An inquiry into the etymology and meaning
of ἴφθιμος in the early epic

By Apostolos Athanassakis, Santa Barbara

The number of Homeric words for which a conventional equivalent is frequently only a translational "filler" of the kind that would fit almost any context in the heroic epic is rather impressive. The most common type of word within this category is the so called epithet of commendation; the term covers all adjectives occurring usually in formulaic phrases of an obviously laudatory character. The gap in translation is not the only reason for readily accepting fixed renditions of such epithets. There is an implicit assumption that the formula is built into a line primarily in order to fill a metrical space, even when its meaning is either vague or inappropriate. This sort of compromise is not the mark of a good poet, and Homer should be the last victim of such high-handed treatment, even when it comes to words of obscure origin and meaning. Such a word is ἴφθιμος, found in the third line of the *Iliad*, where it is applied to the souls of the heroes who perished during the war. This adjective occurs many times in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as well as in Hesiod (including the *Catalogi*), and in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. I think that the meaning "strong" or "mighty" in the case of men, and "beautiful" or "comely" in the case of women, is obviously more convenient than accurate.

A very recent attempt at coming to grips with the puzzling use of the word in the epic is found in an article by John Warden in *Phoenix*[1]). Of the meanings "seedy, rich fertile, fat; virile, sexually potent; endowed with rich soul material, powerful, strong in a non-bodily sense; powerful, strong in a bodily sense" which are ascribed to it[2]) at the end of the discussion, only "powerful, strong" seem in some way etymologically cogent and demanded by the context in comparatively few cases. The other meanings, besides being etymologically groundless, are demonstrably inappropriate. Thus, the sug-gestion that ἴφθιμος in *Od.* 19.110 ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσων means "rich, fruitful, fertile," because the scene depicted in the passage is one of peace and fecundity, rests on no more than the implicit assumption that in a

---

[1]) John Warden, Ἴφθιμος: *A Semantic Analysis, Phoenix* 23 (1969) 143–158.
[2]) *Ibid.* 157.

2   Apostolos Athanassakis

given series of even disparate elements the same qualities are shared by each of the series[3]). Then, it is difficult to see how a word which connotes "a quality that a woman possesses *qua* woman, one of the characteristics of the female sex" and which "has some reference to female fertility and sexuality"[4]) can also mean "virile." Argumentation which ascribes meanings to words only by means of context and assumes that forumlaic expediency and metrical necessity made the poet apply his adjectives even where they would be meaningless or nonsensical can go as far as stating that "the wife of Sthenelos may borrow her right to the term from her husband who, probably, derives his from his metrical form"[5]). Finally, despite the possible connections between ψυχή and κεφαλή, the meanings "soulful," "seedy" ascribed to ἴφθιμος in the phrases ἰφθίμους κεφαλάς, ἴφθιμα κάρηνα[6]) seem unlikely, particularly because in the latter phrase the heads are those of oxen. Whatever ψυχή means in the early epic, there is, to my knowledge, nothing in Homer supporting the notion that oxen possess it.

The comment of Aristonikos on the third line of the *Iliad* has semantic implications[7]); he obviously takes ἴφθιμος to mean ἀνδρεῖος, ἀγαθός. Apollonios (Sophista), who based his lexicon on the commentaries of Aristarchos, gives us ἰσχυροψύχους (s.v. ἰφθίμους), and ἀγαθή (s.v. ἰφθίμη)[8]). The meanings ἀνδρεῖος, ἰσχρόψυχος most likely go back to Aristarchos himself and might well indicate that, if Aristarchos and those influenced by him, linked ἴφθιμος with any other word, this word was the adverbial form ἴφι. The author of the *Etymologicum Magnum* derives it from ἴφι with the addition of an unexplained θ; according to the same source others took it as a compound of ἴφι and θυμός[9]). No attention is paid to the difference between υ and ι, a fact which tells us something about the date of this conjecture, and syncope is given as the reason for the loss of the ι of ἴφι. The author of the Lexicon objects to the notion of the compound on account of the form ἰφθίμη because, as he says, τὰ γὰρ σύνθετα κοινά εἰσι τῷ γένει. Some modern efforts to find the origin of this puzzling epithet cannot be lightly dismissed strictly from the

---

[3]) *Ibid.* 150. There is no reason to believe, as the author maintains, that *Od.* 24.26, and 16.244 are inappropriate adaptations of *Od.* 19.110. Further, it is difficult to see how ἴφθιμοι ἄνδρες would mean "fertile men" simply because the land, the trees, and the sea of the kingdom are productive (*Od.* 19.110–114).

[4]) *Ibid.* 152.

[5]) *Ibid.* The statement on this as well as on the previous page that most of the Homeric heroes received the adjective ἴφθιμος *metri gratia* makes a positive approach to the problem impossible.

[6]) *Ibid.* 153–157.

[7]) G. Dindorfius, *Scholia Gr. in Il.* (London 1875) A 3.

[8]) *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum* (ed. I. Bekker, Berlin 1833).

etymological point of view. Their main weakness is their failure to account for the meaning of the word, which, in view of its wide variety of application in the epic, is more complicated than they are intimating.

Collitz takes ἴφθιμος to be reflecting the Sanskrit root $\sqrt{ksi}$ (2) = "to rule," "to have power." $\sqrt{ksi}$ (2) would be reflected in Gr. φθι and the ι of ἴφθιμος is to be explained as an "anaptyxis" of the same kind as in ἰκτῖνος, ἰκτίς, ἰχθύς [10]). He distinguishes this root from two other Sanskrit homophonic roots $\sqrt{ksi}$ (1) reflected in Gr. κτι (κτίμενος etc.) and $\sqrt{ksi}$ (3) reflected in Gr. φθι (φθίνω etc.)[11]). A connection between ἴφθιμος and Sanskrit $\sqrt{ksi}$ (ksayati) and Avestan *Xsayate* is also made by Kuiper[12]). The same author connects this root not only with ἴφθιμος but with φθάνω as well, and sees in both IE. $\sqrt{q^u ph\bar{a}}$ [13]). He argues convincingly about the semasiological development of verbs meaning "to rule," (herrschen) in the present tense to meaning "take," "occupy," or "possess" (einnehmen, besetzen) in the aorist tense. He considers φθάνω a new formation from ἔφθην, ἐφθάμην[14]). In this case ἴφθιμος might mean both "ruling," "lordly" and "having possessions," perhaps then "rich" or something along these lines. It is not clear exactly in what relationship Schwyzer sees the connection of ἴφθιμος to the above mentioned IE. labiovelar root, but, although he considers its etymology unclear, he seems inclined to grant the proposed relationships some degree of probability[15]). It should be pointed out that it is not easy to see how the same root would be reflected in three not only phonologically but also semasiologically different entities in Greek. The so-called anaptyctic -ι is found in very few forms and, as Collitz admits, in ἴφθιμος the accentuation of the word does not support its assumption since this ι is not accented. He suggests that the Alexandrian grammarians changed the accent of the word in order to obtain congruity with their presumed hypothesis that the word was a compound involving ἴφι + τιμή or θυμός[16]). There is no evidence whatsoever about this unflattering conjecture, and the fact remains that his proposed *ἰφθιμός is nowhere to be found.

Certain clues offered by the structure and prosodic behavior of the word have led me to a reconstructed parent form of ἴφθιμος which hopefully accounts for the ostensible incongruities in the usage of the word in the early epic. In this study ἴφθιμος is taken to be a form

---

[9]) See also Eustathius, *Comment. in Homerum*, 16.11, 413.11, 566.21.

