Homeric Evidences of an Inherently Actional Opposition: ἔρχομαι vs ἦλθον

Castrenze Nigrelli

Dept. of Humanities, University of Palermo

Viale delle Scienze, Ed. 12, 90128, Palermo, Italy

Tel: 393-280-192-208   E-mail: castrenze.nigrelli@unipa.it

Abstract

The paper aims at analyzing the paradigmatic relationship between the verbs ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον in Homeric Greek. Both verbs convey the idea of *going* within a Homeric suppletive paradigm. Although suppletivism between ἔρχομαι, εἶμι, ἐλεύσομαι (future), ἦλθον (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect) is generally accepted, there is still uncertainty on both etymology and semantic features involving inherent actionality, with particular reference to ἔρχομαι. Therefore, the actional status of ἔρχομαι and its relationship with ἦλθον need further investigation. A textual analysis of the Homeric occurrences of both ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον, focusing on the semantic-syntactic discourse context, has shed light on their mutual suppletive relationship and proved that it is ultimately based on their inherently actional opposition within the paradigm.

Keywords: Suppletivism, Actionality, Homeric Greek, Motion verbs

1. Introduction: Status Quaestionis, Methodology and Purpose of the Study

As generally accepted by scholars (cf. Osthoff 1899; Brugmann & Delbrück 1897-1916; Brugmann & Thumb 1913; Snell 1955-2010; Schwyzer 1959; Chantraine 1968-80; Létoublon 1985; Kölligan 2007), the Homeric suppletive paradigm for *going* includes ἔρχομαι, εἶμι, ἐλεύσομαι (future), ἦλθον (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect). Both ἔρχομαι and εἶμι always occur as present stems and never as aorist stems, while ἦλθον (in Homer also ἤλυθον) always occurs as aorist stem (to which also pf. εἰλήλουθα and fut. ἐλεύσομαι trace back). In particular, the verb ἔρχομαι is employed in Homer as present, with habitual value as well; whereas the present εἶμι is mostly employed with an intentional-futuristic value (while ἐλεύσομαι functions as a simple future), and compensates for the lack of the imperfect with

its imperfect forms; the use of εἶμι as generic present is only residual (Létoublon 1985; Kölligan 2007).

Actually, the suppletive relationships between the forms of this a paradigm are still not entirely clear. Some scholars try to explain these relationships by taking into account the notion of spatial deixis, namely distinguishing between centrifugal (*away from* the speaker), centripetal (*towards* the speaker), neutral deictic orientation. One hypothesis consists in a clear semantic split between εἶμι *gehen* "to go" (with futuristic value, "to be going to go") and ἦλθον *kommen* "to come", while ἔρχομαι can assume both semantic values (see Bloch 1940). According to others, although co-occurring spatial elements expressing source (e.g. ἐξ ἁλὸς "from the sea") or goal (e.g. Ἰθάκηνδε "to Ithaca") of movement can actually neutralize potential deictic oppositions between the verbs, when they are used with no co-occurring spatial elements: εἶμι can be both centrifugal and neutral, ἦλθον is always centripetal, ἔρχομαι can be centrifugal, centripetal, and neutral (Kölligan 2007).

However, accounting for the suppletive relationship within this paradigm can be more suitable in a different perspective that takes into account the notion of actionality (i.e. Lexical aspect, *Aktionsart*). Unlike grammatical aspect, which morphologically conveys the speaker's point of view in reference to the event expressed by a verb, actionality concerns the inherent nature of the event and the verbal inner meaning (see, among others, Comrie 1976; Bertinetto 1986). In particular, the actional-semantic inherent feature of telicity, which is typical of those events concerning a natural or intended endpoint (cf. Vendler 1957; Depraetere 1995), e.g. πίπτω "to fall" or μανθάνω "to learn", has recently proved to be crucial for the development of inflectional morphology within verbal paradigms in old Indo-European languages such as Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. Both Homeric and Vedic evidences show that the grammatical-aspectual (and, then, temporal) opposition between aorist stem (*perfectum* system) and present stem (*infectum* system) is actually consequent to an original actional opposition based on verbal (a) telicity, and that the distribution of tense inflectional markers in a more recent stage of the Proto-Indo-European depends on the verb-inherent [±telic] feature (see Bartolotta 2009; 2016; 2017a for further details) (Note 1). According to the specific distribution of the stems within the *going* paradigm, the following opposition seems to appear: [–telic] ἔρχομαι and εἶμι, present stem, *infectum* system *vs* [+telic] ἦλθον, aorist stem, *perfectum* system. The actional status of both atelic εἶμι (see Meillet 1929; Létoublon 1985; Romagno 2002; Bartolotta 2016; 2017b) and telic ἦλθον (see Pokorny 1959; Chantraine 1968-80; Rix 2001) is actually quite definite (Note 2). As for its etymology (Chantraine 1968-80: 377; Rix 2001: 238 f.; Snell 1955-2010), there is no agreement among scholars about the actional status of ἔρχομαι that still remains quite uncertain and requires further analysis. Despite slight difference within their terminology, some scholars hypothesize that the prototypically actional value of ἔρχομαι is telic. Meillet (1929: 249 ff.) connects ἔρχομαι to the IE root *ser- > Gr. ἕρ-πω; Lat. *ser-pō*; Skr. *sár-pati* "to slither; to drag", to which a -χ$^{(ε/o)}$- suffix gives a basically telic value; Rix (2001: 238 f.) connects the verb to the zero grade **h₁r̥*- of the IE root *h₁er- "to come to/reach; to arrive/bump into", with a -*ské*- suffix (**h₁r̥ské*- > *erske- > **erk^{h}e*-; see Ved. *r̥ccháti* "he reaches; blumps into"), or, doubtfully, to the IE root **h₁erĝ^h*- "to ascend"; Pokorny (1959: 326 ff.) connects ἔρχομαι

