

# Tetsuro Watsuji as one of the Pioneering Classicists in Japan and the *Iliad*<sup>1</sup>

Makoto Anzai

## 1. Watsuji's view about Homer's world

Tetsuro Watsuji (1889-1960), one of the most influential writers in humanities in modern Japan, taught as a professor of philosophy (European ancient and medieval philosophy)<sup>2</sup>, first in Kyoto Imperial University and after several years moved to Tokyo Imperial University (the department of European Philosophy and Ethics). He had received, as a student of philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University, a serious and lifelong influence from Dr. Raphael von Köber (1848-1923), a German scholar and a philosopher invited by the Meiji Government from Europe to help them establish an academic system of modern Japan. The German philosopher in his later years as a professor in Tokyo Imperial University strongly recommended classical philology to students and offered earnestly extra reading courses in Greek and Latin every year. Among Tetsuro Watsuji's colleagues who had been a student of Köber we find also Soseki Natsume<sup>3</sup>, one of the greatest novelists (he started as a scholar of English Literature) in modern Japan. Both Tetsuro Watsuji and Soseki Natsume wrote *memoire* on their influential teacher. These are also important documents on how we, Japanese, started to know about classical philology, the core of European *humanitas*.

This paper has some connections with Tetsuro Watsuji's juvenile work on Homeric Criticism (on so-called higher criticism or Analysis in Homeric problem), which was written in 1920s in the form of lecture notes to be delivered in universities in Tokyo, and first published after the Second World War (1946). I will try here to develop his most important insights into the world of the *Iliad*, which were hinted at in the book.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a revised version of the paper I read at Fondation Hardt (Geneva), August 27th, 2007, at an international meeting on the future of Liberal Arts, supported by JSPS (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science). The latter half of the paper was since then translated (with revisions) into Japanese and was published in the form of two different papers, one in a Japanese philological journal and the other in a book (see n. 13 and 19).

<sup>2</sup> Though his influential writings are of far wider varieties, including books on, e.g., Asian traditional thoughts, Japanese culture, ancient Greek ethics.

<sup>3</sup> Beside them, we also find Hidenaka Tanaka and Tsutomu Kubo, first Japanese classical philologists and linguists.

What he says in the introduction of the eventually published book, *Homeric Criticism*<sup>4</sup>, which I will cite later, is similar to the following words by Thucydides:

τεκμηριοῖ δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος· πολλῶ γὰρ ὕστερον ἔτι καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν γενόμενος οὐδαμοῦ τοὺς ξύμπαντας ὠνόμασεν, οὐδ' ἄλλους ἢ τοὺς μετ' Ἀχιλλέως ἐκ τῆς Φθιώτιδος, οἵπερ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἕλληνες ἦσαν, Δαναοὺς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσι καὶ Ἀργεῖους καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνακαλεῖ. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἶρηκε διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἑλληνάς πω, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀντίπαλον ἐς ἐν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι.  
 [...he (Homer) has not used the term Barbarians either, because, it seems to me, the idea of Hellene had not yet been separated off so as to acquire one common name as its counterpart....] (Thucydides *Historia*, 1.3.3)

Here the historian says that, since Homer and his audience had not yet gained the idea of Hellenes as a social unity<sup>5</sup> of the Greeks, they did not know the word "Barbarians (who are not Greek)", either. Since Thucydides was not a scholar in Homeric epic, his statements about Homer and the audience sound a little vague. I would like here to translate his "Homer" as a man roughly at the embryonic stage in the texture of Homeric epic. There was, *pace* Thucydides, no such concept as *barbarians* in the mind of Homer, nor in his audience's. Among the personages in the *Iliad* the poet could not have made any ethno-national distinction<sup>6</sup>. At the same time he seems to be warning us that we should not understand the *Iliad* upon the basis of antagonism between Hellenes (the Greeks) and *Barbarians* (the Trojans and their auxiliary troops).

<sup>4</sup> Watsuji, T., *Homeric Criticism*, Tokyo 1946.

<sup>5</sup> Since Thucydides is not here conscious of "Homeric problem", his discussion is based on, apparently, a vague notion of a poet and the audience of early epic tradition. There is a problem here: that Hesiod, whom we as well as ancient Greek people believe to be Homer's contemporary, expresses his clear idea of Hellenic unity in his poems: ἄλλ' ἐπὶ κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε / στρωφᾶται, βράδιον δὲ Πανελλήνεσσι φαεῖνει. (*Op.* 527f.); εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὐβοίαν ἐξ Αὐλίδος, ἢ ποτ' Ἀχαιοὶ / μείναντες χειμῶνα πολὺν σὺν λαὸν ἄγειραν / Ἑλλάδος ἐξ ἰερῆς Τροίην ἐς καλλιγύναικα. (*Op.* 651ff.); καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ μόνους τοὺς ἐν Θερταλία καλεῖσθαι φησιν Ἕλληνας, "Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἕλληνες" (*Il.* 2.684), Ἡσίοδον μέντοι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ἦδη εἰδέναι καὶ Ἕλληνας λεγομένους τοὺς σύμπαντας καὶ Πανέλληνας, τὸν μὲν περὶ τῶν Προϊτιδῶν λέγοντα ὡς Πανέλληνες ἐμνήστευον αὐτάς, τὸν δὲ κτλ. (fr. 130 Merkelbach-West (*Inachi progenies*)). The huge difference between the two contemporary poets (and their audiences) in their view on the social unity has, to my view, much to do with what is meant by "epic tradition". I read a short paper on this meaning of "epic tradition," which made the difference, at the annual meeting of IAS (International Institute of Advanced Studies, Nara). The paper will be published in the Acta of the Institute in a few years.

