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La manipolazione e/o la riproduzione (totale o parziale) e/o la diffusione telematica di quest’opera sono consentite a singoli o comunque a soggetti non costituiti come imprese di carattere editoriale, cinematografico o radio-televvisivo.
The connection between the noun ληίς, -ίδος and the derived term ληίδας, -ίδος allows us to understand the full meaning of the hapax legomenon ληίδας. The significance of the word ληίς and the related legal and religious implications must be taken into consideration. Both the linguistic and the conceptual examination match the compositional analysis of the Homeric piece in which the syntagma ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας is found. The evidence indicates that we are dealing with a very ancient feature, which should be traced back to the pre-Archaic civilization and society (cf. Thuc. 1.5), referring to the very early stages of the Homeric traditions.

La connessione linguistica e semantica tra il sostantivo ληίς, -ίδος e l’hapax ληίδας, -ίδος, consente di cogliere l’apparato concettuale inscritto nel sintagma ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας. Gli aspetti giuridico-religiosi correlati alla parola che indica la preda di guerra sono stati presi in considerazione, facendo riferimento anche al contesto storico delineato da Thuc. 1.5 e confrontato con il quadro sociale ed economico che è possibile ricavare dai testi di Omero. Tutti questi elementi trovano corrispondenza nell’analisi compositiva e linguistica della sezione in cui è registrata l’espressione ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας. Si tratta, verosimilmente, di un’elemento da porre in relazione con la civiltà pre-araico e con gli stadi più antichi delle tradizioni epiche.
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Il. 20.191: ἐνθέν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔνθεν δ’ ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν ἔ

The topic of this brief essay is the hapax legomenon ληίδας, -ίδος, embedded within the syntagma ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας recorded at II. 20.193. Line II. 20.193 is part of section II. 20.176-198, which reports Achilles’ speech to Aeneas1 before the duel between the two heroes2. This is, in turn, one of the main subjects of the 20th Song of the Iliad. The hexametric pair II. 20.176-177 forms the speech introduction3; the following 21 lines II. 20.178-198 are made up of two hexametric groups II. 20.178-1864 and II. 20.187-1985, according to the scheme 9 + 12 = (5 + 4) + (4 + 4 + 4). The Homeric piece

---

1 Currie 2011; see also also Dück 2011.
3 Edwards 2000, pp. 311-312; Eust. ad Hom II. 20. 178s., 180s., 181-3, 184-6, 182, 183, 184, 186: 1202, 19-20; 1202, 21-29; 1202, 30-35; 1202, 36-43; 1202, 44-45; 1202, 46-55; 1202, 56-62; 1202, 62-63 (IV pp. 388-389 van der Valk); schol. ad Hom II. 20.180-6a-b, 180, 181, 183, 185 (V p. 31 Erbse).
4 Edwards 2000, pp. 312-313; the verse 20.193 is similar to 16.831 (Τρομώσαις δὲ γυναίκας ἐλευθέρων ἡμερίδας Ἀτρασ), ibid. p. 313: «Among the captured women was Briseis (2.690-1);» Eust. ad Hom II. 20.187-90, 191-4, 188-90, 187, 191s.,193s., 194, 195-8, 195, 197: 1202, 63 - 1203, 3; 1203, 4-10; 1203, 10-19; 1203; 19-21; 1203, 22-23; 1203, 24-25; 1203, 25-27; 1203, 28-30; 1203, 39;
is examined following the methodological approach that I proposed in the previous monograph *Histologia Homerica. Studio sulle sezioni dell’Iliade* (2016)⁶: the systematic dissection of Homer’s texts reveals a compositional structure made up of recurring and modular hexametric blocks, due to oral and extemporaneous techniques of composition-in-performance⁷. Therefore, Homer’s texts really appear as a hand-sewn fabric (cf. the terms *rhapsōidía, hýmnos, hyphainō*), formed through a dynamic and lengthy oral-aural composition and transmission phase. And so, the analogy with the study of the biological tissues, or *histologia*, seems particularly suited to early epic poetry. This phenomenon is consistent with the findings of Milman Parry and Albert Lord and is closely related to the multiformity of Homer’s texts⁸.