to an extended form *er-g^h- of the IE root *er- "to start to move; to excite; to put up", that he considers as telic (Note 3). Apart from the etymological doubts, textual examples do not provide strong evidence about the telic value of ἔρχομαι (Chantraine 1968-80: 377). Although the actional value of ἔρχομαι has been extensively investigated, there is still uncertainty about it. On the one hand, Létoublon (1985: 72 ff.) considers ἔρχομαι as atelic; on the other hand, Romagno (2002) has analysed ἔρχομαι from a split intransitivity perspective and considered it as telic (i.e. ἔρχομαι: unaccusative and telic *vs* εἶμι: unergative and atelic). At the same time she also underlines a frequent overlap, rather than an opposition, between ἔρχομαι and εἶμι (for further details see Romagno 2002 and the references given therein). Furthermore, the disagreement on the semantics of this verb is also shown by the variation within lexicographic data (Note 4).

The present study aims at clarifying the semantic and actional value of ἔρχομαι, also in reference to its relationship with ἦλθον and the other forms built on the aorist stem (i.e. ft. ἐλεύσομαι, pf. εἰλήλουθα), by analyzing their occurrences within the Iliad and the Odyssey (Note 5). In particular, the analysis takes into account the motion events expressed by these Homeric verbs in the light of Talmy's cognitive-typological theory (Talmy 2000, 2009). According to this framework, languages are distinguished into two types, i.e. *V(erb)-* and *S(atellite)-Framed*, depending on the pattern they tend to use to express the semantic components of a motion event, i.e. *Figure* (the moving object), *Ground* (the reference object/frame), *Motion* (the presence of motion), *Path* (the path followed by the object), *Manner* (the way of motion), *Cause* (the cause of motion), and, in particular, the Path component, which is the core element (Note 6). V-Framed languages tend to convey Path in the verb root (e.g. Sp. *El perro* [Figure] *entró* [Motion+**Path**] *en* [(Path)] *el jardín* [Ground] *corriendo* [Manner] "The dog ran into the garden"). On the contrary, Homeric Greek is a S-Framed language (see Talmy 2000; Baldi 2006; Skopeteas 2008; Imbert 2010; Nikitina 2013; Verkerk 2014), as it tends to convey Path in a so-called satellite, i.e. particles functioning as both preverbs and prepositions (e.g. ἐπ-έδραμε "He ran **against**"; θέων ἐπὶ νῆας "Running **to(wards)** the ships"), adverb(ial)s (e.g. **σχεδὸν** ἤλυθεν "He came **close**"), nominal case markers (e.g. ἔρχονται πεδί-**οιο** "They go **through** a plain"), while verbs convey [Motion+Manner], such as the manner-of-motion verbs ἔδραμον and θέω "to run", or only [Motion], such as the verbs ἦλθον and ἔρχομαι "to go" (Note 7). The verbal class of self-propelled motion, to which the chosen verbs ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον belong, is involved in an encoding pattern (i.e. verb [Motion] + satellite [Path]) which is actually less prototypical in reference to S-Framed languages, as it is actually used by V-Framed languages as well. Among Path-encoding satellites, depending on their degree of semantic compatibility with the idea of reaching a goal, there are both those which are prototypically directional/goal-oriented (e.g. the particle ἐπί "to, towards", the adverb ἀντίον "against", the accusative case marker with allative value), and the prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented ones (e.g. the particle περί "around", the adverb ἐγγύθεν "near", the genitive case marker with perlative value).

It has been recently shown that verb-inherent telicity plays an important role on motion event encoding as far as morphosyntactic cohesion between verbs and spatial particles is concerned.

In fact, Homeric data show a higher morphosyntactic cohesion between directional/goal oriented particles and telic, rather than atelic, manner-of-motion and self-propelled motion verbs, i.e. a higher frequency of agglutinated preverbal forms, rather than prepositions or tmetic preverbal constructions, are found between telic motion verbs and directional/goal oriented particles (for further details, see Bartolotta & Nigrelli 2017; Nigrelli 2019; see also below, Section 2.1) (Note 8).

In the present study, the textual analysis on Homeric verbal uses concerns the semantic-actional features of ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον and takes into account those occurrences in which these verbs co-occur with a Path-encoding element, focusing on the actual arrival of the moving objects (i.e. Figure) to the endpoints. The results are presented and discussed in the next section through a selection of noteworthy examples.

2. Distributional and Textual Analysis of ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον in the Homeric Poems

2.1 Distribution of Path-Encoding Elements and Variation Within Particle Semantic Value

The total Homeric occurrences of ἔρχομαι are 149, that of ἦλθον are 808, including those in which the verbs occur without Path-encoding elements (ἔρχομαι 42, i.e. about 28%; ἦλθον 207, i.e. about 26%) and those with Path-encoding elements (ἔρχομαι 107, i.e. about 72%: 84 with particles, 19 with adverbs, 4 with case markers; ἦλθον 601, i.e. about 74%: 387 with particles, 145 with adverbs, 69 with case markers) (Note 9).

