Homeric Evidences of an Inherently Actional Opposition: ἔρχομαι vs ἔλθων
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Abstract
The paper aims at analyzing the paradigmatic relationship between the verbs ἔρχομαι and ἔλθων in Homeric Greek. Both verbs convey the idea of going within a Homeric suppletive paradigm. Although suppletivism between ἔρχομαι, εἴµι, ἐλέούσομαι (future), ἔλθων (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect) is generally accepted, there is still uncertainty on both etymology and semantic features involving inherent actionality, with particular reference to ἔρχομαι. Therefore, the actional status of ἔρχομαι and its relationship with ἔλθων need further investigation. A textual analysis of the Homeric occurrences of both ἔρχομαι and ἔλθων, focusing on the semantic-syntactic discourse context, has shed light on their mutual suppletive relationship and proved that it is ultimately based on their inherently actional opposition within the paradigm.
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1. Introduction: Status Quaestionis, Methodology and Purpose of the Study
As generally accepted by scholars (cf. Osthoff 1899; Brugmann & Delbrück 1897-1916; Brugmann & Thumb 1913; Snell 1955-2010; Schwysker 1959; Chantraine 1968-80; Létoeblon 1985; Kölligan 2007), the Homeric suppletive paradigm for going includes ἔρχομαι, εἴµι, ἐλέοσομαι (future), ἔλθων (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect). Both ἔρχομαι and εἴµι always occur as present stems and never as aorist stems, while ἔλθων (in Homer also ἔλθων) always occurs as aorist stem (to which also pf. εἰλήλουθα and fut. ἐλέοσομαι trace back). In particular, the verb ἔρχομαι is employed in Homer as present, with habitual value as well; whereas the present εἴµι is mostly employed with an intentional-futuristic value (while ἐλέοσομαι functions as a simple future), and compensates for the lack of the imperfect with
its imperfect forms; the use of ἐμ as generic present is only residual (Létoublon 1985; Kölligan 2007).

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

However, accounting for the suppletive relationship within this paradigm can be more suitable in a different perspective that takes into account the notion of actionality (i.e. Lexical aspect, Aktionsart). Unlike grammatical aspect, which morphologically conveys the speaker’s point of view in reference to the event expressed by a verb, actionality concerns the inherent nature of the event and the verbal inner meaning (see, among others, Comrie 1976; Bertinetto 1986). In particular, the actional-semantic inherent feature of telicity, which is typical of those events concerning a natural or intended endpoint (cf. Vendler 1957; Depraetere 1995), e.g. πίπτω “to fall” or μαθάνω “to learn”, has recently proved to be crucial for the development of inflectional morphology within verbal paradigms in old Indo-European languages such as Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. Both Homeric and Vedic evidences show that the grammatical-aspectual (and, then, temporal) opposition between aorist stem (perfectum system) and present stem (inflectum system) is actually consequent to an original actional opposition based on verbal (a) telicity, and that the distribution of tense inflectional markers in a more recent stage of the Proto-Indo-European depends on the verb-inherent [±telic] feature (see Bartolotta 2009; 2016; 2017a for further details) (Note 1). According to the specific distribution of the stems within the going paradigm, the following opposition seems to appear: [−telic] ἔρχομαι and ἐμ, present stem, inflectum system vs [+telic] ἤλθον, aorist stem, perfectum system. The actional status of both atelic ἐμ (see Meillet 1929; Létoublon 1985; Romagno 2002; Bartolotta 2016; 2017b) and telic ἤλθον (see Pokorny 1959; Chantry 1968-80; Rix 2001) is actually quite definite (Note 2). As for its etymology (Chantry 1968-80: 377; Rix 2001: 238 f.; Snell 1955-2010), there is no agreement among scholars about the actional status of ἔρχομαι that still remains quite uncertain and requires further analysis. Despite slight difference within their terminology, some scholars hypothesize that the prototypically actional value of ἔρχομαι is telic. Meillet (1929: 249 ff.) connects ἔρχομαι to the IE root *ser- > Gr. ἔρ-πω; Lat. ser-pō; Skr. sár-patī “to slither; to drag”, to which a -χ(e) suffix gives a basically telic value; Rix (2001: 238 f.) connects the verb to the zero grade *h₁er- of the IE root *h₁er- “to come to/reach; to arrive/bump into”, with a -sk(e) suffix (*h₁srk-e > *ersk(e) > *erk(e) > *rcc(h)āti “he reaches; bumps into”), or, doubtfully, to the IE root *h₁ergbh- “to ascend”; Pokorny (1959: 326 ff.) connects ἔρχομαι
to an extended form \(^*er-g^h\) of the IE root \(^*er\) “to start to move; to excite; to put up”, that he considers as telic (Note 3). Apart from the etymological doubts, textual examples do not provide strong evidence about the telic value of \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) (Chantraine 1968-80: 377). Although the actional value of \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) has been extensively investigated, there is still uncertainty about it. On the one hand, Létoublon (1985: 72 ff.) considers \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) as atelic; on the other hand, Romagno (2002) has analysed \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) from a split intransitivity perspective and considered it as telic (i.e. \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\): unaccusative and telic vs \(\dot{e}i\mu\): unergative and atelic).

