The First Word of the *Odyssey* *

Ahuvia Kahane
St. Cross College, Oxford

1.1 In this paper I would like to demonstrate how a pattern set by epic usage in general and *Odyssey* 1.1 in particular is used to mark a special meaning of the word ἀνήρ. I suggest that in the *Odyssey* verse–initial (accusative) attestations of ἄνδρα carry a subliminal reference to "Odysseus." The ambiguity of reference, "man" vs. "Odysseus," is applied to create irony and emphasis. It contributes to many scenes which rely for their dramatic force on disguise or disclosure of the hero's name.[1] Furthermore, the *Odyssey*, in P. Pucci's words, "dramatizes the voice of the inmost *being* in contrast with different *semblances*, and accordingly it displays semblances as momentary ways of disguising an immutable self."[2] The mechanism discussed below is one narrowly defined method of contrasting semblances with a fixed identity. Lastly, this mechanism reveals and exploits different states of perception and knowledge which correspond to different narrative realities (those of the characters in the plot, those of the audience and those of the narrator).[3] It allows us to juxtapose deceptive and shifting "meanings" (as perceived by the characters in the plot) and a constant "voice" (that of the poet, and that which is heard by the audience)—which reaffirms the ultimate integrity of Odysseus and of the *Odyssey*.[4]

1.2 Several recent studies have examined the "implicit" (and perhaps traditional) meanings of epic words and phrases, e.g. φαίδιμος, ἀνδροφόνος, πολύτροπος, κατὰ μοῖραν.[5] The present paper owes much to such studies,

---

[1] On this topic see recently A. Webber, "The Hero Tells His Name: Formula and Variation in the Phaeacian Episode of the *Odyssey*," *TAPA* 119 (1989) 1–13.

[2] P. Pucci, *Odysseus Polytropos. Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca 1987) 81–82.

[3] The narrator and the poet are not identical (see M. W. Edwards, *Homer, Poet of the Iliad* [Baltimore and London 1987] 29–41). For the purposes of this paper (and for those purposes only) these two terms do, however, share enough properties to allow free interchange. The same applies to the narratee and the audience.

[4] See Pucci (above, n. 2) 76–82 for further comments on the integrity of the *Odyssey*.

[5] R. Sacks in *The Traditional Phrase in Homer* (Leiden 1987) discusses important earlier work and contributes much of his own to our understanding of the "traditional" epic meanings of ἀΐδηλος, φαίδιμος, ἀνδροφόνος. G. Nagy, apart from his numerous and extensive investigations of κλέος ἄφθιτον, discusses the special epic usage of a word like

but it presents a somewhat different perspective. What follows is an investigation, not so much of "meanings" as of *differences* and *discrepancies* in meaning (and the poetic consequences thereof), and of different *methods* of assigning meaning. Most previous studies (see above, note 5) analyse complex meanings of highly specialized words. The present study examines the relatively simple meanings ("man," "Odysseus") of a very common word (ἀνήρ): it is the ways in which we arrive at these meanings and their uses which are complex. The terminology of previous studies, such as "implicit" meaning, "depth" of meaning, "resonance," etc., does not provide the necessary distinctions. We must therefore adopt more precise, technical terms.

Consider the following sentences:
A. The Phaeacians entertained Odysseus.
B. The Phaeacians helped this man.

These are perfectly ordinary, grammatically well–formed sentences. It is, however, obvious that in B some further indication is required as to who "this man" is, and that the words of B do not, on their own, provide this information: "This man" can, in principle, refer to any one of many people (reputedly) helped by the Phaeacians. One common way of providing the required additional information is to link the words "this man" to some more specific *word/words in the same text*. Thus, for example, if we read A and B as one text, we may correctly assume that B's "this man" and A's "Odysseus" refer to the same person (they are *co–referential*). In the text AB we are thus using one semantically attenuated expression ("man") as a substitute for another, fuller lexical expression ("Odysseus"). Such substitution has been the subject of extensive study in modern linguistics and is generally known as *anaphora* (this term must not be confused with "anaphora" as used in rhetoric). There is, however, another option. We may provide the necessary information about sentence B's "this man" by linking these words to an *extra–linguistic* phenomenon or to something *outside our actual text*: we may physically point to a particular man, or to a picture of a particular man; it may also be that the situation in which the utterance takes place provides us with the necessary information for interpretation. Thus, for example, if we are visiting No. 10 Downing Street in London and someone says (the text) "The Prime Minister is

---

πολύτροπος, noting the importance of the word's position in the verse (*Greek Mythology and Poetics* [Ithaca 1990] 18–35 (a revised version of earlier, well–known work), esp. pp. 33–34). His definition of the formula as "a fixed phrase conditioned by the traditional themes of oral poetry" (29) is particularly useful in the study of patterns. M. Finkelberg's discussion of κατὰ μοῖραν, its meaning and metrical characteristics ("Homer's View of the Epic Narrative: Some Formulaic Evidence," *CP* 82 [1987] 135–38), is also noteworthy.

