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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: oικος above all; but we shall also discuss specific terms related to the precise place in which one lives (δόμος and δῶμα) 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 oικος and its family and on certain terms which serve as contrast to same.

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

a) The term oικωδες, that is, the fossilized accusative of oικος with the lative particle -δε. It is always governed by verbs of movement (ἀγω, ἀπάγω, βαίνω, εἰμι, ἔλαθω, ἔπομαι, ἔρχομαι, ἔμαι, ἐκβάλω, κνέω, κ νάσσω, νιστέω, πέμπω, ὑψέω). Its frequency is high: the Odyssey offers 52 examples (including those with elision, oικωδ’). It most often appears in formulae that are repeated.

b) The term oικος. Statistics for this are as follows: Acc. sg. oικον 51; idem with -δε 20; Dat.–Loc. oικοθε 3, oικοι 5, oικω (generally with ἐν, ἐνι) 50; G. sg. oικον 3; oικον 10; Acc. pl. oικους 3; G. pl. oικων 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 δὲ νέκυς oικον φόρεσον καὶ θάπτων ἐκαστοι).
The same goes for a N. pl. in P 738); the D. pl. is lacking in both the Od. and Il.

c) The term ὀἶκος, 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 4 ὀἶκος καὶ χορὸν ἔδω) or else, in almost all other instances, a direct object (with δεῖσαι, ἔχω, νέμω, ναοῦ, ὀπάζω), or otherwise it is finally an Acc. after διὰ (β 154 ἔριξαν διὰ ὀἶκος καὶ πόλιν αὐτῶν). Note that in some examples such as those given above in μ 4 and β 154, the plural is a numerative; more often it is a non-numerative plural, doubtless a discontinuous one as in examples like the formula τ 505, 531 ἔθηξεν ἐν ὀίκῳ ἔχοντα.

d) The term ὀἶκως “servant”: 5 examples.

e) The verb ὀἰκέω “to dwell”: only one example τ 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 ὀἶκος, ὀἶκα and δόμος, δῶμα which we find in Homer has been substituted by that which occurs merely between ὀἶκος and ὀἶκα (N. sg. fem., not the n. pl. as in Homer), for δόμος 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 Homeric Dialect by R. J. Cunliffe (1924), ὀἶκος 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 α 356 or a separate building in which the miller’s wife lives (τ 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 ὀἶκας is only found in the Acc. sg. and at this precisely in lative use; that ὀἶκος should practically be a singulae tantum (there is minimum development of the plural) which at times is equivalent in use to ὀἶκας (ὀίκον ὄς is often used instead of ὀἶκας, whilst ὀἶκον
is also on occasion a lative with verbs of movement), only the metric 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 οἶκας in the lative; and that οἶκας is merely a pl., with a meaning that only partly coincides with that of οἶκος.

Οἶκας, οἶκόνδε 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 δᾶς μὴ Ὅδυσσε, πτωλυρόθιον οἶκος ἵππον “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 οἶκόνδε φίλην ὡς πατρίδα γαῖαν (ε 204, etc.), the two concepts 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 οἶκας, in variations of the above-mentioned formula such as ζ 315 οἶκον ἔστησεν καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, ε 42 οἶκον ἐς ὕψιστον καὶ ἐγὼ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, οἶκος has become a specific house.

But this is not what is original or even general: in οἶκας only the general meaning is given, and the same goes for οἶκόνδε; 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 exclusive also in οἶκας. 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 relationship in Greek: alongside οἶκος, we have a denominative οἰκέω, albeit rare (ναίω, ναυστάω are more frequent), which means simply “to reside” and no more.1 Obviously, it derives from the “general” use of the root, which on the other hand, is confirmed as Indo-European as we shall see below. Here we find the substantives *μικ- and *μοίκος and a different denominative verb *μικτέμι “to go”, witnessed by O.I. visati, Av. *visaiti: it perhaps meant at first “to go home” in the general sense.

