

Mycenaean Onomastics, Poetic Phraseology and Indo-European Comparison: The Man's Name *pu₂-ke-qi-ri**

JOSÉ L. GARCÍA RAMÓN

Universität zu Köln

Summary

§1. Interpreting Mycenaean proper names: perfect correspondences and synonymy.

A. Compounded Personal Names and Phraseology.

§2. Mycenaean names with perfect correspondences in Alphabetic Greek. — §3. Mycenaean names in the light of synonymous names, compounds and collocations attested in Alphabetic Greek.

B. The Myc. MN *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^hugeg^wrī(n)s*/ ‘who escapes/d the HEAVY spear’ or ‘HEAVY evil, misfortune’ or ‘the HEAVY enemy’ or ‘the stone’ (*‘the HEAVY one’).

§4. The MN *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^hugeg^wrīns*/ (PY, TH). — §5. Myc. /*p^huge^o*/ reflects the aorist ἔφυγε ‘escaped’ and Hom. ἠλεύατο. — §6. Myc. /*g^wrīn-*/, Alph. Gk. βρῖ, as synonym of βριθύ, ὄβριμος, and βαρύς; overview of the different forms belonging to this semantic field. — §7. The IE background and the morphology of /*g^wrīn-*/. — §8. Myc. *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/ [ESCAPE (: ἔφυγε) HEAVY (βρῖ, cf. βριθύ, ὄβριμον, βαρύς)], where [HEAVY] is a transferred epithet. — §9. The Homeric evidence suggests that HEAVY is the designation for [spear], for [evil, misfortune] or for [enemy], which

* The present article was written as part of the research project “La segunda edición del Diccionario Micénico como fuente de estudio lexicológico de la civilización micénica” (CAICYT, HUM 2007-64475). The final version has benefited from remarks by Alan J. Nussbaum (Cornell) after the oral exposition, and by Stephanie Jamison (UCLA), José Luis Melena (Vitoria), Ana Vegas Sansalvador (Köln) and Calvert Watkins (UCLA). Francisco Aura Jorro (Alicante) has kindly placed the latest version of his forthcoming Mycenaean indices (direct and reverse) at my disposal. It is my pleasant duty to express my gratitude to all of them. Final responsibility remains my own. Homeric translations basically follow those of Richmond Lattimore.

Abbreviations: KN: Knossos; PY: Pylos; MY: Mycenae; TH: Thebes.

MN: man's name; WN: woman's name; GN: god name; PN: place name.

Citations follow current conventions, especially those of the X. Mycenaean Colloquium (Salzburg 1995: *Floreat Studia Mycenaea*, Wien 1999). For Mycenaean forms, reference is made to Fr. Aura Jorro, *Diccionario Griego-Micénico*, Madrid 1985, 1993; for Alphabetic Greek names, Fr. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917 (HPNG) and especially the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (LGPN: I, III.1 and III.2 ed. by P.M. Fraser - E. Matthews, II ed. by M.J. Osborne - S.G. Byrne).

may have been selected as transferred epithet. — §10. Possible objections. — §11. Two possible transferred epithets as theonyms in Mycenaean theophoric: *a-wi-to-do-to /Awisto-dotos/* ‘Given by the invisible (deity)’, *i-su-ku-wo-do-to /Isk^huo-dotos/* ‘Given by the powerful (deity)’. — §12. The distributional patterns of [stone] in Homer support the interpretation of /^og^wrīn-/ as an inherited term for ‘stone, rock’ (cf. Alb. *gur*). — §13. Conclusion.

§1. The interpretation of Mycenaean proper names (both simplicia and compounded) encounters difficulties depending on the recognisability of the lexemes they are based on. Moreover, the deficiencies of Linear B make things even more difficult.

In the case of compounds, the problem obviously lies in identifying their first and second members, and interpreting their internal syntax as far as this can be established. This is not always easy, even for the onomastics of first millennium Greek, as many compounded names do not have the structure of current compounds and simply consist of two lexemes that make no sense and defy any attempt at interpretation in terms of logic. The same applies for Mycenaean. The ideal case is when both members of the compound can be recognised as reflecting a nominal or verbal phrase, poetic or not, which is actually attested in Alphabetic Greek and/or in other IE language(s): a sampling of such cases is presented in §2. The situation is more complicated when the lexeme or lexemes underlying the compounded name do not match lexemes or collocations attested in first millennium Greek: in this case we have to operate with synonyms, which may either be inherited or may have been created within Greek as substitutive continuants (‘Ersatzkontinuante’) of inherited terms (§3).

In the case of Mycenaean names consisting of (or built on) a noun or an adjective that does not match any form directly attested in Alphabetic Greek, the only way to provide an interpretation is to operate with synonymous and/or semantic parallels.¹ In other words, an interpretation must be supported by the

¹ In the case of “short” names, taking into account word formation, namely the subsystem of onomastic suffixes, may also be of help. A nice instance is the MN *da-te-wa* (García Ramón 2001–2002a:436ff.). There is a set of specific onomastic suffixes, which are for the most part attested also in Linear B, namely -āς, -εὺς, -έας, -ις, -[i]ος, -[i]ων (Myc. /-ā-/ , /-ēu-/ , /-ēwā-/ , /-i-/ , /-[i]o-/ , /-[i]on-/), also -ιχος, fem. -ώι, as seen e.g. in Κῦδ-ας (Κυδ-ās), Κυδ-εὺς, Κυδ-έας, Κῦδ-ις, Κῦδ-ων, Κῦδ-ιχος or in Μνας-εὺς, Μνας-έας, Μνάσ-ις, Μνας-ίων, Μνάσ-ων, fem. Μνας-ώ (“short” forms of Μνησί-στρατος). On the other hand, the pairs -εὺς : -έας (Myc. /-ēus/ : /-ēwās/) are well attested, cf. Οἰνέας : Οἰνέας (Myc. /Woinēwās/), Φυλ(λ)εὺς : Φυλέας, -ῆς (Myc. /P^hulēwās/), Myc. *ta-re-u* /T^halēus/ (PY) : Θαλέας, -ῆς. On the strength of this statement, the existence of Alph. Gk. Δαίτ-ας (or Δαιτās), Δαίτ-ις, Δαίτ-ιχος allows for the interpretation of *da-te-wa* as /Daitēwās/

existence of synonymous names (or appellatives), or by the evidence of other names belonging to the same word family as the proposed name. This can be illustrated by Myc. *te-u-to* and *o-ki-ro*. The MN *te-u-to* may conceal τεῦθος ‘cuttlefish’, as proposed by Olivier Masson (1972):² there is no attestation of such a name in first millennium Greek, but the existence of names like Σηπία ‘cuttlefish’ *vel sim.* shows that ichthyonyms are in fact a naming motif, and this makes the interpretation of *te-u-to* as */T^heut^hos/* highly probable. The same applies to *o-ki-ro*, which matches the bird name ὀρχίλος ‘wren’, as shown by P. H. Ilievski.³ Even if ὀρχίλος were not attested, the existence of a MN Τροχιλλῶς, reflecting another bird name τροχίλος, strongly supports the interpretation of *o-ki-ro* (and *o-ki-ra*) as */Ork^hil(l)os/*, */Ork^hil(l)ās/*, as I have tried to show elsewhere.⁴

As to the religious and geographic names, the situation is basically the same. If the Mycenaean name does not match a form attested in the first millennium, it is only semantic parallels and identity (or close similarity) of character and function on the basis of lexical correspondences that can provide significant support for the interpretation. The validity of this principle is proved by cases in which the Mycenaean form may be recognisable, but the meaning (and eventually the etymology) may be elucidated only in the light of comparison with other forms or names, whether Greek or not, that have the same meaning or refer to the same entities. This is the case with the PN *e-u-de-we-ro* and the GN *e-ra*, which are easily identifiable with Hom. εὐδείελος (quoted by Strabo 9.2.41 as the old name of Aspledon in Boeotia)⁵ and with Ἥρα.

The meaning of Myc. *e-u-de-we-ro* */E^hu-dewelo-/* ‘having nice afternoons’ (whence ‘nice in the afternoons / sunsets’) is confirmed by the Cyrenaean place name Εὐεσπερίδες, Εὐεσπερίς (Ἐσπέρα), as I have tried to show elsewhere.⁶

(and makes a MN **/Daitēus/* perfectly conceivable) as a short form of Myc. *e-u-da-i-ta* */E^hu-daitās/* or of Δαίταρχος.

² Other interpretations, such as Illyrian */Teutos/*, or */Steutōr/* (Meier-Brügger 1992), are less likely.

³ Ilievski 1992, García Ramón 2001–2002a.

⁴ García Ramón 2001–2002a:431ff.

⁵ Probably also attested as a place name in Phocis in a treaty (3rd C.) between Phanoteon and Stiris (Rousset-Katzourous 1992).

⁶ García Ramón 1998–1999. The Proto-Greek form is **e^hu-deuelo-* (**h₁esu^o*, *°deuh₁-elo-*, not *°deus-elo-* pace Schulze 1892:244f., 248), whence Myc. */E^hu-dewelo-/*, whereas <ει> in Hom. εὐ-δείελος (instead of ⁺εὐ-δέελος) reflects a metrical lengthening. Att. δειλή is the phonetic outcome of PGk. **deuelā*.

For its part, the name of Hera has been explained satisfactorily as an individualisation of the flourishing period of time or of life, with reference to Gk. ὄρα ‘spring’:⁷ this points to PGk. *H₁ĕrā-, cf. IE *H₁ĕro-: OE *gear* ‘year’.⁸ The name of Hera’s Latin counterpart offers, in my opinion, a clear semantic parallel that has not been paid the attention it deserves:⁹ *Iūnō* (*h₂ĵéu-h₃on-, an -on-formation to *iūn-, cf. Lat. *iūnī-x* ‘young woman’ to masc. *iūuen*, as shown by Helmut Rix)¹⁰ may be understood as ‘having youth (= vital force)’.

On the strength of this theoretical framework, the present contribution will propose an interpretation of the obscure man’s name *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* (Pylos, Thebes).

A. Compounded Personal Names and Phraseology

§2. An ideal case for the identification of a Mycenaean compounded name is when it perfectly matches a compound or a collocation of first millenium Greek, i.e. when the lexemes of both members are identical. The correspondence may also be partial, namely when one or both of the members are expressed by synonyms in Alphabetic Greek (§3).

Let us recall several instances of Mycenaean compounded personal names (presented conventionally in alphabetical order) that have perfect correspondences in Alphabetic Greek. The sample that follows is drawn from the material for a book on Mycenaean personal names that is intended to be for Mycenaean what Friedrich Bechtel’s *Historische Personennamen des Griechischen* (1917) is for first millennium Greek:¹¹

1. MN *a-ke-ra-wo* (KN) /*Age-lāwo-*/ (: Ἀγέλαος Hom.+, Λᾱγος), cf. *Il.* 2.580 ἄγε λαούς #, 10.79 # λαὸν ἄγων. A first member /^h*Age*^o/ is not excluded: the second member of the MN Λᾱγος may be both ^o*agós* or ^{oh}*āgós*. An alternative interpretation as /*Ark^he-lāwo-*/ (: Ἀρχέλαος) may not be ruled out, cf. ἀρχέλαος [Aesch.+], Λᾱρχος. In fact, *^hῆρχε λαῶν / λαοῖς, *λαῶν / λαοῖς ἄρχων would be unmetrical.