[10]) Herman Collitz, Ἴφθιμος *Und Ved. kṣi*, AJP 8 (1887) 214ff.

[11]) For a detailed discussion of this see Herman Collitz, *Die Drei indischen Wurzeln kṣi und ihre Verwandten im Griechischen, Beitr. zur Kunde d. Indogerm. Spr.* 18 (Series Göttingen 1877–1907) 201ff.

[12]) *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 8 (1933) 249ff.

[13]) For this see *Glotta* 21 (1933) 289ff.

[14]) *Ibid.* p. 292.

[15]) *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich 1959) 1.326, 327, 413.

[16]) *Op. Cit.*, 217.

1*

4 Apostolos Athanassakis

derived from *(ϝ)ἰφίτιμος a determinative possessive compound consisting of the well-known adverb (ϝ)ἶφι and the stem of τιμή in its normal adjectival variation τιμο-. This hypothetical form would be a perfectly legitimate compound and one which might have survived in that form, had it not been for its metrical value $\_\cup\_\cup$ which made it inadmissible into the hexametric scheme. The -ι of the syllable φι might have been dropped in order to avoid the cretic, and the resultant *(ϝ)ἴφτιμος might undergo a further change involving consonantal assimilation through which φτ would go into φθ with a spread of aspiration not unparallelled in Greek. It should be remarked that the shortening of the root -τῑ, found in Homer a few times for obviously metrical reasons (cf. *Il.* 23.703 τῖον with 705 τίον), might have been another solution, because a form *(ϝ)ἰφίτιμος could occur before words beginning with consonant, since the ultima would be lengthened by position. In other cases, where inflection would make the fourth syllable long (e.g. (ϝ)ἰφιτίμοιο, etc.), this change of quantity would have also worked. The root -τι, however, is very rarely found short even before vowel, and the case of ἄτιτος in *Il.* 13.414 must be taken as an exception and a license perhaps influenced by the more understandable τίον; τι- before consonant is long.

The fact that ἴφθιμος does not show a digamma effect anywhere, despite the fact that ἶφι does, is one of the strongest factors which make etymologists look upon the connection with ἶφι as very improbable[17]). There are, however, forms which do not show a digamma effect in the epic, despite the fact that comparative philological study and other evidence lead us to believe that they possessed an initial digamma[18]). Therefore, on this basis alone we cannot exclude the possibility of some connection between ἶφι and ἴφθιμος. As has already been mentioned, the idea that ἴφθιμος may not be a compound is not new. It is found both as a two-termination and as a three-termination adjective. The termination -η is found when the word refers to a woman and it qualifies such words as ἄλοχος, παράκοιτις, βασίλεια, θυγάτηρ, κούρη. The pertinent lines are in the *Odyssey* 4.797, 10.106, 11.287, 12.452, 15.364, 16.332, 23.92, and in the *Iliad* 5.415, 19.116. The ending -ος for the feminine form occurs with the word ψυχάς (*Il.* 1.3) and κεφαλάς (*Il.* 11.55). Two things should be pointed out. The two times in which the form

---

[17]) So Frisk in *Etymol. Wört.*, but not Chantraine in *Grammaire Homér.* (Paris 1942) 143, 145.

[18]) Cf. εἰροπόκος, ὀρθός, ὀρθογόη which exhibit no initial ϝ effect in either Homer or Hesiod.

ἰφθίμη occurs in the *Iliad*, it does so in the sequence ἰφθίμη ἄλοχος (5.415) and ἰφθίμην ἄλοχον (19.116), that is, where it would be metrically impossible to write ἴφθιμος, ἴφθιμον. If the -η ending were original, then why not the perfectly possible ἰφθίμας ψυχάς and ἰφθίμας κεφαλάς. If the *Odyssey* is, as it seems, a somewhat later work, then the sequences ἰφθίμη βασίλεια (16.332) etc. in the *Odyssey*, where ἴφθιμος βασίλεια would be possible and in no way offensive, might be patterned after the two examples in the *Iliad*. The form Ἰφθίμη (*Od.* 4.797) taken to be a proper name, need cause us no concern because in Homer there are no feminine personal names in -ος. Feminine names from two termination adjectives have either -α or -η as an ending. It is possible, however, that the feminine form in the aforementioned line is not a proper name, but rather an adjective qualifying the word κούρη. The curious thing, at any rate, is that when referring to women the ending is -η; otherwise -ος. The fluctuation found even in certain types of compounds (cf. ἀντίβιος, α, ον), and the explanation given for the two examples in the *Iliad*, show that there is no ground for objecting to ἴφθιμος as a compound on account of the existence of the feminine form in -η.

That ἶφι is used as the first member of a compound is obvious from such compounds as Ἰφιμέδεια, Ἰφιάνασσα, Ἰφιδάμας, Ἰφικλος, Ἰφίνοος all found in Homer. This type of compound with ἶφι is old and, if, as is most probable, wi-pi-no-o in the Linear B tablets is the Mycenean spelling for Ἰφίνοος, we can assume that other similar compounds were in use that far back in the development of the language[19]). Far more interesting in connection with a form *(ϝ)ἰφίτιμος are the names Ἰφιτος (*Il.* 2.518, 17.306) and the derivatives Ἰφιτίων (*Il.* 20.382) and Ἰφιτίδης (*Il.* 3.128). There is no doubt that Ἰφιτος is a shortened form of a longer name. Monro considers it similar to Εὔρυτος, Ἔχετος, etc. where the second part of the compound has been dropped and the suffix το-ς has taken its place (Εὔρυτος from Εὐρυβάτης or Εὐρύλαος for example)[20]). According to this Ἰφιτος might stand for Ἰφιδάμας. I think it more probable, however, that Ἰφιτος is a name shortened in the same manner as Αἴγισθος, Σθένελος, Ἰφικλος (< Αἰγισθένης, Σθενέλαος, Ἰφικλέης) whereby the first part of the compound remains intact and the second one is reduced only to the consonantal part of the stem with

---

[19]) See M. Ventris, T. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenean Greek* (Cambridge 1959) 79.

[20]) D. B. Monro, *Homeric Grammar* (Oxford 1891) 125; Also Schwyzer in *op. cit.* 1.503.

6   Apostolos Athanassakis

the ending -ος added to it. If so, the -τ in "Ιφιτος might be what is left from the stem of the second member of the reconstructed compound adjective *(Ϝ)ἰφίτιμος. It is interesting that Ἴφιτος may exhibit an initial Ϝ at least once in *Hes. Cat.* 79.4 τοξεὺς τ' ἀντίθεος ἰδὲ Ἴφιτος, ὄζος Ἄρηος (cf. also the suspicious πρῶτον δ' ἕλεν Ἰφιτίωνα in *Il.* 20.383). Longer forms such as Αἰγισθένης, Πατροκλέης, Ἰφικλέης, etc., have built-in cretics, just as *(Ϝ)ἰφίτιμος does, and although the pattern of shortening may not be indicated only by metrical necessity, the resulting metrical convenience can be hardly ignored. The course, however, which was open to the poet in the case of a proper noun, could not be followed in other cases[21]).

Although scholars justly have reservations whenever changes in the structure and phonology of a word are accounted for by appeal to metrical convenience, it is beyond doubt that such changes took place[22]). Syncope as a way of rendering a word metrically admissible into a line of poetry cannot have been popular[23]), but Schwyzer's assertion that it is „vollends unerwiesen und kaum wahrscheinlich" is unduly strong[24]). Surely there is syncope in φέρτε (*Il.* 9.971) contrasting with φέρετ' (*Il.* 17.718), πυκνός for the much more common πυκινός, and in such forms as κάτθανε, κάββαλε where Schwyzer would not accept Ehrlich's view that there is a metrical reason for leaving out the vowel of the preposition[25]). In our presumed *Ϝιφίτιμος syncopation of the second ι would be necessary on account of the built-in cretic and, perhaps, also dissimilatory and euphonic[26]).

