THE POETICS OF HIERARCHY: DEFINING THE SEMANTIC SCOPE
OF INDO-EUROPEAN *DEMHI- IN HOMERIC GREEK

by
LUDEENNA FONG CHOW
(Under the Direction of Dr. Jared Klein)

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to define and describe the semantic scope of the Indo-European verb root *demH₂- in Homeric Greek. It has a dual focus: a discussion about the use of this verb root in establishing hierarchical relationships in the Iliad and the Odyssey and a linguistic exploration of the synchronic and diachronic semantic field. The poet’s use of this root identifies and categorizes the relationships of domination between gods, men, women, and animals. The goal of this study to demonstrate how the polysemy of this root contributes to our understanding of Homeric characters and society.

INDEX WORDS: Semantic field, taming, control, binding, subduing, synchronic, diachronic, hierarchy, Iliad, Odyssey, Homer.
THE POETICS OF HIERARCHY: DEFINING THE SEMANTIC SCOPE
OF INDO-EUROPEAN *DEMHW- IN HOMERIC GREEK

by

LUDEENNA FONG CHOW
B.A., Dartmouth College, 2007

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012
THE POETICS OF HIERARCHY: DEFINING THE SEMANTIC SCOPE
OF INDO-EUROPEAN *DEMΗ2- IN HOMERIC GREEK

by

LUDENNA F. CHOW

Major Professor: Jared Klein
Committee: Nancy Felson
Nicholas Rynearson

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2012
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I’d like to thank Dr. Jared Klein, who nurtured my interest in and contributed infinitely to my knowledge of Indo-European linguistics. The other members of my committee, Dr. Nancy Felson and Dr. Nicholas Rynearson, were invaluable in their guidance in the writing process and patient editing of my drafts.

I am grateful to my teachers at Dartmouth College: Dr. Paul Christesen who provided endless encouragement in all avenues of life through his lens of Classics and Dr. Timothy Pulju, who first inspired my interest in Indo-European linguistics.

I am especially thankful for my peers, Sin Guanci, Nate Moore, Brent Peterson, and Charlie Russell-Schlesinger, who have helped, challenged, and supported me throughout this process. A final word of thanks goes to David Driscoll, who endlessly encouraged me by reading Greek with me, editing my drafts, suggesting resources, and sharing my love of Classics.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  THE UNIVERSE OF CONTROL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  <em>DEMH₂</em> IN HOMERIC GREEK</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  <em>DEMH₂</em> ELSEWHERE IN INDO-EUROPEAN</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKS CITED</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of this thesis is to define the semantic range of the Indo-European verb root *demH₂- in the Homeric language of the Iliad and the Odyssey. The root *demH₂- yields a variety of derivatives in Homeric Greek, the most common of which is δαμάζω, which is itself a secondary development of δάμνημι, but semantically and grammatically the two function identically. Its basic definition ‘tame’ undergoes semantic widening to take on several meanings within the Homeric corpus, ranging from training an animal to exerting an overwhelming force that sometimes results in the death of the recipient. Those meanings, however, are not distinct: they all, rather, imply a hierarchical relationship between two figures. The polysemous ambiguity of *demH₂- provides a rich portrayal of the inherent hierarchy among characters and natural forces in the Homeric world.

Henceforth, I will use the term “agent” to refer to the character or force which performs the overpowering, and the term “patient” to refer to the character or force which is overpowered. This identification of agent and patient makes it possible to address the semantic role of this verb independent of voice. While verbs do not characteristically change semantically when used in different tenses, it is not unusual for verbs to have some
variation with respect to voice. The definition of *demH₂*, however, does not differ based on voice, which is illustrated by the following examples of this verb in the 3rd person aorist. Whether the verb is active, middle, or passive, the meaning 'overpower, subdue' is conjugated accordingly, i.e. the active can be translated ‘subdue,’ the passive can be translated ‘is subdued,’ the middle can be translated either way. First, consider the following example of *demH₂-* used in the active voice:

\[
\tau \on\d' \'\omicron\nu\ \beta\'\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\zeta\ \omicron\nu\ \kappa\'\omicron\mu\alpha\mu\alpha\omicron\sigma\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\nu.1
\]

'the swift arrow did not subdue him'

In this first example, the arrow is the agent, he (Diomedes) is the patient, and the verb is active, translated here as ‘subdue.’ (It could also reasonably be defined as ‘strike,’ but in a battle scenario, it stands to reason that an arrow strike is capable of subduing its victim.)

Now consider the following example of *demH₂-* used in the middle voice:

\[
\eta\ \mu\alpha\lambda\alpha\ \sigma' \ '\omicron\nu\ \beta\'\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\zeta\ \omicron\nu\ \kappa\'\omicron\mu\alpha\mu\alpha\omicron\sigma\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon.2
\]

'it is true that the swift shot, the sharp arrow, did not subdue you'

In this second example, the arrow is the agent, and the patient is the addressee (Diomedes), providing δαμάσσατο with a semantic value identical to that of the active form above.

Finally, consider the following example of *demH₂-* used in the passive voice:

\[
'\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ \gamma\acute\alpha\rho\nu\ \kappa\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\mu\mu\nu\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon.3
\]

'for it [the boar] would have been subdued not by a few mortals'

---

1 *Iliad* 5.106 (translations are all my own except when otherwise noted).
2 *Iliad* 5.278.
3 *Iliad* 9.545.
In this third example, the verb is passive, so the patient being acted upon is the boar, while the agent is expressed by means of the dative. It is therefore reasonable to posit that this root does not vary semantically based on voice. This is not to say that voice should be completely disregarded – the voice of the verb will often provide nuance as to the interpretation of the scene – but it can be set aside in the analysis of the syntax.

The vocabulary derived from \(*demH_2*- expresses a hierarchy between the agent and the patient: the person performing the action of ‘dispatching’ (as \(*demH_2*- will be translated for now) is shown by that very action to be in some way superior to the person being dispatched. \(*demH_2*- verbs could even be translated as ‘prove through action to be superior to.’ It is therefore important to discover what differentiates \(*demH_2*- from other verbs that likewise appear to express control over others. The goal of this chapter is to delimit and describe a ‘universe of control’ in archaic hexameter verse by exploring what makes the authority expressed in \(*demH_2*- different from other authoritative verbs like κτείνω 'kill,' δέω 'bind,' and ἰμάσσω 'lash.'

The first step towards answering this question is to look at places where \(*demH_2*- is paired with other verbs or nouns that imply an action, e.g. when a verbal noun like βέλος is the subject of \(*demH_2*-\). Specifically, I will look at instances where \(*demH_2*- and another verb are joined hypotactically, either through a participial relationship or through a subordinate

---

4 This “true dative” is a kind of ethical dative that has been extended semantically to occupy the same grammatical role as ὑπὸ with the genitive, even when the agent is a person (see Monro, Chantraine, Kühner). In *Il.* 18.103 we see οἱ δὴ πολέες δάμεν Ἕκτορι δίῳ ‘those many who were defeated by excellent Hector,’ where the dative is definitively used as a dative of agent.
clause. I will also consider a few paratactic relationships, if the relationship between the two verbs can be readily ascertained.

Other verbs that are found with *demH₂- can be divided into the following categories:
verbs of hitting with a weapon (βάλλω, πλήσσω, ἱμάσσω); verbs of binding (πεδάω, δέω);
verbs of killing and dying (κτείνω, θνῄσκω, ὄλλυμι); verbs describing actions after dispatching (fleeing, sleeping, and stealing). By addressing each of these categories, I will determine: 1) if the verb supplements *demH₂- by illustrating how somebody can demonstrate his predominance (since *demH₂- alone can express a hierarchy between two entities, but does not specify what action the agent undertakes to prove his superiority); 2) if the verb is not a descriptor of the root, but otherwise related temporally and causally to the nearby use of *demH₂-.

1. Verbs of hitting, striking, and lashing (βάλλω, πλήσσω, ἱμάσσω)

The most abundant and straightforward category is that of *demH₂- in concordance with verbs of hitting, striking, and lashing. All these verbs occupy a single semantic field, since all describe injury to another man’s body through physical blows (either of projectile weapons, melee weapons, or whips/lashes). Consider the following illustrative example, where a verb of hitting and striking occurs in a subordinate clause with a form of *demH₂- in the main clause. Lykaon, one of Priam’s sons, supplicates Akhilleus, begging to be
ransomed alive back to the Trojans. Lykaon points to the fate of his brother Polydoros, whose death was described at 20.407-418, and notes that if Lykaon dies, Akhilleus will have killed both of his mother’s sons:\(^5\)

\[\tau\acute{e}ς δὲ δύω γενόμεσθα, σὺ δὲ ἀμφὸς ὃς θομήσεις, ἤτοι τὸν πρῶτοι μετὰ πρυλέεσσι δάμασσας ἀντίθεον Πολύδωρον, ἐπεὶ βάλες ὀξέϊ δουρί.\(^6\)

'And we two were born from her, but you will slay both of us. Indeed you already dispatched one among the foremost foot-soldiers, godlike Polydoros, since you hit him with a sharp spear.'

The relationship between βάλλω and *demH\(_2\)* in this sentence hinges on the question of whether the subordinate conjunction ἐπεί conveys purely temporal force ('after') or also a causal force ('since').\(^7\) The context demands the latter, since Lykaon would not add the detail of the spear if its only significance were that it happened before the dispatching. There would be little rhetorical force behind Lykaon's plea if he said “you dispatched him after you hit him.”\(^8\) Instead, the two must be linked causally as well as temporally: Akhilleus' spear-toss is directly responsible for the dispatching of Polydoros. Such a reading also makes sense rhetorically, since Lykaon wishes to emphasize Akhilleus' personal responsibility for the dispatching and resultant death of Polydoros, so that Akhilleus is more likely to spare Lykaon now.\(^9\)

---

\(^5\) Richardson, 1993: 61.

\(^6\) **Il.** 21.89-91.

\(^7\) Both meanings attested in Homer. Cf. Cunliffe, *LSJ* and *LfGrE* ad loc.

\(^8\) Nor could *demH\(_2\)* refer to another action (e.g. striking Polydoros with a sword) after hitting him with a spear. The spear-toss is Akhilleus' only interaction with Polydoros; immediately after the spear hits Polydoros he sinks to the ground and dies (**Il.** 20.417-8).

\(^9\) Cf. Mackie, 1996: 76-7 (“... the genealogy constitutes an appeal to pity”).
The relevance of this causal relationship for the study of *demH₂-* lies in the understanding that Akhilleus actually asserts his dominance over Polydoros by means of the spear-toss. Consequently, the two actions are congruent, and βάλλω is one example of the action by which one person can dispatch (*demH₂-*) another. In the context of a successful hit, βάλλω implicitly expresses hierarchy, while the nearby use of *demH₂-* marks it explicitly.

The same relationship is evident when the verb of striking has a participial relationship to *demH₂-*. Consider the following passage from the Theogony, where Zeus attacks and defeats Typhoeus:

Zeίς δ' ἐπεί οὖν κόρθυνεν ἑὸν μένος, εἶλετο δ' ὅπλα, βροντὴν τε στεροπὴν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν, πλῆξεν ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο ἐπάλμενος· ἀμφὶ δὲ πάσας ἐπρεσε θεσπεσίας κεφαλὰς δεινοῖο πελώρου. αὐτὰρ ἐπεί δὴ μιν δάμασε πληγῆσιν ἱμάσσας, ἥρπε γυιωθείς, στονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη.¹⁰

'And when Zeus marshalled his strength, and picked up his weapons, the thunder, lightning, the shining thunderbolt, he leaped (on Typhoeus) from Olympus and struck him. And he kindled all the large heads of the dread beast. But when he subdued him by lashing him with blows, he fell unlimbed, and the monstrous earth groaned.'

Hesiod specifies πληγῆσιν ἱμάσσας in addition to πλῆξεν (855) and ἐπρεσε (856), all three of which seem to denote doing injury to another’s body. But the most significant aspect of this scene is that the participle ἱμάσσας 'lashing' is a circumstantial participle expressing

---

¹⁰ Hes, Th. 853-8.
means: Zeus has dispatched Typhoeus by lashing him. As with the blow in the previously mentioned scene, the subordinate verb of striking specifies the actual action by which the superior proves his advantage.11

The use of nouns for 'arrow' and 'spear' with *demH₂- without any other more specific context suggests a default context of striking or hitting. These martial implements support the notion that a successful shot or blow is one means by which a person can exert his superiority over another. Consider one common collocation of arrows with *demH₂-, with this noun as the agent of the verb,12 such as when Odysseus kills the suitors:

τοὺς δ' ἣδη ἐδάμασε βίος καὶ ταρφέες ιοί.13

'And the others the bow and the thick arrows had already dispatched.'

The use of the metonymic βίος 'bow' and ιοί 'arrows' as the subjects of *demH₂- is suggestive. These nouns can only serve as the subjects of the sentence if the shots themselves are the instruments that subdue another person. A warrior can express his superiority over another by means of the act of hitting with a shot.

Another common collocation consists of martial instruments such as an arrow or spear appearing in the dative with mediopassive forms of *demH₂-.14 Consider this example

11 Smyth # 2063, cf. Od. 18.56-7 for a similar example.
12 For similar examples (all from the Iliad), see Il. 5.106, 5.278, 11.478, 14.439, and 16.812. The examples at Il. 11.478 and 14.439 are further discussed on p. 29.
13 Od. 22.246.
from book 14 of the *Iliad*, where Akamas boasts over his slaughter of the Boeotian Promakhos:

φράζεσθ’ ὡς ύμιν Πρόμαχος δεδημένος εὐθεί / ἔγχει ἐμῷ...

'Consider how your Promakhos sleeps, subdued / by my spear...'

Here ἔγχος 'spear' is an instrumental dative with a middle perfect form of *demH₂*. The noun that represents its previous action – a spear-thrust that killed Promakhos at 14.476 – is the actual mechanism that dispatched Promakhos. In previous examples, striking is the action by which a warrior dispatches another. Akamas here asserts his superiority over Promakhos by suggesting that through wounding him with his spear, he has dispatched (*demH₂*) him.

