

# Double deixis in Homeric speech: on the interpretation of ὄδε and οὗτος<sup>1</sup>

IRENE J.F. DE JONG

The aim of the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* is to increase our understanding of Homer's world through a precise analysis of his words. The way to proceed was shown by the founder of the lexicon, Bruno Snell, who famously reconstructed the Homeric notion of self, or rather the lack thereof, on the basis of a set of words. At first sight, a contribution dealing with demonstrative pronouns may not seem appropriate to a volume celebrating the completion of the *Lexikon*: pronouns are virtually passed over in the *Lexikon*, as are most so-called 'Formwörter'. However, I hope to show that even words like ὄδε and οὗτος can tell us much about Homer, notably about an important aspect of his narrative art. I will start by establishing what in my view these pronouns do *not* do (section 1); I will then analyse in detail how they function within the fabric of Homer's narrative (sections 2–4), and end with an evaluation of the cumulative effect of their presence (section 5).

## 1. Gestures of the aoidoi?

The demonstrative pronouns ὄδε and οὗτος occur regularly in the Homeric text, almost exclusively in the speeches.<sup>2</sup> Let us take a look at some examples:

(1) *Iliad* 3.191–2+199–200

Δεύτερον αὐτ' Ὀδυσῆα ἰδὼν ἐρέειν' ὁ γεραίός·  
“εἴπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ **τόνδε**, φίλον τέκος, ὅς τις **ὄδ'** ἐστί”.

...

Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειθ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα·  
“**οὗτος** δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, ...”

---

1 This contribution is a token of gratitude for the highly enjoyable and instructive year that I spent in Hamburg in 1984, on a stipendiary from the Netherland Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

2 For figures, see the Appendix. I do not discuss ἐκεῖνος (for which see Bonifazi 2009). For οὗτος in the narrator-text, see Bakker 1999.

Looking secondly at Odysseus the old man [Priam] asked:  
 “Tell me now about this man, my dear child, who this is.”  
 And him Helen, daughter of Zeus, answered:  
 “That man is the son of Laertes, clever Odysseus,...”<sup>3</sup>

(2) *Iliad* 22.38 (Priam is speaking)

“Ἐκτορ, μή μοι μίμνε, φίλον τέκος, ἀνέρα **τοῦτον**...”  
 “Hector, do not wait, dear child, for that man [Achilles]...”

(3) *Odyssey* 13.344–51 (Athena: Odysseus)

“ἀλλ’ ἄγε τοι δείξω Ἴθάκης ἔδος, ὄφρα πεποιθήσῃ·  
 Φόρκυος μὲν **ὄδ**’ ἐστὶ λιμὴν, ἀλίσιο γέροντος,  
**ἦδε** δ’ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος τανύφυλλος ἔλαιή·...  
**τοῦτο** δέ τοι σπέος εὐρὺ κατηρεφές, ἔνθα σὺ πολλὰς  
 ἔρδεσκες Νύμφησι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας·  
**τοῦτο** δὲ Νήριτόν ἐστιν ὄρος καταειμένον ὕλη.”

“But look now, I will show you the site of Ithaca, in order for you to be sure.  
 This here is the harbour named after Phorcys, the old man of the sea,  
 and this the long-leaved olive tree at the head of the harbour.  
 And that is the wide arching cave, where you were wont  
 to make your ample and perfect sacrifices to the nymphs.  
 And that is tree-clad mount Neriton.”

With regard to such instances of ὄδε and οὔτος, commentators regularly refer to gestures: e.g. Ameis-Hentze (ad 1): ‘beachte den regelmässigen Wechsel der Pronomina ὄδε und οὔτος in Frage und Antwort: Beide sind hinweisend’; scholia (ad 2): ‘as if he points out Achilles to him [Hector]’ (οἰοεὶ ... δακτυλοδεικτεῖ); Stanford (ad 3): ‘τοῦτο in 349 and 351 need a gesture = “over there”’; de Jong (ad *Od.* 1.156–318): ‘the frequent use of deictic pronouns, which suggest gestures, lends it an air of drama’.<sup>4</sup>

In itself, this connection between demonstrative or deictic nouns and gestures is appropriate. The linguist Wackernagel, for instance, states:

Demonstrativa sind lautliche Fingerzeige, hörbare Winke, und enthalten eigentlich immer ein “sieh hin”. Somit sind sie den hinweisenden Gebärden verwandt, *die auch oft diese Pronomina begleiten*. Am vollsten kommt ihre Funktion zum Ausdruck bei eigentlicher Deixis, wenn auf ein Stück des gegenwärtigen Wahrnehmungsbildes hingewiesen wird.<sup>5</sup>

3 Translations are my own. The texts are those of Monro-Allen for the *Iliad*, von der Mühl for the *Odyssey*.

4 Similar comments are found passim in these commentaries. They do not appear in the *Iliad* commentary of Kirk c.s., the *Odyssey* commentary of Heubeck c.s., or the recent *Iliad* commentary of Latacz c.s.

5 Wackernagel 1924, 101, my italics. Cf. also Diessel 1999, 94.

The question I will address in the first part of my paper is: what exactly do commentators mean when they talk about gestures? *Whose* gestures are they referring to? This is rarely made explicit.

One exception is Victor Bérard, who is very explicit in a paper dating from 1918 with the speaking title ‘Le geste de l’aède et le texte homérique’. In his view it is the *aoidos* (Homer) who makes gestures. He arrives at this conclusion after a fascinating *parcours* of academic reasoning:

“l’*Iliade* et l’*Odyssee* sont les formes premières du drame grec ... Les aèdes de l’ancien temps, puis les rhapsodes de l’âge classique “représentèrent” durant des siècles les poèmes homériques. (We know about the theatricality of the rhapsodes from Plato’s *Ion*⁶) ... Avant ces représentations toutes théâtrales des rhapsodes classiques, avant leurs manières pompeuses, leurs grands gestes et leurs éclats de voix, nous ne savons rien de la récitation primitive des aèdes. Était-elle aussi animée et scénique? est-ce, au contraire, à l’imitation et à l’école des tragédiens et comédiens que les rhapsodes prirent leurs habitudes de déclamation gesticulante? et l’aède n’avait-il, auparavant, que le débit rituel et l’attitude quasi hiératique d’un officiant, d’un porte-parole du Dieu et de la Muse? ... L’antiquité ne nous ayant rien transmis là-dessus, toutes les hypothèses sont permises. (His hypothesis is that the *aoidoi* did gesticulate, and in support of his standpoint he points at the deictic pronouns). Tout au long des poèmes homériques ... il est des mots pareils qui non seulement appellent le geste, mais le nécessitent: on ne peut pas les comprendre sans lui. Il est même des tirades entières, semble-t-il, qui n’ont pas jamais pu être prononcées *par l’auteur ou par ses interprètes*, sans un commentaire perpétuel de la main, des yeux ou du visage. Aujourd’hui encore, il nous est impossible de les lire, même à voix basse, sans que le geste involontaire éclaire telle ou telle intention qui paraît évidente, mais que l’auteur n’a fait qu’indiquer par les mots.”⁷

We see how Bérard reasons back from the rhapsodes to the *aoidoi*: we *know* that the former gesticulated and it is highly likely that the latter did so as well, especially since the deictic pronouns which are sprinkled throughout the poems *need* gestures. Indeed, by the end of his argument (and throughout the remainder of his paper), Bérard no longer distinguishes between *aoidos* and rhapsode but simply places them on a par: ‘par l’auteur ou par ses interprètes’.

