parallel to list these examples together with the other (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses. Because of the parallel between Akhilleus', Xanthos', Thoon's and Hektor's frustrated return home it is natural to view all these heroes' (denial of a successful) return home in terms of a homecoming.

Since the pattern of negated *δέχομαι* clauses is also used to denote a return of an Akhaian to the camp these movements of Trojans back to Troy are also parallel to such a motion of an Akhaian back to the camp, unless the (negated) motion of the Akhaian back to the camp is in itself viewed in terms of a homecoming:

μετὰ δέ σφι ποδώκης εἶπετ' Ἀχιλλεύς
 δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων, ἐπεὶ εἴσιδε πιστὸν ἑταῖρον
 κείμενον ἐν φέρτρῳ δεδαῖγμένον ὄξεϊ χαλκῷ,
 τὸν ῥ' ἦτοι μὲν ἔπεμπε σὺν ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν
 εἰς πόλεμον, οὐδ' αὐτίς ἐδέξατο νοστήσαντα.

and along with them swift-footed Achilleus / went,

letting fall warm tears as he saw his steadfast companion / lying there on a carried litter and torn with the sharp bronze, / the man he had sent off before with horses and chariot / into the fighting; and he did not again come back to be welcomed.

[Σ234-38; transl. Lattimore, modified]

What is meant with the phrase οὐδ' αὖτις ἐδέξατο νοστήσαντα? A welcome at Patroklos' homecoming or a welcome at his coming back to the camp?

The verb (ἀπο)νοστήω is used with spatial markers (Σ60, 90 κτλ.), and without, to denote an Akhaian homecoming (for usage with the destination home implied cf. A60, B253, Σ330). (ἀπο)νοστήω is not used overtly to denote a return to the Akhaian camp. Passages like K247, P239, 406, 636 and Σ238 in which (ἀπο)νοστήω is used without spatial marker are therefore ambiguous: they may denote a homecoming or just a return to the place from which the hero had started out (i.e. a return to the camp). Consequently, the phrase οὐδ' αὖτις ἐδέξατο νοστήσαντα refers either to a welcoming within the camp or a welcoming at Patroklos' homecoming. The pattern of the (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses approximates return to camp and return home and suggests at the same time that the Trojan movements back to Troy are viewed as homecomings, regardless whether they are viewed parallel to Akhaian homecomings or parallel to Akhaian returns to their camp.

Moreover, οὐδ' αὖτις ἐδέξατο νοστήσαντα in Σ238 recalls

the "his mother / wife will not receive him back home" topos. By applying this topos to Akhilleus the narrator corroborates Akhilleus' own comparison of Patroklos to a child and himself to the child's mother at Π7-11.²³¹ The Akhaian camp is represented as Akhilleus' real or only home. The language of homecoming, as it is applied to Akhilleus, is progressively confined to that of the temporary homecoming to the Akhaian ships.²³²

Conclusion: the aim of this chapter has been twofold; the first part shows how the homecoming motif is exploited as a powerful rhetorical tool by certain speakers who manipulate their audience. Special attention is given to Akhilleus who opens the quarrel-scene with the hyperbolic proposal that, in view of the plague, the army might as well go home. This proposal serves as prelude to Akhilleus' subsequent threats, as the ultimate measure of his wrath, to abandon the

²³¹ See I323: Akhilleus likens himself to a mother bird bringing food to its young. Similes in character-text are extremely rare and, therefore, extraordinary. See Moulton, C. Similes in the Homeric Poems. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977. 101 and Martin, R. The Language of Akhilleus. Speech and Performance in the Iliad. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1989. 204.

²³² See Akhilleus' maximum achievement of slaying Hektor and returning to the "ships" with "booty" while singing a paean, a song of triumph and rejoicing (healing):
 νῦν δ' ἄγ' ἀείδοντες παιήονα κούροι Ἀχαιῶν
 νηυσὶν ἐπι γλαφυρῆσι νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ' ἄγωμεν.
 ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος· ἐπέφνομεν Ἔκτορα δῖον,
 ᾧ Τρῶες κατὰ ἄστυ θεῶ ὧς εὐχετόωντο (X391-394).

expedition by returning home. The topos is used as a kind of touchstone against which the morale of the Akhaian leaders and host is repeatedly measured.

The second part confronts the issue of Trojan movements back to Troy and Akhaian movements back to the ships. The investigation starts out with the central question whether Trojans have a homecoming. The similar distribution of Akhaian movements back to the camp and Trojan movements back to Troy in narrator-text and character-text suggests a parallel of Troy and the Akhaian camp, a parallel which is corroborated by the camp-like features of the polis and polis-like features of the camp. But μή πρίν ... πρίν clauses, flee/stay debates (μερμηρίζειν monologues) and (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses intimate that Akhaian movements back to the camp and Trojan movements back to the city are, in certain instances, parallel to Akhaian motions home and should, therefore, be viewed in terms of a homecoming. In particular, the language of homecoming, as it is applied to Akhilleus, increasingly intimates that the Akhaian camp is the hero's only or real "home".

		7	οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι#
		7	Φθίηνδε νέεσθαι#
		7	κενεόν τε νέεσθαι#
		7	εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ικέσθαι#
	3tr		πάρος φίλα οἰκί' ικέσθαι#
	3tr		τὰ ἄ πρὸς δῶμαθ' ικέσθαι#
	3tr		ἀνηθέντα νέεσθαι#
	3tr		ἀναιμωτί γε νέεσθαι#
#αὐτίς 1 1/2			
	3tr		Διὸς πρὸς δῶμα νέεσθαι#
	3tr		μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι#
	3tr		ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο#
#ἴξεσθαι 3			
	5		πολέμου ἔκπεμπε νέεσθαι#
	5		πρὸς Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι#
	5		νοσησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο#
	5		πρὶν Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι#
	5	τὸν γ' ἔλθειν	bD
#οἴκαδ' ἴμεν 3			
#εὔχετο νοστήσαι	5		
#ἄστυδε νῦν ἰέναι	5		
#οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν	5		
#ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν	5		
#πρὶν Ἄργοςδ' ἰέναι	5		
	5		
#φεύγοντας πεσέειν	5		πρὶν αὐτ' ἐν χερσὶ γυναικῶν #
#δυσκλέα Ἄργος ικέσθαι	3tr		
#Ἴλιον εἰσαναβῆναι	3tr		
#ἄψ ἴμεν Οὐλυμπόνδε	3tr		
#εἶα ἰεμένους ἐπιβαίνεμεν			bD οὐδὲ πόληος#
			bD

