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AMONG other wonders, the temple of Aphrodite at Megara housed a triad of statues depicting ἔρως, πόθος, and ᾦμερος, the work of the fourth-century sculptor Scopas. About these images Pausanias comments skeptically (1.43.6): εἰ δὴ διάφορα ἐστι κατὰ ταύτα τοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τὰ ἔργα σφίσι. In other words, Pausanias seems to doubt that the concepts expressed by ἔρως, πόθος, and ᾦμερος, the basic triplet of Greek terms describing desire, were distinct enough to allow three different and recognizable personifications.† This is a very astute observation on Pausanias’ part in two ways. For, on the one hand, there indeed is, or appears to be, a high degree of synonymy between at...
least ἔρως and ὕμερος—the specific distinctions made in Plato’s *Cratylus* 420 being largely inspired by fanciful folk etymology. On the other hand, the very existence of three different words does suggest, at least at some very early date, three specific and distinct referents.

I propose here to examine this family of terms, to study what semantic distribution they originally may have had, and to suggest etymologies for two of the three terms, namely ἔρως and ὕμερος which do not as yet possess convincing historical explanations.

**PART ONE: πόθος**

To begin with the strongest leg of the tripod, neither the specific meaning nor the etymology of πόθος is in doubt. πόθος, the least sexualized of the words in question, means a “desire for something not at hand,” as was noted already by Plato (*Cratylus* 420): καὶ μὴν πόθος αὐτῷ καλεῖται σημαίνων σῶτ’ τοῦ παρόντος εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἄλλοθί ποιοῦ ὄντος καὶ ἄποντος. That this definition is not merely folk-etymological fantasy is proved by a survey of some passages from Homer: *Od.* 4.596 (Telemachus to Menelaus) οὗδέ με ο’κου ἔλοι πόθος οὐδέ τοκῆων; *Od.* 11.202 (Odysseus’ mother to Odysseus) ἀλλὰ με σὸς τε πόθος ἀπηύρω; *Od.* 14.144 (Eumelos to disguised Odysseus) ἀλλά μ’ ὃ ὀδυσσήσῃ πόθος αὖνται. Notice that πόθος refers regularly in the Homeric poems to the feelings that Odysseus’ friends and family have for him during his wanderings. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* πόθος describes the feeling Demeter has for her kidnapped daughter (201, 304): πόθῳ μινύθουσα βοθυζόνοι θυγατρός. It is interesting, but perhaps not significant, that the noun πόθος which gives the name to a quintessentially Odyssean feeling does not occur in the *Iliad*. The feminine ποθή does, however, occur there, typically describing the longing that the Achaians or Trojans have for a warrior during his temporary or permanent absence from battle, e.g., 6.362: (Hector to Helen) ἐμεῖο ποθὴν ἀπεόντος ἔχουσιν. Cf. also 11.471 (of Odysseus), 17.690 (of Patroclus), 1.240 (of Achilles).2

In fact, there is not one example of πόθος/ποθή which requires the translation “sexual desire” in either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*. This sexual meaning, it seems, does not appear before the pseudo-Hesiodic Scu-

---

2 J. Gagnepain, *Les noms grec en -os et en -a* (Paris 1959) 69–70 discerns a difference in the meaning of πόθος and ποθή which, I admit, escapes me.
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*tum 41 and the notably late Homeric Hymn to Pan (33–34): θάλε γὰρ πόθος ύγρός ἐπελθὼν/νύμη ἐκπλοκάμω Δρύσος φιλότητι μιγήναι.3 That πόθος means "desire for that which is not at hand" is perfectly in keeping with its etymology. As Bezzenberger saw more than a century ago,4 πόθος is a direct descendant of *gʷʰóðhos the thematic, o-grade, barytone derivative of the Proto-Indo-European root *gʷʰedh- "pray." The verbal derivatives of this root survive in Greek in the s-aorist θέσσασθαί, θεσσάμενος (Hes. +) "prayed" < *gʷʰedh-s- and in the present θέσσεσθαι which Hesychius glosses αἴτείν, ἰκετεύειν. This present stem can only derive from earlier PIE *gʷʰedh-ye-, formed by adding the present-forming suffix -ye- to the root. The antiquity of this present stem is confirmed by the precise agreement of Old Irish guidid "pray" and Old Persian jadiya- "pray," both going back to PIE *gʷʰedh-ye-.5 For the derivation of a noun like *gʷʰóðhos from a verbal root like *gʷʰedh- compare λόγος from λέγω or φόνος from ἐπέφηνον.6 The development of sounds, though at first sight somewhat obscure, is in fact perfectly regular. In the case of πόθος from *gʷʰóðhos the developments were as summarized below:

*gʷʰóðhos > *kʷʰóthos > *kʷóthos > πόθος

That is to say, *gʷʰóðhos became *kʷʰóthos by the devoicing of voiced aspirates. Next, *kʷʰóthos became *kʷóthos by Grassmann's law of the dissimilation of aspirates. Finally, *kʷóthos became πόθος by the development of labiovelars into labials before back vowels.7

On the other hand, the pre-history of the s-aorist of this verb was as summarized below:

*gʷʰedh-s- > *gʷʰet-s- > *kʷʰet-s- > θεσσό-

4 See Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen 21 (1898) 297.
6 See P. Chantaine, La formation des noms en grec ancien (Paris 1933) 10.
7 See M. Lejeune, Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien (Paris 1972) 30, 47, 56 for these developments. The ordering of the last two steps is not entirely certain.
First \( *g\text{whedh-s} \) became \( *g\text{het-s} \) because the voiced aspirate \( dh \) lost both its aspiration and voicing before \(-s-\). Next \( *g\text{het-s} \) became \( *k\text{het-s} \) by the devoicing of voiced aspirates, but Grassmann’s law did not apply because the second aspirate of the stem had already been lost so there were not two aspirates to dissimilate. Finally, \( *k\text{het-s} \) became \( \theta\varepsilon\varsigma\sigma \) because the labiovelars \( *k\text{h} \) before \( e \) became \( th- \) in all dialects except the Aeolic ones and \(-ts-\) assimilated to \(-ss-\).