At times matters get even more complicated, when Bérard refers to *characters* who are gesticulating, e.g. (ad *Il.* 3.166, Priam to Helena: “ὤς μοι καὶ τόνδε ἄνδρα πελώριον ἔξονομήνης”) ‘Priam doit montrer du doigt, dans les rangs achéens, un guerrier qui domine la foule’, or (ad *Od.* 15.174, Helen to Telemachus: “ὤς ὄδε χῆν’ ἦρπας’ ... ὤς ...”) ‘un geste d’Hélène—ou de l’aède—,

6 E.g. when they perform ‘the lay of Odysseus leaping forth on the threshold, revealing himself to the suitors and pouring out the arrows before his feet, or of Achilles dashing at Hector’ (*Ion* 535B). Note also that Socrates calls the rhapsode an actor (536A).

7 Bérard 1918, 1–5, my italics. Kühner-Gerth 1898, 641 also seem to connect the demonstratives with Homer the *aoidos*: ‘Die Grundbedeutung der Demonstrativa tritt uns am deutlichsten und am häufigsten in den Homerischen Gedichten entgegen. Den sprechenden Homer muss man . . . sprechen nicht lesen.’

montrant dans le ciel l'aigle qui s'enfuit, fait sans peine comprendre ce que désigne cet ὄδε que n'accompagne aucun substantif.<sup>8</sup> Chaos now is complete: who gesticulates? The *aidos*, rhapsode, or one of the characters? I will turn to the option of characters gesticulating below, but for now focus on the *aidos* and rhapsode.

Bérard's simple equation of *aidos* and rhapsode is misleading, since a rhapsode recites while holding a *rhabdos*, or stick, in his hand, whereas an *aidos* sings while holding a *phorminx*, or lyre, in one hand, and a plectrum in the other.<sup>9</sup> A rhapsode had ample opportunity to gesticulate, but how much room to manoeuvre does a lyre leave the *aidos*? I put this question to Martin West as expert on Greek music (amongst many other things). He replied:

I think the scope for gesticulation while holding a phorminx would be very limited, though one could imagine a measure of expressive movements of the upper body, and facial expression enhancing the vocal. All speculation really, as I think there is no external evidence, and I hardly think that deictic *hode* in speeches needed to be accompanied by gestures—especially as the things or persons referred to were not there to be pointed at.<sup>10</sup>

Leaving aside his last remark for the moment, I am inclined to concur with West in assuming that an *aidos* would have his hands full with both lyre and plectrum and hence would find it difficult to make manual gestures.

It is as if Bérard has simply forgotten about this crucial difference between *aidos* and rhapsode and, lumping them together, erroneously ascribes the gesturing that we can safely associate with the rhapsode to the *aidos* as well. A similar equation of rhapsode and *aidos* appears in a study by Boegehold on signs of gesticulation in Greek texts. While discussing the Homeric poems he says:

Consider now such a rhapsode who not only recites but also tells his story with motions of head and hand—indeed, acts out his song....*The poet himself (or in later generations, the rhapsode)* acting as Agamemnon completes whatever sense is needed with a gesture.<sup>11</sup>

8 Bérard 1918, 5, 20, my italics.

9 For textual references to lyre cf. e.g. *Od.* 8.67, 261–2, 266, to lyre and plectrum, cf. e.g. *HHHermes* 418–19; *HHApollo* 184–5. For depictions on vases, see e.g. Maas-McIntosh Snyder 1989.

10 Personal communication via email. For discussions of the singing of Homer, see West 1981 and Danek-Hagel 1995.

11 Boegehold 1999, 36–42, my italics. Lateiner 1995, 20, referring to Bérard, also accepts bardic gesturing, but does not make clear whether he is talking about the *aidos* or the rhapsode: 'Henceforth, the contribution of nonverbal behavior should be factored in as well, a highly affective and focused form of human expression allotted to persons in the text and presumably—but for us irretrievably—employed by *the performers of the text*. We can observe not only marked *movements of face and hand* but also expressive body tonus and orientation, whispers, pace, and posture.' (my italics). Herington 1985, 13

Boegehold bases his claim that Homer gesticulated amongst other things on Plato *Republic* 393B, where the *mimesis* taking place in speeches is described as involving not only words but also some form of body-language:

Οὐκοῦν τό γε ὁμοιοῦν ἄλλω ἢ κατὰ φωνήν ἢ κατὰ σχῆμα μιμεῖσθαι ἔστιν ἐκεῖνον ᾧ ἄν τις ὁμοιοῖ;

And is not likening one's self to another in speech or bodily bearing an imitation of him to whom one likens oneself?

The problem here is that Plato without doubt was thinking of the rhapsodic performance of the Homeric epics in his own times (as described by him in his *Ion*). So already at this stage there is a blurring of rhapsode and *aoidos*.<sup>12</sup>

I summarise my argument so far: it is unlikely that Homer would gesticulate while voicing deictic pronouns in speeches. Scholars who claim this are mixing up *aoidoi* with rhapsodes; only the latter, no longer holding lyre and plectrum, had the opportunity to gesticulate. The numerous demonstrative pronouns in Homeric speech are not some kind of script or score for the original performance.

## 2. Gestures by characters

Let us now turn to the interpretation of demonstrative pronouns as referring to gestures of the characters. There are some passages that explicitly confirm this interpretation: example 3, where Athena says “ἀλλ’ ἄγε τοι δειξω ἰθάκης ἔδος”, or

(4) *Iliad* 5.870–2

δειξεν δ’ ἄμβροτον αἶμα καταρρέον ἐξ ὤτειλῆς,  
καί ῥ’ ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·  
“Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὐ νεμεσίζη ὄρων τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα;”

“and he [Ares] showed him the immortal blood dripping from his wound, and weeping spoke winged words to him:

‘Father Zeus, are you not angry at the sight of this violence?’”<sup>13</sup>

---

discusses the rhapsode, yet claims ‘...Homeric poetry seems to have been designed *from the first* to be acted. It demands impersonation; it demands skillful variations in tone, tempo, and dynamic; and there are some points, also, where it seems imperiously to exact from the speaker some form of physical gesture...’(my italics).

12 Note that Aristotle at *Poetics* 1462a6 explicitly and correctly connects gesturing with rhapsodes.

13 And cf. *Il.* 10.476–7. More in general, Homer often describes the nonverbal behaviour of his characters (smiling, scowling, taking someone’s hand, etc.), for which see Latener 1995.

Later narrators, too, sometimes explicitly note that characters gesticulate when they voice deictic pronouns, e.g.

(5) Herodotus *Histories* 5.49 (the Ionian Aristagoras: the Spartan king Cleomenes)

“Κατοίκηνται δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐχόμενοι ὡς ἐγὼ φράσω. Ἴώνων μὲν τῶνδε οἶδε Λυδοί, οἰκέοντές τε χώραν ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολυαργυρώτατοι ἔοντες” (δεικνύς δὲ ἔλεγε ταῦτα ἐς τῆς γῆς τὴν περίοδον τὴν ἐφέρετο ἐν τῷ πίνακι ἐντετυμημένην).