What about the next step, namely, the spread of aspiration within the word? The spread of aspiration in Greek from one consonant to another does not occur in accordance with phonological regularity of the kind which might lead us to the formulation of a rule governing its behavior. It is irregular and haphazard and, therefore, unpredictable; but it does occur, and it does not require immediate proximity of the two consonants (Φερσεφόνα, θυφλός, θεθμός, φάρχμα,

---

[21]) Ἔκατος may not be the shortened form of ἑκατηβόλος (as suggested by Monro in loco cit., and Liddell-Scott s.v.), but even if it is, it almost has the force of a proper noun always applied to Apollo (cf. Ἑκάτη).

[22]) For a full discussion see Chantraine, *op. cit.* 94–112.

[23]) Modern Greek employs it in poetry, but sparingly, and never to the extent that the resulting form is difficult to recognize.

[24]) *Op. cit.* 1.239 (n. 9).

[25]) Schwyzer, *op. cit.* 1.239; H. Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der gr. Betonung* (Berlin 1912) 1–57 passim.

[26]) Regarding ζείδωρος for the expected but metrically inadmissible *ζειόδωρος see Monro, *op. cit.* 118. Interesting is also the case of αἶθοψ contrasting with Αἰθίοψ which may be the older form (for possible occurrence in the Mycenean tablets see Ventris-Chadwick, *op. cit.* 99).

ῥηχμός)[27]). Forms such as ἤχθη, ἤφθη, ἐδιώχθη attest to the fact that the spread of assimilation is not confined only to examples from inscriptions which could be labelled as isolated irregularities, or, sometimes, downright errors. Assimilation involving the change of τ to the corresponding aspirated stop θ in the presumed *(F)ἰφίτιμος, particularly, after the dropping of the -ι is not an impossibility.

We now come to that part of our inquiry which should deal with the meaning of ἴφθιμος by examing the various contexts in which the word is found and by trying to account for the obvious divergence which characterizes its usage. Ἴφθιμος is used to qualify not only individual heroes, but also their souls, heads, and shoulders. Those who are not preplexed by the traditional rendition "mighty" will find no contradiction thus far. Yet, one cannot but begin to have some scruples when one encounters the very same word as an epithet describing heads of cattle, and royal spouses such as Penelope or Arētē, or young princesses such as Ktimenē or Pērō.

Throughout our search for another meaning which might account better for the rather wide application of the epithet, the suggested parent form *(F)ἰφίτιμος will be tested in each case within the context of ἴφθιμος. In a compound of this type the emphasis and, hence, the meaning lie in the non-adverbial component. This means, in turn, that in the present case it is the word τιμή in its primary meanings which should give us the primary meanings of ἴφθιμος.

The first part of *(F)ἰφίτιμος, however, occurs independently, and ἶφι has the force of the old instrumental case. Thus *(F)ἰφίτιμος may not behave exactly the same way as, let us say, ἐρίτιμος, the first part of which has no independent existence. Indeed in some compounds with ἶφι such as Ἰφιδάμεια, Ἰφιάνασσα (cf. ἶφι ἀνάσσεις Il. 1.38) it seems that the first part retains its full force as opposed to Ἰφικλος (< Ἰφικλέης), Ἰφίνοος in which it seems to simply act much like ἐρι- in ἐρίτιμος, that is, like a quantitatively qualifying adverbial prefix. Originally *(F)ἰφίτιμος may have also meant 'honored with power,' hence, 'powerful' (cf. Ἰφιάνασσα = ἶφι ἀνάσσουσα). But compounds such as Ἰφικλος, Ἰφίνοος (= having much κλέος or νοῦς) show that ἶφι gradually followed the way of other case adverbs. *(F)ἰφίτιμος could thus mean "having much τιμή." Although this last meaning has become more prevalent, the other one, that is, "powerful," is still to be found in a few cases.

There are lines in which the traditional rendition seems both fitting and likely. In *Il.* 8.144 where Lattimore translates "no man can beat back the purposes of Zeus not even one very strong, since Zeus is by far the greater" (φέρτερος), "strong" for ἴφθιμος is not guaranteed only by the context but also by the presence of φέρτερος, which clearly always refers to power, usually, physical. The same meaning is undoubtedly demanded by the context in *Il.* 12.410 and

---

[27]) For these and other similar examples from inscriptions see C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago 1955) 59–60.

8   Apostolos Athanassakis

20.356, where the word occurs in a similar context and in exactly the same formula. In 12.410 the adjective refers to Sarpedon and in 20.356 to Achilles. Both exhort their men to follow them in the persuit of a task which requires physical strength ($[F]\breve{\iota}\varsigma$). Although rivers are gods and as such enjoy certain $\tau\iota\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}$, there can be little doubt that in *Il.* 17.749 the reference is to the power of rushing streams. Patroklos has just been killed and the Achaeans are carrying his body while the two Ajaxes are holding off the pressing Trojans. $\check{\omega}\varsigma$ $\tau\varepsilon$ $\pi\varrho\grave{\omega}\nu$ $\grave{\iota}\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\varepsilon\iota$ $\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omega\varrho$ | $\grave{\upsilon}\lambda\acute{\eta}\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$, $\pi\varepsilon\delta\acute{\iota}o\iota o$ $\delta\iota\alpha\pi\varrho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota o\nu$ $\tau\varepsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\eta\varkappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, | $\check{o}\varsigma$ $\tau\varepsilon$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$ $\pi o\tau\alpha\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\grave{\alpha}\lambda\varepsilon\gamma\varepsilon\iota\nu\grave{\alpha}$ $\acute{\varrho}\acute{\varepsilon}\varepsilon\vartheta\varrho\alpha$ | $\breve{\iota}\sigma\chi\varepsilon\iota$ ... (*Il.* 17.747/750). The meaning "powerful" can hardly be doubted when $\breve{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\iota\mu o\varsigma$ refers to the gigantic man-eating Laistrygones in *Od.* 10.119. The same meaning is incontestable in *Od.* 16.89. Telemachos tells Odysseus, still unrecognized and giving the impression of a suppliant beggar, that he does not want to send him to the palace among the insolent suitors adding: $\pi\varrho\tilde{\eta}\xi\alpha\iota$ δ' $\grave{\alpha}\varrho\gamma\alpha\lambda\acute{\varepsilon}o\nu$ $\tau\iota$ $\mu\varepsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\lambda\varepsilon\acute{o}\nu\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\iota\nu$ $\grave{\varepsilon}\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ | $\check{\alpha}\nu\delta\varrho\alpha$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\breve{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\iota\mu o\nu$, $\grave{\varepsilon}\pi\varepsilon\grave{\iota}$ $\tilde{\eta}$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\grave{\iota}$ $\varphi\acute{\varepsilon}\varrho\tau\varepsilon\varrho o\acute{\iota}$ $\varepsilon\grave{\iota}\sigma\iota$. Somewhat less certain but rather likely is this meaning in *Od.* 16.244, 19.110, 24.26 where the word occurs in the formulaic $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\tilde{\iota}\sigma\iota$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\acute{\iota}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota$. Telemachos speaking to his father, before the encounter with the suitors, warns him with the remark $o\grave{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\varepsilon}$ $\varkappa\varepsilon\nu$ $\varepsilon\check{\iota}\eta$ | $\check{\alpha}\nu\delta\varrho\varepsilon$ $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\tilde{\iota}\sigma\iota$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\acute{\iota}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota$ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\chi\varepsilon\sigma\vartheta\alpha\iota$. In *Od.* 19.110 Odysseus speaking to Penelope as a stranger likens her to a king $\grave{\alpha}\nu\delta\varrho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu$ $\grave{\varepsilon}\nu$ $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\tilde{\iota}\sigma\iota$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\acute{\iota}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota\nu$ $\grave{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$. The reference is, of course, to the suitors and it is no genuine compliment, but a specious one intended to elicit a response which might make it plain to Odysseus whether his wife derived any vainglorious pleasure from "lording it over" so many zealous suitors, all sons of noble families. In *Od.* 24.24/26 the soul of Achilles calls Agamemnon dearer to Zeus because he ruled over $\pi o\lambda\lambda o\tilde{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$ $\tau\varepsilon$ $\varkappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\grave{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\acute{\iota}\mu o\iota\sigma\iota\nu$. There is a chance that originally the formula did not mean "many powerful (men)" but, rather "the many (i.e. the $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$) and those much honored." In other words, the phrase might contain a distinction between the privileged chieftains and the rest of the people. This implication, rather unlikely in *Od.* 16.244, cannot be excluded in *Od.* 19.110 and 24.26.