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 lative, “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 lative 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 wo-i-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 *μικ-, *μοικ- whilst it availed itself of other terms for “house” in the concrete sense (δόμος, δόμα, μέγαρα plus the “economic” terms). However, it gradually developed other uses of μοίκος, which are conditioned by the distribution and use of the diverse cases; and it also developed to the same end the plurale tantum (in its origins another numerically nondifferentiated form) οἶκα.

One may sum up by stating that although the lative use oίκον “house” is rare (ξ 167 οὐ’ Ὄδος ὡς ἐπὶ οίκον ἐλέεσται: α 128, π 356 ὧλ’ ἐλεύσσα τα’ αὐτῆς ἐργα κύμαξ), this specific use is the only non-lative one of oίκον, 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 Π.) and the plural very rare indeed; that the meaning “house” is very broad and may refer to any place of dwelling (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 oίκος, 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 oίκος, belonging to someone, inhabited by his family and a place in which his belongings are kept. In sum, the “general” oίκος 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
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γαίαν etc.) or δόμος, δώμα, μέγαρα. It was predominantly used in the lative, as a substitute for οἶκος, 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 οἶκος is given in:

a) a large number of the 50 examples of οἶκος: specifically in 23 of them, according to my counting. Most often, οἶκος is a direct object with verbs that mean "to destroy", "to ruin", "to devour" (ἀπόλλυμι, διαφέρομαι, ἐδωκόμοι, κατακεφάλω, κατέδωκα, κηθώ, τρύχω), "to enlarge" (διεῖδε), "to dwell" (ναίω), "to give" (δίδωμι, ἐπιτρέπω), "to govern" (ἐγκυρώ). 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 οἶκος.

b) All the examples in the G., either οἶκος (3) or οἶκοι (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 οἶκος (ά 397 οἶκοι ἢ μὲν ἔσομαι, δ 596 οὐδὲ κέ μ’ οἶκον ἐλοί τόπος). In the other examples, the G. determines a verb, either directly or by means of a preposition ἐκ or ἀπό: "to look after" the house (τ 23, 161 οἶκου κηθίζομαι) or else "to leave, to distance oneself, to throw out of, far from, from the house", with specific determinations.

c) All the local examples: besides κατὰ οἶκον "at home", with identical determinations to those mentioned.

In the cases of οἶκοι and οἶκοι: the context makes it clear that it is somebody's "home": Aegisthus's, Odysseus's, etc., or that of different gods (0 324 θηλύτερας δὲ θείαι μὲνον αἱ δωδοὶ οἶκοι ἐνάκτητ); there is a reference to the belongings in the house (χ 398), to the wife and mother who live in it (ν 42, ω 15).

In the case of οἶκῳ 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 σῷ (ὁ) ἐν οἶκῳ, οἶκῳ ἐν ἄλλοτρῳ, οἶκῳ ἐν ἱμετέρῳ, οἶκῳ ἐν Αλήθειᾳ (Οἰκτρία), ἐν ἑμὸν οἶκῳ. Certainly in other instances the adjunct determiner is missing and there is only ἐν οἶκῳ,
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... oίκω but the broader context leads one to an identical conclusion. As far as I can see, there are only two examples without ἐν, ἐνί: β 186 σοὶ oίκω δόρον ποτιδέγμενος and π 70 τὸν ἔξειν ἐγὼν ὑπο-
δέξομαι oίκω. 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 III. 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. (σ 265 oίκος ἐς... Ὄδυσσης), with demonstratives (the former example, also α 232 oίκος ἐς ἄφνειάς, ν 34 oίκος μέν τοι ἐς ἐς ὁ), posses­sives (β 64 oίκος ἐς ἐς διάκλως), possessive or sympathetic datives of the personal pronouns (δ 318, ω 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 oίκους are numerative plurals: ζ 9 ἃμφι δὲ τείχους ἐλασσε πόλει, καὶ ἔδειματο oίκους would clearly seem to refer to the fact that Nausithous, upon founding Scheria, built “houses”; whilst the formulaic verse (β 140, 375) ὡλὰ κτήματε ἔδοτες ἀμειβόμενοι κατὰ oίκους 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., ω 417 ἐκ δὲ νέκους oίκουν φόρει σαὶ θάπτον ἔκαστοι, 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 oικως “servant”, dependent upon this very meaning, means the same.