A larger tendency of motion verbs to occur without Path-encoding elements (rather than with) may be a clue of an atelic actional value, as verbal semantics is more compatible with expressing bare motion without any information about the path followed by Figure (see Bartolotta & Nigrelli 2017). Taking into account the occurrences without Path-encoding elements, only slight differences between the self-propelled motion verbs ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον are actually shown by their distribution, whose percentages are quite overlapping.

Taking into account the occurrences with Path-encoding elements, Homeric data about telicity and its reflecting on a higher morphosyntactic cohesion between directional/goal-oriented particles and telic verbs due to their mutual semantic compatibility are quite similar: a higher tendency of telic ἦλθον to occur with directional agglutinated preverbs, rather than prepositions or tmetic preverbs, is actually limited to one directional/goal-oriented particle (i.e. κατά "downwards"; see Nigrelli 2019).

However, from the textual analysis of ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον within their Homeric contexts of use, data show that inherent (a) telicity has strong reflections on the semantic value of Path-encoding spatial elements (Note 10). Given the higher semantic compatibility between telic verbs and directional/goal-oriented particles, same directional particles tend to maintain their directional semantic value when co-occurring with [+telic] ἦλθον, as in (1), whereas they can assume also a non-directional/non-goal-oriented semantic value when co-occurring with ἔρχομαι, as in (2), fact that may lead to a hypothetic atelicity of this latter verb (see also below, Section 2.2.1).

(1) [...] ἐκ δέ μοι αὐχὴν / ἀστραγάλων ἐάγη, ψυχὴ δ' Ἄϊδόσδε **κατῆλθε** (*Od*. 11.64-5)

"[...] and my neck was broken away from the spine and my spirit **went down** to Hades"

The motion event in (1) describes Elpenor's spirit (i.e. ψυχή) as the moving Figure that, going down, reaches the house of Hades. Functioning as an agglutinated preverb within the verbal compound κατῆλθε, the prototypically directional/goal-oriented particle κατ(ά) "downwards" maintains its own directional semantic value, encoding the main directional Path with reference to the movement of Elpenor's spirit (i.e. Figure), which is encoded by the aorist ῆλθε (i.e. Motion). The adverbial lexeme Ἄϊδόσδε "to Hades", with the allative suffix -δε, represents a further Path-encoding element, besides its expressing Ground (i.e. Hades) (Note 11).

(2) [...] αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιούς / ὦρσε Διὸς θυγάτηρ κυδίστη Τριτογένεια

ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμιλον (*Il*. 4.514-6)

"[...] but the daughter of Zeus, most glorious Tritogeneia, urged the Achaeans **as she went through** the throng"

In (2), functioning as a preposition, the same prototypically directional/goal-oriented particle καθ' (ά) "downwards" exhibit, instead, a non-directional/non-goal oriented semantic value (i.e. "through"). In fact, καθ' represents the non-goal-oriented Path satellite which refers to the intermediate segment of the followed path (i.e. the *traversal* subcomponent of the Path component; see Talmy 2000), with reference to ὅμιλον "throng" (i.e. Ground) and in connection with the participle ἐρχομένη conveying the atelic movement (i.e. Motion) of Athena (i.e. Figure) (Note 12).

2.2 Variation on Figure's Reaching the Endpoint Within ἔρχομαι and ῆλθον Homeric Uses

It is worthy of note that, focusing on the expression of the actual arrival of the moving Figure to the endpoint, data show further significant differences between ἔρχομαι and ῆλθον in reference to an actional concept of their mutual opposition, thus further corroborating the hypothesis of the inherently atelic nature of ἔρχομαι. Table 1 shows the Homeric distribution of ἔρχομαι and ῆλθον with both directional and non-directional Path-encoding elements (i.e. spatial particles, adverbs, nominal case markers) as well as the information about the actual arrival (or no arrival) of the moving Figure to the endpoint (Note 13).

Table 1. Homeric distribution of arrivals of the Figure with ἔρχομαι and ῆλθον

	ἔρχομαι		ῆλθον	
Directional particles	arrival	no arrival	arrival	no arrival
ἐπί "to"	2	18	80	26
εἰς "to"	4	10	69	25
κατά "downwards"	2	7	17	4
ἀνά "upwards"	–	7	6	4
πρός "towards"	3	5	8	1
Non- directional particles				
ἐκ "out"	–	2	44	14

μετά "between"	3	8	18	6
διά "through"	1	3	17	5
ὑπό "under"	–	–	13	2
παρά "beside"	1	3	2	7
ἀπό "from"	1	3	4	6
ἀμφί(ς) "on both sides"	–	–	2	–
ὑπέρ "over"	–	–	–	2
σύν "with"	–	1	–	–
περί "around"	–	–	4	–
ἐν "in"	–	–	1	–
Directional spatial adverbs	1	13	39	15
Non-directional spatial adverbs	–	5	52	39
Directional case markers	2	1	51	13
Non-directional case markers	–	1	–	5

2.2.1 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Particles

Data included in Table 1 show a significant variation within the distribution of the arrivals (i.e. the Figure's actual reaching the endpoint), which seems to be ascribable to the role played by verb-inherent telicity. In fact, the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἦλθον tend to express the Figure's actual reaching the endpoint very frequently (about 75% of the occurrences) when co-occurring with directional/goal-oriented particles, as shown, besides in (1), in (3)-(4).