2. MN *a-ko-ro-da-mo* (TH, KN) matches perfectly Ἀκρόδημος (Tenos, 2nd

⁷ Schröder 1956:57ff., 67 and Pötscher 1961:302 (“die zur Ehe reife Frau”).

⁸ From *H₁ĕh₁-ro- ‘period of time’, whence CLuv. *āra/i-* ‘time’ (Morpurgo Davies 1987:218f. n. 31).

⁹ García Ramón 2001:115. The term ‘hero’ (ἦρως) fits perfectly into this pattern as the masculine personification of the flourishing time of life (or ‘who is in his flourishing age’, if one understands -ōu- formations as hypostases of locative forms in -eu-, as per Widmer 2008:623ff.).

¹⁰ Rix 1981:107ff. (= *Kl. Schr.*, 275ff.).

¹¹ Cf. the updates in García Ramón 2001–2002b, 2005c.

C.),¹² a determinative compound that reflects the individualisation of [τὸ ἄκρον δῆμον] or [τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δήμου] ‘the highest *dāmos* (: community)’ or ‘the highest of the *dāmos*’.¹³ It is parallel to other compounds with ἄκρο° ‘at the topmost, highest’ of the type ἀκρόπολις ‘citadel’ (Hom.+, cf. ἐν πόλει ἄκρη *Il.* 6.88) to designate τὸ ἄκρον τῆς πόλεως either *stricto sensu* (cf. *Od.* 3.278 Σούνιον ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων ‘the promontory of Athens’) or metaphorically (cf. Ἄργεος ἄκρα Πελασγοί ‘Pelasgians, glory of Argos’, Theocr. 15.42). In fact Ἀκρόδημος reflects the poetic metaphor of the *propugnaculum ciuitatis* as it has been convincingly set out by O. Longo¹⁴ on the basis of Alc. fr. 112.10 Voigt ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλεως πύργος ἀρεῦιος ‘for men are the Aean tower of the town, (ἀρεῦιος ‘of Ares’, as war god, also as protector during war). The conception that men are the highest tower for the defense of the city is clearly reflected in *Il.* 15.735ff. ἢε τινὰς φαμεν εἶναι ἀοσητήρας ὀπίσσω, / ἢε τι τεῖχος ἄρειον, ὃ κ’ ἀνδράσι λιογὸν ἀμύναι; / οὐ μὲν τι σχεδὸν ἔστι πόλις πύργοις ἀραρυῖα, / ἦ κ’ ἀπαμυναίμεσθα(α) ... ((Hektor speaks to the Danaoi) ‘Do we think there are others who stand behind us to help us? Have we some stronger / Aean wall that can ward off perdition of men? There is for us no city fenced with walls, within which we could defend ourselves’). The metaphor is clearly recognisable in *C.Theogn.* 233 ἀκρόπολις καὶ πύργος ἐὼν κενεόφρονι δήμῳ ‘(an excellent man), being citadel and tower against the stupid crowd’.

3. MN *a-no-me-de* (PY) /*Anormēdēs*/ or /*Anṛmēdēs*/ (: Ἀνδρο-μήδης, Ἀνδρομέδης, cf. *Il.* 2.340 μῆδεά τ’ ἀνδρῶν).

4. MN *a-pi-da-ta* (KN) /*Amp^hidaitās*/, cf. Eur. fr. 147.1 ἀμφὶ δαῖτα καὶ τράπεζαν.¹⁵

¹² The formal match *a-ko-ro-da-mo* : Ἀκρόδημος renders other possibilities unnecessary. Myc. *a-ko-ro-da-mo* and *a-ko-da-mo* (TH), the latter probably designating another person, have been much debated, and have received interpretations that range from the absurd (a title /*agoro-dāmos*/ ‘rassembleur du damos’, as per Aravantinos-Godart-Sacconi 2001:170f.) to the reasonable, but which are not supported by the facts (/Argro°/ [Ruijgh 2003:224] and /Argo°/, dissimilated from */Argro°/, cf. García Ramón 2006:46ff.). On the assumption that *a-ko-ro-da-mo* and *a-ko-da-mo* are two different persons, *a-ko-da-mo* may be /*Ark^ho-dāmos*/ (: Alph. Gk. Ἀρχόδαμος, Hom. ἀρχός) as a formal variant of Ἀρχέ-δαμος and/or as a reflex of [ὃ ἀρχός τοῦ δήμου], cf. Ἀρχό-δαμος and Ἀρχέ-δαμος (cf. Δήμαρχος). Compounds of this type are attested also in Mycenaean, cf. e.g. *pi-ro-wo-na* /*P^hilo-woinās*/, WN /*P^hilo-woinā*/ (variant of *Φιλέ-φοινός : Οἰνό-φιλος), *pi-ro-pa-ta-ra* /*P^hilo-patrā*/ (cf. Φιλοπάτωρ).

¹³ The structure is essentially the same as that of the MN Ἀριστόδημος (also Πρωτο°, Ἀρχι°, or Ἀκρόπολις (: Ἀριστο°, Ἀρχι°).

¹⁴ Longo 1974.

¹⁵ García Ramón 2001–2002a:437.

5. MN *da-i-go-ta* (KN) /Dā^(h)i-k^{wh}ontās/ (: Δηίφονος, Δηιφόντης) ‘killing in the fight’. The same collocation underlies the mediopassive counterpart δαικτάμενος (*Il.* 21.146 ... ἐπεὶ κεχόλωτο δαικταμένων αιζήων = 21.301), with synonymous κτείνω.

6. MN *e-ti-ra-wo* (PY) /Ertilāwōi/ (dat.) is surely connected with (and continued by) Ὀρμησίλεως, Ὀρμασίλας, and Ὀρσίλαος, Ὀρσιλλᾶς. A variant of the compound with inversion of its members is Λαέρτης.¹⁶ The underlying collocation is well attested in Homer, cf. *Il.* 19.139 ἀλλ’ ὄρσευ πόλεμον δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ὄρνυθι λαούς.

7. MN *e-u-da-i-ta* (KN) /E^(h)udaitās/ (cf. Εὐδαιτίδας), cf. *Il.* 1.368 καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖ δάσσαντο μετὰ σφίσιν υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.¹⁷

8. MN *e-u-me-de* (PY) /E^(h)umēdēs/ Εὐμήδης, cf. *Il.* 2.360 ἀλλὰ ἄναξ αὐτός τ’ εὖ μήδεο ... and *Od.* 11.445 λίην γὰρ πιτυτή τε καὶ εὖ φρεσὶ μήδεα οἶδε.

9. MN *ka-sa-no* (KN) /Kassānōr/ is attested in the first millenium in the thematic variant Κάσσανδρος and fem. Κασσάνδρα, Καστιάνειρα. The first member of the compound *kasti° (*k̑nd-ti°) is κέκασμαι ‘excel’ (cf. Ved. śásad- ‘id.’), /°anōr/ : °ανδρος reflects the dative-locative of the people among whom the name-bearer excels, cf. *Od.* 4.725 παντοίησ’ ἀρετῆσι κεκασμένον ἐν Δαναοῖσιν ‘excellent in all qualities among the Danaans’.¹⁸ The collocation is also expressed by means of names with Πρεπ(ε)° (*prep-o/e- : Arm. *erewi* ‘φαίνεται’), cf. Πρέπ-ανδρος, Πρεπέ-λαος, cf. *Il.* 2.483 ἐκπρεπέ’ ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἕξοχον ἠρώεσσιν, 18.194 Μαιμαλίδης, ὃς πᾶσι μετέπρεπε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν.

10. MN *ke-sa-do-ro* (PY, KN) /Kessandros/, WN *ke-sa-da-ra* (PY) /Kessandrā/ seem to match the anomalous <ΚΕΣΑΝΔΡΑ> (3x in Corinthian vases). The compound goes back to *k̑ens-ti-andro- ‘who speaks authoritatively to men’, which matches Ved. śámsā nāryā- [1x RV I 185.9a], YAv. *nairiiō. saṅha-*, also Ved. *narām śámsa-*, *narāśámsa-* (epithet of Agni and of Pūṣan). The first member of the compound is IE *k̑ens-, Lat. *cēnset* (pres. *k̑ns-éje-ti), Ved. *śámsati* : OAv. *sēnghaitī*, YAv. *saṅhaiti* (Pres. *k̑éns-e-ti), with derivative Ved. *śásti-* ‘praise’ : OAv. *sasti-* (*k̑ns-ti-). The Mycenaean name is continued by Αἰνησι-μβρότα (Alcm. *Parth.* 1.73), the name of the leader of Laconian young women. The substitution of PGK. *k̑ens- by αἰνέω is evident also in

¹⁶ Mühlestein 1968:113. On the basis of the correspondence /Erti°/ : Ὀρπι°, Ὀρσι°, the MN *e-ti-me-de-i* (PY) /Erti-mēde^{hi}/ may reflect the collocation [ὄρνυμι μήδεα], which is attested with synonymous νόος in *Od.* 1. 347 τέρπειν ὄπηι οἱ νόος ὄρνυται.

¹⁷ García Ramón 2001–2002a:437.

¹⁸ García Ramón 1992. Fem. Κασσάνδρα is obviously a mere motion form.

ke-ti-ro /Ke(n)sti-los/ (PY, KN), ‘short’ form for */Ke(n)sti-lāwos/* → Αἰνησί-
λας, Αἰνησίλεως, (→) Αἰνησίδαμος, as I have tried to show elsewhere.¹⁹

11. MN *mo-ro-qo-ro* (PY) dat. */Molog^wrōi/*, gen. *mo-ro-qo-ro-jo* matches Μόλοβρος (the name of a Laconian). The name reflects an insulting form addressed to Odysseus, disguised as a beggar (*Od.* 17.219, 18.26). The compound means ‘devourer of dung’, as shown by Günter Neumann:²⁰ both the first and second members of the compound do not match any form attested in Alphabetic Greek, but both are recognisable from an etymological point of view: *μολο^o (cf. μέλας ‘black’) is related to Skt. *māla-* ‘dirt’, ^oβρος is a *nomen agentis* to βιβρώσκω ‘devour’ (Lat. *uorāre*).

12. MN (dat.) *na-ne-mo /Nānemōi/* (TH) matches νήνεμος ‘windless’²¹ (Hom.+, of αἰθήρ ‘air’ *Il.* 8.556, cf. also γαλήνη ... νηνεμῆ ‘windless weather’ *Od.* 5. 392, 12.169; Aesch. *Ag.* 740), νηνεμῆν (Hipp.).²² The epithet has been used for persons metaphorically since Classical times (Eur. *Hec.* 533 νήνεμον ἔστησε ὄχλον).²³

13. MN *ne-ti-ja-no* (KN, PY, TH) */Nestiānōr/*, dat. *ne-ti-ja-no-re* (PY). The name may be interpreted as ‘who saves his men’ (: Νέστωρ) on the assumption that its first member is IE **nes-* ‘arrive where one will’ (Ved. *nāsate* ‘meets gladly’, Goth. *ga-nisan* ‘σώζεσθαι’), with causative **nos-éjo/e-* ‘cause to reach (home)’, whence ‘save’ (Goth. *nasjan* ‘σῶσαι’, OE *nerian*). The Mycenaean form has a purely formal continuant in the Thessalian MN Νέσσανδρος²⁴

¹⁹ García Ramón 1992, 2005a:131ff. The term αἶνος ‘decree’ (inscriptions) matches the meaning of Ved. *śámsa-* ‘authoritative opinion, praise’.

