The Classical Quarterly 69.1 23–34 © The Classical Association (2019)
doi:10.1017/S0009838819000557

GLORY AND *NOSTOS*: THE SHIP-EPITHET ΚΟΙΛΟΣ IN THE *ILIAD**

In the *Iliad* the Achaean ships play a prominent role in the narrative; they are foregrounded as Achilles sits by his vessels in anger and threatens to sail home; as the Trojans come close to burning them; and as Hector's body lies by Achilles' ships until ransomed. Where not in the foreground, the ships remain a consistent background; without them the Achaeans would not have reached Troy; they are an essential component of the Greek encampment; and are the unrealized potential vehicle of the Achaean homecoming.[1]

For such a constant facet of the Homeric world we find a correspondingly wide array of epithets.[2] Considering the centrality of the ship to the *Iliad* we might expect the epithets that qualify it to be similarly significant. Despite this, relatively little attention has been paid to the ship-epithets in the poem beyond either metrical quantification or questions of nautical construction.[3] This study aims to go some way towards addressing the paucity of literary investigation by considering the usage and meaning of the ship-epithet κοῖλος ('hollow', transliterated hereafter) in the *Iliad*.[4]

As with the majority of ship-epithets in Homer, the current attitude towards the expression κοῖλαι νῆες ('hollow ships') has been greatly influenced by archaeological-

* I would like to thank Ahuvia Kahane, Seth Schein, *CQ*'s former editor Andrew Morrison and the journal's anonymous reader for their helpful suggestions and questions, all of which improved this paper and saved me from some embarrassing errors. Fiachra Mac Góráin and Giulia Maltagliati pointed out a number of inaccuracies just in time for me to correct them. Mistakes that remain are my own.

[1] The lemma ναῦς occurs 589 times in the *Iliad*, and is the third most common substantive in the poem (after Ἀχαιός and ἀνήρ).

[2] The total count differs depending on the definition of 'epithet' applied. O'Sullivan lists 34 epithets of ships to be found throughout early Greek epic: *LfgrE*, Band 3, s.v. νηῦς, ναῦς, 381–400. By his criteria, Dee finds a total of 48 different epithets for ships in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (the second-most diverse system in the poems, after that for ἵππος), of which 31 are present in the *Iliad*: J.H. Dee, *Epitheta rerum et locorum apud Homerum* (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York, 2002), 373–90. Cf. D. Grey, 'Seewesen', in H.-G. Buchholz (edd.), *Archaeologia Homerica. Band II, Kapitel G* (Göttingen, 1990), 93, who finds 22 in the *Iliad*.

[3] Metrically see B. Alexanderson, 'Homeric formulae for ships', *Eranos* 68 (1970), 1–46 and, less detailed, M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford, 1971), 109–13. For discussions of ship construction, see J.S. Morrison and R.T. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships* (Cambridge, 1968); C. Kurt, *Seemännische Fachausdrücke bei Homer* (Göttingen, 1979); L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Baltimore, 1995); and S. Mark, *Homeric Seafaring* (College Station, TX, 2005). On poetics, see Vivante, who does consider epithets for ship: P. Vivante, *The Epithets in Homer* (New Haven and London, 1982), 65–71 and 193–6. He discusses 'hollowness' in passing at 13 and 118 but with emphasis on the representational nature of the epithet 'irrelevant to the narrative occasion' (i.e. divorced from contextual application). This view will be challenged.

[4] Constraints of space restrict my analysis to the *Iliad* and exclude a similarly detailed analysis of *koilos* in the *Odyssey* and the complex ways in which that poem is in dialogue with the *Iliad*. A cursory survey suggests that this would be a fruitful avenue for further analysis.

historical discussions of ship construction and ship composition of the Mycenaean period or later, dependant on how Homer is 'dated'. This approach uses the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, often without differentiation, as concrete evidence for contemporary or near-contemporary practice. Here *koilos* is understood in a very pragmatic sense as denoting a material historical reality.[5] This interpretation of *koilos* leads to one of two conclusions: either the 'hollowness' of a ship is indicative of its construction, or the hollowness refers to the carrying capacity of the ship itself.[6] In the absence of literary investigation these archaeological-historical conceptions of the epithet have been taken as definitive. In *LfgrE*, for instance, Führer defines *koilos* as 'hollow, furnished with holding capacity, spacious'.[7]

Understanding the epithet in terms of archaic nautical construction can be useful, but I suggest that there is (also) a deeper literary significance to *koilos* in the *Iliad*. I will argue that the use of 'hollow' as an epithet for ship functions as a lynchpin which draws together and combines two major thematic strands of the Homeric web. The first of these 'strands' is the importance of material gain (prizes, objects) as the means by which the Homeric hero wins and displays his honour. The second is the hero's *nostos*, his return home and to his community after distinguishing himself in war. *Koilos*, I submit, is used to connect and denote these themes by signifying a potentiality: the 'hollow' (that is, 'empty') ship has the potential to be filled, and filled with hero-won prizes for the journey home.

A useful analogy to this 'potentiality' is provided by the similar ship-epithet θοή ('swift'); although the Achaean ships remain beached throughout the *Iliad*, they nevertheless have the capacity to be 'swift'.[8] This is to say that these epithets may denote an as yet unrealized narrative possibility. In the hollow ships this possibility embodies the importance of prize-giving/winning in the *Iliad*'s heroic society and functions as an external prolepsis anticipating the hero's eventual return from Troy.