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

1. oίκω is reduced to generic meaning and lative case, in which it alternates with oίκον (this also in Myc.), which is generic and specific.
2. *oιξος* 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 *oιξος* in the general meaning rather than a *singulare tantum* (with the above-mentioned recent exceptions), was a non-numeral form: it was only to be determined contextually whether it 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: *οίκια* (pl., not to be confused with the later sg. *οίκιον*), 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 *οιξος* 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, *οίκια* appears almost only in the Acc.: that is, in the oldest use to my mind, of the “special” meanings of *οιξος*. It is a variant of *οιξον*, with the above-mentioned distinctive feature; and when the other cases of *οιξος* were created, there was no time to create a G. and D. for *οίκια*. Neither was there to create a sg. *οίκιον*. What was indeed created was a numerative *οίκιον* (β 254 διὰ τ’ *οίκιον* καὶ πόλιν κύτων. Cf. also μ. 4).

*Οίκια* almost always appears as a direct object with the same verbs as *οιξον*: διδωμι, ναίοι, ὀπάξω (an above-mentioned prepositional usage διὰ τ’ *οίκια* is added). It is therefore a substitute with a distinctive feature and a different metrical value (as had already occurred with *οιξον*, *οιξόνδες* with regard to *οιξόδες*). As from here, a sole example of the use in the N. was created: μ. 4 ὀίκια καὶ χοροί εἰσι καὶ ἀντολαὶ Ἡλείοιο. Of course, *οίκια* bears the same relationship to the subject of belongings, woman, etc., as the specific sense of *οιξος*.

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 ὀξ-, ὀξον is presupposed which in turn had narrowed down its older Indo-European meaning and of which the second term produced a denominative ὀξέω that still had a general meaning. It is now a matter of establishing the relationship of the new term ὀξος to older terms such as νής, μέγαρον/-α, δῶμος/-οι, δῶμα/-τα.

For ὀξος and ὀξα 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 ὀξος may simply be a cave. Its relation to the verbal system (ναίω, ναλέτω then the rare ὀξέω) 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 ὀξ-, ὀξο-, 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 ὀξ-, ὀξο-, 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 νής, μέγαρον, δῶμος and δῶμα. As against ὀξ-, ὀξο-, the relationship of which to the verbal system is not etymological, δῶμος (and without a doubt δῶμα) is related to δέω “to build” (contrary to Benveniste’s opinion, see below), νής to ναίω; only μέγαρον is in an asymmetrical position, the same as ὀξ-, ὀξο-.

Let us begin with ναίως > νής, which can be dealt with rapidly. Its relation to ναίω 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 ηῆδες is a positive term, for the other nouns, which are negative, indifferently denote either a human or divine dwelling. Although οἶκος really only very rarely, and doubtless by analogy, had a “non-human” use (cf. A 606, v 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 οἶκος may refer, besides to the whole building, to one of its parts (above all to the main room or μέγαρον). 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 (δῶματα, κατὰ δῶμα, etc.) or as the direct object of verbs of the type of “to look after”, “to build”, “to dwell in”, etc.: έσθιω, ἔχω, θείω, κοmidiω, ναίω, νοσφίξομαι, τίθημι, etc. All this practically coincides with the “specific” uses of οἶκος.

