

Gr. ἄφρων [adj.] ‘senseless’: a Reassessment

Romain Garnier

University of Limoges, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines,
39E Rue Camille Guérin, 87000 Limoges, France; garromain@gmail.com

For citation: Garnier R. Gr. ἄφρων [adj.] ‘senseless’: a Reassessment. *Philologia Classica* 2021, 16 (1), 50–56. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2021.105>

The present article offers a reassessment of Hom. ἄφρων [adj.] ‘unreasonable, senseless, foolish’, which is traditionally accounted for as an ablauting compound (of the type πατήρ : ἀπάτωρ) based on the simplex φρένες [f.pl.tant.] ‘midriff, diaphragm’ (+Il.). This archaic ablauting pattern (viz. °φρων vs. simplex φρήν*) is totally unparalleled for body parts; besides, the Ancients’ interpretation of φρένες as ‘diaphragm’ is flawed. Φρονέω ‘to have (good) understanding or intelligence’ is a back-formation coined after ἀφρονέω ‘to act senselessly, to be foolish’. From zero-graded ἀφραίνω (via a synchronic reanalysis of -αίνω as a deverbative suffix of the type °φραίνω), an adverb *ἄφρα-δόν ‘senselessly, foolishly’ was eventually coined, which was the starting point of a whole new group. From this group was reanalyzed a “new” synchronic root √φραδ- ‘to heed, to consider’, reflected by Hom. φράζω. The lack of comparative evidence for this sprawling word family leads the author to assume that Hom. ἄφρων [adj.] ‘senseless, fool, heedless’ is in fact the reflex of a PIE etymon *ḡ-g^{wr}(h₁)-on- ‘without sense of smell, not able of scenting’, from PIE *g^{wr}reh₁- ‘to smell’ (cf. Ved. *jí-ghr-a-* < *g^{wr}t₁-g^{wr}(h₁)-V-). This verbal compound of the type νήφρων [*-on-adj.] ‘sober’ (< PIE *ḡ-h₁g^{wr}-on- ‘not having drunk’) would have been eventually reanalyzed as a privative *bahuvrīhi* (viz. ‘lacking φρένες’).

Keywords: PIE verbal compounds, reanalysis, back-formations, Homeric phraseology, universal semantics.

1. Gr. ἄφρων [adj.] ‘unreasonable, senseless, foolish’ (+Il.) is a well attested adjective, whose generic meaning is exemplified by Γ 220 ἄφρονά τ’ αὐτως # “like of man of no understanding” (Loeb) or E 875 σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κούρην # “for thou art father to that mad maid” (Loeb), but which more specifically quite often refers to rather young and unexperienced warriors, who clearly lack common sense, foolishly risking their lives. From Homer onwards, the abstract is ἀφροσύνη [f.] ‘senselessness, recklessness’, regularly associated to a denominative verb ἀφρονέω ‘to act senselessly’, which is interestingly most often used at the participle in Homer, as in O 104 Νήπιοι, οἱ Ζηνὶ μενεαίνομεν ἀφρονέοντες “Fools, that in our witlessness are wroth against Zeus!” (Loeb). By contrast, there is a (not univerbated) Homeric locution εὖ φρονέων ‘with good sense’ (or ‘with good intent’), for instance in εὖ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο (A 73, β 160) “he spoke with good sense”.¹

We may quite plausibly assume that φρονέω ‘to have (good) understanding or intelligence’ is a back-formation coined after ἀφρονέω ‘to act senselessly, to be foolish’. Hom.

¹ This sporadic formula must be kept separated from εὐφρων [adj.] ‘mirthful, merry, taking one’s pleasure’, whose abstract is εὐφροσύνη [f.] ‘joy, mirth, merriment’. The denominative verb is εὐφραίνω ‘to gladden, rejoice’, being clearly causative, by contrast with Hom. ἀφραίνω ‘to act senselessly, foolishly or recklessly’.

