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.

22   Eric P. Hamp

is his careful account of the formation pattern of names which we
may formulate (as stages in a generative derivation)

(A) Vb-V^2) + Noun ⇒ Vb + $\begin{cases} \tau o \varrho\text{-} \\ \mu o \nu\text{-} \end{cases}$

($N\varepsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\varepsilon\omega\varsigma$ ⇒ $N\acute{\varepsilon}\sigma\tau\omega\varrho$; $\mathrm{E}\chi\varepsilon + N$ ⇒ e-ko-to $\mathrm{E}\varkappa\tau\omega\varrho$;

$\Phi\varrho\alpha(\delta)\text{-}\,\sigma\iota + N$ ⇒ $\Phi\varrho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\text{-}\tau\omega\varrho/\mu\omega\nu$)

and his identification of *men- as $\mu\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\omega$. Therefore

$$M\varepsilon\nu\acute{\varepsilon}(\lambda\alpha o\varsigma) \Rightarrow M\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\omega\varrho \mid M\acute{\varepsilon}\mu\nu\omega\nu$$

The purpose of this note is to improve three of Heubeck's points of
analysis.

1. Heubeck quite correctly states the metathesis *$\nu\mu > \mu\nu$ as
being essentially the same as the well known *$\tau\varkappa > \varkappa\tau$ etc. The
entire phonological constraint of $\varkappa\tau,\ \gamma\delta,\ \chi\theta,\ \pi\tau,\ \beta\delta,\ \varphi\theta,\ \mu\nu$ may be
generalized in an output rule.

(B) $\begin{bmatrix} \alpha\ \text{obstr} \\ -\ \alpha\ \text{nas} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha\ \text{obstr} \\ -\ \alpha\ \text{nas} \end{bmatrix}$ → [+ grave] [− grave]

Thus these phonological phenomena are not parallels, nor single
instances of avoiding *unbequeme Lautfolgen*; they are, in distinctive
feature terms, but a single pervasive pan-Greek rule, of early date.

2. In terms of the last point, it is clear that (a) the assimilated
forms $A\gamma\alpha\mu\varepsilon\nu(\nu)\omega\nu$ and $A\gamma\alpha\mu\varepsilon\mu\mu\omega\nu$ cannot result from differential
fashions of avoiding the unwanted sequence on the part of Attic;
that had already been accomplished by the above rule prehistori-
cally. And (b) the Attic variant $A\gamma\alpha\mu\varepsilon\sigma\mu\omega\nu$, which clearly goes with
$\mathring{\iota}\sigma\mu\varepsilon\nu$ and $\theta\varepsilon\sigma\mu\acute{o}$s beside Doric $\tau\varepsilon\theta\mu\acute{o}$s, cannot be a simple phono-
logical (phonetic) avoidance of dental + labial nasal.

We must regard these Attic sigmatic forms, which are linked to
verbal paradigms, as extracted afresh from the paradigms where
sigma has absorbed the dental obstruent, just as $\varphi\varrho\alpha\delta$- etc. gives
$\varphi\varrho\alpha\sigma\iota$-. Later the rule was generalized to include obstruents and the
nasal; i.e.

(C) $\begin{bmatrix} -\ \text{grave} \\ +\ \text{obstr} \end{bmatrix}$ → σ / ―― $\begin{bmatrix} +\ \text{grave} \\ +\ \text{nas} \end{bmatrix}$^{3}) (among other environments)

---

^{2}) Cover-symbol for thematic vowel, -$\sigma\iota$, and the like. Incidentally, the $\bar{e}$ of
$A\gamma\acute{\eta}\nu\omega\varrho$ neatly illustrates the laryngeal origin of α- in $\grave{\alpha}\nu\acute{\eta}\varrho$.

^{3}) This may be regarded as a sort of assimilation rule since the gravity
specification was avoided with σ, in the vicinity of μ.

became

$$(D) \quad [- \text{grave}] \rightarrow \sigma \; / \; \underline{\quad\quad} \begin{bmatrix} + \text{grave} \\ + \text{nas} \end{bmatrix}^{4)}$$

Here we have a case of rule simplification, which accounts for paradigmatically generated *v-μ* such as in πέ-φασ-μαι[5]).