The difference in use depends on the fact that, wherever οἶκος 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 οἶκος is rare (N., G. and D. sg., the whole of the pl.), δῶμα is frequent; and in the pl. δῶματα often indicates not the numerative (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 οἶκος 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 οἶκος, 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 δῶματαν are to be found, and in these cases the continuous/discontinuous distinction is impossible. On the other hand, there is no lack of examp-
les of synonymy with ὀἰκος (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 (−−), 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/δῶματα/δῶματι. 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 lative 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 δῶμα. Except for one exception in which it is a N. (α 392), in the rest it is an Acc.: generally a lative one and rarely a direct object (with ἐπέφερας, ἐδέ), in one instance it has local value (λ 17 κατ' ... δῶ). Just like δῶμα, it has both human and divine use, takes the G., possessive and "architectonic" adjectives (χαλκοβατες, ψηφεφες, 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 δῶμος and sum up, for brevity’s sake, the evidence in the LfrgE and in Ebeling’s work. The meaning here is also the "special", architectonic 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 (η 81 and examples in the II.). Its distributions and constructions

². This was already the meaning of the word in Mycenaean, where only do-de (= δῶδε) 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.
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. (διὶ πλεῖστα δόμοις 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 δόμος 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 δόμω and δό­μος function as synonyms, but with a different diffusion of their case system and with different metrical and formulary schemata. The restrictions of δῷ 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 οἰκος. Δό­μος appears alongside δέμω: it is an etymological relationship (see below), but in Homer there is no δόμον δέμεω or equivalents (there is ζ 9 ἐξεύματο οἰκους). Neither is there in the case of δόμω, the etymological relationship of which with δόμος and δέμω is not on the other hand quite clear: here (as in the case of οἰκος) we find ποιέω, τίθημι, τεβίχω. 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 ῆγαρον/α, also Indo-European and without an etymological relationship to a verb. It has a “special”, architectonic 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 ῆγαρον (of men and women). 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 δόμος, 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).
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With regard to óμος, 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 óμος, 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 formulaic 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.4

Here we find, alongside diverse terms for "parts" of the house, others with a more general sense:

*dómos, *dóṃ "house", cf. O.I. dámas, Lat. domus, Arm. tun (<dóṃ), etc.


*kściis "establishment, colony", Cf. O.I. kściis (and Gr. κτίςω). *pʰ(ʰ) "citadel", cf. O.I. pūr, Gr. πόλις, Lith. pilis.

*uōikos "village, clan", cf. O.I. vis- "room", vėsas "neighbour", Lat. uicus "district", Goth. weiks "village", Alb. vis "place".

*uōstu "dwelling, house", cf. O.I. vāstu "house, place", Gr. άσπο "city", O. Ire. foss "permanence, repose".

The different orgins of the words can be clearly seen, among which *uōik-, *uōikos are originally related to "to dwell", and the same goes for *uōstu. Other roots have more specific original meanings. However, Greek specialized the other roots in diverse direc-

tions and maintained the older sense of *'\(\text{uoik-}\), *'\(\text{uoiko-}\), specializing same as “house” and rejecting the other specializations; but at the same time it preserved words that had come from the root of δέμω “to build” which with *'\(\text{uoikos}\) make up a supplementary system to which μέγαρον—which is also Indo-European—was added.

I am aware that Benveniste\(^5\) separated Gr. δόμος from Lat. domus which he referred to the “family”, and that this has been accepted by, for example, Chantraine, S.V. δόμος. Only this word would come from δέμω. This is impossible for there is total coincidence in the form and the reference to the inhabitants or wealth of the house as we have seen is normal in all these words.

The points of coincidence and opposition within the vocabulary we have studied can be better summarized from three points of view.

I. The semantic one, on the basis of the distributions and contexts and, more precisely, on the determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Divine</th>
<th>Temple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίκαδε</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίκονδε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίκα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίκον</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίκος, -ος, -οι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νής</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμα</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμος</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέγαρον</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The use of numbers and cases:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg.</th>
<th>Pl. num.</th>
<th>Pl. disc.</th>
<th>Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oíx-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oíko-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oíkiz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νήδε</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώμε</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (rare)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώ</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δομες</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (1 ex.)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέγαρου</td>
<td>+</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 ΟΡΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΣ
ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΣΗΜΑΣΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΔΙΟ ΣΤΗΝ ΟΔΥΣΣΕΙΑ
(Περίληψη)

