

vielmehr der, das Neugeborene prophylaktisch im „reinen“ Zustand zu bewahren? Pindar a. O. (wie immer man dort *καθαρός* grammatisch zu beziehen hat) und Aretaios beweisen ja immerhin, daß der im Sinne einer „Wiedergeburt“ erneuerte Körper als *καθαρός* galt.

## Two Greek Words for 'Beard': *ύπήνη* and *πόγων*

By DOUGLAS Q. ADAMS, Moscow (Idaho)

### *Υπήνη*

*Υπήνη* is attested in Aristophanes and Plato Comicus (both v/iv BC) and means 'beard, (particularly) moustache',<sup>1)</sup> and (by extension) 'upper lip'.<sup>2)</sup> It is for Frisk (1970) "ohne Etymologie", though Frisk does suggest that there might be a folk-etymological connection of *ύπήνη* and *ύπό* 'under'. He regards as semantically unsatisfying any connection with *άπηνής* 'ungentle, rough, hard', *πηνής* (original Attic form *πράνης* 'with the face downwards, prone') (cf. Hesychian *πρανόν* 'το κατωφερές, πρανές, and *προσηνής* (Doric *προσανής*) 'soft, gentle', though that connection has had a distinguished history (Frisk credits Goebel, Benfey, Kretschmer, and Prellwitz with having held it). For the trio of adjectives Frisk does commend Benfey's suggestion (1862) that we have here compounds of *άπό*, *πρό*, and *πρός* plus an old *\*ānos* (n.) 'face' which he compares to Sanscrit *ānanam* (n.) 'mouth; face'.

Before moving to focus on *ύπήνη*, we might improve on Frisk's (and Benfey's) essentially correct treatment of *άπηνής*, etc. in a couple of ways. In the first place *ύπήνη* need not imply a neuter *s*-stem as the underlying noun. There is ample precedent for the derivation of *s*-stem adjectives from thematic nouns, particularly from *ā*-stems

---

<sup>1)</sup> In the meaning 'moustache' it may be specifically opposed to *πόγων* as it is in Eubulus (iv BC).

<sup>2)</sup> As in Aristotle (iv BC, *Historia Animalium*, 518b 18). In these latter two meanings it is the non-Doric equivalent of Doric *μούσταξ* (m.) whose descendants were to have such success in the languages of Europe (Kahane and Kahane, 1981: 922-924). *ύπήνη*'s antiquity is indirectly attested by the Homeric *ύπηνήτης* 'growing one's first beard'.

(Schwyzer, 1953: 513).<sup>3)</sup> Thus, rather than \**ānos* (n.) we might reasonably assume a feminine \**ānā*. Secondly, rather than compare either \**ānos* or \**ānā* with Epic Sanskrit *ānanam*, we might better compare it with Vedic *ānā-* (m.) ' + /-face; mouth; nose' (unaccountably not in Mayrhofer, 1956).

Returning to the question of *ύπήνη* we find then that there is no morphological impediment to assuming a compound of the shape \**hupó* + \**ānā*. If \**ānā* meant only 'face' (and certainly the derived adjectives in Greek presuppose such a meaning), the meaning of \**hupó* + \**ānā* would mean 'that which is below the face' which seems to me a possible designation for the beard or moustache, particularly as the face par excellence would appear to be between the bottom of the nose and the top of the forehead.<sup>4)</sup> If the original Indo-European meaning was more general, 'face, nose, mouth' (as suggested by Sanskrit), then a PIE \**upó* + \**ānā* might be 'that which is below the mouth, nose', an even more appropriate description for 'beard, moustache'.

It is appropriate to speak of a Proto-Indo-European combination \**upó* + \**ānā* rather than merely a pre-Greek one (and here we take the argument beyond the place where Benfey, et al., have left it) because a reflex of the same compound occurs in Iranian—in Shughni *būn*. For this word Morgenstierne (1974: 19–20) reconstructs either a Proto-Iranian \**upā(ha)nā-* or \**upāhanā-* (i. e. \**upa-āhanā-*). He opts for the latter and compares it with Avestan *āhan-* 'mouth'. He specifically disclaims any connection with Greek *ύπήνη*.<sup>5)</sup> However a Proto-Indo-European \**upānā-* (not related to PIE

---

<sup>3)</sup> Frisk suggests that the Hesychian *πρανόv* may be a backformation from *πρανής*. Whether that is the case or not, it does suggest that Greek speakers could perceive a derivational relationship between an *s*-stem adjective and a thematic noun.

<sup>4)</sup> Compare Tocharian A *akmal* 'face', lit. 'eye-nose'.

