

Domaine grec.

μῶνυχες ἵπποι.

Contents : 1. introduction, 2. *μον(ᾤ)ωνυξ impossible, 3. *σμ-ωνυξ impossible, 4. *ση-Η₃ nogh-, date, 5. ὄνομα, νώνυμ(ν)ος, 6. ὀδών, νωδός, 7. Arm. *elungn*.

1. The phrase μῶνυχες ἵπποι is a typical specimen of a Homeric formula, occurring eight times in the Iliad, in the accusative (plural) twenty-five times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey (ο 46), always at the end of the verse, that is after the bucolic caesura. It is not embedded in greater formulas, the only thing that may be remarked being that it is often preceded by a verb form of two short syllables, thus filling the space between the hephthemimeres and the bucolic caesura (where such a verb form is often found ; here we have ἔχε eight times and τράπε, τρέπε and λύε once each).

Homeric formulas may be very old phrases, though they need not be so. In our case the word μῶνυξ backs this claim, since its formation is not clear and therefore is probably old. I think it is unique ; the present pages are to demonstrate this.

2. It is generally held that μῶνυξ means ‘ with a single, i.e. uncloven, hoof ’. There are two explanations of the form. The first is that it contained μον(ο)- and ὄνυξ and was shortened by haplology. An objection is that *μονονυξ could only have given *μονυξ, while *μονωνυξ (with compositional lengthening of the first element of the second member, of the type δυσ-ώνυμος) would also have given *μονυξ. For if there are no other consonants between the two identical ones (affected by haplology), the vowel after the first consonant is thrown out (cf. ἀμφ(ι)ορεύς, ἡμ(ι)έδιμνον, κελαιν(ον)εφής) ; the only instance comparable with the one supposed here (*μονωνυξ > μῶνυξ) I can find in SCHWYZER, *Griech. Gramm.* I.263, τριβώλετερ (< *τριβολωλ-), is entirely unreliable (see LSJ). Also a final *μονυξ would have been backed by μον- : the word would have been more easy to understand than μῶνυξ. Then, the first syllable is only rarely affected by haplology (“ zur Seltenheit ”, SCHWYZER, 262 ; no example is given). Finally, even when μῶνυξ would have been the regular result of haplology, one would expect that the form would have been protected against haplology, because it would have become entirely isolated (as it is indeed) and therefore incomprehensible.

Moreover, because μῶνυξ most probably belongs to the older elements in the Iliad, we would have to start from *μονF-ῶνυχ-. Haplogy affects only identical consonants, i.e. in the case of groups either the whole group (τετρ(άδρ)άχμιον) or part of it (ἀμφ(ιφ)ορεύς). When applied mathematically, this would have resulted here in *μονFυχ- (or *μοFυνυχ- = *μουνυχ- ??). From this form only *μουνυχ- can be expected, a form that would undoubtedly have been preserved by analogy of μοῦνος (and would not have been changed into μωνυχ-, for which there would have been no basis). But in my opinion haplogy would not have operated at all in such a sequence. (From *μονF-ῶνυχ- > *μουνῶνυχ- too only *μουνυχ- is to be expected — by the rules of haplogy discussed above and by analogy of μοῦνος —, but it is impossible that the F was already lost and that afterwards haplogy would have occurred before the word was incorporated in our formula.) For *μονF-ῶνυχ-, then, haplogy is even less probable than when the basic form would have been *μον-ῶνυχ-.

Essential is to my mind the objection (found in FRISK's *Griech. Etym. Wörterb.* s.v.) that one would have expected οἰο- instead of μονο- in this early compound (for which he refers to SCHWYZER, *Gr. Gr.* I.433 n. 3). Homer indeed has no compounds with μονο- over against οἰοχίτων (ξ 489 ; μονοχίτων Arist.) and οἰοπόλος (*N* 473 *P* 54, both χώρω ἐν οἰοπόλω, *T* 377 Ω 64 λ 574) (1).

These two objections are enough to discard this explanation.

3. Once more DE SAUSSURE devined the right way to solve the problem. He thought (*Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes* (Leipzig 1878), p. 285 = *Recueil* 266) it contained as first element *sm-, the zero grade of *sem- 'one', found in εἶς, Lat. *semel* etc. The form as a whole is explained as *sm-ωνυξ, that is with compositional lengthening.

