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The Semantics of Oikos and its Semantic Field in the Odyssey

THE SEMANTIC field corresponding to “to live”, “place in which one lives”, “home” is a complex one in Homer—I refer specifically here to the Odyssey. Along with general concepts, it covers others related to the precise place in which one lives and also at times refers to those who live in this space, at others to family belongings. There are terms which refer to both the general and specific meaning; and there are fundamentally specific terms. We shall here be concerned with those terms which occupy this vast semantic spectrum: oikoiz above all; but we shall also discuss specific terms related to the precise place in which one lives (δόμος and δομω) above all. We leave aside terms referring to the diverse rooms or installations of the house and others with a basically human or economic value. That is, we centre on oikoiz and its family and on certain terms which serve as contrast to same.

The family of oikoiz, so prolific in later Greek, takes up a very restricted space in the Odyssey (and in the Iliad). Following Dunbar’s concordance (I have followed the re-edition by Olims, Hildesheim 1971), it can be reduced to the following:

a) The term oikato, that is, the fossilized accusative of oikos with the lative particle -ôs. It is always governed by verbs of movement (έγω, ἐδέχομαι, ἐξέχω, ἐλέει, ἑλάθει, ἐπάλλει, ἐκβάλλει, ἐκβάλει) νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί, νεκροί). Its frequency is high: the Odyssey offers 52 examples (including those with elision, oikado). It most often appears in formulae that are repeated.

b) The term oikos. Statistics for this are as follows: Acc. sg. oikos 51; idem with -ôs 20; Dat.-Loc. oikos 3, oikos 5, oikos (generally with év, én) 50; G. sg. oikos 3; oikos 10; Acc. pl. oikos 3; G. pl. oikos 1. The rareness of the pl. should be noted: of the examples given, those of the Acc. are numerative and the G. one is also this in all probability (ἐν ἐν νέοις oikos φόρον καὶ ὀπτοῦν ἐκατον).
The same goes for a N. pl. in P. 738); the D. pl. is lacking in both
the Od. and II.

c) The term οἶκος, of which there are 11 examples, is only once
a N. pl. and the rest an Acc. pl. The sg. and the other cases are
missing; it is either a subject (μ. οῖκος καὶ γρατίς εἰς) or else, in
almost all other instances, a direct object (with δῆμοις, ἔμοι, νόμοι,
ναοῖς, οικίσκοι), or otherwise it is finally an Acc. after διὰ (§ 154 διὰ οἶκος
διὰ οἶκος καὶ τοῖς κυνῖσι). Note that in some examples such as those
given above in μ. 4 and § 154, the plural is a numerative; more
often it is a non-numerative plural, doubtless a discontinuous one
as in examples like the formula : 505, 531 Ὑδάκες ἐν οἴκοις ἑξετανα.
d) The term οἰκᾶς "servant": 5 examples.
e) The verb οἴκω "to dwell": only one example ζ. 204.

This is the situation with which we are faced, one which does not
differ much from that of the Iliad and Hymns (the terms are the
same, although the frequencies vary slightly), but very different
from later Greek in that here the number of derived terms is very
high. The system also varies greatly: the play between οἶκος, οἶκαξ
and δῶρος, δῶμα (which we find in Homer has been substituted by
that which occurs merely between οἶκος and οἴκαξ (N. sg. fem., not
the n. pl. as in Homer), for δῶρος and δῶμα were reserved for poetic
language.

On this basis we can begin to work to improve the view of things
which the dictionaries give us. For LSJ, as for A Lexicon of the
Homerian Dialect by R. J. Cunliffe (1924), οἶκος denotes either
dwelling or residence in the wider sense or one’s specific “house”,
indifferently (also a “cave”, τ. 478, a “tent”, Ω. 471); it may refer to
the inhabitants or to their belongings. A few examples are left out
which refer to some particular part of the house: thus Penelope’s
rooms in ζ. 356 or a separate building in which the miller’s wife
lives (π. 105).

This is not inaccurate, but should be specified in more detail to
include it in a consideration of the whole semantic field of “dwelling”.

For to begin with, it is quite remarkable that the word οἴκαξ
is only found in the Acc. sg. and at this precisely in late use; that
οῖκος should practically be a singular tautum (there is minimum
development of the plural) which at times is equivalent in
use to οἶκαξ (οἴκονε is often used instead of οἶκαξ, whilst οἶκον
is also on occasion a lative with verbs of movement), only the me-
trical schema and the formulae varying; that there are other uses
of οἶκος in diverse cases of the sg., at times with a different meaning
to that of οἶκαξ in the late; and that οἴκαξ is merely a pl., with
a meaning that only partly coincides with that of οἶκος.