²⁰ Neumann 1992.

²¹ García Ramón 2006:42. Gk. νήνεμος (**ḡ-h₂nh₁-mo-*, cf. IE **h₂enh₁-* ‘wehen’, Ved. *ániti*) was recharacterised as ἄ+νήνεμος (Soph. *OC.* 677, Eur. *Hel.* 1456), ἄνηνεμῆν (Str. 7.3.18), like PGk. *nōp^heles-* ‘unprofitable’ (**ḡ-h₃b^hel-es-*), Myc. *no-pe-re-a₂ /nōp^hele^ha/* ‘out of service’ (of chariots) was to ἄ+νοφελής (Class.). The old term was correctly understood, cf. Hsch. νήνεμον· ἄνευ ἀνέμου. εὐπνοῦν. εὐδίων. ἦσυχον. ἄπνοῦν. καὶ ἄνήνεμον τὸ αὐτό. A priestess of the winds is also attested in Mycenaean (cf. *a-ne-mo(-)i-je-re-ja* KN Fp 1.10, 13.3).

²² Poetic epithets that do not primarily designate persons may be used as personal names, e.g. Ἄσπετος (: ἄσπετος ‘unutterable’ (of αἰθήρ ‘air’, ῥόος ‘stream’ in Homer)), Ἀφθόνητος (: ἀφθόνητος ‘beyond the reach of envy’ (of αἶνος ‘praise’ in Pindar)), Νήριτος Hom.+ (: νήριτος ‘numberless’, of ὕλη Hes. *Op.* 511), cf. García Ramón 2005b:23.

²³ Other compounds with ἄνεμος are well attested in onomastics: Εὐήνεμος (also a by-name of Zeus in Sparta, cf. Paus. 3.13.8) : εὐήνεμος (Soph., Eur.+), Ποδάνεμος : Hom. ποδήνεμος ‘with feet like wind’, of Iris.

²⁴ As seen by Peters 1986:547 n° 727. There is little doubt that Myc. */Nestiānōr/* and Alph. Gk. Νέσσανδρος stand in the same relation as Hom. Καστιάνειρα and Myc. */Kassānōr/*,

(Atrax, 3rd C.), with ‘short’ form Νέσσυλος²⁵ (Larisa, 1st C.). The causative function of the first member /Nes^o/ was continued by Gk. σῶσαι, and is recognisable in strictly synonymous Σωσί-ανδρος (and Σῶνδρος), which is in turn reflected in Homer (cf. *Od.* 3.231 ἄνδρα σαώσαι). Cf. also, with φῶτα instead of ἄνδρα, *Il.* 17.149 πῶς κε σὺ χεῖρονα φῶτα σαώσειας.²⁶

14. MN *o-ku-na-wo* (KN) /*Ōkunāwos*/ (and ‘short’ form *o-ku-no* /*Ōkunos*/),²⁷ cf. Hom. ὠκέας νῆας ‘swift ships’.

15. MN *o-ti-na-wo* (PY) /*Ortināwos*/ ‘who powers the ship’ (as a rower). The name reflects a collocation *ὄρσα- νῆα(ς) / ὄρτυμι νῆα(ς), as attested indirectly by Hom. νηὺς ὄρτυμένη (: ὄρτο νηὺς)²⁸ in *Od.* 12.182-3 ..., τὰς δ’ οὐ λάθεν ὠκύαλος νηὺς / ἐγγύθεν ὄρτυμένη ‘... the swift ship did not fail to be noticed by them (the Sirens) as it drew nearer’. This collocation matches perfectly the Rig Vedic formula *īyarti nāvam*, cf. II 42.1ab *kānikradaj janīsam prabruvāṇā īyarti vācam aritēva nāvam* ‘telling his race aloud with repeated cries, he powers his voice (*īyarti* : ὄρτυσι), as a rower (*āritā* : *ἔρετήρ, PN Ἐρετρία) his ship (*nāvam*)’ (also IX 95.2ab), as I have tried to show elsewhere.²⁹ Thus, the Greek collocation *ὄρσα- / ὄρτυσι νῆα(ς) underlying *o-ti-na-wo* turns out to be inherited in view of Ved. *īyarti nāvam*. The inherited verb has been replaced by ἐλασσα- / ἐλαύνω in the collocation with νῆα(ς), cf. *Od.* 7.109 ἴδριες / νῆα θοῖην ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνέμεν or 13.155-6 ὀππότε κεν δὴ πάντες ἐλαυνομένην προΐδωνται ‘when all the people watch it (*scil.* the ship) ... as it is powered closer’, which shows a perfect parallel to νηὺς ἐγγύθεν ὄρτυμένη (cf. *supra*).

16. MN *pe-ri-me-de* (PY) /*Perimēdēs*/ : Περι-μήδης, cf. Hes. *Th.* 559 ... πάντων πέρι μήδεα εἰδώς.

17. MN *qa-sa-ko* (KN) /*K^wās-ark^hos*/, as a compound of the type τερψίμβροτος. This name, of which the first member is πάσσασθαι (**kuā[s]*)-), synonymous with Ion.-Att. κτήσασθαι ‘get’, reflects a collocation τὴν ἀρχὴν κτήσασθαι / κεκτῆσθαι ‘get the power’ / ‘have the power’ (after having gotten it), cf. Hdt. 6.34 κτησαμένου τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην, Thuc. 7.66.2 ἀρχὴν ... κεκτημένου. Myc. *qa-sa-ko* matches Πάσσαρχος (= Κτήσσαρχος).³⁰

Κασσάνδρα.

²⁵ The onomastic formation with -υλος presupposes Νεσσ^o (cf. Νύσσανδρος, Νύσσυλος also in Thessaly), cf. García Ramón 2007a:44f.

²⁶ García Ramón 2005b:38ff.

²⁷ Cf. Neumann 1994.

²⁸ The type is also attested in Class. Gk. ναὺς ὄρτυσα- / ὄρτώω, which is the continuant of ὄρτυμι / ὄρσα-, cf. Thuc. 8.34 αἱ μὲν μάλιστα ὀρμήσασαι (*scil.* νῆες) τρεῖς διαφθείρονται.

²⁹ García Ramón 2002.

³⁰ García Ramón 2000a: esp. 154ff., 158ff., 164. Cf. also the ‘short’ form *qa-ti-ja* /*K^wā(s)tiās*/

18. MN *ta-ta-ke-u* (PY) /*Stāt-ark^hēus*/, with its highly productive *-ēu-* suffix, matches Alph. Gk. Στήσαρχος, and reflects an underlying collocation ἀρχήν / ἄρχοντα (κατα)στήσαι, cf. Thuc. 1.62.3 Ἴόλαον ... καταστήσας ἄρχαντας ἄρχοντα, Hdt. 3.89.1 ... καταστήσας δὲ τὰς ἀρχάς.³¹

19. MN *to-wa-no* (KN) /*T^howānōr*/, also dat. *to-wa-no-re* (PY) and ‘short’ form *to-wa* (: Θόας), matches *θοὸς ἀνὴρ, just as Ἄριστανδρος matches ἄριστος ἀνὴρ (cf. Hdt. 3.81 ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἀρίστων) or Νέαανδρος matches νέος ἀνὴρ (cf. νέου ἀνδρός *Od.* 23.589). The compound is not necessarily to be understood as possessive (‘who has swift men’), but simply as determinative, reflecting a nominal phrase.³²

§3. In other cases, one (or both) of the members of a compound name do not match a form attested in Alphabetic Greek, but the collocation they reflect is expressed by means of one (or two) synonyms. Some instances have already been mentioned à propos *da-i-go-ta* and δαϊκτάμενος (§2.5), *ke-sa-do-ro*, *ke-sa-da-ra* and Αἰνησιμβρότα *et al.* (§2.10), *ne-ti-ja-no* and Σωσίαανδρος (§2.13) and Κτήσαρχος and *qa-sa-ko* (§2.17).

1. MN *e-ka-no* (PY) /*^hEk^hānōr*/ ‘he who overcomes men’. The first member *e-k(e)-* /*^hEk^h(e)-*/ (: ἔχω), as in *e-ke-me-de* /*^hEk^he-mēdēs*/ (PY, KN), reflects the old meaning of IE **seǵh-* ‘overcome’³³ (cf. Ved. *sah* ‘overcome’, Goth. *sigis* ‘νίκος’ ‘victory’). It matches Alph. Gk. Νικ(ε)°, Νικ(ο)°, e.g. Νικάνωρ, Νικανδρος, Νικομήδης. The Vedic collocation is actually attested in RV V 7.10cd ... *ātriḥ sāsahyād dāsīyūn iśāḥ sāsahyān nṛ̥n* ‘... might Atri overcome the Dasyu’s, the impulses, the men’,³⁴ as well as in *nṛ̥-śāḥ-*, *nṛ̥-śāhya-* (also *vīrā-sāḥ-* ‘domination over men’ RV I 35.6b).

2. MN *e-ri-ke-re-we* /*Eri-klewēs*/ (KN): ‘who has good [ἐρι°] fame [κλέος]’. The meliorative prefix ἐρι° is glossed as μέγα (Hsch.). The name is basically equivalent to inherited Μεγακλής (cf. Hom. μέγα κλέος : Ved. *māhi śrávas*), as well as to εὐ-κλήης (Pind.) : Εὐκλήης (: Ved. *Su-śrávas*).

(KN), which is parallel to Alph. Gk. Κτησίας.

³¹ Cf. García Ramón 2000a:173f.

³² García Ramón 2000b. Hom. Προθοήνωρ is a conflation of *προθόος and ἀνὴρ, cf. *Il.* 22.458-9 ... ἐπεὶ οὐ ποτ’ ἐνὶ πληθυῖ μένεν ἀνδρῶν, /ἀλλὰ πολὺ προθέεσκε, ... ‘since he never stayed back in the crowd of men, but would break far out in front’.

³³ Meier-Brügger 1976.

³⁴ García Ramón 2005a:127, 2005b:37ff. The hapax *iśāḥ* (RV V 7.10e) is understood as the acc. pl. of *iś-* ‘Impuls, Erfrischung’ (suggestion of Stephanie Jamison). It is, in any case, irrelevant whether *iśāḥ* is the nominative of a name *iśá-* (and the subject of opt. *sāsahyāt*) in c (“möge Iṣa die (kargen) Herren bezwingen”; Geldner, *ad loc.*).

3. MN *ne-e-ra-wo* (PY) dat. /*Ne^he-lāwōi*/ (perhaps with ‘short’ form Νηλεῦς) may be understood as ‘he who saves his people’. The same collocation underlies *Σοί-λαος (‘short’ form Σοίλος), also Σώ-λοχος, Σώ-στρατος, Σώ-δαμος (‘short’ form -δαῖς), as well as Σωσί-δαμος, cf. *Il.* 13.47 Αἴαντε σφῶ μὲν τε σαώσετε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν.