in his office," we may correctly assume that the words "Prime Minister" refer to one particular person (who is, at the time of utterance, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom). Similarly, the opening of the *Odyssey*, "Tell me, Muse, the story of a man...," does not verbally specify who the "man" is (not until line 21), but because the event is a reading/recitation of the *Odyssey*, and we know this, there is, from the very beginning, no ambiguity about the identity of this "man." The reference of the words "this man" in sentence B above can be indicated in a like manner. This type of reference is commonly known in linguistics as *deixis*. The phenomena discussed below are special cases of *anaphora* and *deixis*.[6]

2.1 The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and other epic poems open in a similar way—with an invocation and a prooemium which in general states the poem's subject. Of particular importance is the poem's first word (verse–initial, of course), commonly a singular noun in the accusative of the direct object,[7] as in the following:

(*Il.*)   Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεὰ, Πηληϊάδεω ᾽Αχιλῆος
            οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί' ᾽Αχαιοῖς...

(*Od.*)   ῎Ανδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
            πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης...

(*Il.P.*)   ῎Ιλιον ἀείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην εὔπωλον,
            ἧς πέρι πολλὰ πάθον...

(*Theb.*)   ῎Αργος ἄειδε θεὰ πολυδίψιον ἔνθεν ἄνακτες,

(*h.Cer.*) Δήμητρ' ἠΰκομον σεμνὴν θεὸν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν,
            αὐτὴν ἠδὲ θύγατρα...

---

[6] For a general survey of deixis and anaphora see J. Lyons, *Semantics*, vol. II (Cambridge 1977) 636–724; S. C. Levenson, *Pragmatics* (Cambridge 1983) 54–94. Two important studies are J. Lyons, "Deixis and Anaphora" in T. Myers (ed.), *The Development of Conversation and Discourse* (Edinburgh 1979) 88–103 and C. J. Fillmore, *The Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis, IULC* mimeograph (Bloomington, Ind. 1975). For the term "reference" as used in this paper see Lyons, *Semantics*, vol. I, p. 177. This brief presentation of deixis and anaphora does not do justice to the true diversity of these phenomena. For further comments on the specific types of deixis and anaphora discussed in this paper see below, n. 12.

[7] Structural similarities between epic prooemia have been noted by S. E. Bassett, "The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *AJP* 44 (1923) 339–40; B. A. van Groningen, *The Proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Mededeel. Ned. Akad. van Wetensch., Afd. Letterkunde 9.8 (1946) 7; A. Lenz, *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos* (Bonn 1980) 21–6; S. R. West in *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. I (Oxford 1988) 67–8.

(*h.Merc.*) Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει Μοῦσα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν,
                   Κυλλήνης μεδέοντα...[8]

Such "theme–words," as we may call them, are part of a pattern for epic prooemia. Virgil's *arma virumque* is obvious proof that this pattern and specifically the accusative theme–word pattern was recognized and followed.

2.2 Let us consider very briefly the first word of the *Iliad*, μῆνις. It is not a common word. In the *Iliad* there are twelve examples overall. In the *Odyssey* there are four examples. But as Redfield says, following Watkins, "the noun is in epic diction restricted, except for Achilles, to gods (the verb is used of other humans); Achilles' anger is godlike, and others fear him as they would an angry god."[9]

The first line of the *Iliad* begins with the accusative theme–word μῆνιν. In the *Iliad* we find a verse–initial accusative μῆνιν six times, more than any other case–form of the word in any other position (three of these judged by M. Parry to be formular: 1.75; 5.444=16.711. See MHV 433). Note the substantially smaller overall number of examples in the *Odyssey*, the fact that only one (3.135) is verse–initial, and that this example is *not* accusative but the genitive μῆνιος, which, apart from anything else, has a metrical shape different from μῆνις or μῆνιν.

If we accept that epic μῆνις is to be associated with "divine anger," and that it is the theme of the *Iliad* and not the theme of the *Odyssey*,[10] then we can understand the above differences. The "theme–word pattern" (i.e. verse–initial accusative μῆνιν, whatever its "real" origin and whether its use is formular or otherwise) is most often repeated in the relevant poem, the *Iliad*, and seldom used in the *Odyssey*, which has a different subject and a different "theme–word."

---

[8] Cf. *Orph. Frag.* 48 Kern (Berlin 1922) 118–19 for an alternative opening verse to the *Iliad*. See also other Homeric hymns: Allen–Halliday–Sikes, hymns XII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XX, XXIII, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, all of which begin with a "theme–word" in the accusative.

[9] J. Redfield, "The Proems of the *Iliad*," *HSCP* 74 (1979) 97, more or less quoting C. Watkins, "À propos de μῆνις," *Bul. soc. ling. de Paris* 72 (1977) 194: "En effet le seul humain pour lequel le substantif μῆνις est prédiqué dans le corpus homérique et hésiodique est précisément Achille." More recently, R. Sacks (above, n. 5) 3 has supported the interpretation of μῆνις as "specifically divine anger." See also Appendix I.