#άντιον αίξασθαι	βtr	πυλάων Δαρδανιάων#	#
#έρχεσθαι μετὰ φύλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν			
#μή ποτ' ἐς Οὐλυμπόν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα			#
#αὐτίς ἐλεύσεσθαι Ἴατην	7		#
#ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν			
#ἐμβαδὸν ἴξεσθαι ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἕκαστος			

As regards the infinitives of expressions for the essential idea "to return home" there is a high degree of economy. These are the phrases which apparently violate this principle:

- (1)
- | | |
|---|---|
| #ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι | # |
| #Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι | # |
- (2)
- | | | | |
|--|-----|---------------------------|--|
| | βtr | τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι# | |
| | βtr | μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι# | |
- (3)
- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 5 | προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι# |
| 5 | νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# |
- (4)
- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| #οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν | 5 |
| #ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν | 5 |
- (5)
- | | |
|----|-----------------|
| bD | ὥστε νέεσθαι# |
| bD | ἀπονέεσθαι# |
| bD | οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# |

Ad(1) #ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι #
 #Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι #

7εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# is a unique extension of the formula οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι#. The latter occurs often in the Odyssey, only once in the Iliad. Hekabe uses this expression in urging her husband to pray for a safe return (καὶ εὖχεο οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# Ω287). Hekabe's prayer recalls Khryses wishing the Akhaians a good homecoming at the beginning of the Iliad: εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# (A19).

The question is why the complete line #ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# is never used again in the Homeric epic in place of #Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι# (B113; 288; E716; I20). Either the two phrases are synonymous (and there is a violation of economy) or they are not synonymous (and there is no violation of economy).

In addition, only a segment of each line might be synonymous with the other. Therefore, it will be simply taken for granted, for the moment, that the two verbal expressions οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι and ἀπονέεσθαι are different in meaning, and thus not interchangeable. All that is to be considered, then, is whether ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' is synonymous with Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον.

The first and obvious difference between both lines lies in the restriction of the masculine accusative

singular of the aorist participle ἐκέρσαντ' versus the aorist infinitive ἐκέρσαι. The subject of the participle ἐκέρσαντ' is necessarily limited to one person; the subject of the infinitive ἐκέρσαι can be one person or more. In the actual context where the infinitive occurs, the subject and addressee is, in fact, not one but all Akhaians:

Ἄτρείδαι τε καὶ ἄλλοι εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί,
 ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι·
 παῖδα δ' ἐμοὶ λύσαιτε φίλην, τὰ δ' ἄποινα δέχεσθαι,
 ἄζόμενοι Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα.

Sons of Atreus and you other strong-greaved Achaians, /
 to you may the gods grant who have their homes on Olympus
 / Priam's city to be plundered and a fair homecoming
 thereafter, / but may you give me back my own daughter
 and take the ransom, / giving honour to Zeus' son who
 strikes from afar, Apollo.

[A17-21]

The whole passage is abundant with plurals; the addressees named in the vocative Ἄτρείδαι and "you other Akhaians" is resumed in the second person plural of the personal pronoun (ὑμῖν). The plurality of the addressees is stressed again in the second person plural aorist optative (λύσαιτε) and in the plural of the present participle (ἄζόμενοι). The singular of ἐκέρσαντ' would be ill suited. ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' cannot be replaced with Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον.

On the other hand, it is metrically and grammatically possible to substitute "Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον for ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' in B113 = 288 = E716 = I20. Since the infinitive ἐκέρσαι leaves open the possibility that its subject is either singular or plural, such a change should not cause any grammatical difficulty in B113 = 288 = E716 = I20. It is, for the moment, plausible to assume that, although ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' and "Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον are not interchangeable in one passage (A19), they are in the other (B113 κτλ.) and, consequently, violate the principle of economy. Economy would not be violated only if these two phrases are different in some respect other than the participle ἐκέρσαντ' and the infinitive ἐκέρσαι.

εὖ in ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι qualifies the return whereas εὐ in the epithet εὐτείχεον qualifies Troy stressing its strong fortifications. More, the focus on Agamemnon would be obscured by the juxtaposition of the addressee with the king of Troy, Priam. Odysseus' argument would not be as strong if he said:

οὐδέ τοι ἐκτελέουσιν ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέσταν
 ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱποβότοιο
 *ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' ἀπονέεσθαι²³³

instead of

²³³ On the plausibility of the combination εὖ δ' ἀπονέεσθαι, see note 236.

οὐδέ τοι ἐκτελέουσιν ὑπόσχεσιν ἦν περ ὑπέσταν
 ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἵπποβότοιο
 Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι.

and they are not fulfilling the promise they undertook
 once / as they set forth to come here from horse-
 pasturing Argos, / *that you go home* only after you had
 sacked well-walled Ilion.