<sup>5)</sup> Not mentioned in Morgenstierne's discussion, but probably related, are New Persian *bāma* 'long beard' (Steingass, 1892: 152), a derivation of \**bām* from \**bān* by distant assimilation and *bāna* 'pubic hair' (ibid.), without the assimilation. For the meaning of the latter word one might compare old Irish *fés* (from PIE \**wendhso-*, cf. OCS *wąsъ* 'beard, moustache' (PIE \**wondhso-*), both 'beard' and 'pubic hair', or Yiddish *berdl*, the diminutive of *bord* 'beard', which is both 'little beard' and 'pubic hair' (Matisoff, 1978: 160). For the aphaeresis of the initial vowel (after the voicing of the originally intervocalic *-p-*), compare New Persian *bayal* 'armpit' from \**upa-ka(x)šā-* (a Proto-Iranian form also seen in Shughni *biǰūǰ* 'id') with a northeastern development of *-š-* to *-l-* (cf. "northeastern" *kalk* 'side' over against *kaš* 'shoulder, arm(pit)' – both from \**ka(x)šā-*).

\*ōs- 'mouth' but to \*āno/ā-) accounts for both the Shughni and Greek data most economically and it is probably not accidental that \*āno/ā- itself is found in the closely related Sanskrit.<sup>6)</sup>

### Πώγων

This word, too, means 'beard', and, as we have seen above, by contrast to *ύπήνη* it can mean more particularly 'beard on the chin'. Labeled as Attic-Ionic by Frisk, it is ancient in those dialects with attestations as far back as the fifth century BC (Herodotus, Aristophanes, and Plato). Its distribution contrasts with that of *γενειάς*, the most widespread Greek word for 'beard', in that the latter is clearly pan-Hellenic (e.g. Homeric and Doric at least besides Attic-Ionic). Frisk says of its etymology that it is "unerklärt", rightly rejecting a number of earlier suggestions as untenable.<sup>7)</sup>

It would seem reasonable then to see if one could construct an etymology that made more sense both semantically and morphologi-

---

<sup>6)</sup> Mayrhofer (1956: 74) connects *ānanam* with *āniti*. If the connection is correct, the earliest meaning of *ānā-* would have been 'nose'. His conclusion, however, is not self-evident either semantically or morphologically (i.e. why *vṛddhi* here?).

<sup>7)</sup> (1) Reichelt suggests a compound \**pō(r)* + *gōn*, with \**pō(r)* a *vṛddhi* derivative of the preposition/adverb \**per* + a *vṛddhi*ed root-noun form of the more usual \**gen-* 'chin'. This suggestion suffers from the necessity of supposing two *vṛddhi* formations in a single word. Furthermore, if we know anything about PIE morphology, we know that \**gen-* is to be reconstructed as an *u*-stem. Even Latin *gena*, remodeled on the basis of *māla*, shows traces of an older *u*-stem in the derived adjective *genuīnus* (*dens genuīnus*). – (2) Walde-Pokorny [I: 587] suggests instead \**poz-gōn* with \**poz-* from *pos*. The meaning would be "was am Kinn ist". The same objection to *-gōn-* exists here. Additionally there is not much evidence that \**-z-* would disappear before a voiced stop with concomitant lengthening and lowering of the preceding vowel (cf. *πρέσβυς*, dialectally *πρεῖγυς* with raising of the vowel) and, of course, *πός* is rather notoriously not an Attic-Ionic form. – (3) Grošelj sees in *πώγων* (< \**pōu-gōn-*) a word originally meaning '\*Wange' and a derivative of a root \**peu-*, *pū-*, *pō(u)-* 'aufblasen'. Such a root does seem to occur (Pokorny, 1959–847) but seems determinedly anit and nowhere to have given rise to anything like 'Wange'. This suggestion is, at best, a possibility from the point of view of PIE morphology (unlike the previous two) but does not tie *πώγων* with anything else in the Indo-European world. If it is the truth, as Hamp points out (1967, s.v. Albanian *thikë*), we lose little by not knowing it. Frisk does not absolutely rule out a fourth suggestion in which Fick sees in it a derivation from the family of *πήγνυμι* or *πηγός*. As Frisk points out the root vowel *-o-* is not well explained by this hypothesis and there is no semantic connection between *πώγων* and its alleged relatives.

cally than those offered heretofore. Taking semantics as the first priority, a word for 'beard' might reasonably be derived from a word for 'hair' or the like – thus a connection with *\*pulo-* 'a single hair (of the body)' or *\*poums-* 'body hair, down, pubic hair' suggests itself (for the PIE connections, see Adams, 1985 a/b). It is worth pointing out that PIE *\*poums-* and *\*pulo-* had a certain affinity for the beard in addition to their more common meaning of 'body hair, etc.' *in sensu stricto*. Witness, for instance Latin *impūberēs mālae* 'beardless cheeks' or Old Irish *ul* (< *\*pulu-*) ~ *ulcha* (f.) 'beard'.