[10] At least not in a way comparable to the *Iliad*. Of course, the wrath of Poseidon (cf. J. Irmscher, *Götterzorn bei Homer* [Leipzig 1950]) and of Athena (cf. J. S. Clay, *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey* [Princeton 1983]) do play their part in the *Odyssey*'s plot.

3.1 Let us now turn to the word ἀνήρ. Here we have a somewhat different case. The word μῆνις is uncommon in epic and its reference is limited, regardless of the "pattern–markers" (i.e. verse–initial position in conjunction with the accusative case). ἀνήρ, on the other hand (although it has partial synonyms ἄνθρωπος, βροτός and πόσις), is a basic and indispensable lexical entry, which can, in principle, refer to any "man." In the singular (in all grammatical cases) it appears a total of 187 times in the *Odyssey* and 222 times in the *Iliad*.[11] In *Odyssey* 1.1 ἀνήρ (verse–initial and in the accusative) refers to the person we know as "Odysseus." While there are other verses in the *Odyssey* where ἀνήρ refers to Odysseus, the word does not, and indeed cannot, refer to Odysseus in each and every of one of its numerous attestations.

It is at this point that the formal features of the "theme–word pattern" come into play as semantic markers. I propose that in the *Odyssey*, wherever we find the "pattern–markers," i.e. the accusative ἄνδρα in verse–initial position, the first line and the first word of the poem are evoked. ἄνδρα then takes on the reference, not of "a man," but of "the man who is the subject of the present poem (i.e. Odysseus)." Following what has been said in section 1.2, I shall call this type of reference by pattern "deixis," or rather "pattern deixis." When the reference of ἄνδρα is specified, not by the pattern but, in the text, by the immediate verbal context of ἄνδρα, I shall, following 1.2 above, speak of "anaphora" or of "anaphoric reference" (anaphora is, of course, the "normal" way of specifying reference).[12] When ἄνδρα is used without any specific referent, i.e. in the sense of "man in general," "any man," "husband," etc., I shall speak of the word's basic denotation.[13]

---

[11] Examples of the accusative ἄνδρα are discussed below. In Appendix II the reference of ἄνδρα and its position and relative frequency are set out. The plural forms cannot, obviously, refer to Odysseus on his own and are thus not directly relevant to this paper.

[12] Detailed comments on deixis and anaphora may further burden an already technical discussion. However, the following should be briefly pointed out. Various pronominal uses are the best known type of anaphora. The particular type of anaphora discussed in this paper involves a type of semantically defined anaphoric relation (as opposed to morpho–syntactically defined anaphora) known as "hyponymy." See F. Cornish, *Anaphoric Relations in English and French* (London 1986) 20. Deixis by means of a pattern (as suggested here) is, as far as I am aware, unique, and may be open to different interpretations. If we think verse–initial accusative ἄνδρα refers back to the linguistic expression found in *Odyssey* 1.1 (rather than to the "person" who is referred to in 1.1), we may be dealing with what is known as "discourse deixis" (see Levenson [above, n. 6] 85–89). If we claim that every occurence of verse–initial ἄνδρα is a reenactment of 1.1, we may be dealing with repeated instances of what is known as the "symbolic usage" of deixis (see Levenson 65–68). Yet again, we may have a "symbolic usage" in 1.1 and subsequent anaphoric references to it by every verse–initial ἄνδρα.

[13] "Denotation" is here used as defined by Lyons, vol. I (above, n. 6) 207. Denotation is to some extent also determined by context, i.e. it is through context that we decide whether to read

3.2 In the *Odyssey* the accusative ἄνδρα appears thirty–two times, (for ἄνδρ᾽ and ἀνέρα see below) of which eleven are verse–initial. By contrast, in the *Iliad* the accusative ἄνδρα appears fifty–two times, only four of which are verse–initial. This in itself is significant. The lexical–grammatical entry ἄνδρα is essential to the *Iliad* but the specific verse–initial pattern refers to Odysseus, is set by *Odyssey* 1.1, and is used only in the *Odyssey*.

3.3 Assuming that the basic denotation of ἄνδρα can always be "a man" (either in general or some un–named individual) or "a husband" (or both), there are, I suggest, four basic categories for its use, as listed below. It should, however, be noted that there is some shared ground, e.g. between a few examples of category I and category II because anaphoric reference can differ depending on different points of view. These differences are discussed in the individual examples.

Category I

Verse–initial accusative ἄνδρα with pattern deixis (which by definition provides the reference to Odysseus) and with reference by anaphora also to Odysseus (*Odyssey* 1.1; 8.139; 10.74; 13.89; 24.266).

Examples

In *Odyssey* 1.1 reference is made primarily through deixis: we know that ἄνδρα=Odysseus because line 1.1 is the first line of the poem called the *Odyssey* (see above, section 1.2). The fact that ἄνδρα is accusative and verse–initial, and is the first word of the poem, "sets" the pattern.[14] The actual name of Odysseus is withheld until line 21. But although ἄνδρα refers to a particular person, it is not linked to any previous *word in the text* (because there is no previous word in the text). Hence we may say that there is no anaphora in *Odyssey* 1.1.