Aristarchus athetized lines *II*. 20.195-198 «on the grounds that the last three were appropriate to Menelaos when he’s struggling to save Patroklos’ corpse from his opponent [...] but not to the furious Akilleus in his first encounter with a Trojan leader»⁹. Verse *II*. 20.196 corresponds to *II*. 17.30, only changing initial βάλλεαι into στήῃς; *II*. 20.197-198 = *II*. 17.31-32. They are actually ‘universal’ or interchangeable hexametric segments, and this typology of small groups of lines, as well as the typology of independent lines, was mostly used in the compositional techniques mentioned above. The independent lines are syntactically autonomous and complete or can be joined elsewhere to other verses in different hexametric segments¹⁰. This technique is a probable mark of oral and extemporaneous composition-in-performance¹¹, and so it should be traced back to the early stages of the Homeric traditions. But Aristarchus could neither have knowledge of the long oral composition-in-performance phases nor of the related phenomenon of the multiformity of Homer’s texts. *II*. 20.193 is an independent line because the following ῥῦγον at 20.194 may be replaced by some other verbal form having the same prosody. The 23 (2 + 21) hexameters that constitute the section *II*. 20.176-198 are mainly independent lines, except for *II*. 20. 178-179, 191-192, 195-196, which are 3 ‘seamless’ hexametric pairs: this compositional technique reminds the Mycenaean accounting records, in which goods are listed by pairs¹².

---

1203, 39-43 (IV pp. 389-391, 391-392 van der Valk); *schol. ad Hom II*. 20.188-94, 188a-b¹-², 193, 194a¹-a², 195-8a¹-a¹, 195, 196, 196-8 (V pp. 31-33 Erbse).
² See also De Cristofaro 2016b.
³ HH pp. 9-35.
⁶ De Cristofaro 2018a, p. X.
⁷ Martin 2011a; cf. id. 2011c.
⁸ Melea 2014, p. 153; Duhoux 2008, p. 276: «D'Ergasós, 'PAI(r)’: in documents dealing with horses (KN So), the abbreviation ZE is contrasted with MO. Since a Mycenaean chariot had a pair of wheels and of horses, ZE must stand for ‘pair’ (cf. ζεόντος), while MO must be ‘single’, *mouνος (cf. μονός/μονός); ibid. pp. 275 (KN So (1) + 4440 + 8700 + 8702 + fr.), 314 (PY Sa 790), 336 (PY Ub 1315); cf. ibid. p. 288; cf. PY Sa 488; PY Sa 483 (Bennet, Olivier 1973, p. 223); Bernabé, Luján 2008, p. 212; Van Alfen 2008, p. 236. See also Ventris, Chadwick 1973, pp. 54, 370-375, 517-520, 562 (MO), 593 (ZE). About the numbers and the measure systems
«I mean ‘seamless’ the lines which are syntactically interdependent and connecting by links between syntactic elements, and which cannot or hardly can be attached to hexameters which are not the previous or the following one in the current hexametric segment. This can be a mark of written composition, even though destined for the oral and aural communication. By contrast, the independent lines are syntactically autonomous and complete or can be attached elsewhere to other verses and to different hexametric segments. The compositional technique by independent hexameters is a very useful tool for the oral-extemporaneous composition-in performance. But it is less useful or unnecessary for the written composition».

20.176: οἱ δ’ ὡς δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπὶ ἀλλήλους ιόντες,
20.177: τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε πωδάρκης διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς.

20.178: “Αἰνεία, τί σοι τόσσον ὁμίλου πολλὸν ἐπεληθῶν
20.179: ἐστής; ἣ σε γε θυμός ἐμοι μαχέσασθαι ἀνώγει
20.180: ἐπόμενον Ἀπολλώνιον ἀνάξειν ἵπποδάμοιοι
20.181: τιμής τῆς Πριάμου; ἀτάρ εἰ κεν ἐμ’ ἐξεναρίζης,
20.182: οὐ τοι τούνεκα γε Πριάμος γέρας ἐν χερὶ θήσει
20.183: εἰσίν γὰρ οἱ παιδές, ο δ’ ἐμπεδος οὐδ’ ἀπεσῆνοι.
20.184: ἢ νῦ τι τοι Ἀπόλλως τέμενος τάμων ἔχοιχον ἄλλων,
20.185: καλὸν φυταλίας καὶ ἀριστής, ὡρὰ νάρμηι,
20.186: αἱ κεν ἐμὲ κτεινής χαλεπῶς δὲ σ’ ἑολτια τὸ ἰέειν.