ΟΙ ΑΕΒΕΣΙ του χαλόμπου αυτο το σημασιολογικό πεδίο συνδέονται με-
tαξί τους με ποικίλους τρόπους χωρίς να μπορούν να ενταχθούν σε ένα
κανονικό σχήμα. Η Οδύσσεια μας προσφέρει τη δυνατότητα να έχουμε
την ευκάλυμα μιας ορισμένης χρονικής στιγμής στην εξέλιξη αυτού του σχή-
ματος. Η δομή του είναι πολύ διαφορετική από τη δομή του ἴδιο-ευρω-
παϊκού σχήματος που προηγήθηκε, διαφέρει ακόμα και από τη δομή του
συστήματος αυτού στη μετακενέστερη αττική φάση.

Πρώτα πρώτο υπάρχει ο αρχαίος τύπος οίκαδε (από την απολιθω-
μένη αιτιατική οίκα του οωσιστικού οίκος και το μόριο δε) που σημαίνει
την κίνηση προς ένα τόπο: ἡ ρίξα είχε την έννοια του *μικ (κατοικώ,
διαμένω), χρησιμοποιείται χωρίς διάκριση και για τον ενικό και για τον
πληθυντικό και σημαίνει «κατοικία», «πατρίδα». Τον τύπο οίκαδε τον
συμπλήρωσε ο τύπος οίκονδε, οίκον, ανάλογα με τις μετρικές ανάγκες.
Η έννοια τους ήταν ότι ένα σημείο η ίδια, αναπτύχθηκε όμως και μια καινούρια, πιο εξειδικευμένη σημασία (μόνο «το απότιμο, όμως η πατρίδα»). Οι τύποι οίκου, οίκω, οίκος και άλλοι που ανήκουν στην ίδια οικογένεια (οίκειο - οίκειος) χρησιμοποιούνται μόνο με αυτή την εξειδικευμένη σημασία και διαφοροποιούνται στον ενικό και στον πληθυντικό. Παράλληλα αναπτύχθηκε και ένας επάνω γνήσιος πληθυντικός.

Υπάρχει οιστόσο και ένας άλλος τύπος, (τά) οίκια, που απαντά μόνο στον πληθυντικό και δηλώνει ένα διηγημένο σύνολο. Σημαίνει μια «κατοικία» που χωρίζεται εσωτερικά σε διάφορα δωμάτια. Έτσι η γλώσσα είχε πιά τη δυνατότητα να αντικρίζει την ανθρώπινη κατοικία από μια άλλη σκοπιά.

Αυτές οι εξειδικευμένες της ρίζας *μίκ* δεν ήταν αρχέτες. Οι λέξεις που βγήκαν από την ρίζα αυτή παιρνούν ποικίλες σημασίες και παρουσιάζουν κενά στους αρχιμόνες και στις πτώσεις, που καλύφθηκαν από ένα σύνολο λέξεων με διαφορετική προέλευση.

Από το ναιό, που σημαίνει «κατοικώ», προήλθε το όνομα ηής, που τήρη στην ειδική σημασία «κατοικία του θεού».

Υπάρχουν ακόμα ορισμένες λέξεις από τη ρίζα *δέμ* που σημαίνει χτίζω: δόμα, δώ (με οβέβα την επιφάνεια) και δόμος. Με το δόμο η επική ποίηση έχουν στα χέρια τους μια λέξη που άλλοτε μιας δίνει τη δυνατότητα να καλολέξουμε αν έγινε να κάνουμε με ενικό ή πληθυντικό και άλλοτε όχι. «Αλλοτε σημαίνει την «κατοικία» ως ένα ενικό σύνολο και άλλοτε ως ένα διηγημένο σύνολο. Για παράδειγμα η δέματα σημαίνει «διάφορες κατοικίες», τις περισσότερες φορές όμως «μια κατοικία με εσωτερικές διαφορές», γενικά όντα παλάτι. Ο τύπος αυτός δεν παρουσιάζει πολλά κενά (όμως το δώματα και δωμάτια δεν υπάρχουν καθόλου). Είναι μόνας ότι όλα η σημείωση συνάντησε με τα οίκους και οικία και τα μετρικά όμως δεν υπάρχει εκφράσεων.

