ODYSSEUS «BY ANY OTHER/BY NO NAME» CHEZ POLYPHEMOS

Thesis: It is an accepted fact that name-games in Heroic Age Hebrew and Greek texts (archaic loci embedded in the long-redacted Biblical and Homeric texts) held veritable significance in the period when the respective actions occurred. When in Ex. 2: 22 Moses names his First Born Son «Gēršôm», «because I was a resident-alien in a Land-Not-Mine», the implicatum is gēr šām «resident alien there» and any reader, knowing Hebrew, would recognize this second level word-game, one very serious. On the other hand, the translations of the LXX, the Vulgata, and Targum Onqelos are superb in meaning (semantically), but make the name aetiogies in vain, for they don't concern themselves with struggling to bring them across, an essential part of translation. But we are not concerned with translations in such word-games, only with the Urtext.

Nevertheless in the *Urtext* of *Odysseia* IX, the names which the protagonist gives his inhospitable host, are apparently unmotivated. The author proposes very strong double motivation for the one form, viz. *Oútis*, the alternate form *Métis* being automatically generated grammatically. As opposed to the biblical exx., knowledge of languages beyond that of the Greek *Urtext* is required to understand the name-games involved.

In Profound Appreciation,
Impervious to Lethe,
of my Belovéd Friend,
Dr. Barbara Jean Griffith Kerns
(1918-1983),
«Dear Princess Wife» and soul-mate
of Prof. J. Alexander Kerns
(1894-1975).

Odysseus, that paradox of a being, that man who is so very much a «Somebody» that he readily and willingly divests himself of the «some» and easily becomes the «none». Every place he goes, he becomes some other life and lifestory. This is his basic mode of survival, his prime amunition of staying ahead of the «other» whom he continually comes into contact with. This Odysseus, look — in the opening of his tale by Homeros, it is first at line 21 that his name is uttered. It is in the first line that this main saving characteristic of his is highlighted

Od. I 1-2: "Ανδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερόν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε·
The MAN, narrate for me, O, Musa, of-many-devices who very many [places] wandered | after Troy's Holy citadel he sacked ¹.

The application of this epithet in two loci where it forms part of a string of epithets is citable from the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*:

II. 13-15: καὶ τότ' ἐγείνετο παῖδα πολύ=τροπον, αἰμυλο=μήτην, ληισ=τῆρ', ἐλα=τῆρα βοῶν, ἡγή=τορ' ὀνείρων, νυκτὸς ὀπωπη=τῆρα, πυλη=δόκον, ὅς...

And then she bare a son of-many-devices, a contriver, a robber, a driver [off] of oxen, a bringer of dreams, a watcher, a 'receiver' -at the gates, who...

11. 436-439: Βου=φόνε, μηχανιῶ=τα, πονεύμενε, δαιτὸς έταίρε,

437 πεντήκοντα βοῶν ἀντάξια ταῦτα μέμηλας.

439 νῦν δ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ, πολύ=τροπε Μαιάδος υἰέ

Oxen-slayer, contriver, busy-body, The Feast's Companion,

fifty oxen are well the equivalent worth of what you have sung.

But, now, come, tell me this, thou many-deviced Son of Maia.

[rendering after Evelyn-White (1914) who, however, commits the cardinal sin of Homeric type epic or hymn narration, to wit different renderings of the stock epithets in different loci: here $\pi o \lambda v = \tau p o \pi$, rendered in the earlier locus as «(a son) of-many-shifts» ², but in the latter locus as «resourceful (son of Maia)»].

ή σύ γ' 'Οδυσσεύς έσσι πολύτροπος, ὃν τέ μοι αἰεὶ φάσκεν έλεύσεσθαι χρυσόρραπις ἀργειφόντης,

Ah, thou then Odysseus art, «of-many-devices», yea he, whom me ever kept on telling to be destined-to-come Gold-Staffed Argeiphonthes.

But in line 339 Odysseus calls Kirke's invitation «to 'mix' in bed and love that we way trust one-another». Odysseus again «calumnies» Kirke with.

- 345 μή τί μοι αὐτῷ πῆμα κακὸν Βουλευσέμεν ἄλλο.
- 344 (Unless thou canst-dare, goddess, swear me an oath)
- 345 not to take counsel, to me, myself, any evil harm more.

Here «the ever self-counseling and Deviceful-One» has met his match in the formidible lady who both plans counsel-of- «deceipt» and whom Odysseus dubs also δολοφρονέουσα (line 339):

- 339 αυτὸν δ' ένθάδ' έχουσα δολοφρονέουσα κελεύεις
- And now that you keep/hold me, myself [besides turning the companions into pigs YLA], Craft-Purposing-One, thou urgest me
- 340 (into the bedroom)

Certainly here neither Odysseus' $\pi o \lambda \acute{u} \tau po \pi o \varsigma$ nor the verbal forms attached by him to Kirke are formulaically innocuous.

² «Son-of-many-Shifts» is fine, for Odysseus does very much do with verbal and mental agility that which the character of the «Supervisor of Security», Odo, does physically on Star Trek: Deep Space Nine; this Odo who is from a species «Shape-Shifters», but who

¹ This epithet in the Odyssey itself reoccurs in Book X, ll. 330-331, where it is spoken by Kirke (English normally *Circe*, by way of Latin), after she had turned the companions into pigs:

From an etymological perspective, $\pi o \lambda v = \mu \eta \tau i$, $\pi o \lambda v - \tau p o \pi o$ resp. are quite literally '(man of) skill/plan/device/contrivance' and '(man of) many (twists and) turns, shifter'. The former is derived from the IE root *meH₁- 'to measure, to calculate, to plan'. See the intense discussion of meaning and of the many cognates in Chantraine (1974, p. 699 and, beyond this, p. 927 ibid. for the many «devious» epithets of Odysseus). The latter obviously a derivative of IE *trep- (Chantraine 1980, pp. 1132-1133) 'to turn'.

Of all these *personae* that Odysseus assumes facing his various hosts, that in the *Kyklopeia* (*Cyclopeia* is the usual form in English from the Latinized Greek), comprising most of Book IX, is the best known and, as the pun there unfolds, it certainly shows itself to be the preëminent amongst all in its consequences. To prepare the way for the contribution of the present paper, let us first here divest ourselves of the common opinion of what the pun consists of. This is best stated for us in Stanford (1947, I, p. 361, 1. 408, commentary *ad loc.*):

The Cyclops intended to say Οὖτις with the recessive accent of a proper name (cp. 17, 292, 'Aργος from ἀργός), but he was not in a condition for faultless enunciation. His kin thought that in reply to their question with μή τις he had said οὖτις (... 'no man' instead of 'No-man') as is made clear by μή τις in 410 (H. elsewhere always uses oὐ when the indicative follows εἰ). The *Paronomasia* is further developed in μητις in 414, with a variation in 460. There is a fuller discussion of this in my A[mbiguity in] G[reek] L[iterature, Oxford, 1939], pp. 104-5.