It is therefore reasonable to conclude that verbs of hitting, striking, and lashing can all be the means by which someone can dispatch (*demH₂*) another. A comparison of other instances of ἱμάσσω in Homer suggests that lashing another intelligent actor always denotes hierarchy. For example, Zeus' threat to Hera points to a reminder of when Hera was utterly under his control:

οὐ μὰν οἶδ’ εἰ αὐτὲ κακοφοραφύς ἀλεγεινής
πρώτη ἐπαύρηαι καὶ σὲ πληγῆσαιν ἱμάσσω.

η οὐ μέμνη ὅτε τ’ ἐκρέμω υψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖν
ἀκμονας ἤκα δύω, περὶ χερσὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἠλα
χώσεων ὀρφεκτον; σὺ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησιν
ἐκρέμω. ἠλάστεο δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,

16  In contrast to the lashing of animals, which agents do in order to make the animals move: *Il.* 5.589, 11.280, 11.531, 17.624, *Od.* 5.380, 6.316. While such an action also suggests the superiority of the person whipping, the action is not solely intended to express hierarchy, as the lashing of other humans or gods is.
'I don’t know if you will again be the first to reap the rewards of your grievous plotting of evil when I lash you with blows. Don’t you remember when you hung from up high, and from your two feet I let two anvils hang, and I tied a bond around your feet, golden, unbreakable? And in the air and clouds you hung. And the gods in broad Olympus raged impotently, but even standing alongside they could not free you. Rather, whomever I caught I grabbed and threw from the threshold, so that he reached the earth hardly able to move.’

Zeus wants to impress upon Hera just how much superior he is to her and to the other gods. Elsewhere, Zeus occasionally asserts his superiority with similar imagery of hanging throughout the Iliad, most explicitly in book 8. He dares the other gods to try and fail to drag him out of Olympus, closing with the boast: τόσσον ἐγὼ περί τ’ εἰμί θεῶν περί τ’ εἴμ’ ἀνθρώπων 'by so much am I both the best of the gods and the best of humans.' So too the image of Hera, hanging in pain as the other gods stand by helplessly, cements Zeus’ position at the top of the Olympian hierarchy.

Here Zeus suggests that lashing Hera with blows would again communicate his superiority over her. The key word, αὖτε, connects the future experience of lashing at lines 16-17 with Hera’s past experience of hanging at lines 18-21. If the point of lines 18-21 is to remind Hera of her fundamental inferiority to her husband, then αὖτε suggests that 16-17 have the same rhetorical force: the lashing of Hera would equally put her in her place.

17 Il. 15.16-21.
18 Il. 8.27.
Interestingly, the poet describes the hierarchy thoroughly without using *demH₂- at all. This scene calls to mind the *Theogony* passage previously mentioned, where 'lashing blows' are deliberately coupled with *demH₂-, but rather than *σε δαμάζω πληγήσιν ἱμάσσας, Homer chooses σε πληγήσιν ἱμάσσω. One can then conclude that verbs of lashing, if the lashing is successful – like verbs of striking and hitting – always imply hierarchy.¹⁹ Inclusion of *demH₂- merely makes this hierarchy explicit.

2. Verbs of binding

A second semantic field connected with *demH₂- is that of binding, using the verbs πεδάω and δέω (as its verbal noun δέσμος). While examples of section 1 are abundant, there are only two occurrences of *demH₂- with words of binding. These occurrences nevertheless make it clear that binding, like striking, can serve as the means by which one agent can dispatch another.

The first instance is found in *Iliad* 13, where Poseidon assists Idomeneus in killing the Trojan Alkathoos, a son-in-law of Ankhises. Poseidon dispatches Alkathoos by binding his limbs with a charm:

\[ τὸν τόθ' ύπ' Ἰδομενῆι Ποσειδάων ἐδάμασσε \]
\[ θέλεσά ὅσσε φαεινά, πέδησε δὲ φαιδιμα γνία. \]

¹⁹ Cf. *Il.* 2.782, where Zeus lashes the earth around Typhoeus to express his anger. Watkins (1995: 454) argues otherwise, suggesting that the lashing of the earth is incidental in the pursuit of the desired patient, Typhoeus.

Then Poseidon dispatched him at Idomeneus’ hands by charming his shining eyes, for he bound his shining limbs.

The charming of the eyes and the binding of the limbs are closely related. Janko, citing Patroclus in *Il.* 16 and Hermes in *Od.* 24 as parallels, claims that the bewitching of the eyes means that Poseidon puts Alkathoos in a trance, and thereby causes Alkathoos’ limbs to be bound, or from another perspective, causes him to lose control of his limbs. Janko, 1994: 102. The δέ of line 435 does not link ἐδάμασσε and πέδησε; rather, it functions as an explanatory δέ after the participle θέλξας. In Homer, δέ frequently substituted for γάρ (Denniston 1959: 169).

The whole sentence could be loosely translated as, “Poseidon dispatched Alkathoos by charming him, because that charm bound his limbs.” The two actions of line 435 together express the means by which Poseidon manages to dispatch Alkathoos, and of these two, the latter is particularly important: the charm dispatches Alkathoos not by its inherent potency, but because it binds his limbs. Binding, then, like striking, is a means for one agent to dispatch (*demH₂*) another.

The second instance of *demH₂*—with a noun meaning ‘bond’—confirms this suggestion. Dione, consoling Aphrodite after she is wounded on the battlefield, reminds her that other gods have suffered at the hands of men. Ares, too, was badly hurt when he was bound in a jar for thirteen months:

χαλκέῳ δ’ ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας·
καὶ νῦ κεν ἐν Ξῆθ’ ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἁτος πολέμοιο,
ἐι μή μητρυή περικαλλής Ἠερίβοια
Ἐχμέα ἐξήγγειλεν· ὁ δ’ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἀρηα

22 In Homer, δέ frequently substituted for γάρ (Denniston 1959: 169).
'And he was bound in a bronze jar for thirteen months. And Ares, insatiate of war, would have perished there, if his stepmother, the gorgeous Eeriboia, hadn't told Hermes. And he stole Ares, already badly pressed, for the tough fetter was dispatching him.'

Aside from the imperfect (ἐδάμνα), this scene exactly parallels the one above with ioi; again, a physical object serves as the subject of the verb *demH1*, suggesting that the bond itself is doing the dispatching. As in that case, the act of binding is how someone (here Otus and Ephialtes) dispatches another.

### 3. Verbs of killing and dying

Verbs of killing ((ἀπο)κτείνω), along with their cousins, the verbs of dying (θνῄσκω, ὀλλυμι in the mediopassive & perfect), compose another category of verbs that sometimes coincide with *demH2*. This category is more complicated than the two previous ones in two ways: first, one can kill another without dispatching him; second, the quality of the dispatching is different.

The distinction between killing and dispatching is most clearly seen in Patroclus' dying speech to Hector:

> ἰδὴ νῦν Ἑκτὸρ μεγάλ’ εὔχεο· σοὶ γὰρ ἐδώκε νίκην Ζεὺς Κρονίδης καὶ Ἀπόλλων, οἱ με δάμασσαν ὁμιδώς· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀπ’ ὠμῶν τεύχε’ ἑλοντο.

23 *Il.* 5.386-391.
Already now, Hector, you have boasted greatly. For Zeus, the son of Kronos, gave you victory, along with Apollo. The two of them dispatched me easily, for they themselves ripped the armor from my shoulders. But even if twenty had faced me, if they had been like you all of them would have perished on the spot, dispatched by my spear. But destructive fate killed me, along with the son of Leto, and among men Euphorbos. You are only the third to kill me.'

Patroclus draws a careful distinction between dispatching and killing in this speech, clearly labeling which perpetrators of his downfall dispatched him and which killed him. In lines 849-850, he freely admits that four figures had a role in his death: fate (here equivalent to Zeus), Apollo, Euphorbos, Hector himself. In the initial lines of his speech (844-846), however, he refuses to admit that he was dispatched by anyone other than Zeus and Apollo. He justifies the discrepancy between these two accounts of his death at lines 847-8: he is so superior to Hector on the battlefield that if the gods hadn't intervened he could have killed twenty warriors equal to Hector. Patroclus' distinction implies that not all killings demonstrate a killer's superiority over the victim, but if somebody kills an enemy in a way that proves his superiority as a warrior, he can rightly claim to have dispatched (*demH₂-) him.

Such a distinction justifies both the occasional presence of *demH₂- with a verb of killing or dying and the absence of *demH₂- as a participle with the superficially similar

24 Il. 16.844-850.
cases of the verbs of striking and binding. *demH₂- is not needed for the verbs of striking and binding because those verbs already implicitly communicate hierarchy, but the addition of *demH₂- as a participle with verbs of killing signals that this killing is one that proves the agent's superiority as a warrior. In the Hesiodic Shield, when Amphitryon kills Electryon, the father of Alkmene, the narrator presents this act as justification for Alkmene's unusual respect for her husband:

> ἥ δὲ καὶ ὡς κατὰ θυμόν ἑὸν τίεσκεν ἀκοίτην,
> ὡς οὖ πίω τις ἐτισε γυναικών ὕηλυτεράων
> ἥ μέν οἱ πατέρῃ ἐσθλὸν ὀπέκτανε ἴφι δαμάσσας...

> 'And she (continually) respected her husband in her heart,
as no other female women ever honored her husband.
He really killed her courageous father, dispatching him with force...'

Alkmene respects her husband not only because he has gained from her father the role of male protector, but also because he is a great warrior, and he has proven that he is a great warrior by dispatching (δαμάσσας) a courageous warrior (ἐσθλὸν). The use of *demH₂-here as a participle helps to justify Alkmene's hyper-admiration for her husband.²⁶

A second contrast between killing and striking is that the quality of the dispatching is different. In the following two examples, the weapon successfully hits its target but does not immediately kill it. First, Hector, struck by Ajax with a boulder, is rushed to the river Xanthos to wash his wounds, but he remains near death:

---

²⁵ Hes. Shield, 11. ἥ μέν is rendered somewhat colloquially as ‘really’ (Denniston 1959: 389); elsewhere it is confined to speeches (with one other exception).
²⁶ Cf. p. 27-8 for a similar juxtaposition of *demH₂- with vocabulary of dying (ὀλέσθαι), and p. 49 for further discussion of the use of demH₂- in conveying misogyny.
Ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἰξον ἐὑρρέειος ποταμοῖο
Ξάνθου δινήεντος, ὃν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεύς,
ἔνθα μιν ἐξ ἵππων πέλασαν χθονί, καὶ δὲ οἱ úῳρ
χεῦαν· ὁ δ' ἀμπνύνθη καὶ ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,
ἐξόμενος δ' ἐπὶ γούνα κελαινεφὲς αἷμ' ἀπέμεσσεν·
αὖτις δ' ἐξοπίσω πλῆτο χθονί, τῷ δὲ οἱ όσσε
νῦξ ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα· βέλος δ' ἐτι θυμόν ἐδάμνα.27

'But when they reached the crossing of the well-flowing river,
the whirling Xanthos, whom immortal Zeus bore,
there they brought him down from the horses onto the earth, and they poured water
over him. And he caught his breath and looked up with his eyes,
and kneeling he vomited up black blood.
And he was carried back down onto the ground, and black night
covered his two eyes. For the blow was still overcoming his soul.'

Here the imperfect force of the verb indicates a process of domination that is ongoing but
not yet completed, and this domination takes the form of continuing to injure Hector. This
injury looks similar to death, but does not quite achieve the deed.28 Contrast another simile,
where a blow does eventually kill its target:

ἀμφὶ δ' ἀρ' αὐτὸν
Τρώες ἔπονθ' ὡς εἴ τε δαφοῖνοι θώες ὀρέσφιν
ἀμφ' ἐλαφον κεραῦν βεβλημένον, ὅν τ' ἔβαλ' ἀνήρ
ἰῷ ἀπὸ νευρῆς· τὸν μέν τ' ἤλυξε πόδεσσι
φεύγων, ὁφ' ἀίμα λιαρὸν καὶ γούνατ' ὀρώρῃ.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τὸν γε δαμάσσεται ὠκὺς ὀϊστός,
ὠμοφάγοι μιν θώες ἐν οὔρεσι δαρδάπτουσιν
ἐν νέμει σκιερῷ.29

'And the Trojans followed
him like tawny beasts on the mountains
follow a wounded horned deer, whom a man hits
with an arrow from a bowstring. It escapes him with its feet

28 νῦξ + ἐκάλυψε often but not always marks death (cf. Il. 5.310, etc.).
29 Il. 11.473-480.
by fleeing, so long as warm blood flows and its knees move.  
But whenever the swift arrow overcomes it,  
the ravenous beasts on the mountains devour it  
in a shady grove.'

The verb δαμάσσεται is an s-aorist subjunctive, expressing the completion of the act of dispatching – the death of the deer. From these two examples one could suppose a continuum of dispatching: the ultimate form of dispatching, marked with an aorist, is that which kills its opponent; less complete kinds of domination, marked with an imperfect, merely wound their target, though even these occasionally bring about a state that resembles death.\(^30\)

4. *demH₂- and the universe of control

The spectrum from incomplete domination to obliteration, punctuated by martial verbs, can be illustrated by the following diagram:

*demH₂-

---

no domination  

degrees of wounding  

obliterate

*Fig. 1. The continuum of dispatching (*demH₂-*)

The previous three sections have surveyed all of the instances in archaic hexameter where a martial verb is collocated with *demH₂-: the three means by which a Homeric or Hesiodic

\(^30\) Il. 5.391 (the bonds overpowering the imprisoned Ares) should belong in this category.
agent can dispatch a patient in combat are by striking, binding, or killing him. Strikingly absent are other types of control one might exert over another; one cannot dispatch another by successfully threatening him into submission, for example, or by bribing him.

Another way to conceptualize the universe of control is with semantic spheres:

![Semantic Spheres Diagram]

*Fig. 2. *$demH_2$* and the universe of control.*

It is necessary to consider the limited size of the *$demH_2$* circle and what differentiates strike, lash, and kill from other types of control. These three actions share a few characteristics: first, they all involve the patient's body. In each case the action violates the integrity of the body and in doing so causes the patient to lose control over his own body. In the case of resulting death, the patient loses control to the point of never again having any control over his body. This violation is also involuntary, having been effected by an outside agent. That is, this outside agent proves his superiority over the inferior patient by asserting control over the latter's body: the patient is proven to be inferior by his inability to maintain the integrity of his body despite his own wishes. With this perspective, *$demH_2$*
could be defined as ‘prove one's superiority to another by seizing control of the latter's body against his/her wishes’.  

