

SENECIO

Direttore

Andrea Piccolo e Lorenzo Fort



SAGGI, ENIGMI, APOPHORETA

Senecio

www.senecio.it

direzione@senecio.it

Napoli, 2019

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-televisivo.

ΛΗΙΑΔΑΣ ΔΕ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑΣ: SOMETHING MORE THAN «CAPTIVE WOMEN»

A SHORT COMMENTARY ON IL. 20.193

di Luigi De Cristofaro

The connection between the noun λῆϊς, -ῖδος and the derived term ληϊάς, - άδος allows us to understand the full meaning of the *hapax legomenon* ληϊάδας. The significance of the word λῆϊς 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 ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς is found. The evidence indicates that we are dealing with a very ancient feature, which should be traced back to the pre-Achaic 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 λῆϊς, -ῖδος e l'*hapax* ληϊάς, - άδος, consente di cogliere l'apparato concettuale inscritto nel sintagma ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς. 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 ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς. Si tratta, verosimilmente, di un'elemento da porre in relazione con la civiltà pre-archaica e con gli stadi più antichi delle tradizioni epiche.

Keywords: Homeric studies - Oral traditions - pre-Achaic society

Il. 20.191: ἔνθεν δ' ἔς Λυρνησὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν

Il. 20.192: πέρσα μεθορμηθεὶς σὺν Ἀθήνῃ καὶ Διὶ πατρί,

Il. 20.193: ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας

Il. 20.194: ἦγον· ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

The topic of this brief essay is the *hapax legomenon* ληϊάς, - άδος, embedded within the syntagma ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς recorded at Il. 20.193. Line Il. 20.193 is part of section Il. 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 Il. 20.176-177 forms the speech introduction³; the following 21 lines Il. 20.178-198 are made up of two hexametric groups Il. 20.178-186⁴ and Il. 20.187-198⁵, according to the scheme 9 + 12 = (5 + 4) + (4 + 4 + 4). The Homeric piece

¹ CURRIE 2011; see also also DUECK 2011.

² Cf. MUELLER 2011.

³ EDWARDS 2000, p. 311 takes in consideration an hexametric group Il. 20.174-177. The lines Il. 20.174-175 end the coherent section Il. 20.156-175 (HH p. 193). About the compositional technique by hexametric pairs and the similarities with the Mycenaean technique in listing goods by pairs cf. DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, p. 3 and n. 18.

⁴ EDWARDS 2000, pp. 311-312; Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 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. Il.* 20.180-6a-b, 180, 181, 183, 185 (V p. 31 Erbse).

⁵ EDWARDS 2000, pp. 312-313; the verse 20.193 is similar to 16.831 (Τρωϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας), *ibid.* p. 313: «Among the captured women was Briseis (2.690-1)»; Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 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 *rhapsōidia*, *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 *Il.* 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 *Il.* 20.196 corresponds to *Il.* 17.30, only changing initial *βάλλεαι* into *στήης*; *Il.* 20.197-198 = *Il.* 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. *Il.* 20.193 is an independent line because the following *ῆγον* at 20.194 may be replaced by some other verbal form having the same prosody. The 23 (2 + 21) hexameters that constitute the section *Il.* 20.176-198 are mainly independent lines, except for *Il.* 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 Il.* 20.188-94, 188a-b¹⁻², 193, 194a¹-a², 195-8a¹-a¹, 195, 196, 196-8 (V pp. 31-33 Erbse).

⁶ See also DE CRISTOFARO 2016b.

⁷ HH pp. 9-35.

⁸ NAGY 2010; DUÉ-EBBOTT 2010; EAED. 2016; DUÉ 2017. *The Homer's Multitext Project* (CHS Harvard) is supervised by Casey Dué and Mary Ebbott: see <http://www.homermultitext.org/>; <http://www.homermultitext.org/index.html>.

⁹ EDWARDS 2000, p. 313; cf. *schol. ad Hom.* 20.195-8a¹-a², 195, 196-8 (V pp. 32-33 Erbse).

¹⁰ DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, p. X.

¹¹ MARTIN 2011a; cf. ID. 2011c.

¹² MELENA 2014, p. 153; DUHOUX 2008, p. 276: «*D²E(ugos)*, '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. ζεῶγοφ), while *MO* must be 'single', **monwos* (cf. μόνος/μοῦνος)»; *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»¹³.

20.176: οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες,
20.177: τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς·

20.178: “Αἰνεΐα, τί σὺ τόσσον ὀμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθῶν
20.179: ἔστης; ἦ σέ γε θυμὸς ἐμοὶ μαχέσασθαι ἀνώγει
20.180: ἐλλόμενον Τρῶεσσιν ἀνάξειν ἵπποδάμοισι
20.181: τιμῆς τῆς Πριάμου; ἀτὰρ εἴ κεν ἔμ' ἐξεναρίξης,
20.182: οὐ τοι τοῦνεκά γε Πρίαμος γέρας ἐν χειρὶ θήσει·
20.183: εἰσὶν γὰρ οἱ παῖδες, ὁ δ' ἔμπεδος οὐδ' ἀεσίφρων.
20.184: ἦ νύ τί τοι Τρῶες τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
20.185: καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμῃαι,
20.186: αἶ κεν ἐμὲ κτείνης; χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἔολπα τὸ ῥέξειν.

20.187: ἤδη μὲν σέ γέ φημι καὶ ἄλλοτε δουρὶ φοβῆσαι.
20.188: ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε πέρ σε βοῶν ἄπο μῦνον ἐόντα
20.189: σεῦα κατ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι
20.190: καρπαλίμως; τότε δ' οὐ τι μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων.
20.191: ἔνθεν δ' ἐς Λυρνησσὸν ὑπέκφυγες· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν
20.192: πέρσα μεθορμηθεὶς σὺν Ἀθήνῃ καὶ Διὶ πατρὶ,
20.193: ληϊάδας δὲ γυναϊκᾶς ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας
20.194: ἦγον· ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι.
20.195: ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν ἐρύεσθαι οἴομαι, ὡς ἐνὶ θυμῷ
20.196: βάλλεται· ἀλλὰ σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω
20.197: ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ' ἀντίος ἴστασ' ἐμεῖο,
20.198: πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν· ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω”.