What I am arguing for here is a cohesive semantic force of *koilos* operative upon and within each contextual application. John Miles Foley has given us a useful framework for conceptualizing this process with the term 'traditional referentiality', in which textual elements command 'frames of reference' larger than an isolated usage.[9] This formulation is useful whether we choose to assign these referential frames to the 'tradition' or to see them as a system of intratextual reference. For both the same holds true: the 'referential' meaning of *koilos* is an evocation of all uses of the epithet,

[5] And see Grethlein on the danger of circular arguments when correlating the text of epic and material remains: J. Grethlein, 'From "imperishable glory" to history: the *Iliad* and the Trojan War', in D. Konstan and K.A. Raaflaub (edd.), *Epic and History* (Chichester and Malden, MA, 2010), 122–44.

[6] For the first conclusion, see Casson (n. 3), 44: 'The ships were "hollow", i.e., undecked.' For the second, see Mark (n. 3), 97; Morrison and Williams (n. 3), 45; and Kurt (n. 3), 36–75, whose discussion of *koilos* leads him to speculate whether Homer knew of 'cargo' ships.

[7] 'Einen Hohlraum enthaltend, mit Fassungsvermögen ausgestattet, geräumig', *LfgrE*, Band 2, 1470–1. R. Janko, *The* Iliad*: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge, 1992), 57, discussing κοίλης ἐπὶ νηυσί (on 13.107), presents both options: 'The epithet may stress the ships' capacity or their lack of a deck.' Cf. I.J.F. de Jong, *Homer* Iliad *Book XXII* (Cambridge, 2012), 182 (on *Il.* 22.465, to which we shall return).

[8] Cf. A. Amory Parry, *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of AMΥΜΩΝ and other Homeric Epithets* (*Mnemosyne Supplementa* 26) (Leiden, 1973), 165–6.

[9] J.M. Foley, *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, 1991), developed in id., *Homer's Traditional Art* (Philadelphia, 1999). Cf. A. Kelly, *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer* Iliad *VIII* (Oxford, 2007), especially 5–17, for a useful summary of traditional referentiality and a defence of its necessarily subjective application.

a meaning contextually effective upon each iteration. The ultimate criterion of this action is referential consistency, which can only be shown through close reading of all iterations of a given word or phrase (undertaken below). Here we see that the referential meaning of *koilos* can be applied in different contexts through separate, but related, formulaic patterns. To make this case I briefly contextualize the two Homeric themes underlying the 'referential' meaning of *koilos* (and discuss the importance of the ship as the element which binds the two together), then outline the approach to 'the formula' applied here. Finally, I turn to an analysis of *koilos* in the *Iliad* through consideration of its contextual usage in light of its referential meaning.[10]

As above, I will argue that the Homeric themes embodied by the hollow ships are prizes/honour and the hero's *nostos*. Actors within the *Iliad* draw an explicit connection between these two motifs when they express a desire to sack Troy and to return home afterwards. We find this from the very beginning of the poem, in Chryses' address to the Achaeans: Ἀτρεῖδαί τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί, | ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες | ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἱκέσθαι· 'Atreus' sons and you other well-greaved Achaeans | to you may the gods grant, they who have Olympian homes, | to sack Priam's city, and to get home safely' (1.17–19).[11] Here we locate the two key Homeric themes connected by the hollow ships: the accumulation and display of material gain for the attainment of honour/glory (both τιμή and κλέος) and the hero's return home.

The pertinent element of the wider 'heroic' theme of glory/honour is the means by which Homeric heroes can attain fame. One crucial element of this process is material gain. The most frequent instance of this gain is the accumulation of prizes, which are an integral constituent of the heroic system, functioning as the means by which the hero wins and displays his honour. There are two main kinds of prize in the *Iliad*: the γέρας, given to the hero by his peers as a mark of honour, and the prize (predominately armour or horses) that the hero wins for himself on the battlefield. For both the same holds true; the prize is the quantitative manifestation of the hero's qualitative worth, a means by which others give him his due honour and by which he displays his achievement to others.[12]

We can quickly see how the prize's function in the *Iliad* relates to the Homeric theme of *nostos*. It is well and good for the Achaeans to sit at Troy killing Trojans and gaining materially (as Achilles to Priam at 24.540–2), but through internal prolepses, the agency of fate in Homer and our extratextual knowledge we know that eventually the city will

[10] As Kelly (n. 9), 6 notes: 'The challenge, therefore, is to detect the traditional quality of the "element" through the semantic significance of its context, not as something which the author or singer must combat in order to make sense, but as an informative source of associative meaning.'

[11] All references are to the *Iliad* unless otherwise indicated. See also 2.113 and 2.288, 4.239, 5.716, 9.20, 12.15–16 (a prolepsis) and 18.326–7.