20.187: ἢ ὅδε μὲν σε γε ϕημι καὶ ἄλλοτε δοφύς φαθήσαι.
20.188: ἢ οὐ μέμιν όντε πέρ σε βοών ἀπο μοῦνον ἐόντα
20.189: σεβὰ κατ’ ἑαυτὸν ὄρεον ταχέες πόδεις
20.190: καρπαλίμως τότε δ’ οὐ τι μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων.
20.191: ἐνθεν δ’ ες Λυρήσσον ὀπέκφηγες; αὐτάρ ἐγὼ τὴν
20.192: πέρσα μεθομηθεῖς σὺν Ἀθώθη καὶ Διὶ πατρί,
20.193: λημάδας δὲ γυναίκας ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας
20.194: ἦγον· ἀτάρ σε Ζεὺς ἐφούσι ἀνδρὶ καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.
20.195: ἀλλ’ οὐ νῦν ἐρυεσθαὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐς ἐνθοθμό
20.196: βάλλεαι· ἀλλὰ σ’ ἐγὼν ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω
20.197: ἐς πληθῶιν ἵναι, μηδ’ ἀντίος ἰσχασ’ ἐμείο,
20.198: πρὶν τι κακὸν παθεῖν· ἐξευθέν δὲ τε νήπιος ἑγνιο”.

The whole section shows several archaisms and ‘Aeolicisms’: «My point of departure is a list of Aeolicisms that we can find embedded in Homeric diction. For the moment I am saying only Aeolicisms, not Aeolic forms, since some of these forms may turn out to be not exclusively Aeolic».

The unaugmented verbs must be traced back to Mycenaean stages of Homeric language: τάμων (II.

see ibid. pp. 53-60; Bartonek 2003, pp. 125-128; see also, e.g. Aravantinos, Godart, Sacconi 2001, pp. 327-354; Bennet, Olivier 1973, pp. 10-11; HH pp. 64-65 and p. 64 n. 183.

1 De Cristofaro 2018a p. 62.
14 NAGY 2011, pp. 135; cf. ibid. pp. 135-138, 165-175. Cf. Miller 2014, pp. 234-356; see also ibid. pp. 95-105, 116-130, 131-138, 183-195; Haug 2011a; Id. 2011b; Mendez Dusuna 2007b; Id. 2007a; Id. 1985; About the vexata quastio about the Aeolic dialects, characters and environments referring the Homeric language and contexts see De Cristofaro 2016a, pp. 15-22, the related nn. 16-45, and the textual and bibliographical references therein; cf. also Id. 2014.
20.184), σεῦα (II. 20.189), ὑπέκφυγες (II. 20.191), πέρσα (II. 20.192), ἐφρύσατο (II. 20.194, which also shows the ‘Aeolic’ double resonant). The probable Mycenaean origin of the formula δίος Ἀχιλλέας (II. 20.177) has been pointed out by C. Ruijgh. The verb ἀνάξειν (II. 20.180) is strongly evocative of Mycenaean language as well (cf. Myc. ἄναξ). The perfect ἔσολπα (II. 20.186) shows the presence of operating digamma, and should be related to linguistic diachronic stages or to linguistic environments in which this phoneme was preserved: «σε ἐδήσε τὸ ἄναξ» would give a better rhythm, providing a major word-break after the first syllable instead of after the trochee» (cf. LSJ p. 601). The non-Ionic modal particle κεν is combined with the Ionic normalized εἰ in place of the original αἳ at II. 20.181, while the construct is fully ‘Aeolic’ at II. 20.186: αἳ κεν. The ‘hybrid’ form ἐμεῖο is remarkable (II. 20.197), as well as the old pronoun οἱ (II. 20.183) and the ‘Aeolic’ and North-Western ‘Doric’ dative ending -εσεῖ: Τῷ κόσμῳ (II. 20.180), ταχέσσοι (II. 20.189), πόδεσσι (II. 20.189). The uncontracted forms are remarkable as well: ἔειπε (II. 20.177), νέμησι (II. 20.185), ἐόντα (II. 20.188), ὑράξων (II. 20.189), μετατροπαλίζει (II. 20. 190), βάλλες (II. 20. 196), παθέειν (II. 20. 198). The formulaic ending ἐν χερι θήσει (II. 20.182) is probably very ancient feature. It is made of the future tense θήσει and the dative singular χερί, which has no compensatory lengthening. The linguistic form showing -ες is also documented at II. 8.289, II. 24.101 and h.19.40. Edwards mentions the formula with the unusual χερί at 20.182, just as Brügger does in the commentary on II. 24.101:


Eustathius does not point out the anomaly, as just like Richardson and the scholia (cf. V p. 539 Erbse). The commentaries on II. 8.289 do not refer to this linguistic form. Eustathius quotes the line II. 8.289 in the commentary ad Hom. II. 8.280-91, but he ‘normalizes’ the singular form χερί


18 WACHTER 2000, p. 312; see also ibid., commentary on 182-3, about the rivalry of the two Trojan royal houses (Aineias leads the Dardans, and Sarpedon the allies).
19 BRÜGGER 2009, p. 57.
20 Eust. ad Hom. II. 24.101s.: 1341, 24-29 (IV pp. 875-876 van der Valk); RICHARDSON 2000, p. 287.
into plural χερσί: πρώτως τοι μετ’ εμ’ προσβήσιμον ἐν χερσί Θήσου (712, 64)22. Just as he does in the commentary ad Hom. II. 20.181-3 (ἐν χερσί Θήσει, l. 34)23, and ad Hom. II. 20.182: Ἠσυχ. δὲ ὅτι τὸ «γέρας ἐν χερσί Θήσει» ταύτων ἐστὶ τὸ ἐγγυαλέξει, ἥγουν ἐγχερσίεσε, πλὴν ὄσον τούτο μὲν κοινόν, ἕκενον δὲ ποιητικὸν24. But in this way, the prosody of the verse is corrupted. Moreover, the ending formula at II. 24.101 is made up by χερι and by the unaugmented aorist θήκη: Ἡσυχ. δὲ χρύσεον καλόν δέτας ἐν χερί Θήκη. So, it seems hard to deny the archaising facies of this line, since both the phenomena regarding the absence of compensatory length and of augment are documented in the Mycenaean texts. Probably, χερι is a very ancient feature: the form with only -ἐ- is documented in the Linear B tablets: cf. (e.g.) ke-ni-qa /kʰe(h)r-niŋʷa/ χέρνιβα25. Thus, it is plausible that the form χερι should be referred to the very early stages of the epic traditions. It is only found in 3 lines within the Iliad, and this fact can be due to the long compositional and re-compositional stages. All the obsolete forms that it was possible to replace have been changed into the current ones, throughout the very long phases of the composition and transmission of the texts. And indeed, the word which indicates the pivotal concept of the Iliadic storyline and traditions, i.e. ληῖς, -ίδος, is only mentioned in five lines within the poem. During many centuries of composition and re-composition, the comprehension of the full meaning of this term and of the related legal-religious implications has been lost, so it has been confused with other similar but non-synonymic terms. Something similar has probably happened to χερι with no compensatory length: the form with -ἐ- could actually be related to the original declension, and so traced back to a very ancient stage of the Greek, as Flippo Cassola has pointed out in the commentary on h. 19.40, referring to accusative χέρα26: «Sarebbe secondo alcuni una forma tarda rispetto all’omerico χεῖρα. Secondo la maggioranza dei linguisti, rappresenta invece la declinazione originaria (nominativo χέρς; cfr. χείροιν, χερσί».

The word ληῖς, -ίδος27 is clearly a derived term from ληίς, -ίδος28, which, in turn, indicate the war booty. The meaningful implications, both legal and religious, which are related to this noun have been the topic of my recent book ΛΗΙΣ. An essay about a pivotal concept in the early epic traditions. The legal and religious implications. Vol. 1: The Homeric Framework, Arbor Sapientiae Ed., Roma