And so, as we see, the contrived pun, in the end, saves the lives of both Odysseus and most of his men/companions. And, in this view, the name $O\tilde{\delta}\pi\varsigma$ which Odysseus twice gives in Il. 366 and 367 and which the Kuklop ³ (sic) repeats in I. 369, is seen as the set up/the setting of the stage for the $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\varsigma/M\tilde{\eta}\pi\varsigma$ undoing pun that developes, at the very fateful moment for the Kuklop in Il. 405-410.

Now we must needs bear in mind that this dénouement of Homer's playing with Greek grammar is not a single simple pun. No, far rather does it involve at least two distinct propositions, but it seems best for the development of the matter at hand to first cite all relevant lines and only then to return to the matter of the pun's/puns' propositions. The citations are limited to three areas:

1) Odysseus' view of the Kuklops' relationships with the rest of the world, 2) his view on their relationships amongst themselves, and 3) the name matter and associated punning material (all from Book IX):

remains with never having met another who is like and who dissolves into molten matter before rematerializing.

³ In my transiliterated words/names I take the liberty of dispensing with macrons.

112-115 τοῖσιν δ' οὕτ' ἀγοραι βουλήφοροι οὕττε θέμιστες, άλλ' οἵ γ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα

έν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος παίδων ἡδ' ἀλόχοων, οὐδ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσι.

They have no counsel-bearing assemblies nor any handed-on Rights, Rather they inhabit the peaks of high mountains, in sculpted-out caves, and Each judges the Right for his children and his wives, and they have for each other no concern at all.

The «barbarity» of this most uncivilized mode of living is driven home almost violently by the triple iteration of the initial syllable of «wife, each= other, and have concern», each time /alV-/.

126-129 οὐδ' ἄνδρες νηῶν ἔνι τέκτονες, οἴ κε κάμοιεν νῆας ἐϋσσέλμους, αἵ κεν τελέοιεν ἔκαστα ἄστε' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἱκνεύμεναι, οἶά τε πολλὰ ἄνδρες ἐπ' ἀλλήλους νηυσὶν περόωσι θάλασσαν·

Nor amongst them are men, wrights-of-ships, who would make well-benched ships, which would effectuate their arrivals to the sundry cities of human-beings, as often men-folk traverse the Sea to each=other in ships.

Another instance of their «beyond the paleness»: they neither build the means of transportation nor do they feel the need for such — their own «society» (for what that's worth) is enough of socializing for them — no visit, no trade! The main contradiction between their behaviour and that of civilized humans lies in the word ἀνθρώπων, although the less significant contradistinction is to be seen in the resp. changes between that word and the twice occurring ἄνδρες, but this a distinction that goes without saying, i. e. ἄνδρες would be normal here and ἀνθρώπων is employed only to emphasize the Kuklops' non-humankind behaviour.

146 ἔνθ' οὕ τις τὴν νῆσον ἐσέ<u>δρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν·</u>
(because of the deep mist and want of the moon)
There not any (of us) caught-sight of the Island with his (own) Eyes ⁴.

My emphases in that here begins the saga of «eyes and vision» which will, in due course, take us to the goal.

So much for Odysseus' instinctual feelings about the Kuklops' lifestyle in general (henceforth I will render their name into English rather than employing the Greek in transliteration: «Circle-Eye»); now we come specifically to Odysseus' reaction to and description of Polyphemos (henceforth rendered, in its

⁴ Reading such metaphysical and modern modes of organization of the mind-body complex, such as «represents here» psychological/spiritual 'insight', more than being just anachronistic, verily boggles Homer qua Homer. We may, if so inclined, just below our consciousness, have such a sub-text program simultaneously running — but no further!

few occurrences, «Many-Tale», using the type of compound which, in the grammar of Old Indic, is called a «Bahuvrīhi built on a karmadhāriya»).

After an expected Greek's reactive description of the type of living quarters which Many-Tale has, Odysseus depicts the man's way of a social and isolated life:

187-193 ἔνθα δ' ἀνὴρ ἐνίαυε πελώριος, ὅς ῥα τε μῆλα οἴος ποιμαίνεσκεν ἀπόπροθεν· οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλους πωλεῖτ' ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐὼν ἀθεμίστια ἤδηκαὶ γὰρ θαῦμ' ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἐώκει ἀνδρί γε σιτοφάγω, ἀλλα ῥίω ὑλήεντι ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ὅ τε φαίνεται οἴον ἀπ' ἄλλων.

And there a man spent his nights — a monstrous (one) — note (his[own]) sheep

alone he was wont to shepherd away-in-the-distance. Nor with (any) others

(does he do his, his shepherding), but apart and separated being, he (only) knows such as is not Right to do, wrong by the Laws of Heaven's decree.

And indeed a marvel (to behold), one monstrous he had been formed (as), nor did he appear

like a bread-eating man at all, but rather (like) a wooded pinacle of high mountains, which strikes us alone from (all) the others.

Two different $\dot{\alpha}\pi$ - derived adverbs occur in this small set of verses in addition to the root, $\dot{\alpha}\pi\dot{o}$ preposition itself. And there is further symmetry, three occurrences of $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda$ - root likewise occur, all of them very antithetical type (cf. Autenrieth [1876] s. u.). And almost as too much of a «good thing», we get the twice-occurring o $\ddot{\iota}$ o $\dot{\iota}$ 'alone'. Allright, Odysseus, Homeros, or whoever — your case has been made! ⁵

As said above here, (1) in the view of our narrator, the Circle-Eyes ⁶ have minimal social and civic intercourse as a whole; (2) that very minimal, even that, is eschewed by Many-Tale.

The frame within which this description of Much-Tale's hermitical life style makes for startling contrast, contrast of the same words: 172-173 are given by

⁵ Many-Tale, beyond even the mere pater familias typology of the rest of the Circle-Eyes, is wifeless, chidless, mixes not even with a familia, from a Greek viewpoint he is really subhuman!

⁶ As to the rather pseudo-question as to whether «Circle-Eye» = «Single Eye», in their commentary to l. 333, Van Leeuwen and Da Costa (ad loc., p. 205), state: «Ex hoc versu totaque quae sequitur narratione apparet poetam Polyphemum (ceterosque Cyclopes?) μονόφθαλμον sibi finxisse, qui inde a natalibus unum oculum haberet in media fronte collacatum, quemadmodum torvum Cyclopis vultum descripserunt Hes. Theog. 144, Theocrit. XI 31 sqq., Verg. Aen. III 636 sq., Ovid. Metam. XIII 851 sq. — Perperam Philoxenus gramaticus (cf. schol. vs. 106) contendebat posterorum hoc fuisse figmentum, Homerum vero Polyphemum finxisse ante Ulixis adventum casu aliquo altero oculo captum (ἐτερόφθαλμον. Item Ar? vid. HIPolak ad Odyss. p. 27-37) — Ipsum nomen sitne a vocibus κύκλος et ὤψ dirivatum necne dubitur,» And we say «amen».