At the same time she also underlines a frequent overlap, rather than an opposition, between \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) and \(\dot{e}i\mu\) (for further details see Romagno 2002 and the references given therein). Furthermore, the disagreement on the semantics of this verb is also shown by the variation within lexicographic data (Note 4).

The present study aims at clarifying the semantic and actional value of \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\), also in reference to its relationship with \(\dot{e}l\lambda\theta\omicron\) and the other stems built on the aorist stem (i.e. ft. \(\dot{e}l\lambda\delta\sigma\omicron\omicron\omicron\), pf. \(\dot{e}i\lambda\lambda\lambda\omicron\omega\theta\alpha\)), by analyzing their occurrences within the Iliad and the Odyssey (Note 5). In particular, the analysis takes into account the motion events expressed by these Homeric verbs in the light of Talmy’s cognitive-typological theory (Talmy 2000, 2009). According to this framework, languages are distinguished into two types, i.e. \(V\)(erb)- and \((S)\)atellite\(-F\)ramed, depending on the pattern they tend to use to express the semantic components of a motion event, i.e. \(F\)igure (the moving object), \(G\)round (the reference object/frame), \(M\)otion (the presence of motion), \(P\)ath (the path followed by the object), \(M\)anner (the way of motion), \(C\)ause (the cause of motion), and, in particular, the \(P\)ath component, which is the core element (Note 6). \(V\)-Framed languages tend to convey \(P\)ath in the verb root (e.g. Sp. \textit{El perro} [\(F\)igure] \textit{entró} [\(M\)otion+\(P\)ath] en [\((P)\)ath] \textit{el jardín} [\(G\)round] \textit{corriendo} [\(M\)anner] “The dog ran into the garden”). On the contrary, Homeric Greek is a \(S\)-Framed language (see Talmy 2000; Baldi 2006; Skopeteas 2008; Imbert 2010; Nikitina 2013; Verkerk 2014), as it tends to convey \(P\)ath in a so-called satellite, i.e. particles functioning as both preverbs and prepositions (e.g. \(\dot{e}n\)-\(\dot{e}d\rho\omega\mu\) “He ran \textit{against}”; \(\dot{\theta}e\omicron\nu\ \acute{e}t\i\) \(\dot{v}\eta\alpha\varsigma\ “\text{Running to(w)wards the ships}”\), adverb(ial)s (e.g. \(\sigma\varsigma\dot{e}\dot{\theta}\omicron\nu\ \dot{\eta}\lambda\theta\omicron\nu\nu\ “\text{He came close}”\), nominal case markers (e.g. \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\nu\tau\omicron\ \pi\delta\iota-\textit{oo} “\text{They go through a plain}”), while verbs convey \([M\]otion+\(M\)anner), such as the manner-of-motion verbs \(\dot{e}d\rho\omicron\mu\nu\) and \(\dot{\theta}e\omicron\ “\text{to run}”, or only \([M\)otion], such as the verbs \(\dot{e}l\lambda\theta\omicron\) and \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\ “\text{to go}” (Note 7). The verbal class of self-propelled motion, to which the chosen verbs \(\dot{e}r\chi\omega\mu\alpha\) and \(\dot{e}l\lambda\theta\omicron\) belong, is involved in an encoding pattern (i.e. verb \([M\)otion] + satellite \([P\)ath]) which is actually less prototypical in reference to \(S\)-Framed languages, as it is actually used by \(V\)-Framed languages as well. Among \(P\)ath-encoding satellites, depending on their degree of semantic compatibility with the idea of reaching a goal, there are both those which are prototypically directional/goal-oriented (e.g. the particle \(\acute{e}t\i\ “\text{to, towards}”, the adverb \(\acute{a}\nu\tau\omicron\ “\text{against}”, the accusative case marker with allative value), and the prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented ones (e.g. the particle \(\pi\rho\iota\ “\text{around}”, the adverb \(\dot{e}\gamma\gamma\omicron\theta\omicron\ “\text{near}”, the genitive case marker with perlative value).