[B286-288; transl. Lattimore, modified]

The participle ἐκέρσαντ' resumes τοι and keeps the focus on Agamemnon. The epithet εὐτείχεος ("well-walled") qualifies Troy in six out of its seven occurrences in Homer.²³⁴ It evokes (in its oxymoronic juxtaposition with the participle ἐκέρσαντ') a prosperous city with prospect of a rich booty - if indeed the well-walled city can be sacked. εὐτείχεον is both generic and specific, as Scully shows very convincingly:

"...it [sc. the epithet εὐτείχεος] both brings the image of Troy into focus, crystallizing a generic quality of the polis, and is clearly part of a specific and identifiable contextual field. This Iliadic epithet is used almost exclusively with Troy ... always in speech, and always by the Greeks (and once by Hera, echoing Greek sentiments) [sc. E716]. ... it *always* appears in a context where desire (human or divine) plays against the seemingly impregnable defense of the city. Even more than highlighting a general sense of Troy's existence, the epithet with almost verbal energy of its own struggles against the sentence's actual verb, thwarting its telos. ... When we recognize that all these examples occur only in

²³⁴ A129, B113 = 288 = E716 = I20 and Θ241. For Π57, see note 237.

the speeches by the Achaeans, it is hard to deny that the epithet carries emotional weight.²³⁵

All this would be lacking had Odysseus used the phrase ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' instead of Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον. Also, ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' would stress that Troy is the legal possession of Priam. εὐτείχεον at once takes away this dilemma and creates an atmosphere of wealth and enticement.

Let us now consider whether the two verbal expressions οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι and ἀπονέεσθαι are, in contrast to our assumption so far, synonymous and interchangeable. If these verbal expressions were synonymous there would be two possibilities for expressing the essential idea of sacking Troy and going home in A19 and B113=288=E716=I20:

ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι

and

*ἐκέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' ἀπονέεσθαι.²³⁶

Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι

and

*Ἴλιον ἐκέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι.²³⁷

²³⁵ Ibid. 74

²³⁶ The combination εὖ δ' ἀπονέεσθαι ("to have a good return trip", "to return well") is not in Homer. But there is a parallel of the combination εὖ + verb of the root *nos/nes:

οὐδέ τί πω σάφα ἴδμεν ὅπως ἔσται τάδε ἔργα,

ἦ εὖ ἦε κακῶς νοστήσομεν υἱεὺς Ἀχαιῶν (B252-253).

²³⁷ The *f* of οἴκαδ' (observed in e.g. Γ72=93; 404 κτλ.) is also neglected in e.g. A19 (εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι). Otherwise the elision of *ε* in *δέ* could not be explained. On the other hand, the effect of the *f* would restore the proper ending of the third declension

The question is whether οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι and ἀπονέεσθαι are equivalent not only in metrical terms (with both expressions occupying the space after the bucolic diaeresis) but also in terms of their meaning and function in context.

First, ἰκέσθαι in the verbal expression οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι is an aorist infinitive, ἀπονέεσθαι is a present infinitive.²³⁸ There seems to be an aspectual difference between these two verbs. ἰκέσθαι in οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι stresses the point of arrival,²³⁹ ἀπονέεσθαι the beginning of a trip or the trip itself ("to go / be on a return trip"). There are, however, instances where ἀπονέεσθαι obviously encompasses the point of arrival, i.e. instances where ἀπονέεσθαι is used with a spatial marker (cf. ἀπονέεσθαι / ἄψορρον προτὶ ἄστυ and προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι).²⁴⁰ The point of arrival is, in those cases at least, taken into account. The aspectual difference, then, between οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι and ἀπονέεσθαι is perhaps insignificant. If there were no other (significant) differences between the two

adjective εὐτείχης with acc. sing. εὐτείχεα: *Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεα (f)οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι. (cf. Π57; here I profited from discussions with Alan Nussbaum).

²³⁸ ἀπονέεσθαι itself does not have an aorist. There is an aorist form of another verb which ultimately belongs etymologically to ἀπονέεσθαι: νοστήσαι. But this verb and form would not be suitable to fill out the adoneus in the fifth and sixth foot of the hexameter.

²³⁹ See above chapter two ad ἰκνέομαι.

²⁴⁰ For further examples of ἀπονέεσθαι + spatial marker, see below.

verbs we would have to conclude that there is a violation of economy.

There is one such significant difference on the poetic level: the two infinitives (ἀπονέεσθαι and ικέσθαι) function differently in the Homeric poems. The infinitive ικέσθαι occurs eleven times in the Iliad, nine times at line-end:

οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι#
 εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι#
 πάρος φίλα οἰκί' ἰκέσθαι#
 τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι#
 νειοῖο βαθείης τέλσον ἰκέσθαι#
 ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἰκέσθαι#
 κτλ.

In other words, the infinitive ικέσθαι tends to be peripheral, responding to a nucleus, the overt destination.²⁴¹ The infinitive ἀπονέεσθαι, however, which is used ten times in the Iliad is only four times overtly specified (M73; E46; O295; P415-416) and six times without any spatial marker (B113 = 288 = E716 = I20; Y212b = Π252b).²⁴² That is, six times in the Iliad the verb is used as nucleus. Since ἀπονέεσθαι means in all instances but one in Homeric epic "to go back" (the

²⁴¹ In the Iliad the infinitive is always peripheral. For nuclear usage in the Odyssey, see o201 and discussion in chapter two.

²⁴² In the Odyssey the destination of ἀπονέεσθαι is - with one exception, σ260 - always overtly specified (see β195, ι451, ο308, π467).

exception (o308) is discussed in chapter three) the question is: to where? What is meant by the formula #Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι#? The reference of Akhaians sacking Troy and "going back" may simply be the Akhaian camp and may not lead any further. ἀπονέεσθαι is, in fact, not used with a spatial marker to signify a return to Akhaia. But it is not unusual for ἀπονέεσθαι to signify overtly a return to the Akhaian camp²⁴³ or to Troy.²⁴⁴ That is to say, the verb ἀπονέεσθαι without spatial marker may have the denotative meaning "return to Akhaia" but also the connotative meaning "return to camp".