There are some apparent exceptions to these conclusions, but as I will show, these exceptions all occur in character speech, and far from disproving these conclusions, they reveal aspects of the characterization and rhetorical force of each speech. First, Polyphemus twice claims – once to a ram, and once to Odysseus himself – that Odysseus blinded him after dispatching him with wine:

[to the ram] ‘Do you miss your master's eye, of which the bad man blinded him, along with his grievous companions, after he dispatched his wits with wine…’

[to himself, in earshot of Odysseus] ‘And as it is, despite being little, a good for nothing, and feeble, [Odysseus] blinded me of my eye, after he dispatched me with wine.’

The wine is highly irregular: nowhere else, in archaic hexameter or even the whole of Greek literature, is anyone dispatched with wine. Nor would someone be expected to be

---

31 This definition also offers insight as to why characters are often described as being 'dispatched by sleep' (Il. 10.2, Il. 24.678, Od. 7.318, 13.119, 15.6, Hes. Op. 116; joined with φιλότης at Il. 14.353). Though not expressing a hierarchy, sleep does involuntarily seize control of one's body. Naturally, these collocations are sometimes joined with a verb of sleeping.

32 Od. 9.452-4.

33 Od. 9.515-6.

34 Hesychius glosses ποτιδέγμενοι as, among other things, οἶνῳ δαμασθέντες, which is puzzling because the meaning does not fit any extant occurrence of ποτιδέγμενοι, and the gloss is itself so uncommon.
dispatched by wine, as drinking alcohol is an entirely voluntary activity (while obviously causing partial loss of one’s faculties), quite unlike being struck or lashed.\textsuperscript{35} In fact, Polyphemus voluntarily chooses to drink the wine, even asking for more at 9.355-359. He claims ignorance, however, of the effect that the wine will have on him, and his declaration that Odysseus dispatched him with wine can be read as an avoidance of responsibility on his part. If he had genuinely been dispatched, like a warrior on the battlefield, he could escape any blame for the outcome. Instead, Polyphemus refuses to acknowledge his own accountability in the loss of his eye.

Another apparent exception occurs when Helen, reminiscing to her husband Menelaos and Telemakhos in Sparta, describes Odysseus’ disguise for his secret mission into Troy:

```
ἀλλ’ οἶον τόδ’ ἔρεξε καὶ ἔτλη καρτερὸς ἀνὴρ
dήμῳ ἐνὶ Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ’ Ἀχαιοῖ.
αὐτὸν μὲν πληγήσας ἀεικελήσας
dαμάσσας, ἵπποις καὶ πόλεις ἀνδρῶν
ἀνδρῶν δυσμενέων κατέδυ πόλιν εὐρύάγυιαν.
ἄλλῳ δ’ αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἤϊσκε
Δέκτει, ὃς οὐδὲν τοῖος ἐην ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.\textsuperscript{36}
```

'But the stout man perpetrated and suffered such a deed as this one in the Troad, where you Achaeans were suffering pains. After dispatching himself with unseemly blows, and after putting dirty clothes on his shoulders, like a slave, he entered the enemy city with its broad roads. And by disguising himself he looked like another man, Dektes, who was not at all the sort of man as was on the ships of the Achaeans.'

\textsuperscript{35} We might note the existence at the classical symposium of the συμποσίαρχος, who did control how much alcohol each person drank, though obviously with the consent of the drinkers.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Od.} 4.242-8.
Odysseus takes the unparalleled action of dispatching *himself*, a seeming contradiction, given the word's essential meaning as mediating a relationship between two entities. Helen distorts the meaning of *demH₂*- here to highlight the exceptionality of Odysseus' action. Odysseus struck his own body with blows with such a disregard for his own wishes, as if he were hitting an enemy. Such an action, split as it were between the rational Odysseus who commands the action and the physical Odysseus who suffers the blows, deserves to be called something which Odysseus both ἔρεξε 'perpetrates' and ἔτλη 'endures.'

5. Other verbs with *demH₂-

Although all these examples extensively plot the universe of control, there are numerous other verbs which occur in close proximity to *demH₂-. Verbs which are found with *demH₂-, but do not describe the dispatching itself, fall into two categories. The first category is semantically equivalent to simply the passive voice of *demH₂-. Some verbs meaning 'submit' or 'obey' are used more or less in the same way as the passive of *demH₂-:

notably υφίστημι (ll. 9.161), but also ἐπιπείθοντο (ll. 5.288). The second category expresses consequences for the dispatched patients, and it consists of 'flee' and 'steal' verbs.

First, when people have been dispatched and proven inferior, they sometimes do not simply die, but rather are able to flee. This only occurs, however, if the characters are

37 Cf. Od. 3.214, 16.95.
metaphorically dispatched, e.g. by their cowardice or by the blow of the god. For example, the Trojans try to return to the city after being ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες “dispatched by their cowardice.” If, on the other hand, one is physically dispatched, he no longer possesses the control over his body needed to flee.

Second, when one warrior dispatches another, he has the ability (and occasionally the inclination) to take the belongings of the patient. Naturally, a warrior who loses control of his own body, which is of utmost priority in battle, similarly loses control of his accoutrements: his ships (Il. 15.476), his people (Od. 3.304), or his sphere of activity among the gods (Hes. Th. 490).

As I have shown, *demH2- expresses a type of control one entity can assert over another, but specifically depicts a hierarchical relationship between the two and specifies which one is the superior. In the next chapter, I will address the nuanced quality of the interactions portrayed by Homer’s use of *demH2-.

---

38 Il. 17.320.
CHAPTER 2

*DEM\text{H}_2- IN HOMERIC GREEK

This chapter will take a closer look at the many different ways that *demH_2- is used in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, with a look also at Hesiod where relevant. Now that I have shown that *demH_2- implicitly expresses hierarchy (without specifying the action that demonstrates that hierarchy), I will focus more directly on the semantic range of *demH_2- itself and explore the nature of the hierarchies it defines. I will address all the instances of this root in the two Homeric poems and comment on how the poet uses *demH_2- to depict hierarchy in the epic environment.

I define the semantic scope of the verb by focusing on three sets of relationships: divine and human, human and human, human and animal. The contexts provide a nuanced definition of *demH_2- and help us not only identify and but also categorize each occurrence. The uses of *demH_2- imply that events occur because of an inherent hierarchy among the characters involved. It is impossible, therefore, to separate the meaning from the hierarchical setting. For the listener of epic poetry, the societal structure and the verb choice are intricately interrelated.
The general definition of *demH₂*- used in the first chapter was 'dispatch,' but in this chapter I will address the more varied definitions this class of verb can take, depending on the context. It can be simply translated as 'overcome/overpower,' and also more specifically as 'tame/break, subdue, kill.' These definitions carry different connotations. 'Tame' describes the patient as subordinate but functional, 'subdue' implies domination but leaves the state of the patient ambiguous, and 'kill' denotes overpowering the patient to the point of permanent incapacitation (i.e. death). Within each context, however, they all similarly imply a hierarchical relationship between the agent and the patient.

1. First and Last Encounters with *demH₂*

Vocabulary derived from *demH₂*- is used early and often throughout the poems to express the idea of dispatching and establish the hierarchies present between characters. The polysemy of this root is clear from the first time it is used at *Iliad* 1.61, where Akhilleus tells Agamemnon how his army is being routed by the Trojans, and specifically by war and plague:

εἰ δὴ ὁμοῦ πόλεμός τε δαμᾷ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιός

'if indeed war and plague together will overpower the Achaeans'

39 LSJ s.v. δάμνημι.
40 *Il.* 1.61.
It is evident to the listener that his army is experiencing defeat because, as they fight, Akhilleus’ men are being killed, one by one. But the use of δαμᾷ illustrates that while some men may die, the army as a whole is being subdued, yet not wholly eliminated. This first instance of the verb, in the beginning lines of the Iliad, shows that *demH₂- is used to explicitly signify domination and to implicitly suggest killing.

The last instance of *demH₂- in the Iliad appears as part of ἵπποδάμος, a commonly applied epithet throughout the epic. It has a straightforward definition, ‘horse-taming,’ but its association with Hektor in the very last line of the poem is both descriptive and somewhat ironic:

Ὣς οἵ γ’ ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἕκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο. 42

‘Thus they went about the funeral of horse-taming Hektor.’

The choice of epithet is loaded. Only rarely elsewhere in the Iliad is Hektor described as ‘horse-taming,’ usually at significant moments, as when he and Akhilleus ‘were running for the soul of horse-taming Hektor’ (περὶ ψυχῆς θέου Ἐκτορος ἱπποδάμου). In the end, too, Hektor is described as ἵπποδάμος; he may have wielded authority over horses and men alike in life, but here, after his death, the fall of Troy is imminent. In spite of his heightened status within the human hierarchy, his lesser status in the divine-human hierarchy is revealed when he is felled at the hand of Akhilleus through the agency of the gods.

---

41 Greek ἵπποδάμος incorporates the *demH₂- root as a second member of a tatpuruṣa compound, similar to the Sanskrit arim-dama ‘conquering the enemy.’
42 Il. 24.804.
43 Il. 22.161; the other four are at Il. 7.38, 16.717, 22.161, 22.211.
Consequently, the choice of this epithet in the final line ironically reinforces his true standing; the adjective suggests his identity as the agent, while his tragic end identifies him as the patient. He ceases to be a tamer once he himself has been tamed. Likewise the epithet anticipates the taming of all the Trojans, of whom Hektor is the leader and who are called ‘horse-taming’ en masse throughout the epic. The final use of *demH₂-* also reinforces the principle that, in the Iliad, divine standing trumps human standing.

In the Odyssey, the use of *demH₂-* expresses similar hierarchical relationships, even without the constant backdrop of war. The first instance of this verb at 1.237 shows how the verb can easily mean 'kill', especially when referring to the relationship between men in war. Telemachus states his wish to a disguised Athena that Odysseus had died at Troy:

επεί οὔ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ᾽ ἀκαχοίμην,
eἰ μετὰ οἶο' ἐτάροισι δάμη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ⁴⁴

'since I should not grieve so much thus for his dying,
if among his comrades he had been overcome in the country of the Trojans'

Here, the future less vivid conditional draws a clear line of causality from *demH₂-* to θνῄσκω. The connection of ἀκαχοίμην and θανόντι in the apodosis is a direct consequence of δάμη in the passive voice in the protasis. Telemachus recognizes that if Odysseus had been overcome in the Trojan War, the likely result would have been his death.

Furthermore, the use of *demH₂-* instead of κτείνω is meaningful: as argued in chapter 1, δάμη here signals a ‘proper’ defeat. The fight between warriors on the battlefield

⁴⁴ Od. 1.236-7.
is not just a zero-sum game, no matter what figures like Sarpedon say (e.g. Il. 12.328: “Let’s go; either we will extend to somebody the victory-boast, or somebody will to us”). Rather, warriors can gain some glory in dying bravely, particularly if they are killed by somebody significant.\textsuperscript{45} Telemachus’ wish that Odysseus had died at Troy makes more sense in this light. Of course, if Odysseus had died at Troy, Telemachus would have a better chance of learning about it, but counter-intuitively, Odysseus' being ‘tamed’ at Troy might have gained him a higher stature and indirectly given himself and Telemachus greater glory, as Telemachus wishes at Od. 1.240.

Compare this to the last instance of *

\*demH\textsubscript{2} in Odyssey 4:

\begin{quote}

\text{

ἡ ὑμή ἐν νῆσσι Ποσειδάων ἐδάμασσεν,

όρσας ἀργαλέους ἀνέμους καὶ κύματα μακρά;

'did Poseidon overcome you on the ships, stirring up troublesome winds and large waves?'

\end{quote}

The context makes it clear that *

\*demH\textsubscript{2} means 'kill,' since the ghost of Agamemnon is speaking to the ghost of Amphimedon, asking him how he died. The agent here is unambiguously Poseidon, but the following line adds a layer of complexity by naming winds and waves as mechanisms of killing. This description clarifies the hierarchical relationship between men and gods: if Amphimedon were killed at sea – by drowning or some storm-related accident – it was because Poseidon willed it so. It is also significant that Agamemnon is the speaker, who was eventually murdered by his wife, Clytemnestra (along

\textsuperscript{45} Schein 1984: 68, citing Il. 22.304-5.

\textsuperscript{46} Od. 24.109-110, similar usage in 11.399, 11.406.
with her lover, Aegisthus) in a deliberate subversion of the human hierarchy. Agamemnon sits higher than his wife in human hierarchy, and he is also a greater hero than Aegisthus. The fact that they two succeed in killing him suggests the opposite, but this crime is clearly unacceptable in Greek society, as evidenced by the subsequent murders by Orestes.

2. *demH₂- as 'defeat'

These first and last instances of *demH₂- in the Odyssey illustrate its most common meaning: to express the victory of one warrior over another in battle. In this context, the verb can reasonably be defined as 'defeat' or 'overcome,' definitions which do not clarify the physical outcome of the patient, but indicate who predominates in the clash. For example, when Aphrodite plucks Paris from combat and returns him to the safety of his chambers, Helen scolds him for leaving the battle and indicates her preference for his demise on the battlefield:

'you came out of the war; if only you were killed, overthrown by a stronger man, who was my former husband. Of course you used to boast that compared to Menelaos, dear to Ares, you were better in your force, hands, and spear.'

Helen contrasts Paris’ past claims to be superior to Menelaos with a future wish that he had perished on the battlefield. Here the aorist passive participle δαμείς is crucial for this comparison: Helen does not merely wish for Paris to ὀλέσθαι 'die', she also wants him to be proved inferior to Menelaos in military prowess, a power imbalance defined by *demH2-. This use of *demH2- to determine the victor in a skirmish is frequently coupled with an instrument:

ἀλλὰ σ’ ἔγωγε
παύσεσθαι κέλομαι, μηδὲ ξανθῷ Μενελάῳ ἀντίβιον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι ἀφραδέως, μή πως τάχ’ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ δουρὶ δαμήῃς.