---

24 Eust. ad Hom. II. 20.182: 1202, 44-45 (IV p. 388 van der Valk).
25 DMic 1, p. 342 ad vv. ke-ni-qa (KN Ws 8497.β). «Probabilmente *χέρνιβα* (χέρνιβα), Nom. Pl. neutron de *χέρνιβα* (κέρνιβα)»; ibid. p. 342 ad v. ke-ni-qa-tef ; ibid. pp. 342-343 ad v. ke-ni-qa-te-še; see also ibid. pp. 211-212 ad v. e-ke-ro-go-no, p. 350 ad v. ke-ro-ke-re-wa; MILENA 2014, p. 115; WACHTER 2000, p. 233 ad v. χείρ; ibid. ad v. χέρνιβος; cf. II. 1.449: χερνιβάντο (see above p. 11); DELG p. 1254 ad v. χέρνιβος; cf. BEEEKES 2002/p. 1620, ad v. χείρ: «also (secondarily) χερ- in χείρ, χερός, χέρα, χέρια, etc. ». But we have seen just now that some forms with the -ἐ- are documented in Mycenaean Greek; see also LfgrE 4, col. 1187 ad χέρνιβος; ibid. coll. 1187ad v. χερνιβάς (πτομέα); ibid. coll. 1187-1188 ad v. χερνιβάν (πτομέα).
26 Cassola 1975, p. 577; cf. Harrocks 1997 p. 2011; DELG pp. 1251-1252, ad v. χείρ; BEEEKES 2016/2 pp. 1620-1621, ad v. χείρ; LfgrE 4, coll. 1157-1179, ad v. χείρ; esp. see coll. 1160, in which M. Markwald points out this phenomenon, is visible also in ll. 8.289, 24.101, h. 19.40.
It seems clear that ληίς, -άδος is formed on the same root as ληίς with the addition of the same suffix -d-, which is a distinctive mark of the Greek in respect to other old Indo European languages, and which shows a certain feminine connotation. This term is similar to Ἀχαίας, -ίδος, which is formed from the root of Homeric ethronym Ἀχαιοί and of the later toponym Ἀχαια, which is probably the same as the Anatolian expression Aḥhiya(wā) and, by adding the same suffix -id. It indicates the Greek homeland both as a noun and as an adjective (e.g. II. 1.254: ὁ πότοι, ἡ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιᾶδα γαῖαν ἱκάνει; II. 3.75: Ἀργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιΐδα καλλιγύνακα). But it also indicates the Greek women (e.g. II. 9.395: πολλαὶ Ἀχαιῶδες εἰσὶν ἀν Ἐλλάδα τε Φθίτην τε). The termination in -ίς, -ίδος is also shared with the adjective πατρίς, -ίδος, which in Homer, joined to the noun γαῖα, forms another syntagma indicating the Greek homeland. Finally, the root of ληίς, -ίδος and ληίς, -άδος is the same as the word which means the Achaean army,
λα(φ)ός, i.e. all the adult males able to fight, the λα(φ)οί24. The noun λα(φ)ός and the verb ληϊζομαι (from *λαρηϊζομαι) semantically correspond to the original meaning of the Latin expressions populus and popular, -āris25. Both the terms λα(φ)ός and ληϊς <*λα-ίς are documented in Mycenaean Greek in compounded nouns (ra-wa-ke-ta)36, in common nouns or adjectives (ra-wija-ja)37, and in personal names (ra-wo-do-ko, ra-wo-ke-ta, ra-wo-po-ko, ra-wo-ko-no)38. The strong connection between the ληϊς and the captured women, during piratical or war raids, is unmistakable and is well expressed by the hexametric syntagma ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας:


<Ληϊάδας: αἰχµαλώτους. Aim40>

The mention of the Ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας at II. 20.193 is also connected to the mention of the raid in Lyrnessos (20.191). We know that Briseïs was captured by Achilles on this occasion (II. 2.688-693) and that the raid in Lyrnessos occurred during the same war expedition in Cilician Thebs, when Chryseïs was also taken (II. 1.366-369), and when the father and the brothers of Andromache were killed by the same Achilles (II. 6.395-397, 414-416, 421-425). So, we can see a clear convergence among some sharply distinct and different Homeric pieces. But they are all related to the root-cause of the plot of the Iliad:

2) The mention of the first of the nine Thessalian contingents which end the Catalogue of Ships in the 2nd Song (II. 2.681-694: HH pp. 18-22; DE CRISTOFARO 2016a; id. 2018a pp. 4-6).