The reference of ἀπονέεσθαι in B288 (#Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι#) is likely to be Akhaia because the promise the Akhaians had given that Agamemnon would come back after the sacking of Troy seems already to have been given on Akhaian soil (Kommen Deixis).²⁴⁵ But in B113 = E716 = I20 (Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι) the reference of ἀπονέεσθαι may or may not be Akhaia. The promise made by the Akhaians which Odysseus refers to (B286-8) is not necessarily identical with what Agamemnon refers to as

²⁴³ Cf. expressions like ἀπονέεσθαι / νῆας ἐπι γλαφυράς, μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι and πληθὺν μὲν ποτὶ νῆας ἀνώξομεν ἀπονέεσθαι. These are only examples with the infinitive form. More could be listed with finite forms.

²⁴⁴ Cf. ἀπονέεσθαι / ἄγορρον προτι ἄστῃ and προτι Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι.

²⁴⁵ See B286b-88: ἦν [sc. the promise] περ ὑπέσταν ἐνθάδ' ἔτι στείχοντες ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱποβότου Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι.

the promise made by Zeus: the temporal markers *πρίν* (B112) and *τότε* (I19) allow for any time in the past including the nine years in which the Akhaians had fought before the city of Troy.²⁴⁶ The meaning of *ἀπονέεσθαι* is, therefore, ambiguous since its reference apparently shifts between return home and return to the Akhaian camp suggesting that a return to the camp is seen in terms of homecoming or that a return home is as good or bad as a return (from the battlefield) to the camp with new warfare ensuing. This ambiguity would not be there if *ἀπονέεσθαι* were to be replaced by the unambiguous *οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι*.

Wyatt explains *ἀπονέεσθαι* not as a compound of *ἀπο* + *νέεσθαι* but as *πονέεσθαι* with lengthened *α*-privativum. He translates *ἀ*-*πονέεσθαι* with "to be free from toil", "to find release from toil".²⁴⁷ Wyatt derives the strongest support for his hypothesis from σ259-260 (*ὦ γύναι, οὐ γὰρ οἴω ἐυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς / ἐκ Τροίης εὖ πάντας ἀπήμονας ἀπονέεσθαι*) and from B291 (*ἦ μὴν καὶ πόνος ἐστὶν ἀνηθέντα νέεσθαι*) a line which is from Odysseus' speech and right next to *Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι* (B288).²⁴⁸ In σ259-260 and B291 *ἀπονέεσθαι* is a transparent etymologizing pun on *ἀπήμων* and *πόνος*. Whether we agree with Wyatt's translation of

²⁴⁶ For the possibility that Agamemnon refers to the deceitful dream (in a playful manner in B112 and seriously in I19), see my comments in the previous chapter.

²⁴⁷ W.F. Wyatt, Jr. 84-87. See also note 93.

²⁴⁸ For the ring composition of B291 and B298, I refer to the discussion of this speech in the previous chapter.

ἀπονέεσθαι or not, the pun on πόνος and ἀπήμων at the least underscores the ambiguity of ἀπονέεσθαι.

To sum up, it has been shown sufficiently that the two lines #ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὐ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# and #Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι# are not interchangeable. It has also been shown that no segments of the two lines (cf. ἀπονέεσθαι and οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι) are synonymous either. Within the system motion home and the category infinitive these two phrases do not violate the principle of economy. Their aspectual difference is perhaps insignificant. But their poetic function is significantly different.

Ad (2)	3tr	τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι#
	3tr	μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι#

The infinitive ἰκέσθαι# is a traditional element in this position not only in the Iliad but also in the Odyssey. δώμαθ' occurs 22 times in the Odyssey, the phrase πρὸς δώμαθ' two times within the phrase 7 πρὸς δώμαθ' 5tr ἕκαστος# (β258; σ428). There is no πρὸς δώμαθ' + a form of ἰκάνω in the Odyssey. This combination occurs once in the hymn to Demeter (τέως πρὸς δώμαθ' ἵκωμαι# H.Cer.138). The nominal form δώμαθ' occurs only one time in the Iliad (O58). The whole infinitive phrase τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι occurs only once in Iliad and Odyssey (O58).

The infinitive ἀπονέεσθαι (like ἰκέσθαι) is also a

traditional expression both in the Iliad and Odyssey. μάχης ἐξ occurs three times in the Iliad. It does not occur in the Odyssey. The complete expression μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι occurs twice in the Iliad (Π252; Υ212). In Υ212 the destination which is implied is both Troy and presumably the Akhaian camp.²⁴⁹ In Π252 the implied destination is likely (but not exclusively) the Akhaian camp.²⁵⁰ As the point of departure in the formula Ἴλιον ἐκπέσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι may not necessarily be Akhaia but the Akhaian camp, so too the point of reference in μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι may not necessarily be the Akhaian camp but Akhaia.

It follows that although, at first sight, the two expressions τὰ ἄ πρὸς δῶμαθ' ἰκέσθαι# and μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι# are metrically interchangeable they are likely not to violate the principle of economy for several reasons: first, the phrase τὰ ἄ πρὸς δῶμαθ' ἰκέσθαι would be a highly unlikely expression of the idea "return to the Akhaian camp." In contrast to οἶκος, forms of δῶμα are not used

²⁴⁹ This line is part of Aineias' speech before Akhilleus. Aineias points out to Akhilleus that they will not separate with [mere] childish words and "go home" from the battlefield:

σήμερον· σὺ γάρ φημ' ἐπέεσσί γε νηπυτίοισιν
ὧδε διακρινθέντε μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι. (Υ211-12)

²⁵⁰ For the question why the narrator does not repeat Akhilleus' phrase (Π247) in the infinitive (*θῶας ἐπὶ νῆας ἰκέσθαι#) but chooses instead to express the denial of Patroklos' return to the camp with a phrase which may denote homecoming (μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι# Π252), see the discussion in the previous chapter.

to denote an Akhaian hut or tent. On the other hand, μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι could be used to express Poseidon's return from the battlefield in O58. An argument that this phrase is not used for gods cannot really be made since all we have are two occurrences of μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι. If there were no further differences we would have to assume violation of economy.