"but I ask you to stop, and not wage hostile war with golden-haired Menelaos or fight recklessly, lest you quickly be subdued by his spear"

As discussed in the first chapter, the spear sometimes acts as the agent, other times as merely a metonymic mechanism used by the agent. Here, the spear is the mechanism in the hands of Menelaos, but the meaning of *demH2- is consistent, whether the agent is a bronze, an arrow, or the hands of a warrior. In addition, battle scenes involving *demH2- often describe the location of the patients in close proximity to the ships:

hydrate ποντοπόροισιν

---

49 Il. 3.433-7.
'or you yourselves are overcome beside the sea-faring ships'

Again, this physical scene has no impact on the semantic value of the verb, but it does emphasize the significance of defeat by suggesting that if the Greeks are overcome at the ships, they have nowhere left to retreat. In addition, men are also described as overcoming their own μένος or θυμός, both of which are emotionally wrought and need to be consciously curbed.

With respect to animals, *demH₂- can be used to describe a combat situation, namely attacking or killing an animal. When the patient is an animal, the agent can be a human or another animal. In several instances, *demH₂- describes a very different relationship, as will be discussed in detail in section 4A, where the animal is tamed, not hurt.

The first instance of *demH₂- in the Iliad, mentioned earlier, illustrated that the agent can be a general force, such as war, or a natural force, such as plague. There is a wide range of agents, all of which straightforwardly overcome their patients: natural forces like the sea waves, a river, frost/dew, fire; psychological forces like rage/fury, sleep, love; physical forces like wine, chill/weariness, weakness; combat forces like blows, force, death, bow

---

53 Il. 5.138 (agent is a shepherd, patient is a lion), 9.545 (agent is men, patient is boar), 11.478 (agent is a man with an arrow, patient is a stag), 16.826 (agent is a lion, patient is a boar), 21.578 (patient is leopard, agent is indeterminate).
54 Waves (Od. 5.454, 8.231), river (Il. 21.291), frost/dew (Od. 5.468 (patient is heart), 17.24), fire (Od. 11.221).
55 Rage (Il. 11.98), fury (Il. 12.186, 20.400), sleep (Il. 10.2, 14.353 (and love), 24.5, 24.678; Od. 7.318, 9.373, 13.119, 15.6), love & desire (Il. 14.199).
56 Wine (Od. 9.454 (patient is mind), 9.516), chill/weariness (Il. 21.52; Od. 14.318), weakness along with the Achaeans (Il. 6.74, 17.320, 17.337).
and arrows.\textsuperscript{57} Many of these forces do not necessarily express hierarchy, but merely indicate the effect of the act on the patient's body: loss of control.\textsuperscript{58}

Beyond these straightforward understandings of *demH₂-, there are many instances where the usage indicates the overarching hierarchy inherent in Homeric society. The verb can often be simply translated as 'kill' but does not carry exactly the same value as κτείνω. As discussed in the first chapter, one crucial distinction between the verbs is a matter of volition: a patient is ‘dispatched’ only if he tried to avoid being dispatched. Another distinction involves the degree of loss of control over one's body, including but not limited to death. It is no surprise that often subsequent language is necessary to clarify whether the end result is death. Based on the following examples, I will show that, whether or not the patient is killed by the agent, *demH₂- expresses the clear dominance of the agent over the patient, and reveals the nature of the hierarchical relationship between the two.

3. *demH₂- as 'kill'

Given the subject matter of the Iliad, it is understandable, and perhaps expected, that *demH₂- sometimes simply means ‘kill.’ The verb is used similarly in the Odyssey, suggesting that *demH₂- could seamlessly be understood by listeners to collapse semantically with κτείνω. For example:

\textsuperscript{57} Blows (Od. 4.244, 18.54), force (Od. 18.57), death (Od. 3.410, 6.11, 11.171, 11.398), bow & arrows (Od. 22.246).
\textsuperscript{58} Cf. p. 11 for discussion of losing control of one's body.
'Chromis led the Mysians, along with Ennomus the augur, but he did not draw off dark death with auguries, but he was overcome by the hands of the swift-footed progeny of Aeacus in the river, where he (Akhilleus) completely was slaughtering the Trojans and others.'

In this context, the end result of *demH₂-* is the death of Ennomus, and likely also Chromis, with the reference to κῆρα μέλαιναν ‘dark death’ and the following κεράϊζε ‘was slaughtering.’ It is not clear, however, that the use of *demH₂-* alone would suffice to indicate that Ennomus died. The implication is there – in war, if a warrior is dispatched, the likelihood is that he is killed – but the verb is not perfectly synonymous with κτείνω.

Instead, it would be most accurate to say that the listener, having heard that Ennomus was ἐδάμη by Akhilleus, would understand that Ennomus has been effectively eliminated from the fight, regardless of whether he is still alive. This unequivocal removal of the opponent from battle is sufficient to assert Akhilleus’ superiority on the battlefield. Also, the patient does not need to die to end the conflict; rather, he can admit his own relative inferiority by surrendering. Thus the verb *demH₂-* can be used effectively in the same context as κτείνω but does not exclusively dictate that the patient dies. To support this assertion, consider the following example where the patient survives:

ὅς τοι πρῶτος ἐφῆκε βέλος Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ

59  _Il._ 2.858-61. Similar usage at _Il._ 2.874.
it was he who first sent the spear at you, horseman Patroklos, but he did not defeat you: he ran back and mingled with the throng, pulling the ashen spear out of the flesh, and he didn’t await Patroklos, though he was unarmed, in the battle. but Patroklos, overcome by the blow of the god and by the spear, fell back into the company of his comrades, avoiding death.’

Euphorbos strikes Patroklos with a spear, then pulls it out and retreats. Here, *demH₂*- is used twice in close proximity to describe Patroklos as the patient. First it is negated by οὐδὲ δάμασσ’ 'he did not defeat [you],' and then five lines later he is δαμασθεὶς 'overcome.' The former explicitly names Euphorbos as the agent, while the latter more abstractly refers to the divine influence and the spear; Patroklos has not been defeated by a man, but instead by a god and a material prop. This aligns with the understanding that a hero of Patroklos’ stature cannot be defeated by Euphorbos, a mortal man who falls below him in the human hierarchy, but he can still be defeated by a spear when it strikes him with the force of divine will. In particular, the poet makes a point of describing Euphorbos as ὃς ἡλικίην ἐκέκαστο // ἔγχεΐ θ’ ἱπποσύνῃ τε πόδεσσί τε καρπαλίμοισι 'who had surpassed the men of his age with his spear and horsemanship and swiftness of his feet,' but even so Euphorbos alone cannot tame Patroklos. Here Patroklos approaches the status of a god, and consequently can only be tamed by a god.

60 ll. 16.812-7.
61 ll. 16.808.
This scene illustrates the semantic range, as well as the different levels of hierarchy, that *demH₂- conveys. In line 813 Patroklos is definitively not removed from battle by Euphorbos, while in line 816, he is significantly injured by the spear. All the while, he has not yet been killed, because he can only be dispatched by a hero of similar stature: Hektor. This is no ordinary attack, however, as it is accompanied by divine force, marking it in contrast to many other altercations in battle. It foreshadows Patroklos' death, which will also be determined by divine will.

The role of gods in battlefield affairs is not easily isolated from purely human actions. Consider the following:

Σαρπηδὼν δ’ ὡς οὖν ἴδ’ ἀμιτροχίτωνας ἑταίρους
χέρο’ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλου Μενοιτιάδου δαμέντας.  

'and so Sarpedon saw his comrades who wear no mitras with chitons, 
defeated by the hands of Patroklos, son of Menoetius'

ὤ μοι ἐγὼν, ὅ τέ μοι Σαρπηδόνα φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν
μοῖρ’ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλου Μενοιτιάδου δαμῆν.  

'O me, that is fate for Sarpedon, the most dear to me of men, 
to be defeated by Patroklos, son of Menoetius'

The meaning of *demH₂- in these two instances does not differ, but the implication of divine involvement does. In the first instance, the mention of the hands as the means of subduing suggests that the action is very much focused on the human players on the battlefield.

---

62 In fact, “it is taken for granted that men receive special abilities from the gods” (Lesky, 1961: 185). Often the divine influence is not considered “interference” as much as a Homeric way of establishing the simple fact that something happened.
63 Il. 16.419-20.
64 Il. 16.433-4.
Patroklos uses his hands to fight the Trojans, and he defeats them because he is a superior warrior. But in the second instance, it has been fated that Patroklos will defeat Sarpedon. This scene adds additional layer to Patroklos' status on earth; his superiority is divinely sanctioned. Another interesting contrast is that the first usage is in narrative, simply descriptive of the scene at hand, while the second usage is in discourse, where the speaker, Zeus, comments freely on the role of fate. I will now discuss the nature of the hierarchical levels implicit in the uses of *demH₂-.

4. Hierarchical Relationships

A. Men and Beasts

One important relationship illustrated by the use of *demH₂- is that between humans and animals, specifically domesticated beasts of burden. In the comparatively few instances in Homeric where *demH₂- is used with respect to animals, it specifically indicates a taming process so that humans can ride or drive the animal, without any implication of harm:

 xls νπνν ςνικξν τς γα ς τς Αχαιων αλλος όμοιος

ιππων αθανάτων εχεμεν δημησιν τε μένος τε

'Alcimedon, who else among the Achaeans, then, can handle the taming and might of immortal horses'

οι δ' αλεγεινοι / ανδρασι γε θυντοις δημησιν ηδ' όχεσθαι

---

65 Il. 17.476.
66 Il. 10.403, 17.77.
they [horses] are troublesome for mortal men to master or drive'

ἑξέτε’ ἀδμήτην, ἤ τ’ ἀλγίστη δαμάσασθαι 67

'a six-year-old unbroken [mule], which is the most troublesome to master'

ὑπὸ δ’ ἡμίονοι ταλαεργοὶ // ἀδμῆτες τῶν κέν κέν ἐλασσάμενος δαμασάμην. 68

'and underneath, unbroken labor mules; of these, driving one, i might break it'

The derivatives of *demH₂* all unambiguously refer to the process by which humans assert their control over animals, which is highlighted when collocated with ἀνδράσι θνητοῖσι 'mortal men.' The definitions 'break' or 'tame' for *demH₂* in this context are unambiguous, allowing the listener to understand easily that humans enjoy superiority over animals in the hierarchy.

As mentioned earlier, this relationship between men and animals is commonly demonstrated by the compound ἵπποδάμος 'horse-taming,' an adjective used unambiguously as an honorific for warriors, whether Greeks 69 or Trojan. 70 At several points, the horse-taming Trojans are contrasted with the Greeks, who are described as χαλκοχίτων 'bronze-clad,' ἐυκνήμις 'well-greaved,' or without any epithet at all. 71 There are also characters whose actual names are based on the compound ἵπποδάμος (Hippodamus, 67 Il. 23.655, 23.266 (similar application of ἄδμητος, describing a horse), 10.293 (describing an ox).

68 Od. 4.636-7.

69 Tydeus (Il. 4.370, 23.472; Od. 3.181), Diomedes (Il. 5.415, 5.781, 5.849, 7.404, 8.194, 9.51, 9.711), Castor (Il. 3.237; Od. 11.300), Atreus (Il. 2.23, 2.60), Thrasymedes (Il. 14.10), Nestor (Od. 3.17).


71 χαλκοχίτων (Il. 3.127, 3.131, 3.251, 8.71), ἐυκνήμις (Il. 3.343, 4.80), w/o epithet (Il. 4.333, 4.352, 4.509), Argives w/o epithets (12.440, 19.317).
Hippodamas, and Hippodamia\textsuperscript{72}), which suggests that this epithet was common enough to become lexicalized as a proper name. In these instances involving horses, mules, and oxen, the stem \textit{demH}_2- illustrates a relationship of non-fatal domination by humans. In a manner deliberately constructed by men, humans unmistakably sit higher than their beasts of burden in the universal hierarchy.

B. Gods and Men

A second significant hierarchical relationship is that between divinities and mortals, where \textit{*demH}_2- illustrates the dominion of divinities over mortals, both implicitly and explicitly. A frequent example of this is when one man defeats another in battle, but specifically with divine favor. This divine influence is sometimes channeled through the hands or a weapon of a human in combat; at other times the interference is direct. The humans involved are subordinate, and the divine interference determines the victor. Consider the following example of \textit{*demH}_2- indicating the role of gods on the human battlefield:

\[ ἠ ἤδη μ' ὑπὸ χερσὶ θεοὶ δαμόωσιν Ἀχαιῶν \textsuperscript{73} \]

'or if indeed the gods will overcome me at the hands of the Achaean'\textsuperscript{73}

Hektor informs Helen that he very well may be defeated imminently in battle, and if he is, it will be because the gods have willed it so. As a warrior, he recognizes that should the gods

\textsuperscript{72} Hippodamus (\textit{Il.} 11.335), Hippodamas (\textit{Il.} 20.401), Hippodamia (\textit{Il.} 2.742, 13.429; \textit{Od.} 18.182).
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Il.} 6.368.
will it, he will die; uttered by the hero of the Trojans, this statement raises the implication that only divine will, not any man alone, can topple him. Even when the agent is a deity, however, there is still a human intermediary to physically carry out the deed. When a god subdues a human in battle, it can be via human hands, a spear (ἔγχος or δόρυ), or simply by a human himself.⁷⁴

There is a parallel context with *demH₂*—where Athena herself wields a spear to break the ranks of human warriors. This usage in narrator speech illustrates another form of divine intervention: a direct connection between the deity and the action on earth.

ἐς δ’ ὀχέα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, λάζετο δ’ ἐγχος βριθυ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν ἦρων, τοίσιν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτη.⁷⁵

'and she went into the flaming chariot with her feet, and she seized the spear, heavy, great, and strong, with which she broke the ranks of heroic men, for whomever she bore a grudge, she the daughter of a mighty sire.'

A nearly identical passage in the *Odyssey*, also in narrator speech, also refers to Athena:

εἴλετο δ’ ἄλκιμον ἐγχος, ἀκαχμένον ὀξέι χαλκῷ, βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν ἦρων, τοίσιν τε κοτέσσεται ὀβριμοπάτη.⁷⁶

'and she took the stout spear, sharp-edged with keen bronze, heavy, great, and strong, with which she broke the ranks of heroic men, with whom she bore a grudge, she the daughter of a mighty sire.'