<sup>6</sup> See also, E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*, Oxford 1989, 9.

Watsuji, despite the similarity of his basic ideas of people in Homeric epic with Thucydides, does not mention the historian's name in the book he published after the war. Therefore, he surely must have reached his idea of "the war in the *Iliad* as a war between two groups in the same *race*," which we will find in the following citation, through his own readings of the Homeric epic, not through the suggestion by the historian.

I am not sure if the following crucial insight<sup>7</sup> was already in his mind, when he was giving lectures on Homeric Criticisms for the students in a few universities in Tokyo. One thing is certain, that for him the Homeric Analysis, the chief part of his juvenile lectures<sup>8</sup>, meant mainly Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Die Ilias und Homer*<sup>9</sup>, as far as it concerned the part of his lectures where he discussed the *Iliad*.

The notes for the lectures in his thirties, though, remained unpublished for more than twenty years. We will be able to understand one of the reasons for the work to have long remained unpublished from two following citations.

In the Introduction of the eventually published book he remarks, after giving readers the keys to understand the background world of the *Iliad*, as follows (translation mine):

If it were correct, we would better consider the Trojan War not as a war between two different ethno-nations but as a war between two groups in the same ethnos. Later, people came to look at the war as one between the East and the West, between Semitic and Arian. However, as far as we can understand from what the poet Homer sings in his Epic, from the fact that enemies and friends speak the same language, from the fact that they engage in a battle using the same ways of fighting (arms, tactics etc.), that they believe in the same gods.(...) I think we must conclude that they, both the Achaeans and the Trojans, belong to the one and the same society<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> We can get information about his activities before getting a chair in Kyoto from an appendix attached to 6<sup>th</sup> volume of his *Works* (in which his *Homeric Criticism* is included): Tetsuro Watsuji, *Works*, 27 volumes, Tokyo 1957, 74.

<sup>8</sup> The purpose of his giving these lectures seems to be twofold: first, to realize Köber's wish to introduce (a part of) classical philology into Japan as an important form of *Wissenschaft*, second, privately for Watsuji, to acquire the method of Homeric Analysis and apply it to his coming studies on the birth and composition of Asian Classics (Buddhist and Confucian ancient texts), which he conducted in the following years.

<sup>9</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1925.

<sup>10</sup> Watsuji (op. cit. (in n.7)), 66.

His remarks are about the behavior of Olympian gods in the Diomedean books of the *Iliad* (Books 3, 4, and 5). His words might, I am afraid, sound a little too naive to the ears of the scholars experienced in the long tradition of Homeric studies even after the Renaissance. The words by Watsuji in his introduction to *Homeric Criticism* cited here are, however, were said with a piece of solid truth, at least to my view. About the truth included in the citation I will discuss later. Before beginning the task, however, I must add an unfortunate remark on the citation.

Even if the words in the introduction includes some truth about the Homeric poetry, the words are surely at the same time discordant with the voices expressed in the main body of his *Homeric Criticism*, discordant with theories he has imported from the contemporary Homeric criticisms in Europe. His words in the introduction, which were cited above, express the idea directly opposite to, e.g., the following words of Wilamowitz, which Watsuji cites almost word for word in his book's main body:

So ist in diesem Gedichte (*Il.* 3, 4, and 5) tatsächlich ein Gegensatz der Götter auf beiden Parteien, der aus dem nationalen Empfinden der Ionier gegenüber den Asiaten stammt, und der Dichter hat danach die Farben gewählt, nicht plump wie der Dichter der Theomachie, aber er hat doch die Götter energisch Partei nehmen lassen, weil er selbst (der Dichter Homer!, a comment by Anzai) energisch Partei nahm,<sup>11</sup> ...

Although Wilamowitz's words cited here are on a particular poet among the poets of the *Iliad*, still we can see clearly that the background world against which Wilamowitz understood the *Iliad* is built on "Parteinahme" of the Olympian gods, in other words, on peoples' plane, on ethnic distinction between the East and the West. We can't know correctly what was the Greek people's national emotion in its historical reality to Asiatic people at the time of the final stage of the creation of the *Iliad*. But so far as the ethno-national emotion that the *Iliad* as a whole expresses concerns, Watsuji's view printed in the introduction of his published *Homeric Criticism* seems to me to be nearer to the *Iliad's* reality than Wilamowitz's view cited above. I do believe that my comment is not expressed through my *Parteinahme* as a Japanese to Watsuji.

---

<sup>11</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (op.cit.(in n.9)), 289. See also Watsuji (op.cit. (in n.7)), 142-143.

I also believe that these two citations (Watsuji's and Wilamowitz's) could have explained the reason why his juvenile work on Homeric criticisms remained unfinished and therefore unpublished for a long time. The contradiction is certainly too serious to be bridged. But here I do not discuss further the reasons for contradiction<sup>12</sup>.

Much more serious question, which I would like to tackle here, is as follows: If the basic view on Homeric (or more correctly, the *Iliad*'s) World taken by both Thucydides and Watsuji were correct, that is, if the Achaeans and the Trojans were not ethno-nationally different people for Homer and his audience, then what was the relation between them? This question seems to be unavoidable when we want to understand, whether or not professionally as classicist, the *Iliad* correctly. It is very important for us as classicists, for the reason that the *Iliad* is certainly built upon the oppositions. We see the opposition of Achilles against the Achaeans who are represented by Agamemnon on the one hand, and of the Trojans against the Achaeans on the other. Every reader of the *Iliad* will admit that the *Iliad* as a narrative epic has something very important to communicate to the audience and to us, through these oppositions. I will not discuss the former opposition here. It will be obvious from what I have here explained that Watsuji's interest was on the latter opposition. And it is also mine here.