4. MN *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* (PY) may be interpreted both as /*Tāti-g^wōwēus*/ or as /*Stāti-g^wōwēus*/. In the first case, /*Tāti-g^wōwēus*/ should be ‘der Rinder raubt’.³⁵ In this interpretation, the name would reflect the motif of stealing cattle (cf. βοῦκλεψ Soph.), which is attested in several IE languages, cf. YAv. *gəuš ... tāiīāṭ*: the first member is IE *(s)teh₂- ‘steal’ (Hitt. *tāizzi*, OLat. (S)TATOD, Gk. τητάομαι Pind.). However, *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* may also conceal /*Stāti-g^wōwēus*/, as the reflex of a juncture *στῆσε βοῦς ‘(he) let the cows stand’ (cf. *Il.* 5.755 ἵππους στήσασα), which finds support in βούστασις ‘cowshed’ (Aesch. *Prom.* 653; also Delos 4th C.), βούσταθμον, βουσταθμός ‘ox-stall’ (Eur. *Hel.* 29, 359).

B. The Myc. MN *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^hugeg^wrī(n)s*/ ‘who escapes/d the HEAVY spear’ or ‘HEAVY evil, misfortune’ or ‘the HEAVY enemy’ or ‘the stone’ (*‘heavy thing’)

§4. The MN *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^hugeg^wrīns*/ is attested in Pylos (PY Ta 711.1), as the name of the official who makes inspection of the vessels and furniture recorded in the *Ta*-series. The existence of a homonymous official in Thebes, probably a collector, was clearly supported by the feminine adjective *pu₂-ke-qi-ri-ne-ja* /*P^hugeg^wrīneiail*/ TH Of 27.3 ‘workers of (the workshop of) *pu₂-ke-qi-ri*’,³⁶ and is now confirmed by the dative *pu₂-ke-qi-ri-ne* /*P^hugeg^wrīnei*/ TH Gp 119.1 in the new Theban tablets from the Odos Didotou. The Theban forms make clear that the second member of the compound is an *-n*- stem.

Myc. /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/ is obviously a governing compound of the type φερέ-οικος, and the lexemes of which it consists are recognisable: /*p^hug-e^o*/ matches Hom. ἔφυγε, and /*g^wrī(n)-*/ is surely related to βρῖ (Gloss.) and to the word family of βρίθω, βριθύς, which is attested in Mycenaean in the MN *qi-ri-ta-ko* (cf. §6). The structure of the compound /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/ is clear, but its semantics are not. A meaning “qui fuit de la lourdeur” as per Michel Lejeune is rather difficult to understand; moreover, “qui fuit” is actually incompatible with the aorist stem φυγο/ε- that /*P^huge^o*/ conceals. An interpretation as “Einer, der den Beschwernissen entkommt” has recently been proposed by O. Panagl and S. Deger-Jalkotzy, who, in the framework of a fine analysis of the status of both

³⁵ Plath 1999:511ff.

³⁶ With Killen’s (1983) appurtenance suffix /-eiā-/.

/P^hugeg^wrīns/ attestations, assume that the compound cannot be a “Kriegername”:³⁷ their interpretation is correct as to the first member, but the abstract meaning proposed for /g^wrīn-/ is less convincing, as I shall try to show.³⁷ The question still remains open whether *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* is an unworthy name, in terms of the rank of the men who bear it. Although this possibility may not be ruled out *a priori*, the fact is that Mycenaean officials do not have shaming (or, at least, not especially honouring) names like *mo-ro-ḡo-ro* (: μολοβρός) ‘Devourer of dung’ (cf. §2.11), or *ku-mo-no-so* ‘(having a) Nude-bottom’ (γυμνός, ὄρσος), in the convincing interpretations of Günter Neumann:³⁸ *mo-ro-ḡo-ro* (PY) and *ku-mo-no-so* (KN) are actually shepherds, although the first is also a *ko-to-no-o-ko*. In what follows, an attempt will be made to interpret the compound /P^huge-g^wrīn-/ *ex Graeco ipso* in light of the morphology and semantics of its members, and especially on the basis of the phraseological collocations one may set out for both and for their synonyms; and the interpretation I shall propose fits well into the pattern of a warrior-name.

§5. The first member Myc. /P^hug-e^o/ reflects, in my opinion, the aorist ἔφυγε ‘escaped’, not the imperfect ἔφευγε ‘was fleeing’. The form of the compound does not by itself definitively argue in favour of this interpretation, for the full grade form φευγ^o (or φευξί^o) is not attested in Classical Greek, with the exception of φευξιπήμων ‘avoiding/shunning troubles’ (Cercid. fr. 6.8) and the MN Φευγόλιμος (Eretria).³⁹ It is only the verbal forms themselves that actually allow us to recognise that in this momentative-telic lexeme (‘escape’) there is an aspectual opposition ἔφευγε ‘was fleeing’ :: ἔφυγε ‘escaped’ :: πέφευγε ‘is safe’ (part. πεφευγώς, πεφυγμένος). This is evident in light of *Od.* 1.11-12 ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον, / οἴκοι ἔσαν, πόλεμόν τε πεφευγότες ἠδὲ θάλασσαν ‘then all the others, as many as fled sheer destruction, were at home now, having escaped (πεφευγότες) the fighting and the sea’. The durative imperfect ‘was fleeing’ is evident in *Il.* 22.158-9 πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δὲ μιν μέγ’ ἀμείνων / καρπαλίμως ‘a great man fled (= was fleeing), but a far better one pursued (= was pursuing) him rapidly’.⁴⁰

³⁷ Lejeune 1965:152f. n. 63; Deger-Jalkotzy 2008:194ff., with an excursus by O. Panagl (194: “Als Kriegername kann er aber in dieser Bedeutung nicht mehr länger gelten”).

³⁸ Neumann 1992, 1999:202ff. The author quotes Μελάμπυγος ‘having a black bottom’ (cf. ἄ-πυγος), and °πρωκτος (δασύ°, εὐρυ°, λακκό°), with reference to compounds with °πυγος.

³⁹ Cf. also in late authors φεύγυδρος ‘shunning water’ (Plb.), φευξασπίδιον ‘hulwort, Teucrium Polium’ (Ps.-Diosc.).

⁴⁰ Cf. also *Il.* 21.255-6 ... ὕπαιθα δὲ τοῖο λιασθεις / φεδῶγ’, ὃ δ’ ὄπισθε ῥέων ἔπετο μέγαλω ὄρυμαγδῶ ‘... and bending away to escape from the river he fled (= was fleeing), but it

A crucial point in favour of the interpretation of /*P^hug-e^o*/ as the reflex of aor. ἔφυγε is the overlap between Hom. ἔφυγε and aor. ἤλεύατο in expressions for ‘escape, avoid, evade’ (not ‘flee’, which is durative):

Il. 13.436 οὔτε γὰρ ἐξοπίσω φυγέειν δύναται οὔτ’ ἀλέασθαι
‘so that he could neither run backward nor evade him’ (*scil.* Poseidon)

In fact, ἤλεύατο is interpreted by the scholiasts and glossators as ἀπέφυγεν and as ἐξέκλινε ‘avoided / eluded (by bending away)’, with explicit indication of the type of movement, cf. ἤλεύατο· ἐξέκλινεν, ἀπέφυγεν, ἀλευάμενος· ἐκκλίνας. φυλαξάμενος Hsch., or ἀλεύετο· ἐξέφευγεν Suda.

The semantic equivalence of ἔφυγε and ἤλεύατο, within their formulaic fields, is evident with EVIL (θάνατον, κῆρα, μόρον) as object, e.g.:

Od. 12.157 ἢ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν
‘(either die,) or turn aside from death and escape destruction’ (cf. also θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγωμεν *Il.* 17.714, φύγε κῆρα *Il.* 18.117, *Od.* 18.155 *et sim.*).

This collocation underlies the epithet κρησφύγετον ‘place of refuge’ (Hdt.), as shown by A. J. Nussbaum.⁴¹

Il. 3.359-60 ἀντικρὺ δὲ παρὰ λαπάρην διάμησε χιτῶνα
ἔγχος· ὃ δ’ ἐκλίνθη καὶ ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν.

‘straight ahead by the flank the spearhead shore through his tunic, yet he bent away to one side and avoided black death’ (= *Il.* 7.253-4).

The segment //ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν # after the trochaic caesura is formulaic (*Il.* 11.360, 14.462).

Od. 9.61 ... οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι φύγομεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε
‘but the rest of us escaped death and doom’

The collocation [ESCAPE - EVIL], which is richly attested with synonymous terms, cf. e.g. ἔφυγες θάνατον (11.362) and μόριμον ... ἀλέασθαι (*Il.* 20.302), κακότητα φυγόντες (*Od.* 23.238), is of great importance for the interpretation of /*P^hugeg^wrīn-*/ (§9.2).

To sum up: the Myc. MN /*P^huge-g^wrīns*/ designates its bearer as someone *who escaped* (ἔφυγε : ἤλεύατο) from something / someone, which / who is /*g^wrīn-*/, the nature of which remains to be determined. This may only be done in light of the semantics of this term and the collocations of its synonyms and continuators in Alphabetic Greek, especially in epic language.

came streaming (= was streaming) after him with a huge noise’.

⁴¹ Cf. Nussbaum 1986:63ff. (“a pre-arranged position in which combatants may take refuge”), with argumentation against other views.

§6. The second member of *pu₂-ke-qi-ri*, namely /^o*g^wrīn-*/, is surely connected with the gloss βρῖ, transmitted as a synonym of βριθῦ, cf. Hes. *apud* Strab. 8.5.3 (fr. 329 M.-W.): ‘Ἡσιόδου δέ, ὅτι τὸ βριθῦ καὶ βριαρὸν βρῖ λέγει (also Eust. 1.455). A variant βρί occurs in Herodian: βρί τὸ μέγα, βριθοσύνη τὸ βάρος, βριαρός ὁ ἰσχυρός, βριάειν αὔξειν καὶ οὐκ ἔχει δίφθογγον. Cf. also the gloss βρῖ (v.l. βρί) ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου, καὶ ἰσχυροῦ, καὶ χαλεποῦ τίθεται (Hsch.).

The form βρῖ, βρί (IE **g^wrh₂-i-*, with and without laryngeal metathesis, respectively) is attested as an adjectival first member of some compounds: (i) βριήπυος ‘loud-shouting’ (Hom. βριήπυος ὄβριμος Ἔρως *Il.* 13.521), in which the meaning of βρι^o is clear in view of the synonymous βαρύ-φθογγος (*HHVen.*, Bacch.) and βαρυ-βόας ‘heavy sounding’ (Pind. fr. 143.2 βαρυβόαν πορθμὸν ... Ἀχέροντος),⁴² (ii) the MN Βριάρεως (*Il.* 1.403 +, with second member ἀρή ‘imprecation’), (iii) the gloss βριηρόν· μεγάλως κεχαρισμένον Hsch. (second member related to acc. ἦρα ‘help, kindness’).

To βρῖ, βρί was formed a denominative βριάω, which has a double function, namely stative ‘be heavy/strong’ and causative ‘make heavy/strong’ (βριάει Hes. *Th.* 447 glossed as θρασύνει). Both functions occur in Hes. *Op.* 5 ῥέα μὲν γὰρ βριάει, ῥέα δὲ βριάοντα χαλέπτει ‘for easily makes strong (causative **g^wrih₂-ah₂-*), and easily oppresses the one who is strong’ (**g^wrih₂-ah₂-ont-*, with ‘passive’ -*nt-* as in Hittite, as shown by C. Watkins).⁴³

The meaning of βρῖ, βρί ‘heavy’ (only the neuter is attested, but an animate form must have existed too, see *infra*) is clear, regardless of its etymology. We can also assume, as a first step, that /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/ means ‘who escapes *something heavy or someone who is heavy*’. The term is certainly obsolete within Greek, and has been replaced by the synonymous βριθῦς and βριαρός, as well as βαρύς, all of which belong to the same root.⁴⁴ Another synonym, Hom.