Pelagon, Sarpedon's $\varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda o\varsigma$ $\grave{\varepsilon}\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varrho o\varsigma$, is called $\breve{\iota}\varphi\vartheta\iota\mu o\varsigma$ in *Il.* 5.695, and the companions of Odysseus are also described with the same epithet (*Od.* 20.20 and 23.313). That the word may have more to do with $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$ in the sense of "price" or "value" than with power may be suggested by the expression preceding the characterisation in 23.313. Odysseus, telling Penelope of his adventures, $\tilde{\eta}$ δ' $\check{o}\sigma\alpha$ $K\acute{\upsilon}\varkappa\lambda\omega\psi$ $\check{\varepsilon}\varrho\xi\varepsilon$,

καί ὡς ἀπετίσατο ποινήν | ἰφθίμων ἑταίρων ... As we shall see, this is not the only instance in which some form of the verb τίω is found in proximity with ἴφθιμος. In this specific case ποινή is the blood-price which Odysseus exacted in kind from the monstrous Polyphemos. A blood-price, i.e., a material compensation in case of homicide, was given to the family of the slain man (cf. *Il.* 18.498). Such compensation could be given for loss or deprivation (*Il.* 5.266 ποινὴ Γανυμήδεος). One's companions were "honored" or "valued" by him since they were singled out and preferred over other men. It is this feeling that ἴφθιμος may have conveyed when applied to companions. It is also possible that, in the absence of those next of kin, a companion felt under obligation to exact the blood-price for a slain comrade's life.

The fact that the word is applied to Sthenelos and Eurymedon, Nestor's two trusty squires (*Il.* 8.114), need not negate the idea that ἴφθιμος is, almost without exception, an epithet characterising individuals whose origin is above that of a common warrior. There is nothing to suggest that the θεράποντες were of servile origin or status. The impression which we get in the epic is that they were young scions of noble families attached to a chieftain as squires. Only on these terms could they share this complimentary epithet with the most distinguished heroes of the *Iliad* (Achilles 20.356, Agastrophos 11.373, Aias 5.625, Aineias 16.620, Diomedes 8.144, Glaukos-Sarpedon 12.376, Melanippos 15.547, Menelaos 17.554, Sarpedon 5.675 and 12.410, Sthenelos 23.511, Thoas 4.534). Only in 8.144 and 12.376 do we have to infer the names; in all other instances they are found in immediate proximity with the qualifying ἴφθιμος. Certainly these heroes were "mighty"; all epic heroes are. What distinguishes them beyond this is their either expressly mentioned or clearly implied position as leaders (ἡγεμόνες, ἡγήτορες) and their descent from noble and, consequently, wealthy families. Agastrophos is not as conspicuous, but the squires attached to him and the appelation ἥρως (*Il.* 11.339–341) are unmistakable tokens of noble origin. There remains Melanippos, who is less well-known, but whose case, as we shall see, is especially interesting. To all these heroes belong τιμαί which are specific and do not come only in the form of "honor" in the sense of respect. Some of these honors are enumerated twice in the same order and in the same passage (*Il.* 12.310ff). In view of the special τιμαί which were accorded to leading heroes ἴφθιμος < *Ϝιφίτιμος should present no problems. One of the above mentioned heroes, Melanippos, at first appears somewhat too

10   Apostolos Athanassakis

obscure and inconspicuous to merit such commendation. However, a brief inquiry into his family tree and a very significant tip from the text should be convincing. He is the son of Hiketaon, a brother of Priamos and one of the Trojan leaders (see *Il.* 3.146–152 and 20.236–239). One might object that the father's honored position did not ensure the son certain privileges which were enjoyed by royal offspring. The *Iliad,* however, not only offers us assurance of this, but uses the very word whose root I assume to be part of ἴφθιμος. Indeed in *Iliad* 15.551 we are told that Priamos μιν τίεν ἶσα τέκεσσι. We should translate "he honored him as much as his children." It is as though the poet, having introduced a less conspicuous character, felt obliged to justify calling him ἴφθιμος with the above mentioned line, whose phrasing should not be passed over lightly.

The epithet is not applied only to single individuals, but also to groups of men. It occurs in the phrases ἰφθίμων Δαναῶν (*Il.* 11.290) and ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι (*Il.* 12.417 and 16.659), and the general assumption is that it refers to the entire host. A closer scrutiny of the context of the phrases in question shows that this assumption may be wrong. In *Il.* 11.276 the wounded Agamemnon calls upon the ἡγήτορες Ἀργείων to defend the ships. Then in 11.289–290 Hektor exhorts Trojan, Lykian, and Dardanian warriors to battle saying: ... ἀλλ' ἰθὺς ἐλαύνετε μώνυχας ἵππους / ἰφθίμων Δαναῶν, ἵν' ὑπέρτερον εὖχος ἄρησθε. The phrase ὑπέρτερον εὖχος should lead us to believe that not all the Danaans are meant and that we should perhaps translate "but drive your single-hoofed horses straight against the much honored Danaans so that you may win superior glory." The lines which follow confirm this view. Hektor proceeds to fight ἐν πρώτοισι, kills nine ἡγεμόνας Δαναῶν, and then turns his wrath against the multitude (πληθύς of *l.*305). All this clearly suggests that attention was first directed against the ἴφθιμοι and then against other warriors, who are collectively referred to with the word πληθύς. The case of ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι in *Il.* 12.417 is not as clear. Is it not possible that, when Sarpedon calls upon the ἀντιθέοισι Λυκίοισι in *Il.* 12.408, he is addressing himself to the leaders, and that when we read οὔτε γάρ ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι Δαναῶν ἐδύναντο / τεῖχος ῥηξάμενοι θέσθαι παρὰ νηυσὶ κέλευθον. (*Il.* 12.417–418) again only the leaders are meant? Sarpedon referred to himself as ἴφθιμος in the same passage (12.410), and it makes better sense to assume that the ἀντίθεοι of *l.*408 and the ἴφθιμοι of *l.*417 are the same group of people, namely, the leaders and not the entire host. Sarpedon, who is called ἴφθιμος, is also called ἀντίθεος (*Il.* 5.629, 663, 692; 6.199; 16.649); and I find it unlikely