[12] As M.I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (Edinburgh, 1954), 199 writes: 'In the final analysis, how can prepotence be determined except by repeated demonstrations of success? And the one indisputable demonstration of success is a trophy … there could be no honour without public proclamation, and there could be no publicity without the evidence of a trophy.' Sarpedon's justly famous speech is the finest exposition of this system in the *Iliad* (12.310–18). S. Schein, *The Mortal Hero* (Berkeley, 1984), 67–72 provides a useful summary. See further J.M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad (Chicago, 1975), 30–9; H. Van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam, 1992), especially ch. 3; and G. Zanker, *The Heart of Achilles: Characterisation and Personal Ethics in the* Iliad (Ann Arbor, 1994), 11–13 for a much fuller discussion than is possible or necessary here.

fall and the Greeks, furnished with their spoils, must sail home. To answer the question 'how will the Greeks get home from Troy?' with 'in their ships' may seem obvious, yet—because of this very fact—it must form the foundation of the argument.[13] We might add another question: 'how will the Achaeans transport the prizes and spoils they have won?' The answer is the same. It is not just the Greeks themselves who will travel home in their ships, but, crucially, they will bring the objects they have gained with them. The centrality of the ship to this act is evident in the *Iliad*: Agamemnon offers to let Achilles load his ship with spoils (9.135–8 = 9.277–80) and twice Hector speaks of the women of Troy being led away in ships (8.164–6 and 16.831–2). At the height of his quarrel with Agamemnon, Achilles intends to fill his ships and sail home (9.356–65), and the prizes that he sets out for Patroclus' funeral games are brought out from his ships (23.257–61).[14]

To bolster this argument, where in the *Iliad* we have future potentiality, in the *Odyssey* we have narrative after the event, as heroes have already sailed home with their spoils.[15] In the *Odyssey* there is undoubtedly a qualitative difference between returning with nothing and returning with something, a difference between Odysseus arriving at Scheria on a raft with no possessions (consider his appearance to Nausicaa at 6.127–41) and his return to Ithaca in a real ship, laden with gifts (13.7–22, 40–1 and 63–75).[16] Odysseus himself gives us the clearest statement of this difference; he would be willing to remain with Alcinous for a year in order to return laden with gifts, as this will make him αἰδοιότερος καὶ φίλτερος ἀνδράσιν, 'more respected and dearer to men' (11.355–62). The return of the hero matters, but the manner of that return—with prizes as concrete proof of his success and his τιμή—is crucial.

It is here that we locate the ship as the point of intersection between prize and *nostos*. It is my contention that in the 'hollow' ships we have the keystone that simultaneously intertwines and draws attention to these themes by the deployment of the epithet at relevant moments in the narrative. Accordingly, we find *koilos* used at the point of contact between prize-taking and *nostos*: κτήματα μὲν ὅσ' Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσίν | ἠγάγετο Τροίηνδ', 'possessions, as many as Alexander in his hollow ships | lead Troyward' (7.389–90).[17] It is not just that possessions (κτήματα) can be placed in ships, nor that a return must be undertaken by sea, but that each requires the other; and at this juncture we find the hollow ships.

With the referential meaning of *koilos* established, it is necessary to discuss its use within the compositional constraints of the hexameter, and to explain the conception of the Homeric formula applied here. Rigid definitions of the 'formula' have created significant difficulties when applied to the range of formulaic elements to be found in

[13] The point is in fact made about Odysseus' lack of ships at *Od.* 4.558–60 and 5.15–16.

[14] Many more examples will occur. See below under 'type C' for explicit uses of *koilos* in this context.

[15] As Nestor at *Od.* 3.130–1 and 3.153–4. Menelaus explicitly states that he has brought his wealth home in his ships (*Od.* 4.78–82).

[16] Cf. the words of the herald at Aesch. *Ag.* 574–9, especially 574: νικᾷ τὸ κέρδος, πῆμα δ' οὐκ ἀντιρρέπει. Note also that we find an iteration of *koilos* at *Od.* 13.216: Odysseus checks that the Phaeacians have not *stolen* (rather than won) any of his prizes and taken them away in their 'hollow' ship.

[17] Cf. an identical usage at 22.114–16, both examples together form type 'C' of the formulaic pattern.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000557 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Homer.[18] The approach adopted here is above all pragmatic: a recurrent usage in recurrent context is 'formulaic', in other words, an adjective (*koilos*) used regularly with a substantive (ship) under the same circumstances. The connection between the two elements was usefully understood by Hainsworth as a 'bond of mutual expectancy'.[19] Rather than see this pairing as rigidly determined by metrics, structure or analogy, I conceptualize the connection between *koilos* and ship as a both flexible and formulaic pattern that has thematic implications which are contextually triggered. This can be expressed: [κοίλη <preposition> νηῦς].[20] As we shall see, this pattern can be inflected depending on the requirements of context. To present this clearly, I have separated each formulaic pattern by form/contextual application, so (for example) κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας has been separated from κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσίν. This is not to suggest that these should be seen as different formulae (as Parry would probably have said), but that each represents *one possible iteration* of the formulaic pattern.

What is gained by thinking in terms of formulaic patterns is an awareness that different contextual applications of a formula can have separate, but related, connotations. It will be found that, whilst the contextual application of each formulaic pattern is different, there is both remarkable usage-cohesion within each pattern and a noticeable referential connection between prizes and *nostos* across the range of formulaic iterations. There are three layers to this process: each iteration of the formulaic pattern can be contextually relevant, each deployment of a given formulaic pattern creates the same contextual effect, and all possible iterations contain—and are informed by—the same cohesive referential force. The advantages that this has for our analysis, and the implications for our understanding of the formula, will become clearer as the study progresses.