⁴² Cf. also βριήπυος· μεγαλόφωνος. The second member is attested in the Myc. MN *a-pu-wa* /*Āpuwās*/ (TH) (“der über einen Gewalt-Ruf verfügt”; as per Heubeck 1970:70ff.) and MN *na-pu-ti-jo* (: privative νηπύτιος *“(noch) nicht vornehmlich rufen kann, der Hilfflose”; as per Neumann 2006:135f.).

⁴³ Watkins 1995:99f., with reference to OHitt. *UL armahḫanzi ... armaḫanteš* ‘not get pregnant ... those pregnant ones’ (cf. *armahḫ-^{hhi}* ‘make pregnant’).

⁴⁴ An adjective βριμός is found as a gloss: βριμός· μέγας. χαλεπός (Hsch.). Its authenticity may be accepted in view of Βριμῶ (*ī*), an epithet of Hecate and Persephone (Ap. Rhod. 3.861-2). The authenticity of βρίμη (cf. βρίμη· ἀπειλή. καὶ γυναικεία ἀρρήτοποιῖα Hsch.) is not fully assured. This may be a “homerisches Wort” created on the basis of the spelled sequence υποβριμης *HHom.* 28.10 ... μέγας δ’ ἐλελίζετ’ Ὀλυμπος / δεινὸν ὑπὸ βρίμης γλαυκώπιδος, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα by reanalysis of ὑπ’ ὀβρίμης as ὑπὸ βρίμης (cf. de Lamberterie 1990:541).

ὄβριμος (with *-i-*, on which cf. §7), comes into consideration as well, irrespective of its being etymologically connected — or not — with βρῖ.⁴⁵ Let us briefly recall the essentials of the form and semantics of these words.

βριθύς ‘heavy’, also in compounds as ὄβριθής, is a poetic equivalent of βαρύς,⁴⁶ cf. βρίθω ‘be heavy/weighed down’⁴⁷ and the synonymous βαρύθω (*Il.* 16.519, *Hes. Th.* 215). Further derivatives are βρῖθος ‘weight’ (*Eur.*+), βριθοσύνη ‘heaviness’ (*Il.* 5.838-9 μέγα δ’ ἔβραχε φήγινος ἄξων/βριθοσύνη, of the weight of Athena). The epithet βριθύς is also attested in compounded names and nicknames: Myc. *qi-ri-ta-ko* PY Cn 655.11 (with */G^wrī^h/*),⁴⁸ Alph. Gk. Βριθαῖος, Βρίθων, Βριθώ, and compounded Βριθ-αγόρας.

βριαρός ‘heavy’, cf. *Hom.* κόρυθα βριαρήν ‘helmet’ (also in the dative), τρυφάλειαν ... βριαρήν (*Il.* 19.381-2).

ὄβριμος is attested in formulas, applied to ἔγχος (13x), to Achilles (*Il.* 19.408), Hektor (4x) and Ares (6x), as well as to λίθος (*Od.* 9.305-6); and θυρεόν (*Od.* 9.240-1), cf. *Od.* 9. 305-6 χερσὶν ἀπόσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον, ὃν προσέθηκεν ‘... push with the hands from the lofty gate the ponderous boulder he had propped there’. Cf. also the compounds ὄβριμοεργός ‘heavy-handed’, of violent Achilles (*Il.* 22.418) and of Herakles (*Il.* 5.403), and ὄβριμοπάτηρ ‘with a mighty father’, of Athena (*Il.* 5.747 = 8.391). The meaning of the epithet is clearly the same as what one may assume for βρῖ, βαρύ, as is explicitly shown by the gloss ὄβριμον· βαρύ. ἰσχυρόν.

To sum up: the second member */^og^wrīn-/* of Myc. *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* */P^huge-g^wrīn-/* does not express something vague (“la lourdeur” or the like), but something concrete, which is βρῖ, i.e. a synonym of βριθύς (or βαρύς, or ὄβριμος).

⁴⁵ The difference in the length of the vowel *-i-*, and especially the initial *ὄ-*, remains problematic. It is possible that ὄβρις belongs to the same lexical group, if it originally meant “pression sur” (Perpillou 1987:197ff.) and if *ὄ-* actually matches ἐπί. In any case this form is not helpful for our purposes.

⁴⁶ Cf. de Lamberterie 1990:539ff., 547 (“βριθύς: c’est le substitut de βαρύς dans un certain style”).

⁴⁷ Also ‘outweight, prevail’ of men (*Il.* 12.346, 17.512; *Od.* 6.159) and βρισάρματος ‘chariot-pressing’ (*HH* 8.1 Ἔρες ... βρισάρματα).

⁴⁸ Myc. *qi-ri-ta-ko* may conceal */G^wrī^h-ark^hos/* ‘of heavy power’ (Heubeck 1958:57), or */G^wrī-stak^hos/* “à la lourde lance” (Pinault 1979:170 n. 19; he operates with a second member *στάχος, cf. σταχύς ‘ear of corn’). I prefer to understand *qi-ri-ta-ko* as */G^wrī^h-ākos/*, a derivative in */-ākos/* of **/g^wrī^hu-/* ‘heavy’, of the type MN *re-wa-ko* (TH) */Leiwāko-/* ‘beardless’ (cf. λειός ‘smooth’), Δρίμακος (cf. δριμύς ‘sharp’), Σίμακος (cf. σῖμος ‘snub-nosed’), for which cf. García Ramón 2005d:96, 2006:33.

§7. The Greek forms dealt with in §6 may be traced back to the derivatives in *-i-* and *-u-* that comparison allows us to reconstruct for IE **g^uerh₂-*.⁴⁹

g^urh₂-í-*, whence **g^urih₂-* (by ‘laryngeal metathesis’): Gk. βρῖ, Ved. *grīśmá-* ‘summer, hot season’.⁵⁰ Specifically Greek formations: βριθός (g^urīth₂-*: **g^urih₂-d^h-*), βριαρός (**g^urih₂-r^ó-* [**g^urii₂-*] better than **g^urih₂-er^ó-*), βριμός (**g^urīmo-*: **g^urih₂mo-*), probably also ὄβριμος (from **g^uri(h₂)mo^o* by de Saussure’s effect, or by loss of laryngeal in composition, type ὄβριμο-εργός, or by analogy with adjectives in *-ιμος*?).

**g^urh₂-í-* ‘heavy’: Ved. *giri-* and Av. *gairi-* ‘high, mountain’, Alb. *gur* (pl. *gúrë*), Arm. *kar* ‘strength, force’, *kari* ‘very’,⁵¹ *korovk’* ‘strength’ (plural of **korov* ‘strong’).

**g^urh₂-ú-* ‘heavy’, whence **g^uruh₂* (by ‘laryngeal metathesis’): Lat. dial. *brūtus*, Latv. *grūts*.

**g^urh₂-ú-* ‘heavy’: βαρύς, Ved. *gurú-*.

A formal difficulty that remains is the structure of the second member /^o*g^wrīn-*/. One may assume an *-n-* stem, namely *-īn-*, which actually goes back to the animate acc. *g^urīh₂-m* (from *g^urh₂-i-m*) of **g^urh₂-i-* (neuter βρῖ, animate βρῖς*), whence phonetically **g^urīm* and PGk. **g^urīn-* (Myc. /*g^wrīn-*/: **βρῖν-*), which then becomes a new stem by reanalysis. The process is similar to that which underlies Gk. Ζῆν+α and the rare formations with suffix **-īn-* (from **-ih₂*) of the type ἀκτίν- (ἀκτίς ‘ray’), γλωχίτν- (γλωχίς ‘end of the yoke strap’, ‘barb of an arrow’), ὠδίτν- (ὠδίς ‘pang’, ‘throes of childbirth’),⁵² to which may be added θίτν- ‘heap’, ‘beach’, ‘sand-bank’ (PGk. **^hīn-*) and ῥίτν- ‘nose’, reanalysed from IE **d^hh₁-ih₂-m* and **sr_u-ih₂-m* (IE **sre_u-* ‘flow’).⁵³

§8. We can assume at this point that the Mycenaean compound /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/: (: ἔφυγε ‘escaped’) conceals a collocation [ESCAPE - HEAVY], where ESCAPE is expressed by φυγο/ε-, and HEAVY is an epithet designating a thing or person as βρῖ, i.e. as βριθός (or βαρύς, or ὄβριμος):

[ESCAPE - HEAVY [thing / person]]

The choice of an adjective, and not of a noun, for the object of ESCAPE actually implies the existence of a nominal phrase HEAVY - [thing / person], and the selec-

⁴⁹ Cf. the detailed analysis by de Lamberterie 1982 and 1990:525ff. Cf. also Pinault 1979:166f.

⁵⁰ I.e. “die Zeit des starken Sommers” as per Wackernagel 1934 (also Pinault 1979:167).

⁵¹ Originally an adjective. Cf. also Arm. *karik* ‘distress’ (**g^urh₂-i^hh₂-* “ce qui accable”, as per de Lamberterie 1982:49f.).

⁵² Schindler 1975:64f. (ὠδίτν-: PGk. **ōdīn-*, reanalysed from IE **h₁ōd_u-ih₂-m*).

⁵³ Cf. Dubois 1987:233f.

tion of the attribute, not the head of the nominal phrase. In other words, HEAVY (Myc. ${}^{\circ}g^{w}r\bar{i}n-$) may be understood as a transferred epithet by contiguity (in C. Watkins's formulation), with deletion of the noun that was *a priori* the head of the nominal phrase, as with Ved. $pr̥thiví$ 'earth' (*'wide': IE $*p_{1}^{l}th_{2}u\bar{i}h_{2}-$) beside Ved. $kṣām\ pr̥thivīm$: OAv. $zqm \dots pərəθuuīm$ 'the wide earth', and the Celt. divinity (cf. St. Brigit) $*Brigantī$ (*'lofty': $*b^{h}r̥g^{h}h_{2}t-ih_{2}-$) beside Ved. $br̥hatī \dots uṣās$),⁵⁴ as well as Lat. *terra* 'earth' (*'dry': $*ters-ā-$), Hitt. $alpāš$ 'cloud' (*'white': $*h_{1}alb^{h}ó-$, cf. Lat. *albus*).

§9. The question now arises: What (thing, or person) is referred to in poetry as βριθύς, βαρύς, ὄβριμος, i.e. as synonymous with βρῖ? Three candidates come into consideration on the basis of the Homeric material, namely (1) spear, (2) evil, and (3) enemy, whether man or god (Ares).