that two words which are used to qualify some of the most distin-
guished heroes, are here indiscriminately referring to the Lykian
multitude. *Il.* 16.659 ἔνθ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι μένον ἀλλὰ φόβηθεν /
πάντες ... presents us with a similar problem. Sarpedon has just been
killed and Hektor and the Trojans have taken to their heels. To be
able to decide whether the epithet refers to all the Lykians or just
to their leaders, one must read very carefully *Il.* 16.306–675.
Patroklos has been sent forth by Achilles to lead the Myrmidons in
battle against the Trojans. There is no doubt that the battle which
ensues rages between the armies and not just between the leaders; but
Homer, naturally, concentrates on them. The first victim of Patroklos
is Pyraichmes, leader of the Paionians (*Il.* 16.287–292). Then, *ll.*
16.306–307 ἔνθα δ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἕλεν ἄνδρα κεδασθείσης ὑσμίνης / ἡγεμόνων ...
support beyond doubt the idea that the poet focuses his attention
on the leaders. What follows is indeed a description of a bloody
debacle in which some of the most prominent Achaean heroes
(Patroklos, Aias, Meriones, Idomeneus, and others) kill prominent
enemies in duel. Again line 16.351 οὗτοι ἄρ᾽ ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν ἕλον
ἄνδρα ἕκαστος is a reminder that it is the battling leaders who engage
the poet's interest. As the battle goes on, Patroklos wreaks havock
on the enemy by killing several men; these, too, are not ordinary
warriors but Sarpedon's ἀμιτροχίτωνες ἑταῖροι (16.419), noble enough
to be called ἐσθλοί (16.425). Sarpedon himself mortally wounded by
Patroklos calls on Glaukos πρῶτα μὲν ὄτρυνον Λυκίων ἡγήτορας
ἄνδρας / πάντῃ ἐποιχόμενος ... (16.495–496). Glaukos does just that
and, in addition, calls upon the Trojan leaders (16.534–538), who
join in the battle around the fallen Sarpedon, the object being to
prevent the Achaeans from stripping the slain hero of his armor.
More heroes are killed in the fray and, then, Hektor, forced by the
will of Zeus, flees and urges the other Trojans to do likewise. It is
exactly at this point that we are told ἔνθ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι μένον,
ἀλλὰ φόβηθεν / πάντες, ἐπεὶ βασιλέα ἴδον βεβλαμμένον ἦτορ. As we have
seen, the poet has ignored the action of the mass of the armies
fighting around the slain hero. Why should he suddenly shift his
attention to them? The word οὐδέ lends this interpretation greater
likelihood because of its emphatic character. Πάντες, then, must
refer not to all the Lykians but to all their ἡγήτορες whose action
concerns the poet throughout the description of this long battle,
and whose stature merits adjectives such as ἀντίθεοι or ἴφθιμοι.

It is time now to discuss a passage in the *Iliad* (12.310ff.) in which
Sarpedon addresses Glaukos in a manner which cannot be irrelevant

Apostolos Athanassakis

to the epithets ἀντίθεος and, I assume, ἴφθιμος as well. This passage must be quoted in full: *Γλαῦκε, τίη δὴ νῶϊ τετιμήμεσθα μάλιστα / ἕδρῃ τε κρέασίν τε ἰδὲ πλείοις δεπάεσσιν / ἐν Λυκίῃ, πάντες δὲ θεοὺς ὣς εἰσορόωσι / καὶ τέμενος νεμόμεσθα μέγα Ξάνθοιο παρ' ὄχθας / καλὸν φυταλίης καὶ ἀρούρης πυροφόροιο· / τῶ νῦν χρὴ Λυκίοισι μέτα πρώτοισι ἐόντας / ἑστάμεν ἠδὲ μάχης καυστείρης ἀντιβολῆσαι / ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἴπῃ Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων. / οὐ μὰν ἀκλεέες Λυκίην κάτα κοιρανέουσιν / ἡμέτεροι βασιλῆες, ἔδουσί τε πίονα μῆλα / οἶνόν τ' ἔξαιτον μελιηδέα, ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ ἲς / ἐσθλή, ἐπεὶ Λυκίοισι μέτα πρώτοισι μάχονται.* Both Sarpedon and Glaukos should lead the Lykian warriors to battle so as to deservedly enjoy the honors which are accorded them, and so as to receive recognition of their power from the warriors under their command. We should not ignore the significance of the word τε-τιμήμεσθα, and the specific enumeration of the τιμαί in appropriate order (ἕδρη, κρέατα, δέπα) in 12.311 for which 12.318–320 offer only a variation (κοιρανίη, πίονα μῆλα, οἶνος ἔξαιτος). Bearing this in mind, we can slightly paraphrase 11.318–321, without distorting the meaning, with "our kings are not enjoying their honors ingloriously, but they have might (ἲς), since they fight with the Lykians in the front lines." The form ἲς, so emphatically mentioned here as an integral property of a king who deserves his τιμαί, could constitute the first part of ἴφθιμος < *(F)ἰφίτιμος, an adjective applied many times to Sarpedon himself, to Glaukos and Sarpedon, and to them and other leaders under their command (12.376). I am not suggesting that Homer is etymologizing, but I think that the unmistakable presence in the same important speech of the very elements (ἲς, τιμή) which make up the suggested parent form of ἴφθιμος cannot be insignificant. Sarpedon whom Glaukos addresses in this speech is called ἀντίθεος no fewer than six times in the *Iliad*. The fact that the phrase πάντες δὲ θεοὺς ὣς εἰσορόωσι (12.312) both explains and justifies ἀντίθεος, makes a connection between the word τετιμήμεσθα (with the elucidation which follows it) and ἲς with ἴφθιμος very tempting and not unreasonable. It also shows that *(F)ἰφίτιμος in some cases may have been felt as a dvadva type of compound. i.e., a determinative possessive compound with both components equally contributing to the meaning (having ἲς and τιμή). The few seemingly aberrant cases in which ἴφθιμος must mean just 'strong' can be accepted without much difficulty. In other words, in a few cases the second part of the compound is not emphasized at all. *Od.* 10.119 offers such an example. There the adjective qualifies the Laistrygones, the gigantic man-eaters, whose king prepared for dinner

one of the three scouts whom Odysseus had sent forth to their unfriendly kingdom.

With one exception, namely, ἰφθίμων ποταμῶν (*Il.* 17.749), thus far we have discussed the application of the word to mortals. Of the gods only Hades (Ἄιδης) is called ἴφθιμος twice in the *Odyssey* (10.534, 11.47), and twice in the *Theogony* of Hesiod (455,768). Proteus, too, the old man of the sea, is called ἴφθιμος (*Od.* 4.365). He is a lesser god who is described in *Od.* 4.385–386 as ἀθάνατος Πρωτεὺς Αἰγύπτιος ὅς τε θαλάσσης / πάσης βένθεα οἶδε, Ποσειδάωνος ὑποδμώς. He is Poseidon's "minister," and knows the depths of all the sea. It is this distinction which may earn him the title ἴφθιμος. But what about the gloomy and dreaded Hades? Prima facie any connection of Hades with τιμή seems less than likely. The text of the *Iliad*, however, justifies and substantiates the use of an adjective like *(F)ἰφίτιμος in reference to Hades. Poseidon, in an angry protest against Zeus, calls himself ὁμότιμος (*Il.* 15.186) to both Zeus and Hades explaining that τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ᾽ ἔμμορε τιμῆς. / ἤτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν. αἰεὶ / παλλομένων, Ἄιδης δ᾽ ἔλαχεν ζόφον ἠερόεντα (*Il.* 15.189–191).