φρόνις [f.] ‘intelligence, insight’ (δ 258) is deemed to be a back-formation of Hom. φρονέω/*φρονίζω (?) ‘to be minded, think, to be wise’ (Beekes 2010:1591). It is commonplace to account for Hom. ἄφρων as a privative *bahuvrīhi* built on a simplex φρένες [f. pl. tant.] ‘midriff’ (taken as the seat of mental activity), whence ‘sense, soul, spirit, mind, heart’ *vel sim.* (Beekes 2010:1590.) It shall be incidentally outlined here that the very localization of this obscure body part is far from being secure. Be that as it may, we find in Homer constructions with negative polarity involving φρένες, which play counterpoint to the use of ἄφρων, such as ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἔνι πάμπαν # (Ψ 104) “albeit the mind be not anywise therein” (Loeb) or οὔτε φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀρηρώς # (κ 553) “nor sound of understanding” (Loeb) (lit. “nor fitted to his φρένες”).

There are reasonable grounds for assuming the existence of a secondary derivative *φροντής [m.adj.] ‘careful, worried’ (of the type ἔθελοντής [m.adj.] ‘volunteer’) as a source of a doublet *φροντέω/φροντίζω ‘to consider, worry, to be concerned’, from which stemmed another back-formation (cf. φροντίς, -ίδος [f.] ‘worry, concern’). It is worth mentioning that the privative compound ἄφρων ‘senseless’ may be regarded as a real cornucopia of words.

2. At its face value, Gr φρήν*, -ενός* [f.] (Hom. dat.pl. φρεσί, φρασί at Pindar) is related to the small group of body parts of the type ἀδήν, -ένος [m./f.] ‘gland’ or αὐχίν, -ένος [m.] ‘neck’, which are both provided with a sound PIE etymology. This is by no means the case of Hom. φρένες [f. pl. tant.] ‘midriff, diaphragm’ (?), which is poorly accounted for as the reflex of PIE $\dagger b^hr̥én$ or PIE asigmatic $\dagger b^hr̥énk$ with loss of the final velar as per Beekes (2010:1590). The comparison with ON *grunnr* [a m.] ‘suspicion, presumption, doubt’ (GEW II:1043; AnEW 191), pointing to PIE $\dagger g^{whr̥}r̥gn-o-$, has little to recommend itself: such a *Transponat* (I dare not say etymon) must be deemed a sin of idiosyncrasy, since PIE * g^{whi} - is not reflected by Germ. **g-*.²

The very assumption of a “dehnstufiger asigmatischer Nom. * $b^hr̥énk$ ” (GEW II:1043), with the loss of the final velar, is a desperate attempt of connecting φράσσω ‘to enclose, surround’ as the reflex of a (putative) PIE root $\dagger b^hr̥enk-$ on the basis of the Ancients’ interpretation of φρένες as a name for ‘diaphragm’. As far as I know, there is no such pattern $\dagger C\acute{E}RC-\emptyset$ in PIE, all the more so we are dealing with an animate noun (PIE * $k\acute{e}rd$ ‘heart’ is a neuter stem). Besides, the dialectal variation between Hom. φράσαι and φάρξαι quite unambiguously point to a vocalic * $r̥$ (PIE * C_rC-), not to PIE * $C_{r̥}C-$. I would tentatively compare Gr. περιφρακτος ‘fenced’ with Ved. *pári-br̥ḍha-* ‘ringsum befestigt’ (< PIE [virtual] * $p\acute{e}ri-b^hr̥ḡh-to-$), connected with the Ved. perfect participle *babṛhāṇá-* ‘fest, stark’ (Kümmel 2000:330). The Greek notion of ‘enclosure’ would have stemmed from the preverbed form. For the semantics, we may start with something like PIE * $b^hr̥ḡh-tó-$