The aspectual difference between ικέσθαι and ἀπονέεσθαι is perhaps, as we just saw, insignificant.

If, however, we indeed exchanged τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ικέσθαι for μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι the two prepositional phrases μάχης ἐξ (O58) and μάχην ἐς in (O59) would create a verbal jingle that is perhaps avoided: compare

παυσάμενον πολέμοιο τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ικέσθαι,
Ἴκτορα δ' ὀτρύνησι μάχην ἐς Φοῖβος Ἄπολλων (O58-59)

with

*παυσάμενον πολέμοιο μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι,
Ἴκτορα δ' ὀτρύνησι μάχην ἐς Φοῖβος Ἄπολλων.

μάχην ἐς Φοῖβος Ἄπολλων# (O59) is a violation of Wernicke's law.²⁵¹ There are about 130 instances of μάχη in the Iliad of which about 100 are at the hephthemimeral caesura. The only violations of Wernicke's law are μάχην ἐς Φοῖβος Ἄπολλων# O59, μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε# (E157), μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι# (P207, X444, Ω705), μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν# (Δ225.

²⁵¹ I am grateful to Hayden Pelliccia who brought this violation of Wernicke's law to my attention.

M325) and perhaps μάχης ἐξ ἀποδίωμαι# (E763) and μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι# (Π252; Y212).²⁵² It is peculiar that all instances of μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε/νοστήσαντι are an indicator of "failure to return from battle."²⁵³ Apollo's stirring Hektor into battle (O59) thus anticipates Hektor's bitter failure to return from battle. Set in juxtaposition, Zeus' harsh command in O58 (τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι#), which does clearly not violate Wernicke's law, may indicate that Poseidon had better not fail to return from the battlefield.

Moreover, when Zeus tells Hera that he wants Poseidon to leave the battleground and go to his home he perhaps stresses that Poseidon ought to behave as ἰκέτης²⁵⁴ (subordinate) and ought to go to his own home (O58). When Zeus tells Iris to go to Poseidon in order to faithfully deliver a message (O158-59), he is more diplomatic. He does not repeat this (perhaps too harsh) phrase. #παυσάμενον πολέμοιο τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι# is extended and changed to παυσάμενόν μιν ἄνωχθι μάχης ἠδὲ πτολέμοιο / ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ φῦλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν (O160-61). Thus, μιν ἄνωχθι is substituted for πολέμοιο, πολέμοιο altered and extended to μάχης ἠδὲ πτολέμοιο and τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι# is extended to a whole new line: #ἔρχεσθαι

²⁵² It is perhaps doubtful whether ἐξ followed by word division is really comparable to ἐκ.

²⁵³ Griffin, J. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1980. 124 n.38. See also the discussion on (ὑπο)δέχομαι clauses in the previous chapter.

²⁵⁴ See LfgrE ad ἰκάνω 2bγ.

μετὰ φύλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλα δῖαν#. Zeus changes his tone, seemingly allowing Poseidon some choice.

Poseidon's departure from the battlefield is narrated in no more than 1 1/2 lines: "Ὡς εἰπὼν λίπε λαὸν Ἀχαιϊκὸν ἐννοσίγαιος, / δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών⁵ (O218-219a). #δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών recalls Zeus' command that Poseidon either "go back / among the race of gods, or into the bright sea" (ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ φύλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλα δῖαν (O161=O177; Lattimore's translation, modified). Poseidon's reaction indicates that he does not interpret Zeus' offer as a possible alternative. The choice offered by Zeus turns out to be a restriction. Poseidon had just explained to Iris that only the sky was allotted to Zeus, not earth and Olympus which were common to Zeus, Hera and him alike (Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὸν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησι· / γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνη πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὀλυμπος. O192-193). When Zeus allows Poseidon only a motion up or down he appropriates the authority over earth in addition to his authority over the sky and even Olympus.²⁵⁵ All which is left for Poseidon is the sea, his own domain. The apparent choice in ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ φύλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλα δῖαν contains as little a choice as the restrictive phrase τὰ ἄπρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι.

In addition, the short and sober #δῦνε δὲ πόντον ἰών (O219a) points to Poseidon's anger.²⁵⁶ His horses, who

²⁵⁵ We, the audience, are so accustomed to Zeus' authority over Olympus that we even take it for granted which, according to Poseidon, we should not do.

²⁵⁶ See O217: χόλος.

brought the god from his home in Aigai to the ships of the Akhaians (N31), are apparently still waiting in a cave for their master to return:

ὄφρ' ἔμπεδον αὐθι μένοιεν
νοστήσαντα ἄνακτα·

so they would wait there steadfast / for their lord to come back.

[N37b-38a; transl. Lattimore, modified]

δόματα (N21) anticipates δώμαθ' in τὰ ἄ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἰκέσθαι (O58). νοστήσαντα (N38) reflects (focalizes) Poseidon's anticipation of a glorious return (nostos). Instead he is made to dive into the sea.

Ad (3)

5 προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι#

5 νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο#

προτὶ Ἴλιον is traditional in the Iliad; this prepositional phrase is not in the Odyssey. ἀπονέεσθαι is traditional in both the Iliad and the Odyssey. The complete phrase προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι# occurs only in the Iliad, and here only once (ὡς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησεν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων / μὴ πρὶν παρ νηῶν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι / πρὶν πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρῆσαι, κτεῖναι δὲ καὶ αὐτούς).²⁵⁷

The future infinitive νοστησέμεν is not in the

²⁵⁷ Ξ45-7. For the term maximum achievement strategy, I refer to the discussion in the previous chapter. For the combination Ἴλιον + a finite form of ἀπονέεσθαι, see Γ313 = Ω330; Φ561.