“They live close to each other as I will show. The Lydians here next to the Ionians there, inhabiting good land and being rich in silver.” (He spoke while pointing out those things at the map of the earth which he carried with him engraved on the tablet).<sup>14</sup>

Herodotus’ stress on Aristagoras’ act of pointing out the countries on a map highlights the latter’s rhetoric: the Ionian is using all available means to persuade his Spartan addressee to join in a revolt against the eastern oppressors.

Homeric characters making gestures is also obviously what Ameis-Hentze mean when they say ‘hinweisend’, as is evident from one of the few places where they are explicit:

(6) *Iliad* 5.214–16 (Pandarus: Aeneas)

“αὐτίκ’ ἔπειτ’ ἅπ’ ἐμεῖο κάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φῶς,  
εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ τὰδε τόξα φαεινῶ ἐν πυρὶ θείην  
χερσὶ διακλάσσας.”

“Then let some strange man right away cut my head from my body, if I do not snap this bow into pieces with my hands and throw it in the blazing fire.”

Ameis-Hentze: ‘den Bogen hier, nachdrücklich hinweisend, um bei *seiner* Versicherung gleichsam keinen zweifel wegen des Objekts zu lassen’ (my italics). As is clear from ‘seiner’, they take *Pandarus* to point at his bow. What they should have added is that we are only dealing with *the suggestion of a gesture* by *Pandarus*.<sup>15</sup> My own formulation, quoted earlier, is better than that of Ameis-Hentze (‘the frequent use of deictic pronouns, *which suggest gestures*, lends it an air of drama’), but for my commentary on *Iliad* 22 (ad 377–95) I have now chosen a very explicit formulation: ‘the deictic pronouns ... strewn over the speech *evoke the gestures which the narratees are to imagine Achilles making while*

14 Pelling 2007, 196, suggests that in his oral delivery Herodotus may have gesticulated. For an example from a modern novel, cf. Theodor Fontane, *Effi Briest*, p. 150 (Nach der Vorstellung aber sagte sie, während sie auf einen in der Nähe stehenden Stuhl mit hoher Lehne zuschritt: „Ich bitte sie nunmehr, gnädige Frau, die Bürden und Fährlichkeiten Ihres Amtes auf sich nehmen zu wollen. Denn von Fährlichkeiten – und sie wies auf das Sofa – würde sich in diesem Fall wohl sprechen lassen...“).

15 Similarly too brief or not explicit enough is Bakker 1999, 7, ad *Iliad* 3.177: ‘with οὗτος she [Helen] is actually pointing at the object of the reference, in the direct sense of “deixis.”’

he speaks'.<sup>16</sup> Thus a full, explicit and diachronically correct summing-up of the question of deictic pronouns and gestures in the Homeric epics would read: deictic pronouns evoke the gestures which the narratees are to imagine the *characters* making. When *rhapsodes* started to recite the Homeric poems, they could actually reproduce those gestures during their performance, unlike the *aidos* who had his hands full holding and playing his lyre.<sup>17</sup>

### 3. Double deixis

Taking leave of the question of gestures imaginatively or actually accompanying ὄδε and οὗτος I will go on to investigate how deixis in speeches functions. In other words, I want to return to the remark by Martin West at the end of his email: how does deixis work when the things being pointed at are not there? In order to answer this question I must first introduce some linguistic theory on deixis. One first important distinction, which was already made in antiquity, is that between the deictic and the anaphoric or, in modern terminology, the exophoric and the endophoric use of demonstrative pronouns.<sup>18</sup> In the sentence 'that house belongs to me', 'that' is deictic/exophoric and refers to an object in the world of speaker and addressee; in 'There is a beautiful house in Amsterdam. That house belongs to me', 'that' refers back to an earlier textual element and is anaphoric/endophoric. I am interested only in the deictic or exophoric use of demonstrative pronouns.<sup>19</sup>

Within this category of the deictic or exophoric use we can further distinguish, as Bühler does, between deixis *ad oculos* and deixis *am Phantasma*:

---

16 Interestingly enough, this has been correctly assessed by Bérard, who, as we have seen, also refers to gestures by characters: cf. e.g. on p. 5 'même *devant les yeux* du lecteur d'aujourd'hui, le geste [of Helen at *Il.* 3.200] suit le mot' (my italics).

17 Cf. Stanford (ad οὗτος in *Od.* 17.442): "'so" with an indicative gesture (presumably a repelling wave of the hand) as is often implied with such words in H. *It could be reproduced by a reciting rhapsodist.*' (my italics). Note that ad *Od.* 1.159 he makes the same mistake as Bérard and Boegehold: 'ταῦτα: probably with an indicative gesture (reproduced in recitation *by the Bard or later rhapsodist*') (my italics). For the possible objection that for the rhapsodes too the referents of the deictic pronouns 'are not there' (see West's point), see Diessel 1999, 95, who observes that even when the referents of demonstratives are physically absent (but do exist in the universe of discourse), speakers may point to them as if they were there.

18 This modern terminology derives from Halliday-Hasan 1976, 57–76.

19 It will be clear that it is not always easy to determine whether a demonstrative pronoun is deictic or anaphoric. Take for example τούτῳ at *Iliad* 4.415+417; this can be both deictic (Agamemnon is present at the dialogue between Diomedes and Sthenelus) and anaphoric (referring back to Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν at 413). Most clear-cut are deictic pronouns at the opening of speeches or conversations, when they simply cannot be anaphoric: e.g. *Il.* 19.8 ("τέκνον ἔμόν, τοῦτον μὲν ἔάσομεν"). For the combination of the exophoric and the endophoric, see Lyons 1983, 67.

whether a demonstrative pronoun refers to something that is visibly present in the context of speaker and addressee or something that is only mentally imagined by these interlocutors.<sup>20</sup> These two types of deixis pertain not only to deictic pronouns but also to personal pronouns and temporal or spatial markers. The deixis of a narrative text such as the Homeric epics is typically *am Phantasma*:<sup>21</sup> the temporal and spatial orientation (origo, base, anchorage) is not that of the narrator in the *hic et nunc* of narration, but that of the characters of the story in the past.<sup>22</sup> The situation has been aptly described by Latacz:

Diese narrative Epik ... baute ... auf dem Fundament ausschliesslich der Deixis am Phantasma auf, sie war ein einziges 'Stellt euch vor!'. Vom Parisurteil auf dem Ida über das Schiffslager in Aulis bis zur Topographie des Stadt- und Kampfgeländes in der Troas, vom Kyklopen bis zur Zauberin Kirke, von Zeus und Hera auf dem Wolkenlager bis zu Apollons Schlag gegen Patroklos, wurde ja im Epos unaufhörlich an die Imaginationskraft des Hörers appelliert. Mit der Errichtung Trojas (...) vor den geistigen Augen seines Publikums baute der epische Sänger bei jedem Vortrag aufs neue ein grosses wohlorganisiertes imaginäres Zeigfeld auf, mit 'oben' und 'unten' ..., mit 'links' und 'rechts' ..., ein Zeigfeld, in das sich jeder Hörer entsprechend seiner individuellen Rekonstruktionskraft hineinzusehen und hineinzutasten hatte, darin in nichts vom modernen Leser unterschieden.<sup>23</sup>