² We may, tentatively, consider the possibility that the starting point is PIE * $ǵ^hwer-$ ‘to be crooked’ (LIV² 182), reflected by Ved. *hvár-as-* [nt.] ‘crookedness, deceit, intrigue’ (< PIE * $ǵ^hwér-e/os-$), cognate of OAv. *zūrah-* [nt.] ‘deceit’, NP *zūr* ‘lie’. The ppp. * $ǵ^hr̥u-tó-$ (< PIE * $ǵ^hr̥u-tó-$ with metathesis) is reflected by Ved. *hru-tá-* ‘crooked’. There was a doublet * $ǵ^hr̥u-nó-$ (< PIE * $ǵ^hr̥u-nó-$) ‘crooked’, surfacing as Germ. **gru-na-* [nt.] ‘deceit, fraud’, with the same derivational pattern as Germ. **tur-na-* [nt.] ‘anger, rage’ (OE *torn*), from PIE * $d_r̥(h_2)-nó-$ ‘split, torn off’. This substantive is the base-stem of a privative **gruna-láusa-* [adj.] ‘without fraud’ (viz. ‘without suspecting a fraud’ or ‘without being suspected of a fraud’). ON *grun-lauss* [adj.] means both ‘unsuspecting’ (ON *trúa guði grunlaust* ‘to believe in God with an absolute faith’) and ‘unsuspected’ (ON *eigi er mér grunlaust* ‘I suspect that’, lit. “That is not unsuspected to me”). The negative polarity of ON *vera grunlauss* ‘to be unsuspected, above suspicion’ developed into a positive expression such as ON *vera grunaðr* ‘to be suspected’ (‘of’: *af*+ dat.). Lastly, they built a weak verb *gruna* (ppp. *grunaðr*) ‘to suspect’ and a back-formed substantive *grunnr* [m.] ‘suspicion’.

‘(built) in height’, concretized as ‘(feste) Burg, fortress’. From ὄφρακτος, finite verbal forms were reanalyzed such as φράξει and φράσσω.

3. Beside ἀφρονέω, an old zero-grade doublet is found: ἀφραίνω ‘to act senselessly, foolishly or recklessly’, attested for instance in H 109 Ἀφραίνεις, Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ # ταύτης ἀφροσύνης (with a *figura etymologica*) “Thou are mad, Menelaus, nurtured of Zeus, and this thy madness beseemeth thee not” (Loeb). After the pattern of ἀν(α) φαίνω ‘to reveal, to make known’ → Hom. ἀμφαδόν [adv.] ‘openly, without concealment’ and ἀμφάδιος [adj.] ‘open, public’ (ἀμφαδίην [acc.adv.] ‘openly, without concealment’), we may assume that from Hom. ἀφραίνω (via a synchronic reanalysis of -αίνω as a deverbative suffix of the type ὄφαίνω), an adverb *ἀφρα-δόν ‘senselessly, foolishly’ was eventually coined,³ the starting point for a whole new group: *ἀφράδιος [adj.] ‘senseless, reckless’, reflected by Hom. ἀφραδίη [f.] ‘senselessness, folly, recklessness, thoughtlessness, heedlessness’ (B 368 ἀφραδίη πολέμοιο ‘heedlessness in war’), ἀφραδής [adj.] ‘imprudent, reckless’ (β 282 μνηστήρων... ἀφραδέων [gen.pl.] ‘of the reckless wooers’), whence ἀφραδέως [adv.] ‘senselessly’ and a denominative verb ἀφραδέω ‘to act senselessly’.

From this group was reanalyzed a “new” synchronic root √φραδ- ‘to heed, to consider’, reflected by Hom. φράζω, aor. πέφραδε ‘to make known, communicate, indicate, inform’. Pace Beekes (2010:1591), √φραδ- is not the result of an inherited zero-grade φρα- provided with a dental enlargement, but rather a back-formation coined after an adverb *ἀφραδόν ‘senselessly, recklessly’ associated with Hom. ἀφραίνω ‘to act senselessly, foolishly or recklessly’. The very meaning of φράζω ‘to inform’ clearly points to a secondary development: from a name for ‘midriff’ (should it mean ‘spirit’ or the like), it is hardly conceivable that one gets a denominative verb meaning ‘to inform’. So √ἀφραδ- ‘to be heedless’ must be older than √φραδ-.

4. A large problem seems to have escaped notice so far: the archaic pattern of ablauting ὄφρων vs. simplex φρήν* is totally unparalleled for body parts, as is clear from Hom. ἐρι-αύχην* [adj.] ‘with high arched neck’ (said of horses in K 305, ἐριαύχενας ἵππους #), not †ἐρι-αύχων. The *Derivationskette* of Hom. ἄφρων remains thus more isolated than ever. Due to the scarcity of comparative evidence, I would tentatively suggest that ἄφρων [adj.] ‘senseless, fool, heedless’ is the reflex of a PIE etymon *h₁-g^wh₁r(h₁)-on-⁴ ‘without sense of smell, not able of scenting’, from PIE *g^wh₁reh₁- ‘to smell’ (cf. Ved. *jīghra-a-* < PIE *g^wh₁-g^wh₁r(h₁)-V-),⁵ a pattern attested by νήφρων [adj.] ‘sober’ [dat.pl. νήφοσι