Odyssey and occurs only once in the Iliad (ὦ πέπον ὦ Μενέλαε διοτρεφὲς οὐκέτι νῶϊ / ἔλπομαι αὐτῷ περ νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο.)²⁵⁸ ἐκ πολέμοιο is traditional in both the Iliad and Odyssey. The whole expression νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# is found only once in the Iliad (P239). Since forms of (ἀπο)νοστήω are used to signify a return home to Akhaia,²⁵⁹ Troy,²⁶⁰ Zeleia²⁶¹ and Lykia²⁶² side by side with a return to the location from where one just has left (cf. N38; K247) the phrase νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# in P239 is ambiguous: it denotes either a return home or a return to the Akhaian camp.²⁶³

Clearly, προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι# could not be substituted for νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# as the camp is not designated Ilion. But νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# could, in theory, be used for προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι# (which itself looks like a future after ἐπηκείλησεν Ξ45) to denote a Trojan homecoming. Forms of νοστήω are used even without local marker for that essential idea.²⁶⁴ All these

²⁵⁸ P238-9; cf. νοστήσομεν ἐκ πολέμοιο in B253. In the Odyssey there is, instead, the future infinitive νοστήσειν (κ285; υ329).

²⁵⁹ Cf. A60, B253, Σ60, 90, 441, Ψ145, α83, 163, β343 κτλ.

²⁶⁰ Cf. E157, Θ499, M115, P207, X444, Ω705.

²⁶¹ Cf. Δ103, 121, E212.

²⁶² E687.

²⁶³ For ambiguous usage of the verb see also κ285 (cf. κ419), P406, 636, Σ238 and discussion of some of these passages in the previous chapter.

²⁶⁴ See ἐπεὶ οὐ ζῶντε μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντε δέξατο· χηρωσταὶ δὲ διὰ κτήσιν दाτέοντο (E157-58), ὅ τοι οὐ τι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι

instances of νοστήω (E157, P207, X444, Ω705), however, are anchored clearly in their context. These motions are viewed in (focalized) Kommen Deixis: they are to be viewed from the perspective of a character who is inside Troy (E157, P207, X444) or the motion is viewed by a character who is both at coding time and (presumably) at reference time inside Troy (Ω705). In addition, Trojan returns to Troy, when viewed in Gehen Deixis (by the narrator or by a character outside Troy), are, as a rule, specified with a local marker.²⁶⁵ The ambiguous phrase νοστησέμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο# is therefore not exchangeable with the unambiguous προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέεσθαι#.

Ad (4) #οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν5
#ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν5

#οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν5 is a phrase of two units. One unit (#οἴκαδ') is traditional occurring 6 times in the first foot, the other (ἀποπλείειν) occurs only twice. The whole phrase #οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν is used twice in the Iliad (I418; I685), once by Akhilleus and once by Odysseus repeating Akhilleus directly.

The question is why Akhilleus uses #οἴκαδ' ἀποπλείειν in I418 and not #ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν, a phrase which he has used

δέξεται Ἄνδρομάχη κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πηλείωνος (P207-208),
ὄφρα πέλοιτο / Ἔκτορι θερμὰ λοετρὰ μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι (X443b-44)
and εἴ ποτε καὶ ζῶντι μάχης ἐκ νοστήσαντι / χαίρει' (Ω705-706a).

²⁶⁵ For the exception μάχης ἐξ ἀπονέεσθαι. (Y212), see above discussion and note 249.

already before (A60).²⁶⁶ The difference of the tenses alone (*ἀπονοστήσειν* is future, *ἀποπλείειν* is present tense) may explain why *ἀποπλείειν* is used in I418 and not *ἀπονοστήσειν*.

There is perhaps also a poetic reason. Akhilleus may by now endorse the view that a return home to Akhaia is a nostos only after Troy has been sacked (cf. the term "maximum achievement strategy" and the traditional phrase Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι). Phoenix disagrees. Right at the beginning of his counter speech he sums up Akhilleus' lengthy speech and his intention to leave for home with those words: εἰ μὲν δὴ νόστών γε μετὰ φρεσὶ φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ / βάλλεται ... (I434-35a).

Ad (5)

bD ὥστε νέεσθαι#
 bD ἀπονέεσθαι#
 bD οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι#

All three expressions start with a vowel, filling out the adoneus after the bucolic diaeresis. If we assume that ὥστε νέεσθαι# is synonymous with ἀπονέεσθαι# and

²⁶⁶ ἀπονοστήσειν occurs always with #ᾠψ, a pleonasm which reinforces the idea of ἀπ- in ἀπο-. #ᾠψ ἀπονοστήσειν⁵ occurs four times in the Iliad (A60^{in.}=P406^{in.}, Θ499=M115), two times in the Odyssey (ν6, ω471). In the Iliad it is used two times without spatial marker (A60^{in.}=P406^{in.}) and two times with the destination of Troy overtly specified (Θ499= M115). In the Odyssey it is in both occurrences without spatial marker (i.e. destination is implied through context).

οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι#, the principle of economy is violated. It has already been shown that οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# and ἀπονέεσθαι# are not synonymous and not interchangeable. The same arguments (spatial marker, poetic function) serve to argue that οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι# and ὥστε νέεσθαι# are not interchangeable either. It remains to examine whether ὥστε νέεσθαι# is a metrical substitute for, and synonymous with, ἀπονέεσθαι#.

ὥστε in Homer regularly means "as", "just as", and "as though" and not "so that".²⁶⁷ Accordingly, Diomedes says to Agamemnon not simply: "if your thumos hastens to go (back), go (back)" but rather "if your thumos hastens as if to go (back), go (back) (I42-43a). Pelliccia accepts Leaf's comment ad I42 that the idea of comparison is not entirely lost but adds a formal consideration: there seems to be a restriction on thumos ἐπέσσεται + infinitive, i.e. there seems to be a need for something that at least admits the possibility of changing the subject from thumos to the person who is the subject of the infinitive ("you").²⁶⁸

The question is: what is compared with what? Pelliccia takes the view that ὥστε compares the two motions of ἐπέσσεται and νέεσθαι. I am inclined to see the comparison rather in νέεσθαι and the following ἔρχεο. Both

²⁶⁷ One time ὥστε is used in the sense "so that" in the Odyssey (ὥστ' ... πιθέσθαι ρ21).