I turn now to an analysis of *koilos* in the *Iliad*. My approach is to analyse each formulaic pattern individually, to suggest both the potential contextual force of this reading of *koilos* and to build (and reinforce) the referential meaning of the formulaic pattern by weight of evidence. I begin with the pattern type κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας (Ἀχαιῶν)—designated pattern type A—as it comprises both the most frequent and the most straightforward instance of the *koilos* formulaic pattern. Notably, it is also confined to the *Iliad*, with only two uses of this formulaic pattern outside of the *Iliad* in Greek epic.[21] Within this category, it will be necessary to distinguish two further

[18] See Russo's survey: J. Russo, 'The formula', in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, 1997), 238–60. Cf. M. Finkelberg, 'Oral theory and the limits of formulaic diction', *Oral Tradition* 19 (2004), 236–52.

[19] The term was originally used in J.B. Hainsworth, 'Structure and content in epic formulae: the question of the unique expression', *CQ* 14 (1964), 155–64, then expanded in id., *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968). Cf. A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Amsterdam, 1965). Subsequent scholarship has suggested a modification of this relationship by emphasizing that the formulaic constituents are not equal but rather form a 'nucleus' and a 'periphery'. See E. Visser, 'Formulae or single words? Towards a new theory on Homeric verse-making', *WJA* 14 (1988), 21–37 and E.J. Bakker and F. Fabbricotti, 'Peripheral and nuclear semantics in Homeric diction: the case of dative expressions for "spear"', *Mnemosyne* 44 (1991), 63–84.

[20] This is somewhat analogous to Nagler's concept of a pre-verbal Gestalt, but does not require the Chomskyan deep structure that underpins his model. See M.N. Nagler, 'Towards a generative view of the Homeric formula', *TAPhA* 98 (1967), 269–311 and id., *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley, 1974).

[21] At *Od.* 24.50 and *Ilias Parua* (F20 Davies). Though we are focussed on the *Iliad*, both examples have a bearing on the argument, and have been considered where appropriate.

subcategories in which we find the same formulaic pattern deployed for a different contextual purpose, yet still informed by the web of associations engendered by *koilos* (filed under 'A_2' and, imaginatively, 'other').

PATTERN TYPE A: 5.26, 7.78, 10.525, 16.664, 21.32, 22.465, 23.883, 23.892

This iteration (κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας [Ἀχαιῶν]) of the formulaic pattern is used without exception to signify that a prize, which has been won, is being taken to the Achaean ships. On a simple level the formula tells us, literally, that the prize was conveyed to the Greek ships. However, through the use of *koilos* the 'empty' ship is connected with the material gain that will fill it, allowing the generation of the referential nexus of implications (glory, *nostos*) discussed above. To pick a paradigmatic example, during his *aristeia* Diomedes captures the horses of Phegeus and Idaeus: ἵππους δ' ἐξελάσας μεγαθύμου Τυδέος υἱός | δῶκεν ἑταίροισιν κατάγειν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, 'and driving out their horses, greathearted Tydeus' son | gave them to his companions to lead down to the hollow ships' (5.25–6). At this point in the poem Diomedes functions as a paradigm of 'heroic' conduct, and as a narrative substitute for the absent Achilles. The use of the 'hollow' ships at this moment brings Diomedes' current role into focus by suggesting the value-system of heroic attainment that underpins his actions.

Whilst battle is the main arena of conspicuous individual achievement in the *Iliad*, Patroclus' funeral games offer a similar opportunity to display pre-eminence to one's peers.[22] As a result, a prize won during the funeral games is denoted by the same formulaic pattern of *koilos* as a prize won during battle: ἂν δ' ἄρα Μηριόνης πελέκεας δέκα πάντας ἄειρεν, | Τεῦκρος δ' ἡμιπέλεκκα φέρεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, 'and then Meriones took up all ten axes, | but Teucer carried the half-axes to the hollow ships' (23.882–3).[23]

The majority of these instances are self-explanatory and conform to the schema outlined above.[24] There is, however, one iteration of this formulaic pattern where the 'prize' is not immediately apparent. At the height of Achilles' savagery, he attaches Hector's body to his chariot and drives the horses to his ships: ταχέες δέ μιν ἵπποι | εἷλκον ἀκηδέστως κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, 'and him the swift horses | dragged heedlessly to the hollow ships of the Achaeans' (22.464–5). This is an example of the standard formulaic pattern exceptionally deployed in order to signify Achilles' singular distance from the other heroes of the poem; the material gain for him at this moment is the death of Hector and retention/display of Hector's body as a prize. In Book 9 Achilles has questioned the heroic system and come to the realization that prizes are not worth a man's life (9.405–9). His return to battle is not motivated by the accumulation of spoils (though he does receive the promised gifts from Agamemnon at 19.140–5 and 19.242–81) but by a desire to kill Hector (18.90–3 and 18.114–16).

[22] See—among others—Redfield (n. 12), 204–10 for the view that the funeral games are analogous to battle as an opportunity for the hero to gain fame.

[23] Cf. Agamemnon's prize for spear-throwing at 23.892–3.