In 13.89–91 Odysseus, after his many wanderings, is at last bound for Ithaca. The Phaeacian ship is rapidly making her way,

> ἄνδρα φέρουσα θεοῖς ἐναλίγκια μήδε᾽ ἔχοντα,
> ὃς πρὶν μὲν μάλα πολλὰ πάθ᾽ ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν
> ἀνδρῶν τε πτολέμους ἀλεγεινά τε κύματα πείρων,

"man" or "husband" (or both). But both senses of ἀνήρ, "man" and "husband," exist regardless of the *Odyssey* or any other text. The same cannot be said for deixis and anaphora.

[14] This statement involves some implicit assumptions about the making of Homeric verse. I readily accept that different opinions on the matter of traditionality/originality may result in slightly different answers to the question of how a pattern is "set." I submit, however, that the way the pattern *operates* in our text would remain unaltered.

The allusion to 1.1 is made by both thematic and verbal means. The verses form a sort of prooemium to the second part of the *Odyssey*, in which Odysseus begins his *innere Heimkehr*.[15] The anaphoric reference of ἄνδρα, which we obtain from the immediate context (cf. 13.73), is to "Odysseus." But reference is also made to Odysseus through pattern deixis, since ἄνδρα is accusative and verse–initial. This is a much more powerful reference, which places the the word ἄνδρα and the name of Odysseus in the perspective of the poem as a whole, and of its two major sections.

In 10.73–4 Odysseus tells of his unfortunate return to Aeolos' island. The angry Aeolos will not help Odysseus a second time:

> οὐ γάρ μοι θέμις ἐστὶ κομιζέμεν οὐδ' ἀποπέμπειν
> ἄνδρα τὸν ὅς κε θεοῖσιν ἀπέχθηται μακάρεσσιν.[16]

Here the basic denotation of ἄνδρα is "a man in general" ("any man"). By anaphora reference is to Odysseus. Ten verses earlier (line 64) he is addressed in his own name, 'Οδυσσεῦ, in surprised but sympathetic tones by members of Aeolos' household. But once Aeolos learns the disgraceful facts, he speaks only of an ἄνδρα; he does not use the name "Odysseus." The tension between the basic denotation "man" and the anaphoric reference "Odysseus" gives us Aeolos' point of view: a guest–friend that has become an unwelcome, nameless stranger. The pattern deixis gives us the the wider perspective of the epic as a whole:[17] the hero of the *Odyssey* who was close to "regaining his former identity" but is once more reduced to the state of a wanderer without a name.

---

[15] W. Schadewaldt, "Der Prolog der *Odyssee*," *HSCP* 63 (1958) 24. B. Fenik, *Studies in the Odyssey*, Hermes Einzelschriften 30 (Wiesbaden 1974) 162 says: "There is a mysterious, haunting beauty in the hero's sleep on the Phaeacian boat as he is transported home to Ithaca." The "haunting" part of the beauty is the result of echoes from other passages in the *Odyssey*. Fenik suggests that this is a transformation of the motif of sleep, and this must be true, but the reference to *Odyssey* 1.1 is at least as strong. This is a good example of how a single passage can resound with multiple echoes.

[16] Von der Muehll in his Teubner text adopts the papyrus reading τε in 10.74. This may have suited the present interpretation slightly better, but the vulgate reading, given in Allen's OCT and accepted by C. J. Ruijgh, *Autour de 'τε épiqué'* (Amsterdam 1971) 429, is κε.

[17] Using terminology introduced into Homeric studies by I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987), I would say that the anaphoric reference is part of the discourse of an internal tertiary narrator/focalizer, $NF_1[NF_2=C_x(NF_3=C_p)]$, of which the recipients are the tertiary, secondary and primary NeFe. Pattern deixis, on the other hand, is exclusive to NF_1 and to $NeFe_1$. The result may be said to be *partially overlapping* narrative situations. The notion that pattern deixis is exclusive to NF_1 and $NeFe_1$ is further developed below.

In 8.138–9 a Phaeacian prince, Laodamas, admits that there is nothing worse than the sea for breaking a man:

> οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ γέ τί φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης
> ἄνδρα γε συγχεῦαι, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς εἴη.

Despite the gnomic value of these words, which relies on the basic denotation of ἄνδρα, "a man in general," they are in context said with specific reference to the Phaeacians' guest.