Verbal nouns of the \( \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma/\phi\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \) type are often \textit{nomina actionis}. \( \phi\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \), for example, is “the act of slaying,” i.e., “murder.” Thus \( \pi\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma \) must originally have meant “the act of praying, prayer.” The semantic connection between “prayer” and “desire” is obvious enough. But why should “the act of praying” take on the specific meaning “desire for that which is not at hand”? A moment’s reflection shows that implicit in the concept of prayer is not only “desire” but also a realization that that which one desires is not obtainable through one’s own efforts alone, but only with the assistance of another, sometimes divine, being. If I am in the Sahara desert, I might pray for a drink. But if I feel thirsty at home, I just turn on the tap.

This twofold nature of prayer is, of course, true in general and also in the particular case of \( \theta\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\omega\theta\alpha\iota \). To cite just one example, the subjects in Archilochus \textit{IEG} 8 are praying for their \( \nu\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \) (\( \theta\varepsilon\sigma\varsigma\alpha\mu\varepsilon\nu\iota \gamma\lambda\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \nu\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\nu \iota \)), something which is notoriously subject to the whims of the gods and the seas.

From this it follows that the nominalization of a verb meaning “pray” should contain within it both the idea of desire and the idea that the fulfillment of that desire is contingent upon the will or action of some other entity. \( \pi\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma \) would therefore have meant in the first instance “desire for that which is not easily obtained by the subject’s actions alone.” Practically speaking, this means in most cases “desire for that which is not at hand.” Eventually this semantic limitation was eroded and we find \( \pi\omicron\theta\omicron\varsigma \) in the simple sense of “desire,” sometimes sexual, which led Pausanias to make his doubting comment.

One more possible trace of the root \( *g\text{whedh} \) in Greek may be found in the name of the Thessalians: \( \theta\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\lambda\omicron \), \( \theta\varepsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron \), \( \phi\varepsilon\tau\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron \), \( \phi\varepsilon\tau\theta\alpha\lambda\omicron \). A possible explanation for the name and its surprising variants is offered in the appendix.

---

8 See Lejeune, \textit{ Phonétique }, 72, 74, 103 for these developments.
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‘ἔρως, one may be surprised to learn, is a word without a past. No plausible etymology has ever been suggested for this word and its family. Frisk in his etymological dictionary says simply “ohne Etymologie.” Chantraine reaches the same conclusion in his dictionary. Now some words do not deserve etymologies—for example, onomatopoetic words and Lallwörter—and some words, though deserving, can clearly not be etymologized within the framework of Proto-Indo-European. But ἔρως and its relatives are not those kinds of words. The simple facts of their morphology guarantee an Indo-European origin. We have just not yet looked in the right place. First let us review the forms in question to see which way they point.

In the early Greek epic we find the following indubitable representatives of the root *ἔρ(α)- “love”:

Verbs 1. a) ἔρωμαι with the thematic variant ἔρόμαι
 b) ἔροτιξω “be greedy for meat,” only in the present participle

Nouns 2. a) ἔρος, -οῦ “love,” a thematic noun
 b) ἔρως, -ώτος “love,” a t-stem

Adjectives 3. a) ἔραννός, -ή, -όν “lovely”
 b) ἔρατός, -ή, -όν “lovely” and the compounds ἐπήρατος “delightsome” and πολυήρατος “much-loved”
 c) ἔρατενός, -ή, -όν “lovely”
 d) ἔρόεις, -εσσα, -εν “charming”

Name 4. Ἐρατώ

Somewhat later forms of interest are compounds with first member in ἔρασι-, e.g., ἔρασι-μολπος (Pind. Ol. 14.15), the adjective ἔρασμιος (Anacreon +), and the noun ἔραστής (Soph. +). The interrelationship of these forms can be schematized as in the figure below.

---

To put this chart into words: we start with the verbal root ἑρα-μαι. From this is derived the verbal adjective ἑρατός from which, in turn, are derived the personal name Ἐρατός, the adjective ἑρατεινός apparently built under the influence of the adjectives in -εινός like ἀλγεινός, ποθεινός, etc., the denominal verb ἑρατίζω, and probably the first part of τερψίμπροτος-type compounds such as ἑρασίμολπος from earlier ἑρατι-.

In addition, ἑρα- made a neuter s-stem of the κρέας type which, although it is not attested, can be inferred with certainty from the Pre-Aeolic *erasnós which became Aeolic ἑραννός, as well as from ἑρασ-μιος and ἑρασ-τής. It is also probable that ἑρως was originally an animate amphikinetic s-stem of the οιδίως, οιδοὺς type where the genitive is from *αιδόσος.¹⁰ This is likely for two reasons. First, the derivation of an animate s-stem with o-grade suffix from a neuter protorokinetic s-stem like ἑρας is a well paralleled Indo-European morphological pattern. Compare, for example, Greek κρέ(φ)ας n. = Skt. kraviṣ (< Proto-Indo-European *krówh₂s) beside Latin cruor m. < *kr(é)wh₂ōs. Second, the replacement of an original s-stem by a t-stem is exactly paralleled by the cases of ἵδρως, ἵδρωτος which has replaced an earlier ἵδρως, ἵδροὺς (cf. Latin sūdor < *sweidōs) and γέλως, γέλωτος which has replaced an earlier γέλως, γέλους (cf. Armenian catr, gen. catu < *gelōs). Finally, one might note that there are no t-stem forms of ἑρως in the Iliad, Odyssey, or Hesiod. The t-stem first appears in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes 449.