It has been recently shown that verb-inherent telicity plays an important role on motion event encoding as far as morphosyntactic cohesion between verbs and spatial particles is concerned.
In fact, Homeric data show a higher morphosyntactic cohesion between directional/goal oriented particles and telic, rather than atelic, manner-of-motion and self-propelled motion verbs, i.e. a higher frequency of agglutinated preverbal forms, rather than prepositions or tmetric preverbal constructions, are found between telic motion verbs and directional/goal oriented particles (for further details, see Bartolotta & Nigrelli 2017; Nigrelli 2019; see also below, Section 2.1) (Note 8).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) [...] ἐκ δὲ μοι αὐχήν / ἀστραγάλων ἐγή, ψυχή δ’ Ἀἰδώσδε κατῆλθε (Od. 11.64-5)
“[...] and my neck was broken away from the spine and my spirit went down to Hades”

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

(2) [...] αὐτὴ Ἀχαιών / ὅρσε Διὸς θυγάτηρ κυδίστη Τριτογένεια

ἐρχομένη καθ’ ὁμιλον (II. 4.514-6)

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

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

2.2 Variation on Figure’s Reaching the Endpoint Within ἐρχομαι and ἥλθον Homeric Uses

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

Table 1. Homeric distribution of arrivals of the Figure with ἐρχομαι and ἥλθον

| Directional particles | ἐρχομαι | ἥλθον |
|-----------------------|---------|--------|
|                       | arrival | no arrival | arrival | no arrival |
| ἐπι “to”             | 2       | 18      | 80      | 26        |
| είς “to”             | 4       | 10      | 69      | 25        |
| κατά “downwards”     | 2       | 7       | 17      | 4         |
| ἀνά “upwards”        | –       | 7       | 6       | 4         |
| πρὸς “towards”       | 3       | 5       | 8       | 1         |
| Non-directional particles |       |         |         |           |
| ἐκ “out”             | –       | 2       | 44      | 14        |
μετά “between” & 3 & 8 & 18 & 6
διά “through” & 1 & 3 & 17 & 5
ὑπό “under” & – & – & 13 & 2
παρά “beside” & 1 & 3 & 2 & 7
ἀπό “from” & 1 & 3 & 4 & 6
ἀμφίζ “on both sides” & – & – & 2 & –
ὑπέρ “over” & – & – & – & 2
σύν “with” & – & 1 & – & –
περί “around” & – & – & 4 & –
ἐν “in” & – & – & 1 & –

Directional spatial adverbs & 1 & 13 & 39 & 15
Non-directional spatial adverbs & – & 5 & 52 & 39

Directional case markers & 2 & 1 & 51 & 13
Non-directional case markers & – & 1 & – & 5

2.2.1 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Particles

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

(3) ᾧ δ’ ἐπεί εἰσήλθεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάινον οὐδόν (Od. 23.88)

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

(4) ἄψ χλισίν εἰσῆλθε, δέπας δ’ ἀπέθηκ’ ἐνὶ χηλῶι. (Il. 16.254)

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

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

Furthermore, it is worth of note that, due to verb-inherent telicity, the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἴλθον tend to express the Figure’s actual reaching the endpoint frequently (about 71% of the occurrences) also when the co-occurring particle is prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented, as shown in (5).
In Bartolotta (2017a: 20.134)

νηκούστησε θεᾶς, ἄλλ’ ἔξ ἄλος Ἑλθε μετ’ αὐτοῦς, (II. 20.134)

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

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

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

(6) δρρ’ ἄν μὲν κ’ ἄγροὺς ἱμεν καὶ ἔργ’ ἀνθρώπον,

τόφρα σῦν ἀμφιστόλουσι μεθ’ ἡμιόνους καὶ ἀμαξαν
καρπαλίμως ἔρχοσθαι- (Od. 6.259-61)

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

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

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

In (7) the verb ἔρχομαι co-occurs, instead, with the directional particle ἄνα “upwards”:

(7) [...] οἱ δὲ τ’ ἐξ αὐτόν / τερπόμενοι λεύσουσιν [...]
“[...] and the other men look upon him (scil. an admirable man) with delight [...] and as he goes through the city, they gaze upon him as upon a god.”