Οἰκεῖος, οἴκονες and many uses of οἶκον only denote “residence”
in a vague sense, as a place of dwelling. It is a question of “going”,
“leaving”, “returning”, “sending”, etc. to one’s “house” quite
simply. Really, there is no distinction or precision, neither is one
intended. If the cyclops asks for ὅς μὴ Ὀδυσσέα τοποθέτησθαι οἶκεῖον
ἐκδοθεῖ “stop Odysseus, the destroyer of cities, from returning
to his home”, he makes no distinction between the city of Ithaca
and his specific house or palace. And this is what most often occurs. In
a formula οἰκεῖονῇ χίλιῳ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖας (ζ. 204, etc.), the two con-
cepts handled are almost synonymous with each other, the second
doing no more than specifying the former. Of course contrary to
what happens with the fossilized formula οἶκαξ (in variations of
the above-mentioned formula such as ζ. 315 οἶκον διατίμησιν καὶ σοι
ἐς πατρίδα γαῖας, ε. 42 οἶκον ἐς δυσφόρον καὶ ζήσῃ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖας,
οἰκος has become a specific house.

But this is not what is original or even general: in οἴκαξ only
the general meaning is given, and the same goes for οἴκονες; in
lative οἶκον there are now the two meanings; in the other cases we
shall see that only the specific meaning is given; and this is exclu-
sive also in οἶκος. All this is typical of Greek and we shall see
that it does not fit in with data from other Indo-European
languages. But it is strictly in accordance with the noun/verb rela-
tionship in Greek: alongside οἶκος, we have a denominative οἶκεο,
albeit rare (ναοῖς, ναζεῖον are more frequent), which means simply
“to reside” and no more. Obviously, it derives from the “general”
use of the root, which on the other hand, is confirmed as Indo-Euro-
pean as we shall see below. Here we find the substantives *uik-
and *goikos and a different denominative verb *gikēi “to go”,
witnessed by O.I. visati, Av. visati; it perhaps meant at first “to
go home” in the general sense.

1. Cf. Michel Casavitis, Le Vocabulaire de la colonization en grec ancien,
As against what occurs in IE, where the nouns of this root at times give meanings such as "community", "village", "house" too, Greek has in principle maintained them merely to denote, with verbs of movement and the latte, "place of residence" and "house", without a distinction. But there have not been the other specializations. The very fact of the predominance of the sg. in latte use indicates this older general meaning. We could interpret these sg. forms as continuous mass nouns (not numerative), but they are really remains of a non-numerical use. Note that the sole uses of the word in Mycenaean are KN As 1519.11 *woi-ko-de (there is no longer *wik-) and TH Of 36.2 *wo-ko-de.

However strange this might seem, Greek has in principle only retained the general meaning of the IE root *muk- (*muk- whilst it availed itself of other terms for "house" in the concrete sense (δόμος, δόμυς, μέγαρα plus the "economic" terms). However, it gradually developed other uses of οίκος, which are conditioned by the distribution and use of the diverse cases; and it also developed to the same end the plural tautum (in its origins another numerically nondifferentiated form) oikía.

One may sum up by stating that although the latte use οίκον "house" is rare (Ξ 167 οίκοι Οδυσσεας ἐτε οίκον ἐλεύσεται: ξ 128, ξ 356 ἀλλ' εἰς οίκον ὑπάστα ἢ σ' ἄντις ἔργα κόμες), this specific use is the only non-lative one of οίκον, as likewise of the G. and the D. (always local), and also of the N. One should note the N. is rare (and more so in the II) and the plural very rare indeed; that the meaning "house" is very broad and may refer to any place of residence (a cave, a tent, as is stated above), and that the existence of this meaning is to be deduced from distributional facts such as the concordance with a demonstrative or a verb that implies it is a specific οίκος, at times with reference to the belongings contained therein or to its inhabitants. In other instances, the distributional facts cannot be formalized so easily, but the context indicates that it is a concrete οίκος, belonging to someone, inhabited by his family and a place in which his belongings are kept. In sum, the "general" οίκος has dropped certain possibilities of development that were exploited by other Indo-European languages and was left as a form that was indifferently equivalent to either πατρίς (and πατρίδα γαίαν etc.) or δόμος, δόμυς, μέγαρα. It was predominantly used in the latte, as a substitute for ὁσμας, which had only a general use. But even in this construction, in the right contexts, it came to have the specific meaning of "house". Moreover, in order to express only this, with synonymy with regard to the above-mentioned words, various case and contextual uses of the word were developed.