(1) The term for 'spear' (ἔγχος) is qualified as βριθύ and as ὄβριμον (the latter in a formula, cf. *infra*). As to ἔγχος, cf. *Il.* 5.745-6:

ἔς δ' ὄχεα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, λάζετο δ' ἔγχος
βριθὺ μέγα στιβαρόν, τῷ δάμνησι στίχας ἀνδρῶν
'she set her feet in the blazing chariot and took up a spear, heavy, huge, thick,
with which she beats down the battalions ...'⁵⁵

It must be stressed that in this case ἔγχος / βριθύ is the warrior's *own* spear, not that of the enemy, and that there is a clear formulaic boundary between both words: this speaks strongly against a real formula. A rather different case is that of // ὄβριμον ἔγχος #, a real formula at the end of the hexameter attested 15 times in Homer,⁵⁶ designating the spear *of the enemy*:

Il. 3.357 διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος ἦλθε φαεινῆς ὄβριμον ἔγχος
'all the way through the glittering shield went the heavy spearhead'

A crucial point may be stressed here: ἔγχος is also the object of ἠλεύατο, the synonym of ἔφυγε (§ 5):

Il. 13.184 ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν ἄντα ἰδὼν ἠλεύατο χάλκεον ἔγχος
'but he (*scil.* Teukros) with his eyes straight on him avoided the bronze
spear'

These passages allow us to recognise a nominal phrase ὄβριμον ἔγχος (i.e. HEAVY [spear]), the epithet of which may be selected for the verbal phrase [ESCAPE - HEAVY], corresponding to the schema of the collocation proposed in §8, namely

[ESCAPE - HEAVY spear].

⁵⁴ On this Celtic material, see the paper by C. Watkins in the present volume.

⁵⁵ Cf. also *Il.* 8.390; 16.141; 16.802; 19.388; *Od.* 1.99-100.

⁵⁶ 14x out of 15x in the *Iliad*, 1x out of 3x in the *Odyssey*.

As seen in *Il.* 13.184, this is the action of a fighting warrior, not that of a coward who flees the spear and by extension the fight. This is actually possible from the purely formal point of view, as shown by φυγαίχμας ‘who flees the spear’ (Aesch. *Pers.* 1025 Ἴάνων λαὸς οὐ φυγαίχμας, also Call. fr. 117),⁵⁷ but does not apply for the Homeric instances quoted in §5.⁵⁸

(2) Designations of ‘evil’ and ‘misfortune’ (κακότης, κακόν) occur in early poetry in nominal phrases with the epithets βαρύς and ἐμβριθής, namely (Hom.) κακότητα βαρεῖαν # (not *κακότητα βριθείαν #, which would be unmetrical), ἐμβριθὲς κακόν (Aesch.):

Il. 10.71 Ζεὺς ἐπὶ γιγνομένοισιν ἴει κακότητα βαρεῖαν

‘that Zeus cast on us as we were born this burden of evil’

just as when one casts a rock/stone (λᾶαν), cf. *Il.* 3.12 ὅσον τ’ ἐπὶ λᾶαν ἴησιν (§12).

Aesch. *Pers.* 693 τί ἐστὶ Πέρσαις νεοχμὸν ἐμβριθὲς κακόν ...;

‘what is the new grievous, heavy evil for the Persians?’

It is important to remember that ‘evil’ is often the object of φυγεῖν, ἀλεύασθαι (§5), cf. (among others) φύγε κῆρα (*Il.* 18.117), θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν (*Od.* 12.157) with variants, φύγομεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε (*Od.* 9.61), κακότητα φυγόντες (*Od.* 23.238), and, with ἀλεύασθαι, ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν (*Il.* 3.359), μόριμον ... ἀλέασθαι (*Il.* 20.302).

The syntagms κακότητα βαρεῖαν or ἐμβριθὲς κακόν (Aesch.) fit into the pattern of the nominal phrase HEAVY - [thing / person], namely HEAVY [evil]. The epithet may be selected for the verbal phrase [ESCAPE - HEAVY], namely

[ESCAPE - HEAVY evil, misfortune].

⁵⁷ I owe this indication to José Luis Melena. The pejorative sense of ‘fleeing the fight’ is also attested in compounds with first member φυγο°, Hom. φυγοπτόλεμος (*Od.* 14.212-13 ... ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀποφώλιος ἦα / οὐδὲ φυγοπτόλεμος ‘for I was no contemptible man, not one who fled from the fighting’), φυγόμαχος ‘shunning battle’ (Simon. fr. 19.1) and φυγομαχέω (Plb.+). The same applies to poetic compounds with φυξ(ι)°, cf. αὐτογενεῖ φυξανορία ‘because of (our) innate aversion to husbands’ (Aesch. *Supp.* 8) and its late continuants φυγόδεμος (Nonn. *Dion.* 2.98 *et al.*), φυγοδέμνιος (Antipator *Anth. Pal.* 6.10, of Pallas Athena), φυγόλεκτρος. Cf. also the Aeschylean compound φυξίμηλα (Aesch. fr. 451c9), glossed as δένδρα τὰ διὰ ὕψος ἐκπεφευγότα ἐσθίεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν βοσκημάτων (Hsch.). In late authors are attested φυξήλιος ‘shunning the sun’ (Nic. *Ther.* 660), φυξίπολις ‘fleeing the city, banished’ (Opp. *Hal.* 1.278).

⁵⁸ In other cases φυγο° simply denotes aversion or reluctance, cf. φυγόξεινον στρατόν ‘shunning strangers = inhospitable’ (Pind. *Ol.* 11.18), φυγοδικέω ‘shirk a trial’ (Dem. 40.16), φυγοπονία ‘aversion to work’ (Plb.+).

(3) The enemy (Achilles, Hektor) and war itself (Ares) are designated in Homer as ὄβριμος. Achilles (*Il.* 19.408 ὄβριμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ) is also referred to as ὄβριμοεργός 'heavy-handed' (*Il.* 22.418), like Heracles (*Il.* 5.403), but he is not ὄβριμος *par excellence* and he does not in fact appear with this word in a formula. In contrast, both Hektor and Ares appear in the formulas // ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ # (4x: *Il.* 8.473, 10.200, 11.347, 14.44) and // ὄβριμος Ἄρης # (*Il.* 5.845, 16.613 = 13.444 *et al.*), also in *Il.* 13.521 redundantly after βριήπυος:

Il. 11.347 νῶϊν δὴ τόδε πῆμα κυλίνδεται ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ

'here is this curse, Hektor the huge, wheeling down upon us'

Il. 13.521 οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ τι πέπυστο βριήπυος ὄβριμος Ἄρης

'but Ares the huge and bellowing had yet heard nothing'

The formulas // ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ #, // ὄβριμος Ἄρης # suggest a verbal phrase [ESCAPE - HEAVY], where HEAVY may be a transferred epithet for an enemy or for Ares, i.e.

[ESCAPE - HEAVY enemy, Ares],

although there are no attestations of verbal phrases with Hektor or Ares (and the like) that could be adduced in support of the possibility that this is the collocation underlying Myc. /P^huge-g^wrīn-/.

To sum up: Myc. /P^huge-g^wrīn-/ reflects a verb phrase, namely a two-member collocation consisting of a verb ESCAPE and a transferred epithet HEAVY. The transferred epithet is the designation either of (1) [spear], or (2) [evil, misfortune], or, less probably, (3) [enemy, Ares].

As to ESCAPE, cf. φυγέειν δύνατ' οὐτ' ἀλέασθαι (*Il.* 13.436), ἢ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν (*Il.* 12.157), φύγοιμεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε (*Od.* 9.61), ἀλεύατο κῆρα (*Il.* 3.360) (§§5, 9.2).

As to HEAVY (1) [spear], cf. ἔγχος βριθύ (*Il.* 5.746), ὄβριμον ἔγχος (formulaic: *Il.* 3.357 *et al.*), (2) [evil, misfortune], cf. κακότητα βαρείαν (*Il.* 10.71), ἐμβριθὲς κακόν (Aesch. *Pers.* 693) (§§9.1-2).

As to [ESCAPE - spear], cf. ἠλεύατο χάλκεον ἔγχος (*Il.* 13.184) (§9.1).

As to [ESCAPE - evil], cf. ἢ κεν ἀλευάμενοι θάνατον καὶ κῆρα φύγοιμεν (*Il.* 12.157), φύγοιμεν θάνατόν τε μόρον τε (*Od.* 9.61), ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν (*Il.* 3.360), κακότητα φυγόντες (*Od.* 23.238) *et sim.* (§§5, 9.2).

The common denominator of 'spear', 'evil' and 'enemy' is evident: they are HEAVY to endure, and a person, more precisely the warrior, tries to avoid / escape them. The interrelation, not to say commutability, between [spear] (ὄβριμον ἔγχος, ἔγχος) and [evil] (κῆρα μέλαιναν) and the connection of both with ἀλεύατο, i.e. φύγε, is abundantly clear in *Il.* 3.357-60 (= *Il.* 7.251-4):

διὰ μὲν ἀσπίδος ἦλθε φαεινῆς ὄβριμον ἔγχος,

καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαιδάλου ἠρήρειστο·

ἀντικρὺ δὲ παραὶ λαπάρην διάμησε χιτῶνα

ἔγχοϛ· ὃ δ' ἐκλίνθη καὶ ἀλεύατο κῆρα μέλαιναν.

‘all the way through the glittering shield went the heavy spearhead and smashed its way through the intricately worked corselet; straight ahead by the flank the spearhead shore through his tunic, yet he bent away to one side and avoided black death’.

We can conclude that Myc. *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* /*P^hugeg^wrī(n)s*/ may be understood as ‘who escapes/d the HEAVY spear’ or ‘HEAVY evil, misfortune’ or ‘the HEAVY enemy’. The Homeric evidence shows clearly that these are not shameful activities, but rather those of a warrior who tries to avoid the enemy’s spear, or evil, as every warrior does, without his being considered a coward at all.

§10. Two possible objections remain. The first concerns the collocations [HEAVY spear] and [HEAVY evil, misfortune]. The first of these is formulaic in the case of // ὄβριμον ἔγχοϛ #, but also with other epithets, such as χάλκεον (*Il.* 3.317, 4.481, ...), δολιχόσκιον (*Il.* 3.346, 3.355 = 5.280, ...), μείλινον (*Il.* 5.655, 6.65, ...), always at the end of the hexameter. For its part, [HEAVY evil, misfortune] is not formulaic, as is // κῆρα μέλαιναν # (*Il.* 2.859, 3.360 = 7.254, etc.). The head of both nominal phrases is the noun, namely [spear], [evil], not the epithet [HEAVY], which is formulaic only in the case of ὄβριμον ἔγχοϛ. On this assumption, one would *a priori* expect selection of the noun, not of the adjective, in a compound. Moreover, once an epithet is preferred, for [evil] (κῆρα) one might expect [BLACK] (cf. μέλαινα), which is formulaic, to be worthy of selection instead of [HEAVY]. This is not, however, a decisive objection against the interpretation proposed: it goes without saying that we can only try to explain *what is attested*, and that we cannot always explain *why* a particular choice was made and *why* another option was *not* selected.⁵⁹

A second open question was kindly pointed out to me by Calvert Watkins: Why should βριθὺς or ὄβριμος, which seem “unmetapherfähig”, have been chosen, instead of βαρὺς, which is clearly “metapherfähig”? For the creation of a structure [ESCAPE - the HEAVY], the more general and unmarked βαρὺς ‘heavy’ is not what was selected. The difficulty is a real one and again we are confronted with a choice that seems difficult to explain. However, our possible strictures do not exclude the possibility that the giver of the name /*P^huge-g^wrīn-*/ could have chosen another way. Myc. /*g^wrīn-*/ could go back to earlier phases of Greek and

⁵⁹ Calvert Watkins suggests as a possible parallel the Theban WN *a-qi-ti-ta* /*Ak^{wh}ītā-*/ (cf. κλέος ἄφθιτον : Ved. *śrávo ákṣitam* ‘imperishable fame’, on which see Risch 1987). In this case, the hypocoristic name reflects the selection of the attribute, not of the noun itself. This may be due to the higher semantic markedness of ἄφθιτος as against βριθὺς or ὄβριμος.

have been replaced by synonymous epithets at later stages of the poetic language. In my opinion, the selection of archaic βρῖ as a transferred epithet instead of βαρύς, βριθύς, ὄβριμος is perfectly possible, even if this is not the device that seems the most logical to us.