Here the anaphoric reference is dependent on point of view. At this stage in the narrative the Phaeacians still do not know the *man's* identity (they will only learn his name in 9.19). Anaphora, from the point of view of Laodamas and the Phaeacians, provides us with a reference to their nameless guest (cf. 8.133). We, the audience, have a different point of view and we possess different knowledge about the situation (derived from the immediate context and from the information provided by the poet). For us the anaphoric reference is to "Odysseus" (cf. 8.92; 144).[18] The difference between the two anaphoric references and the basic denotation, between "Odysseus," "the nameless guest" and "man," emphasizes the secret hidden from Laodamas. But pattern deixis allows the poet to manipulate his character and put in Laodamas' mouth an unchanging truth which is beyond the Phaeacian's knowledge. Laodamas' words can be interpreted as "there is nothing more harmful to the man who is the subject of this poem than the sea." Significantly, only a few lines later (in 145 ff.) Laodamas reveals his ignorance of the true meaning of his words by inviting Odysseus to take part in the games—an invitation that leads to Odysseus' unpleasant conflict with Euryalos. Thus, through pattern deixis the audience shares "privileged information" with the narrator. This information (i.e. Odysseus' real identity) is known to Odysseus as well, but the narrator and the audience share their own special language, as it were, by which an immutable truth can be communicated.

At 24.244 ff. Odysseus at last speaks to his father, whom he has not seen for twenty years. But he still pretends to be a foreigner, asking about a certain "man" from Ithaca, whom he once knew (266): ἄνδρα ποτ' ἐξείνισσα φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ. The basic denotation "man" is significant since we can only vaguely suspect who ἄνδρα is from the context. ἄνδρα is the first word of Odysseus' false tale, and we know that he is prone to deception (cf. 24.240). Reference to Odysseus is affirmed, but only later in the narrative, in line 270.

---

[18] Technically put, primary deixis at the level of NF$_1$ and NeFe$_1$ is to "Odysseus," and at the level of NF$_2$ and NeFe$_2$ (with the exception of Odysseus himself) it is to "the nameless guest."

There, adding an ironic twist, Odysseus tells *his father Laertes* that the man he once entertained "had a father called Laertes." However, pattern deixis in line 266 allows the poet to shape Odysseus' speech in such a way that the latter utters the *unambiguous truth* about his identity even as he spins a web of lies.[19] This contributes to the irony and dramatic force of the situation, but also reaffirms the ultimate integrity of the *Odyssey* and its values: there is a point at which the identity of Odysseus is unchanging.

Category II

In the second category we find examples with pattern deixis but with anaphoric reference to a character *other* than Odysseus (3.125; 6.181; 16.89; 18.53; 18.81; 22.32).

Examples

In 3.124–5 Nestor speaks. Looking at Telemachos and listening to him, he is astonished by the young man's speech:

> ἦ τοι γὰρ μῦθοί γε ἐοικότες, οὐδέ κε φαίης
> ἄνδρα νεώτερον ὧδε ἐοικότα μυθήσασθαι.

The basic denotation of ἄνδρα here is "a man" in general. Reference by anaphora is to Telemachos: he is named by the poet in 3.75 and he identifies himself (although not by name) in lines 80–85.

Now, a significant theme in the *Odyssey* is Telemachos' *Entwicklung*, his development, and his learning of the ways of the *man,* his father. Nestor speaks plainly of this, and indeed mentions the name of Odysseus several times in the passage (121, 126 etc.). But while Nestor's words *tell* of the similarity between father and son, the pattern deixis *shows* it. The words ἄνδρα νεώτερον thus come to mean "a young Odysseus," illuminating Telemachos' potential.[20] The pattern allows the poet to "take over" the voice of one of his characters, and use that voice for the purpose of foreshadowing.

---

[19] Is Odysseus here being made to use the pattern deixis "consciously"? This would imply *an identity of discourse* between NF$_1$ (the narrator) and NF$_2$ (Odysseus). Such notions are akin perhaps to the attempts to compare the discourse of Achilleus to that of the poet (see R. Martin, *The Language of Heroes. Speech and Performance in the Iliad* [Ithaca 1989] 193 n. 77 for bibliography). But Odysseus (and any other internal narrator) would have to be familiar with the *text* of the *Odyssey* in order to use the pattern. Since this is an absurdity, it is obvious that pattern deixis can only function at the level of NF$_1$ and NeFe$_1$.

[20] It is again impossible that Nestor "himself" is here using the pattern "consciously," i.e. that he himself wishes to convey the implicit sense "Odysseus" by uttering the word ἄνδρα in initial position (see n. 19 above on 24.266).

In book 6 the shipwrecked Odysseus meets young Nausicaa, who is of marrying age (cf. 27, 66, 180, 244, 277). He seeks her help in a speech that is both μειλίχιον and κερδαλέον. In return for her assistance, he says, may the gods give her such and such things (180–81):

σοὶ δὲ θεοὶ τόσα δοῖεν ὅσα φρεσὶ σῇσι μενοινᾷς,
ἄνδρα τε καὶ οἶκον καὶ ὁμοφροσύνην ὀπάσειαν

The implications of these lines are well known,[21] but the present approach allows us to make a detailed analysis.

The basic denotation of ἄνδρα here is "husband." We may suspect that Odysseus is in some ways a potential ἄνδρα, but there is no direct verbal information to enable anaphora. Pattern deixis, on the other hand, spells out Odysseus' name. The pattern is again used as a foreshadowing device. An idea which may just begin to figure in the plot (and is still dormant in the young and bashful Nausicaa) is hinted at by the poet.