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»¹⁴.

The unaugmented verbs must be traced back to Mycenaean stages of Homeric language¹⁵: τάμον (*Il.*

see *ibid.* pp. 53-60; BARTONĚK 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.

¹³ 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 DOSUNA 2007b; ID. 2007a; ID. 1985; About the *vexata quaestio* 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.

¹⁵ DE DECKER 2015; BLUMENTHAL 1974; WILLI 2007. See also RUIJGH 2011, p. 272; cf. *ibid.* pp. 255-258; WILLI 2011, p. 463; CHADWICK 2007, p. 400; BARTONĚK 2003, p. 337, 340-341. Cf. DUHOUX 2008, p. 253: «*k^wrijato*: cf. πρίατο/ἐπρίατο, ‘he bought’ –

20.184), σεῦα (*Il.* 20.189), ὑπέκφυγες (*Il.* 20.191), πέρσα (*Il.* 20.192), ἐρρούσατο (*Il.* 20.194, which also shows the ‘Aeolic’ double resonant). The probable Mycenaean origin of the formula δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.* 20.177) has been pointed out by C. Ruijgh¹⁶. The verb ἀνάξειν (*Il.* 20.180) is strongly evocative of Mycenaean language as well (cf. Myc. *wanax*)¹⁷. The perfect ἔολπα (*Il.* 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 (F)έ(F)ολπα 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 εἶ in place of the original αἶ at *Il.* 20.181, while the construct is fully ‘Aeolic’ at *Il.* 20.186: αἶ κεν. The ‘hybrid’ form ἐμειο is remarkable (*Il.* 20.197), as well as the old pronoun οἶ (*Il.* 20.183) and the ‘Aeolic’ and North-Western ‘Doric’ dative ending *-essi*: Τρώεσσιν (*Il.* 20. 180), ταχέεσσι (*Il.* 20. 189), πόδεσσι (*Il.* 20. 189). The uncontracted forms are remarkable as well: εἶπε (*Il.* 20.177), νέμηαι (*Il.* 20.185), ἐόντα (*Il.* 20.188), ὀρέων (*Il.* 20.189), μετατροπαλίζεο (*Il.* 20. 190), βάλλεαι (*Il.* 20. 196), παθέειν (*Il.* 20. 198). The formulaic ending ἐν χειρὶ θήσει (*Il.* 20.182) is probably very ancient feature. It is made of the future tense θήσει and the dative singular χειρὶ, which has no compensatory lengthening. The linguistic form showing *-ě-* is also documented at *Il.* 8.289, *Il.* 24.101 and *h.*19.40. Edwards mentions the formula with the unusual χειρὶ at 20.182¹⁸, just as Brügger does in the commentary on *Il.* 24.101:

«ἐν χειρὶ θῆκεν: flektierbare Wendung in unterschiedlichen Vers-Positionen zur Bezeichnung der Übergabe eines Gegenstandes [...]. Die Form χειρὶ statt χειρὶ erscheint nur hier und an den Parallelstellen 8.289 und 20.182 (VE ἐν χειρὶ θήσω/-ει): Analogiebildung zu regelmäßigem Dat. Pl. χειρ-σί, vgl. 6.482 u.ö. ἐν χειρσὶ ἔθηκεν [...]»¹⁹.
Eustathius does not point out the anomaly, as just like Richardson²⁰ and the *scholia* (cf. V p. 539 Erbse). The commentaries on *Il.* 8.289 do not refer to this linguistic form²¹. Eustathius quotes the line *Il.* 8.289 in the commentary *ad Hom. Il.* 8.280-91, but he ‘normalizes’ the singular form χειρὶ

Homer uses πρίστο only apropos of the purchase of slaves. The omission of the augment is the rule in LB» (KN B (1) 988 + 5761 + 7040 + 7601 + *fr.* a); cfr. *ibid.* pp. 316 (PY Ta 711. 1: *owide, teke*), 341 (PY Un 267. 1: *doke*), 363 (TH Fq 126. 1b: *theto*), 386 (TH Fq 254 + 255. 1: *a-pi-e-qe/amphihes^kwe*). About the augmented verbs in the Mycenaean texts see ITZÉS 2004, pp. 144, 148; cf. also *ibid.* pp. 148-150; cf. PY Fr 1184.1, BENNET, OLIVIER 1973, p. 155: *DMic* 1, p. 76 *ad v.* *a-pe-do-ke*; PY An 607.3, BENNET, OLIVIER 1973, p. 50: *DMic* 1, p. 203 (*e-e-to*) *ad v.* *e-e-si*; see also PY An 724.2, BENNET, OLIVIER 1973, p. 54: *DMic* 1, p. 76 *ad v.* *a-pe-e-ke*.

¹⁶ RUIJGH 2011, pp. 285-286.

¹⁷ RUIJGH 2011, pp. 263-264; cf. WACHTER 2000, p. 212 *ad v.* ἄναξ; *DELG*, p. 84 *ad v.* ἄναξ; *DMic* 2, pp. 400-401 *ad v.* *wa-na-ka*. Cf. *LfgRE* 1, col. 781 *ad v.* ἄναξ: «zur Behandlung im Epos s. M. ἄ. ist schon im Myk. als Bezeichnung für der König nachgewiesen»); *ibid.* coll. 781-790.

¹⁸ EDWARDS 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. Il.* 24.101s.: 1341, 24-29 (IV pp. 875-876 van der Valk); RICHARDSON 2000, p. 287.

²¹ KIRK 2001, p. 323; *Eust. ad Hom. Il.* 8.289: 713, 35-40 (II p. 582 van der Valk); *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 8.289 (II p. 355 Erbse).

into plural *χερσί*: *πρώτῳ τοι μετ' ἐμὲ πρεσβήϊον ἐν χερσὶ θήσω* (712, 64)²². Just as he does in the commentary *ad Hom. Il.* 20.181-3 (*ἐν χερσὶ θήσει*, l. 34)²³, and *ad Hom. Il.* 20.182: Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ «γέρας ἐν χερσὶ θήσει» ταυτόν ἐστι τῷ ἐγγυαλίξει, ἥγουν ἐγχειρίσει, πλὴν ὅσον τοῦτο μὲν κοινόν, ἐκεῖνο δὲ ποιητικόν²⁴. But in this way, the prosody of the verse is corrupted.