¹⁰ I follow the terminology laid out by J. Schindler in “Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme der indogermanischen,” in Flexion und Wortbildung, ed. H. Rix (Wiesbaden 1975) 262–264, except that I use ‘amphikinetic’ instead of ‘holokinetic.’
As for the apparent thematic stem ἔρος, a number of possibilities might be entertained. On the one hand, one might simply say that ἔρος is a barytone λόγος-type verbal abstract which, instead of showing the expected o-grade of the root, has copied the apparent e vowel of the verbal root ἔρα-. Although surprisingly few exact parallels can be found in the early period, cf. τάφος not *τόμφος "funeral rites" < θάπτω. This would mean—and nothing obvious is against this claim—that thematic ἔρος is of no great antiquity. On the other hand, it is also conceivable that the original neuter s-stem *ἔρας has been replaced by a more regular looking *ἔρος, a neuter s-stem like γένος which has been derailed and diverted into the second declension and the masculine gender. Nothing in particular—except perhaps the semi-parallels of Latin Venus and Ceres, both originally neuter s-stems—speaks in favor of this hypothesis and it is, on the whole, rather more complicated than the first hypothesis given above. In any case, nothing crucial turns on the correct historical interpretation of the thematic ἔρος.

The family tree sketched out above makes it clear enough that the verb ἔραμαι is at the morphological heart of this system, and it is from this verb that we must start our investigation into the prehistory of this word family. A consideration of the forms of this verb attested in early Greek epic reveals the following points:

a. The verb is, at this early stage, middle only. There is no active form in Homer, Hesiod, or the Homeric Hymns. Active forms do not appear in Greek before Archilochus.\(^{11}\)

b. The verb is athematic. The one example of thematic inflection in Homer, ἔρασθε with diectasis from ἔρασθε at Iliad 16.208, is a metrically determined Streckform: φυλόπιδος μέγα ἔργον, ἔτο το πρίν γ' ἔρασθε. This line starts off with a well defined formula which extends from the beginning of the line to the feminine caesura. Cf. Iliad 20.286 Αἴνειας, μέγα ἔργον, δ' οὖ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν; 10.282 ρέξαντας μέγα ἔργον, ὀ κε Τρώεσσι μελήσῃ; 5.303 Τυδείδης, μέγα ἔργον, δ' οὖ δύο γ' ἄνδρε φέροιεν, etc.

\(^{11}\) IEG 19.3, 125.2. Another peculiarity of the Archilochean passages is the apparent shift of the verb ἔρσα to ἔρεο. This form is also found in the editions of Anacreon (PMG 359.1, 428.1) In all these cases a contracted ἔρω would scan and is in fact transmitted by the codd. at all the loci except IEG 125.2. As Alan Nussbaum has demonstrated in a lecture delivered at the 1990 East Coast Indo-European Conference, these forms are not the result of sound change, but rather hyper-Ionisms created on the analogy Attic κολῆω: Ionic κολέω:: ἔρω: X, X = ἔρεω.
The normal conclusion for lines which begin with this formula is a relative clause defining the μέγα έργον as in the three examples just cited. The composer of this line, wanting to stick close to this tradition and wanting also to express the central idea “which you formerly loved,” found that the strictly expected *ής το πρίν γ’ έρωσθε failed to scan and chose to use two artificial forms to fill out the line. For ές can have little claim to linguistic reality and is obviously created on the model οὖν ∴ ής: ής X where X = ές.12 έράσθε on the other hand, may best be explained as a replacement, under dire metrical necessity, of the athematic έρωσθε of the traditional diction by a thematic έράεσθε which may have already existed in the composer’s everyday speech. This innovative thematic form is also used once by Hesiod fr. 30 line 32

c. The verb did not begin with digamma which would have been incompatible with the scansion found at Iliad 16. 208, Hes. fr. 185 line 14 and fr. 30 line 32. Furthermore the augmented forms in eta, e.g., ήροτο, are incompatible with the prior existence of an initial digamma. If digamma had existed in this verb, then the augmented forms would have been *ειρότο like, for example, ειρόσα the aorist of έρνω “dig” from ερώτω (ερωσάω Delphi, 4v. B.C.E.) Finally Cypriote e-re-ra-me-na έροράμένα (ICS 264.2) in an inscription preserving initial digamma argues conclusively against an initial digamma for the root of έρωμαι.

d. The verb belonged to that subclass of verbs which did not show lengthening of the final stem vowel before the s of the s-aorist. For example, the first alpha of ήρωσάμην scans unambiguously short at Iliad 14.317 οὖν’ ὁπότ’ ήρωσάμην ήξινής ἀλόχοιο and Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 57. In this regard ήρωσάμην is exactly parallel to έπέραμα, έκέραμα, etc. Verbs of this sort, it is generally agreed, owe the final a vowel of their stems to the prior existence of the second laryngeal. Cf., for example, the περά of έπέραμα and the κερά of έκέραμα which go back to PIE *perh₂- and kerh₂- respectively.13

And finally one observation pertaining to semantics:

e. The verb is not exclusively sexual. Thus the objects of έρωμαι include war (πόλεμος II. 9.64, φύλακς II. 16.208) and food (H. Dem. 129 δόρπον, H. Herm. 130 κρέας). Note also that the derived verb έρωτιζω always has meat (κρέας) as its object.

12 See P. Chantraine, Grammaire homérique (Paris 1973) 1.83.
13 Chantraine, DELG 517.
On the basis of the five insights that can be gleaned from the early Greek data we may venture an internal reconstruction, as yet purely hypothetical and relying on no external comparative evidence. That is, Greek ἔρως-ματι must reflect a Proto-Indo-European root *h₂erh₂-. It is noteworthy that this is not one out of many possible reconstructions but the sole possibility that can account for the Greek facts. Once we have