§11. The interpretation of /°g^wrīn-/ as a transferred epithet, though plausible in itself, may find support in two Mycenaean theophoric names, *a-wi-to-do-to* and *i-su-ku-wo-do-to* (KN), with second member °do-to (cf. the type Διό-δοτος, Ἡρόδοτος). In both names the first member is an epithet that may be the actual designation of a deity, even if a minor one.⁶⁰

(1) The MN *a-wi-to-do-to* has been interpreted as /Awisto-dotos/ ‘Given by the invisible (deity)’.⁶¹ Myc. *a-wi-to-* conceals /awisto°/ : ἄϊστος ‘invisible’, a transferred epithet, designating a god or goddess who is invoked and felt as not visible, or whom one cannot look at, i.e. an *ἄϊστος θεός. It must be stressed that ἄγνωστοι θεοί are also mentioned in Attica and in Olympia by Pausanias (1.1.4).

What kind of deity Myc. **a-wi-to* could be remains unclear. It may be some divinised being like Sleep, which risks being made ἄϊστον by Zeus (*Il.* 14.258 καὶ κέ μ’ ἄϊστον ἀπ’ αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε πόντῳ / εἰ μὴ Νύξ ... ἐσάωσε ... ‘and he (*scil.* Zeus) would have sunk me out of sight in the sea from the bright sky had not Night ... rescued me’).⁶² It may also designate the Night, called θεὸν ἀθέατον by Proclus (Schol. ad Hes. *Op.* 15), and most probably a deity who was felt to be (or who occasionally worked as) ‘invisible’. This is, in Classical times, the case of Athena, who becomes invisible by putting on the helm of Hades (*Il.* 5.845) and who is addressed as ἄποπτος by Ajax (*Soph. Ai.* 15 ὡς εὐμαθές σου, κἄν ἄποπτος ἦς, ...).⁶³ She is in fact called ἄϊστος in Schol. in Ar. *Nub.* 967. This may also be the case with the underworld goddess Persephone, who is called τὰν ἀφανῆ θεὸν in Sophocles (*OC* 1556, lyr.).⁶⁴ Hades (Ἄ-ἰδης, poetic form for Ἄιδης) himself is felt to be the one ‘whom one may not look at’ (*Soph. Ai.* 608 ἀίδηλον Ἄιδαν), and his helm occasionally renders someone invisible

⁶⁰ On both names cf. García Ramón 2005d:85ff. and 2007b:324ff.

⁶¹ Ilievski 1999:310, with reference to dat. Ἄγνωστον θεῶν in New Testament Greek.

⁶² Cf. Schol. *D.*: καὶ ἄν ιδὼν με ἀνιστόρητον καὶ ἀφανῆ ἐποίησεν, Hsch. ἄϊστον· ἀφανῆ. ἀνήκοον <ἄγνωστον>.

⁶³ Cf. Schol. *ad loc.* δῆλον γὰρ ὡς οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὴν ἐκ τοῦ· κἄν ἄποπτος ἦς, ὁμῶς, τουτέστιν ἀόρατος. τῆς δὲ φωνῆς μόνης αἰσθάνεται ... ὡς ἐθάδος αὐτῷ οὔσης.

⁶⁴ Persephone is called ἀθήητος by Nonnos (6.139 ἀθηήτοιο ... Περσεφονείης), but this is not a good parallel, as the poet refers to other gods (Zeus, Artemis, Dionysos) with the same epithet.

(cf. *supra*): whatever the etymology of his name may be, it was synchronically interpreted as ‘invisible’ by the ancients.⁶⁵

(2) The MN *i-su-ku-wo-do-to* /*Isk^huo-dotos*/ may be understood as ‘Given by the powerful (god/goddess)’ on the assumption that **Isk^hu-o^o*/ is originally not the deification of ἰσχύς ‘power, strength’, but an adjective, i.e. an epithet of a deity.⁶⁶ In fact, Myc. /*Isk^hu-*/ may be a motionless adjective ‘powerful’,⁶⁷ also designating a goddess, as seen in gen. Αθαναας Θερσουος (Larisa, 2nd C.), in a text edited by Helly 1970:271f., line 24: the form unmistakably points to an Athena Θερσός.⁶⁸ An epithet **ισχύς* ‘strong’ (“fort, qui résiste” as per de Lamberterie) from **si-sg^h-ú-* (cf. ἰσχο/ε-) may be assumed beside ἰσχύς (-*ū-*) ‘force’ and **seġ^h-ú-* (: **séġ^h-o/e-*), continued by Gk. ἔχου-ρός : Ved. *sáhu-ri-*, denominative Hitt. *šakurrija-mi*.⁶⁹ Some deities of different rank are mentioned as ‘powerful’ in the 1st millenium, cf. Hera ἰσχυρά, Ares κρατερός *et al.*, Moira κραταιή, Hades ἰφθιμος, Phobos κρατερός.

To sum up: Myc. *a-wi-to^o* /*A-wisto^o*/ and *i-su-ku^o* /*Isk^hu^o*/ as the first members of theophoric names may be transferred epithets that designate deities or divinised beings who are invisible (**áistos* θεός) and strong (**ισχύς* θεός), respectively. Who these deities could be escapes us, but one thing is clear: they can hardly be major divinities, because these are mentioned in Linear B by their proper name, never by an epithet or cultic epiclesis.

§12. An alternative explanation for *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* was suggested to me by Calvert Watkins.⁷⁰ In his opinion, /*g^wriⁿ-*/ may be a noun denoting something concrete and weighty, “anything heavy and potentially threatening”, such as Ved. *giri-*, Av. *gairi-* (§7), which could conceivably have meant ‘stone, rock’, like Alb. *gur*, and which could have been used as a weapon. This is a very attractive possibility, and actually fits into a well-known Iliadic commonplace, although the usual Homeric terms for ‘stone, rock’ are λίθος or λάαξ. This idea may be developed on the strength of the following points:

⁶⁵ That the basic form is **n₂-uid-* (Schulze 1892:468, Beekes 1998) is not cogent from the formal point of view. Whether ἰσθις belongs to **seh₂i-* (Janda 2000:114ff.) must remain open.

⁶⁶ “Given by the Strong” (Ilievski 1999:309). The gods are often considered to be “strong”, cf. Ar. *Plut.* 946 τοῦτον τὸν ἰσχυρὸν θεόν, and Aesch. *Sept.* 226 θεοῦ δ’ ἔτ’ ἰσχύς.

⁶⁷ The motionless type, cf. e.g. ἡδὺς ἀντημή (*Od.* 12.369), has always been explained as metrically conditioned (most recently de Lamberterie 1990:886f. n. 4).

⁶⁸ Athena is often called Θερασεία (Pind. *Nem.* 3. 50), also Θερασώ (Lycophr. 936), δορυθαρσεία (*Anth. Gr.*).

⁶⁹ De Lamberterie 1990:297. See also Nussbaum 1998:528.

⁷⁰ *Per litteras* 27.4.2006.

(1) In Homer [stone] (λίθος) is referred to as ὄβριμος (*Od.* 9.305),⁷¹ exactly like [spear] (ἔγχος) and enemy / Ares (cf. §§9.1, 3):

Od. 9. 304-5 οὐ γάρ κεν δυνάμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων

χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον, ὃν προσέθηκεν.

‘seeing that our hands could never have pushed from the lofty gate the ponderous boulder he had propped there’

(2) λίθος, as the synonym of λάας, is clearly associated with βριθοσύνη (*Il.* 12.445ff., esp. 453, 460-1):

Il. 12.445 Ἔκτωρ δ’ ἀρπάξας λάαν φέρεν, ὃς ῥα πυλάων

...

453 ὧς Ἔκτωρ ἰθὺς σανίδων φέρε λαάν ἀείρας,

...

459 ῥῆξε δ’ ἀπ’ ἀμφοτέρους θαιρούς· πέσε δὲ λίθος εἴσω

βριθοσύνη, μέγα δ’ ἀμφὶ πύλαι μύκον, ...

‘meanwhile Hektor snatched up a stone ... and carried it along ... (453) so Hektor lifting the stone carried it straight for the door leaves ... (459) ... and the stone crashed ponderously in and the gates groaned deep’.

This is a second common collocation that [stone] shares with [spear], cf. ἔγχος βριθύ (*Il.* 5.745-6, §9.2).

(3) A stone is thrown (βλήτο, active ἵησι) and reaches its goal (or does not): this collocation is attested with different lexemes for [stone], which occur in the accusative with ἵημι (λάαν *Il.* 3.12), in the accusative or instrumental dative with βάλλω (λάεσσι *Il.* 3.80, λίθον *Il.* 7.264-8, χερμαδίῳ *Il.* 4.518+, πέτρῳ *Il.* 7.270+),⁷² as in:

Il. 3.12 τόσσον τίς τ’ ἐπιλεύσσει ὅσον τ’ ἐπὶ λάαν ἵησιν

‘and a man can see before him only as far as a stone cast’

The parallelism between (ἐπὶ) λάαν ἵησιν and ἵει (ἵει κακότητα βαρεῖαν) is evident, cf.

Il. 10.71 Ζεὺς ἐπὶ γιγνομένοισιν ἵει κακότητα βαρεῖαν

‘that Zeus cast on us as we were born this burden of evil’

The burden of [evil] is cast on someone, just as a [stone] (λάαν) is thrown in battle.

(4) The connection between [stone] and [escape], like that between [evil] and [escape] (§§5, 9.2), is evident in

⁷¹ Also with θυρεόν *Od.* 9.240-1 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ’ ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψὸς ἀείρας / ὄβριμον ‘he heaved up and set into position the huge door stop (θυρεόν), a massive thing’; with πέτρην ‘cliff’ 9.243.

⁷² *Il.* 7.264ff. λίθον εἴλετο χειρὶ παχείῃ ...: 266 / τῷ βάλεν, *Il.* 4.518 χερμαδίῳ γὰρ βλήτο, *Il.* 7.270 ἀσπίδ’ ἔαξε βαλὼν μυλοειδέϊ πέτρῳ, *Il.* 16.41 Ἐρύλαον ... βάλε πέτρῳ.

Il. 20.288 ἔνθα κεν Αἰνεΐας μὲν ἐπεσσύμενον βάλε πέτρῳ
 ἢ κόρυθ' ἢ ἐσάκος, τό οἱ ἤρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,
 ‘and there Aineias would have hit him with the stone as he swept in, on helm
 or shield, which would have fended the bitter death from him’.