Odysseus to his men just before the 1st set of «final instructions» before he investigates the Circle-Eyes' place (i.e. some narrative intervenes between the speech and the encounter in Many-Tale's quarters, very few lines). Lines 193-195 follow Odysseus' report to his men and then he sets out again to Circle-Eyes' Land and, more specifically, to Much-Tale's cave:

> But the others. remain now, (you) to-me Loyal Companions; However I with my (own) ship, and with my (special) Fellows...

193-195 Δὴ τότε τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμην ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους αὐτοῦ πὰρ νηί τε μένειν καὶ νῆα ἔρυσθαι· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κρίνας ἐτάρων δυοκαίδεκ' ἀρίστους | βῆν·

There then, the others, I bad, my loyal Companions: here, by the ship to both remain and to guard the ship.

I, however, having selected, from my companions, twelve best | to go...

We cannot not but see in these two Odyssean exhortations, that the word ἄλλος is used with 'us together' sense, not with 'us vs. them' sense as it is in description of (the) Circle-Eye's/Eyes' manner of social intercourse. 172: Ἄλλοι μὲν νῦν μίμνετ', ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι· Again in 193-194: Δὴ τότε τοὺς ἄλλους κελόμεν ἐρίηρας ἐταίρους | αὐτοῦ πὰρ νηί τε μένειν καὶ νῆα ἔρυσθαι· Resp. «Now then you-remain, Companions Loyal to me» and «Now then, the others I bad, Loyal Companions, | both [here] along the ship to remain and to safeguard it». Indeed the two loci primarily differ in the verb stem of «to remain». In fact these «[These] others, Loyal Companions» cannot be labelled here as «formulaic». They function as an inclusio, one that sets off in bold relief the «alien-ness» of the Circle-Eyes, against the cooperation, collaboration, fellows-of-a-single-goal of the Greeks.

Above I referred to the thricely-used «nom-de-guerre» of Odysseus, $O\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\iota\zeta$ and stated that its use there is to be seen as the setting-up/set up for the $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\tau\iota\zeta/M\tilde{\eta}\tau\iota\zeta$ «undoing pun» that will occur at ll. 405-410. We are getting there, but first we need provide the rest of the set-up.

And this «mise en scène» takes off at line 263; Many-Tale is speaking:

252-255

ή τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ή μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε οἶα τε ληϊστῆρες ὑπεὶρ ἄλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖδι φέροντες;

Is it for business or wantonly that you rove, as pirates upon the Sea who wander, setting themr lives at stake, bringing Evil to Others?

Odysseus responds:

ηλθομεν· ούτω που Ζεὺς ηθελε μητίσασθαι 7.

We, having-been-driven-off-course, Akhaians, by Winds coming-from-every-direction, upon the great Gulf of the Sea; making for home, 'The Other way', 'The Other Routes', did we come; Thus, for whatever reason, did Zeus devise it.

For that which the communis opinio holds to be the pun, we have started, gone a little further, to the change from $O\tilde{v}\pi\varsigma$ to $M\tilde{\eta}\pi\varsigma$ — «A rose by any other name?» — I think not.

Notice the thricely occurring $\dot{\alpha}\lambda(\lambda)$ - in II. 253-255, albeit that two of the three are not cognate with the «other» one. And in lines 259-262 observe well the Zeus' device causes them to be driven «Other Way» and «Other Routes», two topoi where $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda$ - is the heteronym of «correct», i.e. «wrong».

281-282 ... ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λάθεν εἰδότα πολλά ἀλλά μιν ἄψορρον προσέφην δολίοις ἐπέεσσι·
(that he was testing me) did not escape my notice, being so highly experienced.

Rather I addressed him in response with crafted words.

The consequences are disastrous, but Odysseus, ever sure of himself, a truly «some-one», a «no-one» at all,

299-301 τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν ἄσσον ἰών, ξίφος ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ οὐτάμεναι πρὸς στῆθος, ὅθι φρένες ἦπαρ ἔχουσι... ⁸

Then did I take-counsel with my spirit of profound feelings; going closer, drawing my sharp sword from my thigh's side; to wound him in the chest, where the midriff contacts the liver...

Here some good sense (from a tutelary deity?) prevails and Odysseus accepts that the fatal consequences of this act far outweigh the merit it may have seemed to have. In the infinitive verb oùta- the sounds call us back to où $\pi \varsigma /O\tilde{v}\pi \varsigma$, which above I called a setting up for the $\mu \acute{\eta}$ $\pi \varsigma$, M $\~{\eta}\pi \varsigma$ to come at a time where Odysseus' «Device» will serve him better than any sword could here.

Next we come to the scene where Odysseus had Many-Tale where he wants him, on the road to full inebriation, the somniferous type. The game of the name now takes place:

⁷ This last verb is an anticipation for what will develope in Il. 377 (here, «lest any one of the companions») and the relevant to several matters here, the hendiadys in 422 (again, in context of Odysseus' «weaving Craft-and-Device» = «forming a skillfully-plotted subterfuge»).

⁸ Just as in the previous fn., the final infinitive here prepares or/and retrospectively glimpses, as I note in my text here; but, besides this, it also anticipates the second level «punning» in line 460, where three sets of «puns» are in close proximaty, the two just noted and another one on «dispensing».

355-356 Δός μοι ἔτι πρόφρων, καί μοι τεὸν οὕνομα είπὲ αὐτίκα νῦν, ἵνα τοι δῶ ξείνιον, ῷ κε σὰ χαίρης

> Give me more, right here and then thy name tell immediately now, so that I will be able to give thee the Host-Guest-Gift, whereby thou may(st) have pleasure.

Many-Tale requires the fulfilling of two conditions, more wine and the name of his guest. In Il. 360-363 Odysseus does readily comply with giving Many-Tale the great wine thricely. Only when Many-Tale arrives at the state produced by the wine's having reached his «midriff», does Odysseus comply with the second request: the all important name.

The first of these lines, 360, whilst of no great semantic import, is important for us to take note of, for phonetic reason, to become clear later!

> 360 "Ως ἔφατ' αὐτάρ οἱ αὖτις πόρον αἴθοπα οἶνον So he spoke. But to-him did I dispense again the gleaming wine.

It needs no directing of the eye or ear to feel that the bi-occurrence in the line of the bisyllabic $\alpha \dot{v} - \tau(\alpha \rho) / \alpha \dot{v} - \tau(\iota \varsigma)$ as only a further attraction of our attention.

Well, now Polyphemos has had both of his requests complied with — now the deadly word-manævring contines in ll. 364 ss.