On this opposition, however, Watsuji did not reach the stage where he could give us a detailed description. We cannot find any more words on the opposition in his introduction nor elsewhere in the whole work. His view remained a mere negation of East-West distinction between the Achaeans and the Trojans. Neither did Thucydides give us plain words on that account. They simply warn us against the understanding of the *Iliad* on the basis that the Greek (and the Europeans) have gained after the creation of the *Iliad*.

I would like to make an attempt to give the answer in their stead, the answer that might offer a considerable help for the future Homeric study, however scanty and weak the evidence for that might be.

I would like to begin with my conclusion. My provisional answer to the question is as follows: The relation between the Achaeans and the Trojans is not of two ethnically different groups of people, but of the central and the marginal parts of one society. Needless to say the Achaeans sit in the center and Priamus' *polis* stands at the periphery of the society. In other words, if the *Iliad* is constructed basically

---

<sup>12</sup> Though the book was eventually published, the fact does not mean that the chasm was bridged over. The publication simply indicates how strong was the influence which the popular author had on the publishers.

upon the notion of historical progress of a society, and I believe it is, the center (the Achaeans) could mean, like everywhere in literary narratives in general, more developed part of a given society, and the margin (the Trojans) less developed one.

In the following two chapters, I would like to discuss two passages of the *Iliad* that seem to be concordant with the view left to us by Thucydides and Watsuji on the relation between the Achaeans and the Trojans in the *Iliad*, and to give some support to my provisional conclusion.

## 2. *Il.* 2.527-533<sup>13</sup>

(- by West, {} by Zen. and Anzai)

Λοκρῶν δ' ἡγεμόνευεν Οἰλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας -  
{μείων, οὐ τι τόσος γε ὅσος Τελαμώνιος Αἴας  
ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείων· ὀλίγος μὲν ἔην λινοθώρηξ,  
ἐγχείη δ' ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς} -  
οἱ Κῦνόν τ' ἐνέμοντ' Ὀπόεντά τε Καλλίαρόν τε  
Βῆσάν τε Σκάρφην τε καὶ Ἀὐγείας ἐρατεινὰς  
Τάρφην τε Θρόνιον τε Βοαργίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα

[And of the Locrians was a leader the swift son of Oileus, Aias

{the less, in no wise as great as Telamonian Aias,

but far less. Small of stature was he, with corselet of linen,

but with the spear he far excelled the whole host of Hellenes and Achaeans.}

These were ...]

Recently again classicists argued over the genuineness of 528-30. E. Hall argued against<sup>14</sup>, following Zenodotus, and Hornblower<sup>15</sup> for the genuineness, putting the word Πανέλληνας in the center of their arguments. M. West, the editor of the most recent *Iliad*, whose judgment is printed in the citation, seems to believe

---

<sup>13</sup> In Chapters 2 and 3, I basically print the text by M. West, *Homeri Ilias*, Stuttgart 1998(I-XII). This chapter's argument has been enlarged and translated after the reading in Geneva into Japanese and published as a chapter (pp.253-275) with the same title in a book: (ed.) T. Sato and the Department of Linguistic Sciences, Graduate School of Letters, Hokkaido University, *Linguistics at the Front*, Sapporo 2010.

<sup>14</sup> See n.6.

<sup>15</sup> S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides*, vol.1, Oxford 1991, 17. The other verse that is doubted by Hall as post-Thucydidean intrusion is 2. 867 (on Karians), on which I will later comment briefly (n.18).

that the lines are by the poet himself<sup>16</sup>, though with considerable amount of hesitation; the hyphens might indicate his concern. Πανέλληνας certainly strikes a suspicious note (see the passage of Thucydides cited above), but at the same time the parenthetical sentence (from ὀλίγος to Ἀχαιοῦς) too gives an awkward rhythm to the flow of the lines. From a purely syntactical viewpoint alone, the intervening 528-30 makes it very difficult for us to see the relation of the antecedent (Λοκρῶν) and the relative (οἱ). In addition, 528-30 includes a formal problem as a part of Achaean catalogue.

Achaean catalogue (I did not mention Trojan catalogue, only for the sake of simpler outlook) contains 28 entries of the people, and there are only three patterns of introducing these entries, as to the ways of giving the leader's (or leaders') name and his/their followers' local identities<sup>17</sup>:

Pattern (A): Followers in gen. pl., then the name of the leader(s), then the verb expressing the act of leading (ἄρχω etc.), then followers' localities introduced by the relative οἱ(x5 within the Achaean catalogue including our example of lesser Ajax):

Αὐτὰρ Φωκῶν Σχεδῖος καὶ Ἐπίστροφος ἦρχον,  
 υἷες Ἰφίτου μεγαθύμου Ναυβολίδαο,  
οἱ Κυπάρισσον ἔχον Πυθῶνά τε πετροήεσσαν  
 Κριῖάν τε Ζαθέην καὶ Δαυλίδα καὶ Πανοπηῆα,  
οἱ τ' Ἀνεμώρειαν καὶ Ὑάμπολιν ἀμφενέμοντο,  
οἱ τ' ἄρα παρ ποταμὸν Κηφισὸν δῖον ἔναιον,  
οἱ τε Λίλαιαν ἔχον πηγῆς ἔπι Κηφισοῖο·
(Il. 2.517-523)

Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον  
Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε,  
οἱ θ' Ὑρίην ἐνέμοντο καὶ Αὐλίδα πετροήεσσαν  
Σχοῖνόν τε Σκῶλόν τε πολύκνημόν τ' Ἐτεωνόν,

<sup>16</sup> This argument involves an important textual issue: “Whose text of the *Iliad* is to be reestablished?” I take Thucydides as the standard. West seems to judge this part genuine whatever is the standard, if not the unusual one: he has, elsewhere, avoided the problem by taking the Ἕλληνες in Πανέλληνας (530) to designate those who live in “northern Greece” against Ἀχαιοί (“those who live in southern Greece”). See West ad Hesiod, *Op*, 528 (West, M., Hesiod, *Works and Days*, Oxford 1978). But West’s view is against the originally usual meaning of the word “Ἕλληνες” (“people living along the river Spercheios”). See *Lexikon der frūgriechischen Epos*, s.v. Πανέλληνας.

<sup>17</sup> We can find virtually the same analysis in: G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol.1, Cambridge 1985, 170.

Θέσπειαν Γραϊάν τε καὶ εὐρύχορον Μυκαλησσόν,  
οἷ τ' ἀμφ' Ἄρμ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Εἰλέσιον καὶ Ἐρυθράς, (Il. 2.494-498)

Pattern (B) (the reverse of (A)): followers' localities introduced by the rel. (οἷ), which is resumed with τῶν and governed by the verb expressing the act of leading (ἄρχω etc.), (x18 in Achaean catalogue):

Οἷ δ' Ἄργός τ' εἶχον Τίρουνθά τε τειχιόεσσαν  
 Ἐρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἐχούσας,  
 Τροιζῆν' Ἡϊόνας τε καὶ ἀμπελόεντ' Ἐπίδουρον,  
οἷ τ' ἔχον Αἶγιναν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν,  
τῶν αὖθ' ἠγεμόνευε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης  
καὶ Σθένηςλος, Καπανῆος ἀγακλειτοῦ φίλος υἱός· (Il. 2.559-564)

Pattern (C) (the simplest and straightforward form): the leader's name in nom., then the verb ἄγω and the people's name(or νῆας) with an attribute which is to identify the followers' locality, then the extension to the followers through relative clauses(x5 in Achaean catalogue):

Αἶας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας, (Il. 2.557)

Τληπόλεμος δ' Ἡρακλεΐδης ἠὺς τε μέγας τε  
 ἐκ Ρόδου ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερώχων,  
 οἱ Ρόδον ἀμφενέμοντο διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες... (Il. 2.653-655)

Our Catalogue on the lesser Ajax and his followers (527-535) is on the pattern (A). The purpose of the Achaean catalogue is simple and plain. It is to give us the basic information about who were present on the Trojan shore under whose leadership (Οὗτοι ἄρ' ἠγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοῖρανοι ἦσαν 2.760). The uniformity is not astonishing: the *Iliad* is created orally.

I would like to add one more fact: syntactically all these introducing parts (who were present under whose leadership) are formed within a single sentence. There is an extension of the followers by relatives everywhere. Sometimes, leaders are given an appositional extension (2.564 italics, 2.518 italics etc.). There is an extension of the followers' locality even within a relative extension (2.572). However, in all the items in the Achaean catalogue, the first mention of the name of the leader(s) and



the local identification of the followers is done in a single sentence. This is not surprising: the role of each catalogue is, after all, to identify the group, “Who is leading whom?” In this respect our example featuring the lesser Ajax (2.527-533) forms an exceptional case, because an independent sentence intrudes before the formal link closes with a relative.

Athenian catalogue, 2.546-556 could be counted as another exception. But it is not, I think. The seemingly independent outlook of 547-551 depends largely on editors’ taste for punctuation. They are all extension of the followers’ name within the relative clause introduced by other relatives.

Οἱ δ’ ἄρ’ Ἀθήνας εἶχον εὐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον  
 δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ’ Ἀθήνη  
 θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ Ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα,  
 καὶ δ’ ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι εἶσεν ἑὼν ἐν πίοι νηῶ·  
 ἔνθα δὲ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἄρνειοῖς ἰλάονται  
 κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν·  
 τῶν αὖθ’ ἠγεμόνευ’ υἱὸς Πεπεῶο Μενεσθεύς. (Il. 2.546-553)

My conclusion on *Il.*2.528-530 is that they are surely the part that has been drawn into the main tradition of the *Iliad*’s after the death of Thucydides. The interpolation will be probably from post-Homeric epic verses and featuring the lesser Ajax<sup>18</sup>. But this is only a preparation. No signs are drawn out to give a detailed picture of the poet’s idea on the opposition between the Achaeans and the Trojans.

### 3. *Iliad* 4.422-445<sup>19</sup>

Ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἐν αἰγιαλῶ πολυηεῖ κῦμα θαλάσσης

<sup>18</sup> In this paper I do not discuss another part of the *Iliad*, which has also been suspected in connection with Thucydides’ words cited above. It is *Il.* 2.867-869: Νάστης αὐ Καρῶν ἠγήσατο βαρβαροφώνων/ οἱ Μίλητον ἔχον Φθιρῶν τ’ ὄρος ἀκριτόφυλλον / Μαιάνδρου τε ῥοὰς Μυκάλῃς τ’ αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα· Here, the word βαρβαροφώνων, which is at the center of the issue, is used without any reference to national-ethnic judgment. It is possible that the stem βαρβαρ- was originally a description of the pure sound-quality of the language (“rugged” etc.) and only later developed the use which primarily implies a quality of a language to make a national-ethnic distinction.