We should now examine the peculiar use of ἴφθιμος as a qualifying adjective for the heads (κεφαλαί, κάρηνα) not only of heroes but also of cattle, as well as for their soul and their shoulders. The phrase ἴφθιμοι ψυχαί occurs only once in the well-known third line of the *Iliad*, and is parallelled by ἴφθιμαι κεφαλαί in *Il.* 11.55. Both are used in a similar context, namely, that of dispatching heroes to Hades. In the few cases in which ἴφθιμος seems to mean "mighty" the reference is definitely to physical strength, something which a soul does not possess. The shift from the hero to his soul becomes easier to understand, if we assume that the semasiological connections of our adjective lie mainly with something other than strength. The expression ἴφθιμος κεφαλή is in every respect synonymous to ἴφθιμον κάρη, which is used thrice in the *Iliad* (3.336, 15.480, 16.137) and once in the *Odyssey* (22.123). If ἴφθιμον κάρη can be explained better in terms of a compound in which the emphasis is on τιμή, then ἴφθιμοι ψυχαί, patterned after ἴφθιμοι κεφαλαί, should present no serious problem. It has been maintained that the "epithet more narrowly expressive of bodily strength is ἴφθιμος ...[28]) The same source also maintains that the head was considered as one of the sources of the

---

[28]) R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (Cambridge 1954) 193ff.

14   Apostolos Athanassakis

vital fluid, and, hence of strength[29]). The first statement is far too strong, considering the number of instances in which the context indicates that ἴφθιμος refers to physical strength; and, to my knowledge, no support can be found for the second one.

It is common knowledge that putting a price on a man's head is a custom which has persisted down to present day. In our days this is usually done for criminals wanted by the law. Putting a price on a man's head, i.e., estimating the value of his life, however, does not always have an opprobrious character. In more primitive times, when no abstract ethical notions existed about a man's life and about the act of murdering, settling a dispute over the loss of a family member was done solely along material lines. In Homeric times murdering does not seem to have been looked upon as an act carrying ethical, religious, or supramundane implications with it. There was no miasma attached to murder and no religious purification was required, as in later times, in order to free the murderer of pollution[30]). A man who took another man's life had two alternatives. The one was to leave his homeland, and to wander abroad as an unprotected and worthless (ἀτίμητος) immigrant, since no blood-money (τιμή) was attached to his life and anyone could harm him or kill him with impunity[31]). The other alternative was to pay materially for the slain man's life. The sum had to be agreed upon by the contending parties, which might submit to arbitration, if further complications arose. The famous trial scene depicted on the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.497–508) is such a process of arbitration over the claims of two men who ἐνείκεον ἕνεκα ποινῆς / ἀνδρὸς ἀποφθιμένου (*ll.*498–499). One of the two men declared that he had given everything, while the offended party refused to have received anything. The contended blood-price must have been a very large one, since two talents of gold, presumably a fraction of the ποινή, would go to the judge who would speak the straightest judgment

---

[29]) *Ibid.* The argument that the phrase νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (*Od.* 10.521, 536 and 11.29, 49) offers support for this idea is not sound. Even if we could be certain that ἀμενηνός is derived from μένος, we might not be justified in translating μένος with "strength." It resides in a man's φρένες (*Il.* 1.106; *Od.* 1.89), and it is something which, much like ψυχή, can be breathed out (cf. *Od.* 24.319, *Il.* 6.182). The expression μένεα πνείοντες found several times in the epic speaks for itself. The phrase ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, whatever its precise meaning, should not be taken as the opposite of ἴφθιμα κάρηνα.

[30]) See Κωνστ. Γαρδίκας, Τό Ποινικὸν καὶ ἰδίᾳ τὸ Φονικὸν δίκαιον παρ' Ὁμήρῳ (Ἀθηνᾶ 1919) 214ff.

[31]) For the expression ἀτίμητος μετανάστης see *Il.* 9.648, and 16.59.

(*Il.* 507–508)[32]). It seems that age or intention played no role. Thus, Patroklos, having killed the son of Adamas over a game of knuckle-bones, was taken by his father to the house of Peleus where he was reared with Achilles. The fact that he was a child (τυτθός) did not matter. He, too, had to face the consequence of harsh exile[33]). In the event of a preagreed duel, such as that between Menelaos and Alexandros in the third book of the *Iliad* there is no blood-price to be paid. The τιμή, which Agamemnon demands in addition to Helen and whatever possessions she took with her (*Il.* 3.284–291), is a compensation which the Trojans must pay, should Menelaos be victorious. This compensation must have been felt as some sort of indemnity for the harm done to Menelaos and for the hardships brought upon the Achaeans. Yet, much is at stake for the Achaeans in this duel because, if Menelaos should be slain, they would have to board their ships and go home after many years of war fought in vain (*ll.* 281–283). One might say that there is an especially good reason here for the formulaic κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκεν (*Il.* 3.336). The very same formula is repeated elsewhere in reference to Teukros (*Il.* 15.480), Patroklos (*Il.* 16.137), and Odysseus (*Od.* 22.123). Strictly speaking the blood-price is material compensation given to the next of kin of a slain man. It seems, however, that the idea of the price of a man's life existed even in war and that a close friend or comrade would feel obliged to exact it by way of revenge, i.e., by slaying the slayer and shedding blood for blood[34]). τιμή or ποινή appears to be the equivalent of the Germanic "Wergeld," that is, the compensation given to the elders of a slain man's clan who would then swear not to raise any further claims[35]). By Homer's time the word τιμή began transcending its purely concrete meaning and acquiring a slightly abstract connotation. It is,

---

[32]) For the difficulties which are involved in understanding the circumstances of the arbitration is this scene see Professor H. Hommel's article *Die Gerichtsszene auf dem Schild des Achilleus*, Palingenesia (Wiesbaden 1969) IV, 11ff. As to the controversy over the meaning of *ll.* 499–501, I have been won over to the side of those who, like Professor Hommel, take it as certain „daß die Frage der Abgeltung des Mordes zwischen dem Mörder und dem nächsten Blutsverwandten des Erschlagenen prinzipiell schon erledigt ist" (*Ibid.* p. 17).

[33]) *Il.* 23.85–90.   [34]) See *Il.* 13.414, 14.484, 21.28, 21.134.

[35]) The price for manslaughter was not small. „Ursprünglich gab man Vieh, später Geld, die schwerste Buße war das Wergeld ..., es betrug in der fränkischen Zeit 200 Solidi, wobei ein Solidus den Wert einer Kuh gehabt haben mag." Alfred Hönger, *Rechtsentwicklung, Deutschkunde* (Leipzig 1929) 93.

therefore, possible that ἴφθιμον κάρη and ἴφθιμος, in general, when applied to heroes and kings, might mean "highly-valued" in the sense of "esteemed;" but there is nothing to exclude the conjectured earlier and purely concrete meaning.