---

⁷⁴ Basler (Bierl & Latacz, 2009: 127) suggests 'under the effect of' to express the instrumental nature of ὑπὸ with the dative. The mention of these instruments does not follow any metrical formulae, but they are consistently collocated with *demH₂*, suggesting a loose formulaic construction: human hands (Il. 3.352, 5.564, 6.368, 16.438, 16.452, 20.94, 22.446; Od. 18.156), a spear (Il. 16.543, 16.816, 22.271, Od. 18.156), human himself (Il. 13.434, Od. 14.367, 19.488, 19.496, 21.213). The divine intervention does not detract from the hero’s valor; instead, it confers divine approval upon him (Kirk, 1994: 101).

⁷⁵ Il. 5.746, 8.390.

⁷⁶ Od. 1.100.
The passages above suggest that Athena herself stood on the battlefield, personally cutting down Trojan warriors. It is very likely, however, that her role in battle is understood as metaphorical. In this case, the listener could hear that Athena, as an underlying cause, broke the ranks of Trojans and understand that the tide of battle had turned in favor of the Greeks under the renewed attention of Athena.

This metaphorical connotation is often present in the use of *demH₂*- when coupled with μάστιξ 'lash' or ιότης 'will'. Consider the following examples, the first in narrator speech, and the second in character speech (Thetis speaking to Akhilleus about Patroklos):

Ἀργεῖοι δὲ Διὸς μάστιγι δαμέντες

'\textit{the Argives, subdued by the lash of Zeus}'

ἐπει δὴ πρῶτα θεῶν ιότητι δαμάσθη

'\textit{and so now he was subdued by the will of the gods}'

The Greeks have been beaten back and Patroklos has been killed in battle, respectively, and the actions are attributed to the 'lash' or the 'will' of the gods. In these cases, it is reasonable to understand the 'lash' of the deities as a metaphor: the loser in any given conflict is the combatant who receives the wrath of the gods, not the one of lesser stature or skill.\footnote{Zeus' literal thunderbolt is reserved for use against gods (cf. 8.405, 15.117, 21.198), although he does employ it once again Diomedes (8.133). The lash can be understood to signal that Zeus is exercising his power from atop Ida to drive the armies (Kirk, 1993: 321).}

Sometimes the gods honor one man in war by beating back his enemy:

\footnote{Il. 12.37. Similar usage in 13.812.}

\footnote{Il. 19.9. Basler (West & Latacz, 2009: 18) suggests that the will of the gods, by Apollo's intervention and with Zeus' consent, is Thetis' attempt to absolve Akhilleus of responsibility for Patroklos' death.}
ὡς νῦν τοῦτον ἔτισε, δάμασσε δὲ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν. 

'as now he honored this man, and **overpowered** the army of Achaeans'

Other times they explicitly discuss whether or not they will permit a man to die in battle, such as the following example in narrator speech:

ὡς γὰρ Απόλλων / εἴα Πάνθου νίόν ἐνι προμάχοις δαμήνα

'for Apollo did not permit the son of Panthous **to be defeated** among the champions'

The clear implication is that gods have the power to permit or prohibit one human from killing another at any time. Similarly, the poet often comments that a man is overcome by fate or the gods, and consequently he is defeated on the battlefield:

ἀλλὰ ἑ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλεός χόλος Ἥρης

'but fate and the difficult wrath of Hera **overcame** him'

The distinction between μοῖρα and the gods is not made clear, but it is evident that both can determine the outcome of a human conflict. Such a direct causality between divine action and the human victim denotes the explicit influence of gods over human affairs and their superior standing in the universal hierarchy.

*demH₂* is also used to implicitly describe the relationship between divinities and mortals by referring to the structural hierarchy in place. The fact that it is necessary to

82 I. 18.119. Similar usage in 5.564, 16.103, 19.417; Od. 3.269, 22.413.
83 Zeus grieves for the foreshadowed death of Sarpedon, but does nothing to prevent it. There is, therefore, an implied hierarchy, since the gods never interfere with fate, but its role is dramatic, not theological, since the plot of the Iliad must unfold in a certain way (Kirk, 1994: 375).
84 Of course, the presence of divine intervention does not absolve the human character of responsibility in the situation (Lesky, 1961: 193).
mention it at all suggests that it is a norm, but not an absolute rule. Menelaos mentions this hierarchy in *Odyssey* 4 when telling Telemachus about his encounter with Eidothea and his scheme to outwit her father, Proteus:

\[ \text{ἀργαλέος γάρ τ' ἐστὶ θεὸς βροτῷ ἀνδρὶ δαμῆαι} \]

'for a god is difficult to be overcome by a mortal man'

Besting a god and upending the hierarchy, while clearly difficult, is by no means impossible. And with the help of Eidothea, Menelaos accomplishes just that. This suggests that such a feat may require a divine accomplice. This is exemplified in *Iliad* 5 when Diomede charges through the Trojans in pursuit of Aeneas and intentionally injures Aphrodite. While unable to do any lasting harm to the divine Aphrodite, Diomede blatantly commits *hubris* when he, a human, assaults a god. Indeed, Aphrodite later complains, "Λίην ἄχθομαι ἐλκος ὅ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν ἀνήρ // Τυδεΐδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο," 'I am exceedingly vexed at the wound, which a mortal man struck me, son of Tydeus, who now would fight even with father Zeus.' This scene shows what an outrage it is that Aphrodite has been injured by a human, and she declares that that man would be willing to take on even the king of gods because he clearly has no shame or respect. As in the scene in the *Odyssey*, this scene shows a Diomede who partially overcomes the separation between gods and humans, but only with the aid of Athena. It

---

85 *Od*. 4.397.
86 *Il*. 5.361. Despite this depiction of the violation of the divine-mortal hierarchy, the verb *demH₂-* is not used in this context, allowing the listener to understand that Diomede has overstepped his bounds as a human, but has not actually upturned it.
emphasizes the cultural norm in place: gods belong above the humans in the hierarchy at all times. This is also evident with divinely blessed objects, such as the shield of Akhilleus:


’silly, he did not understand in his mind and heart how the glorious gifts of the gods are not easy to be mastered by or submit to mortal men’

This clash demonstrates that not even divine objects can be overcome by a man, much less the deities behind them. Despite this understanding, humans sometimes still have doubts about their place in the hierarchy, and the poet represents humans as having a range of understandings of the nature of things. Even though his shield was commissioned by Thetis and forged by Hephaestus, Akhilleus still fears that it may be penetrated in battle.

*Odyssey* 11 portrays the divide between gods and men similarly. When Odysseus encounters Herakles in the Underworld, the hero complains that he suffered the ultimate insult despite his semi-divine status:


‘for I was subdued to a much inferior man’

Herakles is referring to Eurystheus, king of Argos, who specified his labors after he killed his children with Megara. Though his new subservient position is punishment for his crime, he still complains about becoming subject to a man who, in his opinion, lies far beneath him
in the natural hierarchy, and he emphasizes his semi-divine status – Ζηνὸς μὲν πάϊς ἦα Κρονίονος, αὐτὰρ ὀιζὺν // εἶχον ἀπειρεσίην 90 ‘though a son of Zeus, the son of Kronos, nevertheless I bore limitless hardship.’ For Herakles, subjection to a wholly mortal man is the ultimate insult. His discomfort highlights the societal norms of the ancient listener.

C. Gods and Gods, Men and Men (or Women)

Another significant hierarchical relationship is that between those of a similar level:

1) between gods, 2) between men, 3) between men and women. Among deities, *demH₂- is used to demonstrate the relative status of the various gods:

ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ πάντες ὁσοὶ θεοί εἰσ’ ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
σοί τ’ ἐπιπείθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἐκαστος 90

‘for all the other gods who are on Olympus
obey you and we each are subject to you’

In this scene, Ares is pleading to the superior king of the gods, Zeus, to intervene, as he complains about Diomedes' conduct on the battlefield. First, Ares affirms Zeus' supreme role in the divine hierarchy: all the other gods are subordinate to the king of the gods. The use of ἐπιπείθονται literally means 'they are persuaded,' expressing a willingness to obey him beyond blind obedience. The poet uses *demH₂- to explicitly elevate Zeus above the rest of the gods, and later uses it again to identify the stature of Poseidon in relation to the other gods:

89 Od. 11.620-1.
90 Il. 5.878-9.
μάλα δ’ ὁκα διακρινθέντας ὀϊω
ἀψ ἴμεν Οὐλυμπον δὲ θεῶν μεθ’ ὁμήγυριν ἄλλων
ημετέρης ὑπὸ χερσίν ἀναγκαίηφι δαμέντας

'I expect that very soon they, having separated, will
go back to Olympus amidst the assembly of the other gods,
overcome by force at our hands'

Poseidon promises to side with Hera against the other gods – namely, Ares and Apollo – to
influence the battles taking place on earth. In order for his plans to come to fruition, he
must first address his position in the divine hierarchy: as Zeus' brother, he is a relatively
high-ranked god, but he is still subordinate to Zeus. Poseidon hopes that teaming up with
Hera, queen of the gods, will allow him to rise to the top. This scene obliquely outlines a
divine hierarchy in which Zeus and Hera sit at the top, and all the other gods sit in a jumble
beneath them with varying roles (as evidenced by their continuous plays for power), while
all together they retain authority over men on earth. Poseidon previously suggested that he
considered himself to be an equal of Zeus, with Hades third in power: τρεῖς γάρ τ’ ἐκ
Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφοί οὗς τέκετο Ρέα // Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ’ Άιδης ἐνέροισιν
ἀνάσσων. 'For we are three brothers, born from Kronos, whom Rhea bore, Zeus and I, and
Hades in the third place, ruling over those below.'

This hierarchy is subjective, however,
based on the perceptions of those involved. While Poseidon may have considered himself
equal to Zeus in authority, other gods or humans rank him differently. Hera, as queen of the
gods, might be considered to have divine authority second only to Zeus but for her gender.

91 Il. 20.141-3.
92 Il. 15.187-8.
It is therefore crucial to consider the fluidity of the divine hierarchy and each individual god's place within it.

Hesiod illustrates this sliding scale in the *Theogony* by suggesting that age, kinship, and male gender elevate status, but do not definitively rank the deities. While Hesiod did not inform Homer, they belonged to the same hexametric poetic tradition, and so the *Theogony* provides some insight into the dynamic nature of the divine hierarchy:

> Ῥείη δὲ ὁμφεῖσα Κρόνῳ τέκε φαίδημα τέκνα
> Ἰστίην Δήμητρα καὶ Ἡρην χρυσοπέδιλον,
> ἱφθιμόν τ' Ἀιδην, ὃς ὑπὸ χθονὶ δώματα ναίει
> νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, καὶ ἑρίκτυπον Ἐννοσίγαιον,
> Ζῆνα τε μητιόεντα, θεῶν πατέρ' ἦδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
> τοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ βροντῆς πελεμίζεται εὐρεῖα χθὼν. 93

'Rhea, overcome by Kronos, bore radiant children, Hestia, Demeter, and gold-sandalled Hera, and strong Hades, who inhabits houses beneath the earth, having a ruthless heart, and the loud-sounding Earth-shaker, and wise Zeus, father of the gods, and indeed of men, beneath whose thunder the wide earth trembles.

Hesiod describes the six gods and goddesses as having the same lineage from Kronos and Rhea, but makes it clear that Zeus is the leader among them. Hades and Poseidon, each a master of a realm, may enjoy greater status than their sisters and the rest of the pantheon, but they cannot compete with Zeus' authority. Hesiod also uses *demH-* to describe the union between Kronos and Rhea, suggesting that he dominates her sexually. I will expand

---

93 Hes. Th. 453.
on this gendered power dynamic expressed by *demH₂* when addressing the hierarchy between humans, but a similar gender bias is clearly present between the gods as well.

Returning to the *Iliad*, the following example suggests that Hades’ refusal to be subordinate to Zeus illustrates an incomplete stratification:

\[
\delta μηθήτω \ Αἴδης \ τοὶ \ άμειλιχὸς \ ήδ', \ άδάμαστος,
\tauούνεκα \ καὶ \ τε \ βροτοῖσι \ θεῶν \ ἔχθιστος \ ἀπάντων' \ καὶ \ μοι \ υποστήτω... \]

94

'let him [Akhilleus] yield, though Hades is relentless and inflexible, and therefore he is the most hated of all the gods by mortals, and let him [Akhilleus] submit to me...'

Agamemnon, speaking to Nestor, asks that Akhilleus yield to his authority and not behave like Hades, who is ἀδάμαστος 'inflexible.' This suggests that Hades is not as subject to Zeus' authority as the other gods, but at the same time, his unwillingness to yield is why mortals hate him. 95 This is, however, the only time that ἀδάμαστος is used in Homeric Greek, so it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions based solely on this instance. The relationship between Zeus and Hades is not the only hierarchical relationship at stake in these four lines. Agamemnon references Hades at this point in order to insinuate that Akhilleus will be equally hated if he refuses to relent. Agamemnon is eager for Akhilleus to return to the war, but only on the condition that the hero submit to him; without a clear

94 *Il.* 9.158-60. Zenodotus and Aristophanes suggested καμφθήτω (instead of δμηθήτω) here to avoid the repetition with ἀδάμαστος, but κάμπτομαι is not otherwise attested in Homer, and ἀδάμαστος reaffirms δμηθήτω (Kirk, 1993: 79).

95 Hades is also considered 'inflexible' in his capacity as god of the Underworld; as the divine representative of death, which is inescapable by mortals, he is understandably hated. Agamemnon invokes Hades to provide a negative example: Hades is hated because of his unwillingness to submit, so Akhilleus ought not to follow Hades' example.
hierarchy among the Greek leaders, Agamemnon must insist on Akhilleus’ prostration to maintain his position at the top.\textsuperscript{96} As Whitman puts it, “[Agamemnon] still must have submission from Akhilleus, even if he has to buy it.”\textsuperscript{97} Key to Agamemnon's aims here is the juxtaposition of δμηθήτω and υποστήτω. Not only does δμηθήτω ask for Akhilleus’ submission, but the use of υφίστημι also underscores what Agamemnon really wants from Akhilleus: for Akhilleus to place himself under Agamemnon's authority, to literally 'stand below' him. Significantly, Odysseus omits these lines when he delivers Agamemnon’s request to Akhilleus, presumably because Agamemnon's demand for submission would be too offensive.\textsuperscript{98} This scene outlined by *demH\textsuperscript{2} hints at the hierarchical structure for gods, while also epitomizing that between humans.