³ The origin of these obscure Homeric adverbs in -δόν is a very complex issue. For a complete survey of the forms, see Mathys (2016) with the relevant literature. As a starting point, we may assume Hom. *ἀγεληδών, -όνος [f.] ‘group’ (= ἀγέλη) whose adverbial dative was *ἀγεληδόνι ‘in herds’, possibly elided in Π 160 # καὶ τ’ ἀγεληδόν [= *ἀγεληδόν(ι)] ἴασιν ‘and they go in a pack’ (Loeb). The same explanation may hold for σχεδόν [adv.] ‘near’ (Hom.+ — possibly elided in K 100 σχεδόν [= *σχεδόν(ι)] εἴαται ‘they bivouac hard by’ (Loeb). The underlying abstract *σχεδών [f.] ‘vicinity’ would be semantically congruous with Hom. ἔχθεσθαι ‘to hold oneself to, to attach oneself to, to cling to’ (governing the genitive), as in ε 329 πικναὶ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχονται # ‘and they [f.] cling to one another’ (Loeb). On the other hand, the deverbative adverbs ending in -δίην are likely to have stemmed from quasi-principles such as *(ἐπι)στροφάς, -άδος [adj.] ‘turning oneself toward’ producing ἐπιστροφάδ-ην [adv.] ‘turning from one to another’. Rau (2009, 219) postulates *προ-βάς, -άδος [adj.] ‘walking forth’ as the source of an adverb προβάδ-ην producing a simplex βάδ-ην [adv.] ‘step by step’ — there is a metrical distribution with Hom. ἐμβαδόν [adv.] ‘by stepping’ [- u u] standing for **ἐμβάδην [- u -].

⁴ With deletion of the laryngeal regularly triggered by the so-called lex-veoγνός (PIE *-VCR(H)V-).

⁵ Cf. Skt. *ghrāṇā* [f.] ‘nose’ and *ghrāṇa-* [nt.] ‘smelling’ — ultimately from PIE *g^wh₁reh₁-m_h [nt.] ‘smell’, source of thematic derivatives *g^wh₁reh₁-(m)n-o- and *g^wh₁reh₁-(m)n-eh₂. The odd Epic form *ghoṇā* [f.] ‘nose’ (Tu. § 4520) must be a wrong resanskritization of Pā. **ghuṇṇā* (< IAr. **ghūrṇā* [f.] ‘nose’ < PIE *g^wh₁r(h₁)-m)

at Theognis] (< PIE **h₁g^{wh}-on-* ‘not having drunk’) which was not originally a *-nt*-participle (Weiss 1994). By stylistic renewal, the inherited compound ἄφρων was reanalyzed as a privative *bahuvrīhi* (‘the one lacking (good) φρένες’). As a result, the complexity of identifying the Hom. φρένες [f. pl. tant.] is vindicated by assuming that this word is a back-formation, coined after ἀδήν, -ένος [m./f.] ‘gland’ or αὐχίν, -ένος [m.] ‘neck’. It was thought to be something akin to the πραπίδες [f. pl. tant.] ‘midriff; seat of the capacity of perception or knowledge’, which was convincingly accounted for by Balles (2002:16) as a secondary derivative of a spatial adjective *πραπός ‘located in the region of the ribs’, pointing to PIE **pr̥k-wó-* [adj.] ‘lateral’.⁶