> 364-370 Κύκλωψ, εἰρωτᾶς μ' ὄνομα κλυτόν; αὐτὰρ ἐγώ τοι έξερέω σὺ δέ μοι δὸς ξείνιον, ώς περ ὑπέστης. Οὖτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα. Οὖτιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι μήτηρ ήδὲ πατὴρ ήδ' ἄλλοις πάντες έταῖροι. "Ως ἐφάμην· ὁ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' άμείβετο νηλέι θυμῷ. Οὖτιν ἐγὼ πύματον ἔδομαι μετὰ οἶς ἐτάροισι, τούς δ' άλλους πρόσθεν· τὸ δέ τοι ξεινήϊον ἔσται.

Circle-Eye, dost thou ask me my famed name? But, thou knowest, I too 364 have-a-request for thee: Thou, on thy part, give! me the Host-Guest-Gift, 365 just as didst promiss.

For the present occasion I conform my translation/interpretation as the communis opinio would have it:

366	Nótany is my name; Nótany is what they call me,
367	my Mother and my Father and the others, all my companions.
368	Thus I spoke; and he, at once, responded, with his pitiless spirit:
369	Nótany I shall eat last, after his own companions,
370	and those others [«the Companions»] first; and that shall be my Host

it-Guest Gift for you.

Before the name-game, let us notice that Polyphemos had perceived very well indeed that close «thickness» between Odysseus and his «Companions». The use of «other» (ἀλλ-) here is not divisive («antithetical», as opposed to «reciprocal», as they are conveniently bifurcated in the English translation of Autenrieth [originally 1876 in German, English tr. R. P. Keep 1958, revised by I. Flagg, p. 17]).

As for the name, I have followed tradition is retracting the accent for the proper name, while using a different lexemic constituent pair. The intention that it be a proper name is expressed in the Greek by the accusative: «1. 366. Οὖτις here becomes a proper name, 'No-man', so in the accus. it appears as Οὖτιν instead of οὖτινα» (Merry 1870, p. 108).

Next Odysseus pushes the bar of flame into Many-Tale's eye and we await the working out of Odysseus' plan/strategy (αὐτὰρ ἐγὰ βούλευον, «But I was planning», 1. 420).

As a consequence of Odysseus' violence to his «(Circle)»-Eye, Many-Tales (1) screams a great scream, (2) draws out the wooden bar, now totally mixed with blood, (3) in great agony, casts-it-away — then follows what could or would be the dénouement:

399-412	αὐτὰρ ὁ Κύκλωπας μεγάλ' ἤπυεν, οἴ ῥά μιν ἀμφὶς ἤκεον ἐν σπήεσσι δι' ἄκριας ἤνεμοέσσας. οἱ δὲ βοῆς ἀἱοντες ἐφοίτων ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος· ἱστάμενοι δ' εἴροντο περὶ σπέος ὅττι ἐ κήδοι· Τίπτε τόσον, Πολύφημ', ἀρημένος ὧδ', ἐβόησας νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, καὶ ἀὕπνους ἄμμε τίθησθα; ἤ μή τίς σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει; ἤ μή τίς σ' αὐτὸν κτείνει δόλω ἡὲ βίηφιν; Τοὺς δ' αὖτ' ἐξ ἄντρου προσέφη κρατερὸς Πολύφημος· ὧ φίλοι, Οὖτις με κτείνει δόλω οὐδὲ βίηφην Οἱ δ' ἀπαμειβόμενοι ἔπεα πτεροέντ' ἀγόρευον· εὶ μὲν δὴ μή τίς δε βιάζεται οἶον ἐόντα, νοῦσον γ' οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέασθαι· ἀλλὰ σύ γ' εὕχεο πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι.
399	But he loudly hailed the Circle-Eyes who round-about hi

399	But he loudly hailed the Circle-Eyes who round-about him
400	dwelled in caves along the windy promontories.

And they, hearing the call, hurried, one from one place, another from another place.

So standing there, they inquired, around the cave, what it was that so vexed him;

What on earth, Many-Tale, are you calling so vehemently for, in the middle of immortal night, thus making us not-sleep!!??

So, no one drives away thy flocks, no one of mortals, against thy will? So, no one kills thee by either craft or by violence!!

Them answered back from his cavern the Powerful Many-Tale:
O, my friends, Nótany kills me by craft and not by violence!
Responding with winged words, they kept offering their advice:
If indeed then not-anyone violences thee, as thou art alone,

411 illness, of course, it is not possible at all, to escape it from Zeus the Great.

But thou then do pray to thy father, Poseidon the Lord.

⁹ Merry, ad loc., notes this too: «Polyphemus means, '«No-man» is [indeed YLA] slaying me by craft and not by force.' The Cyclopes understand his words, 'No man is slaying me by craft or force, and so in v. 410 oǔ $\pi\varsigma$ appears $\mu\dot{\eta}$ $\pi\varsigma$, which suggests the pun of $\mu\ddot{\eta}\pi\varsigma$, inf. v. 414.» Stanford's comment ad loc., I have cited much earlier in this article.

The first problematic we encounter here is that all of a sudden this colony of un-partaking of a society beings, has been transformed into a mutual aid society where these beings without council, without laws, without societal or divine norms, is now addressed by Many-Tale as «Friends, My Own!»

These beings, whom Odysseus had described as every man a pater familias to his own familia (to wit, those in his own cave!), every pater familias from each and every direction comes out to determine Many-Tale's suffering and its cause, to see if they could offer succour.

It well behooves us here to concisely as possible finish with the citations wherein the pun plays itself out:

```
413-414 "Ως ἄρ' ἔφαν ἀπιόντες· ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ
         ώς ὄνομ' έξαπάτησεν έμὸν καὶ μῆτις ἀμύμων
          Thus did they speak as they departed; and my own heart laughed
          at how the name I used had deceived and also my efficacious Device.
         ... πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον,
         ώς τε περί ψυχῆς· μέγα γὰρ κακὸν ἐγγύθεν ἦεν.
          ... all possible crafts and Device was I trying to weave,
          as in a matter of Life itself. For the Great Evil was close-at-hand.
455
         Οὖτις, ὄν οὖ πώ φημι πεφυγμένον ἔμμεν ὅλεθρον.
459
                     ..., κὰδ δέ κ' ἐμὸν κῆρ
460
         λωφήρειε κακῶν, τά μοι οὐτιδανὸς πόρεν Οὖτις.
455
         Nótany, whom I do not quite think to-be-fled from Destruction already.
459
                    ..., which would totally relieve
460
         my heart from the Evils, which that Good-for-No-Thing No-One/Nótany
                                                              dispensed to me 10.
502-505 Κύκλωψ, αἴ κέν τίς δε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων
         όφθαλμοῦ εἴρηται ἀεικελίην ἀλαωτύν,
         φάσθαι 'Οδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον έξαλαῶσαι,
         υίὸν Λαέρτεω, 'Ιθάκη ἔνι οἰκί' ἔχοντα.
         Circle-Eye, should Any of mortal-humans
         ask the source of the Grim Blinding of thy Eye,
         declare that-Odysseus, the-Sacker-of-Cities, blinded thee,
         Laertes'son, who keeps his home in Ithake 11.
```

The «pun» between «dispensing a burning-out of his (one and only) eye» here in l. 460 and «dispensing more gleaming wine» in l. 360 is indeed a painful crying out by Many-Tale and man indeed, imply a retribution that would spring from the verb twice repeated. «The Evils which that Good-for-Nothing No-One/Notany dispensed to me» shows Many-Tale's own «spin», emphasizing the fullness, from beginning to end, of Odysseus' act; in 360 the text says: «But to him did I dispense again the gleaming wine», that is the inebriation, «foreplay» to the blinding, while «The many Evils» is the consequence and consumation of the dispensing act.