14 One further detail needs to be addressed. The case has just been made that the root *er- can only go back to *h₂erh₂- and that, as is shown by the aorist stem *er-αι, the final α of the root is the reflex of the second laryngeal. On anyone’s theory a vocalic r could not account for the root shape *er-. For *h₂rC- could only give er according to Rix’s law (H. Rix, “Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis Sonans im Griechischen,” MSS 27 (1969) 79–110) and #rC-—assuming that PIE had any r- initial roots, which is uncertain—could only have given #arC-. An apparent difficulty for this account is presented by the Boeotian and Thessalian ἐρωτο-, inferable from personal names like Boet. ἔρωτος, ἐρωτές and Thess. ἐρωτοκλίας (Matropolis), F. Bechtel, Die griechischen Dialekte (Berlin 1921) 1.147, 243. It is clear that the Thessalian and Boeotian form ἐρωτο- belongs to that class of forms which have an Aeolic (and sometimes Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean) op/po corresponding to Attic-Ionic and West Greek αρ/ρα, e.g., Lesbian βρόχος vs. βροχύς. See Lejeune, Phonétique 197. In most cases, it is clear that “Aeolic” op/po corresponding to West Greek/Attic-Ionic αρ/ρα reflects Proto-Greek *r. How then should the po of ἐρωτο- be explained? Of course, it is logically possible that *r became ar/ra in Proto-Greek, and that “Aeolic” changed a of whatever origin to o in the vicinity of r. This view, put forward by W. Porzig (“Sprachgeographische Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Dialekten,” IF 61 (1954) 161) among others, even finds a specious support in Mycenaean pa-ro, Aeolic πάρο, i.e., πάρεστι (Alc. 130 a,12 Voigt) = Attic-Ionic παρό where the second a is the result of *h₂e, the allative case marker. For a discussion of the reconstruction of the allative see my paper, “Life Everlasting . . .” in MSS 55 (1996) n. 44. For a different view of the directive/allative case see G. E. Dunkel, “The I.E. Directive” in Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch, ed. G. E. Dunkel et al. (Wiesbaden 1994) 17–36. However, πάρο can simply be analogical to ὀπό. And Porzig’s view is refuted by clear cases of α, whether from PIE *a or *h₂ in the vicinity of ρ which show up unchanged in Aeolic, e.g., ὀρτιάς (S. 98a10; 123 Voigt) from the root *(h₂)ar- “be fitting” with PIE *a, cf. Hittite ἄρα “(what is) fitting.” A further argument against the view that αρ > op in “Aeolic” is provided by the fact that initial Attic-Ionic/West Greek αρ-never corresponds to Aeolic ορ-—ὁρχαίος contra P. Kretschmer, “Etymologisches,” ZvS 36 (1900) 268 (and Myc. o-ka if really equivalent to *ὁρχά, cf. πλοκάμος ~ πλοκτή). See F. Aura Jorro, Diccionario Micénico [Madrid 1993] 2.19) is not Aeolic for *ὁρχαίος, but from an o-grade *h₂orγh-. We are led then to the conclusion that ἐρωτο- cannot be phonological. As per Peters, “Ein weiteres Fall des Rixisch Gesetz,” in Indogermanica et Itlica ed. G. Meiser (Innsbruck 1993) 380, n. 34, it is most likely that ἐρωτο- is a hyper-Aeolism on the basis of the clear pattern West Greek αρ/ρα ~ Aeolic op/ρο. In any case, the expected α of Aeolic ἐρα- is well attested, e.g., Boeot. ἔρατος (Tanagra, in a pre-Ionic alphabet SGDI 914 III.7), ἐρατος (Alc. 296b12 Voigt); ἐπήρατος (Sapph. 44.32 Voigt).
established this internal reconstruction, the task now becomes to anchor it in the comparative evidence. But if there were obvious reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *h₁erh₂-meaning “love” in other Indo-European traditions we could be sure that scholars would have pointed them out a long time ago. This must mean either that there are no such reflexes or that the meaning of these reflexes must be sufficiently different to have precluded comparison. First we must turn our attention to semantics.

Where do words for “love” come from? There is, of course, no one semantic source. But consider some selected examples. In Latin, diligo, Cicero claims, expresses a milder emotion than amo (Cicero ad Brut. 1.1.1): diligit vel, ut ἐμφατικῶτερον dicam, valde me amat. But still this word often occurs simply in the sense “love,” e.g., (Plautus Amph. 509 [Juppiter to Alcumena]): Satin habes, si feminarum nulla est quam aeque diligam? Diligo is, of course, quite clearly a compound of the preverb dis- and lego, legere, and should therefore mean as the sum of its parts “to take or choose apart.” A close relative of this more concrete meaning is apparently preserved in two passages quoted by Nonius 290: Plautus Curc. 424: clupeatus elephantum machaera diligit (codd. dissicit); Tit. Com. 84: pemam totam diligit. Compare our own colloquial “to take someone apart,” meaning “to tear to pieces.”

The semantic evolution must then have been “takes apart (for oneself)” > “enjoys” > “loves.” Traces of an earlier sense may perhaps be felt in examples like Plautus Bacch. 817–818: quem di diligent, adulescens moritur. A very similar development may be seen in Sanskrit. There one finds the root bhaj-, the exact cognate of Greek φαιγένω “eat.” In the active bhajati this verb means “divides,” but in the middle bhajate it means “divides for oneself, uses, enjoys, loves” as in this example from Nala: yadi tvam bhajamāṇāṁ māṁ pratyākhyāsyasi mānada/ viṣam agnīṁ jalam rajjam āsthāsyē tava kāraṇāt “If you will reject me who loves (you) I’ll kill myself on your account.” Thus in the case of both diligo and bhajate, we find the same semantic development from “divides for oneself” to “loves.”

Upon closer inspection this change of meaning would appear to be a two-step one. First, “divides for oneself, takes one’s share” leads to

---

15 Literally: I will resort to poison, fire, water, rope on your account. Another partial semantic parallel may be provided by Latin amāre, if this verb is indeed from the PIE root *h₂emh₃- ‘seize’ (Skt. (abhi) amṛ etc.) as O. Hackstein has suggested, Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstammbildungen des Tocharischen (Göttingen 1995) 66.
Enjoys.” This kind of development is very common and finds parallels within the classical languages. For example, Greek ἀπολαύω “have enjoyment of” is related to ληφθομαι “carry off as booty” and Old Church Slavonic loviti “capture.”