(3) ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ **εἰσῆλθεν** καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν (*Od*. 23.88)

   "And after she (*scil*. Penelope) **came in** and passed over the stone threshold"

(4) ἂψ κλισίην **εἰσῆλθε**, δέπας δ' ἀπέθηκ' ἐνὶ χηλῶι. (*Il*. 16.254)

   "he (*scil*. Achilles) **went** again **into** his tent, and put the goblet away in the chest."

Functioning as an agglutinated preverb in both (3) and (4), the directional/goal-oriented particle εἰς "to" encodes a directional Path with reference to the Figure's telic movement (i.e. Motion), which is expressed by the aorist ἦλθον. In both examples, the verbal compound εἰσῆλθε(ν) "(s)he went/came in(to), (s)he entered" refers to the Figure's (i.e. Penelope and Achilles, respectively) actual reaching the endpoint, that is to Figure's *entering* the Ground, which is implied (as in (3), i.e. *the chief room*) or encoded (as in (4), by the accusative κλισίην "tent").

Furthermore, it is worth of note that, due to verb-inherent telicity, the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἦλθον tend to express the Figure's actual reaching the endpoint frequently (about 71% of the occurrences) also when the co-occurring particle is prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented, as shown in (5).

(5) ὣς οἳ μὲν Διὸς ἔνδον ἀγηγέρατ᾽· οὐδ᾽ Ἐνοσίχθων

νηκούστησε θεᾶς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἁλὸς **ἦλθε μετ᾽** αὐτούς,   (*Il.* 20.134)

"So they (*scil.* the gods) gathered together within the house of Zeus; and the
Earth-Shaker did not disobey the goddess, but he **came to the midst** of them from the
sea"

Functioning as a preposition with the accusative, the prototypically non-directional/non-goal
oriented particle μετ᾽(ά) "between" expresses in (5) a directional Path towards a multiple
Ground (i.e. αὐτούς "them(selves)", the gods gathered together), which is actually reached by
the Earth-Shaker Poseidon (i.e. Figure), with reference to a telic movement (i.e. Motion)
conveyed by the aorist ἦλθε (Note 14). The phrase ἐξ ἁλὸς "from the sea" gives further Path
information expressing the Source of movement, which is a subcomponent of the Path
component (see Talmy 2000).

On the contrary, several evidences lead to assign an atelic actional value to ἔρχομαι. The
motion events expressed by [-telic] ἔρχομαι tend not to express any Figure's actual reaching
the endpoint, when co-occurring with prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented
particles (the occurrences with no arrival represent about 77%; cf. Table 1), as shown in (6),
and, interestingly enough, also when co-occurring with prototypically
directional/goal-oriented ones (the occurrences with no arrival represent about 88%; cf. Table
1), as shown in (7).

(6) ὄφρ᾽ ἂν μέν κ᾽ ἀγροὺς ἴομεν καὶ ἔργ᾽ ἀνθρώπων,

τόφρα σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι **μεθ᾽** ἡμιόνους καὶ ἄμαξαν

καρπαλίμως **ἔρχεσθαι** ·(*Od.* 6.259-61)

"so long as we are going through the country and the tilled fields of men,

keep on going (inf.) at a brisk pace **behind** the mules and the cart with the handmaids"

In (6) Nausicaa warns Odysseus to be careful during the way to the palace of her father
Alcinous. The infinitive (with imperative value) ἔρχεσθαι refers to a generic and atelic
movement (i.e. Motion) with reference to Odysseus (i.e. Figure). Unlike in (5), although it
co-occurs with the accusative ἡμιόνους καὶ ἄμαξαν "(the) mules and (the) cart", which refers
to a double Ground, the prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented particle μεθ᾽(ά)
"between" maintains its own non-directional semantic value, giving information about a
stative-locative Path with reference to the backward position Odysseus himself has to
maintain during the way. Furthermore, the contextual presence of the [–telic] verb εἶμι "to
go" (cf. the subjunctive ἴομεν) is noteworthy, as well as that of the durative adverbial ὄφρ᾽(α)
[...] τόφρα "until", this latter representing one of the diagnostic tests for verbal atelicity (cf.
Bartolotta 2017a and the references given therein).

In (7) the verb ἔρχομαι co-occurs, instead, with the directional particle ἀνά "upwards":

(7) [...] οἱ δέ τ᾽ ἐς αὐτὸν / τερπόμενοι λεύσσουσιν [...]

ἐρχόμενον δ' **ἀνὰ** ἄστυ θεὸν ὣς εἰσορόωσιν. (*Od*. 8.170-3)

"[...] and the other men look upon him (*scil*. an admirable man) with delight [...]

and **as he goes through** the city, they gaze upon him as upon a god."

With reference to the atelic movement of the implied Figure (i.e. an admirable man), the participle ἐρχόμενον co-occurs with the prototypically directional/goal-oriented particle ἀνά "upwards" functioning as a preposition with the accusative. As clarified by the context, it is worth of note that the semantic value of ἀνά, albeit prototypically directional/goal oriented, is non-directional, as it refers to a generic *going through* the city (i.e. Ground), that is focusing on the intermediate segment of the Path followed by the Figure (i.e. the *traversal* subcomponent of the Path component; see Talmy 2000) (Note 15).