The above, which would account for *Αγαμεσμων*, is, as it were, the synchronic result of Kretschmer's second historic form *-μέν-σμων[6]). I believe we must see two parallel alternate results of the latter (either as historical or as underlying) in the assimilation variants with *v(v)* and *μμ*. That is:

(Ea) *vσμ* (or *vhμ*) $> \underset{\circ}{v}μ > μμ$

(Eb) $\qquad\qquad\qquad > \underset{\circ}{v}μ > vv$

That is, we regard the devoiced nasal in each case as the weaker segment and as yielding to the other in gravity, both progressively and regressively.

On these grounds I regard *Αγα-μεν-μων* as yielding in the first instance general Greek Ἀγαμέμνων. Then Attic productively creates *Αγα-μεν-σ-μων*. This leads dialectally (stylistically?) to Ἀγαμεσμων, Ἀγαμεμμων, and Ἀγαμεν(v)ων.

3. When we consider the form of this name, the clear fact of productivity of the elements (esp. *μεν-*) and of such name formations, and what is known of Mycenaean and Homeric society and kingship, the juxtaposition of Ἀγαμέμνων and Μενέλαος is striking. The names of these two great leaders have all the earmarks of mythological or legendary type-names. Μενέ-λαος is 'der dem Ansturm des Kriegsvolks (λαός) standhält'[7]), he is the eponymous *wanakts* who stands against the opposing *rawaketa*. But I do not think that Ἀγαμέμνων is 'der, dessen bezeichnende Eigenschaft es ist, (den Feinden) hervorragend (ἀγα-) standzuhalten'[7]).

---

[4]) I have shown (Papers from the 6th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, 1970, 486–7) that *μ* must be characterized phonologically as [+ round]. Here and above we see that it was also [+ grave].

[5]) Which was, of course, historically *πέφαμαι.

[6]) This reminds one of the developed *-s- in Old Irish verbal nouns in -m[e]n- when affixed to roots in velar or dental. But these are probably unconnected, since the Old Irish rule must be related to the affixation of -s- in the subjunctive to roots of similar termination. But typologically they are both generalizations of rules for absorbing obstruents by the sibilant in paradigms.

[7]) Heubeck, *op. laud.* 360.

24 R. M. Frazer

Rather, as Heubeck has himself pointed out, $*M\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\mu\omega\nu$ is nothing but an apocopation of the name-set epitomized by $M\varepsilon\nu\acute{\varepsilon}\lambda\alpha$os; it is therefore the formulaic equivalent, so to speak. $*A\gamma\alpha\text{-}\mu\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\mu\omega\nu$ is then 'great, Ober-$*M\acute{\varepsilon}\nu\mu\omega\nu$'. He is the principal *wanakts* of the coalition, whatever such a contemporary office exactly was.

II

In connexion with the above developments we see then that the Attic inscriptional variant $\mu\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\mu\nu\eta$ to $\mu\varepsilon\sigma\acute{\sigma}\delta\mu\eta$ provides us with an extremely valuable form. It is apparent that the undisturbed non-paradigmatic development of $\delta\mu$ was Attic $\mu\nu$. We must suppose that $\delta\mu$ assimilated to Attic $*\nu\mu$, and that this then submitted to rule (B) above, which however already existed in the grammar. At the same time we confirm that Attic dental $+ \sigma + \mu$ was not a purely phonetic development; it was clearly paradigmatic, and we thus understand forms such as $\check{\iota}\sigma\mu\varepsilon\nu$ more thoroughly. That is, the insertion of σ was essentially a sequence-preserving mechanism.

We thus see again that in Attic $*A\gamma\alpha\text{-}\mu\varepsilon\nu\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\mu\omega\nu$ clearly had a value placing it in paradigmatic relation with $M\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\text{-}$ etc.

We also get an interesting insight into the productive relation of $\theta\varepsilon\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ to $\theta\varepsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$; on this set of related notions see my remarks elsewhere on Eng. *doom* and *do*, etc.

῾Ρηγμῖνος at Iliad XX. 229

By R. M. FRAZER, New Orleans

226   αἲ δ' ὅτε μὲν σκιρτῷεν ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν,
    ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀνθερίκων καρπὸν θέον οὐδὲ κατέκλων·
    ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ σκιρτῷεν ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης,
229   ἄκρον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνος ἁλὸς πολιοῖο θέεσκον.

The above verses describe how the immortal fillies which Boreas has fathered run over the tops of the wheat and over the tops of the waves. In the last verse (229) there appears the word $\dot{\rho}\eta\gamma\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu\sigma\varsigma$ which presents us with two problems I should like to discuss. First, there is a textual problem: Should we emend $\dot{\rho}\eta\gamma\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu\sigma\varsigma$, which is the reading