The second part of the change from “enjoyment” to “love” may be seen in several ways. For example, “I enjoy ping-pong” hardly differs from “I love ping-pong.” Consider also the case of Greek χράμαι. In the perfect, when used with a genitive, this verb means “desires,” e.g., Odyssey 1.13 (Odysseus): νόστου κεχρημένον ἥδε γυναικός. Cf. Euripides Ph. 359 πατρίδος ἔραν. But when used with a dative it means “enjoy the use of,” e.g., Odyssey 14.420–421: οὐδὲ συβώτης / λήθετ’ ἀρ’ ἀθανάτων. φρεσι γὰρ κέχρητ’ ἀγαθήσιν. But perhaps we may be more specific. In Modern German gebrauchen means “to use” but brauchen means “to want, or need.” Thus we see from this example that the meanings “use” and “want” are distinguished formally merely by the presence or absence of the aspectual particle ge- which at one time had perfectivizing force.

In the light of these observations, we might imagine the following hypothetical semantic prehistory for our root *h₁erh₂-. Let us begin by assigning an original meaning “divide” to the root *h₁erh₂-. Let us suppose that this root made a middle root-aorist *(e-)h₁erh₂-to which, as an indirect reflexive middle, meant “divided for oneself” and then “enjoyed” (recall the cases of Skt. bhajate and ἀπολαύω). By regular sound change this would have become Greek augmented *θεράτο, unaugmented *θράτο. The athematic middle root present was a Narten present *h₁erh₂-toi.¹⁷ This present form, being naturally imperfective or


incompletive aspectually, took on the meaning “to seek to enjoy,” and hence “to desire sexually or otherwise.” This hypothesized development of the present stem is closely parallel to, if not identical with, the well known phenomenon of the conative present and imperfect. Consider, for instance, this example from Isocrates (6.12): ταυτην [την δοξαν] πειθον ημις ἀποβαλειν. “They seek to persuade us to get rid of that glory.” Or consider the familiar case of the verb ὄνεομαι “to buy,” which regularly means “to seek to buy” in the present and imperfect. Next we may suppose that as soon as the meaning of the present was no longer decomposable as “seek to enjoy,” but simply meant “desire,” a new s-aorist was created replacing the old root-aorist in order to carry the new meaning “desire” into the aorist stem.18

This hypothesis, to my mind plausible enough in view of the parallels, will, of course, convince no one in the abstract. What one wants is to be able to point clearly to the other members of the family of *hlerh2- “divide” both in other Indo-European languages and, crucially, within Greek itself.

Outside of Greek, the language which provides the most information about laryngeals is, of course, Hittite. If our hypothetical root *hlerh2- must be reconstructed with a full grade since *h,ιr C- would have given Proto-Greek *er-pa- as Paul Wilson has shown, A Linguistic and Philological Study of Selected Greek Verb Forms, diss. Cornell University (1993) 11.

18 For the extension or replacement of a root-aorist by an s-aorist form, cf. γελοιον (Alic. 349c Voigt) “they broke into laughter” > ἐγελασαν. See F. Specht, “Griechische Misszellen,” ZvS 62 (1936) 222. A very similar set of developments may be seen in the case of the verb(s) ἐχραω(ε)ν “attacked” and χραω “graze,” Cypr. χράουμαι “touch upon.” In this case, its seems we must start with the aorist ἐχρα(ε)ν. Cf. Latin ingravo, ingrui “fall upon” < *en-ghraw-. The present stem built to this root by means of the -ye/-yo-suffix was χρα(ε)ye-. For a -ye/-yo- present beside a thematic aorist cf. δοϊω < *dawye- “to set on fire” ~ aor. δα(ε)ν- inferable from the Homeric subjunctive δοῃται. The present had imperfective meaning, e.g., “attack incompletely” whence “graze.” Once this meaning was no longer analyzable as derived, the present χρα(ε)ye- was cut loose and formed a new s-aorist, after which, in turn, the expected phonological outcome of the present stem, viz. *χραίω, was remodelled to χραίω. In this case, in contrast to the hypothesized case of ἐρομαι, the original athematic aorist survived side by side with the new s-aorist.
were to turn up in Hittite in the zero-grade, i.e., \( *h₁rh₂^- \), it would come out as \( arh^- \). The preconsonantal e-grade, i.e., \( *h₁.erh₂C^- \), following the phonology of Melchert, would also come out as \( *arh-C \). Cf. \( wålhi_zi \) “strikes” < \( *welh₂-ti. 19 \)

Now it so happens that in Old Hittite we find a noun \( arhās \)\(^{20} \) (common gender) which means “border” (= Cuneiform Luvoir \( ir₃əha- \), Hieroglyphic Luvoir \( ir₃ha- \)) and is replaced in Later Hittite by \( ir₃ha- \). This noun belongs to the Hittite equivalent of the thematic declension, but derivatives like \( arh₂zίya^- \) “external, foreign” and \( ar₃h₂zena^- \) (same meaning) suggest that \( arhās \) was originally an athematic root noun.\(^{21} \)

The derivation of a word for “border” from a verbal root meaning “divide” is self-evident and well-paralleled. To cite a well known example, Old Irish \( crɪch \) “boundary” is a derivative of the root seen in Greek \( κρίνω \) and Latin \( cerno. 22 \)

Latin, as has been known now for some time, has a close relative of Hittite \( arh₂s \) in \( ọra \) “border, seacoast.”\(^{23} \)

\( Ọra \) has, in fact, nothing to do with \( ọs \), \( ọris \) “mouth”, and \( c₃õram < *ko-₃r₃-am \) “face to face,” which has been supposed to support the existence of an \( a \)-stem derivative of \( ọs \), simply owes its -\( am \) to the very nearly synonymous \( palam \) “openly.”\(^{24} \) Instead \( ọra \) can best be understood as a \( ṣ₃ddhi \) derivative of the \( o \)-grade of the Italic descendant of