Το δώ έχει την ίδια έννοια, είναι όμως ένας αρχαιότομος με πολύ περιορισμένη χρήση. Αυτός ο τύπος και το οίκουντε είναι οι μόνοι χριστιανικοί ομοίοι και στα Μυθικά. Την ίδια σημασία έχει και το δόμος που παρουσιάζει λιγότερο κενά και εντάσσεται σε ποικίλες τυποποιημένες εκφράσεις και μετρικά σχήματα.

Το μέγαρο, τέλος, οφείλει την τύχη του σε μια εξειδικευμένη έννοια, στα μετρικά χαρακτηριστικά του και στις δυνατότητες που έχει να εν- τάσσεται σε τυποποιημένες εκφράσεις.

Αυτό το πολύπλοκο σύστημα έδωσε στη δυνατότητα του Όμηρο να αποτυπώσει την έννοια την «αιθιοπική κατοικία» και το «κτήριο» με
Πώς ερμηνεύονται οι ειδικοί όροι που χρησιμοποιούνται στην εισήγηση

General meaning: η πατρίδα, ο τόπος ή το σπίτι όπου κατοιχεί κανείς, χωρίς διάκριση.
Dative: η αιτιατική που δηλώνει την κίνηση προς ένα τόπο.
Mass nouns: τα ονόματα όπου δεν διαφοροποιείται σημασιολογικά ο ενικής από τον πληθυντικό (όπως στα αρχαία ελληνικά το κρέας και το άλλο).
Non numerical 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 numerical plural: δηλώνει ένα διηρμένο όλο όπως το οίκιο, δηλαδή ένα σπίτι που το αντικρίζουμε ως εσωτερικά διηρμένο.
Non numerical singular: δηλώνει ένα όλο ως αδιαίρετο σύνολο (όπως ένα σπίτι χωρίς αναφορά στις εσωτερικές του υποδιαιρέσεις).
Numerative plural (γνήσιος πληθυντικός): δηλώνει πολλά σύνολα (π.χ. πολλά σπίτια).
Numerative singular (γνήσιος ενικῆς): δηλώνει ένα σύνολο (π.χ. ένα σπίτι).
Specific meaning (εξειδικευμένη έννοια): ο συγκεκριμένος τόπος κατοιχίας.

Πώς οργανώνονται σε σύστημα οι ποικίλες όρους που ανήκουν στο σημασιολογικό πεδίο του όρου οίκος

Συνοπτικά το σύνολο των όρων που μας απασχόλησε θα μπορούσαμε να το δούμε από τρεις σπειρές γωνίες.
I. Η σημασιολογική με βάση τη χρήση των πτώσεων, τα συμφρακτικά μενα και το ισχυρό συγκεκριμένα τους ποικίλους προσδιορισμούς.
THE SEMANTICS OF ΟΙΚΟΣ IN THE ODYSSEY

| oίχαδε | + | - |
| oίχονδε | + | - |
| oίχια | - | + |
| oίχον | + | + |

| οίχου, -οι, -φ | οίχων, -ους | νήσ | δώμα | δό | δόμος | μέγαρον |
| - | + | + | + | + | + |

παραδείγματα

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ενικός</th>
<th>Πληθυσμικός γνήσιος</th>
<th>Πληθυσμικός μη γνήσιος</th>
<th>Χωρίς κενά</th>
<th>Με κενά</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oίχ-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (μόνο oίχαδε)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίχο</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(σπάνιος)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oίχια</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ (1 παρ.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νήσ</td>
<td>+ (1 παρ.)</td>
<td>(1 παρ.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δώμα</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(σπάνιος)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δό</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμος</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(1 παρ.)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μέγαρον</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Μετρικό σύστημα και τυποποιημένες εκφράσεις: αυτό το θέμα απαιτεί ξεχωριστή μελέτη που θα συμπλήρωσε την έννοια αυτή.