If the Homeric epics as a whole are a form of deixis *am Phantasma*, then how do we analyse the deixis in the speeches that are embedded in them? How does the ὄδ᾽ of example 1 function, where Homer tells his narratees that in the past, on the walls of Troy, Priam said to Helen 'who is this man?' The abundant linguistic literature on deixis is not very helpful in formulating an answer.<sup>24</sup>

My suggestion would be to analyse deictic pronouns in Homeric speeches in terms of double deixis: first and foremost there is deixis *ad oculos* on the level of the communication between the characters: Helen can see the man Priam is pointing out to her. For the narrator and his narratees, however, there is no

20 Bühler [1934] 1965, 123.

21 Deixis *am Phantasma* is a form of what Lyons 1977, 579, calls 'deictic projection': 'shifting the deictic center from the speaker in the concrete speech situation to a person in a different situation that is evoked by the ongoing discourse'; see also Levinson 1983, 64, and Diessel 1999, 95. I have found only one study on deixis *am Phantasma*, Sitta 1991, who notes on p. 5 that 'die Deixis am Phantasma jedoch nach wie vor ein Mauerblümchendasein [führt]'.  
 22 For this point see de Jong [1987] 2004, 234–6 (on ἦματι τῶδ᾽ε and ἦματι κείνῳ).

23 Latacz 1985, 69.

24 The chapter 'Deixis in Redewiedergaben' in Sitta 1991 does not provide an answer. Sennholz 1985, 232–3 suggests analysing deixis in speeches in novels as a form of 'deictic projection', thereby leaving unaddressed the point that a novel is itself a form of deictic projection (and hence the question of how these two projections relate to each other).



more than a deixis *am Phantasma*, since they do not actually see the object or person referred to. My analysis closely resembles that of Latacz:

Es [das imaginäre Zeigfeld] schloss den Nachvollzug sogar mehrerer übereinandergetürmter Fiktionsschichten ein—etwa wenn der Sänger erzählt, wie Odysseus erzählt, wie der Kyklop erzählt, wie Telemos erzählt, dass einst ein Odysseus den Kyklopen blenden werde (Od. 9, 507–512) —, und es schloss damit zugleich innerhalb dieser je sekundären, tertiären usw. Fiktionsschicht auch wieder ein quasi-konkretes Hinzeigen fiktiver Figuren auf andere fiktive Figuren mittels sprachlich durch Zeigewörter signalisierter fiktiver Zeigegesten ein (also eine ‘sekundäre’, ‘tertiäre’ usw. Demonstratio *ad oculos*, z.B.: der Sänger imaginiert, wie Diomedes seinen Gefährten den Ares zeigt, der Hektor begleitet: καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κείνος Ἄρης “auch jetzt ist wieder *jener Ares dort* bei ihm”, Il. 5, 604).<sup>25</sup>

In the next section I will take a closer look at how double deixis actually works: how can narratees understand pronouns which refer to objects or persons which they cannot see but which they have to imagine? How can they understand in terms of deixis *am Phantasma* what for the characters is deixis *ad oculos*? How can they process, as Latacz calls it, ‘sekundäre’ or ‘tertiäre’ Demonstratio *ad oculos*?

#### 4. Double deixis in practice

In discussing the function of ὅδε and οὗτος within the fabric of Homer’s narrative I will not go into the difference between these two demonstratives.<sup>26</sup> What I am interested in here is the general question as to how narratees can tell what demonstrative pronouns refer to. The thesis I will defend is that the Homeric narrator virtually always takes care to provide his narratees with the information needed to understand and process the deictic pronouns in a speech, whether in the direct or in the larger context. I will argue my case by

25 Latacz 1985, 70. Note his correct ‘fiktive Zeigegesten’ and ‘der Sänger *imaginiert*, wie Diomedes ... zeigt’ (my italics).

26 For general discussions, see e.g. Martin Lopez 1994, Manolessou 2001, 130–9; for a discussion of these deictic pronouns in Homer, see Magnien 1922, and in Sophoclean drama Ruijgh 2006. Most scholars take ὅδε as proximal and οὗτος as distal; from this basic opposition all other uses (‘I’ versus ‘you’; ‘new’ versus ‘given’; ‘emotionally close’ versus ‘pejorative’) can be derived. The Homeric corpus backs up this analysis, but there are some problematic instances, e.g. Il. 17.418 and 421, where the Greeks refer to Patroclus with τοῦτον, the Trojans with τῷδε, while the two parties are at exactly the same distance from him (cf. 389–97); Od. 15.119 (ἔθέλω τόδ’ ὀπάσσαι) and 125 (δῶρον...τοῦτο δίδωμι), where Menelaus and Helen give presents to Telemachus under identical circumstances. Could metre play a role here? See also note 29.

means of a number of examples, which proceed from the simple to the more complex and even problematic.<sup>27</sup>

(7) *Iliad* 14.214–20

Ἥ, καὶ ἀπὸ στήθεσφιν ἐλύσατο κεστὸν ἱμάντα ...  
τόν ῥά οἱ ἔμβαλε χερσὶν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·  
“τῇ νῦν, **τοῦτον ἱμάντα** τεῶ ἔγκάθθεο κόλπῳ, ...”

So she [Aphrodite] spoke, and untied from her breasts the embroidered band...  
She put it in her [Hera's] hands and said:  
“Here now, take that embroidered band and put it away in the bosom of your robe...”

This is a straightforward example: for the characters *τοῦτον ἱμάντα* refers to a concrete referent present in the speech situation. Since the narrator has introduced the prop of the embroidered band just before the speech, it is also clear to the narratees what Aphrodite is talking about.

A somewhat larger context plays a role in:

(8) *Iliad* 5.159–75

Ἔνθ' υἷας Πριάμοιο δύω λάβε Δαρδανίδαο  
εἰν ἐνὶ δίφρῳ ἐόντας, ...  
ὥς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐξ ἵππων Τυδέος υἱὸς  
βῆσε...  
Τὸν δ' ἴδεν Αἰνεΐας ἀλαπάζοντα στίχας ἀνδρῶν, ...  
“ἀλλ' ἄγε **τῷδ'** ἔφες **ἀνδρὶ** βέλος, Διὶ χεῖρας ἀνασχῶν,  
ὅς τις **ὄδε** κρατεῖ καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε  
Τρώας, ...”

There he [Diomedes] took two sons of Priam, the son of Dardanus,  
who were standing on one and the same chariot...  
So Tydeus' son sent the two from their chariot...  
And Aeneas saw him working havoc in the ranks of men (and said to Pandarus):  
“Come then, raise your hands in prayer to Zeus, and send an arrow at this man,  
whoever it is who is holding the field and has done much damage to the Trojans,  
...”

For the characters *τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ* and *ὄδε* are clear examples of deixis *ad oculos*: Aeneas has seen a man ‘working havoc in the ranks of men’ and in his speech he points him out (and describes him) to Pandarus.<sup>28</sup> The narratees also know who ‘this man’ is because of the anaphoric pronoun *τὸν* in 172, which refers

27 I have made use of subdivisions of exophoric deictic pronouns in Fillmore 1997, 62–3, Levinson 1983, 65–8, and Diessel 1999, 94–5. Cf. also Bonifazi 2004 on deictic pronouns in Pindar.

28 Fillmore 1997, 62, calls this gestural deixis: ‘By the gestural use of a deictic expression I mean that use by which it can be properly interpreted only by somebody who is monitoring some physical object of the communication situation’.

back to the subject of the actions recounted in lines 159–65. Indeed, they know what Aeneas does not know, viz. that the man is Diomedes.