19 For the elimination of the possibility that the final \( h \) of Anatolian \( *arh^- \) is from \( h₂ \), see H. Craig Melchert, Anatolian Historical Phonology (Amsterdam 1994) 72–73. For the pre-Proto-Anatolian change of \( e \) to \( a \) before \( Rh₂C^- \), see Melchert, Anatolian 83–84. The phonological development of \( arh \) and its congeners is dealt with on p. 84. Sara Kimball, on the other hand, who kindly sent me a pre-print version of her paper “The Phonological Pre-history of Some Hittite mi-conjugation Verbs,” MSS 53 (1994) 89, prefers to explain the non-assimilation of the laryngeal from a zero-grade \( *h₁rh₂^- \). As for the problematic vocalism of \( ir₃ha-, ir₃h₂a-, \) Melchert believes that the vocalism is derived from the denominative verb \( ir₃ha⁽i⁾- \) “make a circuit” < \( *er₃h₂-Hye/o⁻ \) which requires that the change of pre-tonic \( e \) to \( i \) be Proto-Anatolian. Kimball, on the other hand, argues that \( ir₃ha- \) may in fact be phonologized as \( /ēɾ₃h₂- \), and that this form, together with Hieroglyphic Luvoir \( ir₃ha- \), points to a Proto-Anatolian \( ν₃ddhi \) derivative \( *h₁.₃r₃h₂₂o⁻ \). I leave it to the experts to decide between these two alternative hypotheses. In any case, either reconstruction is perfectly compatible with our extra-Anatolian hypotheses.

20 Plene spelling of the stem vowel in \( er⁻₃ha-a-a₃ \) KUB XIX 37 II 23 (Neo-Hittite).

21 See Melchert, Studies in Historical Hittite Phonology (Göttingen 1984) 137.


24 See A. Walde and J. B. Hoffmann, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg 1938) 272.
the PIE root-noun which is also reflected by Hittite *arḥāš. We may therefore reconstruct an original root-noun nominative *h₁orh₂s which ablauted with e-grade *h₁erh₂- in the oblique cases. Nouns of this sort are regularly feminine result-nouns of the verbs from which they are derived.25 Our root-noun would then have meant in the first instance "that which results from a division" and therefore "border." Hittite appears to have a thematized derivative of this root-noun, whereas Latin has used the o-grade as the basis for a vṛddhi derivative *h₁ōrh₂0- "pertaining to the border" which was then substantivized as *h₁ōrh₂eh₂ > ēra with originally collective force.26 For the survival of vṛddhi in Italic as a productive process one may compare sacrum ~ säcer, i-stem (Pl. Men. 290 etc.) = Umbrian saakri- < *sākri- as in porci sacres "pigs which belong to the sacrum, ‘the sacred rite’." For the substantivization of a vṛddhi adjective as a feminine a-stem, cf. Grk. ἑός27 “sheepskin” < *ōwi-o- derived from ōflες.28

27 This accentuation is given in Theognostus, but the word is attested from the fifth-century comic poet Hermippus.
28 Another probable example of an Italic or Latin vṛddhi derivative is hīra “intestine” pl. “guts” with a dialectal i in place of a Roman Latin ē. See F. Solmsen, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache,” ZvS 34 (1897) 2. This word belongs to the same family as the first part of haru-spes. Latin haru- Skt. hīra- m. “band,” hirā f. “vein,” and Greek χωρτή, etc. (see Walde-Hoffmann [above, n. 24] 635, 649.) all point to a root of the shape *gwerh₂- with the Greek form exhibiting de Saussure’s law of non-vocalization of a laryngeal in the vicinity of a resonant and an o-grade (see M. Peters, Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen (Vienna 1980) 95). Since we are dealing with an indubitable short-vowel set root, *hēra can only be explained as a vṛddhi derivative of *gwerh₂-, perhaps with originally collective meaning. This vṛddhi derivative does not seem to have any parallels outside of Latin. Albanian zorrë “intestines,” contra Solmsen, is probably from *gwr₂neh₂ and not *gwr₂neh₂. See Martin Huld, Basic Albanian Etymologies (1983) 54.

Latin has one other piece of evidence that seems to me to confirm the idea that Latin ēra “border” and therefore Hittite arḥāš are, in fact, derived from a verbal root meaning “divide.” This is the word ora, which is traditionally glossed as “rope.” Making a connection between the meaning of ora₁ and ora₂ has always been difficult. But consider the attestation of ora₂:

Liv. 22.19.10 alii resolutis oris in ancoras evehuntur, alii ancoralia incidunt
Liv. 28.36.11 orasque et ancoras praecedunt
Quint. Inst. 4.2.41 sublatae sunt ancorae solvimus oras
Quint.Inst. Praef. 3 oram solventibus bene precemur
Erotica: On the Prehistory of Greek Desire

It is also probable that Celtic preserves a member of the family of *h₄r₂h₂- in Old Irish or m. “border,” Welsh or f. “border,” eirion-yn, Old Breton orion, Mod. Bret. erien with internal i-affection from *oryono-. These forms, although mentioned in this connection before, have not been seriously considered, presumably because of the belief that the Celtic words were somehow borrowings either from Latin ṥra, as Thurneysen suggested, or from OE or or ora, as Pokorny believed. Neither of these theories is very compelling. As for the idea that Celtic or is from Latin ṣra, one may note that Latin ṣ is normally represented as úal/ó in Irish and as u in Welsh. cf. (h)ọra ~ OIr. úar, older ór (f. a-stem) “time”; Latin scōpa > OIr. scūap f., Welsh ysgub f. Even in the peculiar case of the learned borrowing of Latin ọrdō as OIr. ord, Welsh accurately reflects the length of the Latin ọ in urdd. There is, to my knowledge, no case where an accented Latin ọ is borrowed as a short o in all the Celtic languages. Another argument against a Latin origin is provided by the masculine inflection of or in Irish. Of course, the real motivation for Thurneysen’s loanword theory is the erroneous belief that Latin ṣra is from *ōsa. Turning to the supposed Old English