[24] We might also note a parallel usage in a fragment from the *Ilias Parua*: αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλῆος μεγαθύμου φαίδιμος υἱὸς | Ἕκτορέην ἄλοχον κάταγε<ν> κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, 'now greathearted Achilles' shining son | led Hector's wife down to the hollow ships' (F20 Davies), which fits well with the contextual usage of pattern A, and relies on the same nexus of associations engendered by *koilos*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000557 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Where other heroes in the *Iliad* remain within the heroic system, content to win arms and horses, Achilles stands, to a degree, outside of it; the material gain he wins/displays to confirm his heroic pre-eminence is nothing less than the death of the Trojans' greatest warrior.

In a challenge to Milman Parry's theory of extension and economy, Bengt Alexanderson analysed 'formulae' for ships and the formulaic pattern κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας. He concluded that this 'formula' was not metrically unique, but could be expressed by the metrical scheme ⏑⏑ |– ⏑⏑|– ⏓. Under these circumstances κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας could be replaced by ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν at four points in the *Iliad*: 5.26, 16.664, 21.32 and 23.892.[25] Alexanderson's conclusion has relevance for our understanding of the contextual selection of *koilos* in these passages. However, we must raise two objections to modify his argument. First, we should note that substitution at 16.664 (χάλκεα μαρμαίροντα, τὰ μὲν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας) is not possible, as ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν cannot be preceded by a short vowel followed by a consonant. The syllable in μέν is short by nature and requires a subsequent consonant to make position. 16.664 is not a metrical duplication but a prosodically necessary metrical alternative (to use Friedrich's terms).[26] This reduces the iterations where substitution is possible to 3.

The second objection is that ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν is not the complete formulaic structure, which is preferentially preceded by θοάς (10 iterations) or ἰόντ' (4 iterations).[27] Nevertheless, ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν is used as an independent formulaic pattern on 6 occasions in the *Iliad*.[28] Alexanderson does not make use of these instances, but two—17.691 and 22.417—support his argument. These uses are both at line-end in the same position as the iterations of κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, and therefore are candidates for metrical substitution. To confirm this, we should note that ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν at 17.691 is reciprocally interchangeable; κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας would be metrically possible (though contextually inappropriate) here.

With these modifications, we can see that Alexanderson's analysis at least points towards the interchangeability of some instances of pattern A. If we can accept that what we find here is a breach of economy, then we enter the realm of poetic selection.[29] At these points in the narrative ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν could have been used instead of κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας (or vice versa), but was not. As I suggest throughout, the reason for this is that κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας carries a contextual force appropriate to narrative moments concerning material gain/glory and *nostos*. Where the potential for material gain and/or *nostos* is operative, κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας is suitably deployed. Where there is no such potential (as at 17.691), the poet can instead use ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.[30] Alexanderson comes close to divining the reason for this. He notes that all these instances have to do with

[25] Alexanderson (n. 3), 29.

[26] R. Friedrich, *Formular Economy in Homer: The Poetics of the Breaches* (*Hermes Einzelschriften* 100) (Stuttgart, 2007), 18–19.

[27] θοάς: 1.12; 1.371; 2.8; 2.17; 2.168; 6.52; 10.450; 10.514; 11.3; 24.564. ἰόντ': 15.116; 24.118; 24.146; 24.195. Alexanderson does not consider this, since his investigation is a strict analysis of metrical *equivalence*, and as such he pays no attention to developments in 'formulaic extension'. Again, it may be more productive to think about a possible variety of 'dictional patterns'.

[28] 14.354, 15.305, 17.691, 22.417, 24.203 and 24.519.

[29] On breaches of economy, see Friedrich (n. 26), especially 78–83 on the avoidance of *contextual unsuitability*. Cf. Parry (n. 3), 155.

[30] Cf. M. Finkelberg, 'Oral formulaic theory and the individual poet', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis (edd.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (*Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volume* 12) (Berlin, 2012), 73–81.

material gain (what he calls 'booty'), but as his investigation was purely metrical he could not pursue the implications of his discovery.[31] It is worth noting that, as all three possible alternative iterations of pattern A occur in the context of material gain/*nostos*, the metrically alternative instance of ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν—used instead of κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας at 17.691—is not in this context. The point here is that, where possible, iterations of the 'hollow ships' were preferred to an alternative when the referential meaning of *koilos* was contextually appropriate.

PATTERN TYPE A_2: 7.372, 7.381, 24.336

As subcategories of Type A we must consider two scenes in which we find the pattern type κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, but where material gain has not yet been won but is offered; here the material gain is potential rather than concrete, pre- rather than post-factual. The first iteration, Idaeus' mission to the Greek ships, is informed by Paris' offer to give back all of the possessions he took from Argos, and to add more of his own besides (7.362–4). As a result, his offer carries the potential for material gain and—should restitution succeed—an end to the war and a return home. *Koilos* is used to draw attention to the possibilities of this offer: ἠῶθεν δ' Ἰδαῖος ἴτω κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας | εἰπέμεν Ἀτρείδῃς, Ἀγαμέμνονι καὶ Μενελάῳ | μῦθον Ἀλεξάνδροιο, τοῦ εἵνεκα νεῖκος ὄρωρεν· 'at dawn let Idaeus go to the hollow ships | to speak to Atreus' sons, to Agamemnon and Menelaus | the word of Alexander, on account of whom strife arose' (7.372–4). The same is true of the second iteration (24.336); here Zeus sends Hermes to guide Priam on his way to Achilles' 'hollow' ships so that Priam can make an offer of material restitution for the return of Hector's body.