The context makes the connection evident: [evil] is produced by the stone, and the shield helps to [ESCAPE/EVADE] it. The conceptual continuity is clear: a man casts a [stone] (λαῶν Il. 3.12, πέτρῳ 7.266 *et sim.*) which hits, just as a man or a god casts [evil, misfortune], which is painful, i.e. a [HEAVY evil] (λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον).

We can therefore conclude that the Homeric evidence, namely the distributional patterns attested for [stone], strongly supports the interpretation of Myc. /^og^wrīn-/ as an old term for ‘stone, rock’, later replaced in Greek by other terms (λίθος, λάα, etc.), a term that may still survive in Myc. /P^huge-g^wrīn-/, if it means ‘who escaped the stone’ (*‘heavy thing’).

§13. To sum up: Myc. pu₂-ke-qi-ri /P^hugeg^wrīns/ may be interpreted on the strength of the Homeric collocations of the synonyms of its second member /^og^wrīn-/ (: βρῖ ‘heavy’, replaced within Greek by βριθύς, βαρύς, ὄβριμος), which is a transferred epithet or even an old term for ‘stone’. Myc. pu₂-ke-qi-ri /P^hugeg^wrī(n)s/ presents the men who bear it as figures ‘who escape/d the heavy (spear)’, or ‘heavy (evil, misfortune)’, or ‘the heavy (enemy)’, or ‘the stone’ (*‘heavy thing’). These actions are those of a warrior in the fight, as repeatedly attested in the Homeric poems, not those of a coward who flees. Myc. pu₂-ke-qi-ri /P^hugeg^wrīns/ may thus be safely considered a warrior name.

References

- ARAVANTINOS, V. L., L. GODART and A. SACCONI. 2001. *Thèbes. Fouilles de la Cadmée I*. Pisa - Roma.
- BEEKES, R. S. P. 1998. “Hades and Elysion”. *Mír Curad* (Studies Calvert Watkins). Innsbruck, 17-28.
- DEGER-JALKOTZY, S. 2008. “A-mu-ta-wo, Ku-ru-me-no und Pu₂-ke-qi-ri: drei ‘mykenische Karrieren’”. *Colloquium Romanum* (Acti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma, 20-25.2.2006). Roma, 179-97.
- DUBOIS, L. 1987. “Le nez coule”. Actes de la 1ère Rencontre Internationale de Dialectologie Grecque (= *Verbum* 10), Nancy 1988, 233-4.
- GARCÍA(-)RAMÓN, J. L. 1992. “Mycénien ke-sa-do-ro /Kessandros/, ke-ti-ro /Kestilos/, ke-to /Kestōr/: grec alphabétique Αἰνησιμβρότα, Αἰνησίλαος, Αἰνήτωρ et le nom de Cassandra”. *Mykenaiika* (Actes du IXème Colloque International des Études Mycéniennes, Athens 1990). Paris, 239-55.

- . 1998–1999. “Mycenaean *e-u-de-we-ro* /*Eudewelos*/ ‘having nice (late) afternoons’, Homeric εὐδειελος, Cyrenaean Εὐεσπερίδες”. *Studies presented to John T. Killen = Minos* 33-34, 135-48.
- . 2000a. “Mycénien *qa-sa-ko* /*K^wās-ark^hos*/, grec alphabétique Πάσαρχος, Κτήσαρχος et le dossier de **kuā(s)*- dans la langue des tablettes”. *Philokypros* (Mélanges Olivier Masson), Suppl. a *Minos* 16:153-76.
- . 2000b. “Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 3. Mykenisch *to-wa-no* /*T^howānōr*/, homerisch Πρόθωος und Προθοήνωρ”. *ŽAnt* 50:205-12.
- . 2001. “Onomástica y cultura clásica”. *EClás* 120:105-18.
- . 2001–2002a. “Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 1. Mykenisch *o-ki-ro*, alph.gr. ὀρχίλος. 2. Mykenisch *da-te-wa* /*Daitēwās*/ und *e-u-da-i-ta*, alph.gr. Δαίτας, Πανδαίτης”. *Minos* 35:431-42.
- . 2001–2002b. “In Vorbereitung: Die historischen Personennamen des Mykenischen (HPNMyk)”. *Minos* 35:461-72.
- . 2002. “Mykenisch *o-ti-na-wo* /*Ortināwos*/ und vedisch *īyarti nāvam*, homerisch Ὀρτίλοχος / Ὀρσίλοχος, *ὠρσε λόχον und λόχον εἶσε”. *Novalis Indogermanica* (Festschrift Günter Neumann), Graz, 183-93.
- . 2005a. “Indogermanische Dichtersprache, Phraseologie und Onomastik”. *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel* (Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Halle 2000), Wiesbaden, 117-38.
- . 2005b. “Antroponimia griega: entre el léxico común y la fraseología indoeuropea”. *Actas del XI Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos* (Santiago de Compostela, 15-20.9.2003), vol. II. Madrid, 17-55.
- . 2005c. “Update on Die historischen Personennamen des Mykenischen”. *Indo-European Studies Bulletin* (UCLA) 11:24-33.
- . 2005d. “Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 5. *a-wi-to-do-to* /*Awisto-dotos*/ und die unsichtbaren Götter im Alph.-Griechischen. 6. *we-re-na-ko* und Myk. */*wrēn*/ : alph.-gr. ὠρην-, ἀρήν”. *ŽAnt* 2006, 55:85-97.
- . 2006. “Zur Onomastik der neuen Texten aus Theben”. *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben: Ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur* (Internationales Kolloquium Wien, 5-6.12.2002). Wien, 37-52.
- . 2007a. “Thessalian Personal Names and the Greek Lexicon”. *Old and New in Greek Onomastics* (Colloquium, British Academy, Oxford, 27-28.03.2003). Oxford, 29-67.
- . 2007b. “Mykenische Personennamen und griechische Dichtung und Phraseologie: *i-su-ku-wo-do-to* und *a-re-me-ne*, *a-re-ī-me-ne*”. *Colloquium Romanum* (Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma, 20-25.2.2006). Roma, 323-35.
- HELLY, Br. 1970. “À Larisa. Bouleversement et remise en ordre des sanctuaires”. *Mnemosyne* 23:250-96.
- HEUBECK, A. 1958. “Myk. **qi-si-po* : ξίφος”. *Minos* 6:55-60 (= *Kl. Schr.*, Erlangen 1994, 379-84).
- . 1970. “Griechisch-mykenische Etymologien”. *SMEA* 11:63-72.
- ILIEVSKI, P. 1992. “The Personal Names from the Knossos D Tablets”. *Mykenaiika* (Actes du IXème Colloque International des Études Mycéniennes, Athens 1990). Paris, 321-48.

- . 1999. "Interpretation of some Mycenaean Personal Names: Nomina theophora". *Floreat Studia Mycenaea* (Akten des IX. Mykenologischen Kolloquiums, Salzburg 1995). Vienna, 299-311.
- JANDA, M. 2000. *Eleusis. Das indogermanische Erbe der Mysterien*. Innsbruck.
- KILLEN, J. T. 1983. "Mycenaean Possessive Adjectives in *-e-jo*". *TPhS* 113:66-99.
- LAMBERTERIE, Ch. de. 1982. "Poids et force: reconstruction d'une racine verbale indo-européenne". *REArm* 16:21-55 & 57-68.
- . 1990. *Les adjectifs grecs en -υς. Sémantique et comparaison*. Louvain-La-Neuve.
- LEJEUNE, M. 1965. "Le damos dans la société mycénienne". *REG* 78:1-22 (= *Mémoires*, 3ème série, 137-54).
- LONGO, O. 1974. "Ad Alceo 112.10 L.-P.: per la storia di un topos". *Boll. Ist. Filol. Greca* 1:211-28.
- MASSON, O. 1972. "Remarques sur quelques anthroponymes mycéniens". *Acta Mycenaea* II, 281-93 (= *OGS* 121-33).
- . *OGS: O. MASSON, Onomastica Graeca Selecta*. I-II Paris 1990, III Genève 2000.
- MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. 1976. "Εχω und seine Bedeutungen im Griechischen". *MH* 33:180-1.
- . 1992. "Mykenisch *te-u-to* = *Steutōr*?" *Glotta* 70:1.
- MORPURGO DAVIES, A. 1987. "To 'put' and to 'stand' in the Luwian Languages". *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill*. Berlin-New York, 204-28.
- MÜHLESTEIN, O. 1968. "Deutung einiger Linear-B-Wörter". *Studia Mycenaea*. Brno, 113-16.
- NEUMANN, G. 1992. "Griechisch *μολοβρός*". *HS* 105:75-80.
- . 1994. "Schiffahrt und Seehandel als Thema altgriechischer Personennamen". *Kleine Schriften*, Innsbruck 641-9 (short version in *BzN* N.F. 22, 1987, 1-10).
- . 1999. "Zwei mykenische Personennamen". *Gering und doch vom Herzen* (Festschrift Bernhard Forssman). Wiesbaden, 201-5.
- . 2006. "... Gans und Hund und ihresgleichen ...". *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben: Ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur* (Internationales Kolloquium Wien, 5-6.12.2002). Wien, 125-38.
- NUSSBAUM, A. J. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin - New York.
- . 1998. "Severe problems". *Mír Curad* (Studies Calvert Watkins). Innsbruck, 521-38.
- PERPILLOU, J. L. 1987. "Grec *ὀ-* pour *ἐπι-*: un préfixe oublié?". *RPh* 61:193-204 (= *Recherches lexicales en grec ancien*, Louvain-Paris 1996, 124-36).
- PETERS, M. 1986. "Indogermanische Chronik". *Die Sprache* 32:2, n° 727.
- PINAULT, G. J. 1979. "Grec *ἀγαθός*". *MSS* 38:165-70.
- PLATH, R. 1999. "Bekannte mykenische Wörter — neu gedeutet". *Floreat Studia Mycenaea* (Akten des IX. Mykenologischen Kolloquiums, Salzburg 1995). Vienna, 502-19.
- PÖTSCHER, W. 1961. "Hera und Heros". *RhM* 104:302-55.
- RISCH, E. 1987. "Die ältesten Zeugnisse für *κλέος ἄφθιτον*". *KZ* 100:3-11.
- RIX, H. 1981. "Rapporti onomastici fra il panteon etrusco e quello Romano". *Studi Pallottino*. Pisa - Roma, 107-26 (= *Kl. Schr.*, Bremen 2001, 272-94.)
- ROUSSET, D. and PH. KATZOUROS. 1992. "Une délimitation de frontière en Phocide". *BCH* 116:198-215.

- RUIJGH, C. J. 2003. Review of Aravantinos - Godart - Sacconi 2001. *Mnemosyne* 56:219-28.
- SCHINDLER, J. 1975. "Armenisch *erkn*, griechisch ὀδύνη, irisch *idu*". *KZ* 89:53-65.
- SCHRÖDER, Fr. R. 1956. "Hera". *Gymnasium* 63:57-78.
- SCHULZE, W. 1892. *Quaestiones epicae*. Gütersloh.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. 1934. "Indoiranica. 13. ai. *grīšmá-*". *KZ* 61:197-8 (= *Kl. Schr.*, Göttingen 1969, 358-9).
- WATKINS, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon in Indo-European*. Oxford.
- WIDMER, P. 2008. "Drei griechische *-ōy-*Stämme*". *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek* (Festschrift Roland Bielmeier). Halle, 615-30.