

locative, which would yield *αλερι, and Avestan *ayarə* (if this is truly related), and (from the weak-case stem) Goth *air* ON *ār* etc. The formation **H_aier-i* + *H_ed-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

. . . καὶ ἐντόνοντ' ἄριστον

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

*. . . καὶ ἐντόνοντ' ἀερῖστον

The length of *ī* here assumed matches the vocalism of *νηστις -ιος* ~ *-ιδος* < **n-H_ed-ti-* = *ñsti-*, 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*, *πέισσομαι*, *παθεῖν*, *πέπονθα*, *πένθος*, *πάθος* as *πρῶ-σκ-ω*, *πενθ-σ-ο-*, *πρῶ-*, *πε-πονθ-α*, *πενθ-ος*, *πρῶ-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 kēsti* Latv. *ciešu cēst* '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^wñth-t-ā-* see now A. Bammesberger, *Études celtiques* 14, 1974, 205–6, with references to previous works.

**bhendh-* 'suffer' < 'bind (by magic)'. The latter conjecture seems semantically far-fetched, and scarcely supported by documentation or intervening reasoning. Therefore, even though Frisk (*GEW* 2. 478–9, 1965) declares the background "nicht sicher erklärt", I see no good reason to depart semantically from the clear parallels which have always been adduced in Baltic and Celtic. And then if we are to compare an etymon in **k^w-* we must take seriously the equation that has been made between the name Πενθεύς and Τενθεύς, and the resulting view (quite defensible) that the forms in *πε-* have been levelled on those in other vocalisms.

The sole residual problem remains the *ϑ*, since such a configuration breaks the well known constraint upon the form of IE roots. It seems to me that the key to the solution of this anomaly lies in an accounting for the duplicate vocalism observed in πένθος beside πάθος. We must have here an old formation such as we see in Skt. *aghá-* 'wicked': *āgas-* *āγος* 'sin', and more precisely in Skt. *sadhá-*, *sádhiṣ-* Avest. *hadiš-* to the root *sad-*; cf. T. Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language* 195–6 and my remarks on Kuiper *IJ* 1, 1957, 91 (*sadhás-*) and 310 ff. in *Studies in Honor of George Lane* (1967) 151, as well as E. Polomé in *Evidence for Laryngeals* (1965) 23–4, 61. It will be recalled that Greek has continued duplicate vocalisms from such an alternating paradigm in the case of πόντος beside πάτος; see my discussion *Lingua* 34, 1974, 231. I therefore propose two old nominalizations of the root **k^went-*: **k^went-H* gen. **k^wηt-H-os*, and **k^went-os* *k^went-es-/-s-²*). These might have given **κ^wέντα κ^wαθός*

The **-ā-* = *-eH_a-* here is the probably mislabelled "factitive" suffix which is left as an open problem by C. Watkins, *TPS* 1971 (1973) 85–6 note 35. Anticipating my discussion below, I would revise Bammesberger's reconstruction to read **k^wnt-t-ā-*.

²) These would then exactly parallel the semantically similar Indo-Iranian set Sogd. *ṛβ* (*rāf*) 'illness' < **raph-* (: Vedic *raphitá-* 'suffering') beside Vedic *rāpas-* n. 'illness'; cf. Benveniste, *Études sur la langue ossète* 1959, p. 20.

These two nominalizations will account parsimoniously for all the observed facts on the IE level. I would not try to account for the stem shapes here under discussion by the kinds of argument advanced by J. Schindler, *Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*, pp. 259–67 in H. Rix ed. *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft* Wiesbaden 1975. Without entering into detail on Schindler's essentially pre-IE claims I might here remark that the full-grade ~ zero alternation considered by Schindler p. 264 § 4.1.1 seems often to arise in situations involving similar consonants at root-end, e.g. **Heus-e/os* 'ear' or **H₃eH₁-e/os* 'mouth', whereby the like consonants would have collapsed at an early time with no intervening vowel; the resulting *s*-stems would therefore reflect early faulty expansion of the zero-grade of ancient root-

and $\kappa^w\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. The ϑ was generalized, giving $\kappa^w\acute{\epsilon}\nu\vartheta\omicron\varsigma$, while the other vocalism gave a duplicate $\kappa^w\acute{\alpha}\vartheta\omicron\varsigma$. Then, with a levelling of the latter stem, $\kappa^w\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\alpha$ ultimately became $\pi\acute{\alpha}\vartheta\eta$. It is possible that the spread of ϑ , which started in the noun, was aided by the ϑ which would have been regularly produced independently in the perfect $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\vartheta\alpha$.

Locative -ov

By ERIC P. HAMP, Chicago

Edda Gebhard has shown (*MSS* 22, 1967, 21–4) that *AYTO* (IG I² 56, 3) is to be read $\alpha\vartheta\tau\omicron\upsilon$, a locative 'hieselbst', that this must contain the locative adverbial -ov, and that this ending which is seen also in $(\delta)\pi\omicron\nu$ and Dor. (Hesych.) $\pi\tilde{\omega} = \pi\tilde{\upsilon}$ must consist of "unechtes -ov". Now it is clear that $\pi\tilde{\omega}$ must go back to $\kappa^w\omega\omicron$ (we shall see that $\kappa^w\omega\epsilon$ does not lead to a fruitful result) since κ^we-s-o is known to yield $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron > \tau\tilde{\omega}$ by the familiar palataliza-

nouns. Ad p. 265 § 4.1.4, I would refer to my discussion of the type $\kappa^w\text{kreu}H$ (with Gk. $a =$ Skt. i), *IF* 82, 1977, 75–6 and *Ricerche linguistiche* 6, 1974, 231 ff.; it should be noted in connexion with our present case that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\vartheta\omicron\varsigma$ shows no - $\alpha\varsigma$. I agree entirely with Schindler (p. 266 § 4.2.2) that Indo-Iranian $\kappa^w\text{m}\acute{a}\text{n}\acute{s} dh\bar{a}$ - and $\kappa^w\text{g}\acute{a}\text{u}\acute{s} dh\bar{a}$ - represent very ancient formations; however I must simply withhold opinion on the thesis of the κ^w proterokinetic paradigm and the claim that the nom-acc. κ^w -os was not original. In fact, this formation in κ^w -s is reminiscent of the ancient neuter in κ^w -u, but it does not exclude an equally ancient (recoverable) form in κ^w -os. Schindler admits (p. 267) that an κ^w acrostatic Dehnstufe is speculative, but in the nouns cited by him there is an interesting correlation of a phonetic nature to be noticed, i.e. a possible ancient morphophonemic function. Observe that $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, Skt. $v\acute{a}has-$, $\gamma\eta\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, $\eta\theta\omicron\varsigma$, and OIr. *síd* all involve (a possible) IE κ^wH ; on $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and OIr. *síd* see the two comparative sets adduced above. Though I do not pretend to explain the genesis of these long vocalisms, I cite this as a possible vestige of an unexplained correlation with κ^wH in parallel fashion to the striking skewed correspondences to which I have drawn attention in *Ériu* 23, 1972, 230–1.

In this thought-provoking article Schindler actually touches on our present class of problem only at one point, and that is the matter raised on p. 267, i.e. a possible laryngeal interaction, a matter which is left aside and not explored.

Finally, I must thank Klaus Strunk for having forced me to clarify the differences between the problem which I address and that tackled by Schindler.