2.2.2 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Adverbs

Evidences of the actional opposition between ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον emerge also from the analysis of both the occurrences with Path-encoding spatial adverbs and, albeit to a lesser extent, that with Path-encoding case markers. As far as the first ones are concerned, data show (cf. Table 1) that the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἦλθον tend to involve the Figure's actual reaching the *endpoint* quite frequently (about 72% of the occurrences) when co-occurring with a directional/goal-oriented adverb, as shown in (8), and frequently enough (about 57% of the occurrences) also with a non-directional/non-goal-oriented one, as shown in (9).

(8) [...] μιν θηρεύοντ' ἔλασεν σῦς λευκῷ ὀδόντι

Παρνησόνδ' ἐλθόντα σὺν υἱάσιν Αὐτολύκοιο. (*Od*. 19.465-6)

"[...] with his white tusk, a boar had struck him (*scil*. Odysseus) while he was hunting, **when he went to Parnassus** with the sons of Autolycus."

In (8) the aorist participle ἐλθόντα expresses a telic movement (i.e. Motion) with reference to Odysseus (i.e. the implied Figure), while the directional adverb Παρνησόνδ'(ε) "to Parnassus", with its allative value, conveys the directional/goal-oriented Path in reference to Ground (i.e. Parnassus), depicting an endpoint which is actually reached by the Figure (Note 16).

(9) **ἀγχίμολόν** ῥά οἱ **ἦλθε** κατὰ στίχας, οὖτα δὲ δουρί

νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα [...] (*Il*. 16.820-1)

"Then he (*scil*. Hector) **came near** him (*scil*. Patroclus) through the ranks, and wounded him in the lowest part of the flank with a spear [...]"

In (9) the aorist ἦλθε refers to the telic movement (i.e. Motion) of Hector (i.e. Figure), while the adverb ἀγχίμολον "near, close at hand" (i.e. adverbial neuter form of the adjective ἀγχίμολος "coming near") expresses Path in reference to Ground (i.e. Patroclus), which is expressed by the dative οἱ (enclitic form of the third person pronoun; cf. LSJ 2011); the prepositional phrase κατὰ στίχας "through the ranks" represents a further Path-encoding

element. It is worthy of note that, despite the semantic value of the Path-encoding adverb ἀγχίμολόν is prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented, the motion event in (9) depicts the actual arrival of the Figure (i.e. Hector) to the endpoint (i.e. Patroclus), due to the inherent telicity of ἦλθε. This is confirmed by the physical contact between both heroes (cf. οὖτα δὲ δουρί νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα "and wounded him in the lowest part of the flank with a spear") (Note 17).

On the contrary, data show (cf. Table 1) that the motion events expressed by ἔρχομαι never involve the Figure's actual reaching the *endpoint* when co-occurring with a non-directional/non-goal oriented spatial adverb, as shown in (10). Interestingly enough, this happens even when the verb co-occurs with a directional/goal-oriented one (except for one occurrence only), as shown in (11).

(10) **ἀγχίμολον** δ᾽ Ὀδυσεὺς καὶ δῖος ὑφορβὸς

στήτην **ἐρχομένω** [...] (*Od*. 17.260-1)

"**As they drew near** (*scil*. to the Odysseus's house), both Odysseus and the excellent swineherd stopped [...]"

The context refers to Odysseus and his swineherd Eumaeus that are slowly moving forwards toward Odysseus's house (cf. v. 249, ἦκα κιόντας "going gently") and, suddenly, take a break near the place, in order to think of how to act (cf. v. 274). In the motion event in (10), the dual present participle ἐρχομένω refers to the atelic moving forward (i.e. Motion) of Odysseus and Eumaeus (i.e. Figure), while the adverb ἀγχίμολον conveys a non-directional/non-goal-oriented (rather stative-locative) Path in reference to an implied Ground (i.e. Odysseus's house). As confirmed by the aorist στήτην "they stopped" (ἵστημι), the motion event in (10) does not depict any Figure's reaching an endpoint (Note 18).

(11) Λητὼ γὰρ ἕλκησε, Διὸς κυδρὴν παράκοιτιν,

Πυθώδ᾽ ἐρχομένην διὰ καλλιχόρου Πανοπῆος. (*Od*. 11.580-1)

"He (*scil*. Tityos) raped Leto, the glorious wife of Zeus, **as she was going toward Pytho** through Panopeus with its fair dancing-grounds."

In the motion event in (11), the present participle ἐρχομένην refers to the movement (i.e. Motion) of Leto (i.e. Figure). Although the adverb Πυθώδ᾽(ε) "to(ward) Pytho" conveys a directional/goal-oriented Path in reference to Pytho (i e. Ground), the event does not involve any Figure's reaching an endpoint, due to the inherent atelicity of ἔρχομαι: in fact, the phrase Πυθώδ᾽ ἐρχομένην means "while she was on her way to Pytho" (cf. a comparable example in *Od*. 10.320).

2.2.3 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Case Markers

As far as the occurrences with Path-encoding nominal case markers are concerned, data show a high tendency (about 80% of the occurrences) to involve the Figure's actual reaching the endpoint in reference to the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἦλθον when co-occurring with a directional/goal oriented case marker (i.e. accusative or dative; cf. Tab. 1), as shown in

(12). On the other hand, the occurrences of [+telic] ἦλθον with a non-directional/non-goal-oriented case marker, in which no Figure's actual reaching the endpoint is involved, are that (5×; cf. Tab. 1) with the accusative of the internal object, i.e. ὁδόν "way, road", κέλευθα (pl.) "road, path, journey", as shown in (13).