The parallel usages in Books 7 and 24, and the fact that Priam in effect 'makes' both offers, encourage us to meditate on the way in which the referential meaning of the 'hollow' ships operates on contextual application. The nexus of associations engendered through the use of *koilos* (glory through material gain, *nostos*) have *a deferred semantic effect*; they point us towards the change in relationship between the Trojans and the Achaeans from Book 7 to Book 24. The first offer is made with the Trojans and the Achaeans in relative equilibrium, and (though we know that the narrative/fate cannot be altered in this way) the epithet raises the possibility that the war may be ended by Priam's offer of material restitution. In this parallel narrative universe, the potentials engendered by *koilos* will be realized; the Achaeans will fill their 'hollow' ships with the prizes offered and sail home.[32] But by the time we reach Book 24 and Priam's second offer, there has been a fundamental alteration in the relationship between Trojans and Achaeans; the Trojans have gone from equals to proleptically defeated, and the entreaty itself has changed from an offer of restitution in Book 7 that aimed

[31] Alexanderson (n. 3), 29. He also does not fully join the dots between *koilos* and material gain, making the connection for only 'six out of the eleven occurrences'.

[32] On the allusion to alternative potential narrative paths, see I.J.F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad (London, 2004[2]), 68–90; J.V. Morrison, *Homeric Misdirection* (Ann Arbor, 1992); id., 'Alternatives to the epic tradition: Homer's challenges in the *Iliad*', *TAPhA* 122 (1992), 61–71; B. Louden, 'Pivotal counterfactuals in Homeric epic', *ClAnt* 12 (1993), 181–98; and M. Lang, 'Unreal conditions in Homeric narrative', *GRBS* 30 (1989), 5–26. See also K. Reinhardt, *Die* Ilias *und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen, 1961), 107–20 on the thematic potential for an early 'Heimkehr unverrichteter'.

to end the war (with Troy intact and her men alive) to an attempt to ransom the body of one man, where the only promise of an end to the war is the fall of Troy.[33]

PATTERN TYPE A 'OTHER': 7.432, 8.98

Finally, we have the two instances of pattern type 'A', where we see a slightly different contextual usage of *koilos*, designated 'other'. We should see these two instances of *koilos* as transitional, moving from pattern A to pattern 'B' (discussed below); the 'hollow' ships are used at a moment in the narrative where the two themes that they embody begin to come under threat; either *nostos* is lost in death or the system of prize-winning is abandoned in retreat.

The first instance comes following the burial of the Achaean dead: ὣς δ' αὖτως ἑτέρωθεν ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί | νεκροὺς πυρκαϊῆς ἐπινήνεον ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ, | ἐν δὲ πυρὶ πρήσαντες ἔβαν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας, 'and likewise on the other side the well-greaved Achaeans | were heaping corpses on the pyre, sorrowing at heart | and when they had burned them in the fire they went to the hollow ships' (7.430–2). Here we have pattern type 'A' of *koilos*, but deployed in a way that takes advantage of the referential meaning of the hollow ships to show the transition between Achaean and Trojan ascendancy. I suggest that we see this iteration in the context of Nestor's words at 7.334–5. The Achaean slain must be burnt ὥς κ' ὀστέα παισὶν ἕκαστος | οἴκαδ' ἄγῃ, ὅτ' ἂν αὖτε νεώμεθα πατρίδα γαῖαν, 'so that each man | may carry the bones home to the dead's children, whenever we return to our fatherland'.[34] The usual connotations of *koilos* are used to create a *frisson* of difference: something will be transported in the hollow ships, but bones not prizes, a *nostos* will be accomplished, but not by a living man. If we choose to athetize 7.334–5, we can nevertheless see that *koilos* is employed on the occasion of the cremation of the Achaean dead to flag up the range of associative meanings (glory/*nostos*) that have now been lost.

There is a similar contextual application of *koilos* in our other iteration of this formulaic pattern. Battle recommences at the beginning of Book 8, and Zeus gives victory to the Trojans (8.68–77). He thunders and sends lightning over the Achaeans, who turn to flight: θάμβησαν, καὶ πάντας ὑπὸ χλωρὸν δέος εἷλεν, 'they were stunned, and pale fear seized them all' (8.77). As the Achaean leaders flee, Diomedes sees Nestor in difficulty and calls out to Odysseus, who does not hear (or does not listen): ὣς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, | ἀλλὰ παρήϊξεν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, 'so he spoke, but he did not hear, much-enduring divine Odysseus | but swept past to the hollow ships of the Achaeans' (8.97–8). Odysseus' flight to the hollow ships uses the referential associations of *koilos* to highlight his abandonment of the normative heroic

[33] We might also note how these parallel offers also serve to confirm Achilles' pre-eminence; the offer in Book 7 is made to the two Atreidae, but by Book 24 Priam supplicates Achilles directly, who feels confident enough in his own position to grant the appeal and to promise a 'break' from the war for Hector's funeral (24.669–70).

