he must attend closely. This greater independence of ϑυμός may also explain why there are so many passages where a person exerts control over his own ϑυμός: as it becomes more active, the person must attempt to control it more.[16])

Although ϑυμός does not appear in Hesiod and the lyric poets to be as prominent a psychic entity as it was in Homer (and once again the fragmentary evidence may be misleading), it none-theless functions with a wide range of activities in a person. Θυμός can act independently, being capable of determining someone's behaviour and causing him on occasion to resist its activity. Θυμός can act in subordination to someone, in harmony with him, or in opposition to him. In the lyric poets, to an even greater degree than in Homer or Hesiod, person and ϑυμός emerge as distinct entities, each independent though bound in a close and varying relation-ship.

'eat' in Greek

By ERIC P. HAMP, Chicago

1. The infinitive ἔδμεναι and the Greek future ἔδομαι make perfect Indo-European equations. We must then ask why we find such presents as ἔσϑω *Il.*+ and ἐσϑίω *Od.*+. The answer is not far to seek if we consider all the relevant facts.

We now know that the Indo-European root 'eat' began with a laryngeal: *$H_e$ed-. Chantraine *Formation* 315 called ἀλφηστής 'bread eater' and ὠμηστής 'carnassier' "degré long". But we now may credit the Greek long vowel to the fusion with *H_e; the following sigma results from *d before dental. A similar explanation is to be given for δείπνηστος (*Formation* 303), and for the same reason we may suppose that ἄριστον originally (or always?) had *ī. We are now ready to reconstruct the present of *$H_e$ed-, an athematic:

$$*H_e\text{ed-}mi \quad > \quad *ἔδμι \quad > \quad *ἔδμι$$
$$\text{-}si \qquad\qquad ἔτσι \qquad\qquad ἔσ(σ)ι$$

---

[16]) Cf. the way φρήν likewise emerges as a more independent agent in the lyric poets than in Homer or Hesiod. See S. M. Darcus, "A Person's Relation to φρήν in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets", *Glotta* 57 (1979) 159–173. See also Snell's discussion of ϑυμός (note 3).

156   Eric P. Hamp, 'eat' in Greek

-ti	ἔστι	ἔστι = Hitt. *ezz(a)zzi*
H_ed-me	ἐδμέ	ἐδμέν/ς
-te	ἐστέ	ἐστέ
-enti	ἐδέντι	ἐδέντι
~ H_ed-onti	ὀδόντι[1])	ὀδόντι = Hitt. *adanzi*

Then from the last, in the varieties of Greek that favoured sigmatic insertion[2]), we would reach:

*ἔσμι, ἔσ(σ)ι, ἔστι, ἔσμέν/ς, ἐστέ, ἐδέντι ~ ὀδόντι.

The base now had the confusing allomorphic form *√εσ- ~ οδ-. A fresh formation therefore regularized and disambiguated this anomaly as ἐσθ-, i.e. as √εδ + θ-.

Heretofore, I would claim, the wrong question has been asked: Such scholars as Schwyzer and Frisk ask where ἔσθ(ί)ω came from, but make no real progress. The suggested source in the imperative is quite unacceptable. We will not expect a stem to be formed on a surviving inflected ending; besides, the regular vocalism from *H_ed-dhi should then be *ĭ- (*MSS* 37, 59).

The correct question asks why the present did not continue to be ἔδμι. We should always expect no change unless a sufficient motivation provokes it. By asking this question we find an interesting answer. And then, going one step farther, we see that the present formant -θ- is the only means of preserving an unambiguous automatic relation of the shape ἐσ- to the stem or base ἐδ-.

A similar situation must have developed in Celtic, where Old Irish shows *ithid* < *(p)it^e/o- in the present system suppletive to *ed-/od-* elsewhere; cf. Thurneysen, *A Grammar of Old Irish* 471 § 766. A clash with the copula would have arisen: *e(d)mmi, essi, essi, e(d)mmesi, essĕ(s), edonti*; for the inflexion cf. *GOI* §§ 562–3, whereby I assume that *d* was absorbed before *mm* < *sm*. Here, with no -θ- available, simple suppletion by *it- ensued, and British Celtic replaced the stem altogether.

2. We return now to ἄριστον, which seems to be misanalyzed both textually and etymologically. The first element is conventionally related in the handbooks to ἦρι, a form which occurs in derivatives.

Such a long vocalism may freely be reconstructed as *$H_aé_i(e)r$ + loc. *i*, with *vṛddhi* from the old nominative. This would then agree well with ἀρι- of ἄριστον as *$H_ai̯ér$ + i = ə$_ai̯ér$-i, a true old

---

[1]) See my formulation *MSS* 37, 1978, 59f.

[2]) I have dicussed this *Glotta* 49, 1971, 119–22. We may presume that *ἔνμι → ἔμνι and *ἔνμέν/ς → ἔμνέν/ς would not have been generated.

locative, which would yield *αῐερι, and Avestan *ayarə* (if this is truly related), and (from the weak-case stem) Goth *air* ON *ār* etc. The formation *$H_a\text{ier-}i$ + $H_ed\text{-to-}$ is then justified from the Indo-European standpoint.

We may now refine the textual attestation; our word occurs but twice in the epic, and only Ω 124 is crucial, where we find

$$\ldots \varkappa a\grave{\iota} \ \grave{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\upsilon}\nu o\nu\tau' \ \check{a}\varrho\iota\sigma\tau o\nu$$

We see immediately that we may avoid the spondaic meter by restoring

$$*\ldots \varkappa a\grave{\iota} \ \grave{\varepsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\upsilon}\nu o\nu\tau' \ \grave{a}\varepsilon\varrho\bar{\iota}\sigma\tau o\nu$$

The length of *ī* here assumed matches the vocalism of νῆστις -ιος ~ -ιδος < *$n\text{-}H_ed\text{-ti-}$ = n̥sti-, an ancient verbal noun later taken as an adjective like *inermis*.

πάθος*

By Eric P. Hamp, Chicago

The internal Greek formation and relations of this etymon are clear and unproblematic. If there is anything unusual about the etymon it is simply that it is isolated as a total configuration, but not at all unique in its parts. We can easily analyze and relate the main forms πάσχω, πείσομαι, παθεῖν, πέπονθα, πένθος, πάθος as πn̥θ-σκ-ω, πενθ-σ-ο-, πn̥θ-, πε-πονθ-α, πενθ-ος, πn̥θ-ος. The verb is attested from the Iliad on, as is πένθος n. in the meaning 'sadness'; on the latter see P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* I, 349. The neuter πάθος is Attic and Ionic, and is matched by a feminine πάθη. On the meaning of the etymon, see H. Dörrie, *Leid und Erfahrung*, Mainz 1956.

Since Fick the Greek forms have been compared with Lith. *kenčiù kę̃sti* Latv. *ciešu ciest* 'suffer, undergo' (see E. Fraenkel, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 246-7) and OIr. *céssaim*, verbal noun *césad*[1]), but it has also been suggested that the root is

---

*) I must thank my friend and colleague Dr. Robert Wissler, Professor of Pathology in the University of Chicago, for having prodded me to focus on the ambiguous morphology of this important word.

[1]) For the surely correct analysis of *céssaid* as *$k^w n̥th\text{-}t\text{-}\bar{a}$- see now A. Bammesberger, *Études celtiques* 14, 1974, 205-6, with references to previous works.