The sense of smell is a commonplace metaphor for designating intellectual intuition: see for instance Fr. *flair* [m.] ‘smell’ and ‘intuition’, *avoir du flair* “to have intuition, be clever”, (colloquial code-switching *avoir du pif*), *flairer le danger* “to see the danger” (lit. “to sniff out the danger”), *avoir le nez creux* = *avoir le nez fin*, *avoir beaucoup de flair* “to be experienced” (lit. **“to have an empty nose”, viz. “to have a good sense of smell, to be wise and clever”*). See also Fr. *sentir* ‘to smell, feel, experience’, *pressentir* ‘to sense, suspect’ (lit. **“to smell before”*) and *subodorer* ‘to sense, to guess’ (lit. **“to smell odours from far”*). Recently, Pinault (2018) has explained Gr. νόος [m.] ‘mind, intellect’ (< Pr.-Gr. **nóhos*) as the outcome of PIE **h₂nós-o-*, a derivative from the root ‘to sniff’ underlying the root-noun **h₂nás-*, which referred to the nose, and precisely to the nostrils. According to the author, “the uses of νόος in Homeric Greek point to the notion of perceiving intuitively a situation or an object, and reaching there from a clear understanding of the reality. The functions of the mind and the cognition were often associated in antiquity with bodily organs and senses. In this perspective, the idea of a semantic connection of ‘perceiving’ with ‘scenting’ is taken up.” (Pinault 2018:294). There is a clear association between the epithet of the wooers (ἄφραδέων... μνηστήρων) and the formula οὐ τι νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι # (β 282) “in no wise either prudent or just” (Loeb).

5. A possible argument for the concrete meaning of the lexeme ὄφρων ‘smelling, scenting’ is the existence of a verbal compound *ὄσ-φρων [adj.] ‘catching scent of’ whose first member is *ὄδ-σ- ‘odour, scent’ (zero-grade of a sigmatic animate *ὄδώς [f.] ‘odour’, just like αἰδώς [f.] ‘shame, reverence’ is reduced to *αἰδ-σ- in the secondary derivation, cf. αἰσχος [nt.] ‘shame’). This verbal compound *ὄσ-φρων was built within Greek, at the time when ἄφρων would still mean something like ‘not smelling, not catching scent of’.

n-éh₂), possibly after the equation Pā. *gunnaṃ*: Skt. *gonām* [gen.pl.] ‘of the cows’. For the phonetics of the (putative) Pā. **ghuñṇā* (< IAr. **ghūrṇā*), cf. Pā. *uñṇā* [f.] ‘wool’ (< Skt. *ūrṇā*, Ved. *ūrṇā* < PIE **wlh₁-(m)n-éh₂*). For the simplification-rule of PIE **-H. (m)n-V*, see Pinault (2014:198).

⁶ However, the author’s comparison of φρήν* with OIr. *barae*, gen. *barann* [f.] ‘anger’ is far from convincing, as the φρένες have nothing to do with the notion of ‘anger’ (pace Balles 2002:7). Besides, the author’s etymology relying on PIE **b^herh₂-* ‘to pierce’ is quite poor: one may rather think about PIE **b^herh₂-/b^hreh₂-* ‘to hurry’, source of Lat. *furō*, Ved. *bharⁱ-* ‘to move rapidly, to rush’, Hitt. *parḫ-* ‘to chase, pursue, to hunt’, and the newly identified HLW. */*parxa-/* ‘to expell’ (Melchert 2016, 204–206), which may be ultimately traced back to a PIE nominal stem **b^hér-h₂-/b^hr-éh₂-* [of proterodynamic inflection] ‘hurry, haste, fury’ (cf. Gr. φέρομαι [mid.] ‘to move rapidly’). OIr. *barae*, gen. *barann* [f.] ‘anger’ would be the reflex of PIE **b^hrh₂-én* [of hysterodynamic inflection] (< PIE **b^hrh₂-én-s*) ‘rush, haste, fury’ or the like. This word would have ultimately stemmed from PIE **b^hrh₂-én* [loc.] ‘in quick motion’, indirectly reflected by Ved. *bhuraṇ-yú-* [adj.] ‘quivering, active’ (of Agni) and by *bhuraṇ-yá-ti* ‘to be active or restless’, prtcl. *bhuraṇ-yánt-* ‘quivering, active’, which can be traced back to a frozen locative: Ved. **bhur-án* ‘in quick motion’ (< PIE **b^hrh₂-én*). We may assign a PIE pedigree to those forms by assuming two inherited decasatives **b^hrh₂-en-yú-* and **b^hrh₂-en-yó[nt]-*.