In 16.88–89 Telemachos painfully admits that he is still too weak to face the suitors:

πρῆξαι δ' ἀργαλέον τι μετὰ πλεόνεσσιν ἐόντα
ἄνδρα καὶ ἴφθιμον, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτεροί εἰσι.

ἄνδρα here denotes "any man." Anaphoric reference is made, by means of an implication, to Telemachos: if he were a strong man—and he is not one yet—then the general maxim could apply to him.[22] But pattern deixis makes the reference to Odysseus, not to the Odysseus of any one particular situation, but to the hero from the perspective of the epic as a whole, the man who we *know* has successfully stood up to the suitors. Telemachos' own words of despair are used by the poet to point in the direction of triumph.

In book 18 Odysseus sits at the suitors' banquet, disguised as a beggar. Another beggar, Iros, challenges him to a fist–fight, and Odysseus pretends to be daunted (18.52–53):

ὦ φίλοι, οὔ πως ἔστι νεωτέρῳ ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι
ἄνδρα γέροντα, δύῃ ἀρημένον·...

---

[21] See e.g. Σ E, P, ad 6.180 (Dindorf, vol. I [Oxford 1856] 309).

[22] If we consider e.g. *Od.* 2.244–51 (esp. 245), reference could also be to Odysseus (as in examples of type I above). This may be a case of anaphora (which *can* span larger sections of text) or a more complex type of reference. But whatever the precise nature of the link to 2.245, it is *not* made through the use of the pattern, i.e. this is not a case of pattern deixis.

Again the basic denotation is "any man." Anaphoric reference is to the beggar, and/or to Odysseus. This example most clearly shows how anaphora is relative to different points of view and may change with regard to the different states of knowledge of different characters. To the suitors ἄνδρα has the reference of "the stranger/beggar" (cf. 18.38 ὁ ξεῖνος; 41; 49); this is the limit of their knowledge. Odysseus, despite the fact that he is hiding his true identity, is making a reference to himself. We the readers know it because the poet mentions Odysseus' name in the preceding speech–introductory verse (18.51).[23]

Pattern deixis in 18.53 is to Odysseus. The unambiguous reference of the pattern allows the poet to put in Odysseus' mouth words that express his true identity (intelligible, however, only to the poet and the audience themselves) even as he hides it. The poet's manner, like that of Odysseus himself, is polytropic.

A few lines later Antinoos rebukes Iros (lines 79–81, with 81 repeating part of 18.53):

> νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βουγάϊε, μήτε γένοιο
> εἰ δὴ τοῦτόν γε τρομέεις καὶ δείδιας αἰνῶς,
> ἄνδρα γέροντα, δύῃ ἀρημένον,...

Here again we see the poet manipulating his characters like puppets. He makes Antinoos utter the ironic words, the true meaning of which (as revealed by the pattern deixis) remains hidden from the suitor. Iros, and indeed not only Iros, has much to fear from this old "man."

There is one, and only one, example that presents a difficulty to pattern interpretation. In 22.31–32 the poet reports the thoughts of the suitors, who are confused by the killing of Antinoos:

> Ἴσκεν ἕκαστος ἀνήρ, ἐπεὶ ἦ φάσαν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα
> ἄνδρα κατακτεῖναι· τὸ δὲ νήπιοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν,

Anaphoric reference is to Antinoos both for the audience and for the suitors (cf. 22.8; 22; 29–39):[24] everyone thought that the beggar unintentionally killed

---

[23] We should distinguish between anaphoric reference as perceived by NF$_1$, NeFe$_1$, NF$_2$, etc., and should also note whether each is "internal" or "external," and so on. To have done so in each of the examples would have encumbered the analysis, and I believe that in most examples a less technical comment on the matter is sufficient. However, because of the different possibilities for anaphoric reference, some examples can be placed either in category I or in category II.

[24] The suitors are in this case NF$_1$[F$_2$].

Antinoos. Furthermore, a reading of line 32 with reference (anaphoric or deictic) to the beggar/Odysseus is clearly ruled out. It would be nonsense to translate: "for they thought that he had unintentionally killed *the beggar/Odysseus.*"

But perhaps an audience could have understood the following:

> * "...for they thought that [it was] without intention [that]
> *the man* [i.e. Odysseus] had killed."

This translation cannot be accepted as such (κατακτεῖναι always takes an object; cf. also the formula ἄνδρα κατακτάς). It may, however, work for one brief moment—just long enough to create the desired effect. The text—especially in an oral performance—is *linear*: up to position 1.5, or even 5.5,[25] we could regard ἄνδρα as a subject accusative, expecting the object later in the verse. For the duration of one or two words ἄνδρα would correspond to the participial οὐκ ἐθέλοντα. Of course, anaphoric reference to Odysseus is still senseless, given what we know from the context. But pattern deixis, *since it is not dependent on the immediate context*, will have flashed before our eyes a reference to Odysseus. We are thus provided with the poet's brief comment on the true identity of Antinoos' killer.