I suggest that the Indo-European preform of Greek *πώγων* was *\*poum-g-on-*. Phonologically *πώγων* is the perfectly regular reflex of such a form, with loss of the intervocalic digamma and the subsequent contraction of vowels. If PIE *\*pou-ms-* could be falsely redivided as *\*poum-s-* (as it surely was to produce pre-Latin *\*poum-ro-*, the ancestor of *pūbes/r-* 'showing the outward signs of sexual maturity',<sup>8</sup>) then *\*poum-g-on-* shows a perfectly regular *-g-* enlargement of a derived stem. As examples of the same morphological formation we might note Latin *lānūgō* 'down' (with admittedly unexplained *-ū-* rather than *-ā-*) or, closer to home, Greek *κραγγών* 'a species of crab' from *\*kṛn-g-on-*.<sup>9</sup>)

Actually *lānūgō* and *κραγγών* are alike in superficial morphology but do not share exactly the same derivational process. *Lānūgō* is an endocentric "collective" derivative (i. e. one whose meaning is essentially identical to the underlying form) whereas *κραγγών* is an exocentric derivative (i. e. "one characterized by [X]," thus in this case, "one characterized by horns"). The complex PIE suffix *\*-g-on-* could signal either process – just as the internal holokinetic derivative could (cf. the endocentric Latin *pūbēs* 'pubic hair' beside exocentric *pūbēs* 'one capable of bearing arms' [from *\*one showing the outward signs of maturity*], both from PIE *\*poums* [see again Adams,

<sup>8</sup>) To recapitulate the relevant part of Adams, 1985 b, PIE (or at least pre-Latin) *\*poum-ro-* > *\*pūbro-* whence a nominative singular, weakly attested, *pūber* which was conflated with the oblique stem *\*(im)pūmer-* form PIE *\*(n)-poumes-*.

<sup>9</sup>) I. e., [[[*kṛ* + *n*] + *g*] + *on-*] like [[[*pou* + *m*] + *g*] + *on-*]. The different accent pattern (*κραγγών* but *πώγων*) is probably neither significant nor original. *Κραγγών* has an alternation of the vowel of the stem formative, *-ōn-* ~ *-on-*, whereas *πώγων* has generalized *-ōn-*. Accent on the vowel of the stem formative is usual in cases where there is length alternation; accent on the syllable that precedes the stem formative is normal when there is no length alternation (see Schwyzer, 1953: 486–487, for examples).

1985 b]). Greek *πώγων* (< \**roum-g-on-*) is like *lānūgō* then in being an endocentric derivative; the Greek word comes from \**roums-* (with misdivision to \**roum-s-*), the Latin from *lānā*. Latin *lānūgō* (like other derivatives in *-gō*) is feminine. Greek is masculine, as is the rule for endocentric collectives in *-(m)on-* in Greek (cf. *τέρωων* 'boundary, end' or *θημών* 'heap').

### References

- Adams, Douglas Q. (1985 a): "A Change of \**u* to \**i* After a Labial in Late Proto-Indo-European." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46: 5–12.
- Adams, Douglas Q. (1985 b): "Sanskrit *pūtmān*, Latin *pūbēs*, and Related Words." *Die Sprache* 31: 1–16.
- Frisk, Hjalmar (1960–1970): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Hamp, Eric P. (1967): "Two Albanian and Indo-Iranian Problems." In *Languages and Areas: Studies Presented to George V. Bobrinskoy*. Chicago, Division of the Humanities, The University of Chicago.
- Kahane, Henry, and Renée Kahane (1981): Rev. of J. Peter Maher's *Papers on language theory and history*. *Language* 57: 919–925.
- Matisoff, James A. (1978): *Variational Semantics in Tibeto-Burman*. Philadelphia, Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1956–1976): *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg, Winter.
- Morgenstierne, Georg (1974): *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Schwyzler, Eduard (1953): *Griechische Grammatik, Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil*. München, C. H. Beck.
- Steingass, F. (1892): *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*. Reprinted 1963. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

## A Sophoclean Periphrasis

By JOHN DAVIDSON, Wellington (New Zealand)

Sophocles' use of the periphrasis *ὄμμα πελείας* involves greater subtlety than has sometimes been fully appreciated. It requires the context to bring out and exploit what is only an inherent possibility in the periphrasis itself.

*μέγαν ὄκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι  
πτηνῆς ὡς ὄμμα πελείας*

(*Ajax* 139–40)