The denominative verb ὀσφραίνομαι ‘to catch scent of, to smell’,⁷ fut. ὀσφρήσομαι (Att.), aor. ὀσφρέσθαι (Att.), has been influenced by αἰσθάνομαι (fut. αἰσθήσομαι, aor. αἰσθέσθαι), via a synchronic reanalysis of -αίνομαι as a deverbative suffix of the type °φαινομαι. The expected pattern is rather something like πεπαίνω ‘to make ripe, ripen’, aor. πεπᾶναι (<*πεπᾶν-σαι), with an action-noun πέπανσις [f.] ‘ripening’ from πέπων, -ονος [adj.] ‘ripe’. The old paradigm was possibly Att. *ὀσφραίνω, aor. *ὀσφρᾶναι (<*ὀσφράν-σαι), with an action-noun ὀσφρανσις [f.] ‘olfactory sense’ (attested at Clearch.), by contrast with ὀσφρησις [f.] ‘id.’ (Pl., Arist.), which is surely coined after αἴσθησις [f.] ‘perception’.

This would imply that the straightforward reconstruction of a PIE etymon **h₃éd-s-g^wreh₁-* of the type **mén-s-d^heh₁-* ‘heeding’ (Schindler 1975:266; Beekes 2010:1121) is anachronistic, and that the assumption of a laryngeal **h₁* for PIE **g^wreh₁-* ‘to smell’ (LIV² 221)⁸ relies only on dubious Attic forms such as ὀσφρ-ησις (for [attested!] ὀσφρανσις) and ὀσφρ-ήσομαι (for *ὀσφραν-ῶ). Perhaps the PIE root should be rewritten as **g^wreh_x-*.

6. Greek language has coined 156 compounds in °φρων. A quick survey of the Homeric °φρων adjectives (22!) shows that they represent, in nucleus, the semantic diversity of the later forms, referring to: (i) stupidity; (ii) intelligence; (iii) personality, temperament, courage, heart; (iv) action of applying one’s mind; (v) mind = opinion (vi) mind = home of feelings.

(i) Stupidity: after ἄ-φρων ‘senseless’ (not to be compared with Hom. ἄ-θυμος ‘faint-hearted, spiritless’) were coined ἀεσί-φρων [adj.] ‘damaged in mind, witless, silly’ and χαλί-φρων [adj.] ‘loosen-minded, thoughtless’ (cf. χαλάω ‘to loosen’).

(ii) Intelligence: ἀρτί-φρων [adj.] ‘sound of mind, sensible’ is an antonym to the formula οὔτε φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀρηρῶς # (κ 553) “nor sound of understanding” (<“nor fitted to his φρένες”); πυκινό-φρων [adj.] ‘wise, prudent’ (HH), parallel to πυκίνο-μηδής [adj.] ‘shrewd in counsel; clever’ reasonably points to a locution *πυκιναὶ φρένες (cf. πυκινὸν νόον, O 461; Ξ 294). In these compounds, the “φρένες” can be interpreted as an organ, by contrast with δαί-φρων [adj.] ‘skilled’ and πολύ-φρων [adj.] ‘inventive’. Hom. δαί-φρων shows the Caland-variant **d^hys-i-°* of PIE **d^hys-ró-* ‘skilled’ (cf. Ved. *das-rá-* [adj.] ‘accomplishing wonderful deeds’). This root is reflected by Hom. δήνεα [nt. pl.] ‘arts, wiles; what one has in one’s mind, thoughts, counsel’ (<PIE **déns-e/os-*) and by δαῖνειν ‘to acquire practical skill’ (Hom. δαίμων [adj.] ‘skilled’). Here, the underlying second member of the compound °φρων would be *φρήν with the abstract meaning of νόος [m.] ‘mind, intellect’ or μῆτις [f.] ‘skill, address’. The same can be said about πολύ-φρων [adj.] ‘ingenious, inventive’ which is quite close to Hom. πολύ-μητις [adj.] ‘of many counsels’.⁹ Interestingly, σαό-φρων [adj.] ‘of sound sense, sound minded’ is the “missing link” between those two subgroups: its base-meaning was possibly ‘whose φρένες [viz. an organ that can be hurt-ed] are free from harm’, eventually reinterpreted as ‘having a sound mind’.

⁷ Chantraine (DELG 804) accepts the connection between φρήν and ὀσφραίνομαι despite the problematic forms ὀσφρήσομαι [fut.] and ὀσφρέσθαι [aor.], arguing that φρήν “peut convenir à une opération des sens”.

⁸ Kümmel (LIV² 221, Fn. 3) mentions the possibility of a nasal infix present **g^wrh₁-n-h₁-é/ó-* > *φράν-ε/ο- restored with a yod present suffix (Gr. *φράν-γε/ο-). In my opinion, this is too far-fetched.