<sup>19</sup> This chapter’s argument has been enlarged and translated after the reading in Geneva into Japanese and published in the form of an article (M.Anzai, “The Language and the Social Unit: *Il.* 4.422-445,” *Philologica III, Societas Philologorum*, 2008, 48-65).

ὄρνυτ' ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὕπο κινήσαντος·  
 πόντω μὲν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
 χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκρας 425  
 κυρτὸν ἐὼν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ' ἄλός ἄχνην·  
 ὡς τότε ἔπασσύτεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες  
 νωλεμέως πόλεμον δέ· κέλευε δὲ οἷσιν ἕκαστος  
 ἡγεμόνων· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἴσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης  
 τόσσον λαὸν ἔπεσθαι ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδὴν, 430  
 σιγῇ δειδιότες σημάντορας· ἀμφὶ δὲ πᾶσι  
 τεύχεα ποικίλ' ἔλαμπε, τὰ εἰμένοι ἐστιχόωντο.  
 Τρῶες δ', ὡς τ' οἷες πολυπάμονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν αὐλῇ  
 μυρίαὶ ἐστήκασιν ἀμελγόμεναι γάλα λευκὸν  
 ἀζηχῆς μεμακυῖαι ἀκούουσαι ὄπα ἀρνῶν, 435  
 ὡς Τρῶων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν ὀρώρει·  
 οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,  
 ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες.  
 ὄρσε δὲ τοὺς μὲν Ἄρης, τοὺς δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη  
 Δεῖμός τ' ἠδὲ Φόβος καὶ Ἕρις ἄμοτον μεμαυῖα, 440  
 Ἄρεος ἀνδροφόνοιο κασιγνήτη ἑτάρη τε,  
 ἢ τ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα  
 οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει·  
 ἢ σφιν καὶ τότε νεῖκος ὁμοῖον ἔμβαλε μέσσω  
 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὄμιλον ὀφέλλουσα στόνον ἀνδρῶν. 445

It will be convenient, here again, for the coming discussion that I state briefly my overall interpretation of this passage at the start.

Here, in two similes (422-431, 432-438), the poet describes the two armies' difference in terms of organization. The keys for the two armies are, silence (ἀκὴν ἴσαν) for the Achaeans on the one hand, disorderly bleating or voices (ἀζηχῆς μεμακυῖαι) for the Trojans on the other. The poet is attempting, it seems to me, to make us understand, by two similes, the great difference in the quality of the armies, a contrast between the organized and well-disciplined Achaean army and the badly organized Trojan army. Therefore, he is here establishing the relation indirectly (if the organization of the army was, as always in the historical societies, a reflex of the societies concerned), as a basis of his narrative. He is giving us a contrast between a

progressed and more tightly composed Achaean society and a primitive and loosely-knit Trojan society. But in the latter half of the citation, after the reference to the Trojans' and the auxiliary forces' language (437ff.), these descriptions seem to go into confusion, at least if we understand the descriptions according to the majority interpretation.

But my view is that it is not the *Iliad*'s text but the traditionally influential interpretation of the latter part of the citation that is responsible for the confusion. The interpretation seems questionable particularly concerning the following two points:

(1). The cause of Trojan army's disorder is attributed to their language mixture according to the majority understanding. But the idea that the meaning of γλωσσα (438) as a "language" which allows one to discriminate the nationality or ethnicity, may be groundless, if we accept Thucydides' and Watsuji's understanding of Homeric society<sup>20</sup>.

(2). The most recent edition of the *Iliad* by M. West indents the word ὄρσε/ᾠρσε (439). The indentation leads us to understand that the object of narration has changed, from that of Trojan army to both armies (the Trojans and the Achaeans). This understanding is popular today and we can understand that the editor's indentation is to clarify his wish that we should follow this lead. I think this is based on a wrong interpretation of the overall structure of 4.422-445. A clumsy current understanding of the lines directly following the indentation (439) suggests that the popular interpretation of the context might be wrong.

Before beginning my version of operation to try to restore a proper context, let me show the origin of the confused understanding. The confusion is certainly a traditional one. The following citations tell us that the understanding (or confusion in the interpretation) is of ancient origin.

(1). Eustathius, ad 437-8<sup>21</sup>:

«Ὅν γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμοῦς θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς, ἀλλὰ γλωσσ' ἐμέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες», ἤγουν ἐκ πολλῶν συγκληθέντες γλωσσῶν. οἱ γὰρ

---

<sup>20</sup> Here the word "society" does not involve the historical reality.

<sup>21</sup> M. van der Valk (ed.) *Eustatii archiepiscopi ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, vol.1, Leiden 1971, 783

Ἕλληνας ὡς ὁμόγλωσσοι, οὐ πολὺκλήτοι, βραχὺ τι κατὰ τὰς διαλέκτους διαφέροντες καὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς τόποις πολυσπερέες καὶ πάνυ μακρὰν διεστῶτες.  
[therefore they were called in from several ethno-national language speaking parts]

(2). Apollonius Sophista, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. πολὺκλήτοι<sup>22</sup>:

<πολύκλητοι> οἱ ἀπὸ πολλῶν τόπων κεκλημένοι βοηθεῖν.