In the same way, Athena's speech at *Od.* 13.344–51, example 3 above, was carefully prepared for by the narrator some two hundred lines earlier:

(9) *Odyssey* 13.96–112

Φόρκυνος δέ τις ἔστι λιμῆν, ἀλίιοιο γέροντος,...  
 αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος τανύφυλλος ἐλαίη,  
 ἀγγόθι δ' αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἠεροειδές,  
 ἱρὸν Νυμφάων...

There is a harbour called after Phorcys, the old man of the sea,...  
 And at the head of the harbour there is a long-leaved olive-tree,  
 and near it a lovely misty cave,  
 sacred to the nymphs...

Cf. in Athena's speech:

“Φόρκυνος μὲν ὄδ' ἔστι λιμῆν, ἀλίιοιο γέροντος,  
 ἦδε δ' ἐπὶ κρατὸς λιμένος τανύφυλλος ἐλαίη...  
 τοῦτο δέ τοι σπέος εὐρὺ κατηρεφές...”

As a result of this careful preparation, not only Athena's addressee, Odysseus, but also the narratees can recognise the landmarks given by the goddess.

(10) *Iliad* 3.191–2

Δεύτερον αὐτ' Ὀδυσῆα ἰδὼν ἐρέειν' ὁ γεραίος·  
 “εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὅς τις ὄδ' ἔστί.”

This example, which I earlier quoted as example 1, illustrates how anxious the Homeric narrator is to inform his narratees, so that they will not be puzzled. To that end, he is even prepared to be slightly illogical: Priam sees Odysseus and yet he asks who ‘this man’ is. The proper name ‘Odysseus’ instead of the more logical ‘another man’ is inserted for the benefit of the narratees. The narrator wants them to understand who Priam is referring to when he describes a man who is short but broad-shouldered and who patrols the ranks of his troops like a ram ranging through a flock of sheep.<sup>29</sup>

29 This passage, where we find the sequence ‘proper name – reference with deictic ὄδε – reference with (anaphorical) οὗτος’, conforms to the prototypical topic chain in narrative texts as described by linguists: 1) priming (bringing the referent within the mental horizon of the addressee, often via a proper name), 2) focussing (introducing the referent as an actively involved participant, often via a proximal demonstrative), 3) topicalizing (maintaining the referent as given topic, often via an anaphoric pronoun); see Kroon 2009, who discusses this phenomenon in Latin narrative texts. Cf also *Od.* 21.11–41 (priming of Odysseus' bow) – 153 (τόδε τόξον) – 170 (τούτο...τόξον); *Od.* 22.45 (Ὀδυσσεύς) – 70 (ἀνήρ ὄδε) – 78 (οὗτος ἀνήρ).

(11) *Iliad* 6.328–9 (Hector: Paris)

“σέο δ’ εἶνεκ’ ἀϋτή τε πτόλεμός τε  
**ἄστν τόδ’** ἀμφιδέδηε.”

“because of you the clamour of war  
 is blazing around this city.”

For the characters ἄστν τόδ’ is an instance of deixis *ad oculos*, more in particular of what Fillmore has called the symbolic use:<sup>30</sup> when Hector says ‘this city’, he is not referring to something which is immediately visible in the speech situation; his addressee Paris, however, understands which city he is referring to. The same applies to the narratees: they too know, on account of the larger context of the speech—the *Iliad* as a whole—that Hector is referring to Troy.

(12) *Odyssey* 16.372–3 (Antinous: other suitors)

“οὐ γὰρ οἶω  
 τούτου γε ζώνοντος ἀνύσσεσθαι **τάδε ἔργα.**”

“For I do not think that  
 as long as that youth [Telemachus] is alive these things will be accomplished.”

Here we have a demonstrative pronoun with an abstract referent. The suitors have just found out that the ambush they set for Telemachus has failed and that the youth has made it home safely. Antinous suggests a new scheme to kill him. For the suitors **τάδε ἔργα** can be nothing else but the thing that has occupied their minds for three years now, viz. their wooing of Penelope. The narratees will likewise arrive at this interpretation on the basis of their knowledge of the *Odyssey* so far, although, to be on the safe side, some commentators provide a note.<sup>31</sup>

(13) *Odyssey* 8.403–406 (the Phaeacian youth Euryalus: Alcinous)

“δώσω οἱ **τόδ’ ἄορ** παγχάλκεον, ᾧ ἐπι κώπη  
 ἀργυρέη, κολεόν δὲ νεοπρίστου ἐλέφαντος  
 ἀμφιδεδίγηται· πολέος δέ οἱ ἄξιον ἔσται.”  
 ὣς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον...

“I will give him [Odysseus] this bronze sword, with a silver hilt  
 and a scabbard of new-sawn ivory  
 around it. It will be a possession of great value to him.”  
 Having so spoken he placed the silver-studded sword in his hand...

In this passage the narrator, by exception, had *not* introduced the prop referred to in the speech beforehand. But in a context where Alcinous refers to the fact

30 Fillmore 1997, 63: ‘by the symbolic use of a deictic expression I mean that use whose interpretation involves merely knowing certain aspects of the speech communication situation, whether this knowledge comes by current perception or not’.

31 Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1928 ‘dieses Vorhaben, die Werbung um Penelope’; Stanford 1958 “‘our business here’, i.e. their wooing of Penelope”.

that Euryalus must appease the guest (Odysseus) with words and a gift (396–7), the narratees will have no difficulty in mentally processing the reference to a sword. Indeed, this order of presentation is quite effective, in that it suggests the speed at which Euryalus is eager to make amends. While the other Phaeacians send heralds to fetch gifts from their homes (398–9), he gives his own, costly sword *on the spot*.<sup>32</sup>

The situation is slightly more complicated at another place where a prop is not introduced beforehand:

(14) *Iliad* 1.234–9+245–6

“ναὶ μὰ **τόδε σκῆπτρον**, τὸ μὲν οὐ ποτε φύλλα καὶ ὄζους  
φύσει, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα τομῆν ἐν ὄρεσσι λέλοιπεν,  
οὐδ’ ἀναθηλήσει· περὶ γὰρ ῥά ἐ χαλκὸς ἔλεψε  
φύλλά τε καὶ φλοῖόν· νῦν αὖτέ μιν υἱὲς Ἀχαιῶν  
ἐν παλάμῃσιν φορέουσι δικασπόλοι, οἳ τε θέμιστας  
πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται.”

...

ᾠς φάτο Πηλεΐδης, ποτὶ δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ  
χρυσείῃσιν ἦλοισι πεπαρμένον, ἔζετο δ’ αὐτός·

“By this sceptre, which will never grow leaves and  
branches, ever since it left its stump in the mountains,  
nor will sprout again. For the bronze stripped  
its leaves and bark all round. Now the judgement-giving sons of the Achaeans  
carry it in their hands, those who guard  
justice given by Zeus.”

...

Thus spoke Peleus’ son, and he threw the sceptre,  
studded with golden nails, against the ground, and himself sat down.