Even now, after all this interaction, Odysseus' self-expression of name and patronym and patria is hardly the Hero's «Siegmund heiss ich und Siegmund bin ich» at the end of Act I of *Die Walküre*, with some play on an alternate name «Friedmund», as this Hero announces himself, with Sieglinde, as husband-brother and Sword-winner.

So, at long last, is this our result and reward?: that a member of a «folk», The Circle-Eyes, one Many-Tale by name, has now become «No-Eye(-at-all)» or «Burned-Out-Eye/Burned-out-Circle-Eye», and this by the actions of Nótany/No-One(-at-all), whose name, when wrongly accented, with an dimoric pitch on the first syllable (Mỹτις) rather than with a single acute on each of the two syllables in $\mu \dot{\eta}$ τίς, means «Device/Cunning» itself? Is this what the whole saga of Οὖτις, beginning in line 366, has served for — a mere triggering device (no pun intended!), first to detonate, indeed only to detonate, in the eventual final plays on $\mu \dot{\eta}$ τίς/Mỹτις? And then we accept that, for Οὖτις itself, there never was any proper-to-it pun? ¹²

Well, not bad; but I suggest we can do better and that originally «Homer» both (a) had the intention and (b) succeeded in putting in his epic, in this present pericope (whoever of the «Homers», the various adders and subtractors and redactors) of having the *First* pun too be more than the anemic matter we perceive it as in the Greek text! Indeed, he had this pun on $O\tilde{\delta}\pi\varsigma$ «deliver a punch that packed a wallop» ¹³ and what a punch it verily was.

In line 366 when Odysseus responded to Many-Tale's query about his name and then the former responded that $O\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\nu/O\hat{u}tin$ is what his parents and the others too, all his companions call him, we see that this would-be «name» is given, by the necessity of grammar, in the accusative case. And we have noted already that this is one clue to its being, here, a proper name and not an appellative/pronominal since the latter takes a «reinforced», as it were, accusative, an original *o $\dot{\upsilon}$ τ (- ν with - ν < IE *- ν to a vowel-stem noun/pronoun. This then was «redetermined» ¹⁴ with Greek α < * ν which is the outcome of the IE accusative, in Greek added to consonantal stems, thus * ν 0 ti- ν 1 (exactly as happens with ν 1 ν 2 ν 2 ν 3, one accusative of ν 3.

Now in a declined language, all still integral Indo-European and Indo-Hittite tongues, if his parents, e. g. call him *Oûtin* in the accusative and in the nominative we know him as *Oûtis*, this is due to poor descriptional methodology handed on to us. If we analyze more in the way of the Sanskrit methodology,

¹² A pun, totally irrelevant to Homer's usages here of that same oυ, has over the last c. 20 years worked itself into English academia, a «pun» that may well be less intentional that one growing out of ignorance: In American sociology courses and writings the antonym to a *utopia* is a *dystopia*, with not the east concern at all that the «u» in the Anglified roots, but word *creatio ex nihilo* as a whole, is from Greek oυ- (and thus «No-Place [/that does or can exist at all]») and not from Greek ευ- (and thus «Good-Place», as part of an oppositional pair: *utopia:dystopia*, resp. «Good-Place» [a perfect society] and «Bad-Place» [a perfectly awful society, worst you could get]).

¹³ English idiom (/slang) for «to strike so forcefully that there may be little, if any, chance of a recovery or come back».

¹⁴ On my usage of this term, see Arbeitman & Rendsburg (1981, p. 148 together with fn. 11).

one that is much more in accordance with reality, the man's name (or, for that matter, any appellative) would be listed and categorized as Ovn-; everything beyond this is mere case ending! And this is the name which The-One-of-Many-Ways/Turns gave to Many-Tale, his Circle-Eye «Host»! Yet Homer never expected us to have to wait until lines much later in the pericope for the pun's resolution.

Just above I have cited Odysseus' final self-declamation — he is a real «some-one/body» this macho! Yet these lines (502-505) are the finale of what is, immediately preceding them, a two-barreled taunting for taunting's-own-sake of Many-Tale, now the Circle-Eye — even that gone, quite scorched out of its socket. These preceding lines are of two mini-episodes: in the first (475-490) Odysseus taunts the ruined Many-Tale to the point that this hurt creature takes a violent revenge. In the second (491-499) Odysseus starts to untertake a second taunting episode, only deterred by his companions who force on him the realization of the danger in giving the now BLIND-ONE vocal clues to their locations (497):

492-493 ... ἀμφὶ δ' ἐταῖροι μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσιν ἐρήτυον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος· ... Round-about-me, my companions tried to dissuade me with conciliatory words, one from this side, another from that side.

They did not succeed, for Odysseus had to get in, as his farewell to the Circle-Eye, Many-Tale, the previously cited 11. 502 ss.: «this grim/disgusting BLINDING, tell them it was the Great I (!) who did it». This is beyond what even the gods will allow irascible Odysseus to shove into the BLIND ONE's soul, taunting μηδὲν ἄγαν — this is EXCESS! But nota it bene!

In closing, I return again to 1. 366, cited several times above already:

Οὖτις ἐμοί γ' ὄνομα. Οὖτιν δέ με κικλήσκουσι.

But here I will offer an original and innovative rendering in accordance with the ideas I have reflected on for the past 15 years. A rewriting of symbols first: $/a^{\hat{w}}ti-/emoi\ g'$ onoma. $/a^{\hat{w}}ti-/d\acute{e}$ me kikléskousi. The NAME which I here give in phonemic virgules was mis-interpreted indeed by Many-Tale the Barbarian; he understood Greek «Nótany»/«Nóbody». Odysseus, however had NOT given Greek où τίς: «Man-of-Many-Devices», such as he is, such a «nom-de-guerre» would be beneath his «greatness» and far too feeble for his level of «cruelty». Odysseus had given, as his name, the Hittite verbal form autti 15.