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

2.2.2 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Adverbs

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

(8) [...] μιὸν θηρειόντ’ ἐλασεν σὸς λευκὸν ὄδόντι

Παρνησόνδ’ ἠλθόντα σὺν νύσσιν Αὐτολύκιο. (Od. 19.465-6)

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

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

(9) ἀγγίμουλον ρά οἱ ἠλθὲ κατὰ στίχας, οὔτα δὲ δουρί

νείατον ἐκ κενεώνa [...] (Il. 16.820-1)

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

In (9) the aorist ἠλθὲ refers to the telic movement (i.e. Motion) of Hector (i.e. Figure), while the adverb ἀγγίμουλον “near, close at hand” (i.e. adverbia lneuter form of the adjective ἀγγίμουλος “coming near”) expresses Path in reference to Ground (i.e. Patroclus), which is expressed by the dative oi (enclitic form of the third person pronoun; cf. LSJ 2011); the prepositional phrase κατὰ στίχας “through the ranks” represents a further Path-encoding
element. It is worthy of note that, despite the semantic value of the Path-encoding adverb ἀγχιμωλόν is prototypically non-directional/non-goal-oriented, the motion event in (9) depicts the actual arrival of the Figure (i.e. Hector) to the endpoint (i.e. Patroclus), due to the inherent telicity of Ἥλθε. This is confirmed by the physical contact between both heroes (cf. οὔτα δὲ διωρί νείατον ἐς κενεόνα “and wounded him in the lowest part of the flank with a spear”) (Note 17).

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

(10) ἀγχιμωλόν δ’ Ὅδυσσείς καὶ δίος υφορβός στήτην ἔρχομένῳ [...] (Od. 17.260-1)

“As they drew near (scil. to the Odysseus’s house), both Odysseus and the excellent swineherd stopped [...]”

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

(11) Λητώ γὰρ ἐλκησε, Διὸς κυδρήν παράκοιτιν,

Ποθόδ’ ἔρχομένην διὰ καλλιχόρου Πανοπήσου. (Od. 11.580-1)

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

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

2.2.3 Variation Within Occurrences With Path-Encoding Case Markers

As far as the occurrences with Path-encoding nominal case markers are concerned, data show a high tendency (about 80% of the occurrences) to involve the Figure’s actual reaching the endpoint in reference to the motion events expressed by [telic] Ἥλθον when co-occurring with a directional/goal oriented case marker (i.e. accusative or dative; cf. Tab. 1), as shown in
(12). On the other hand, the occurrences of [+telic] ἔλθον with a non-directional/non-goal-oriented case marker, in which no Figure’s actual reaching the endpoint is involved, are that (5x; cf. Tab. 1) with the accusative of the internal object, i.e. ὁδὸν “way, road”, κέλευθα (pl.) “road, path, journey”, as shown in (13).

(12) κλάθθι μεν, δ θατίζοις θεός ἔλθος ἔμετρον ὁδὸν (Od. 2.262)

“Hear me (scil. Telemachus), you (scil. Athena) god who came to our house yesterday”

In (12) the aorist ἔλθος refers to the telic movement (i.e. Motion) of Athena (i.e. Figure), while the accusative, with allative value, ἔμετρον ὁδὸν “to our house” (cf. δομά) conveys a directional/goal-oriented Path in reference to Telemachus’s house (i.e. Ground), which represents the endpoint reached by Athena (Note 19).

(13) [...] ἄλλην ὁδὸν ἄλλα κέλευθα / ἔλθοσεν - (Od. 9.261-2)

“[...] we (scil. Achaeans) came by another way, other paths”

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

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

(14) ἔρχεσθον κλασίην Πηληϊάδεσ Αχιλῆος (Il. 1.322)

“Go you both (scil. Talthybius and Eurybates) to(wards) the tent of Achilles, Peleus’s son”

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

(15) ἔρχονται πεδίοιο μαχησόμενοι προτὶ ἄστω (Il. 2.801)

“They (scil. Trojans) go through the plain to fight against the city”

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

The textual analysis of the Homeric contexts of use of ἔρχομαι and ἔλθον has allowed to shed light on the uncertain and debated actional value of ἔρχομαι, and to clarify its relationship with ἔλθον within the Homeric suppletive paradigm for going. In fact, Homeric data have provided evidence relating to the inherent atelicity of [−telic] ἔρχομαι, in opposition to the inherent telicity of [+telic] ἔλθον. As a result, the Homeric suppletive paradigm for going would ultimately be as follows: on the one hand [−telic] ἔρχομαι (present), εἰμί (futuristic present), on the other hand [+telic] ἔλθον (futuristic), ἔλθον (aorist), εἰλήλουθα (perfect).