²⁶⁸ In his forthcoming book on Mind, Body, and Speech.

verbs (ἔρχεσθαι and νέεσθαι), when used peripherally (and not as nuclei) in verbal expressions like #ἔρχεσθαι μετὰ φύλα θεῶν ἢ εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν# and οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι# react to the dominant nucleus which in these phrases is the overt specification of destination; i.e. the verbs fill out the baccheus at the beginning, or the short-long-anceps at the end, of the hexametric line. But in I42-43 these verbs are used as nuclei; i.e. they are not mere metrical "fillers" responding to a nuclear dominant. The phrase ὥστε νέεσθαι# is an individual coinage, never occurring otherwise in Homer. The infinitive νέεσθαι is most commonly localized at the end of the hexameter and it often denotes, with²⁶⁹ and without²⁷⁰ spatial marker, homecoming.

The imperative ἔρχεο is regularly localized at the beginning of the hexameter in both the Iliad and the Odyssey. Only here does it carry the idea "return home" if indeed this is the implied destination. ἔρχομαι is only rarely used without spatial marker to denote homecoming and then commonly in Kommen Deixis (see discussion in chapter two). For the idea of homecoming in Gehen Deixis I can find one instance: Ἐκτορ, ἀτὰρ εὐ πόλινδε μετέρχεο (Z86). Whether the motion denoted with μετέρχεο is a homecoming or simply a motion back to Troy (parallel to Akhaians returning from the battlefield to

²⁶⁹ B290, 354, 357, 453-54 κτλ.

²⁷⁰ B291, 298, β238, γ60, δ351 κτλ.

the camp) is a problem which is discussed in detail in the previous chapter. Even if μετέρχαιο in Z86 denotes a homecoming (viewed in *Gehen Deixis*) the verb which is used to denote this idea is a compound, not the simplex, and it is used with a spatial marker.

Diomedes may compare the homecoming with a simple going: if your thumos hastens as if to go home (as if to have a nostos), go (sc. and you will see how far you will get).²⁷¹ Since Diomedes, on the other hand, resumes Agamemnon's language of homecoming (cf. #φεύγωμεν σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν# I27 and #φευγόντων σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν# I47) ἔρχαιο in I43 is perhaps so strongly influenced by these spatial markers that it carries also the idea of homecoming. Then, Diomedes compares one verb which denotes homecoming with another which also denotes homecoming. Diomedes may allude to the notion that a return is a nostos only after the sacking of Troy. A premature return would, in his view, not be a nostos.²⁷²

²⁷¹ See Nestor's response to Agamemnon in B: "But if any man is terribly desirous to go home, / let him only lay his hands on his well-benched black ship, / that before all others he may win death and destruction" (B357-59).

²⁷² This is surely a system of designation which is not shared by all the other characters nor by the narrator (cf. "Ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη (B155), ἧ εὖ ἦε κακῶς νοστήσομεν υἱεὺς Ἀχαιῶν (B253), ἀνηθήντα νέεσθαι (B291), κενεόν τε νέεσθαι (B298) κτλ. In the *Odyssey* Nestor uses verbal forms of φεύγω and νέομαι as synonyms (see γ166-70).

To sum up: all apparent violations of economy within the system of classification "return home" and within the category "infinitive" prove, upon closer scrutiny, not to violate this principle. Instead, aspectual, syntactical and poetic factors are more or less decisive for the use of one phrase and not another. Because it is sound to regard word choice as a matter meaning rather than a violation of economy it is plausible to assume poetic reasons also for phrases which do not violate the principle of economy. In short, narrator and character dance freely despite their "Ketten".

Bibliography

- Ameis, K. F. and C. Hentze. Anhang zu Homer's Odyssee.
4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1879-80.
- Anderson, S. R. and E. L. Keenan. "Deixis." Language Typology and Syntactic Description. 3 vols. Ed. T. Shopen. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985. 259-308.
- Andronikos, M. "Totenkult". Archaeologica Homerica. Vol. IIIW. Ed. F. Matz and H. G. Buchholz. Göttingen: 1968.
- Arend, W. Die Typische Scenen bei Homer. Berlin: Weidmann, ¹1933, ²1975.
- Austin, J. How To Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bakker, E. J. Linguistics and Formulas in Homer. Scalarity and the Description of the Particle Per. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 1988.
- Bakker, E. J. and F. Fabbricotti. "Peripheral and nuclear semantics in homeric diction. The case of dative expressions for 'spear'." Mnemosyne 44 (1991): 63-84.

Bakker, E.J. and N. van den Houten. "Aspects of synonymy in homeric diction." Classical Philology 87 (1992): 1-13.

Barthes, R. Writing Degree Zero. Printed together with Elements of Semiology and transl. Lavers, A. and C. Smith. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Benveniste, E. Problemes in General Linguistics. Trans. Meek, M. E. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1971. Trans. of Problèmes de Linguistique Générale. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Bloch, A. Zur Geschichte einiger suppletiver Verba im Griechischen. Diss. Basel, 1940.

Homer's The Odyssey. Ed. Bloom, H. New York, Philadelphia: Chelsea House Publishers, 1988.

Brugmann, K. Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprache. Leipzig, 1904.

Chantraine, P. Grammaire Homerique. 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948-53.

Clay, J. Strauss. The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983.