To be more precise, the concrete meaning of οίκος is given in:

a) a large number of the 50 examples of οίκον: specifically in 23 of them, according to my counting. Most often, οίκος is a direct object with verbs that mean "to destroy", "to ruin", "to devour" (ἀπόλοιμι, ἀκατάστατον, ἄθαντον, κατακαίον, κατάβας, καταβολή, τρόγλος), "to enlarge" (ἐπάλλαξε), "to dwell" (κατοικεῖ), "to give" (δίδωμι, ἐπιτρέπει), "to govern" (ἐξοικείο). It is easy to see that an economic meaning and/or one of government and possession is implied. Most often the determiners (adjectives, Genitives, etc.) complete this characterisation as an individual οίκος.

The exception are several examples of κατά οίκον "at home", with identical determinations to those mentioned.

b) All the examples in the G., either οίκος (3) or οίκου (10). There is a first type in which the G. is a determiner in such a way that one can see that it is a concrete οίκος (ξ 397 οίκοι ἐναζ. ἑσώμε, δ 396 οίκος κ' εύκ. οίκου ἑλό τιθεο). In the other examples, the G. determines a verb, either directly or by means of a preposition ἐν or ἐπι: "to look after" the house (ξ 23, 161 οίκου καθεσθεν) or else "to leave, to distance oneself, to throw out of, far from, the house", with specific determinations.

c) All the local examples: besides κατά οίκον (see above), οἴκωθ (3 examples), οἴκος (5 examples), οίκα (50 examples).

In the cases of οἴκωθ and οίκος the context makes it clear that it is somebody's "house": Aegisthus' s, Odysseus' s., etc., or that of different gods (θ 324 θελότες. δ 324 χεις μένοι αἰδοί οίκοι ἐκάστη). There is a reference to the belongings in the house (ξ 398), to the wife and mother who live in it (v 42, s 15).

In the case of οἴκω there is an overwhelming majority of the use with ἐν or ἐν and a determiner that indicates the owner of a specific "house": types like αἰών (ὁ) ἐν οίκω, oίκω ἐν ἀλλήλῃν, οίκω ἐν ἑμετέρῳ, οίκα ἐν Αἰγιλέου (Ὀρτιόλου), ἐν ἑμοί οίκω. Certainly in other instances the adjont determiner is missing and there is only ἐν οίκῳ
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... σῶο but the broader context leads one to an identical conclusion. As far as I can see, there are only two examples without ἐν, ἐν: 2 186 σὸν σῶο δῖρον ποταμόναω and π 70 σὸν ξενον ἔτη ὡπον ἰππεῖρας ὡῖν. In them, the context once more leads one to the same conclusion. One should add that there is frequent mention of belongings, servants, women, ritual acts (π 288) in the house.

d) All the uses in the N. (7). This is without a doubt the more secondary development: in the II, as has already been said, there is only one example. It is easy to see that part of these examples have arisen from passive or middle transformations of the examples with a direct object: the house “is devoured”, “it is destroyed”, “it is enlarged”. In other instances there are various determinations: with the G. (π 265 σῶος δῖς... ὡδικησις), with demonstratives (the former example, also π 232 σῶος δῖς ἀρείας, π 34 σῶος μὲν τοι δῆμος ἐστιν), possessives (π 64 σῶος ἐμος ὑπὸλος), possessive or sympathetic dative of the personal pronouns (π 318, π 208), and there is reference to the belongings.

e) All the plural uses, which as has been seen are restricted to very few. The three examples of σῶαι are numerative plurals: ζ 9 σῶαι δὲ κατὰ κατακλώσα τίνες, καὶ ἰππεῖρας σῶοι would clearly seem to refer to the fact that Nausithous, upon founding Scheria, built “houses”; whilst the formulaic verse (π 140, 375) ὡμα κατακλώσα ἰππεῖρας θυσίας θεοῦσας: κατὰ σῶαις uttered by Telemachus tells the inhabitants of Ithaca that the suitors are plundering from house to house. As for the only example of the G. pl., π 417 ἐν ἔτη σῶαι φάρσεον καὶ ὀμαῖον ἔναστιν, it means that the corpses of the suitors were taken out of their respective houses to be buried.