Just as between gods, we find that *demH\textsuperscript{2} is used to indicate military or political dominion between men. When Priam asks Helen to identify Greek leaders from atop the walls of Troy, he remarks about Agamemnon:

\[ ἦ ὃς νῦ τοι πολλοὶ δεδμήατο κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν \]

'surely for you many youths of the Achaeans have been subdued'

\textsuperscript{96} Taplin 1990: 60-82.

\textsuperscript{97} The classic formulation of Whitman 1958: 192. Most commentators have read these lines this way (see Scodel 2007: 151n24 for a complete list). Scodel claims that the hierarchical meaning given to υποστήτω here by most commentators – e.g. 'let him take his place beneath me' (Griffin 1995: 94) 'submit to' (LfGrE s.v. ἰστήμι IB12 12c) – ought to be rejected for lack of parallels (Scodel 2007: 140-1). She is right that the meaning is an unicum in early Greek poetry, but she overlooks the attestations in tragedy (LSJ s.v. υφίστημι).


\textsuperscript{99} \textit{Il.} 3.183. Basler (Bierl & Latacz, 2009: 76) calls this τοι a dative of person involved (again, a “true dative” that possibly operates as a dative of agent) and comments that Priam uses the pluperfect here because Helen's response is confirming the reports he heard previously: 'have, as I see now, become subject.'
Addressing Agamemnon directly (though Agamemnon is clearly out of earshot), Priam marvels at the number of men who followed the military leader into battle. But rather than use a ‘lead’ or ‘command’ word, the poet chooses *demH₂- to emphasize the wealthy king’s high position in the military hierarchy. In this context, *demH₂- in the pluperfect tense establishes the stative concept of continued dominance over a duration of time, notably the command of men by a military leader. Ironically, at the same time, Agamemnon is having hierarchical problems on his side. In *Odyssey* 3, *demH₂- is used similarly to express the relationship between a king and his people, even when it involves a king who has usurped the throne. When Telemachus asks Nestor to tell him about the fate of the Achaeans, Nestor describes how Aegisthus came to power by slaying Agamemnon:

> ἑπτάετες δ' ἤνασσε πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης, κτείνας Ἀτρείδην, δέδμητο δὲ λαὸς ὑπ' αὐτῷ.100

> 'he ruled over Mycenae, rich in gold, for seven years, having killed Agamemnon, and the people were subdued by him.'

First, the poet utilizes *demH₂- in the pluperfect tense to express the extended state of dominance by Aegisthus over the people of Mycenae. Second, he uses κτείνω as an aorist participle in the same line to indicate the single event of Aegisthus' killing of Agamemnon. Third, the poet chooses ἀνάσσω in the imperfect tense in the previous line to describe his actions which stretched on afterward. The juxtaposition of these verbs in three tenses is striking because it could theoretically render the use of *demH₂- unnecessary. Instead, its

---

100 *Od*. 3.304-5.
inclusion here suggests an additional nuance: the question of the legitimacy of Aegisthus' rule. In the wake of Aegisthus' coup, it is possible that the people of Mycenae might have rejected his rule, knowing that Agamemnon had a legitimate heir, Orestes. The collocation of these three verbs, however, illustrates that people did, in fact, recognize Aegisthus' authority: he not only removed the previous king (κτείνας) but also completely took over Agamemnon's position (η νασσε) and established himself at the head of the governmental hierarchy (δέμητο). Within this chain of events, the listener would understand how *demH₂* characterized the Mycenae citizens' affirmation of Aegisthus' supremacy.

The divine and human hierarchies, however, are far from distinct. Instead, the poet also uses *demH₂* to highlight where they intersect, and in fact overlap, in *Iliad* 6:

\[
\text{αὐτάρ ὁι Προῖτος κακᾶ μήσατο θυμῷ,}
\text{ἄς ζ' ἐκ δήμου ἐλασσεν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,}
\text{Ἀργείων: Ζεὺς γὰρ οἱ υπὸ σκήπτρῳ ἐδάμασσε.}
\]

'but Proetus schemed evil things in his heart, who drove him out of the deme, since he was much stronger, of the Argives, for Zeus made him [Bellerophon] subject to his scepter.'

Zeus, as the agent in this clause, forces the human patient, Bellerophon, to be subordinate to the scepter of a human king, Proetus. This instance is unique because although Zeus is the agent, he does not directly dominate the patient. Rather, by the mention of the scepter, the poet reinforces Proetus' authority over Bellerophon. By introducing Zeus, he translates all

101 *Il. 6.157-9.* Basler (Bierl & Latacz, 2008: 65) emphasizes that Bellerophon was not lacking in personal qualities, but Zeus is a lender of royal authority, which includes power over individuals, and Proetus' power was specifically a function of the will of Zeus. There is also the plausible translation of the Argives as the object of *demH₂*, which does not help clarify the conflict between Bellerophon and Proetus, but Kirk (1990: 179) suggests that flexibility with roles and places is allowable.
the weight of his position at the top of the divine hierarchy into divine affirmation of
Proetus' position at the top of the human hierarchy. In addition, the enjambment of
Ἀργείων may lend further weight to Proetus' authority over the deme of Argives, almost as
if suggesting that they too are patients of ἔδαμασσε – subject to Proetus' rule.

The third kind of hierarchical relationship between beings of similar stature is that
between men and women. This relationship is easy to characterize: when *demH2-* is used to
describe women as the object, they are relegated to a subordinate role in the hierarchy with
respect to men. In the *Iliad*, *demH2-* is used with respect to women only twice, the first time
to describe women as captives of war, as warriors on both sides pray to Zeus for success in
battle. They specify the fate they hope for the wives of the opposing warriors and make it
clear that they want enemy women not simply as captives, but as sexual slaves:

Ζεῦ κύδιστε μέγιστε καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοί ἀλλοι
ὀππότεροι πρότεροι ύπέρ ὅρκια πημήνειαν
ἀδέ σφ’ ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις Ἰέωι ὡς ὅδε οἶνος
αὐτῶν καὶ τεκέων, ἄλοχοι δ' ἄλλοισι δαμεῖεν.102

'O Zeus, noblest, greatest, and other immortal gods,
whichever first transgresses in violation the oaths
let their brains pour thus on the ground like this wine,
theirs and their children's, and may their wives be subdued by other men'

The poet uses *demH2-* here with a clear pejorative flavor to indicate that in war, women are
not to be categorically slaughtered along with the men and their children, but rather to be
subjugated – to be placed in a role markedly subservient to their captors. The victors take

102 *Il. 3.298-301. Basler (Bierl & Latacz, 2009: 111-2) suggests that in the passive, δαμεῖεν is best translated as
'submit,' and is better suited to a curse than μιγε ἔν because of its more comprehensive implication of rape.
these women not only to show their dominance over women, but also to assert their superiority over the defeated warriors. In addition to gaining a valued commodity, they also emasculate the losers by ending their genealogical line. The women will never bear the defeated warriors any more children, and coupled with the slaughter of their living children, the defeated men are consequently stripped of both life and legacy. The victors then supplant that legacy by having their own children with the women, producing future warriors to protect their interests. With this consideration, women are simply the means by which men define their hierarchy with one another.

It is possible to take this same perspective when Zeus delivers Thetis as a bride to honor Peleus:

ἐκ μέν μ’ ἀλλάων ἁλιάων ἀνδρὶ δάμασσεν // Αἰακίδῃ Πηλῆϊ

'out of those of the sea, he [Zeus] subdued me to a man, Peleus, son of Aeacus'

Being divine, Thetis is a prize Peleus could not otherwise hope to win, and she becomes a transactional good, an emblem of divine affirmation from Zeus to Peleus. The poet uses *demH₂*- to illustrate her lesser status among divinities because of her gender: first, Zeus gives her hand in marriage to Peleus without consideration for her choice, indicating that female deities are hierarchically lower than male deities; second, Thetis becomes subservient to her husband in marriage. The latter aspect is intriguing because it transcends the usual hierarchy between gods and humans, suggesting that the male-female distinction

103 II. 18.432.
trumps the divine-mortal distinction. Despite her divine status, the female Thetis has less
stature than the mortal Peleus because he is male.104 This reminds the listener that the
hierarchies in place are dynamic rather than static, and they are constantly being
negotiated, even on Olympus. On the one hand, she is a sea nymph, which makes her a
lesser goddess by birth, but on the other hand, Zeus deliberately marries her off to a mortal
because of the prophecy that she will give birth to a son greater than his father. Again,
Thetis is merely the means by which Zeus eliminate a potential challenger and asserts his
authority. Thetis

This portrayal of Thetis is confirmed by Hesiod’s description of the encounter, or
rather, by its juxtaposition with another encounter which is decidedly less hierarchical:

Πηλεῖ δὲ δμηθεῖσα θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
γείνατ’ Αχιλλῆα ῥηξήνορα θυμολέοντα.
Αἶνειαν δ’ ἄρ’ ἐτικετέν ἐνοστέφανος Κυθέεια,
Ἀγχίσῃ ἥρωι 
ἐρατῇ φιλότητι
Ἴδης ἐν κορυφήσι πολυπτύχου ἱνεμοέσσης.105

'The silver-footed goddess, Thetis, having been overcome by Peleus,
bore rank-breaking, lion-hearted Akhilleus.
And well-crowned Cytherea bore Aeneas,
having mingled in lovely desire with the hero Anchises,
on the peaks of many-valleyed, windy Ida.'

Like Homer, Hesiod uses *demH2* to describe Thetis' submission to Peleus. Immediately
afterward, however, Hesiod uses μιγεῖσ’ 'mingling' to portray the encounter between

104 Gantz (230) points out that the status of married life between Peleus and Thetis is problematic in Homer. The
Iliad implies that they live together as expected, since Thetis is around to witness Akhilleus' departure for and
return from war (II. 18.57-60, 329-32), but later when Thetis is summoned by Akhilleus or Iris, she is dwelling
in the depths of the sea with her father and her fellow Nereids, seemingly having abandoned her husband.
105 Hes. Th. 1006-1010.
Aphrodite and Anchises, drawing a stark contrast between their union and that between Thetis and Peleus. Whereas Thetis is relegated to lower hierarchical status when 'overcome' by Peleus (and Zeus), the choice of μίγνυμι describes a consensual encounter where Aphrodite chooses to sleep with Anchises but refuses to marry him, retaining her stature.

This hierarchical relationship between men and women lies in stark contrast to the ὁμοφροσύνη 'unity of mind and feeling' between man and wife Odysseus describes in *Odyssey* 6. The adjective ἀδμής 'untamed/unbroken,' previously used to describe animals, is also used twice in *Odyssey* 6 as a descriptor for Nausicaa. Here, the adjective can be translated as 'unwed,' especially with respect to her encounter with Odysseus, where her single status is of paramount importance. In the context of a man taking her as his wife and legal responsibility for her, *demH₂- expresses his superiority over her. Such nomenclature, however, suggests that an unmarried woman is also ‘untamed,’ needing to be trained into subservience by the act of marriage. With that in mind, Nausicaa’s boldness when she interacts with Odysseus is reflective of her non-subservient manner and the fairyland-like environment of her homeland, Phaeacia. But the prospect of marrying a man like Odysseus from a more realistic land like Ithaca implies that she eventually must be controlled by whoever becomes her husband. Homer only uses *demH₂- to describe gendered relations these two times, but as supported by Hesiodic tradition, he uses it to reiterate women’s inferiority to men and also as a way to better define the hierarchy between men.

---

106 Od. 6.180-185.
107 Od. 6.109, 6.228.
CHAPTER 3

*DEMH₂*- ELSEWHERE IN INDO-EUROPEAN

The goal of this chapter is to provide a diachronic view of the Greek verb by tracing the development of the *demH₂*- root in other Indo-European languages. I will then compare the conclusions reached in chapters 1 and 2 to the verb's cognates in other major IE poetic traditions, particularly the tradition reflected in the Rig Veda and the plays of Plautus: do these show a similar semantic range for *demH₂*-? Finally, I will use the aforementioned observations and conclusions to present my own hypothesis about the background of Greek δάμαρ — namely, that it too could conceivably derive from *demH₂*. I will investigate the possible linguistic connection between the two separate IE roots *dem(H₂)- 'build' and *demH₂- 'tame', which might allow δάμαρ to be derived from the same root as δάμνημι or δέμω. It is my goal that this expansion on the issue of domination will support my assertions about the hierarchical relationships between men and between the genders.

There are six Indo-European branches in which *demH₂- has attested reflexes: Anatolian, Celtic, Germanic, Greek, Indo-Iranian, Italic. In Greek, the IE root *demH₂- has provided various derivatives; in Homeric Greek: δμητήρ (ἵππων) 'tamer, 109 δμήσις (ἵππων)

'taming,' ἀδμής, -τος [f.m.] 'untamed, unmarried,' ἀδμήτος 'unbroken,' ἀ-δάμα-σ-τος 'unyielding,' παν-δαμάτωρ 'all-tamer.' As I mentioned briefly, δαμάζω is a secondary development from δάμνημι, but Homer uses the two interchangeably.

In the previous chapters I focused on the poetic corpora of Homer (and Hesiod where relevant) to investigate the synchronic semantic scope of this root. In this chapter, I will similarly investigate the synchronic semantic scope of this root in other languages by focusing on the poetic corpora of two amply attested IE daughter languages: Vedic Sanskrit (Indo-Iranian) and Latin (Italic). By exploring these corpora, I will attempt to answer three questions:

1. Does this language use *demH₂- to describe hierarchy as it does in Homeric Greek?
2. Does this root bear a relationship to other verbs similar to that seen in Homeric Greek; namely, does it distinguish itself from 'kill' words?
3. Which aspects of hierarchy does this root indicate, e.g. taming of animals, relationships between beings of like or different stature?