Now there is the same objection to this as to the explanation of the negative adjectives with νη-, νᾶ-, νω-, e.g. νηλεής, from *n-āleμ- (ἀλέομαι). There the problem is that we have no evidence for a consonantal *n- (the negative element) in composition (see for a full discussion *The Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, p. 104), here we have the same problem in that there is no evidence for consonantal (non-syllabic) *sm- in compounds. This is, I think, what FRISK means, when he says *σμ-ωνυξ "muss uralt sein und sogar wie μ-ία (arm. *mī*) in vorgriechische Zeit zurückgehen, was nicht besonders wahrscheinlich

(1) In Mycenaean we have οἰο- in *owowe* [οἰωδωες] 'with a single handle', a form of μόνος is evidently meant with the abbreviation *mo* (always with the numeral 1), which stands in opposition to *ze* [*zeugos*] 'pair'. This confirms the conclusion drawn from the evidence of the oldest classical language, viz. that not μόνος but only οἰο- occurs in composition, but the material is, of course, too limited to allow any conclusions.

st". This can only mean that we have no evidence for consonantal *sm- in Greek but for μία. The syllabic form *sm̥- is of course well known in Greek from ἄπαξ ἄπλος. Our form, however, cannot be compared with μία, since this is not a compound (it is therefore no exception to the rule that compounds must have *sm̥-). This objection may seem rather trivial, in fact it means that the explanation in this form cannot be correct. A reconstruction *sm̥-ὄνυχ- is not possible either, since this would have given *άμουνυχ- (cf. ἄμαρτή, which probably contains *sm̥- before a syllabic sound).

4. The solution of the problem is to my mind the same as for the negative adjectives. These must continue, e.g. *n-H₂leu-ēs, i.e. they must have had a vocalic *n- followed by a (consonantal) laryngeal before consonant. Combined with the three laryngeals this *n- gave, *n-H₁C- > νηC- (νήγρετος, νηλεής 'pitiless'), *n-H₂C- > νāC- (Ion.-Att. νηC- in νηκουστέω, νηλεής 'unavoidable', νημερτής etc.), *n-H₃C- > νωC- (a sure case is only Myc. *nopereha* [*nōphēleha*] 'useless' (neuter plur.), which appears in a younger form in ἀνωφελής Soph.). The same developments are found, mostly with other resonants, in the zero grades of the disyllabic roots, e.g. βλητός < *g^ul̥H₁tos, -κράτος < *k^hl̥H₂tos, πέπρωται < *pe-p^hl̥H₃-(toi). In the same way μῶνυξ can be explained, and only so, as *sm̥-H₃nogh-; for δυνξ see my *Development*, p. 47. FRISK's objection that *σμ-ωνυξ must be very ancient does not hold for our interpretation: Greek certainly used *sm̥- when it was a separate language, and it certainly had preserved the three laryngeals as such, since the above developments are only found in Greek. It is then quite possible that (only) Greek formed *sm̥-H₃nogh- (> μῶνυξ), though it must have been at an early date in its history; it must be pre-Mycenaean, since here there is no trace of the laryngeals as such: they appear everywhere in the forms known from the classical language. If the word was coined for the epic idiom, it would testify to a very early beginning of the epic tradition, but this conclusion, of course, is by no means sure.

5. I may add here a few remarks on νόνημ(ν)ος and the etymology of ὄνομα. I withdraw my conclusions, *Development* 47 and 229f., where I defended an original form *enH₃-m̥n̥. I build my interpretation on the fact that ὄνομα < *ένομα (as ὄροφος < *έροφος beside έρέφος; the έ- is found in Laconian forms) beside Armenian *anun* points to initial laryngeal, and further on Toch. A *ñom* B *ñem*. Against the laryngeal tells only the lack of lengthening in Vedic, which to my mind is not decisive. The Tocharian forms most probably point to *-nēm- (so KRAUSE-THOMAS, *Toch. Elementarbuch*, p. 57). VAN WINDEKENS, *Orbis* 18 (1969) 167-72, compared A *šom* B *šem* 'one'. Here, as in *ñom* /*ñem*, the original vowel must be *e* or *ē*, because the preceding consonants are palatalised (1).

(1) WINTER, *Evid.* 202, supposes the palatalization of *ñom* /*ñem* was due to the preceding H₁. This idea, however, is by no means proved. Beside the word for

It cannot have been *e* (giving A *ä* B *ä/a*), so it must have been *ē*, which gives A *a* B *e*; A *a* was probably changed into *o* before labials.