⁹ Similarly, Hom. δολό-μητις [adj.] ‘crafty of counsel’ is echoed by Post-Hom. δολό-φρων/δολό-φρων [adj.] ‘id.’

(iii) Personality, temperament, courage, heart: ἀταλά-φρων [adj.] ‘tender-minded’; εὖ-φρων [adj.] ‘glad, cheerful; merry, bringing joy (said of wine in Γ 246)’;¹⁰ ταλά-φρων/ταλασί-φρων [adj.] ‘patient of mind, stout-hearted’ (= Hom. τλήμων [adj.] ‘patient’), semantically paralleled by Dor. τλά-θύμος [adj.] ‘persevering’ (Pind.), Ion.-Att. τλή-θύμος [adj.] ‘of enduring soul, stout-hearted’ (PA); ἐχέ-φρων [adj.] ‘sensible, prudent’ (PN Ἐχέφρων) with ἔχω meaning ‘to hold, to restrain, to stop from’, not ‘to have’ (*pace* von Kamptz 1982, 62). The same meaning appears in ἐχέ-θύμος [adj.] ‘continent, a master of one’s passions, under self-control’. Here φρένες could be glossed by ‘impulse, drive’.¹¹ The same base-meaning is seen in πρό-φρων [adj.] ‘with forward mind, displaying zeal’, associated to πρό-φρασσα [f. adj.] (< *φρα-τ-γα) and to προφρονέως [adv.] ‘zealously, earnestly, seriously’.¹² Another depiction of a personality trait is exemplified by κερδαλέο-φρων [adj.] ‘greedy of gain’. There are also φρων adjectives specifically referring to courage: κρατερό-φρων [adj.] ‘stout-hearted, dauntless’, which matches perfectly with Hom. καρτερό-θύμος [adj.] ‘stronghearted’ and θρασύ-κάρδιος [adj.] ‘stout of heart’.¹³ We may reasonably assume *λυκό-φρων [adj.] ‘wolf-hearted’ on the basis of the Hom. PN Λυκό-φρων.¹⁴ Lastly, ὀλοό-φρων [adj.] ‘meaning mischief, baleful’ (Il.)¹⁵ is glossed by οὐλό-θύμος [adj.] ‘id.’ (Hsch.).

(iv) Action of applying one’s mind: ἐπί-φρων [adj.] ‘thoughtful, applying the mind to something’ and περί-φρων [adj.] ‘very thoughtful, very careful’. These adjectives may be reasonably accounted for as back-formations coined after the corresponding verbs ἐπι-φρονέω ‘to be prudent’ (Od.) and περι-φρονέω ‘to meditate’ (attested after Homer). Within the same semantic sphere, we may add Hom. περιφραδής [adj.] ‘capable, astute’ and Hom. περιφραδέως [adv.] ‘capably, shrewdly, skillfully, prudently’.

(v) Mind = opinion: ὁμό-φρων [adj.] ‘agreeing, united’ (= Hom. ὁμό-θύμος [adj.] ‘id.’).

(vi) Mind = home of feelings: μελί-φρων [adj.] ‘sweet to the mind, delicious’.

7. Greek language is well known for its pervasive tendency to create new words, within inherited patterns. The whole word family of ἀφρονέω and other φρονέω verbs (including the substantives) represents 207 lexemes; ἄφρων and other φρων compounds include 156 words; ἀφραίνω and other φφραίνω verbs (with their nominal derivatives) reach 28 words; the root √φραδ- is reflected by 72 forms, while φρένες and its derivatives produced no less than 45 nominal or verbal forms, which totals 480 words.¹⁶ This word family is a major piece of evidence for the economy principle in reconstructing the lan-

¹⁰ Not to be compared to Hom. εὖ-θύμος [adj.] ‘kind, generous, well-disposed bountiful’.

¹¹ Those correspondences vindicate Darcus’ claim of a special connection between θῦμός and adjectives in φρων (Darcus 1977). Note however that Hom. compounds in φρων and θυμός are not always interchangeable, as is clear from ὑπέρθυμος [adj.] ‘high-spirited, high-minded, noble’ vs. Post-Hom. ὑπέρφρων ‘haughty, arrogant’, or from εὖ-θύμος [adj.] ‘kind, generous, well-disposed bountiful’ vs. εὖ-φρων [adj.] ‘glad, cheerful; merry, bringing joy’, or from ἄ-φρων ‘senseless’ vs. ἄ-θύμος ‘fainthearted, spiritless’.