First, let me briefly address this root in the languages whose corpora I will not be exploring. Hittite (Anatolian) shows the verb tamāšš-zi, tame/išš- ‘(op)press,’ connected as a derivative of *demH₂- since Sturtevant. It also has a nominal derivative damme/išā- ‘damaging, act of violence, punishment,’ which conveys a similar meaning to that in Greek, where one inflicts harm on, but does not kill, another being. These cognate words indicate

110 Kloekhorst, s.v. tamāšš-zi.
111 Kloekhorst, s.v. damme/išā-.
that the root in Hittite does convey a domination of agent over patient, but it does not necessarily prescribe a specifically hierarchical relationship.

From this root, Old Irish (Celtic) shows *damnait, -danna* 'bind, subdue.'\(^{112}\) The meaning 'tie, bind' is not well-supported in Old Irish, but its other meaning 'subdue, conquer' is well-attested, and it morphologically mirrors the Greek δάμνημι.\(^{113}\) Interestingly, there is also a noun derivative in Old Irish *dam*[o m] 'bull,' which is actually cognate with Sanskrit *damya-* 'young bull to be tamed.' The use of this root with respect to the taming of animals is illustrated by this semantic extension of this root from the act of taming to the animal which is tamed.\(^{114}\)

The derivative *gatamjan* is only attested once in the Gothic New Testament:

```gothic
saei bauain habaida in aurahjom: jah ni naudibandjom eisarneinaim manna mahta ina gabindan. unte is ufta eisarnam bi fotuns gabuganaim jah naudibandjom eisarneinaim gabundans was jah galausida af sis ḣos naudibandjos jah ḣo ana fotum eisarna gabrak, jah manna ni mahta ina gatamjan.\(^{115}\)

'Who had a dwelling among the tombs: and no one could bind him with iron fetters. Since he was often bound with irons bent around his feet and with iron fetters and chains, and he had loosened those chains from himself and had broken those irons upon his feet, and no one could tame him.'
```

Wulfila's Gothic, translated directly from the Greek, reflects the original Greek verb choices:

```greek
ὁς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν· καὶ οὐδὲ ἀλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς ἐνδύνατο αὐτὸν ἁλύσει.
```

\(^{112}\) Matasović., s.v. *dam-na-.*
\(^{113}\) Likely 'tie, bind' as a result of correlation with δέω. Instead, the true Irish cognate is *daimim*, which aligns it with Sanskrit and Germanic (Dictionary of the Irish Language, s.v. *damnait*).
\(^{114}\) Matasović. s.v. *damo-.*
\(^{115}\) Mark 5:3-4.
The Greek makes a distinction between δέω 'bind' and δαμάζω, initially stating that no one can bind this man, and after describing how the iron fetters fail to trap him, it states that no one could subdue him. Similarly, the Gothic distinguishes between *gabindan* 'bind' and *gatamjan* 'tame.' As this verb is only attested once in the New Testament (in both Greek and Gothic), little can be determined about its semantic scope in Gothic. It does, however, highlight its separation from the idea of simply 'binding.' The repetition of the phrase, with an explanation of the failure of the chains in between, emphasizes the significance of the second verb after reiterating how the man is not able to be bound. Gothic *tam-* is clearly derived from the *demH₂*-root, and in this capacity, indicates an increased level of 'boundness' than *gabindan*. Like in Hittite, it is possible to posit a controlling relationship between the agent (no man) and the patient (this man) by means of chains, but not possible to determine whether this relationship is a hierarchical one. Based on this single instance, it is unlikely (but not impossible) that *gatamjan* covers the wide semantic scope in Gothic as it does in Greek.
1. Vedic Sanskrit

In the Rig Veda, *demH* is primarily used to describe the dominant position of Indra (and occasionally Agni) over both gods, men, and beasts, primarily in combat. Semantically, the derivatives function similar to the most common usage in Homeric Greek, where the agent overcomes, and sometimes kills, the patient. In the Rig Veda, the lines of separation between each level of hierarchy are blurred by numerous similes comparing men, animals, and gods. For example:

\[
\text{anānudó vrṣabhó jāgmir āhavāṃ // nīṣṭaptā śātrum pṛ́tanāsa sāsahīḥ}
\]
\[
\text{āsī satyā ṛṇayā brahmaṇas pata // ugrásya cid damitā viḥuḥarśīṇah}
\]

'An unyielding bull, glad to march to conflict, a scorcher of the enemy, victorious in conflicts, you are the true avenger, O Brahmaṇaspati, the tamer of the mighty one who delights in his toughness.'\(^{116}\)

The addressee is described as anānudó vrṣabhó 'unyielding bull,' a metaphorical usage that suggests that this bull cannot be tamed, just as animals are in Greek (or Latin, to be shown next). At the same time, the addressee is in fact the deity Brahmaṇaspati, who, by the nature of his divine status, is clearly ugrásya cid damitā 'tamer of the mighty.' Additionally, the description that he is superior to mortals, which could go unsaid, portrays a divine hierarchy in which he is not an insignificant figure. It is important to recognize that this is

---

\(^{116}\) RV 2.23.11, modified translation of Geldner.
praise discourse, however, and embellishment of stature for the sake of flattery is quite possible.

Similarly, "*demH₂-" is used to describe Indra's heightened stature in the divine hierarchy:

\[ \text{inde ra ośadhir asanod āhāni \, vānaspátim̐ asanod antárıkṣam} \]
\[ \text{bibhéda valāṇi nunudé vívācó athābhavad damitábhíkratúnām} \]

'Indra won the plants, the days; the trees he won, the air. He split the cave, dispelled the fighters, and so became the tamer of the overweening.'

Indra asanod 'won' many things, but most notably, he bibhéda 'split' Vala (the cave\textsuperscript{18}), and became damitábhíkratúnām 'the tamer of the overweening.' Here, as in Greek, "*demH₂-" collocated with other martial verbs in Vedic asserts hierarchy without specifying how an agent asserts that hierarchy. Two of Indra's actions – his splitting of Vala and his expulsion of the fighters – are key to his superiority. While splitting is not associated with 'dispatching' in Greek\textsuperscript{19}, it does, like striking or hitting, assert control over another's body. The idea of thrusting away the fighters, however, is not associated with "*demH₂-" in the Greek experience, as it is in Vedic. His military prevalence over both gods and men affirms his hierarchical status, and Indra's superiority is explicitly spelled out:

\[ \text{śṛṇvé virá ugrám-ugraṃ damāván} \, \text{anyám-anyam atinenīyámānah} \]

\textsuperscript{17} RV 3.34.10, modified translation of Geldner.
\textsuperscript{18} Also personified as a demon withholding the heavenly waters from man (Macdonell, 2012: s.v. valá). The epithet valavṛtrahan- 'slayer of Vala and Vṛtra' for Indra clearly implies some degree of animation of Vala.
\textsuperscript{19} Perhaps in part because the Greek cognate φείδομαι has dramatically shifted its semantic sense (Pokorny s.v. *bheid).
edhamānadvīḷ ubhāyasā rājā // coṣkūyāte viṣā indro manusyān

'The hero is famed as taming every mighty person, as leading one after another over (his enemies). He hates the one smug in his good fortune, as king over both parts, Indra is always involving himself with the tribes of men.\textsuperscript{120}

This description of Indra adds an extra nuance: he hates the one smug in his good fortune and is constantly involved with mankind. Just as the Olympian gods do, Indra lends his favor to chosen warriors on earth. Along the same lines, he and Agni are both described as ánānataṃ damāyantam pṛtanyūn 'unyielding tamer of foes.'\textsuperscript{121}

The root is limited to divinities in Vedic, which clearly uses *demH₂- to describe hierarchy in a simple binary form: Indra (and sometimes Agni) stands above other gods and all men. Elsewhere, Indra is also described using *demH₂- with respect to 'everyone' (viśvasya damitā), Dasyu's (adam āyo dáśyūmr), and Dhuni and Cumuri (dhúniṃ ca cúmuriṃ ca dembhāyaṇ).\textsuperscript{122} At one point *demH₂- is situated alongside a description of Indra's influence when Trita slew the boar, and the close proximity of han 'slew' to damanyat 'defeated' does not offer much likelihood that the Dāsa\textsuperscript{123} survives the encounter:

\begin{verbatim}
sá id dāsaṃ tuvīrāvam pátir dán // śaḷakṣāṃ triśiśāṇaṃ damanyat
asýa tritó nv ójasā vṛdhānō // vipā varāhám áyoagrayā han
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{120} RV 6.47.16, modified translation of Geldner.
\textsuperscript{121} RV 7.6.4 (Agni), 10.74.5 (Indra).
\textsuperscript{122} Everyone (RV 5.34.6), Dasyu's (6.18.3), Dhuni & Cumuri (10.113.9). The Dasyus were non-Aryan enemies of the Vedic Indians, also characterized as a class of demons hostile to the gods (Macdonell, 2012: s.v. dás-yu). When Dhuni and Cumuri are named together, *demH₂- signifies a nocturnal attack, as it is a constant feature that Indra lulls them to sleep (Oldenberg, 1988: 83).
\textsuperscript{123} Like the Dasyus, the Dāsas were foreign dark-skinned enemies of the Vedic Aryans.
This house-lord defeated the loudly roaring Dāsa with six eyes and three heads. Strengthened by his [Indra's] might, Trita slew the boar with iron-pointed speech.\footnote{RV 10.99.6, modified translation of Geldner.}

This scene demonstrates that *dem\(H\)_2, while not being specifically collocated with 'kill' words, is distinct in meaning from them and indicates that Indra subdued (and quite possibly killed) the Dāsa. The conflict is analogous to one warrior dispatching another, removing the patient from fighting capability, in Homeric Greek. While there are plenty of other deities in the Rig Veda, it appears that no one can measure up to Indra in the divine hierarchy. Vedic does not use *dem\(H\)_2 to describe any taming of animals or human relationships; rather, it confines it to contexts confirming Indra's position above gods and men.

2. Latin

In Latin, the primary derivation of the *dem\(H\)_2 root is the verb *domō/domāre* 'tame' alongside several secondary derivations: *domītāre* 'subdue by taming,' *domitor* 'a trainer (of animals), conqueror.'\footnote{domitāre possibly built to *domāre* as an iterative or built to the past passive participle as a denominal verb (de Vaan, domō). It is possible that *dominus* 'master of the household, ruler' is also derived from the same root, supporting a power structure where the *dominus* stands at the top of the hierarchy of the house. I will address the question of uncertain derivatives further at the end of this chapter. This root in Latin displays a semantic range similar to that of...
Greek δαμάζω as described in the previous chapters: a) the taming of animals, b) domination in battle, c) exertion of authority over, d) bringing one’s emotions or actions under control. In addition, it can mean ‘render [things] milder/amenable,’ which seems to be an extension of definition (d).\textsuperscript{126}

This variety of meanings and contexts is readily evident in the plays of Plautus, who is a fair exemplar because he is the earliest Latin author to survive in any bulk. The total Plautine corpus – approximately 20,000 verses – is in fact close to the length of the \textit{Iliad and Odyssey} put together, large and rich enough to support our exploration.\textsuperscript{127} There is a wrinkle in the fact that Plautus’ plays are adapted from Greek New Comedy, and so one might wonder whether the verb choice in Latin reflects that of the original Greek. The answer is squarely no: Plautus’ words are his own. To judge from the one example where we can place Latin and Greek side by side – a roughly hundred line stretch of the \textit{Bacchides}, whose Greek source (Menander’s \textit{Dis Exapaton}) was recovered in the 1960s – Plautus is decidedly an adaptor, not a translator. As Fortson begins his exploration of Plautus’ language: “The stylistic and comic language of Plautus’ plays is therefore his, not Menander’s, and Latin, not translated Greek.”\textsuperscript{128}

Plautus’ use of this root throughout his plays does, then, provide a good test case to illustrate its wide semantic scope. He uses domō to describe hierarchical relationships: 1)

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{126} OLD, s.v. domō.
  \item \textsuperscript{127} Fortson 2008: 10.
  \item \textsuperscript{128} Fortson 2008: 1.
\end{itemize}
between men and animals, 2) among men, 3) between men and the forces they must overcome.

First, Plautus uses *demH₂-* to describe animals, both oxen and horses, as being 'tamed' by men. In The Persian, Sagaristio describes cows as such:

nam erus meus me Eretriam misit, domitos boves ut sibi mercarer...
nunc amico homini boves domitos mea ex crumina largiar.¹²⁹

'My master sent me to Eretria to purchase tamed oxen for him...
now let me bestow tamed oxen on my friend man from my purse.'

The boves domitos mentioned here are oxen which, in addition to having been tamed and trained by men, are suitable for plowing and currently for sale. In Truculentus, Astaphium mentions that various animals, and in particular horses, can be tamed:

verum ego illúm, quamquam violentust, spero inmutari pote blandimentis, oramentis, ceteris meretriciis;
vidi equom ex indomito domitum fieri atque alias beluas.¹³⁰

'Oh well, whether he is violent or not, I hope it is possible [for him] to be changed by blandishments, ornaments, other wiles;
I have seen a horse become tamed from wildness, as well as other beasts.'

On the surface, she illustrates how *demH₂-* describes the domination of men over animals, but she also overlays this hierarchical relationship with the hierarchical relationships of societal norms. While Plautus never used domō to describe the relationship between men and women, Astaphium refers to the hierarchical norm in place by suggesting the opposite: that women, by conniving and bribing, can subdue men to overcome their wild impulses

¹²⁹ Plaut. Persa, 259, 265.
¹³⁰ Plaut. Truc. 319.
and tame them to become more civilized members of society. She recognizes the
domination of men over women by referencing the taboo of it being overturned, and
referencing the taming of animals allows her to describe how she hopes that Truculentus
can be similarly 'tamed.'

Second, Plautus uses *demH₂- in the Asinaria to indicates a hierarchy among men:

Argyrippus: Perii hercle. Si verum quidem et decorum erum vehere servom,
isciende.
Libanus: Sic isti solent superbi subdomari.¹³¹

'Argyrippus: Oh hell. If it is indeed right and seemly that a master carry his servant,
climb up.
Libanus: Thus those damn haughty men are accustomed to being subdued.'

Libanus, the slave arguing with Argyrippus, suggests that they trade roles so that the latter
can experience his suffering. When Argyrippus agrees, Libanus uses subdomari to describe
this subversion of the natural societal hierarchy, where the master is carrying his slave,
instead of vice versa. Like in Homeric Greek, the use of this verb shows the expected
hierarchy in place and highlights when it is violated.