This group **-nēm-* cannot have had *H₃*, nor *H₁*, because of Goth. *namo*, which presupposes **-nom-*. We then have **H₁nēm-*, **H₁nōm-* (Skt. *nāma*, Lat. *nōmen*, OFr. *nōmia*, OHG *be-nuomen*), **H₁nom-* (ὄνομα, Goth. *namo*) beside **H₁ym-(e)n-* (OIr. *ainm*, OCS *imę*; OPr. *emmens*?, Alb. *emën*?) and perhaps **H₁enm-(e)n-* (OPr. *emmens*?, Alb. *emën*?). I refrain from a reconstruction of the paradigm: we simply do not know enough about its history, especially, I think, in the case of neuters.

The adjective *νόνυμ(ν)ος* cannot represent **n-H₁nom(n)-*, since this would have resulted in **νηνυμ(ν)-*. It must then be secondary.

6. Also with regard to *ὀδών* I am inclined to take a different view. Since Greek and Armenian (*atamn*) alone have a vowel preceding the *d*, a laryngeal is more probable. Because of *ἔδω* etc. it must be *H₁*, so Aeolic *ἔδουρες* must be the ancient form and *ὀδών* must have its *ḍ-* from assimilation. The alternative etymology proposed by BENVENISTE, *BSL* 32 (1931) 77f., who derives the word from the root **den-* in *δάκνω*, is impossible as this form has no 'prothetic vowel', i.e. no initial laryngeal.

Νωδός 'teethless' cannot represent **n-H₁d-*, so it must be secondary. Its formation is also remarkable.

7. When *νόνυμ(ν)ος* is secondary for **νηνυμ(ν)ος*, it cannot entirely be excluded that *μῶνυξ* is secondary for **μηνυξ* < **sm-H₁nogh-*. There would be no reason to consider this possibility but for Arm. *elungn*, which has been explained as **H₁nogh-* with secondary *-n*, anticipation of this same *n* and dissimilation *n - n > l - n*. The problem is that about the timbre of the prothetic vowel in Armenian nothing sure can be said; see *Development* 87f. The present word, *eluzanem* — *ἐλεύσομαι* and *inn* — *ἐννέα* might point to *H₁- > e-*. The contradicting forms are explained, e.g. by WINTER, *Evid.* 203, as due to umlaut of *a* and *u* (*anum*, *atamn*, *orcam* < **orucam* — *ἐρεύγομαι*). But in *eluzanem* and *elungn* we have exactly the same conditions. It remains a vexed problem when *e* and when *a* (or *o*) arose as prothetic vowels in Armenian. There are no sure indications for *H₁ > e* elsewhere in Armenian. On the contrary,

'name' and that for 'I, me', which I leave out of discussion, it is based on AB *šām-* 'sit' and B *ikām* 'twenty'. The first is considered an enlargement of the root **šs-* in Skt. *āste*; it would be **H₁es-* and the Tocharian form would have its palatalisation from *H₁s-*. If, however, **sed-* is also an extension of this root, it cannot have been **H₁sed-*, since Gr. *ἔδος* etc. have no prothetic vowel. (If this hypothesis is right, then **šs-* is a root of the structure VC- without initial laryngeal, i.e. not CVC-.) B *ikām* would have *w* palatalised from *H₁y-*. If indeed we would expect palatalisation of *w* parallel to that of *n*, it is refuted by A *wāp-* B *wāp-* 'to weave', which represent **H₁yebh-* as is shown by Myc. *ewepesomesna* [*ewepšesomena*] 'that must be woven' (*Development* 67). Also, in B *laniktse* 'light (= not heavy)' we do not find *ly* < *H₁l-* (*ἐλαχύς*).

alawri 'mill' (< **alatrio*-) must go back to **H₂elH₁-trio*- as appears from Gr. ἀλέτριος. *Elungn*, moreover, has also been explained as a compound, in which *-ung-* represents *-(*H*)*ongh*-. Lastly, since μῶνυξ is entirely isolated, remodelling (from *μηνυξ) is not probable; *μηνυξ would rather have been given up entirely. So the most probable reconstruction for μῶνυξ is **sm-H₃nogh*-.

University of Leiden.

R.S.P. BEEKES.