At first, in view of the suggested explanation for ἴφθιμον κάρη in regard to men, the expression βοῶν τ᾽ ἴφθιμα κάρηνα (*Il.* 23.260; also in Hymn to Hermes *ll.* 94, 302, 394, 402) should appear rather odd. Although even in our days "head of cattle" is by no means unknown, the expression may still be a periphrasis for ἰφθίμους βόας. This, however, still does not really alter the problem. The translation is, as usual, "mighty," "stout," "powerful." Yet, there are other animals, including lions, and even monsters, mentioned in the early epic, far more powerful than oxen, and none is characterised by the epithet ἴφθιμος. This limitation cannot be meaningless. As all primitive societies, Homeric society placed a great value on cattle, used them in trade, and even counted the worth of other commercial items by using cattle as a sort of numismatic unit. Thus, in *Il.* 23.703–704, among other trophies at the funeral games for Patroklos, we find a great tripod which the Achaeans valued (τῖον) at twelve head of cattle (δυωδεκαβόειον), and a woman whose price was only four head of cattle (τεσσαράβοιος). Ἴφθιμα κάρηνα βοῶν are among the trophies which Achilles took out of the ships for the funeral games (*Il.* 23.260). The trophies include *lebetes*, tripods, horses, mules, women, iron, gold. If the value of all the other items could be counted in terms of heads of cattle, there should be nothing surprising about referring to these animals which were used to set prices (notice τῖον) as *(ϝ)ἰφίτιμα, i.e., very valuable or precious[36]).

Our word is used to describe the shoulders of Achilles once in the *Iliad* (18.204), and those of Apollo in the Homeric Hymn to this god (*l.* 7). It is true that the expression "strong" or "mighty shoulders" does not have to be infelicitous. Even here, however, it is likely that the underlying semasiological element is τιμή. The shoulders carry the warrior's most precious armour (τεύχεα or ἔντεα)[37]), and the normal expressions for despoiling a fallen enemy are ὤμοιϊν τεύχεα ἀφελέσθαι, ἀπ᾽ ὤμων τεύχεα ἑλέσθαι, ἀπ᾽ ὤμων τεύχεα συλᾶν[38]). The importance and value which the heroic world placed upon armor

[36]) See Wace-Stubbings, *Companion to Homer* (London 1962) 543, 439. Cf. also the semasiological development of L. *pecunia*, and Germanic *Vieh* (whence "fee").

[37]) For an impressive description see *Il.* 11.15–46.

[38]) *Il.* 16.663, 19.412, 6.28.

was great. Pieces of armor are described as καλά or κλυτά and are valuable not only for their precious metals but also for their superb workmanship. The τιμή which is attached to them, and which goes to the victorious despoiler, is twofold. They are part of the hero's prowess and, at the same time, they have a definite material value which must have been coveted by the plunder-loving Homeric warrior. It is not unlikely that the expression ἴφθιμοι ὦμοι is con- sistent with the meaning of the word suggested in this article.

The traditional rendition of ἴφθιμος with "mighty," "powerful," particularly in reference to physical strength is more difficult to accept in the case of women. The cases in point are *Il.* 5.415 (wife of Diomedes), *Il.* 19.116 (wife of Sthenelos); also, in the *Odyssey* 16.332 and 23.92 (Penelope), 10.106 (daughter of Antiphates, king of Laistrygones), 12.452 (Queen Arētē), 15.364 (Ktimenē, sister of Odysseus), 11.287 (Pērō, daughter of Neleus), 4.797 (daughter of Ikarios and sister of Penelope). It should be noted that all these women share one characteristic, they are either queens or princesses. Despite the presence among them of the Laistrygonian princess whose parents are man-eating giants, the reference to physical strength is doubtful. Curiously enough, the encounter of Odysseus' men with the princess is peaceful and civil and nothing about her startles them or shocks them. She shows them the way to the palace of Antiphates. How are we to reconcile the notion of strength either with the aging Penelope or with old queen Arētē? It might be argued that perhaps the implication is one of "ruling power," but Penelope is completely helpless and at the mercy of the wanton suitors, while queen Arētē, despite the respect which her husband and children accord her, is not in any way transcending her subordinate role in the patriarchal frame of her society[39]). Let us abandon the idea of strength or power and look at the question with a view to the hypothetical *(Ϝ)ἰφίτιμος*, and, consequently, to τιμή in its two prin- cipal meanings, namely that of respect, perhaps in a more concrete sense than our own, and that of value or price. Whereas we are nowhere told about Arētē's strength, Homer is very clear on the τιμή which she enjoyed: Ἀρήτην· τὴν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ποίησατ' ἄκοιτιν | καί μιν ἔτισ' ὡς οὔτις ἐπὶ χθονὶ τίεται ἄλλη, | ὅσσαι νῦν γε γυναῖκες ὑπ' ἀνδράσιν οἶκον ἔχουσιν. | ὥς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηταί τε καὶ ἔστιν | ἔκ τε φίλων παίδων ἔκ τ' αὐτοῦ Ἀλκινόοιο. (*Od.* 7.66–70). This passage

---

[39]) For her very womanly role in the royal household see *Il.* 7.235 and 8.423/424.

18 Apostolos Athanassakis

is not unique. There is a better one in which Eumaios tells Odysseus that his mother brought him up with her daughter Ktimenē θυγα-τέρ' ἰφθίμῃ, τὴν ὁπλοτάτην τέκε παίδων· / τῇ ὁμοῦ ἐτρεφόμην, ὀλίγον δέ τι μ' ἧσσον ἐ τ ί μ α (*Od.* 15.364–365). The τιμή accorded Ktimenē may yet have another side. It is well-known that in the Homeric world the bridegroom paid a price for his bride (the so called ἔδνα). When Ktimenē became of age, she was married obviously to a wealthy nobleman in Samos and her parents μυρί' ἕλοντο (*Od.* 15.367). It is possible that this fact, particularly in the case of fair young princes-ses for whom their suitors had to offer handsome material rewards, contributed to their being looked upon as very "valuable." Indeed, such phrases as πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκεν, πορὼν ἀπερείσια ἔδνα, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα[40]) show that a fair young princess was also an economic asset to her family. Iphidamas, for example, in order to buy his wife, πρῶθ' ἑκα-τὸν βοῦς δῶκεν, ἔπειτα δὲ χίλι' ὑπέστη / αἶγας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὄις, τά οἱ ἄσπετα ποιμαίνοντο. (*Il.* 11.245–246). In some extraordinary occasions a man might hope to take a maiden ἀνάεδνον, but some other form of compensation had to be offered in place of the customary ἔδνα[41]). The bride's father often reciprocated the gesture—we do not know to what extent—by dowering his daughter. Old Priam speaks of ransoming his two sons from Laothoē with copper and gold which came as part of their mother's dowery and which must have been considerable because (*Il.* 22.51) πολλὰ γὰρ ὤπασε παιδὶ γέρων ὀνομάκλυ-τος Ἄλτης. Penelope is called ἰφθίμη twice in the *Odyssey* (16.332, 23.92). Admirers of this model of conjugal fidelity might not find it easy to look upon her either as a financial asset or a financial hazard. Not so, however, her son Telemachos, who, in an obvious reference to his mother's dowery which would have to be returned to her father, tells the suitor Antinoos: ... κακὸν δέ με πολλ' ἀποτίνειν / Ἰκαρίῳ, αἴ κ' αὐτὸς ἑκὼν ἀπὸ μητέρα πέμψω. (*Od.* 2.132–133). Elsewhere Telemachos suggests that the suitors should go to Ikarios, Penelope's father, so that he might dower (ἐεδνώσαιτο) his daughter and give her to whomsoever he pleased[42]). The idea that Penelope might marry one of the suitors, who should pay him as master of the household in his father's absence, is clearly evident in *Od.* 16.73–77, where Tele-machos says that Penelope's second alternative is to follow the best of the Achaeans who wooed her within the palace and the one who paid the most (11.76–77: ὅς τις ἄριστος ... καὶ πλεῖστα πόρῃσιν). It

---

[40]) *Il.* 11.241, 16.178, 16.190.
[41]) See *Il.* 9.144ff., and 13.665ff. [42]) *Od.* 2.53 (cf. *Od.* 2.195ff).

