

ERIC P. HAMP

UDC 807.653—54

University of Chicago
 Department of Linguistics
 Chicago

ἦθος, ἔθος, Myc. *e-ti-we*

Frisk, *GEW* 1.625, says that there is nothing in ἦθος ἦθεα 'lair, residence' (from which I would derive the glosses 'vertraut, gewohnt, coutume, caractère' as secondary) to distinguish it at bottom from ἔθος. Chantraine, *DÉLG* 407—8, reconstructs **swēdh-* with a long vocalism to ἔθος. These accounts are unprincipled and lax, both in morphology and in semantics. It seems to me clear that we must equate ἦθος with OIr. *síd* (neuter *s*-stem) 'fairy mound, tumulus', Lat. *sēdēs*, Skt. *sādhiṣ*. On these forms see my remarks in *Glotta* 59, 1981, 158—9 (on πάθος) and in *Études celtiques*, 19, 1982. While it is not clear just how we are to connect this stem with **sed-* 'sit', there can be no doubt that these reflexes share a common semantics and development and that the problem is an Indo-European one and not one of the separate dialects.

I have pointed out (*Études celtiques* loc. cit.) that OIr. *síd* 'peace' = Welsh *hedd* (with short **e!*) must be a different lexeme from *síd* 'tumulus', and is best equated with Lat. *sēdāre*, which last I would not follow Ernout—Meillet in joining to *sed-* 'sit'. I would then regard *sēdāre* not as a factive-causative (which *sēdāre fluctūs* does not impose), but as a denominative.

The Mycenaean tablets show us that their culture featured several kinds of oil, *wo-do-we* 'rose-flavored or -scented' etc. Hooker has recently set these forth in his manual *Linear B* (1980) 65 § 141. The varietal adjective *e-ti-we* has given trouble, and no plausible name for a flavour/scent has been found. But *e-ti-we* is not like its fellow specifiers: it is agreed that *a-e-ti-to* is its negative, or privative, and it is noteworthy that *a-e-ti-to* has the privilege of occurring with one of the other specifiers (*pa-ko-we*). Now if *e-ti-we* meant 'containing x-scent' it is unlikely that another oil would be characterized as 'not x-scented'; and it is still less likely that an oil specified as 'containing y-herb' would be further characterized as 'not x-scented'. We do not speak of 'strawberry non-chocolate ice cream' or 'buckwheat non-linden honey' or 'cherry non-lemon yoghurt' (if these varieties were additives), or 'raspberry non-apricot jam' (if these differentiae were felt as sources). Therefore the 'non-X' should be capable of being at the same time a parti-

cular special specified variety (e.g. *pa-ko-we*); this means logically that 'X' was not special, i.e. not one of the varieties characterized by a named flavour/scent. We conclude then that *e-ti-we* meant 'ordinary', and *a-e-ti-to* 'non-ordinary' i.e. 'special'; from the limited context we cannot tell whether this would have meant 'special' in the sense of 'de luxe' and todays „export“ and yesterday's „ouzo“, as opposed to 'quotidian, common' or (*vin*) *ordinaire* or (Tuborg) „green“, or whether *e-ti-we* would have been 'crude, unrefined, basic, unflavoured, untreated, vel sim.'

The morphology of *e-ti-we* remains to be indentified. If *X-wen* means 'ordinary', i.e. 'X-having', then *X* must be 'ordinari-ness, habit, consuetudo'. The base must be that of θoc. I propose that we have here *ethi-wen*, with a „Caland“ stem θi- to θoc. The privative *a-e-ti-to* then becomes *a(h)ethi(H)ton*, or better *a(h)ethiston*. We may now relate the last directly to the verb ἐθίζω, Attic ἐθῖω.

We may now further specify the form of the perfect εἶωθα Ion. εἶωθα (*GEW* 1.472, *DÉLG* 327; *εἶω is a fiction). While *DÉLG* has here **sw-* and yet accepts the comparison with Gothic *sidus*, we must surely reconstruct **sesodh-* > **hehoth-* > **eoθh-*; this would then perhaps be contaminated as a derivative with ἦθος to give *eōth-* = εἶωθ. It is also possible that the long vocalism was aided by such forms as ὄφληκα. The comparison with *suēscō* given by *DÉLG* then falls away. This perfect then should have been **se + sodh-* in origin.

We may now turn to the old problem of θoc 'Sitte'; all the essentials are provided by *GEW* 1.449 and *DÉLG* 327. Surely we wish to retain the equation with Goth. *sidus*. Chantraine himself declares (*DÉLG* 408): Dès le grec ancien ἦθος ne se confond nullement avec εἶθος. For all these reasons we must distinguish this last etymon from ἦθος.

As an adjective to θoc *GEW* 1.449 observes „alt nur ἐθαῖς ἐθαῖδος m. f.; spät ἔθιμος 'gewöhnlich'“. I would suggest that ἔθιμος has replaced the older *e-ti-we* (*ethiwen*). We see now on internal Greek grounds that θoc could not have originally had an initial digamma. Thus the purely Greek data is entirely consistent with the desired comparisons: **sedh-*.

There can then be no question of a relation to Lat. *sodālis*, which is now confirmed as *suodālis* in the new Satricum inscription. The Hesychian gloss βεσόν may well be corrupt. Any relation to ἐσθίω is totally excluded; on this verb and its background see my discussion in *Glotta*, 59, 1981, 155—7.

Both *GEW* 1.448 and *DÉLG* 315 claim that θνος (neut.) ≠ γένος contained an initial *F* -. This would then imply **syedh-nos*; but this involves the intricate question of the exact shape of the initial of the Indo-European reflexive in its different contexts.

Received 30. august 1981.