¹⁵ For a good set of comparanda, cf. NEnglish video «television/the t. v.», from the Latin first person sg. «I see»; but we must take into consideration that the first person sg. is the citation form of any Latin verb. The appearence-wise identically formation audio «pertaining to the broadcast, reception and reproduction of sound» and such: according to The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1969₁) and AHD (1992₃) the noun and the

Now what does this verbal form, used here as a personal name, mean? None other than that which is best rendered in Classical Greek as βλέπεις, concerning which LSJ, s.u. states: «see, have the power of sight (dist. fr. ὁρῶ 'perceive, be aware of'...), opp. 'τυφλός είμι', S. OT 302...». For readers who are Hittiteless, let me immediately - after all your patience - translate the ad hoc Hittite «name» into the common language of the West: this Hittite /awti-/ means 'uides' ('thou seest/du siehst', Italian 'vedi', Spanish 'ves /miras', French 'tu vois', etc.). But as both the Hittite verb autti /awti-/ and the Greek verb I rendered with, βλέπεις, carry with them no baggage of the explicitly stated 2nd p. sg. pronoun as English, German, and French do, I prefer to stick more by the renderings of the Classical Languages, viz. βλέπεις and vides resp. Also as Odysseus had spent so many years in Asian Minor Troy, there is a possibility (which I refrain from quantifying here) that he picked up some Hittite and/or Luwian there (cf. Arbeitman 1986, in toto). The oldest Germanic rendering for βλέπεις is, of course, Gothic saihuis, as we see in some of Ulfilas' rendering of the Greek.

It well behooves us first to adduce here the locus from Oidipus Tyrannos 300-303 middle. Oedipus addresses Teiresias, the Blind Seer:

> ὧ πάντα νωμῶν Τειρεσία, διδακτά τε ἄρρητά τ', οὐράνιά τε καὶ χθονοστιβῆ, πόλιν μέν, εί καὶ μὴ βλέπεις, φρονεῖς δ' ὅμως οία νόσω σύνεστιν.

O Teiresias, The-One-Who-Grasps both matters studied and matters taboo(-to-study), matters heavenly and matters which tread this earth, This City(-of-Thebes), Even granted that thou seest not/canst not see, Still thou knowest well the How and the Why that it is coupled with such an illness (as this plague).

The Classical Greek, and the Latin and the Gothic equivalents I have taken form the New Testament, Mark 12:14. In his entry for saihuan «βλέπειν, ὁρᾶν 'sehen'», Feist (1939, p. 405a, s.u.), concludes: «Kein entspr. Verbum im Hett.; $\check{s}ak$ - ($\check{s}\bar{a}g$ -) bed. 'wissen', ist also nicht... = got. saihuan; 'sehen' heißt hett. au-...».

And so it is — the Hittite šak(iya-) being cognate with Latin sagus et al.

Allow me to diagrammatically sketch the two aspects of the intertwining of two significant name puns which I propose we are provided with. As I see it,

adjective usages of audio are «back-formations», let us say, from a combining form audioderived from Latin verb audire. But really, one must needs remember that this dictionary goes against all tradition, by citing Latin verbs in their infinitival form, and not in their first person sg. form. Thus audio may also well be from audio (audire) resp. «I hear» («to hear»). But the time for further research, on so relatively speaking, slight a matter is not worthwhile at the present point.

it is the $O\tilde{v}\tau\iota\varsigma$ pun which is far older and embedded in our text's story from its very earliest narration — the $M\tilde{\eta}\tau\iota\varsigma$ I see as a far younger and a pun forcebly inserted to make sense of a story whose primary trigger was no longer at all understood whatsoeven in and of itself, in that latter period from the end of Hittite civilization in Asia Minor Proper, an event temporally not too separate from the end of the «Trojan War» and the destruction of the Troy of our story.

CHART I (AN ATTEMPT TO REPRODUCE THE SEMANTICS OF THE PAIRS OF PUNS IN ENGLISH)

A.1

A.2

4 ss. THE PRIMARY PUN

Odysseus, always looking forward to the next problem, after plying Many-Tale with the finest of wines, gives his name, in response to Many-Tale's offer of a host-guest «Exchange», as HITTITE /a*ti-/(autti-) 'uidēs'. If Many-Tale was only «Semi-Barbaric» in that he could only «Semi-understand» Greek, his Hittite was non-existant, a fact that Odysseus was playing off. Many-Tale (mis-)understands what he hears Odysseus give as his name, as GREEK /o*ti-/(outi-)/(ou=ti-) 'Nullus/nemo', 'Not-Any (One)'.

B.1

4 ss. THE SECONDARY PUN

Greek Mῆτις, 'Device, Cunning' is produced as the necessary other part of the μή τί-ς, 'Nullus, nemo'.

B.2. B.1, having generated Greek /Meti-/ (Meti-) (Mη=π-), 'Nullus, nemo' 'Not Any(One)', lexical difference determined by the grammatical component, either as the aetiology of the choice or as the teleology of the same choice! (This, in its turn generates B.2 supra ↑↑↑, if only ouroboros-wise).

But, fellow-lovers of the (ancient) word/Philologists — as alluring and satisfying to me, at least, this cruel Hittite pus is in and of itself, we have more, so much more as to constitute an embarrassment or riches.

Laroche (1959, p. 103) presents us with «ú-ut-ti-iš: 133 II 25; sg. nom.» Alas and quite self-evidentary one does not use for either (a) an etymological comparandum or (b) a textual paronomasiac elucidation (my present goals) a lexeme whose meaning is totally unsurmised («surmised» would be fraught with risk enough), let alone an item unknown beyond even the dare-heartedness to surmise! And even that which Laroche could tell us, that too eventuated

CHART II (AN ATTEMPT TO REPRODUCE THE SOUNDS OF THE PAIRS OF PUNS IN ENGLISH)

Odysseus says: «My Name is /a^wti-/ (same Hittite lexeme as above): Let's Anglify: Odysseus says: «My Name is 'Nót-ice'. Many Tale, not understanding English, (mis-)understands this as «Not-Any(one)», present in his limited English vocabulary.

ού τί-ς «Not-Any(One)»

Οὖτι-ς «Nótany/Nó-One/None»

B

Odysseus says: «My Name is «No-Wight». Now although this is (1995 C.E.) «archaic» for New English, Many-Tale, again interpreting in his very limited English vocabulary, understands «Wit(s)» 16

410: μή τί-ς [«(If indeed) No-Man...»] «No-Wight» Mῆτι-ς «Wit(s)/(wise, wis=dom»). [NE «wit», «wise, wis=dom» are syrrhizaic, of course, with the Latin uides I have been glossing The A. items with; and, obviously, with OI $v\overline{e}da < */woid-o = (s) / «Know$ ledge» (2. veda = (s), m. «Kentniss», Einsicht, Verstand», Grassmann

1872)].

to be wrong, at least in the version I adopt here. Laroche's dictionaries, his contributions to Cun. Luwian, Hiero. Luw. (his Hieroglyphic Hittite), Late Luwic Lycian, mostly today — and this is an indication of the great progress of our Fach, are from the primaeval period of our Luwiological science(s).