[πολύκλητοι, those who are called in from many places as an auxiliary force]

These ancient interpretations have one thing in common. They explain the Trojan force's disorder by their several languages, by their incapability in mutual communication. Of course if we accept the views expressed by Thucydides and Watsuji, these are examples of anachronistic reading; the discrimination of people through their languages and cultures had not yet been established in the age of Homer and his audience. We can further observe that these interpretations of the words γλῶσσα and πολὺκλήτοι, by giving the Trojans and the allies' different and therefore mutually not understandable languages as the reason of their disorderly bleat (435), close the logical sequence of the part began at 433. Once a logical sequence closes, it can easily produce the idea that a new part with new object (both the Trojans and the Achaeans, respectively or mixed) will begin (i.e. from 439). This understanding of the context is still alive in contemporary commentaries. For example:

“Compare the words of Iris-Polites to Hektor at 2.803f. (πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστρῳ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπικούροι,/ ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων.<sup>23</sup>) and the conclusion that each group should be given orders by its own leaders. Here the idea is similar but the expression completely different. The ἐπικούροι are now πολὺκλήτοι..ἄνδρες, ‘men summoned from many places’ etc.”<sup>24</sup>

The following two remarks of the same commentator, too, are built on the same basis of the understanding of the context. Let me cite these together, for the convenience of the discussion:

---

<sup>22</sup> I. Bekker (ed.), *Apollonii Sophista Lexicon Homericum*, Berlin 1833, 132.

<sup>23</sup> I have not found a way yet to explain this cited part properly. I am still struggling on the way to remove anachronistic understanding from the *Iliad*, that is, anachronistic according to the view of Thucydides and Watsuji on Homeric world.

<sup>24</sup> G. S. Kirk, op. cit. (in n.17), 380.

"(ad 439) As usually but not invariably in Homer, the μὲν-clause refers to the last to be named of a preceding pair (here, the Trojans) and the δὲ-clause to the first, in a chiasmic arrangement. Ares is Athena's pro-Trojan counterpart as war-deity."<sup>25</sup>

"(ad 440-441) Despite the close relationship of Eris, Strife, to pro-Trojan Ares, these three are to be understood as spreading the spirit of war among both sides equally."<sup>26</sup>

The commentator surely thinks that the part describing the Trojan army has come to the end at 438 and that the change in the object to be described comes with δὲ-prima (439). The keys to reach the understanding of the proper context of 422-445 seem to me, if we concentrate our attention to the word(s) in the text, to lie within the closer examinations of the followings:

- (1). Whether the word γλῶσσα means the language which marks a difference among ethno-national communities, as Eustathius understood, or it simply means the organ to pronounce words<sup>27</sup>?
- (2). Is “οἱ ἀπὸ πολλῶν τόπων κεκλημένοι” (Apollon.) a correct gloss on the word πολύκλητοι? The meaning “from many places”, which is ascribed to πολύ-, is very unlikely. πολύ- in Homer and elsewhere in Greek language means usually, ‘much’ (internal acc. to the latter part of the word) or ‘many’ (which works as a subj. to the verbal meaning of latter part of the word).
- (3). Who are the persons designated as objects that stand under the influence (excitement/fear) of Athena, Ares, Deimos, Phobos, and Eris? Do the particles by μὲν, δὲ work as Kirk explains? And do τ’ ἠδὲ, καὶ (both, in usual scenes, mean simply “and”) work in such a complicated role as will be necessary once we take μὲν, δὲ as Kirk explains? His comments, from linguistic point of view, are far from persuasive. However, no better interpretations seem to have been offered.

These seem to be the most conspicuous problems in the confused understanding of the lines 437-440.

---

<sup>25</sup> Kirk ad 4.439 (Kirk, op. cit. (in n. 17)), 380.

<sup>26</sup> Kirk ad 4.440-441 (Kirk, op. cit. (in n. 17)), 380.

<sup>27</sup> For parallel use in Homer, see, e.g., οὐδ’ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ’ εἶεν (*Il.* 2.489).

The best way to begin the “operation” will to discuss first the last problem. Let us examine Kirk’s commentary cited above.

The confusion seems to lie deeply in the understanding of the “whole” in the context, which must have been put down before we divide it to the “parts” expressed in the form of τοὺς μὲν, τοὺς δὲ, τ’ ἠδὲ, καὶ (439-440). Logically, if we start with the division of the whole that is composed of; a) the Trojans on one side, and; b) the Achaeans on the other (439), there remain no other simple groups available for the addition by τ’ ἠδὲ, καὶ (440). No other groups of soldiers are present before us. Therefore, it becomes necessary, almost automatically, to create the persons who are to be attacked by Deimos (fear), by Phobos (panic flight), and by Eris (rivalry), who neither are the Trojans nor the Achaeans. We therefore will be forced to create other groups than the Trojans and the Achaeans, more or less artificially, as Kirk was forced in his commentary. However, the conjunctions used here (μὲν, δὲ, τ’, ἠδὲ, καὶ) cannot carry these difficult and artificial tasks. Their functions seem, usually, simply to add other items to the preceding one(s).

It is obvious that the attribution of Ares to the Trojans and of Athena to the Achaeans has caused the difficulty. I think that a part of the confusion owes its cause to our deeply held tendency to see the *Iliad* as a description of the war between the Greeks and the Trojans, between two different “countries”, between Arian and Semitic according to Watsuji. Certainly we know very well that Ares’ favour is for the Trojans and Athena’s for the Achaeans in the *Iliad*. But these “Parteinahme” of the two gods are not a completely fixed fact within the epic (see also Edwards ad *Il.* 18. 516<sup>28</sup>):

οἱ δ’ ἴσαν· ἦρχε δ’ ἄρά σφιν Ἄρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη  
 ἄμφω χρυσείῳ, χρύσεια δὲ εἴματα ἔσθην,  
 καλῶ καὶ μεγάλῳ σὺν τεύχεσιν, ὥς τε θεῶ περ  
 ἄμφις ἀριζήλω λαοὶ δ’ ὑπολίζονες ἦσαν.  
 [Then they had started. Ares and Pallas Athena led them,  
 both ...]