Notice that an ora is not just any rope but specifically a ship’s release rope. Starting from the historically attested meaning of ora, it is hard to arrive at this very specific meaning of ora₂. But if we start from a verbal root *h₄r₂h₂- “divide, cut apart” we may suppose that the ora was the rope that was cut apart or untied in order to release the ship. Cf. for the semantic development from “cut” to “untie” Skt. lunaṭi “cut” vs. Latin solvo, Grk. λῶο (Pokorny, Indogermanisches 681). Note that in all four attestations of this word it is governed by a verb meaning ‘release’ or ‘cut.’ There is no mention of tying up the orae as one might have expected if ora meant simply rope for the tying up of a ship at dock. As for the morphology of ora₂, it is worth pointing out that, although the Oxford Latin Dictionary 1262 marks the o of the first syllable as long, we have no real evidence that this is the case. The word is not attested in poetry, does not survive in the Romance languages, and does not occur in any compounds which would not show vowel weakening if the first vowel were long. Nothing but the idea that this word is somehow an extended use of ora requires us to assume a long initial vowel. Since this is the case, we are free to assume that the first syllable of ora₂ is short. The morphological analysis of ora₂ would then be clear, i.e, it would be an o-grade deverbal noun from the verb *h₂r₂h₂- “that which is cut” with secondary concretization. This is the well known ṭoṭi- type. Admittedly, the semantic development from “that which is cut/untied” to “release rope” is highly peculiar, and would probably be beyond plausibility, if not for the striking unanimity of the contexts. Perhaps this sense of ora is a feature of sailor’s slang.

30 Laroche does mention the Irish form.
31 Pokorny, Indogermanisches 784.
source, we may note that OE or n., which also has a long vowel, means not “border” but “beginning,” glossing Latin *initium.*\(^{32}\) Ora, a masculine n-stem, on the other hand, does mean “border” and translates Latin *ōra* from which it is clearly a relatively late borrowing. For the transfer of a Latin a-stem feminine to the masculine n-stem declension, cf. OE *gloria -an m.* < Latin *gloria.*\(^ {33}\) Thus the loan hypotheses for Irish or are rather unlikely. It is much simpler to say that OIr. or m. is from < \(*h₁erh₂-os* “divider.”

We find other probable members of the family of \(*h₁erh₂-* in Lithuanian *irti, irńa* “dissolve oneself” < “divide oneself up,” and *irti, irių* “tear open” the accents of which point to a root-final laryngeal.\(^ {34}\)

Let me summarize the argument so far: on internal grounds alone, the Greek root ἐπα- must go back to PIE \(*h₁erh₂-.* On the basis of parallel semantic developments, it has been shown that verbal roots meaning “divide, cut for oneself” can develop to “enjoy” and finally “seek to enjoy, love.” Hittite *arḥāš* “border,” Latin *ōra,* and Old Irish or can all be taken as nominal reflexes of a root \(*h₁erh₂-* “divide” of which Lithuanian *irti* preserves a primary-looking verbal form.

But one would like to point to a member of the family of this root \(*h₁erh₂-* “divide” in Greek which would confirm that this root did, in fact, survive into Greek with the meaning “divide.” Such a form does indeed exist. And this is, I believe, ἐρανος “a meal to which each contributed his share.” The connection between ἐρανος and ἐραμαα has already been tentatively suggested by Risch, and formally there is not the slightest problem in taking ἐρανος from \(*h₁erh₂-nos.* But Risch made no attempt to justify the divergence in meaning and since an ἐρανος is clearly not a “love feast,” no one seems to have followed him in this interpretation. But if the original meaning of the root \(*h₁erh₂-* was “divide,” then the case of ἐρανος would be exactly paralleled by another Greek banquet name: δαίας which is a derived from the root of δαύμαω “divide, distribute, feast on.” An ἐρανος is then the reciprocal mirror image of a δαίας. Whereas in the latter everyone gets his share, in the former everyone gives his share.\(^ {36}\)

34 See above, n. 17.
36 Another etymology, first suggested by K. Brugmann, “Wortgeschichtliche
Finally, I would tentatively add ἔρις to this family. The personal name Ἀμφήριτος shows that the -ι-stem accusative ἔριν is older than the -δ-stem ἔριδος, and nothing formal stands in the way of assuming that ἔρις is from *h₂erh₂-is. The specialization of meaning from “division” to “quarrel” is a very slight change and well-paralleled, for example, by Old Norse deila “quarrel” from the verb deila “divide, deal.” Within Greek itself we find δῆρις “contest, battle” which is a derivative of the verb δέρω “flay.” The antipodal ἔρος and ἔρις then, would share a common root in linguistic prehistory, as they do so often in the human psyche.

PART THREE: ἤμερος

Coming to ἤμερος, the third member of Scopas’ triad, we would seem to be faced with a non-problem from the point of view of etymology. Chantraine, although somewhat uneasy, is willing to take a chance on the hypothesis of Bally who would take ἤμερος as a back-formation from the verb ἤμείρω which, in turn, Bally derives from *sismeryō, a reduplicated present formation to the root *smer-“think about,” cf. Skt. smárati “thinks about, lusts.” Frisk likes the hypothesis of Curtius, mentioned also by Chantraine, who wanted to derive ἤμερος from the root *h₂is-“want” found among other places in Skt. icchātti “wishes.” But he too eventually decides in favor of Bally’s suggestion. So we have here two competing theories each considered plausible enough to be mentioned in each of the two standard etymological dictionaries. But the problem with these two theories is that neither of them can be

37 Chantraine, DELG 372. Another member of the family of *h₂erh₂- in Greek may be found in ἔρεσκηλεῖν ‘to quiz, to talk lightly,’ if the original meaning of this verb was originally ‘to incite discord’ as suggested by J. Wackernagel, “Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik,” Kleine Schriften 1 (Göttingen 1953) 736. For a different view on the prehistory of ἔρις see Jean Haudry, “Altinisch arī-, griechisch ἔρις,” in Indogermanica et Italica Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. Gerhard Meiser (Innsbruck 1993) 169–189.