But for our present locus light has come. On 21/V/'93 I wrote my colleague, Prof. H. Craig Melchert (Univ. of North Carolina, USA) asking whether, in his on on-going work on his Lexica Anatolica (Cun. Luwian and Lycian, 1st and 2nd edd. so far all appeared), he had come to any serviceable conclusion on this «nom. sig. noun» of Laroche's without any meaning in Cun. Luw.

In his response of 24/V/'93, he informed me that:

There are two competing accounts. I prefer that of Morpurgo Davies, KZ 94:106²⁴, who interprets wasu uttis as 'you shall dring well' [...] Starke, Sprache 31-249f., inteprets [this form] in -tis as nom. sg. of [the noun] 'drink'. I find Morpurgo Davies' syntactic analysis with $w\overline{a}su$ (as elsewhere) functioning as an adverb more plausible, but the context is too fragmentary to exclude Starke's interpretation entirely.

Much rich evidence do I need to exclude from Melchert's letter here and, indeed from Morpurgo Davies' (1980) fertile footnote (I discuss these ramifications in a forthcoming short article in General Linguistics). But what we get from Morpurgo Davies' analysts is a 2nd p. sg. verb: «Thou shalt drink (well)».

¹⁶ See here fn. 18 infra.

When we plug this date into our Odyssean pericope, we are left with little choice than to trace our protagonist's name-giving to Circle-Eyed to the creation of a wordsmith of the most archaic stratum of the Homeric corpus, for his creation and/or employment of the trilingual word-game was targeted to an audience which he could reasonably expect would catch his meanings and their references. In this sense, this audience was a step, indeed two steps, ahead of the *dramatis personae*, the Circle-Eyed and his fellow Circle-Eyed-Ones. But, no problem, no one would ever expect the Kuklopes to understand Greek, or either Greek, Hittite, or Luwian, far less Greek, Hittite, and Luwian. That Odysseus could cruelly pun in all three was was certainly not likely for the hearers of the Proto-Poem, but not a problem they would at all have been bothered by.

The new Luwian data, being superimposed on the Hittite punning, requires a Chart III, addendal to the recent Charts I & II, but limited to the A column.

CHART III GREEK, HITTITE, AND LUWIAN

«My name is»: Greek: Οὖτι'No One'

Hittite:/a^wti-/

'Notice' = 'seest'

Luwian: /uti-/ 'Nog' (obsolete English for 'ale', survives only in Eggnog 'an

alcoholic drink of milk, eggs with alcohol, but certainly not with ale').

= 'Drink, alcoholic drink'. Alas, I cannot come up with an English verb that both (a) means 'drinkest, imbibest' and (b) sounds like 'No one, Notice' and noun 'Nog'. The Latin verb (e-)bibes well serve us well. For the noun, if we go with Starke, Latin potus (its cognateness with the just given Latin verb is too opaque to matter) serves alongside

the English (not so good) 'Nog'.

All-in-All «My name is»:

«Sum Nullus ego — nunc (bene) uides; sed, cum e=biberis potum

hunc, non uidebis umquam».

We must remember that the «giving in» by Odysseus to Circle-Eyed's importuning for his name, is surrounded by the following forms of the root *pi-:

IX	346	μέλανος οἴνοιο·
	347	πίε οἶνον,
	348	οἶόν τι ποτὸν τόδε
	349	σοὶ δ' αὖ λοιβὴν φέρον,
	353	ο δὲ δέκτο καὶ ἔκπιεν· ήσατο δ' αἰνῶς
	354	ήδὺ ποτὸν πίνων, καί μ' ήτεε δεύτερον αὖτις
	355	Δός μοι ἔτι πρόφρων, καί μοι τεὸν οὕνομα ειπὲ 17
	360	αὐτάρ οἱ αὖτις πόρον αἴθωπα οἶνον·
	361	τρίς δ' ἔκπιεν ἀφραδίησιν
	362	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος,

¹⁷ It will be well noted that I omit the Kuklops' tempting description of the Wine of his Land, a «tributary», if I dare, «of Ambrosia & Nektar».

363 καὶ τότε δή... (beginning of the name-giving as «No One/Nullus» lines which finally come in 365 with the blatant statement itself: No One is my name; And Outis Mother and Father and all the others, the companions calle me». By three millennia earlier, this statement is «too reminiscent for comfort» by its much later, much more overblown and wild, echo in *Die Walküre* (end Act I): She: «'Wehwalt' heißt du fürwahr?» ... He: «Siegmund heiß ich und Siegmund bin ich», etc., etc. (She: «Art thou called 'Woe-Bestower' really?...» He: «'Victory-Protection' am I called and 'Victory-Protection' am I»).

While the Sister-Marrying Siegmund is an unabashed braggart, Odysseus is the supreme Cunning Man, an heroic age characteristic, as — on less grand scale — Jacob does both to his Father Isaac and to his Father-in-Law Laban.

The appropriate Greek audience for what we have herein outlined existed only at one time and one place: In Asia Minor where they dwelled symbiotically with the IE Anatolians (maybe also with more autochthonous peoples). The time was the very period within which the Trojan war took place. For when Troy falls (c. seven centuries befores the presumed 8th Cent. B.C.E. date of «The Homer», or «The Final Redactor», not counting Peisistratos nor later athetizers), the Hittite and West Luwian worlds come to an end. There were no Greeks after that who could have encapsulated in their epic significant Hittite and Luwian nomenclatural paronomasia. The Heroic Age all ended max. 1400 B.C.E. - min. 1200 B.C.E. when the Philistines invade Egypt and Canaan too.

I conclude this confrontation between Many-Tale and Odysseus with citing of lines 506-535 which I give in the standard English translation of Lattimore

(1965): (Odysseus says):

So I spoke, and he groaned aloud and answered me, saying:

«Ah now, a prophecy spoken of old is come to completion.

There used to be a man here, great and strong, and a prophet,

Telemos, Eurymos' son, who for prophecy was pre-eminent
and grew old as a prophet among the Cyclopes. This man told me
how all this that has happened now must someday be accomplished,
and how I must lose the sight of my eye at the hands of Odysseus.