(12) κλῦθί μευ, ὃ χθιζὸς θεὸς **ἤλυθες ἡμέτερον δῶ** (*Od.* 2.262)

> "Hear me (*scil*. Telemachus), you (*scil*. Athena) god who **came to our house** yesterday"

In (12) the aorist ἤλυθες refers to the telic movement (i.e. Motion) of Athena (i.e. Figure), while the accusative, with allative value, ἡμέτερον δῶ "to our house" (cf. δῶμα) conveys a directional/goal-oriented Path in reference to Telemachus's house (i.e. Ground), which represents the endpoint reached by Athena (Note 19).

(13) [...] ἄλλην **ὁδὸν** ἄλλα **κέλευθα** / **ἤλθομεν** ·(*Od.* 9.261-2)

> "[...] we (*scil*. Achaeans) **came by** another **way**, other **paths**"

In Homer, the phrase ἦλθον ὁδόν/κέλευθα generally refers to the idea of *making a journey, a way* (cf. *Il.* 1.151; 12.225; *Od.* 3.313). With the adjectives ἄλλην... ἄλλα "another... other", in (13) the phrase means *we came by another way/path* (i.e. different to the one we supposed to take). Although a telic explanation of this phrase is also suitable, the accusative marker cannot be understood as an allative conveying a directional/goal-oriented Path (Note 20).

As for ἔρχομαι, data do not allow to make generalizations in reference to it, due to the scarceness of its co-occurrences with Path-encoding case markers (cf. Tab. 1), i.e. with directional/goal-oriented dative (1×) and accusative (2×), as in (14), and with non-directional/non-goal-oriented genitive (1×), as in (15).

(14) **ἔρχεσθον κλισίην** Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος· (*Il.* 1.322)

> "**Go** you both (*scil*. Talthybius and Eurybates) **to(wards) the tent** of Achilles, Peleus's son"

In the motion event described in (14) by the dual present imperative ἔρχεσθον (i.e. Motion), Talthybius and Eurybates are the implied Figure, while the accusative κλισίην "tent" refers to the directional Path in relation to the Ground, i.e. "to(wards) the tent". Although the co-occurring directional/goal-oriented accusative κλισίην could telicize the event, it is significant that Talthybius and Eurybates do not reach the tent, as they meet Achilles sitting outside, near the ships (cf. vv. 329-30).

(15) **ἔρχονται πεδίοιο** μαχησόμενοι προτὶ ἄστυ (*Il.* 2.801)

> "they (*scil.* Trojans) **go through the plain** to fight against the city"

In (15) ἔρχονται expresses the generic and atelic idea of going (i.e. Motion) with reference to the Trojans (i.e. the implied Figure), while the partitive genitive πεδίοιο, with perlative value, i.e. "through the plain" (see Snell 1955-2010: 1030; Schwyzer 1959: 112), represents the non-directional/non-goal-oriented Path, which refers to the intermediate segment of the Path followed by the Figure (cf. also above (2), the traversal subcomponent).

3. Conclusion

The textual analysis of the Homeric contexts of use of ἔρχομαι and ἦλθον has allowed to shed light on the uncertain and debated actional value of ἔρχομαι, and to clarify its relationship with ἦλθον within the Homeric suppletive paradigm for *going*. In fact, Homeric data have provided evidence relating to the inherent atelicity of [–telic] ἔρχομαι, in opposition to the inherent telicity of [+telic] ἦλθον. As a result, the Homeric suppletive paradigm for *going* would ultimately be as follows: on the one hand [–telic] ἔρχομαι (present), εἶμι (futuristic present), on the other hand [+telic] ἐλεύσομαι (future), ἦλθον (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect). Verb-inherent (a)telicity has proved to be an important feature with reference to Homeric motion events, as it strongly affects the semantic value of the co-occurring elements, namely Path-encoding particles, and thus of the whole motion events too. In particular, due to the higher semantic compatibility between directional/goal-oriented Path-encoding elements and telic verbs, the prototypically directional particles tend to maintain their own directional value when co-occurring with [+telic] ἦλθον, unlike with [–telic] ἔρχομαι, with which they can also show a different (i.e. non-directional/non-goal-oriented) semantic value. Furthermore, extending the analysis to the other kind of Path-encoding elements (i.e. spatial adverbs and nominal case markers, besides spatial particles) and focusing on the Figure's actual reaching an endpoint within the motion events expressed by both chosen verbs, data have shown further significant evidences with reference to the mutual actional opposition of these verbs, based on inherent (a)telicity. In fact, the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἦλθον tend to involve the Figure's actual arrival to the endpoint, not only with directional/goal-oriented Path-encoding elements, but also with non-directional/non-goal-oriented ones; on the contrary, the motion event expressed by [–telic] ἔρχομαι never involves the Figure's actual arrival to the endpoint, not only with non-directional/non-goal-oriented Path-encoding elements, but also with directional/goal-oriented ones.

By clarifying the atelic actional status of ἔρχομαι, this study ultimately contributes to a better understanding of the suppletive relationship between the forms within the Homeric paradigm for *going*, also confirming that verb-inherent (a) telicity represents a crucial feature with reference to both Homeric motion events and verbal suppletivism.

References

Baldi, P. (2006). Towards a history of the manner of motion parameter in Greek and Indo-European. In P. Cuzzolin, & M. Napoli (Eds.), *Fonologia e Tipologia lessicale nella storia della lingua greca* (pp. 13-31). Milano, Franco Angeli.