What can the narratees make of Achilles’ unannounced reference to a sceptre? The discussion by Martin Schmidt in the *Lfgre* (s.v., 2ca) is worth quoting in full:

Dass bei Hom. Sitte zugrundeliegt, wonach in öffentl. Versammlungen das Zepter von den Herolden dem gereicht wird, der damit das Wort erhält (...), ist mögl., aber nicht eindeutig. Contra: σ. nur bei wenigen Rednern erwähnt (...), noch seltener Herold, der σ. überreicht, nie Wiedergabe od. Rückgabe an Herold. Pro: auch wenn bei typ. Szenen Selbstverständliches oft übergangen wird (...), das Zepter nur bei “remarks of peculiar seriousness and importance”(...) erwähnt wird, erklärt die Annahme einer solchen Sitte die Verwendung von Zepter in Reden am besten (...). A 234 (...), nichts dazu, ob Ach. das σ. seit Beginn seiner Rede (nach-

32 Another example is *Odyssey* 10.287+302–6, where Hermes first refers to *τόδε φάρμακον ἐσθλόν*, which is then described by the narrator Odysseus after his speech. The order may be due to the fact that Odysseus is telling according to his experiencing focalization: he describes the herb at the moment when the god reveals to him its nature.

dem er das Schwert in die Schiede gesteckt hat V. 220) in der Hand hält (...) od. es sich für den Eid nahm bzw. von Herold geben liess; auch nichts dazu, ob es sein σ. ist (...) od. e.m. Herold gehört.

The length of this discussion is an indication of what happens when the Homeric narrator leaves out his customary introduction. The sudden reference to the sceptre and Achilles' lengthy description of it do, however, enhance the impact of his solemn prediction (the Greeks will come to miss him dearly, as surely as the sceptre will never sprout leaves again) and —as in the previous example— the order is highly effective in terms of storytelling.

I will end with a passage where a deictic pronoun has presented genuine interpretative problems:

(15) *Iliad* 6.321–336

τὸν δ' εὖρ' ἐν θαλάμῳ περικαλλέα τεύχε' ἔποντα,  
ἀσπίδα καὶ θώρηκα, καὶ ἀγκύλα τὸς' ἀφώντα·  
Ἀργεῖη δ' Ἑλένη μετ' ἄρα δμῶησι γυναιξίν  
ἦστο...

τὸν δ' Ἔκτωρ νείκεσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι·  
“δαίμονι, οὐ μὲν καλὰ **χόλον τόνδ'** ἐνθεο θυμῷ,  
λαοὶ μὲν φθινύθουσι περὶ πτόλιν αἰπύ τε τεῖχος  
μαρνάμενοι· σέο δ' εἶνεκ' αὐτὴ τε πτόλεμός τε  
ἄστυ τόδ' ἀμφιδέδηε· ...”

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής·  
“Ἔκτορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἴσαν,  
τοῦνεκά τοι ἐρέω· σὺ δὲ σύνθεο καὶ μευ ἄκουσον·  
οὗ τοι ἐγὼ Τρώων τόσσον χόλω οὐδὲ νεμέσσι  
ἦμην ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ' ἄχει προτραπέσθαι.”

Him [Paris] he found in his bedroom, turning over his exquisite armour,  
his shield and corselet, and fingering his curved bow.

And Argive Helen was sitting among her servant-women ...

When Hector saw him, he criticized him with reproachful words:

“Strange man, not appropriately have you conceived this anger in your heart.

The people are dying, fighting around the city and steep wall.

Because of you the clamour of war

is blazing around this city.”

Godlike Alexander spoke to him in reply:

“Hector, since you deservedly and not undeservedly criticise me,

I will answer, and you give heed and listen to me.

It is not so much because of anger or resentment at the Trojans

that I am sitting in my bedroom, but I wanted to turn myself headlong to grief.”

What is Hector referring to when he talks about *χόλον τόνδ'*? Nowhere has the narrator told the narratees that Paris is angry, and this question has puzzled

critics from antiquity onwards.<sup>33</sup> Let us start by examining Paris' anger more closely. Most scholars agree that Hector is sincere here and reject the suggestion, supported e.g. by Eustathius and Kirk, that rather than mentioning cowardice or slackness he *assumes* anger on the part of Paris, so as not to offend him. This suggestion is precluded by the manner in which Hector's speech is introduced (νείκεσεν) and appreciated by Paris (ἐπεὶ με κατ' αἴσων ἐνείκεσας). There is also near consensus that we should take χόλον to mean 'you have conceived anger *against* the Trojans' rather than 'you have taken to heart the anger *of* the Trojans against you', though the two interpretations are closely related: Paris can be expected to be angry at the Trojans because he resents their indignation against him (which we hear about at 3.454; 6.524–5; and 7.390).

But what makes Hector refer to a χόλος of Paris precisely at this moment? In other words, what is the force of τόνδ'? Leaf, typically, comes up with an analytical solution: 'τόνδ' implies that some particular manifestation of Trojan resentment was immediately present to Hector and Paris'. Hence he assumes that a scene like 7.345–79, in which the Trojan Antenor suggests that Paris give Helen back, must originally have preceded the fraternal dialogue. Kirk calls the idea that 'Emphatic τόνδ' might seem to suggest a more specific cause for resentment, like Antenor's proposal at 7.347–53' 'improbable' (without indicating why) but leaves τόνδ' unexplained.

Let us once more adopt the rule of thumb set out in this paper and comb out the direct and larger contexts in search of clues on how to understand χόλον τόνδ'. Hector finds Paris in his bedroom, turning over his armour in the company of his wife and her maids. Paris' surroundings and actions are focalized by Hector, as witness the marker εὔρ'. It seems to be these perceptions—Paris finding himself in his bedroom instead of on the battlefield, together with his wife rather than his fellow-warriors, and turning over his weapons rather than using them<sup>34</sup>—which lead Hector to conclude that Paris is angry. He may have thought of that hero of former times Meleager, who out of anger (χόλος: 9.553, 565, cf. 525) withdrew from the battle, and lay in his bedroom (582, 588), together with his wife (556). The narratees may also recall the example of Achilles, who angrily (χωόμενον/ς: 1.429; 2.689) sits (1.349) or lies (2.688, 772) inactively in his tent, in the company of his best friend Patroclus, and plays the lyre (9.186–9) rather than wielding his spear. In Hector's view, Paris' location and behaviour clearly suggest heroic anger (and

33 For doxography see Heitsch [1967] 2001, and Kirk 1990 and Stoevesandt 2009 ad 6.326, to which add Hijmans 1975.

34 Here I disagree with Hijmans 1975, 178, Kirk 1990, ad 6.321–4 and Stoevesandt 2009, ad 6.321–2, who take ἐποντα and ἀφώντα to imply that Paris is preparing to return to battle, and concur with Leaf 1900–1902, ad 6.321: 'the "dandy" Paris is turning over and admiring his fine armour with the same affection which Odysseus shews to his old bow' (*Od.* 21.393).

concomitant inactivity), an interpretation which the narratees can understand.<sup>35</sup> The force of *χόλον τόνδ'* is best captured by 'this anger which I assume on the basis of what I see'.<sup>36</sup>

As plausible as Hector's interpretation may be, it is not the right one. Paris himself rejects it, maintaining that he is not angry at the Trojans but sad (obviously because he has lost his duel with Menelaus). The narratees know that this explanation is still far from the truth: Paris finds himself in his bedroom because Aphrodite, having saved him from certain death at the hands of Menelaus, placed him there, and because he took the initiative, cheering himself up—and appeasing a furious Helen—by making love to her.