All these mentions are displayed in three very different contexts, of course. But the long centuries-old transmission did, however, preserve some coherence between them. The mention of Ληϊάδας δὲ

35 DE VANA 2016, p. 480, ad v. populus: «Derivates: populāri ‘to ravage, plunder (Naev. +); […] depopulāri ‘to sack, plunder (Enn. +), depopulātor ‘who sacks’ (Caecil. +); […] Ptl. *populō ‘army’ wv; cf. DELL pp. 521-522, ad v. populō, -āre; ibid. p. 533 ad v. populus.
37 D Mic 2 pp. 233-234 ad v. ra-wi-ia-ja.
39 Eust. ad Hom. II. 20.193s.: 1203, 24-25 (IV p. 391 van der Valk).
40 Schol. ad Hom II. 20.193 (V p. 33 Erbse).
γυναῖκας in Achilles’ speech to Aeneas, referring to the same raid, must have been somehow perceived by Homer’s early audience as evocative of the two girls, because they were ληΐάδας γυναῖκας. Their legal status was not the status of a simple slave or of a war prisoner, but it was meant as something of very different and intimately related to the legal and religious value of ληῖς:

«When we first encounter Briseis in Iliad 1, she is not referred to by name. She is simply a prize. Two chieftains are fighting over a prize of honor, a spoil of war. That prize happens to be a girl, but, at least initially, she may as well be a tripod or a herd of cattle. The point is status, and the man who gets her has more status. Agamemnon, whose claim to honor (timê) is that he is leader of the expedition and commands the combined Greek forces, insists that he have a prize to compensate for the loss of his own. He threatens, moreover, to seize another man’s prize if he is not given one»41.

The linguistic data concerning the feminine overtone of both the terms (cf. above n. 30) match the Homeric narrative contexts. The ληῖς of young Nestor at II. 11.778-781 (see DE CRISTOFARO 2018a pp. 28-31), e.g., also consists of feminine features: ἀγέλας is a feminine term, the raided cattle is the sum of 50 cows and 50 sheep (11.778), 50 she-goats (11.679), 50 mares (11.680); συῶν συβόσια (11.679) indicate the herds of pigs, but the Greek term σύς indicates both the masculine and the feminine meaning. It actually seems that the term ληῖς shows some feminine semantic features, both linguistic and relating to some components of pre-Archaic economy and society. Moreover, the derived masculine term ληϊάδης does not occur in Homeric poetry (cf. ThGL 6 col. 245), while the feminine hapax ληῖάς is documented therein. In the Homeric framework, a man, i.e. a warrior, can be a war prisoner and murdering him is legally and religiously correct, just as a ransom can be paid to release him. But he cannot be owned, while women, goods, cattle, and slaves can be:

«Achilles clearly says in the 9th Song that the life of a man cannot be seized as a prey (II. 9.408), replying to the speech of Odysseus (see above pp. 60-72), who is Agamemnon’s legal representative one more time (II. 9.224-306: see above, pp. 27-28; cf. pp. 7-13). He refers to Achilles the honors and the prizes promised by Agamemnon (II. 9.114-161: see pp. 24-28), among which the ‘war prey’ (ληῖς) is also mentioned: ὅτε κεν δοτεέωμεθα ληῖδ’ Ἀχιλοί (II. 9.138 = 9.280). The verbal adjective from ληῖζοµαι (i.d. «to seize» in war action or raids) is used by Achilles at II. 9.408: ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχή πάλιν ἔλθειν οὔτε λεῖστή. He said in the previous lines 9.406-407 that oxen and sheep can be seized as war booty (ληῖστοι μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἱμάτια μῆλα, 9.406), as well as tripods and horses can be owned (κτῆτοι δὲ τρῖποδές τε καὶ ἵππων ἔξενθα κάρηνα, 9.407). He uses some masculine terms at 9.406-407, just referring to animals and objects, but he adds at following 9.408-409 that the life of a man, i.e. a warrior, cannot be taken as a war prize (οὗτε λεῖστη).