seems that it is taken for granted that in the case of Penelope's sister ἰφθίμη is her name, and not an adjective which qualifies her. The passage in question is ἔνθ᾽ αὖτ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἐνόησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη· / εἴδωλον ποίησε, δέμας δ᾽ ἤϊκτο γυναικί, / Ἰφθίμῃ, κούρῃ μεγαλήτορος Ἰκαρίοιο (Od. 4.795—797). Both the capital I and the comma before κούρη are modern conventions based on an assumption[43]). I think that one could assume even more safely that the girl's name is not given and that the word is used of Penelope's sister to mean what it means in the case of Penelope herself. The name of the Laistrygonian king's daughter is also withheld and, as already mentioned, despite the weirdness of her parents, the young girl behaves in no less civilized manner than Nausikaa (Od. 10.105—111). Finally, there should be no difficulty in assuming ἰφθίμη to mean "valuable," "dear," "well-dowered," or even "honoured," when applied to Aigialeia, the wife of Diomedes (Il. 5.415), or the wife of Sthenelos, lord of Argos Achaikon (Il. 19.116), or for that matter to Pērō, sister of Nestor and daughter of Neleus, who had married his wife Chlōris ἑὸν διὰ κάλλος ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἕδνα (Od. 11.282). Pērō's beauty must not have been inferior to her mother's, since the poet refers to her as θαῦμα βροτοῖσι / τὴν πάντες μνώοντο περικτίται (11.287/8). We should note that ἰφθίμη is not found even once in conjunction with the name of a goddess or of a mortal woman of less than princely standing. In fact, it is always connected with women born to royal houses who are or have been nubile, and for whom we are sometimes clearly told that much was given or paid to the father by the successful suitor. If my conjectured derivation of ἴφθιμος from *(ϝ)ἰφίτιμος is correct, the notion of τιμή, when this compound adjective refers to women, must not be different from that of Germanic brûtmiete[44]).

The use of ἴφθιμος in Hesiod, though naturally more limited than in Homer, is not different in any significant way. Its meaning when applied to Hades (Th. 455, 768) has already been discussed, and there is no problem with ἴφθιμον Φαέθοντα (Th. 987), the son of Ēōs and Kephalos, who is also referred to as δῖος δαίμων (991). So, too, its use in reference to the head of Herakles (Aspis 136), to Proitos (Cat. 6.12), or the kingly suitors of Dēmodokē (Cat. 42.3)[45]). There are two lines in Hesiod where the meaning "strong," "mighty,"

---

[43]) It must be said in all fairness that the opinion is not modern, and that the ancients took the word as a proper name (so Apollonios Sophistes in his lexicon s.v.).

[44]) See Jacob Grimm, Deutsche Rechtsaltertümer (Darmstadt 1965) 1.578 ff. (esp. 585).

[45]) The order to the references in the Catalogi is that followed in the edition by Augustus Traversa (Naples, 1951).

2*

20   Apostolos Athanassakis

seems incontestable, namely *Th.* 698 and *Erga.* 704. They are both of the
"concessive" type, that is, varieties of the formulaic καὶ ἴφθιμός περ ἐών, the
only type of formula in which the meaning "strong" is clearly demanded by
the context [46]). The role of this formula in its several varieties (οὐδὲ μάλ' ἴφθιμος,
ἄνδρα καὶ ἴφθιμον, etc.) must have been signifigant in swaying the opinion of
readers of Homer toward assuming that the adjective meant "strong" in
every case where it did not qualify a woman [47]). In fact, it went so far in deter-
mining the understanding of the word that Hesychius under ἰφθίμη lists the
meanings ἀγαθή, ἰσχυρά, μεγάλη, ἰσχυρόψυχος, ἀνδρεία, thereby implying that
even in the case of women the reference was to strength. It is easy to see how
this came about. The only cases in which context helped in determining what
ἴφθιμος meant were those of the "concessive" type where the meaning was
doubtless "strong." No such obvious clues existed in the remaining instances,
which constituted the majority; hence the generalization. It may be true that
the few cases where the meaning "strong" has to be assumed represent an
early connection with Ϝίς, Ϝῖφι, and testify to an already imperfect under-
standing of the adjective. However, since in so many other lines meanings
other than this one can be shown to be appropriate, Page's statement that
"the epithet . . . is obsolescent already in the *Iliad*" [48]) seems rather strong. It
is *after* the times of Homer and Hesiod that ἴφθιμος, except in a couple of imi-
tations, becomes in fact obsolete, and ceases to be used.

In searching for an appropriate translation of ἴφθιμος, one should
bear in mind the fact that τιμή cannot be accurately rendered with
"honor." Even where this word seems to fit, Homer usually has
something more specific and concrete in mind, such as a reward or a
prize which comes from the divided spoils, or the right to the first
seat in the games, the best meat, and the finest wine. Not
infrequently, it seems to refer to the price which a slayer would have
to pay to kinsman or comrade of a kingly warrior, and the phrase
κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ strongly suggests this. Certainly, in the case of the
heads of oxen the reference is to their material value. Interestingly
enough, our epithet qualifies kingly chieftains or select groups of
nobles and one need no longer puzzle over the ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι; careful
reading of the *Iliad* shows that Homer means only the leaders, just
as he does when he speaks of the ἴφθιμοι Δαναοί. Although the τιμή
given to Arētē may consist of certain concrete tokens of respect, it is

----

[46]) For a discussion of this phrase and its formulaic variations see John
Warden (*op. cit.* 147ff.). It is correctly pointed out in the same article (n. 25)
that in *Theognis* 1388/89 we are faced with a distant relative of this family of
phrases.

[47]) According to *Etymol. Magnum* (s. v.) when qualifying a woman, it
means συνετή.

[48]) D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles
1963) 270, n. 33.

very likely that, when applied to royal spouses and daughters, the word meant the price which a bridegroom paid to the bride's father, or some form of dowery which she brought with her as a gift from her father. It is with this in mind that, besides "mighty" in some few cases, I suggest the following range of meanings for ἴφθιμος: "highly valued," "precious," "dear," "well-dowered;" "much honored," "highly esteemed."

Of course, there cannot be absolute certainty about the derivation of ἴφθιμος from *(F)ἰφίτιμος. However, the disappearance of the initial F, the syncope of an ι belonging to the short element of a cretic, and the spread of aspiration rendering the resultant cluster φτ admissible into the phonological pattern of Greek, are neither unlikely nor unparalleled in the language of the epic. The more original feminine termination -ος points to a compound adjective. The noun Ἴφιτος with a probable F effect, at least once, and a pattern of shortening similar to that of Αἴγισθος < Αἰγισθένης, strongly suggests the existence of the proposed *(F)ἰφίτιμος. Finally the use of some form of τίω / τιμή in connection with those who are qualified with our epithet is such that it cannot be dismissed as mere coincidence. The advantages of the proposed etymology and meaning for ἴφθιμος are abvious. The word is no longer a filler, but a qualifying adjective congruent with the realities of the Homeric world. Once more Homer is not a *sartor verborum*, and aged Arētē can have the meaningfulness of her title deservedly restored to her, since Alkinoos μιν ἔτισ' ὡς οὔτις ἐπὶ χθονὶ τίεται ἄλλη.

The variants of Ἀγαμέμνων

By Eric P. Hamp, University of Chicago

I

It seems to me that Alfred Heubeck[1] has definitely settled the origin and identity of elements of the name of the famous king. We must accept as basic the form *Ἀγα-μέν-μων. Especially convincing

---

[1] *Gedenkschrift Brandenstein* (Innsbruck 1968) 357–61.