Bartolotta, A. (2009). Root lexical features and inflectional marking of tense in Proto-Indo-European. *Journal of Linguistics*, *45*(3), 505-532.

Bartolotta, A. (2016). Inherent telicity and Proto-Indo-European verbal paradigms. *Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia*, *18*, 9-50.

Bartolotta, A. (2017a). On syntactic diagnostics as tests for telicity in ancient Indo-European languages. Evidence from Vedic and Greek. *Incontri Linguistici*, *40*(40), 39-63.

Bartolotta, A. (2017b). On deictic motion verbs in Homeric Greek. In F. Logozzo, & P. Poccetti (Eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics: new approaches, insights, perspectives* (pp. 277-292). Berlin-Boston, De Gruyter.

Bartolotta, A., & Nigrelli, C. (2017). Sulla codifica degli eventi di moto in greco omerico: il ruolo dell'aspetto lessicale. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, *120*(1), 20-39.

Bertinetto, P. M. (1986). *Tempo, aspetto e azione nel verbo italiano: il sistema dell'indicativo*. Firenze: Accademia Della Crusca.

Bloch, A. (1940). *Zur Geschichte einiger suppletiven Verba im Griechischen*. Basel.

Brugmann, K., & Delbrück, B. (1897-1916). *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Brugmann, K., & Thumb, A. (1913). *Griechische Grammatik, Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*. München: Beck.

Chantraine, P. (1968-1980). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cuzzolin, P., Putzu, I., & Ramat, P. (2006). The Indo-European Adverb in diachronic and typological perspective. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, *111*, 1-38.

Depraetere, I. (1995). On the necessity of distinguishing between (un) boundedness and (a)telicity. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, *18*(1), 1-19.

Imbert, C. (2010). Multiple preverbation in Homeric Greek: A typological insight. *CogniTextes*, *4*. Retrieved from http://cognitextes.revues.org/387

Kölligan, D. (2007). *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

Lehmann, C. (1995). *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Létoublon, F. (1985). *Il allait pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: suppletisme et aspect verbal*. Paris: Klincksieck.

LSJ. (2011). *The online Liddell Scott Jones. Greek English lexicon*. Irvine: University of California.

Luraghi, S. (2003). *On the meaning of prepositions and cases: The expression of semantic roles in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Meillet, A. (1926). Sur ἤλυθον, ἦλθον. *BSL*, *26*, 6-7.

Meillet, A. (1929). Grec ἔρχομαι. *Memoires de la Societè de Linguistique de Paris*, *23*, 249-258.

Nigrelli, C. (2019). Going in Homer: The Role of Verb-Inherent Actionality Within Self-Propelled Motion-Event Encoding. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, *9*(12), 1275-1291.

Nikitina, T. (2013). Lexical splits in the encoding of motion events from Archaic to Classical Greek. In J. Goschler, & A. Stefanowitsch (Eds.), *Variation and change in the encoding of motion events* (pp. 185-201). Amsterdam-Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Osthoff, H. (1899). *Vom Suppletivwesen der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Heidelberg: J. Hörning.

Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Voll. I-II. Bern-München: Francke Verlag.

Pompei, A. (2014). Verb-particle constructions and preverbs in Homeric Greek between telicization, incorporation and valency change. In A. Bartolotta (Ed.), *The Greek Verb. Morphology, Syntax and Semantics. Proceedings of the 8th International Meeting on Greek Linguistics, Agrigento, October 1-3, 2009* (pp. 253-276). Louvain-La-Neuve-Walpole, Peters.

Rix, H. (2001). *Lexicon der Indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

Romagno, D. (2002). Diatesi Indoeuropea e verbi di movimento greci: alcune considerazioni sull'intransitività. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, *87*, 163-174.

Schwyzer, E. (1959). *Griechische Grammatik* (Voll. I-II). Munich: Beck Verlag.

Skopeteas, S. (2008). Encoding spatial relations: language typology and diachronic change in Greek. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)*, *61*(1), 54-66.

Snell, B. (1955-2010). *Lexikon des Frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics: typology and process in concept structuring* (Vol. II). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Talmy, L. (2009). Main verb properties and equipollent framing. In J. Guo, E. Lieven, N. Budwig, S. Ervin-Tripp, K. Nakamura, & Ş. Özçalışkan (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic approaches to the psychology of language. Research the tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin* (pp. 389-402). New York-London, Psychology Press.

TLG. (2000). *Thesaurus Linguae Grecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. Irvine: University of California.

Vendler, Z. (1957). Verbs and Times. *The Philosophical Review*, *66*(2), 143-160.

Verkerk, A. (2014). *The evolutionary dynamics of motion event encoding*. Enschede: Ipskamp Drukkers.

Notes

Note 1. Actually, also a syntactical-compositional perspective on telicity is quite accepted, as co-occurring elements can change the inherent value of verbs (e.g. θέω "to run" [–telic] > ἐκθέω "to run out (of)" [+telic]). Nevertheless, all possible actional shifts are originated from inherent values, which are also confirmed by Homeric morphological evidences (i.e. the non-random distribution of tense inflectional markers).