The speech is certainly passionate. But the ‘histological’ dissection of the whole piece shows a very tidy order in listing his motivations, throughout the hexametric groups which compose this piece. Achilles’ argumentations appear very reasonable, if we contextualize them within a pre-Archaic framework and according to the Homeric heroes’ *forma mentis*. The frequency of independent lines suggests that this section was at least partially formed by means of oral-extemporaneous techniques of composition-in-performance. Thus, it is probable that some key-passages can be very ancient. The Homeric men are essentially warriors, and they constitute the Λαξ(β)ώς. In both cases, whether he is a chief or not, the man can be an owner, but he can’t be owned. Both from the legal and religious point of view, a free man (i.e. a warrior) can be killed by the enemy or ransomed by his family if he’s a war prisoner, but he can never be a slave. Male slaves and the verb ληίζομαι are mentioned by Telemachus at Od. 1.398 (καὶ δῆμων, οὕς μοι ληίζεσσατο διὸς Ὀδυσσέας): but he is probably talking about subjects who were already in this status of slavery when Odysseus seized them. The same can be said about the female slaves mentioned at Il. 18.28. In the Homeric world, slaves do not have a legal status as human beings, although they may be well treated by their masters, as in the case of Eumaeus, who, however, was bought (and not seized in a raid) when he was a child and not a man. By contrast, women can be owned and they represent the most important and valuable part of the war booty, as Agamemnon’s promised prizes at Il. 9.128-140 would seem to indicate. They can be ληίς. The linguistic, morphological and semantic analysis of this noun and of its derived terms, the examination of the narrative contexts, in which they are embedded, and of their compositional structures, allow us to set this word in a very ancient, and maybe ancestral, stage of the very early Homeric traditions. The comparison with the antecedent or contemporary Ancient Near Eastern documents shows that the ληίς is a Greek peculiarity, which does not find full and precise correspondence in the Oriental sources. The related legal and religious implications highlight some key points of the ideological-psychological issues and of the social and economic organization of the Homeric world.

We saw that Achilles mentions the ληίάδας δὲ γυναῖκας (Il. 20.193) within the speech he addresses to Aeneas, referring to the raid in Lyrnessos. Briseïs was captured in the same raid (cf. e.g. Il. 2.690-694), and she was probably among the mentioned «women who became ληίς»: this is the original meaning of the hapax ληίάδας (from ληίάς)43. The raid in Lyrnessos occurred in the same war expedition in which Cilician Thebes was plundered and Chyseïs was taken (cf. e.g. Il. 1.365-369):

«The evidence from both the *Iliad* and the *Cypria* suggests that the sacks of Lyrnessos, Pedasos, and Thebes (in which the brothers of Andromache were killed and Chryseïs was taken and given as a prize to Agamemnon) took place on a single campaign. Aeschylus’ *Phrygians* (fr. 267) refers to Lyrnessos as the birthplace of Andromache, even though everywhere else in Greek literature she is said to come from Cilician Thebes»44.

Achilles seems to synthetize within *Il.* 20.193 the root cause of the storyline of the *Iliad*, which is clearly connected to the ληίς and to the violation of the sacrocanct rights over the prey. He is probably alluding to the two maidens who lay at the heart of the Iliadic storyline. In fact, both of them are

---

42 De Cristofaro 2018a, pp. 114-115.
43 Due 2011a; Ead 2011b; Ead 2011c; Ead 2011f; Ead 2011e; Ead 2011f.
44 Due 2011e, p. 492; Ead 2011f; Ead 2011e; Ead 2011b; Ead 2011c; Ead 2011d; Minchin 2011; Finkelberg 2011; Rutherford 2011; cf. Latacz, Nünlist, Stoevesandt 2000, p. 132; Kirk 2001, p. 91; Id. 2000, pp. 211, 215, 216; Stoevesandt 2008, pp. 127-129, 135; see also ibid. 134-138. The essay of Enrico Scafa was published in 2005 (Scafa 2005), and it is decisive for the Cilian location of Thebes below the mount Plakos. See also Morris 2013; Miller 2013; Breyer 2011; Meyer 2011.
«women who have become ληίς», i.e. ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας. So, they are something more than simply slaves or «captive women»: they are ληίς45. The concept expressed by the word ληίς is really a special and complex one46 and precise correspondences cannot be found in the Ancient Near Eastern sources47.

«The Hittite word arnuwalaš seems to indicate something similar to the Homeric syntagma ληίδας δὲ γυναίκας (cf. above, p. 82) and so to the legal status of Briseis and Chryseis, who are not simply slaves and who are not simply war-captives. This Hittite term is also found in the Hittite Laws: «Law 40 shows that the king assigned fields to such persons for cultivation, and they assumed obligations in connection with that land-holding. Law 112 indicates that under certain circumstances the arnuwala- was exempt from the new obligation for the first three years of his holding a land» (HOFFNER 2002, p. 64; cf. above, pp. 105-106). Unfortunately, we have neither mythological nor historical sources from the Mycenaean world. Thus, a comparison between the case of restitution of the two maidens, who were part of the booty, and real cases of single war captives it is impossible to make»48.