This means that once the specific “house” had been developed, it was logical that a need should have been felt for a numerative plural “houses”: its very scant development once more bears witness to the late, secondary nature of this evolution. The rareness of σῶαις “servant”, dependent upon this very meaning, means the same.

To my mind, then, this evolution is to be reflected in certain statistical facts:

1. σῶι is reduced to generic meaning and lative case, in which it alternates with σῶον (this also in Myc.), which is generic and specific.

THE SEMANTICS OF ΟΙΚΟΣ IN THE ODYSSEY

2. σῶον in certain constructions has the sole specific and concrete meaning of “house” and from here onwards, forms of the G. and D. spread with this exclusive, specific meaning. We think that the specific meaning is always secondary.

3. A more recent phase of the process consists of the extremely rare development of plurals.

As may be seen σῶον in the general meaning rather than a singular tantum (with the above-mentioned recent exceptions), was a non-numeral form; it was only to be determined contextually whether is was “one” particular house. And there was no room for the distinction between a continuous and a discontinuous meaning, as happens in the case of the sg./pl. distinction in the mass nouns.

This lacuna was filled in by a new form which was created for the specific use: σῶις (pl., not to be confused with the later sg. σῶις), a creation exclusive to Greek to indicate “house” with the meaning of a discontinuous mass noun “ensemble of rooms or buildings”. It is a positive term as against σῶος with its at times generic, at others specific, meaning.

Yet that this is also a secondary development is to be seen because, as has been said above, σῶις appears almost only in the Acc.: that is, in the oldest use to my mind, of the “special” meanings of σῶος. It is a variant of σῶον, with the above-mentioned distinctive feature; and when the other cases of σῶος were created, there was no time to create a G. and D. for σῶις. Neither was there to create a sg. σῶιον. What was indeed created was a numerative σῶις (π 253 δίᾳ τ’ σῶιοι καὶ πῶλον χίτον. Cf. also μ 4).

σῶις almost always appears as a direct object with the same verbs as σῶον: ἔθεμεν, κέισα, ὡπόκεισα (an above-mentioned prepositional usage δίᾳ τ’ σῶις is added). It is therefore a substitute with a distinctive feature and a different metrical value (as had already occurred with σῶον, σῶοι, with regard to σῶις). As from here, a sole example of the use in the N. was created: μ 4 σῶις καὶ χορός σῖν καὶ ἐντολὰς Ἡθίκον. Of course, σῶις bears the same relationship to the subject of belongings, woman, etc., as the specific sense of σῶος.

Thus we think that the Homeric language (and we cannot state the same outright for the Mycenaean one), developed a new term
for "house" in the concrete sense of "family dwelling", "place of keeping for the family's belongings". The oldest meaning of ὀίκος, ὀίκων is presupposed which in turn had narrowed down its older Indo-European meaning and of which the second term produced a denominative ὀίκειον that still had a general meaning. It is now a matter of establishing the relationship of the new term ὀίκος to older terms such as νησίς, μέγεχον-ς, δᾶμος-ς, δώμα-ς, τά.

For ὀίκος and ὀίκα cannot by any means suffice to indicate "residence" or "house". They have a restricted case and number use and the contexts in which they appear are also restricted. They do not allow one to distinguish between the different types of human habitation or between the whole and its parts; they are not applied to gods. They only very vaguely refer to a building, the ὀίκος may simply be a cave. Its relation to the verbal system (ναίο, νεκτάω then the rare ὀίκεσω) indicates the fundamental simple meaning "to dwell". It is a Greek development that made way within a partially preserved Indo-European system that had even been developed in Greek itself.

In fact, alongside ὀίκος, ὀίκως, with generic meaning and only with a specific one in secondary developments which we might call "architectonic", we find four words of Indo-European origin in the Odyssey that mean "house" in the specific, architectonic sense and which only secondarily developed either even more specialized meanings at times or else a generic meaning. But even in as far as they coincide with ὀίκος, ὀίκως, they display differences that were useful to the poet. I leave to one side concrete terms that refer to diverse parts of the house.