Moreover, the ending formula at *Il.* 24.101 is made up by *χερὶ* and by the unaugmented aorist *θῆκε*: Ἦρη δὲ χρύσειον καλὸν δέπας ἐν χερὶ θῆκε. So, it seems hard to deny the archaizing *facies* of this line, since both the phenomena regarding the absence of compensatory length and of augment are documented in the Mycenaean texts. Probably, *χερὶ* is a very ancient feature: the form with only *-ě-* is documented in the Linear B tablets: cf. (e.g.) *ke-ni-qa* /*k^he(h)r-nig^wal* / *χέρνιβα*²⁵. Thus, it is plausible that the form *χερὶ* 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. *ληϊς*, *-ῖδος*, 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 *χερὶ* with no compensatory length: the form with *-ě-* 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 *χέρσα*²⁶: «Sarebbe secondo alcuni una forma tarda rispetto all'omerico *χεῖρα*. Secondo la maggioranza dei linguisti, rappresenta invece la declinazione originaria (nominativo *χέρος*; cfr. *χεροῖν*, *χερσί*)».

The word *ληϊάς*, *-άδος*²⁷ is clearly a derived term from *ληϊς*, *-ῖδος*²⁸, 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

²² Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 8.280-91: 712, 61-713, 1 (II p. 579 van der Valk).

²³ Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 20.181-3: 1202, 30-35 (IV p. 388 van der Valk).

²⁴ Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 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). «Probablement **χέρνιγ^wα* (*χέρνιβα*), Nom. Pl. neutron de **χέρνιγ^wον* (-*βον*)»; *ibid.* p. 342 *ad v.* *ke-ni-qe-tef*; *ibid.* pp. 342-343 *ad v.* *ke-ni-qe-te-we*; see also *ibid.* pp. 211-212 *ad v.* *e-ke-ro-qo-no*, p. 350 *ad v.* *ke-ro-ke-re-we-o*; MELENA 2014, p. 115; WACHTER 2000, p. 233 *ad v.* *χεῖρ*; *ibid.* *ad v.* *χέρνιβον*; cf. *Il.* 1.449: *χερνίψαντο* (see above p. 11); *DELG* p. 1254 *ad v.* *χέρνιψ*; cf. BEEKES 2016/2 p. 1620, *ad v.* *χεῖρ*: «also (secondarily) *χερ-* in *χερὶ*, *χερός*, *χέρσα*, *χέρες*, etc. ». But we have seen just now that some forms with the *-ě-* are documented in Mycenaean Greek; see also *LfgrE* 4, col. 1187 *ad v.* *χέρνιβον*; *ibid.* col. 1187 *ad v.* *χερνί(πτομαι)*; *ibid.* coll. 1187-1188 *ad v.* *χέρν(ιψ)*.

²⁶ CASSOLA 1975, p. 577; cf. HORROCKS 1997 p. 2011; *DELG* pp. 1251-1252, *ad v.* *χεῖρ*; BEEKES 2016/2 pp. 1620-1621, *ad v.* *χεῖρ*; *LfgrE* 4, coll. 1157-1179, *ad v.* *χεῖρ*; esp. see col. 1160, in which M. Markwald points out this phenomenon, is visible also in *Il.* 8.289, 24.101, *h.* 19.40.

²⁷ EBELING 1963/1, p. 985 *ad v.* *ληϊάς*; cf. *ThGL* 6, coll. 245 *ad v.* *ληϊάς*; *LfgrE* 2, col. 1682 *ad v.* *ληϊάς*; Hesych. λ 15 (II p. 591 Latte): *ληϊάδας*: ἐκ λείας αἰχμαλώτους συλληφθείσας (Υ 193); Hesych λ 16 (II p. 591 Latte): *[*ληϊάδης*: αἰχμάλωτος] ASvg; Hesych. λ 20 (II p. 591 Latte): *ληϊάδας*: αἰχμαλώτους;

²⁸ BEEKES 2016/1, p. 842 *ad v.* *λεία*; *ibid.* p. 118 *ad v.* *ἀπολαύω*; *DELG* p. 626 *ad v.* *λεία*; *ibid.* p. 98 *ad v.* *ἀπολαύω*; FRISK 1973, p. 96 *ad v.* *λεία*, p. 115 *ad v.* *ληῖον*; EBELING 1963, 1, p. 985 *ad v.* *ληῖς*: «*ληϝ-ιδ-ς*, a rad. *λαϝ*, *ἀπο-λαύ-ω*, lat. *lū-crūm*, *Lav-erna* goth. *Lau-n*». Cf. *ThGL* VI coll. 157 *ad v.* *λεία*, 247 *ad v.* *ληῖς*; Hesych. λ 28 (II p. 591 Latte): *ληῖς*: κτήσις ἢ ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων. καὶ βούλησις; Hesych. λ 19 (II p. 591 Latte): *ληῖδα*: **μερῖδα* Avgn. ἢ *λείαν* (ξ 87). τὴν ψιλὴν κτήσις; cf. Hesych. λ 29-35, 37-38 (II pp. 591, 592 Latte); cf. also Hesych. λ 14 (II p. 591 Latte): **ληῖα*: κτήνη. πρόβατα AS. ἐφόδια. χορήματα ASn. ἢ σιτοφόρα χωρία (AS); Hesych. λ 17 (II p. 591 Latte): *ληϊάνειρα*: ἢ ποιοῦσα τοὺς ἄνδρας γυναικῶν ἐρᾶν.

2018. The twin Volume, on the Anatolian and Biblical records referring to this topic, is forthcoming. So, I refer here to the first Volume, especially to pp. 16-22, concerning the noun λῆϊς and related derived terms. The Homeric expression λῆϊάδας δὲ γυναικάς probably corresponds to the Mycenaean term *ra-wi-ja-ja*:

«Apel. de pers. Fem. Nom. Pl. en PY Aa 807 (*ke-re-za ra-wi-ja-ja* MUL 26 *ko-wa* 7 *ko-wo* 7 *DA* 1 *TA* 1); Ab 586.B (*pu-ro ke-re-za ra-wi-ja-ja* MUL 28 *ko-wa* 9 *ko-wo* 5 *NI* 7...). *ra-wi-ja-ja-o*: Gen. pl. en PY Ad 686 (*pu-ro ke-re-za ra-wi-ja-ja-o ko-wo* VIR 15, debajo de *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[ka-wata-ra[]p̄ōō*, en .a). Probablemente designación de oficio o étnico; sin intrpr. gr. satisfactoria: ζ̄ *λαφιαία «cautivas» (cf. hom. λῆϊάδης *Il.* 20.193, jón. λῆϊη, dor. λαῖα, át. λεία)?; ζ̄ o designación de oficio? ζ̄ cf. λήιον, dor. λᾱον «campo de trigo»?; ζ̄ o cf. **ra-wo* (*λαφος, λαός)?; o étnico *Λᾱφιαία (derivado de un top. *Λᾱφιᾱ, cf. Λήϊον en Taso)?»²⁹.