The ληίς is exclusively related to the prey which is taken in war, by means of valiant deeds; it is a mark of pride and nobility for its owner (see Thuc. 1.5), and it can be given as a prize to a chief by the community of the chiefs or of the warriors (i.e. the λάξις): «The sphere of the private property cross with the community dimension: Achilles leads the expedition in Thebes (1.366-367, 6.414-428) and in Lyrnessos (2.688-694; 19.291-294), but the υἷες Ἀχαιῶν share the booty and give the prizes»49. The violation of Achilles’ property right over his ληίς arouses and justifies his μήνις, around which all the Iliadic traditions gravitate: it didn’t sound strange to Homer’s early listeners. This hubristic act involves both legal and religious implications: the cosmic order is broken by this heavy impietas: the community gives and shares the ληίς, of course, but in the first instance it is given by Zeus himself and he can give it to whomever he wishes, to the heroes but to the wicked men too (cf. Od. 14.85-86). Furthermore, the goddess Athena is the «Predatory» deity (ληίτις, II. 10.460)50; finally, the involvement of both Chtonian and Uranian gods in the release ritual for Briseïs in the 19th Song of the Iliad (19.258-259) suggests that these deities are also closely connected to the war booty. The restitution of the ληίς (and of the individual and legal entity who has become ληίς) needs a complex procedure, both liturgical and juridical, which also shows strong implications, both

45 DE CRISTOFARO 2018a pp. 17, 62-63, 113-115; cf. Id. 2016c.; cf. also THALMANN 2011. This word expresses a similar but not equal meaning to γέρας: DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, p. 18; cf. MARTIN 2011b.
48 Ibid. pp. 112
49 Ibid. p. 15.
50 CIRO 1994; DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 82-84, 113. Something similar can be found in the Hittite texts: victory, booty and war prisoners are given to the king by the Storm-god and by the Sun-goddess of Arinna: see e.g. AhT 1A § 18’, BECKMAN 2011, pp. 16-17; BRYCE 2011, pp. 45-49 (commentary on AhT 1A-B); cf. DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, p. 103 and n. 549. A more detailed discussion will be provided in the forthcoming Volume 2, relating to the Anatolian and Biblical documents.
public and private\textsuperscript{51}: see \textit{Il.} 1.440-474\textsuperscript{52} and \textit{Il.} 19.252-266\textsuperscript{53}. If we consider 1) the previous linguistic and semantic remarks about the noun \textit{Ληΐς}\textsuperscript{54}, 2) the ‘historigic’ structure of \textit{Il.} 20.187-198, mostly made up of independent hexameters and clearly due to oral and extemporaneous composition-in-performance, 3) the substantial presence of archaism in this section, we must assume that the term \textit{Ληΐς} expresses some very old and probably pre-Archaic features, from both the linguistic and conceptual points of view. It regards the legal and religious spheres of course, but it also strongly recalls social and economic issues connected to the pre-Archaic world, as Thucydides testifies in the fifth chapter of the first Book of the \textit{Historiae}. The Mycenaean term \textit{ra-wi-ja-ja} seems to support this inference. Moreover, the morpheme \textit{ra-wi-ja-ja} is documented in the Linear B texts from Messenian Pylos, the pre-Doric kingdom of Nestor, who is another Homeric predatory hero (\textit{Il.} 11.677-681)\textsuperscript{55}, having ancestors from Aiolos’ offspring, just as the son of Peleus is\textsuperscript{56}.

\textit{Bibliography}


\textit{51} DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 8-16.


\textit{54} DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 29-32, 83.

\textit{55} See above p. 5 n. 30; cf. DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 17-18, 21-23.

\textit{56} Cf. FINKELBERG 1999. One of his usual epithets is ἵππηλόττης, «the one who drives/carries away horses», probably from the same root of *Ἄξ(π)ος/Ἄξης and Ἀξ(π)ος (cf. BEEKES 2016/1 p. 842).


ThGrL: Thesaurus Graecae Linguae. ab Henrico Stephano contractus, Vols. 1-9, Graz 1954 (Anastatic Reprint).


VENTRIS, CHADWICK 1973: M. VENTRIS - J. CHADWICK, Documents in Mycenaeans Greek, Cambridge 1973².