These terms have already been mentioned and are νησίς, μέγεχον, δᾶμος and δώμα. As against ὀίκος, ὀίκως, the relationship of which to the verbal system is not etymological, δῶμας (and without a doubt δῶμας) is related to δῆμος "to build" (contrary to Benveniste's opinion, see below), νησίς to ναίο; only μέγεχον is in an asymmetrical position, the same as ὀίκος, ὀίκως.

Let us begin with νησίς→νησίς, which can be dealt with rapidly. Its relation to ναίο implies that the older meaning is simply "place of dwelling". But it is well known that its sole meaning became "temple", at times a provisional structure made of branches (A 39), at others most likely a true building (Ζ 10, μ 346). Diachronically, there is an evolution; synchronically, we would say that νησίς is a positive term, for the other nouns, which are negative, indifferently denote either a human or divine dwelling. Although ὀίκος really only very rarely, and doubtless by analogy, had a "non-human" use (cf. A 606, μ 478); it depends on the fact that the older use is the lative one.

As has been said, δῶμα always has a specific use: it refers to a building that can be a dwelling for men or for gods; far more often than ὀίκος may refer, besides to the whole building, to one of its parts (above all to the main room or μέγεχον). Its diverse determinations guarantee these interpretations: whether they be with the G. of the owner, with the demonstrative or possessive, with "architectonic" adjectives (referring to its characteristics) or simply in broad contexts that denote that the δῶμα should be interpreted as we have stated. The use may be lative (with or without a preposition), local (δῶμας, κτῆς δῶμα, etc.) or as the direct object of verbs of the type of "to look after", "to build", "to dwell in", etc.: ἐσόμε, ἐρέω, θεόν, κομίζω, ναιω, νοστίζωμε, τύμημε, etc. All this practically coincides with the "specific" uses of ὀίκος.

The difference in use depends on the fact that, wherever ὀίκος is ambiguous, δῶμα is not so: more specifically, in the lative use. Besides, as has been said, in the use to indicate the dwellings of gods. Moreover, in those cases in which ὀίκος is rare (N., G. and D. sg., the whole of the pl.), δῶμα is frequent; and in the pl. δῶματα often indicates not the substantive (various δῶματα), which certainly exists, but the discontinuous mass noun. In fact, δῶμα and δῶματα are equally frequent and practically synonymous to each other although in principle one must bear in mind that δῶμα indicates the whole ensemble of building, δῶματα the existence of several rooms within it: it thus magnifies the base noun. That is, δῶμα offers a possibility that ὀίκος lacks.

All this may easily be checked in the Lexicon des frühgriechischen Epos, Lief. 11 (Göttingen 1984): for this reason and because our main theme is ὀίκος, I will not give examples. But in this same lexicon one may check that δῶμα, despite all, does not take up the whole field of "house" or "building", neither δῶματα nor δῶματον are to be found, and in these cases the continuous/discontinuous distinction is impossible. On the other hand, there is no lack of exampl-
les of synonymy with οἶκος (in the specific sense of this word), with reference at times to the inhabitants or belongings in the house. For the rest, the metrical schema is the same (− η), although the fact that one word ends in a vowel and the other in a consonant may introduce differences; besides, one may also play with the possibility of variants δῶμα/δομήκτε/δομήκτι. But this is not the main reason for the choice, but the existence of the other differences which nevertheless disappear in some interchangeable examples with a specific meaning and with reference to men in an identical building. Even in these, there is the difference related to number, and often, to the formulary system.

The use of δῶ is similar but has a much more restricted distribution. One should bear in mind that δῶ, however much some linguists might think that it comes from a native particle (see the bibliography in Frisk’s and Chantraine’s etymological dictionaries), it is for the epic tradition a simple synonym of δῶμα with a more restricted distribution; it is to be understood thus as “house” in the specific sense.² It is a seldom-used word (13 examples in the Odyssey), one which is always placed at the end of a line of verse, which most likely has something to do with its origin in a particle, although it later became assimilated to δομή. Except for one exception in which it is a N. (2 392), in the rest it is an Acc.: generally a native one and rarely a direct object (with ἐπέρρασε, ἔγειρε), in one instance it has local value (9 17 χαὶ... δῶ). Just like δῶμα, it has both human and divine use, takes the G., possessive and “architectonic” adjectives (χάρισμακτε, ἄργερες, etc.). It is therefore an equivalent of δῶμα but with restrictions with regard to cases, lack of the sg./pl. opposition and fixed final position. Of course, the metrical and formulary difference is important.