If we insist that a temporary "misinterpretation" of the grammar is impossible, we have a more complex case: a clash between pattern deixis and grammar and a possible exception (the *only* exception) to a pattern reading.

Category III

Examples in the third category involve neither pattern deixis nor reference to Odysseus, and may hence be dealt with very briefly. Here we find the accusative ἄνδρα in positions *other* than verse-initial (i.e. with no pattern deixis) and with reference by anaphora to a character *other* than Odysseus or else with no anaphoric reference and only the basic denotation (2.188; 3.24; 4.693; 8.216; 9.429; 9.494; 10.173; 10.547; 12.207; 14.380; 15.224; 15.272; 16.294; 19.13; 22.22; 24.441). The elided ἄνδρ', the accusative form ἀνέρα, and ἀνήρ in grammatical cases other than the accusative (which, of course, have no pattern deixis) may also be included in this group whenever their (anaphoric) reference is to characters *other* than Odysseus, and regardless of their position in the verse.

---

[25] Using the now standard numerical notation for positions in the hexameter (cf. N. H. Porter, "The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 12 [1951] 16).

We may note, however, that in this category anaphoric reference tends to be identical from all points of view (i.e. those of the narrator, the audience, and the characters in the plot). Thus, for example, at 2.188 the suitor Eurymachos makes an angry reply to Halitherses, an old friend of Odysseus, warning him not to incite a younger man. The words "younger man" refer (by anaphora) to Telemachos from all points of view:

> αἴ κε νεώτερον ἄνδρα παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδὼς
> παρφάμενος...

Complex ambiguities are usually reserved for Odysseus in his many guises.

Category IV

Examples in this category have no pattern deixis, but their anaphoric reference is, or seems to be, to Odysseus. This category includes examples of non–verse–initial accusative ἄνδρα, examples of ἀνέρα in any position, and attestations of ἀνήρ in grammatical cases *other* than the accusative (and hence lacking one or more of the pattern–markers and having no pattern deixis), but only where anaphoric reference is to Odysseus.

It is essential to point out that examples in this category do not pose a difficulty from a methodological point of view. In a system that displays "marked" examples (in our case, those conforming to the theme–word pattern) and "unmarked" examples (those that lack one or more of the pattern–markers) the unmarked set can extend over a greater semantic range (i.e. can refer to many different characters, including Odysseus). This principle has widespread support in general linguistics and has been acknowledged recently with specific reference to Homer.[26]

For the specific form in question, ἄνδρα, there are in the *Odyssey* only four such examples, two of which can also be interpreted otherwise. Thus,

---

[26] Martin (above, n. 19) 29–30. Another discussion of Homer which mentions this principle is Webber (above, n. 1) 2. Martin quotes O. Ducrot and T. Todorov, *Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage* (Paris 1972) 148 as a reference, but more important are R. Jakobson, "Zur Struktur des russichen Verbums," in *Charisteria G. Mathesio* (Prague 1934) 74–84 and N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Grundzüge der Phonologie*, Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 7 (1939). B. Combrie in *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge 1976) 111 writes: "The intuition behind the notion of markedness in linguistics is that, where we have an opposition between two or more members...it is often the case that one member is felt to be more usual, more normal, less specific than the other (in markedness terminology it is unmarked, the others marked)." Implicitly the above notion is embedded in much work on the poetics of formula and variation in Homer.

while theoretically permissible, these "exceptions" to the pattern are, in practice, not numerous.

Examples

In 3.231 Athene (as Mentor) rebukes Telemachos for his lack of faith. The gods, she says, are powerful: ῥεῖα θεός γ' ἐθέλων καὶ τηλόθεν ἄνδρα σαώσαι. Reference here may be implicitly to Odysseus (we understand it from the context), but it is a far stronger proposition that the basic denotation of ἄνδρα is the substantial element. The point of the argument is that a god can save *any man*. If we accept this, then 3.231 is a borderline case, lying between categories III and IV.

In 5.129 Calypso remonstrates with the gods: ὡς δ' αὖ νῦν μοι ἄγασθε, θεοί, βροτὸν ἄνδρα παρεῖναι. Reference to Odysseus may be implicit in this verse, but the point of Calypso's words is that the gods resent *any* mortal living with a goddess.

A few lines earlier Hermes arrives on Calypso's island bearing a grim message (5.105): φησί τοι ἄνδρα παρεῖναι ὀϊζυρώτατον ἄλλων,... Anaphoric reference here is to Odysseus.