[34] We should bear in mind, however, that this passage was athetized in antiquity. Commentators noted that the motivation given by Nestor for burning the bodies of the dead is inconsistent with other passages in the poem, where it is suggested that the dead will be buried in tombs at Troy (Σ A on 7.334). M.L. West, *Homerus* Ilias (Stuttgart, 1998), 219 brackets the passage in his edition on the grounds that '*utique mos Atheniensium insinuatur*', citing F. Jacoby, '*Patrios nomos:* state burial in Athens and the public cemetery in the Kerameikos', *JHS* 64 (1944), 37–66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000557 Published online by Cambridge University Press

code. Deployed in this way, both of these instances of the formulaic pattern are the ideal passage between types 'A' and 'B'. They emphasize the abandonment or loss of the potentials of *koilos* as ascendancy swings from Achaean to Trojan.[35]

PATTERN TYPE B: 5.791, 12.90, 13.107, 15.743

To turn to our second pattern type, κοίλῃς ἐπὶ νηυσί is always used in the context of the Trojans fighting at the Greek ships (three of the four instances—5.791, 12.90 and 13.107—are completed by a form of μάχομαι). With this pattern the web of referential meaning engendered by *koilos* (material gain/glory, *nostos*) is used contextually to stress that these fundamental constituents of the Achaean heroic world are under threat. Whilst the Trojans have the upper hand the ships must remain empty, heroes will not win prizes, Troy will not be sacked and the Achaeans will not sail home.[36] The force of this narrative potentiality is cumulative in magnitude; each iteration comes as the threat to the Achaean 'hollow' ships grows graver. Initially, Hera exhorts the Achaeans by pointing out that, as a result of Achilles' withdrawal from battle, the Trojans will now fight at the hollow ships (as opposed to around Troy): νῦν δὲ ἑκὰς πόλιος κοίλῃς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ μάχονται, 'now they fight far from the city, upon the hollow ships' (5.791).

As the narrative progresses, we find the pattern used as the Trojans threaten the Achaean camp and, by extension, the hollow ships. Pattern B is deployed as both Hector and the Trojans assault the wall around the encampment (12.89–90), and again as Poseidon (echoing Hera's words above) exhorts the Achaeans to resist Hector (13.107) in order to save the ships (σαωσέμεναι νέας ἀμάς, 13.96).[37] It is surely significant that the final instance of pattern B is found at the height of danger to the Greek ships (15.743–5), at the very moment that Ajax—the final bulwark of the Achaeans—fights upon (ἐπί?) the decks of a hollow ship. Note also that, in order to emphasize the intensification of the danger to the themes engendered by *koilos*, this final iteration of pattern B is not completed by a form of μάχομαι but by φέροιτο | σὺν πυρὶ κηλείῳ; the danger has shifted from fighting to burning, and all of the potentialities embodied by the hollow ships may go up in smoke.

I suggest that we see these two formulaic patterns as *mutually complementary*; pattern Type A is used when the Achaeans are 'winning' and enables the evocation of the intertwined themes of prize and *nostos* as Achaean heroes fulfil their role in the Homeric system of prize-winning and advance towards their *nostos*. Type B complements this as it is used when the Trojans are on the front foot, Achaean

[35] To these two uses we might add the final iteration of pattern 'A' outside of the *Iliad*, used in relation to Achilles' death and the common soldiers' resulting desire to sail home empty-handed at *Od.* 24.50. This passage contains numerous verbal references to the *Iliad* (not only the deployment of the formulaic pattern but, for instance, μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἱπποσυνάων at line 40). Cf. K. Usener, *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der* Odyssee *zur* Ilias (Tübingen, 1990), 104–8, who argues that this passage in the *Odyssey* is directly influenced ('beeinflußt') by the *Iliadic* use. Alternatively, see B.G.F. Currie, 'Homer and the early epic tradition', in M.J. Clarke, B.G.F. Currie and R.O.A.M. Lyne (edd.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition* (Oxford, 2006), 1–45, at 40 for the suggestion that this passage is a quotation (we might prefer referential usage) of a lost *Memnonis* that predated both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

[36] Morrison (n. 32 [1992]), 75–6 provides a good discussion of the danger that firing the ships poses to Achaean *nostos*.

[37] cf. Σ T on 13.107: ἐπιφέρει <δὲ> τὰς ναῦς, ἐν αἷς ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἡ σωτηρία, 'he mentions the ships, in which lies their [the Greeks'] salvation' (Erbse, III 421).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000557 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prize-winning stops and the hero's *nostos* is under threat; should the ships be destroyed the motifs they embody cannot be realized. In this way pattern A shows that everything is proceeding as planned; the normative heroic world continues and the narrative is following the proper course towards Achaean victory, whilst pattern B raises the possibility that the plot might short-circuit, the ships remain 'hollow' and the Achaeans lose their *nostos*. This becomes clearer if we consider the distribution of patterns A and B throughout the *Iliad*, where we find a strikingly distinct system of usage. Instances of type A are exclusively used when the Achaeans are 'winning' (Books 5–10 / 16–24), whilst pattern B fills the gap between, and is used almost exclusively when the Trojans are on top (3 uses concentrated from Books 12–15).[38]

PATTERN TYPE C: 7.389, 22.115

The two instances of the formulaic pattern κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσίν constitute the explicit connection of the hollow ship (and associated potential *nostos*) with the system of material gain that forms a key component of heroic achievement and fame. Notably both occur in the context of material restitution from Trojan to Achaean, specifically of the 'possessions/acquisitions' (κτήματα) that Paris carried back to Troy in his ship. The use of *koilos* in the context of Paris' visit to Sparta cements the referential function of the hollow ships as the cornerstone that connects the two themes of glory and *nostos*, as what is potential for the Achaeans is concrete for Paris. In Sparta he confirmed the potentialities embodied by his 'hollow' ships; he emphasized his worth through material gain and completed his *nostos* successfully, bringing the 'prizes' he gained (including Helen) with him.