## 5. Conclusion. Deictic pronouns and Homeric realism

This example brings me to the end of my paper. I have argued that deictic pronouns in Homeric speeches have a double function: they function as deixis *ad oculos* for the characters, as deixis *am Phantasma* for the narratees. The narratees must imagine that the characters are gesturing and pointing to places and characters which, again, they have to imagine. In the original performance situation, an *aoidos* like Homer, holding and playing the phorminx, could not reproduce those gestures, but later rhapsodes could. But even for rhapsodes and their audience the referents of the deictic pronouns remain a product of their *Phantasma* or imagination. In order to enable his narratees (and in their wake all his listeners and readers) to process this act of imagination, the narrator usually takes care to introduce and describe the objects or persons to be referred to in speeches beforehand, in the directly preceding context, or directly after the speech. Occasionally he trusts his narratees to make use of the context of the narrative as a whole.

I would like to conclude by asking one final question: why does Homer insert so many deictic pronouns in his speeches? One explanation, which I hint at in my narratological commentary (cf. quotation in section 1: 'the frequent use of deictic pronouns, which suggest gestures, *lends it an air of drama*'), is to

35 Schadewaldt 1959, 227, Fenik 1968, 122, and Stoevesandt 2009, ad 326, have all connected Paris' anger to that of Meleager and Achilles, without, however, explaining *τόνδ'* in connection with Hector's focalization of Paris' whereabouts and activities.

36 Ameis-Hentze 1940, ad 326 ('den Groll hier, der sich jetzt in deinem Fernbleiben vom Kampfe zeigt') and O'Sullivan in the *LfgRE* s.v. 1bβbb ('anger of Paris at Tro. (assumed by Hector [app. on basis of Paris' absence from battle]...') are close but not specific enough. Stoevesandt 2009, ad 326, reverses the order: '**diesen Grimm da**; sc. Grimm gegenüber den Troianern als Grund für Paris' Fernbleiben vom Kampf'. Hijmans 1975, 180, gives the right translation ('that anger of yours that I apprehend') but the wrong interpretation (Hector, as often, is jumping to the wrong conclusion and misinterpreting Paris' activities, which he takes as signs of angry inactivity, while his brother is in fact preparing to return to battle).



connect the frequent use of deictic pronouns to the theatrical quality of the Homeric epics, which has often been remarked upon, first by Plato, who called Homer ‘the first of the tragedians’ (*Republic* 607a). This suggestion is backed up by a comparison of the number of deictic pronouns in epic and drama (see the appendix). Homer aims at *mimesis*, at making his characters speak like real persons. A passage like *Il.* 1.275–84 reads like a dramatic script: Nestor first addresses Agamemnon and Achilles together as ‘you’ (257–74), and then turns to each separately: ‘You [Agamemnon], powerful man though you are, do not take away the girl from this man (τόνδ’ = Achilles) ... and you, Achilles, do not want to quarrel with the king... As truly as you are stronger and a divine mother bore you, this man (ᾄδε = Agamemnon) is more powerful and rules over more men.’ Nestor first looks at Agamemnon and points to Achilles; then he turns to Achilles, looks at him with a penetrating gaze and points to Agamemnon.

But I believe we can go one step further, by moving to a higher or more general level of Homeric literary criticism. Homer’s narrative art is rightly celebrated for what has been variously referred to as *energeia/enargeia*, graphicness (*Anschaulichkeit*), and realism.<sup>37</sup> He places the past before the eyes of his narratees (πρὸ ὀμμάτων ποιεῖν: Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1410b27–36), or as Ford puts it:

The first words of each poem effect this appearance [of the past] by calling on the Muses: because we are granted their perspective, when the great speeches are given we seem to be on the edge of the assembly, and when the heroic actions are performed we seem to be present as onlookers. Though epic is by definition poetry of the past, it is poetry that claims to transport us to an *au dela*, not a beyond buried in the vault of recollection but a place as present as our own, though elsewhere.<sup>38</sup>

It is important that this *energeia/enargeia* is not merely a matter of aesthetic principle, but also serves Homer’s profound interest in narrative authority. In the Homeric epics, graphicness means credibility, as is clear from the narrator’s emphatic enlisting of the Muses, eyewitnesses to world history (*Il.* 2.485), and from the compliment that Odysseus pays the Phaeacian singer Demodocus: ‘I congratulate you above all mortal men...You sing with such truth about the fortunes of the Greeks, all they did and suffered and all the toils they went

---

37 See Ford 1992, 49–56, Bakker 1993, and de Jong 2005. Most scholars use *energeia* in connection with Homer, but it seems better to talk in terms of *enargeia*: he shows things in a state of actuality (as opposed to a mere potentiality). Homer devotes far less attention to the visual appearance of persons and things than to their working, dynamics, or effect (we do not know what Helen or Penelope looked like but we do hear about their effect on men; we hear more about the history of objects than about their appearance). See Otto 2009, esp. 71–6 and Uhlmann-Radke 2009.

38 Ford 1992, 55.

through, *as if you were there yourself or have heard from one who was* (*Od.* 8.487–91).

The use of deictic pronouns clearly should be connected to this striving for realism by the Homeric narrator. Again and again the narratees are invited to activate their fantasy and mentally to imagine the events told. A final, highly cinematographic example will serve to illustrate this. The suitors have just heard that Telemachus has arrived home safely and they decide to send a ship with men to warn the suitors lying in an ambush that they can return home:

(16) *Od.* 16.349–55

“οἱ κε τάχιστα  
**κείνοις**’ ἀγγείλωσι θεῶς οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι.”  
 οὐ πῶ πάν εἴρηθ’, ὅτ’ ἄρ’ Ἀμφινόμος ἴδε νῆα,  
 στρεφθεῖς ἐκ χώρης, λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντός,  
 ἰστία τε στέλλοντας ἐρετμά τε χερσὶν ἔχοντας.  
 ἦδ’ οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνεεν οἷσ’ ἐτάροισι·  
 “μή τιν’ ἔτ’ ἀγγελίην ὀτρύνομεν· **οἶδε** γὰρ ἔνδον.”

“”who could let those over there  
 know that they should come home quickly.”  
 He had not finished speaking when Amphinomos,  
 turning round from his seat, saw the ship within the deep harbour,  
 the men taking in the sails and holding the oars in their hands.  
 He laughed out heartily and said among his companions:  
 “No need to send a message. For here they are inside already.”

The order of the deictic pronouns (first κείνοις, then οἶδε) helps us to visualise the scene, the return of the ship with suitors during the time that the other suitors on Ithaca are talking. The technique will later be exploited, e.g. by:

(17) Plato, *Phaedrus* 229 A–230 B

{ΦΑΙ.} Ὅραξ οὖν **ἐκείνην** τὴν ὑψηλοτάτην πλάτανον; {ΣΩ.} Τί μήν;  
 {ΦΑΙ.} Ἐκεῖ σκιά τ’ ἐστὶν καὶ πνεῦμα μέτριον, καὶ πόα καθίζεσθαι ἢ ἂν  
 βουλώμεθα κατακλινῆναι. {ΣΩ.} Προάγοις ἄν. ... {ΣΩ.} ἄτάρ, ὦ ἑταῖρε,  
 μεταξὺ τῶν λόγων, ἄρ’ οὐ **τόδε** ἦν τὸ δένδρον ἐφ’ ὅπερ ἦγες ἡμᾶς; {ΦΑΙ.} Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν αὐτό.