It seems clear that λῆϊάς, -άδος is formed on the same root as λῆϊς 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 connotation³⁰. This term is similar to Ἀχαιίς, -ίδος, which is formed from the root of Homeric ethnonym Ἀχαιοί and of the later toponym Ἀχαιία, which is probably the same as the Anatolian expression *Ahhiya(wā)*³¹, and by adding the same suffix *-id*. It indicates the Greek homeland both as a noun and as an adjective (e.g. *Il.* 1.254: ὦ πόποι, ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιῖδα γαῖαν ἰκάνει; *Il.* 3.75: Ἄργος ἐς ἰππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιῖδα καλλιγύνακα). But it also indicates the Greek women (e.g. *Il.* 9.395: πολλὰ Ἀχαιῖδες εἰσὶν ἀν' Ἑλλάδα τε Φθίην τε)³². The termination in *-ίς, -ίδος* is also shared with the adjective πατρις, *-ίδος*, which in Homer, joined to the noun γαῖα, forms another syntagma indicating the Greek homeland³³. Finally, the root of λῆϊς, *-ίδος* and λῆϊάς, *-άδος* is the same as the word which means the Achaean army,

²⁹ *DMic* 2, pp. 233-234 *ad v. ra-wi-ja-ja*.

³⁰ CHANTRAINE 1979, p. 339; *ibid.* pp. 335-337. Something similar could be the Semitic feminine suffix *-t*: cf., e.g., Canaanite *baal/baalat*.

³¹ BEEKES 2016/1, p. 181 *ad v. Ἀχαιοί*: «The name Ἀχαιοί < Ἀχαιῶί (cf. lat. *Achivī*) is known from Egyptian sources as 'q jw š, to be read as *Aqaiwaša*, and also in Hitt. *Ahhiya*, later *Ahhiyawā* [...]. In spite of strong opposition [...] the equation is now generally accepted, but the Hittite form has not been satisfactorily explained (why is there no reflex of the second α in Hittite? [...]). The name is no doubt Pre-Greek, e.g. /Akay^wa-/»; FRISK 1973, pp. 198-199 *ad v. Ἀχαιοί*; *DELG* p. 149 *ad v. Ἀχαιός*; *LfgRE* 1, col. 1733 *ad v. Ἀχαιίς*; cf. *ibid. ad vv. Ἀχαιί(ας), Ἀχαιϊκός*; FISCHER 2010, pp. 1-3, 31-39, 40-45; cf. *ibid.* pp. 5-30, 46-66; NIEMEIER 2011; HEINHOLD-KRAHMER 2007, p. 191 n. 2, pp. 193-194; EAD. 2003; FINKELBERG 1988; about the historical background see also CLINE 2011, pp. 1-6, 267-283.

³² This sentence is spoken by Achilles within *Il.* 9.307-429, the long answer to Agamemnon's purpose reported by Odysseus. About the historical-geographical implications between Phthie and Hellas, Hellenes and Myrmidones see HAINSWORTH 2000, p. 115; *ibid.*: «Achilles claims Hellas and Phthie as his ancestral home also at 2.683-4». Cf. Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 9.359, 9395s.: 758, 54-56; 758, 56-59 (II p. 740 van der Valk); school. *ad Hom. Il.* 9.395a-b (II p. 483 Erbse).

³³ EBELING 1963/2, pp. 147-148 *ad v. πατρις, -ίδος*; *LfgRE* 3, coll. 1053-1058 *ad v. πατρις*; cf. BEEKES 2016/2, p. 1158 *ad v. πατήρ*; *DELG* p. 864 *ad v. πατήρ*.

λᾱ(Ϝ)ός, i.e. all the adult males able to fight, the λᾱ(Ϝ)οί³⁴. The noun λᾱ(Ϝ)ός and the verb ληϊζομαι (from *λᾱϜϊζομαι) semantically correspond to the original meaning of the Latin expressions *populus* and *populor*, -āri³⁵. Both the terms λᾱ(Ϝ)ός and ληϊς <*λᾱϜ-ίς are documented in Mycenaean Greek in compounded nouns (*ra-wa-ke-ta*)³⁶, in common nouns or adjectives (*ra-wi-ja-ja*)³⁷, and in personal names (*ra-wo-do-ko*, *ra-wo-ke-ta*, *ra-wo-po-qa*, *ra-wo-qa-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:

Φησὶ γὰρ «ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας», ἤγουν ληϊστάς, αἰχμαλώτους, «ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας ἦγον». δι' οὗ δηλοῖ ὡς δύναται τις ληϊάδας γυναῖκας ἐρμηνεῦσαι τὰς δουλίδας. τοιαῦται γὰρ αἱ τὸ ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀφαιρεθεῖσαι.³⁹

<ληϊάδας:> αἰχμαλώτους. A^{im} 40

The mention of the ληϊάδας δὲ γυναῖκας at *Il.* 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 (*Il.* 2.688-693) and that the raid in Lyrnessos occurred during the same war expedition in Cilician Thebs, when Chryseïs was also taken (*Il.* 1.366-369), and when the father and the brothers of Andromache were killed by the same Achilles (*Il.* 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*:

- 1) Achilles' speech to his mother in the 1st *Song* (*Il.* 1.364-412: HH pp. 62-63).
- 2) The mention of the first of the nine Thessalian contingents which end the *Catalogue of Ships* in the 2nd *Song* (*Il.* 2.681-694: HH pp. 18-22; DE CRISTOFARO 2016a; ID. 2018a pp. 4-6).
- 3) The speech of Andromache to Hektor in the 6th *Song* (*Il.* 6.391-439: HH pp. 94-95).