Verb-inherent (a)telicity has proved to be an important feature with reference to Homeric motion events, as it strongly affects the semantic value of the co-occurring elements, namely Path-encoding particles, and thus of the whole motion events too. In particular, due to the higher semantic compatibility between directional/goal-oriented Path-encoding elements and telic verbs, the prototypically directional particles tend to maintain their own directional value when co-occurring with [+telic] ἔλθον, unlike with [−telic] ἔρχομαι, with which they can also show a different (i.e. non-directional/non-goal-oriented) semantic value. Furthermore, extending the analysis to the other kind of Path-encoding elements (i.e. spatial adverbs and nominal case markers, besides spatial particles) and focusing on the Figure’s actual reaching an endpoint within the motion events expressed by both chosen verbs, data have shown further significant evidences with reference to the mutual actional opposition of these verbs, based on inherent (a)telicity. In fact, the motion events expressed by [+telic] ἔλθον tend to involve the Figure’s actual arrival to the endpoint, not only with directional/goal-oriented Path-encoding elements, but also with non-directional/non-goal-oriented ones; on the contrary, the motion event expressed by [−telic] ἔρχομαι never involves the Figure’s actual arrival to the endpoint, not only with non-directional/non-goal-oriented Path-encoding elements, but also with directional/goal-oriented ones.

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

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

Note 2. The verb εἶμι (cf. Skr. ē-mi; Lat. eō < *ei-ō, athematic *ei-mi) traces back to the IE root *ei- “to go” (Pokorny 1959: 293 f.; Chantraine 1968-80: 322). As for ἴλθον, taking into account both stems ἐλθ- and ἐλυθ-/ἐλευθ-, to which aorist ἴλθον/ὁλθ 0ν, future ἐλεύσομαι (< *ἐλεύ[θ]σομαι), perfect ἐλήλουθα trace back, Chantraine (1968-80: 337) hypothesizes that -θ- may be a telic aspectual marker; Meillet (1926) and Pokorny (1959: 306) connect ἴλθον to the IE root *el-ew- and *el-u- (*el- < *h1l) “to push, put in motion”, with -dh- as dental extension (cf. Arm. eli-; Gr. ἐιαύλσ and ἐιάσ “to push, put in motion”); Rix translates IE *h1ludh- (> ἴλθον) as “to go up; to increase”, then, for semantic extension, “to go; to come”.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note 9. The Homeric corpus has been analyzed by means of the digital Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG 2000). As the results of both nominal forms (i.e. participle and infinitive) and
finite ones basically overlap, they are presented together, albeit their different level of representativeness.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note 16. Comparable examples with directional adverbs are in Il. 11.231 (with ὀντίον “against”); 15.175 (with δεῦρο “hither”).

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

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

Note 19. Comparable examples are those referring to the formula τάχα δ ουτῳ / ἦλθε κακόν “but swiftly an evil came to him” in Il. 15.449-50; 17.291-2, whose context describes a hero (i.e. Ground) who is mortally wounded by a κακόν “evil” (i.e. Figure), that is a fatal shot/assault of an enemy. Although ουτῳ may also be considered as an ethical dative, an allative value (i.e. “to him”) seems more suitable given this specific context: the dative thus encodes the directional/goal-oriented Path, also depicting a Ground (i.e. the wounded hero), which is the endpoint actually reached by the Figure. Furthermore, as it refers to an instant process, the co-occurring Manner-encoding adverb τάχα “quickly” is a significant clue of the inherent telic value of ἦλθε.
Note 20. A perlative explanation of the accusative marker (i.e. ἔλθον ὁδὸν/κέλευθα “I/we went through a path”) seems unsuitable, because of both the presence of the accusative (rather than genitive), and the telic nature of the verb.
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