At times, Plautus hints at a hierarchy in which divinities rank higher than humans,
while affirming the intra-human hierarchy in place. In Amphitruo, Sosia meets Mercury,
disguised as Sosia himself, and Sosia gears up for a fight:

Mercury: Gestiunt pugni mihi.
Sosia: Si in me exercituru’s, quaeso in parietem ut primum domes.¹³²

¹³¹ Plaut. Asin. 701-2. This is a hapax legomenon, but commentators (e.g. Ludwig Gurlitt) have suggested that
subdomari 'be subdued' indicates a sexual joke, presumably that the master is accustomed to being the receiver
in homosexual intercourse (Bertini, 1968: 284).
'Mercury: My fists are itching to go.
Sosia: If you're going to have it out against me, I ask that you first strike against a wall.'

Sosia, not addressing his adversary directly, mutters that he'd rather the unknown foe try to take down a wall rather than himself. Without knowing that he's about to clash with a god, he worries that he'll be bested and proved the inferior of the two 'men.' Later in the play, when Jupiter reveals that he has slept with Alcmena, Amphitryon accepts that the god has superiority in the hierarchy over his human stature, just as Sosia accepts the same of Mercury. Similarly, in Trinnumus, Charmides calls out to Neptune and recognizes his superiority:

\[\textit{atque hanc tuam gloriam iam ante auribus acceperam, et nobilest apud homines, pauperibus te parcere solitum, dites dammure atque domare. abi, laudo, scis ordine, ut aequomst, tractare homines; hoc dis dignumst.}\]

'and I will have received this glory of yours already before my ears, and it is noble among men, that you are accustomed to sparing the poor, destroying and subduing the rich. No, I praise you, you know properly how it is fair to handle men: this is befitting the gods.'

Plautus uses \textit{domō} with respect to the \textit{dites} 'rich,' but when Neptune spares the poor and destroys the rich, he upends the expected human hierarchy of rich over poor. At the same time, he reaffirms the expected hierarchy of divine over mortal.

Third, Plautus uses *\textit{demH}*_ to describe situations where man must overcome a part of himself, akin to its use in connection with \textit{μένος} or \textit{θυμός} in Greek.\textsuperscript{134} These instances,

\textsuperscript{133} Plaut. \textit{Trin.} 827-30.
\textsuperscript{134} Cf. p. 29.
however, hint at the previous two relationships. In the *Miles Gloriosus*, the obvious patients of *domō* are faculties and limbs, but the use of this verb highlights the slave's lowly position in society:

*Immo indigne; nám hominem servom suos*  
*domitos habere oportet oculos et manus*  
*orationemque.*

'No, not a chance; for it is proper for a servant man to have his eyes and hands tamed, as well as speech.'

While it is necessary for any *hominem* 'man' to have control over his sight, touch, and speech, the *servom* 'slave' must exercise greater restraint because he belongs to a lower echelon of society. Similarly, in *Casina*, the patient of *domō* is the mind, but the context makes it clear that it is a woman who is meant to be subdued:

*sed quid ais? iam domuisti animum, potius ut quod vir velit fieri, id facias, quam adversere contra?*

'But what are you saying? Have you already overcome your mind, so that you can do that which your husband wants to happen, more easily than fighting against it?'

Lysidamus asks his wife, Cleostrata, if she is ready to subdue her *animum* 'mind,' but only as part of asking her to subdue herself, subjecting herself to his authority as a man and her husband. This is reminiscent of the inferiority of women in Greek, but distinct in that Homer only describes warriors as taming their own minds or spirits. In addition to the Cleostrata overcoming her mind, this scene also refers to the hierarchy between men and

137 Cf. p. 29.
women in a blatantly sexual way: the wife subjects her mind and body to the carnal desires of her husband.

As demonstrated in the plays of Plautus, Latin uses *demH₂- to describe hierarchy in a manner very similar to Homeric Greek: taming of animals, relationships among men (and between men and women), the relationship between gods and men. The nuance of this root in the universe of control is not evident in Latin; it does not distinguish itself from 'kill' words, and so it has slightly narrower semantic scope.

As a conclusion to the study of *demH₂- in Latin, I’d like to return to the question of dominus, whose uncertain origin raises an interesting question in the connection of this root to another PIE verb root, *dem(H₂)- 'build.' The laryngeal in the 'build' root is disputed, notably posited by Rix, but I will utilize evidence from daughter languages to highlight the likelihood of an etymological and semantic connection between the two roots. To that end, I will return to the Greek evidence, namely drawing a line from δάμνημι to δέμω to δόμος to δάμαρ. It is my argument that the relationship between *dem(H₂)- 'build' and *dōm/dem- 'house, household' is close enough that it is possible to connect the latter with *demH₂- 'tame,' and finally to associate all three with the Greek δάμαρ 'wife,' whose etymology remains unclear. The evidence will not prove conclusively that one is derived from the other or provide a definite common pre-form, but I will illustrate that it is a valid possibility to derive δάμαρ from either and possibly both of these roots.

138 Rix, 2001: s.v. *demH₂-. 
First of all, the connection between 'build' and 'house' is disputed. Watkins states that *dem(H₂)- 'to build' serves as the root form of *dem- 'house, household,' but is uncertain as to whether it is a separate root.¹³⁹ Pokorny defines the verb root dem- to simultaneously mean both 'build' and 'to house.'¹⁴⁰ Conversely, Beekes argues that the Greek derivative δόμος is an adaptation of the original root noun, rather than a verbal abstract form from δέμω.¹⁴¹ It is fair to say that, without defining the directionality of derivation, 'to build' and 'house' are intimately related. The noun 'house' stem *dōm/dem- (as it is most frequently reconstructed) is well-attested in IE daughter languages: Avestan dam-, Greek δόμος, Latin domus, Lithuanian nāmas, Old Church Slavic domь. and Sanskrit dáma.¹⁴² It is not clear, however, whether the daughter languages have built the cognates from a noun form or a verb form. There appears to be no doubt about the existence of the original root noun *dōm/dem-, but if that is in fact the root of these cognates, they developed differently in each language. The o-stem form in Sanskrit is secondary, appearing alongside an old u-stem in dámūnas- 'lord of the house,' and is further complicated by a neuter dám which stands alongside dáma. The Latin form behaves in the opposite way, replacing the older o-stem inflection with a feminine u-stem inflection.¹⁴³

On the other hand, if these nouns are based on a root verb, they could reasonably be derived from either 'build' or 'tame.' Pokorny suggests that 'home' is an old branching of the

¹³⁹ Watkins, 2000: s.v. dem-.
¹⁴⁰ Pokorny, 1969: s.v. dem-.
¹⁴¹ Beekes and van Beek, 2010: s.v. δόμος.
¹⁴² de Vaan, 2008: s.v. domus.
¹⁴³ Beekes and van Beek, 2010: s.v. δόμος.
root to demā- 'tame', originally probably 'tie up in the house, domesticate'. Lanman highlights how this ambiguity manifests itself in the Sanskrit form: "it is not certain whether dáma comes from √dam and so means literally 'the place where one is master' or whether it is to be connected with δέμω 'build': in the latter case, it would mean literally 'a building." Frisk connects 'build' to 'house', a logical combination due to the nature of a house being a basic unit of building. He also mentions the possibility, however, that there is an original kinship between δάμνημι and the 'house' root. This final speculation is crucially important for drawing the three roots together. Based on these assessments, one could argue that 'house' can be derived from either 'build' or 'tame,' and by extension, the possibility that the two verbs roots were identical at some point in time becomes far more plausible. Essentially, the relationship between the two is closer than appears on the surface, and it is therefore reasonable to suggest that 'build,' 'tame,' and 'house' are all interrelated.

Based on these connections, the existence of a laryngeal as part of the 'build' root seems more feasible. The possibility for there to be a laryngeal at the end of the 'build' root is further suggested by derived forms such as Latin dominus, which can be produced from either *domHno- or *domVno-. The continuation of a construction*domu-no- or *domo-no built to nouns in -u and -o, respectively, is perfectly plausible, but uncertain. Semantically, the Latin form can function simply as 'he of the house (like Gothic kindins 'he of the gens' and

---

144 Pokorny, 1969: s.v. dem-.  
145 Lanman, 1971: s.v. dáma.  
146 Frisk, 1955: s.v. δέμω.  
147 Frisk, 1955: s.v. δάμνημι.
thiudans 'he of the people'), but it is more commonly construed as 'he who possesses/profits from a house' (Pinault reconstructs *dom-H₃en-, thematized as *dom-H₃n-o*). Rather than indicating merely an existence of the noun, these formulations of the root suggest a masterful relationship over the noun. Gothic thiudans has been lexicalized as 'king, and Sanskrit dámūnas- 'lord of the house' suggests a position of ruling-power within the house. A similar semantic drift is evident in the Latin synchronic language from 'the master of the house' to 'supreme ruler, he who is in control,' and the subsequent Latin derivatives dominium and dominārī have both left behind the connection with the home.

Each head is therefore responsible for managing and taming his household, and it is reasonable to conjecture each as having an etymological undertone of the 'tame' root, if not a direct correlation. But each daughter language has incorporated the root(s) in a different manner: Armenian tanutēr has reformulated the noun as a u-stem (like Skt. dámūnas-), while Greek δεσπότης and Sanskrit dāmpati- both utilize the IE genitive *dems in their formation, each connecting the derived forms to the archaic root noun form. If δάμαρ is cognate with Lat. dominus, the two represent a typical r/n neuter formed from 'to tame', and δάμαρ would be 'the tamed one, the woman possessed.' Both Frisk and Chantraine suggest an archaic final -r, but Szemerényi dismisses this suggestion by arguing the unlikelihood that δάμαρ could have ever been anything but a feminine form.

---

149 de Vaan, 2008: s.v. dominus.
150 Glare, ed. 1982: s.v. dominus.
151 Beekes and van Beek, 2010: s.v. δεσπότης.
152 Szemerényi, 1977: 78.
unlikely, but Szemerényi’s argument doesn’t necessarily preclude the possibility that the noun has been contaminated by the related noun and verb roots which are complexly intertwined.

In the previous chapters I discussed how the use of *demH₁* in archaic Greek describes the nature of various relationships and specifies their hierarchical nature. The semantic spectrum from 'kill' (dominating a living being to the point of death) to 'tame' (dominating a living being such that it is properly subordinate) included instances where *demH₁* denoted the inferior role of a wife to her husband. Therefore, when a woman is married and enters a household subservient to her husband, she is effectively tamed. Similarly, the Greek ἀδμής is used to mean both 'untamed' with respect to animals (Od. 4.637) and 'unmarried' with respect to women (Od. 6.109, 6.228). Here the meaning of 'wife' comes around full circle to simultaneously indicate 'she who is in the house' and 'she who is tamed.'

Although the exact etymology of δάμασ is unknown, it is traditionally associated with δόμος, though in some unidentifiable manner.¹⁵³ Schulze suggested a combination of 'house' with ἀρ (from ἀραφίσκω).¹⁵⁴ Szemerényi rejects this as well, declaring that ἀραφίσκω can only mean 'to join, fit together' or 'fit, furnish with', but not 'to arrange,' which means that δόμον ἀρ- could only mean 'construct, build a house,' a thoroughly unreasonable description for a Homeric or IE woman. Instead, he argues that, based on the

---

¹⁵³ Beekes and van Beek, 2010: s.v. δάμασ.
pattern of δάπεδον from *dm-pedom, the -μαρ is cognate with Lithuanian marti 'bride, young woman,' providing an endocentric compound 'woman of the house, housewife.'

Based on the previous arguments about the interrelatedness of 'build' and 'tame' in contributing to the 'house' noun, the most probable answer lies somewhere in the nebulous middle ground, where δάμαρ has etymological commonality with both the house and the taming. The woman who is tamed and brought into the household as married is in fact the same wife and the woman of the house. Rix suggests that the root *demH₂- 'tame' is possibly identical to *demH₂ - 'build, join together.' Though the two roots may merely be homophones rather than one and the same, it is quite likely that the two are in some way related, and their identical presentation is not coincidental. At the very least, their identical appearance is a likely contributor to some cross-contamination.

Because the etymological evidence is inconclusive, it makes sense to look at their semantic presentations. The house is the most fundamental entity which can be built, and the breaker/master stands at the head of the household; one can reasonably understand that he who builds the house is also the person who rules the house. It's true, there are many parallel constructions in daughter languages which are quite likely independent: Greek παν-δαμάτωρ, Latin domitor, and Sanskrit damitar- all show the agentive suffix -tor built to the root. Still, the uncertainty about the final laryngeal, coupled with the apparent homophony of the roots, provides a compelling likelihood that these words are a conflation

155 Szemerényi, 1977: 78.
156 Rix et al. s.v. *demH₂- , n.1.
of both *dem(H₂)- 'build' and *demH₂- 'tame.' In Greek, the complex imbalance of power portrayed by the use of δάμνημι/δαμάζω infiltrates the δόμος and creates a δάμαρ who can only be defined by her subordinate role in the house.

3. Conclusion

This exploration of *dem(H₂)- in IE languages illustrates that this root lent itself well to semantic widening, but no other language displayed as wide a range as Greek. In Homeric Greek, it often worked in concordance with other martial verbs to produce a universe of control, where it denoted hierarchy and sometimes overlapped with verbs of killing to provide a framework for a story of war. When the audience of the Homeric epics heard vocabulary rooted in *dem(H₂)-, the rich polysemy of the words provided a nuanced reception of the texts. By listening closely to the words immediately preceding and following, the listener could determine which level of meaning *dem(H₂)- conveyed, as well as which levels of hierarchy it circumscribed. These multiple levels of understanding were no doubt only one contributor to the enjoyment of the listener. I hope that my suggestion of a linkage between the 'build' and 'tame' roots has added depth to the already complex experience of dem(H₂)-. Listeners of the epics may have wondered about the connection of these roots simply by looking at the vocabulary within their own language. The listener of Vedic Sanskrit or Latin poetry perhaps did not gather as many degrees of connotation, but
one certainly would have internalized the hierarchy drawn by the use of \( *\text{dem}(H_2) \). The basic definition 'tame' that began this exploration of IE \( *\text{dem}(H_2) \) was actually a window into the immense and complex culture of hierarchy in epic literature.
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