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

³⁴ DELG p. 619-620 *ad v.* λᾱός; FRISK 1973, pp. 83-84 *ad v.* λαός; EBELING 1963/1, pp. 971-973 *ad v.* λαός; LfgrE 2, coll. 1633-1644 *ad v.* λαός**. Cf. BEEKES 2016/1, pp. 832-833 *ad v.* λαός.

³⁵ DE VAAN 2016, p. 480, *ad v.* *populus*: «Derivates: *populārī* ‘to ravage, plunder (Naev.+), [...]’; *dēpopulārī* ‘to sack, plunder (Enn.+), *dēpopulātor* ‘who sacks’ (Caecil.+), [...] Plt. *poplo- ‘army’»; cf. DELL pp. 521-522, *ad v.* *populō*, -āre; *ibid.* p. 533 *ad v.* *populus*.

³⁶ DMic 2 pp. 230-231 *ad v.* *ra-wa-ke-ta*; *ibid.* p. 231: «[...] **ra-wo* con el supuesto valor semántico de “pueblo en armas” o “clase de guerreros [...]» Cf. *ibid.* pp. 228-229 *ad v.* [*ra-wa-e-si-jo*], p. 229 *ad v.* *ra-wa-ke-ja*, pp. 229-230 *ad v.* *ra-wa-ke-si-jo*; cf. SHELMEKDINE 2008, pp. 129-131.

³⁷ DMic 2 pp. 233-234 *ad v.* *ra-wi-ja-ja*.

³⁸ DMic 2 p. 234. *ad vv.* *ra-wo-do-ko*, *ra-wo-ke-ta*; *ibid.* pp. 234-235. *ad v.* *ra-wo-po-qa*, *ibid.* p. 235 *ad vv.* *ra-wo-qa-no*, *ra-wo-qa-ta*, *ra-wo-te[]*, *ra-wo-ti-jo*. Cf. MELENA 2014, p. 33 (*ra-wo-qa-ta*, PY Jn 750.7: **Lāwokontās*).

³⁹ Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 20.193s.: 1203, 24-25 (IV p. 391 van der Valk).

⁴⁰ *Schol. ad Hom. Il.* 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 ληϊάδας 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 ληϊς:

«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 (*timē*) 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 ληϊς of young Nestor at *Il.* 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 ληϊς 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* ληϊάς 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 (*Il.* 9.408), replying to the speech of Odysseus (see above pp. 60-72), who is Agamemnon's legal representative one more time (*Il.* 9.224-306: see above, pp. 27-28; cf. pp. 7-13). He refers to Achilles the honors and the prizes promised by Agamemnon (*Il.* 9.114-161: see pp. 24-28), among which the 'war prey' (ληϊς) is also mentioned: ὅτε κεν δατεώμεθα ληϊδ' Ἀχαιοί (*Il.* 9.138 = 9.280). The verbal adjective from ληϊζομαι (i.d. «to seize» in war action or raids) is used by Achilles at *Il.* 9.408: ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λειϊστή. He said in the previous lines 9.406-407 that oxen and sheep can be seized as war booty (ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα, 9.406), as well as tripods and horses can be owned (κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδες τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ 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 (οὔτε λειϊστή).

⁴¹ DUÉ 2002, p. 37; see *ibid.* pp. 37-47, pp. 67-81; see also *ibid.* 21-36; 2011a; EAD. 2011b. About the legal and religious implications of ληϊς see DE CRISTOFARO 2018a; cf esp. pp. I-IX, 7-15, 16-22, 60-63, 112-115; cf also ID. 2018b. Cf. Hainsworth's commentary at 9.336 (2000, pp. 106-107; cf. at 335-343, p. 106); CORAY 2009, p. 125; LATACZ, NÜNLIST, STOEVEsandt 2000, p. 126; KIRK 2000, p. 87-88.

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-Achaic 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 and some topics can be very ancient. The Homeric men are essentially warriors, and they constitute the λα(φ)ός. 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 ληϊζομαι are mentioned by Telemachus at *Od.*1.398 (καὶ δμῶων, οὗς μοι ληϊσσατο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς): 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 ληϊς. 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 ληϊς 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»⁴².

We saw that Achilles mentions the ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικας (*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 ληϊς»: this is the original meaning of the *hapax* ληϊάδας (from ληϊάς)⁴³. The raid in Lyrnessos occurred in the same war expedition in which Cilician Thebes was plundered and Chryseïs 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 synthesize within *Il.* 20.193 the root cause of the storyline of the *Iliad*, which is clearly connected to the ληϊς 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 DUÉ 2011a; EAD 2011b; EAD 2011b; EAD 2011e; EAD 2011f.

⁴⁴ DUÉ 2011e, p. 492; EAD. 2011f; EAD. 2011a; EAD. 2011b; EAD. 2011c; EAD. 2011d; MINCHIN 2011; FINKELBERG 2011; RUTHERFORD 2011; cf. LATA CZ, NÜNLIST, STOEVE SANDT 2000, p. 132; KIRK 2001, p. 91; Id. 2000, pp. 211, 215, 216; STOEVE SANDT 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 Cilician location of Thebes below the mount Plakos. See also MORRIS 2013; MILLER 2013; BREYER 2011; MEYER 2011.

«women who have become ληϊς», i.e. ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικας. So, they are something more than simply slaves or «captive women»: they are ληϊς⁴⁵. The concept expressed by the word ληϊς 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 ληϊάδας δὲ γυναικας (cf. above, p. 82) and so to the legal status of Briseïs and Chryseïs, 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 ληϊς 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 λαῖφος): «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 υἱες Ἀχαιῶν share the booty and give the prizes»⁴⁹. The violation of Achilles' property right over his ληϊς arouses and justifies his μῆνις, 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 ληϊς, 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 (ληϊτις, *Il.* 10.460)⁵⁰; finally, the involvement of both Chthonian 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 ληϊς (and of the individual and legal entity who has become ληϊς) 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.

⁴⁶ Cf. DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, esp. pp. IX-XV, 13-15, 16-22, 112-115.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* pp. 99-113.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 112

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* p. 15.