But always I was on the lookout for a man handsome
and tall, with great endowment of strength on him, to come here;
and now the end of it is that a little man (ἐὼν ὀλίγος) 18, niddering, feeble,

¹⁸ If one were inclined to proceed (retrograde) from the «archaic» wight to NE «obsolete», we could render here νῦν δέ μ' ἐὼν ὀλίγος τε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς καὶ ἄκικυς by «But, in the event, a being/a wight both little and notworth-a-whit, strengthless, (| blinded) me!». Notice, but ignore, the fact that in the cazy spelling system of NE, we get the velar fricative(s) */wIχt/, resp. pronounced, wight / wayt / and whit / hwIt/, with metathesis of the aspirate in, the second of the two, and consequent distinctive vowels before /-ayht/ and /-It/ resp.

	has taken away the sight of my eye, first making me helpless
	with wihe. So come here, Odysseus, let me give you a guest-gift 19
	and urge the glorious Shaker of the Earth to grant you conveyance
	home. For I am his son, he announces himself as my father.
520	He himself will heal me, if he will, but not any other (οὐδέ τις ἄλλος)
521	of the blessed gods, nor any man who is mortal» (οὖτε ϑεῶν μακάρων
321	οὖτε θηντῶν ἀνθρώπων).
	나는 사람들은 아이들 마다 아이들 바다 아이들 때문에 가장 마다를 하다고 하다면 아이들이 바람이 되었다. 그는
	So he spoke, but I answered him again and said to him:
	«I only wish it were certain I could make you rest of spirit
	and life and send you to the house of Hades, as it is certain
	that not even the Shaker of the Earth will ever heal you eye for you.»
	So I spoke, but he called to the lord Poseidon
	in prayer, reaching both his arms up toward the starry heaven:
	«Hear me, Poseidon who circle the earth, dark-haired. If truly
	I am your son, and you acknowledge yourself as my father,
	grant the Odysseus, Sacker of cities, son of Laertes,
	who makes his home in Ithaka, may never reach that home;
532	but if it is decided that he shall see his own people (φίλους ἰδέειν)
533	and come home to his strong-founded house and to his own country (πατρίδα γοᾶαν)
534	let his come late, in bad case, with the loss of all his companions
	(ἐταίρους)
536	in someone else's ship (νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης), and find troubles in his
	household.»

As to both Many-Tale's imprecation and also to the occasions where I inserted the Greek, res ipsae loquuntur, leaving only one single word to exegetize, namely $\partial \lambda \partial \tau \rho (\eta \zeta)$. In the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Bible, made some many centuries after Homer and all additional «Homers» and all redactors had set their text in bronze, there occurs a very, very touching and affecting usage of this same word. Exodos 2:22:

In the just made-up translation we would get a pronunciation something like: but In ou event, ey bi-in/ey wayt bob lit and nut wurb-a-hwlt.

In the neuter use, the etymon of this word in OE and its Gothic cognate are used e. g. in Matth. 27:12: «But when he was accused by the Chief-Priests and the Elders, Gk Vorlage: οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο; Gothic: ni waiht andhof; Latin «Vorlage»: nihil respondit; MS VII Northumbrian glosses: nowiht geond=uearde, geon=suarde; MS VIII: nauwiht and-swarede.

But this is OE gloss-language only. In the actual OE translations:

MS I. has: nan bing he ne and=swarode

MS V. has: nan bing he ne and-swerede (Skeat, ed., 1887), inherited with the 3 other gospels from the noble lady to whom this article is dedicated). The New Eng. derivative of this syntagm is naught (alternate spelling nought) and we can certainly translate the Greek or the Latin here as «He answered naught».

¹⁹ With reference to fn. 10 and the verses there cited with πόρ-, we take note of the parallelism of this verb with δῶκε and a case of πόρεν having δῶρα as its direct object! All this in II. 197-203, the coupling occurs in I. 201: ὁ δέ μοι πόρεν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα. («... Maron, Euantheos' son, Apollo's priest, gave me it» — 197-198). | (201) « ... Yes, he distributed/presented glorious gifts.»

Hebrew: «And Sipporah gave birth to a son and he (Moses) called him with the name Gershom ($g\overline{e}r\overline{s}\overline{o}m$), for he 'explained': 'I was a metic' ($g\overline{e}r$) in a land not my own ($n\overline{o}k\partial riyy\overline{a}h$).» The aetiology of the name-giving is based on (1) the explicit ($g\overline{e}r$ 'metic') and (2) the implicit word ($s\overline{a}m$ 'there'='Land not my own'). The Greek renders «I was a metic in a Land not my own» by "Οτι πάροικός εἰμι, ἐν γῆ ἀλλοτρία. The Vulgata renders: aduena fui in terra aliena.

Odysseus knew full well in his gut that such revenge would come from Poseidon and yet he had to be finished with his close-knit group of «companions-for-the-voyage-home» (German «Gefährte» — 'travelling-mate-' — etymologically) before he could «see his own folk, those who are, by the way it is, his own men».

The νόστος... νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης — this long return on therewith on an alien ship!

YOËL L. ARBEITMAN

REFERENCES

- Albeitman, Yoël L., 1986: «'Trojan', Luwian, and the Mass Media, 1985 (C. E.)», Diachronica III/2.
- Arbeitman, Yoël L., & Gary A. Rendsburg, 1981: «Adana Revisited [so correct wrongly printed title]: 30 Years Later», Ar. Or. 49/2.
- Autenrieth, Georg, 1876: A Homeric Dictionary (translated into English from German by Robert P. Keep; revised by Isaac Flagg; 1st printing of new edition 1985), Norman, Oklahoma, University of Oklahoma.
- Chantraine, Pierre, 1980: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, Paris, Klincksieck.
- Evelyn-White, Hugh G., 1914: Hesiod, The Homeric Hyms and Homerica, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University.
- Feist, Sigmund, 1939: Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache, Dritte neubearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage, Leiden, E. J. Brill.
- Grassmann, Hermann, 1872: Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda, Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz. Laroche, Emmanuel, 1959: Dictionnaire de la langue louvite, Paris, Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Lattimore, Richmond, 1965: The Odyssey of Homer (translated with an introduction), New York, Harper & Row.
- Melchert, H. Craig, 1993: Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon (Lexica Anatolica, volume 2), Chapel Hill, N. C., H. Craig Melchert (available from the scholar-author).
- Merry, W. W., 1870: Homer: Odyssey (with introduction, notes, etc.), Oxford, The University Press.
- Morpurgo-Davies, Anna, 1980: «The Personal Endings of the Hieroglyphic Luwian Verb», ZVS 94/1-2.
- Skeat, Walter W. (ed.), 1887: The Gospel according to St. Matthew in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions, Synoptically Arranged (being a revision of the incomplete 1858 edition by John M. Kemple), Cambridge, The University Press.

Stanford, W. B., 1965: The Odyssey of Homer (edited with general and grammatical introductions, commentary, and Indexes), 2 Volumes, 2nd Ed., London, Macmillan. Van Leeuwen, J., & M. B. Mendes Da Costa: Homeri Odysseae Carmina (editio altera, passim aucta et emendata), (1st ed. was 1890), 2 volumes, Lugduni Batavorum, A. W. Sijthoff.