- Cunliffe, R. J. A Lexikon of the Homeric Dialect.
Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, ¹1924,
²1963.
- Ducrot, O. and T. Todorov. Encyclopedic Dictionary of
the Sciences of Language. Trans. Porter, C. Baltimore
and London: The John Hopkins UP, 1979. Trans. of
Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage.
Paris: Seuil, 1972.
- Ebeling, H. Lexikon Homericum. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G.
Teubner, 1880-85.
- Edwards, M. Homer, Poet of the Iliad. Baltimore and
London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.
- Fillmore, J. C. Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis 1971.
Bloomington: Mimeo, Indiana University Linguistics Club,
1975.
- Frame, D. The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic. New
Haven and London: Yale UP 1978.
- Frisk, H. Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. 2
vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1960-
70.

Führer, R. Formprobleme - Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der Frühgriechischen Lyrik. Zetemata. Heft 44. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.

Goldhill, S. The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Griffin, J. "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity." CO 26 (1976): 161-187.

--- Homer on Life and Death. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Hall, E. Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Hellwig, B. Raum und Zeit im Homerischen Epos. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964.

Heubeck, A., et alii. A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1988-92.

Hoekstra, A. "Metrical Lengthening and Epic Diction." Mnemosyne. 31 (1978): 15-23.

Hooker, J.T. "Postpositive -δε". Indogermanische Forschungen. Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik and allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. 70 (1965): 164-171.

Householder, W. F. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus, transl. and with commentary. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science. Vol.23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V, 1981.

Jakobson, R. Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb. Selected Writings II. The Hague: Mouton, 1971. 130-147.

de Jong, I. Narrators and Focalizers. The presentation of the story in the Iliad. Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Pub. Co., 1987.

Kirk, G. S., et alii. The Iliad: A Commentary. 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP., 1985-1993.

Latacz, J. Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlandes. München und Zürich: Artemis, 1989.

Leaf, W. The Iliad. 2 vols. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900-02.

Létoublon, F. Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: suppletisme et aspect verbal. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.

Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

Lohmann, D. Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1970.

Lord, A.B. "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts." TAPA 84 (1953): 124-134. Repr. Lord, A.B. Epic Singers and Oral Tradition. Ithaca: Ithaca UP, 1991.

--- The Singer of Tales. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1960.

Lynn-George, M. Epos: Word, Narrative, and the Iliad. Atlantic Highlands, 1988.

Lyons, J. Semantics. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977.

--- "Deixis and Anaphora." The Development of Conversation and Discourse. Ed. T. Myers. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1979. 88-103.

Macleod, C. W. Homer, Iliad Book XXIV. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Martin, R. The Language of Akhilleus. Speech and Performance in the Iliad. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1989.

Merry, W. W. and J. Riddell. Homer's Odyssey. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1876.

Monro, D. B. A Grammair of the Homeric Dialect. Philadelphia: William H. Allen · Bookseller, 21992.

Morrison, J. V. "Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the Iliad." TAPA 122 (1992): 61-71.

Moulton, C. Similes in the Homeric Poems. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.

Mutzbauer, C. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der Homerische Tempusgebrauch. Ein Beitrag zur Historischen Syntax der Griechischen Sprache. Strassburg. 1893.

Nagler, M. N. Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Nagy, G. The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek poetry. Baltimore: The John Hopkins UP, 1979.

--- "Another Look at Kleos Aphthiton." Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft. 7 (1981): 113-116.

--- "On the Death of Sarpedon." Approaches to Homer. Ed. Rubino, C. A. and C.W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983. 189-217.

--- Greek Mythology and Poetics. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1990

--- "Homeric Quaestiones." TAPA 122 (1992): 17-60.

O'Neill, E. G, Jr. "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter. Homer, Hesiod and the Alexandrians." YCS 8 (1942): 105-78.

Osthoff, H. Vom Suppletivwesen der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Heidelberg, 1900.

D.L. Page. History and the Homeric "Iliad". Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Parry, M. L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère. Essai sur une problème de style homérique. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1928.

--- The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Pelliccia, H. "Pindarus Homericus: Pythian 3.1-80." HSCP 91 (1987): 39-63.

--- Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and in Pindar. Hypomnemata. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht [forthcoming].

Peradotto, J. Man in the Middle Voice. Name and Narrative in the Odyssey. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.

Pucci, P. Odysseus Polutropos. Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987.

Ramersdorfer, H. Singuläre Iterata der Ilias. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie. Vol. 137. Königstein/Ts.: Hain, 1981.

Redfield, J. Nature and Culture in the Iliad. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Reinhardt, K. Die Ilias und ihr Dichter. Ed. U. Hölscher. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Richardson, S. The Homeric Narrator. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1990.

Sale, W. "The Formularity of the Place Phrases of the Iliad." TAPA 117 (1987): 21-50.

Schadewaldt, W. Homer. Ilias. Frankfurt am Main: Insel Verlag, 1975.

Schein, S. The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Schwyzler, E. Griechische Grammatik. 3 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1939-52.

Scully, S. Homer and the Sacred City. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

Snell, B. Ed. Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos 2 vols. to date. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955-.

Stanford, W. B. The Odyssey of Homer. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959².

Thornton, A. Peoples and Themes in Homer's Odyssey. London/Dunedin: Methuen & Co. in association with University of Otago Press, 1970

--- Homer's Iliad, its Composition and the Motif of Supplication. Hypomnemata. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Visser, E. "Formulae or single words? Towards a new Theory in Homeric Verse-Making." Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft. NS 14 (1988): 21-37.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich. Die Ilias und Homer. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, ²1920.

Wissowa, G. Ed. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlerscher Verlag, 1896-.

Wohl, V. J. "Standing by the Stathmos: Sexual Ideology in the Odyssey." Arethusa 26 (1993) 19-50.

Wolf, F. A. Prolegomena to Homer. 1795. Trans.
Grafton, A., Most, G., W. and J., E., G. Zetzel.
Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985. Trans. of Prolegomena ad
Homerum: sive, De operum Homericorum prisca et genuina
forma varisque mutationibus et probabili ratione
emendandi. Vol.1. Halle, 1795.

Wyatt, W. F. Jr. Metrical Lengthening in Homer. Rome:
Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1969.