⁵⁰ CIRIO 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 § 18⁷, 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 private⁵¹: see *Il.* 1.440-474⁵² and *Il.* 19.252-266⁵³. If we consider 1) the previous linguistic and semantic remarks about the noun λῆϊς⁵⁴, 2) the ‘histologic’ structure of *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 archaisms in this section, we must assume that the term λῆϊάς expresses some very old and probably pre-Achaic 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-Achaic world, as Thucydides testifies in the fifth chapter of the first *Book* of the *Historiae*. The Mycenaean term *ra-wi-ja-ja* seems to support this inference. Moreover, the morpheme *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 (*Il.* 11.677-681)⁵⁵, having ancestors from Aiolos’ offspring, just as the son of Peleus is⁵⁶.

Bibliography

- AhT: G.M. Beckman, T. R. Bryce, E.H. Cline (Eds.), *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, Atlanta 2011 («Writings from the Ancient World» 2).
- ARAVANTINOS GODART, SACCONI 2001: V. L. ARAVANTINOS, L. GODART, A. SACCONI, *Thèbes. Fouilles de la Cadmée I. Les tablettes en Linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou. Édition et commentaire*, Pisa-Roma 2001.
- BARTONĚK 2003: A. BARTONĚK, *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg 2003 («Indogermanische Bibliothek» 308).
- BECKMAN 2011: G.M. BECKMAN, in G.M. Beckman, T.R. Bryce, E.H. Cline (Eds.), *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, Atlanta 2011 («Writings from the Ancient World» 28: introduction, transliteration and traduction).
- BEEKES 2016/1-2: R. BEEKES, *Ethymological Dictionary of Greek*, Vol. 1-2, Leiden-Boston 2016.
- BENNETT, OLIVIER 1973: E. BENNETT JR., J.-P. OLIVIER, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Part I: Texts*, Roma 1973.
- BERNABÉ, LUJÁN 2008: A. BERNABÉ, E. LUJÁN, *Mycenaean Technology*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Volume 1, Louvain-La-Neuve, 2008 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l’Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 120), pp. 201-242.
- BLUMENTHAL 1974: H.J. BLUMENTHAL, *Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Aegaeon*, «INDOGERMANISCHE FORSCHUNGEN» 79, pp. 67-77.
- BREYER 2011: F. BREYER, *Kilikien, Hethiter, und Danaer in ägyptischen Quellen der Spätbronzezeit*, in Ch. Ulf, R. Rollinger (hrsg.), *Lag Troia in Kilikien? Der aktuelle Streit um Homers Ilias*, Darmstadt 2011, pp. 149-175.
- BRÜGGER 2009: C. BRÜGGER, *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar / BK). Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913)*. Herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz.

⁵¹ DE CRISTOFARO 2018a pp. 8-16.

⁵² 440-474 KIRK 2001, pp. 100-103; LATA CZ, NÜLIST, STOEVE SANDT 2000 pp. 150-157; Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 1.440s. - 472: 131, 41-138, 28 (I pp. 202-213 van der Valk); *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 1.440a-b – 474a-b (I pp. 123-133 Erbse). Cf. *Hom. Il.* 1.365-369, 389-393; KIRK 2001, pp. 91-93; LATA CZ, NÜLIST, STOEVE SANDT 2000 pp. 132-133, 136-137; Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 1.365, 366ss., 367, 368, 369, 370ss., 387s., 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393: 118, 33-38; 118, 38 – 119, 23, 119, 24-25; 119, 26-28; 119, 29-35; 120, 16-34; 120, 34-37; 120, 37-38; 120, 38-45; 120, 46 - 121, 3; 121, 3-6; 121, 7-13; 121, 13-20 (I pp. 184-187, van der Valk); *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 1.365a-b, 366a-c, 368a-b¹⁻², 392a-b, 393a-c (I pp. 108-110, 111 Erbse); cf. *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 1.383a (I p. 110 Erbse): ἐπασσύτεροι: Αἰολικόν ἔστιν. ἄσσον ἄσσοτέρος ἄσσύτερος, ὡς ὄνομα ὄνυμα, καὶ ἐπασσύτερος. A; see also the ‘Aeolic’ from ἄμμι 1.384: *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 1.384 (I p. 111 Erbse): ἄμμι δὲ μάντις: οὐ προσέθηκεν, ὡς αὐτὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συνήγαγεν, οὐδὲ ὄλωσ ὑποπτον ἑαυτὸν καθίστησι τῇ μητρὶ. T. About *Il.* 1.366-92: KIRK 2001, p. 91: «Aristarchus /Arn/A on 365) evidently athetized all 27 verses».

⁵³ EDWARDS 2000, pp. 263, 264-265, 265-266; CORAY 2009, pp. 109-117; Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* 19.253-266: 1182, 60-1183, 50 (IV pp. 323-327 van der Valk); *schol. ad Hom. Il.* 19.252a-b – 19.265 (IV pp. 622-624 Erbse); see also

⁵⁴ See above p. 5 n. 30; cf. DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 17-18, 21-23.

⁵⁵ DE CRISTOFARO 2018a, pp. 29-32, 83.

⁵⁶ Cf. FINKELBERG 1999. One of his usual epithets is ἵππηλάτης, «the one who drives/carries away horses», probably from the same root of *lā(φ)ίς/λῆϊς and λᾱ(φ)ός (cf. BEEKES 2016/1 p. 842).