¹² Cf. Hom. *πρό-θύμος [adj.] ‘ready, willing, eager, zealous’, indirectly attested by its secondary derivative ἦσι προθυμίησι πεποιθώς (B 588) “his heart full of ardor for the fray” (Hom. προ-θυμιαί* ‘ardor, zeal, alacrity’).

¹³ Cf. also Post-Hom. θρασύ-θύμος [adj.] ‘bold-hearted’ nicely echoing Hom. μεγάθυμος [adj.] ‘great-hearted’.

¹⁴ Paralleled by Post-Hom. ὠμό-φρων [adj.] = Post-Hom. ὠμό-θύμος [adj.] ‘savage-hearted’.

¹⁵ Note the existence of a very different meaning ‘crafty, sagacious’ (Od.).

¹⁶ This research was done with the help of the Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon database in the Perseus Digital Library available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/resolveform?type=substring&lookup> (accessed on 9.3.2021).

guage: PIE $*\acute{h}_2-g^{w/r}(h_1)-on-$ ‘without sense of smell, not able of scenting’ accounts for circa 500 Greek words.

References

- AnEW = de Vries, J. *Altnordisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden — Boston — Köln, Brill, 2000 [1961].
- Balles I. Air. *barae*, gr. φρένες, gr. παπίδες und die Vertretung von idg. $*-k_4-$ im Griechischen, in: M. Fritz, S. Zeilfelder (eds). *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günther Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Graz, Leykam, 2002, 1–23.
- Beekes R. S. P. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (2 Volumes). Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Vol. 10. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2010.
- Darcus S. M. *-phrōn* Epithets of *thumos*. *Glotta* 1977, 55 (3–4), 178–182.
- DELG = Chantraine P. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque, Histoire des mots*. Paris, Klincksieck. Nouvelle édition, avec, en supplément, les CEG 1–10 rassemblées par A. Blanc, C. de Lamberterie et J.-L. Perpillou, 2009 [1968].
- GEW = Frisk H. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3 Volumes), Heidelberg, Winter, 1960–1972.
- Kümmel M. J. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen. Eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden, Reichert Verlag, 2000.
- LIV² = Rix H. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix, bearbeitet von Martin J. Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Wiesbaden, Reichert, 2001 [1999].
- Mathys A. À propos des adverbes en $-\delta\eta\nu$, $-\delta\omicron\nu$, $-\delta\alpha$ ou $-\delta\acute{\alpha}$ du grec ancien: problèmes morphologiques et syntaxiques, in: A. Blanc, D. Petit (eds), *Nouveaux acquis sur la formation des noms en grec ancien*. Collection Linguistique de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, Vol. 101. Leuven — Paris, Peeters, 2016, 243–279.
- Melchert C. H. New Luvian Verb Etymologies, in: H. Marquart, S. Reichmut, J. V. García Trabazo (eds), *Anatolica et Indogermanica. Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*. Innsbruck, IBS 155, 2016, 203–212.
- Pinault G.-J. Traum-deutung: étymologie du grec ὄναρ, ὄνειρος, arm. *anurj* etc. *Wék^wos* 2014, 1, 191–206.
- Pinault G.-J. Avoir du nez: grec νόος. *Wék^wos* 2018, 4, 269–294.
- Rau J. The Greek Adverbs in $-\delta\omicron\nu$, $-\delta\eta\nu$, $-\delta\alpha$. *Glotta* 2009, 82, 211–220.
- Schindler J. Zum Ablaut der neutralen *s*-Stämme des indogermanischen, in: H. Rix (ed.), *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten des Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Regensburg, 9–14 September 1973*. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1975, 259–267.
- Tu. = Turner R. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages* (5 Volumes). London, Oxford University Press, 1962–1966.
- von Kamptz H. *Homerische Personennamen. Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Weiss M. On the Non-verbal Origin of the Greek Verb νήφειν ‘be sober’. *Historische Sprachforschung* 1994, 107, 91–98.

Received: August 1, 2020

Accepted: March 24, 2021