PATTERN TYPE D: 1.26, 1.89

Our final formulaic pattern, κοίλῃσιν/κοίλῃς παρὰ νηυσί, is concentrated within just 60 or so lines of the *Iliad*.[39] These seem to be bound up with the genesis of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, and again (as pattern types 'A other' and 'B' above) rely on the referential meaning of *koilos* to show exactly what is at stake (Achaean glory and *nostos*). At 1.26, after Chryses has supplicated Agamemnon for the return of his daughter, Agamemnon responds: μή σε, γέρον, κοίλῃσιν ἐγὼ παρὰ νηυσὶ κιχείω | ἢ νῦν δηθύνοντ', ἢ ὕστερον αὖτις ἰόντα, 'let me not, old man, come upon you by the hollow ships | either lingering now, or later returning again' (1.26–7). Here the 'hollow' ships are indicative of Chryseis' presence at the ships; her current status as Agamemnon's γέρας, the prize allocated to him as a material symbol of his status, and a prize that he intends to take home (1.29–31 and 1.112–15).[40] His refusal to return his 'prize' is the beginning of the quarrel, the next step of which is Achilles' promise to protect Calchas from any anger/retribution his speech may provoke. This promise will set him in direct opposition to Agamemnon. Again, we find *koilos* deployed as part

[38] There is, of course, Hera's use at 5.791, but this does not upset the overall scheme, as it proleptically marks and establishes the coming narrative theme.

[39] On 'phrase clustering', see [J.]B. Hainsworth, 'Phrase clusters in Homer', in A. Morpurgo Davies and W. Meid (edd.), *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics* (Innsbruck, 1976), 83–6.

[40] I am indebted to *CQ*'s anonymous referee for this point.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838819000557 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of this speech (1.89) as a form of shorthand that draws attention to the implications and consequences that will follow as a result of Achilles' withdrawal from the war.

What I hope to have shown by this analysis is the literary function of *koilos* as the element that binds together Homeric themes of material gain and *nostos*, a referential meaning that informs the narrative at relevant points. We have seen both the notably consistent referential meaning of *koilos* throughout the poem and the way in which—through differentiation into various 'formulaic patterns'—the utterances denoting this can have separate, but related, connotations. I have tried to suggest some of the ways by which this reading of *koilos* enriches and deepens the narrative through contextually relevant application.

To emphasize the importance of context for referential meaning, we should consider the instructive comparison afforded by γλαφυρός. This ship epithet is—like *koilos*—frequently translated with 'hollow', and dictionary definitions often equate one with the other (under γλαφυρός in *LfgrE* we find '= κοῖλος').[41] However, when we look at the contextual application of these epithets in the *Iliad*, we find that this abstract equivalence does not translate into practical equivalence at the level of language usage.[42] The difference between abstract semantic congruence and actual linguistic use is in a way the subject of this paper: as we have seen, what is important for our understanding of *koilos* is context. When we consider γλαφυρός, we find that it does not have the same contextual function as *koilos*. This is to say that *koilos* and γλαφυρός share a similar denotation, but differ in connotation.[43]

It is not necessary to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the usage of γλαφυρός in the *Iliad* to make this point, but simply to note that the majority of uses of γλαφυρός as an epithet for ships appear in one of two contexts: either (1) in the catalogue of ships, or (2) when a warrior withdraws from battle (often through injury).[44] The relevance of this is that what looks at first like rough semantic equivalence in fact shows a degree of differentiation when contextual relevance is taken into account. In other words, where the fundamental themes of material gain and *nostos* were operative in the text *koilos* was deployed by the poet. Where *koilos* was not contextually relevant (for instance when a warrior withdraws from battle), there is an alternative.

To embark on one final piece of interpretation, we might follow this reading of *koilos* through to its logical conclusion. Proceeding from the basis that *koilos* denotes an unrealized potentiality, we can ask when the themes of material gain and *nostos* will be realized: when will the hero receive his spoils, when will he have no prizes left to win and when must he sail home? In other words, when will the hollow ships be full? At the furthest interpretation of the 'hollow' ships we can discern an eternal and external prolepsis, sitting on the beach, waiting for the fall of Troy.

Royal Holloway, University of London MATTHEW WARD
matthew.ward.2014@rhul.ac.uk

[41] *LfgrE*, Band 2, 162–3.

[42] Michael Clarke's recent book-chapter rightly draws attention to the dangers of accepting handy *linguistic equivalents* from our lexica without considering how the meaning of a word is the result of its usage in context: M. Clarke, 'Semantics and vocabulary', in E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester and Malden, MA, 2010), 120–33.

[43] In Gottlob Frege's example: the 'morning star' and the 'evening star' are both terms that denote the same thing (i.e. Venus), but which differ in their connotational associations. G. Frege, 'Über Sinn und Bedeutung', *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik* 100 (1892), 25–50.

[44] (1): 2.516; 2.602; 2.680; 2.733. (2): 8.334; 10.510; 10.531; 11.274; 11.281; 11.400; 11.520; 12.38; 13.423; 16.296; 17.453; 17.625.