- Generalredaktion: Magdalene Stoevesandt. Band VIII. Vierundzwanzigster Gesang (Ω): Faszikel 2 Kommentar, Berlin - New York 2009.*
- BRYCE 2011a: T.R. BRYCE, in G.M. Beckman, T.R. Bryce, E.H. Cline (Eds.), *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, Atlanta 2011 («Writings from the Ancient World» 2: commentary).
- CASSOLA 1975: F. CASSOLA, *Inni Omerici*, Milano 1975.
- CHADWICK 2007: J. CHADWICK, *Mycenaean Greek*, in A.F. Christidis (Ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginning to the Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 395-404.
- CHANTRAINE 1979: P. CHANTRAINE, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1979 (1st Ed. 1968).
- CIRIO 1994: A.M. CIRIO, *Hapax omerici e reperti linguistici nel X libro dell'Iliade*, «RCCM» 36, 1994, pp. 97-100.
- CLINE 2011: E.H. CLINE, in G.M. Beckman, T.R. Bryce, E.H. Cline (Eds.), *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, Atlanta 2011 («Writings from the Ancient World» 28: introduction and epilogue).
- CORAY 2009: M. CORAY, *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar / BK). Auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913). Herausgegeben von Anton Bierl und Joachim Latacz. Generalredaktion: Magdalene Stoevesandt. Band VI. Neunzehnter Gesang (T). Faszikel 2: Kommentar, Berlin - New York 2009.*
- CURRIE 2011: B. CURRIE, in HE/1 pp. 8-9 ad v. «Aeneas».
- DE CRISTOFARO 2014: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *L'episodio iliadico di Glauco e Diomede. Mito, elementi dialettali e motivi interculturali (Iliade, 6, 152-155; 167-177)*, «RCCM» 56/1, 2014, pp. 13-55.
- DE CRISTOFARO 2016a: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *Achille e la Tessaglia. Brevi osservazioni storiche e linguistiche a proposito di Hom. Il. II 681-685*, in L. De Cristofaro (a cura di), *Σύγγραμμα πολυμαθές. Studi per Amalia Margherita Cirio. Introduzione di Maurizio Sonnino*, Lecce 2016 («Satura» 16), pp. 19-59.
- DE CRISTOFARO 2016b: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *Histologia Homerica. Presentazione di uno studio sulle sezioni dell'Iliade*, «RCCM», vol. 58, 2016, pp. 211-276.
- DE CRISTOFARO 2016c: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *Criseide 'e le altre'. Alcune considerazioni storico-letterarie*, «Ἔπεα Πτερόεντα» 23, 2016, pp. 39-52
- DE CRISTOFARO 2018a: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *ΛΗΙΣ. An essay about a pivotal concept in the early epic traditions. The legal and religious implications. Vol. 1: The Homeric Framework*, Roma, 2018 («Ipazia» 16).
- DE CRISTOFARO 2018b: L. DE CRISTOFARO, *Reading the Raids: The sacred value of the spoils. Some considerations on Il. 2.686-694, 9.128-140 and Il. 19.252-266. Part 1*, «RCCM» 60/2, 2018.
- DE DECKER 2015: F. DE DECKER, *The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions*, «JOURNALIPP», 4, 2015, pp. 53-71 (<https://lipp.ub.lmu.de/>).
- DE VAAN 2016: M. DE VAAN, *Ethymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden-Boston 2016.
- DELG: P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots avec un Supplément*, Paris 1999 (1st Ed. 1968-80).
- DMic 1-2 : F. Aura-Jorro, F.R. Adrados (red.), *Diccionario micénico (DMic.). Vols. 1-2*, Madrid 1985-1993.
- DUÉ 2002: C. DUÉ, *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*, Lanham-Oxford 2002.
- DUÉ 2011a: C. DUÉ, *Briseis*, HE 1, pp. 144-145.
- DUÉ 2011b: C. DUÉ, *Chryseis*, HE 1, p. 165.
- DUÉ 2011c: C. DUÉ, *Chryses*, HE 1, pp. 165-166.
- DUÉ 2011d: C. DUÉ, *Eëtion*, HE 1, p. 239.
- DUÉ 2011e: C. DUÉ, *Lyrnessos*, HE 2, pp. 491-492.
- DUÉ 2011f: C. DUÉ, *Thebes Cilician*, HE 3, pp. 861-862.
- DUÉ 2017: C. DUÉ, *Iliad 20, Multiformity, and Tradition* (<http://homermultitext.blogspot.it/2017/06/summer-2017-iliad-20-multiformity-and.html>).
- DUÉ, EBBOTT 2010: Dué-Ebbott. 2010. Dué, Casey, Mary Ebbott. 2010. *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary*. Hellenic Studies Series 39. Washington 2010 (http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_Due_Ebbott.Iliad_10_and_the_Poetics_of_Ambush.2010).
- DUÉ, EBBOTT 2016: C. DUÉ, M. EBBOTT, *The Homer Multitext and the System of Homeric Epic*, *Classics@* 14, 2016 (http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn3:hlnc.essay:DueC_and_EbbottM.The_Homer_Multitext_and_the_System_of_Homeric_Epic.2016).
- DUECK 2011: D. DUECK, *Dardanians*, HE 1, p. 194.
- DUHOUX 2008: Y. DUHOUX, *Mycenaean anthology*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (Eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Vol. 1, Louvain-La-Neuve, 2008 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 120), pp. 243-393.
- EBELING 1963: H. EBELING (hrsg.), *Lexicon Homericum*, vol. 1-2, Hildesheim 1963 (1st Ed. Leipzig 1880-1885).
- EDWARDS 2000: M.W. EDWARDS, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. General Editor G.S. Kirk. Volume V: books 17-20, Cambridge 2000 (1st Ed. 1991).
- FINKELBERG 1988: M. FINKELBERG, *From Ahhiyawa to 'Αχάια*, «GLOTTA» 66, 1988, pp. 127-134.
- FINKELBERG 1999: M. FINKELBERG, *Greek Epic Tradition on Population Movements in Bronze Age Greece*, in R. Laffineur (éd.), *POLEMOS. Le contexte guerrier en Égée à l'âge du bronze. Actes de la 7^e Rencontre égéenne internationale Université de Liège, 14-17 avril 1998* («AEGAEUM» 19), Liège-Austin 1999, pp. 31-35.
- FINKELBERG 2011: M. FINKELBERG, *Ortilochos*, HE 2 p. 613.