(*Il.* 18.516-519)

Here, the god and goddess appear in the *Iliad* as gods of war, *bellator* and *bellatrix*, not as gods who “Partei nehmen” either to the Achaeans or the Trojans. Unmistakably these (war gods in general) are the original images of the gods for Greek language. Gods who “Partei nehmen” are more or less specific to the *Iliad* or

<sup>28</sup> M. Edwards, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. 5, Cambridge 1991, 219.

Homeric Epic, or to those poetical works under the influence of Homeric Epic. In principle both aspects (as gods who “*Partei nehmen*”, and as war gods in general) can appear according to the context. I believe that here (4. 422-445) the more original images of the two gods have emerged. I believe this is the only way to avoid the confusion seen in the traditional misunderstandings.

If we allow the possibility that the two gods appear here as war god and goddess in general, who are to encourage any soldiers in a given context, and that they might not be acting as a patron on either side (the Achaeans/the Trojans), we could be in a better position where we can avoid attributing artificial meanings to *μὲν, δὲ, τὴ δὲ, καὶ*.

In the scene described in the lines 439-445, both armies are standing at separate places in the field. They meet first at line 446 (*Οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐς χῶρον ἕνα ξυυιόντες ἴκοντο* [Then, when both armies went to the same place and met ...]). It is very unlikely in epic diction that both these two groups of persons, who are to be imagined as standing apart, become the foci of two different sentences in the same line one after another, with simple help of *μὲν* and *δὲ*, and it is also very unlikely in epic diction that a person who has occupied the center of narration (the Trojans, here) should be discarded and new one (the Trojans and the Achaeans together) should be introduced by the simple help of *δὲ* (*ὄρσσε δὲ* 439).

When we understand the gods, Ares and Athena, as war gods in general, not as gods who “*Partei nehmen*”, and when we understand that those particles are used with their usual meanings, I think the context becomes much clearer: Ares is encouraging here some of them (the whole is still “the Trojans”, and the description continues on Trojan side), and flashing eyed Athena others (some others of the Trojans, again), and Deimos others (some others of the Trojans, again), and Panic Flight others (some others of the Trojans, again), and Eris others (some others of the Trojans, again). The function of the particles employed here of course is simple additions.

The description continues, after 439, still on the side of the Trojans. Of course the first *δὲ* (*ὄρσσε δὲ* 439) can work out the function. The description of Trojan Army without strict discipline continues here. They are occupied by several emotions, excitement before war, terror, panic flight, etc. Then comes Eris, “hostility”, sister of Ares. While the hostile groups (the Trojans see the Achaeans approach) come nearer until they meet, she, Eris, becomes stronger and stronger, even for those badly disciplined soldiers, even for the Trojans (422-445).

What is more important, we can thus get the description of the Trojan army without proper discipline after the line 439, and this description corresponds to the characterization of the Trojans in the simile (sheep bleating severally in the court of a rich man before milking or some other treatment). The lines that are cited above (422-445) show us the scene where even undisciplined soldiers that look like gathered sheep can become courageous soldiers by the help of Eris.

Before entering a brief lexical discussion concerning γλῶσσα (438) and πολύκλητοι, I would like to make sure on one point about the context. If the lines 439-445 still continue a description of Trojan soldiers' emotion (not of the soldiers of both armies) just in front of the enemy, the Greek army, and if we follow the lead of Eustathius and Apollonius here, then we will get the following order, 1) simile of the Trojans as groups of sheep (433-6); 2) the mention of a wide variety of languages (with ethno-national connotation) of the Trojan soldiers, though in fact this is the traditional interpretation of the passage (437-8) for a long time; 3) the description of different psychological responses seen in the Trojan (perhaps) soldiers at 439-445. It will be very difficult to draw a logical sequence of ideas from this order of descriptions. On the other hand, if the context flowed, 1) the simile of sheep; 2) the free and widely different words (or expressions) for the soldiers (of course the soldiers are the Trojans) to express their sentiments (437-8); 3) a variety of gods who enkindle a variety of emotions, it will be easy for us to draw a logical sequence from these verses.

Therefore, first, we had better take the meaning of γλῶσσα not as the "language" that makes ethno-national differences among people, and that will build up a group to become a basis for nations, but as the "language" that merely expresses people's thoughts and emotions. Since both meanings of γλῶσσα (as "language" with ethno-national connotation, and as an organ of expression of ideas) are in use in the *Iliad*, we cannot get the "evidence" for us to decide<sup>29</sup>. But on πολύκλητοι, I can have a hope that we can reach somewhere.

I said the meaning, "called from many places," traditionally attributed to the composite adjective πολυκλειτός (or πολυκλήτος) for a long time, is unlikely. It certainly is odd. If so, what is the meaning?

As Leaf noted on *Il.* 5.491<sup>30</sup>, we are not certain on one point: whether we should spell the word πολύκλητοι or πολύκλειτοι? What is more important, we are far

<sup>29</sup> Only at one place in the *Iliad* (2.488), the word is used to make a national difference of the people concerned. Other examples from the *Iliad* are used with the other meaning. Should we doubt the authenticity of the verse or the part including the verse?

<sup>30</sup> W. Leaf, *The Iliad*, vol.1. London 1900, 228.



from being confident about the stem κλ-, κλυ-, κλα-, κλε-<sup>31</sup>etc. and their mutual relations. Therefore possible candidates for the meaning of the word are logically almost countless. I will here discuss only two likelier explanations.