Note 2. The verb εἶμι (cf. Skr. é-mi; Lat. eō < *ei-ō, athematic *ei-mi) traces back to the IE root *ei- "to go" (Pokorny 1959: 293 f.; Chantraine 1968-80: 322). As for ἦλθον, taking into account both stems ἐλθ- and ἐλυθ-/ἐλελυθ-, to which aorist ἦλθον/ἤλυθον, future ἐλεύσομαι (< *ἐλεύ[θ]σομαι), perfect εἰλήλουθα trace back, Chantraine (1968-80: 337) hypothesizes that -θ- may be a telic aspectual marker; Meillet (1926) and Pokorny (1959: 306) connect ἦλθον to the IE root *el-ew- and *el-u- (*el- < *h1l) "to push, put in motion", with -dh- as dental extension (cf. Arm. eli-; Gr. ἐλαύνω and ἐλάω "to push, put in motion"); Rix translates IE *h1ludh- (> ἤλυθον) as "to go up; to increase", then, for semantic extension, "to go; to come".

Note 3. Yet, the o-grade *or-gh of the same extended IE root (*er-gh-) is also connected to the verb ὀρχέομαι "to dance", which is atelic instead (see Bartolotta 2016: 27).

Note 4. The verb ἔρχομαι is commonly translated as "gehen/fahren; dahinziehen; (gerade) unterwegs sein" (Snell 1955-2010), "komme" (Pokorny 1959), "aller; venir" (Chantraine 1968-80), "gehe; komme" (Rix 2001), basically with reference to a generic idea of going, semantically more compatible with an atelic and non-directional movement.

Note 5. For the reasons discussed so far, the study is focused on ἔρχομαι, rather than εἶμι. The verb εἶμι, whose imperfect forms compensate for the lack of the imperfect within the paradigm, is excluded from the sample as its function as present is only residual, having actually a rather futuristic value (see Kölligan 2007).

Note 6. The Path-encoding elements are in bold within the examples of the present study.

Note 7. According to Talmy (2009), prepositions and prepositional phrases can be understood as Path-encoding satellites.

Note 8. Originally, particles were multifunctional and polysemic spatial adverbs which gave rise to preverbs along a path of increasing morphosyntactic cohesion with co-occurring verbs Cuzzolin et al. (2006). Due to its own diachronic linguistic stratification, the Homeric state of Ancient Greek synchronically shows different diachronic phases along which the grammaticalization process of particles took place. In particular, the status of agglutinated preverb, i.e. agglutinated to the verbal base in a verbal compound, represents the highest level of morphosyntactic cohesion with the verb, thus reflecting the most advanced phase within the grammaticalization process of the Homeric particles (see, among others, Schwyzer 1959; Lehmann 1995; Pompei 2014).

Note 9. The Homeric corpus has been analyzed by means of the digital Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG 2000). As the results of both nominal forms (i.e. participle and infinitive) and

finite ones basically overlap, they are presented together, albeit their different level of representativeness.

Note 10. In case more than one Path-encoding element co-occurs within a single motion event, the analysis focuses on the main one, which is also the one included in the sample, while the other further elements are excluded.

Note 11. Adverbs as Ἄϊδόσδε "to(wards) Hades" specifically convey [Path + Ground], whereas adverbs as ἀντίον "against" only convey Path, while Ground can be expressed by a nominal item or implied. Although the adverbial suffix -δε would be to reconnected to an old allative case marker, in the present study, lexemes as Ἄϊδόσδε "to(wards) Hades" are interpreted as Path-encoding adverbs rather than case markers.

Note 12. Comparable examples are in Od. 7.40; 17.329; cf. also below (15).

Note 13. All the occurrences without any Path-encoding elements are thus excluded from the sample. As far as particles are concerned, although they exhibit an inner polysemy, for space reason, each presented particle shows only one meaning.

Note 14. The particle μετά "between" prototypically has a stative, non-directional, semantic value when selecting a dative or genitive case; yet, it can also has a directional, goal-oriented, value when selecting an accusative, with reference to a double or, as in (5), multiple Ground (see Luraghi 2003: 247). Comparable examples are in Il. 7.35; 10.205-6; 15.56-7; Od. 4.258.

Note 15. A comparable example is in Il. 10.82.

Note 16. Comparable examples with directional adverbs are in Il. 11.231 (with ἀντίον "against"); 15.175 (with δεῦρο "hither").

Note 17. The example is even more interesting considering that a non-directional/goal oriented value is as well exhibited by the prototypically directional particle κατά "downwards" within the prepositional phrase κατὰ στίχας "through the ranks". A comparable context is in Il. 4.529-30; cf. also Il. 13.402-3 (with the adverb σχεδόν "near, hard by").

Note 18. Comparable example is the one in Il. 5.441-2 (with the stative-locative adverb χαμαί "on the ground").

Note 19. Comparable examples are those referring to the formula τάχα δ' αὐτῷ / ἦλθε κακόν "but swiftly an evil came to him" in Il. 15.449-50; 17.291-2, whose context describes a hero (i.e. Ground) who is mortally wounded by a κακόν "evil" (i.e. Figure), that is a fatal shot/assault of an enemy. Although αὐτῷ may also be considered as an ethical dative, an allative value (i.e. "to him") seems more suitable given this specific context: the dative thus encodes the directional/goal-oriented Path, also depicting a Ground (i.e. the wounded hero), which is the endpoint actually reached by the Figure. Furthermore, as it refers to an instant process, the co-occurring Manner-encoding adverb τάχα "quickly" is a significant clue of the inherent telic value of ἦλθε.

Note 20. A perlative explanation of the accusative marker (i.e. ἦλθον ὁδὸν/κέλευθα ''I/we went through a path'') seems unsuitable, because of both the presence of the accusative (rather than genitive), and the telic nature of the verb.

Copyrights