- HAUG 2011a: D.T.T. HAUG, *Aeolic Phase*, *HE* 1, pp. 9-10.
- HAUG 2011b: D.T.T. HAUG, *Archaisms*, *HE* 1, p. 79.
- HEINHOLD-KRAHMER 2003: S. HEINHOLD-KRAHMER, *Aḥḥijawa - Land der homerische Achäer im Krieg mit Wiluša?*, in C. Ulf (hrsg.), *Der neue Streit um Troia. Ein Bilanz*, München 2003, pp. 190-214.
- HEINHOLD-KRAHMER 2007: S. HEINHOLD-KRAHMER, *Zu diplomatischen Kontakten zwischen dem Hethiterreich und dem Land Aḥḥiyawa*, in E. Alram-Stern, G. Nigthingale (hrsg.), *Keimelion. Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur homerischen Epoche. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 3. bis 5. Februar 2005 in Salzburg*, Wien 2007, pp. 191-207.
- HE: M. Finkelberg (Ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1-3, Malden - Oxford 2011.
- HH: Luigi De Cristofaro, *Histologia Homerica. Studio sulle sezioni dell'Iliade. I gruppi di nove versi (1 + 8, 2 + 7)*, Roma 2016 («Ipazia» 7).
- HOFFNER 2002: H.A. HOFFNER, *The Treatment and Long-Term Use of Persons Captured in Battle*, in K. Haslihan Yener, Hanry A. Honnfer, Simrit Dhesi (Eds.), *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock, Eisenbrauns*, Winona Lake 2002, pp. 61-72.
- HORROCKS 1997: G. HORROCKS, *Homer's Dialect*, in I. Morris, B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden-New York-Köln 1997, pp. 193-217.
- ITZÉS 2004: M. ITZÉS, *The Augment in Mycenaean Greek*, «ACTA ANTIQUA» 44, pp. 143-150.
- KIRK 2000: G.S. KIRK, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. General Editor G. S. Kirk. Volume II: Books 5-8, Cambridge 2000 (1st Ed. 1990).
- KIRK 2001: G.S. KIRK, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. General Editor G. S. Kirk. Volume I: Books 1-4, Cambridge 2001 (1st Ed. 1985).
- LATACZ, NÜLIST, STOEVE SANDT 2000: J. LATACZ, R. NÜLIST, M. STOEVE SANDT, *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar auf der Grundlage der Ausgabe von Ameis-Hentze-Cauer (1868-1913). Herausgegeben von Joachim Latacz. Band I Erster Gesang (A). Faszikel 2: Kommentar*, München - Leipzig 2000.
- LfgrE: Thesaurus Graece Linguae, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. (LfgrE). Begründet von Bruno Snell*, Vols. 1-4, Göttingen - Oakville 1955-2010.
- LSJ: H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H.S. Jones & R. McKenzie, *A Greek and English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940.
- MARTIN 2011a: R. MARTIN, *Composition-in Performance*, *HE* 1, pp. 173-174.
- MARTIN 2011b: R. MARTIN, *Geras*, *HE* 1, p. 312.
- MARTIN 2011c: R. MARTIN, *Performance*, *HE* 2, pp. 642-644.
- MELENA 2014: J.L. MELENA, *Mycenaean Writing*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (Eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Volume 3, Louvain-La-Neuve 2014 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 133), pp. 1-186.
- MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA 1985: J.V. MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA, *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*, Salamanca 1985.
- MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA 2007a: J.V. MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA, *The Doric Dialects*, in A.F. Christidis (Ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginning to the Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 444-459.
- MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA 2007b: J.V. MÉNDEZ-DOSUNA, *The Aeolic Dialects*, in A.F. Christidis (Ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginning to the Late Antiquity*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 460-474.
- MILLER 2013: J.L. MILLER, in R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen et al. (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Vol. 7, London-Hoboken 2013, pp. 3777-3778, ad v. «Kizzuwatna».
- MILLER 2014: D.G. MILLER, *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors: Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer. With Notes on Lyric and Herodotus*, Boston - Berlin 2014.
- MINCHIN 2011: E. MINCHIN, *Andromache*, *HE* 1, pp. 53-54.
- MORRIS 2013: S.P. MORRIS, *From Kizzuwatna to Troy? Puduhepa, Piyamaradu, and Anatolian Ritual in Homer*, in S.W. Jamison, H.C. Melchert, B. Vine (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Bremen 2013, pp. 151-167.
- MUELLER 2011: M. MUELLER, *Duels*, *HE* 1, pp. 223-224.
- NAGY 2010: G. NAGY, *The Homer Multitext Project*, in J. McGann, A. Stauffer, D. Wheelles, M. Pickard (Eds.), *Online Humanities Scholarship: The Shape of Things to Come. Proceedings of the Mellon Foundation Online Humanities Conference at the University of Virginia March 26-28, 2010*, Houston 2010, pp. 87-112.
- NAGY 2011: G. NAGY, *The Aeolic Component of Homeric Diction*, in S.W. Jamison, H.C. Melchert, B. Vine (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, Bremen 2011, pp. 133-179.
- NIEMEIER 2011: W.-D. NIEMEIER, *Aḥḥiyawa*, *HE* 1, pp. 18-19.
- RICHARDSON 2000: N. RICHARDSON, *The Iliad: A Commentary*. General Editor G.S. Kirk. Volume VI: books 21-24, Cambridge 2000.
- RUIJGH 2011: C.J. RUIJGH, *Mycenaean and Homeric Language*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (Eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Volume 2, Louvain-La-Neuve 2011 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 127), pp. 253-298.
- RUTHERFORD 2011: I.C. RUTHERFORD, *Cilicians*, *HE* 1, pp. 166-167.
- SCAFA 2005: E. SCAFA, *A proposito di Tebe Ipoplacia*, «RANT» 2, 2005, pp. 315-326.

- SHELMERDINE 2008: C.W. SHELMERDINE, *Mycenaean Society*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Volume 1, Louvain-La-Neuve 2008 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 120), pp. 115-158.
- THALMANN 2011: W.G. THALMANN, *Slavery*, HE 3, pp. 808-809.
- ThGrL: Thesurus Graecae Linguae, ab Henrico Stephano contractus*, Vols. 1-9, Graz 1954 (Anastatic Reprint).
- VAN ALFEN 2008: G. VAN ALFEN, *The Linear B Inscribed Vases*, in Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo-Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Volume 1, Louvain-La-Neuve 2008 («Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain» 120), pp. 235-242.
- VENTRIS, CHADWICK 1973: M. VENTRIS - J. CHADWICK, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge 1973².
- WACHTER 2000: R. WACHTER, *Wort-Index Homerisch-Mykenisch*, in J. LATACZ (hrsg.), *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. (Basel Kommentar / BK). Prolegomena*, München - Leipzig 2000, pp. 209-234.
- WILLI 2007: A. WILLI, *Of aspects, augments, aorists - or how to say to have killed a dragon*, in C. George (ed.), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 34-48.
- WILLI 2011: A. WILLI, *Language, Homeric*, HE 2, pp. 458-464.