{Phaedrus} Do you see that very tall plane tree there? {Socrates} What about it?  
 {Phae.} There is shade there and some breeze and grass to sit on or, if we want, to  
 lie down on. {So.} Please lead the way. ... {So.} But, my friend, to interrupt our  
 conversation, wasn’t this the tree to which you were leading us? {Phae.} Yes, that  
 is exactly the one (I was talking about).

Here the deictic pronouns ἐκείνην and τόδε suggest the moving of Socrates and Phaedrus and their arrival at the *locus amoenus* which will be the setting of their dialogue.

The constant use of deictic pronouns in Homeric speech, which refer to objects and persons that are visible to the characters and hence exist, serves to

increase the narratees' belief in the existence of those objects and persons. In other words, the *ad oculos* status of the deictic pronouns helps to make the actual *am Phantasma* status of the epics less conspicuous.<sup>39</sup>

## Appendix

### 1. ὄδε and οὔτος in Homer<sup>40</sup>

	ὄδε		οὔτος	
	speech	narrator-text	speech	narrator-text
<i>Iliad</i>	182	3	153	11
<i>Odyssey</i>	277	0	160	7

### 2. occurrences in 500 lines

	total	ὄδε	οὔτος
<i>Iliad</i>	23	13	10
<i>Odyssey</i>	42	16	26
<i>S. Ajax</i>	77	52	25
<i>Ap. R. Argonautica</i>	23	21	2

## Bibliographie

- Ameis, K.F. / Hentze, C., *Homers Ilias IV–VI* (Leipzig-Berlin 1940).  
 Ameis, K.F. / Hentze, C. / Cauer, P. *Homers Odyssee XIII–XVIII* (Leipzig-Berlin 1928).  
 Bakker, E.J., *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca-London 1993).  
 —, „Homeric HOUTOS and the Poetics of Deixis“, *CP* 94 (1999) 1–19.  
 Bérard, V., „Le geste de l'aède et le texte homérique“, *REG* 31 (1918) 1–38.

<sup>39</sup> I wish to thank audiences in Amsterdam and Hamburg for commenting on this paper, S. R. van der Mije and A. Rijksbaron for reading through a written version, and Mrs. B. Fasting for correcting my English.

<sup>40</sup> In compiling these figures I made use of the electronic Chicago Homer, which makes it possible to search for narrative or speech. I differ from this—very useful—program in considering the Apologue speech and rejecting the reading τόνδε δ' at *Il.* 24.17.

- Boegehold, A.L., *When a Gesture Was Expected: Selection of Examples from Archaic and Classical Greek Literature* (Princeton 1999).
- Bonifazi, A., „Communication in Pindar’s Deictic Acts“, *Arethusa* 37 (2004) 391–414.
- , „Discourse Cohesion through Third-Person Pronouns. The Case of κείνος and αὐτός in Homer“, in S. Bakker, G. Wakker (eds.) *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden-Boston 2009) 1–19.
- Brugmann, K., *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen. Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Leipzig 1904).
- Bühler, K., *Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, (Stuttgart <sup>2</sup>1965, first edition from 1934).
- Danek, G. / Hagel, S., „Homer-Singen“, *Wiener Humanistische Blätter* 37 (1995) 5–20.
- Diessel, H., *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam 1999).
- Fenik, B., *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad. Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description* (Wiesbaden 1968).
- Fillmore, C.J., *Lectures on Deixis* (Stanford <sup>2</sup>1997, first edition 1971).
- Ford, A., *Homer. The Poetry of the Past* (Princeton 1992).
- Halliday, M.A.K. / Hasan, R., *Cohesion in English* (London 1976).
- Heitsch, E., „Der Zorn des Paris. Zur Deutungsgeschichte eines homerischen Zetemasma“, in *Gesammelte Schriften I* (München-Leipzig 2001) 178–209 (original from 1967).
- Herington, J., *Poetry into Drama. Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Los Angeles-London 1985).
- Hijmans, B.L., „Alexandros and his Grief“, *GB* 3 (1975) 177–89.
- de Jong, I.J.F., *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (London <sup>2</sup>2004, first edition from 1987).
- , *A Narratological Commentary to the Odyssey* (Cambridge 2001).
- , „Convention versus Realism in the Homeric Epics“, *Mnemosyne* 58 (2005) 1–22.
- , *Homer Iliad XXII* (Cambridge 2012).
- Kirk, G., *The Iliad: A Commentary, II, Books 5–8* (Cambridge 1990).
- Kroon, C.H.M., „Text Structure and Referential Choice in Narrative. The Anaphoric Use of the Latin Demonstrative *ille*“, *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 23 (2009) 115–131.
- Kühner, R. / Gerth, B., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache II*, 1 (Hannover-Leipzig <sup>3</sup>1898).
- Latacz, J., „Realität und Imagination. Eine neue Lyrik-Theorie und Sapphos *fainetai moi kēnos*-Lied“, *MH* 42 (1985) 67–94.
- Lateiner, D., *Sardonic Smile. Nonverbal Behaviour in Homeric Epic* (Ann Arbor 1995).
- Leaf, W., *The Iliad I, I–XII* (London <sup>2</sup>1900–2).
- Levinson, S.C., *Pragmatics* (Cambridge 1983).
- Lyons, J., *Semantics 2* (Cambridge 1977).
- Maas, M. / McIntosh Snyder, J., *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven 1989).
- Magnien, V., „L’emploi des démonstratifs chez Homère“, *BSL* 23 (1922) 156–83.

- Manolessou, I., „The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek“, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2 (2001) 119–48.
- Martín López, I., „Deixis frente a anafora en griego antiguo“, *Minerva* 8 (1994) 11–41.
- Otto, N., *Enargeia. Untersuchung zur Charakteristik Alexandrinischer Dichtung* (Stuttgart 2009).
- Pelling, C.B.R., „Aristagoras (5.49–55, 97)“, in E. Irwin, E. Greenwood (eds.), *Reading Herodotus. A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus Histories* (Cambridge 2007) 179–201.
- Ruijgh, C.J., „The use of the demonstratives ὄδε, οὗτος, and (ἐ)κεῖνος in Sophocles“, in I.J.F. de Jong, A. Rijksbaron (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek language. Aspects of Diction, Syntax, and Pragmatics* (Leiden 2006) 151–61.
- Schadewaldt, W., *Von Homers Welt und Werk. Aufsätze und Auslegungen zur homerischen Frage* (Stuttgart 31959).
- Sennholz, K., *Grundzüge der Deixis* (Bochum 1985).
- Sitta, G., *Deixis am Phantasma. Versuch einer Neubestimmung* (Bochum 1991).
- Stanford, W.B., *The Odyssey of Homer* (Hampshire-London 21958).
- Stoevesandt, M., *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar IV, Sechster Gesang (Z)* (Berlin-New York 2009).
- Uhlmann-Radke, G., „Über eine vergessene Form der Anschaulichkeit in der Griechischen Dichtung“, *Antike und Abendland* 55 (2009) 1–61.
- Wackernagel, J., *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch, und Deutsch*, II (Basel 1924).
- West, M.L., „The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music“, *JHS* 101(1981) 113–29.