I now go on to δῶμα and sum up, for brevity’s sake, the evidence in the LfrgE and in Ebeling’s work. The meaning here is also the “special”, architectural one which at times includes reference to the inhabitants and wealth of the household; the owner may be divine (rarely) or human: the meaning “temple” even appears (γ 81 and examples in the Il.). Its distributions and constructions are the same as those we have already seen. Sg. and pl. alternate almost always with continuous and discontinuous values respectively, or otherwise as synonyms; the LfrgE only gives one example of a numerative pl. in the Od. (δῆκες πλείστα δῶμας ἐν κτήματα κεῖται in δ 127 = I 382, another in Σ 290 and three in the Hymns). What, then, is the difference?

One is that δῶμα is used in sg. and pl. in all cases: the numeric opposition may occur in all of them. Another, obviously, is the different metrical schema and the different formulary system. A further one is the lack of specialization to indicate the “parts” of the house. In general terms, one could therefore say that δομή and δῶμα function as synonyms, but with a different diffusion of their case system and with different metrical and formulary schemata. The restrictions of δῶ are greater.

From the point of view of the relation to the verb, we already saw that its etymological situation is different to that of οἶκος. Δῶμα appears alongside δῶμον: it is an etymological relationship (see below), but in Homer there is no δῶμον δῶμεν or equivalents (there is ξ 9 δῆμακτο οἶκους). Neither is there in the case of δῶμα, the etymological relationship of which with δῶμα and δῶμον is not on the other hand quite clear: here (as in the case of οἶκος) we find πνεύμα, τίθημι, τύχω. In fact, all the “house” nouns, both those which appear isolated without any etymological relationship to a verb, and these others, made up a common system that was independent of the verbs.

Let us finally discuss μέγαρον/-α, also Indo-European and without an etymological relationship to a verb. It has a “special”, architectural use, either for a man’s house or palace, or (rarely) a god’s, even for a tent; sometimes it is used for the main room which we call μέγαρον (of men and women).³ Its constructions and determinations are the same as those we have already seen and there is reference to the inhabitants and wealth of the house. On the other hand, as is the case with δῶμα, all the cases are represented. And the existence of one form of sg. alongside another of plural is habitual, with the sense of continuous and discontinuous mass (there is no numerative plural).

². This was already the meaning of the word in Mycenaean, where only δο- (δο-σ) is to be found: TH Of 26-2-3, 31-1-2, 33-1. This use speaks against the etymology of δῶ as a particle.

With regard to δῶμα, the more similar term, then, the difference lies in the more specialized meaning of the word when it denotes a “part” of the house, and in its more complete case use, and of course, in the metrical and formulary differences. With regard to δῶμας, in the fact that μέγαρον lacks the meaning “divine” as likewise that of denoting a part of the house: this, apart from the metrical and formulary differences.

This is the complex range of terms for “house” in the generic and specific meanings: it is not a case of a simple semantic system, and together with the semantic data there are others related to the presence or absence of certain cases, to the sg./pl. opposition, to the existence of “secondary” meanings, to the metrical and formularic features. Before attempting to schematize all this, we shall sum up the foregoing by trying to place this system in relation to the Indo-European one which preceded it.

The Indo-European system may be reconstructed through the Indo-European vocabulary. Here we find, alongside diverse terms for “parts” of the house, others with a more general sense:

*δῶμος, *δόμος “house”, cf. O.I. δόμα, Lat. domus, Arm. tan (*δոմ), etc.


*οἶκος “village, clan”, cf. O.I. ύις “room”, ύσσας “neighbour”, Lat. uicius “district”, Goth. weiks “village”, Alb. vis “place”.

*οὐστο “dwelling, house”, cf. O.I. ύστο “house, place”, Gr. ἐστι “city”, O. Ir. foss “permanence, repose”.

The different origins of the words can be clearly seen, among which *οἶκο-, *ουκοι- are originally related to “to dwell” and the same goes for *οὐστο. Other roots have more specific original meanings. However, Greek specialized the other roots in diverse direc-


II. The use of numbers and cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl. num.</th>
<th>Pl. disc.</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Defective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oik</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (only oikade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oinoi</td>
<td>+ (rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (not -ei, -oi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akoi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veis</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (only -ev, -oi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doms</td>
<td>+ (rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (not domesti, -ei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(only N., Acc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domos</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Metre and formulary system. This subject requires a separate study, which would be complementary to this one.

ΟΙ ΣΗΜΑΣΙΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΩΡΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΑΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΔΙΟ ΣΤΗΝ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑ (Περιλήψη)

Οι λέξεις που καλύπτουν αυτό το σημασιολογικό πεδίο συνδέονται μεταξύ τους με ποικίλους τρόπους χωρίς να μπορούν να εντοπίζονται σε ένα κανονικό σχήμα. Η Οδύσσεια μας προσφέρει τη δυνατότητα να έχουμε την ευκολία μιας ορισμένης χρονικής στιγμής στην εξέλιξη αυτού του σχήματος. Η δομή του είναι πολύ διαφορετική από τη δομή του νεοευρωπαϊκού σχήματος που προηγήθηκε διαφέρει ακόμη και από τη δομή του συστήματος κατοικίας στη μεταγενέστερη αττική φάση.

Πρόκειται πρώτα να υπάρχει ο αρχικός τόπος οικάδα (από την απολύωμενη αιτιατική οίκη του ουσιαστικού αι ακόμη και το κρίσταλ δε) που σημαίνει την κίνηση προς ένα τόπο: η ρίζα έχει την έννοια του "ψηλάτο του (κατοικία, διαμένω, χρησιμοποιώ χώρας διάκριση και για τον ενικό και για τον πληθυσμό και σημαίνει "κατοικία", "πατρίκια"). Τον τόπο οικάδα τον συμπλήρωσε ο τόπος οικάδα, οίκος, ανάλογα με τις μεταρρυθμίσεις που ανέλαβε οικάδα, οίκος, ανάλογα με τις μεταρρυθμίσεις ανάγκες.
Πώς ερμηνεύονται οι εικοσείς όροι που χρησιμοποιούνται στην εισήγηση

General meaning: η πατρίδα, ο τόπος ή το σπίτι όπου κτιστέται κατοικία, χωρίς διάκριση.

Dative: η αποκαλεί την κίνηση προς ένα τόπο.

Mass nouns: οι ονόματα όπου δεν διαφοροποιείται σημασιολογικά ο ενικός από τον πληθυντικό (όπως στα αρχαία ελληνικά το κρέας και το άλες).

Non-numerative use of a word: σημαίνει ότι δεν υπάρχει σημασιολογική αντίθεση ανάμεσα στον ενικό και στον πληθυντικό (ο τύπος μπορεί να είναι στον ενικό ή στον πληθυντικό).

Non-numerative plural: δηλώνει ένα διερισμένο, όπου όπως το οίκο, δηλαδή ένα σπίτι που το αντικαθίσταμε ως εισαγωγικά διερισμένα.

Non-numerative singular: δηλώνει ένα άλες ως ανικεφαλές σύνολο (όπως ένα σπίτι χωρίς αναφορά στις εισαγωγικές του υποδιακρίσεις).

Numerative plural (γνήσιος πληθυντικός): δηλώνει πολλά σύνολα (π.χ. πολλά σπίτια).

Numerative singular (πληθυντικός ενικός): δηλώνει ένα σύνολο (π.χ. ένα σπίτι).

Specific meaning (εξειδικευμένη έννοια): ο συγκεκριμένος τόπος κατοικίας.

Πώς οργανώνονται σε σύστημα οι ποικίλοι όροι που ανήκουν στο σημασιολογικό πεδίο του όρου οίκος

Συμπτωματικά το σύνολο των όρων που μας απεικονίζει θα μπορούσαμε να το δώσουμε από τρεις οπτικές γωνίες.

I. Η σημασιολογική με βάση τη χρήση των πτώσεων, τα συμφραζόμενα και τα συγκεκριμένα τους ποικίλους προσδιορισμοί.

II. Πώς χρησιμοποιούνται οι αριθμοί και οι πτώσεις:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ενικός</th>
<th>Πληθυντικός</th>
<th>Κατοικία</th>
<th>Παραδείγματα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οίκος</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπίτι</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(σπίτι)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νάξι</td>
<td>+ (αρχ.)</td>
<td>(μενόμενο)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δάκτυλο</td>
<td>+ (απάνω)</td>
<td>(δάκτυλο)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιθανός</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>(μενόμενο, -ος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιθανός</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>(μενόμενο)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Μετρικό σύστημα και τυποποιημένες εκφράσεις: κατά το θέμα απαιτεί ξεκομιστή μελέτη που θα συμπλήρωσε την έννοια αυτή.