In 19.209 Penelope is weeping: κλαιούσης ἑὸν ἄνδρα, παρήμενον. αὐτὴρ Ὀδυσσεὺς... The basic denotation of ἄνδρα here is "husband," and anaphoric reference is to Odysseus.[27]

4. We have seen a mechanism by which a composite message is conveyed to the *Odyssey*'s audience/reader. This message consists of three elements, each with different narrative properties. First, there is the basic denotation of the word ἀνήρ ("man"/ "husband"). Then there is the "normal" mechanism of anaphora which is commonly used in all languages. This allows the value of the word ἀνήρ to change according to its immediate context. At the levels of the basic denotation and of anaphora there is, as we have seen, frequent polysemy and ambivalence. This is one of the means by which the theme of "disguise and recognition" is developed in the *Odyssey*. But in addition to basic denotation and to anaphora we have seen pattern deixis at work. This mechanism, exclusive to the narrator and the audience/reader, is totally unambiguous. The entry ἄνδρα, verse–initial and accusative, whatever reference it has at other levels, maintains the unchanging reference of "Odysseus" at pattern level. Here

---

[27] I must re–emphasize that all these examples pose no methodological difficulty. Nevertheless, in the case of 19.209 it may be that the extraordinary contents of the verse have affected the shift in position. ἑὸν ἄνδρα, παρήμενον is a pointed σύνθεσις which demands this positioning. παρήμενον, as Edwards (above, n. 3) 59 notes, is "perhaps the most heavily weighted word in all the *Odyssey*."

there is no "disguise" and no "recognition." Furthermore, this device, while dependent on the larger context (it is defined by the *Odyssey* and applies only within this work), operates unambiguously *anywhere* within it, regardless of the immediate textual context.

The *Odyssey* and its poet are wily and polytropic by nature. At the same time there is a truth behind it all. Odysseus does have an ultimate, fixed identity. Moreover, the poet, for all his many devices, never lies to us, and at no point in the narrative are we, the audience, left in the dark as to the hero's "real" identity. Many features of the *Odyssey*'s text help trace the boundaries of polytropy, and pattern deixis is one of them. The first word of the *Odyssey* thus ends our search for a name and begins a deeper quest for identity and meaning.[28]

---

[28] See S. Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice* (Cambridge 1991) 2: "In *andra*, then, there is to be recognized a paradigmatic and normative representation of what it is to be a man in society, an announcement that the narrative to come will explore the terms in which an adult male's place is to be determined." J. Peradotto, *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey* (Princeton 1990) 116 speaks of the *Odyssey*'s "stratagem of deferral, building a controlled identifying description" prior to the disclosure of Odysseus' name. What lies beyond the deictic pattern is clearly a subject for further investigation.

Ahuvia Kahane

Appendix I: Occurrences of μῆνις by position

Iliad: Acc., 1.1; 1.75; 5.34; 5.444; 16.711; 9.517; 13.624; 19.35; 19.75. Nom., 5.178; 15.122; 21.523. *Odyssey*: Acc., 2.66; 5.146; 14.283. Gen., 3.135.

	1.5	5.5	9.5	12
Iliad				
Nom.			2	1
Acc.	6.0	1		2
Odyssey				
Acc.				3
Gen.		1		

Appendix II: Occurrences of anaphoric reference of ἄνδρα[a] by position

A. *Odyssey*

	Total	%	1.5	3	3.5	5.5	9.5	12
Odysseus	3	9.4	3[b]					
as mortal	2	6.3			1		1	
as guest	1	3.1	1[b]					
as beggar	2	6.3	2[b]					
as Ithacan	1	3.1	1[b]					
as a man	1	3.1					1	
as husband	1	3.1				1		
Total: Odysseus	11	34.4	7[b]			1	1	2
A man/any man	13	40.5	1[b]	1	1		10	
Telemachos	4	12.5	1[b]			3		
Polyphemus	1	3.1						1
Husband	1	3.1	1[b]					
Antinoos	2	6.3	1[c]				1	
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**11[b]**	**1**	**2**	**4**	**13**	**1**
%of total			34.4	3.1	6.3	12.5	40.6	3.1

a: This table does not reflect the full complexity of ambiguities, which depends on point of view and different states of knowledge of different characters. See the detailed discussion of the examples.

b: Pattern deixis is to Odysseus.

c: Pattern deixis could be to Odysseus but the example (22.32) does present special difficulties (see above, pp. 125–6).

B. *Iliad*

	Total	%	1.5	3	3.5	5.5	9.5	12
A man/any man	21	40.4		1	2	6	12	
Husband	1	1.9	1					
Agamemnon	6	11.5				2		4a
Hector	4	7.7	1			2		1
Achilleus	3	5.8			1			2
Diomedes	2	3.9					1	1
Moulios	2	3.9				1	1	
Relative of Eriopis	2	3.9					2	
Agelaos	1	1.9					1	
Akamas	1	1.9	1					
Bienor	1	1.9				1		
Deikoon	1	1.9						1
Echepolos	1	1.9					1	
Epikles	1	1.9					1	
Eurysthalion	1	1.9						1
Herakles/Eurystheus	1	1.9			1			
Imbrios	1	1.9					1	
Laogonos	1	1.9					1	
Sarpedon	1	1.9	1					
Total	52	100.0	4	1	4	12	21	10
%of total			7.7	1.9	7.7	23.0	40.4	19.2

a: Two examples (2.24; 61) may also refer to "any man."