If we can read πολύκλειτοι here, i.e., if πολύκλητοι and πολύκλειτοι are virtually the same word, I think we should take the following data into account, and interpret the word as “much famed.”

Datum (1): Since the meaning of the adjective τηλεκλειτός, “far-famed” (τηλε- meaning “far”) seems to be constant and τηλεκλειτοὶ ἐπίκουροι (nom. appears as τ’ἐπίκουροι) always occupies the end of verse, τηλεκλειτοὶ seems to be established as an epithet to the ἐπίκουροι<sup>32</sup> within the *Iliad*.

Datum (2): πολύκλειτος in Pindar (*Ol.*6.71, *fr.*194.4) means “much famed”.

Datum (3): At *Il.* 10. 420 πολύκλητοι (or πολύκλειτοι) ἐπίκουροι occupy almost the same position as the combinations cited in note 32, nevertheless the compound adjective has been long interpreted as “summoned from many places,”<sup>33</sup> similarly as in the case of πολύκλητοι (or πολύκλειτοι) in our passage (4.438). But I strongly doubt this (πολύκλητοι at 10.420) traditional interpretation of the adjective. It is against the rule of meaning in compounds. It seems to reflect an unconscious prejudice of ancient Greeks after the Classical Age against the people in Turkish Peninsula as a mixed one. I doubt this peculiar meaning attributed to the adjective is also an *ad hoc* one fabricated by later readers of the *Iliad* to fit into the context and their view of the world. Surely the allies’ wives and children were not near to be watched (10. 422). So the traditionally ascribed meaning (“summoned from many places) here sounds passable, apart from the linguistic awkwardness. But the allies are naturally fighting for the host without having brought their families. I agree with Hainsworth that πολύκλητοι (or πολύκλειτοι) is used here as a metrical variant by the poet of *Doloneia*<sup>34</sup>, and, though the commentator of the Cambridge *Iliad* repeats here the traditionally assumed meaning, I myself would like to take this word to be with the meaning suitable for the epic “Allies”. In terms of linguistics

<sup>31</sup> See, for example, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1999, s.vv. καλέω, κλέος etc.

<sup>32</sup> *Il.* 5.491, 6.111, 9.233, 11.564 (v.l. πολυηγερέες by Arist.), 12.108.

<sup>33</sup> B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. 3, Cambridge 1993, 195.

<sup>34</sup> Not a beautifully made variant, perhaps. See the hiatus caused by the drop of τ’, and the conjectures suggested by Heine and *recc*; of course the insertion of τ’ is contextually impossible.

and epic diction, I consider “much famed” as far better meaning of πολύκλητοι (or πολύκλειτοι) at *Il.* 10.420 than “summoned from many places.”

This line of explanation and its conclusion have one fateful weakness: the noun to be combined with the word is not ἐπίκουροι here (4.438). In its stead we find δ'ἔσαν ἄνδρες. What is more important is that the adjective here seems strongly to recommend itself to be taken as a predicate adjective. Since δ'ἔσαν ἄνδρες is metrically equal with τ'ἐπίκουροι, and since both πολύκλητοι (πολύκλειτοι) δ'ἔσαν ἄνδρες (4.438) and πολύκλητοι (or πολύκλειτοι) ἐπίκουροι (10.420) occupy the same position in the verse, we can still stick to the idea that the adjective is used here (4.438) under a strong influence of oral diction and the use and meaning of τηλεκλειτοί (“far-famed”) and its (semi) variant (πολύκλειτοι), thus we can take the meaning to be “much famed” here.

With all the above considerations in mind, the following treatment of the word (πολύκλητοι *Il.* 4. 438) seems now best to me.

- (1). We should spell it as πολύκλητοι.
- (2). Its stem is the same with καλέω (*cf.* κλητός, *Il.* 9.165, *Od.* 17.386).
- (3). Its meaning is “much called”, “much invited.”
- (4). It works here as a predicate to ἄνδρες, and the latter part of the verse means, “The soldiers were invoked much, i.e. severally.” And it explains the former half of the verse, which has explained why “Their voices or expressions were mixed, i.e. confused.” Therefore the latter half of the verse explains what is described as happening inside the soldiers’ heart. Therefore the line is formed parataxically, and the later half works as a cause to the former half.
- (5). The lines 439-441 explain or develop the idea included in πολύκλητοι δ'ἔσαν ἄνδρες. So the first δέ of 439 is δέ for γάρ<sup>35</sup>. This passage describes how these gods or personified psychic phenomena attacked the Trojan soldiers, and finally built them into a body prepared for fight.

#### 4. Conclusion

Since Watsuji’s *Homeric criticism*, as I said above, does not inform us the detailed textual basis for his understanding of the Homeric world, I am not certain which Homeric passage made him hold and express his thought similar to that of

---

<sup>35</sup> J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Oxford 1951, 169-170.

Thucydides. Here, however, I think I could show that, by following the lead by Watsuji and Thucydides, and by making ourselves free of the prejudice concerning the nationalistic distinction in the *Iliad* posthumously fabricated by the readers, we can reach a better understanding of the context of the verses cited. I believe I could reconstruct the intention of the poet who attached particular importance to *Iliad* 4.422-445. Here the contrast between the advanced and disciplined army (=society) of Achaeans and natural and disordered Trojans is designed and expressed in the form of a simile, and this contrast is the basis on which the poet, probably the last poet in the long creation history of the *Iliad*, wanted his audience to enjoy his long narrative.

Hokkaido University  
amakoto@let.hokudai.ac.jp