38 See Chantraine, DELG 364, and J. deVries, Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Leiden 1961) 75.
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correct. The simple argument which applies equally well to both accounts is this: both Bally’s derivation of ἵμερος from *sismeros and Curtius’s derivation of ἵμερος from *h3is-meros assume the prior existence of an s before the m in the first syllable of this word. By regular Greek sound law, the sequence -VsmV- regularly lost the s together with a compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. 39 For example, Proto-Greek *esmi (= Sanskrit ásmai) became Attic-Ionic εἰμί, Severe Doric ἰμί. But the outcome of sequences like -VsmV- was, of course, not the same in all Greek dialects. In Aeolic, sequences of this sort did not undergo compensatory lengthening, but rather assimilated the s to the following m, giving -VmmV-. For example, Sappho and Alcaeus say ἰμμῆ. 40 It is clear then that if either of the etymologies which are on the books for ἵμερος was correct, then we would expect to find *ἵμμερος in Sappho and Alcaeus exactly parallel to ἰμμί corresponding to Attic-Ionic εἰμί, Severe Doric ἰμί. No such form occurs. ἵμερος and its derivatives occur frequently in the Lesbian poets: in Sappho ἵμερος 95.11 Voigt (= P. Berol. 9722 fol. 4), 96.16 (P. Berol. 9722 fol. 5), 137.3 (P. Oxy. 1787 fr. 10), 78.3, ἵμέρρῳ 112.4,1.27, ἵμεροει 31.5, ἵμεροφωνος 136; in Alcaeus ἵμέρρῳ 73.5 Voigt (= P. Oxy. 1234 fr. 3), 130b3 (= P. Oxy. 2165 fr. 1 col. III), 117b5. There is not one trace in all these instances of the spelling *ἵμμερος. It is true that the supporters of the Bally hypothesis could claim that an original Aeolic *ἵμμερος was replaced by Attic ἵμερος in every case, but the cases of Alcaeus 73.5 (= P. Oxy. 1234 fr. 3) and Alcaeus 130b3 (= P. Oxy. 2165 fr. 1 col. 3) offer particularly strong arguments against this view. Here

39 The forms ἵσμερα • τὰ εἰς τοὺς καθαρμούς (Hsch.); ἵσμερα • τὸ εἰς τοὺς καθαρμούς (Theognost. Can. 14); ἵμερα • τὰ πρὸς τοὺς καθαρμούς φερόμεναι ἄνθη καὶ στεφανώματα (Hsch.) which have sometimes been cited in support of the derivation of ἵμερος from *ismsoro-, e.g., by W. Prellwitz, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache (Göttingen 1892) 130, are quite irrelevant, not only for semantic reasons, but also for phonetic ones, since no Greek dialect preserves any trace of a sequence of the type -VsmV- which is not the result of analogical restoration. These forms are most probably to be explained as loanwords from some Anatolian language. Cf. Hittite ışımeri- n. “bridle, rein.”

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that there is also a near homophone of ἔρως which also has the meaning “wreath” (EM 379): ἔρως • ὁ στέφανος παρὰ Νικαέσνον ἐκ πάντων ἁ监督检查 τοῖς νέκτισι παιδούμενος. As M. Kwintner has suggested to me (p.c.), this form is best taken as a derivative of the verbal root *ser- “to string” (Grk. εἰρω, Latin serto) For the meaning, cf. Latin serra.

40 Sapph. 31.15 Voigt, Alc. 306A Voigt. See Lejeune, Phonétique 122.
we are faced with two verbal forms, the infinitive ιμέρην (73.5) and the participle ιμέρροιον (117b5), which show the expected Aeolic ρο from earlier *ry, whereas Attic with metathesis has ιμείρω. One would have to suppose that the editor had before him an Ur-Aeolic *ιμμέρρομον which he decided to Atticize by changing ιμμ to ιμ- but leaving the equally Aeolic ρο untouched: a very unlikely hypothesis. Furthermore, names derived from the stem ιμερ- are attested for Lesbian (‘Ιμερία, Mytilene, iii B.C.E.; Ειμερίον, Mytilene ii B.C.) and again no trace of the μμ required for the hypothesis either of Bally or of Curtius is found.

This objection deals a serious blow to all previous accounts. A new theory must begin from the realization that Aeolic has ιμερος, with one μ, and that the long i of the first syllable cannot be of secondary origin and therefore must go back to Proto-Greek. On this basis, one sees that the only possible mechanical reconstruction of ιμερος is *sih_meros. We must reconstruct initial s to account for the rough breathing, since the other possible source of initial rough breathing, i.e., *h_y-, would produce an unlikely, and probably impossible, Proto-Indo-European root shape. We must reconstruct some laryngeal to account for the Proto-Greek length of the first syllable. And since there are no PIE roots of the shape siHm-, a morpheme boundary must lie between the laryngeal and the m, and consequently we must recognize that the root of this form must be *sihx-.

Having gotten this far on formal considerations alone, let us turn to the semantics of ιμερος and its family. There is undoubtedly a fair amount of synonymy between ιμερος and ιμος. For example, we find

41 The form ιμέρρομον is also quoted by the grammarian Herodian III.2.949 as an example of Aeolic ρο. He says nothing about the first syllable.
42 On the contrary, we find in our texts of the Lesbian poets many cases of hyper-Aeolic μμ which have no etymological justification, e.g., νόημα Sapph. 60.3 Voigt (= P. Oxy. 1787 fr. 44); κλάμα Alc. 119.11 Voigt (= P. Oxy. 1788 fr. 15). See A. Thumb and A. Scherer, Handbuch der griechische Dialekte (Heidelberg 1959) 2.81.
43 See R. Hodot, Le dialecte éolien d’Asie (Paris 1990) 65 and P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (Oxford 1987) 204. It is also noteworthy that Pliny the Elder N.H. 5.139 reports that ‘Ιμερτή was a poetic name for the island of Lesbos. This form, of course, tells us nothing about the correct Aeolic form of the stem in question.
44 Lejeune, Phonétique, has also made precisely the same observation, 122 n. 1: “Les formes lesbiennes ιμερος ιμέρρομον répondant à hom. ιμερος ιμείρω rendent douteuses l’explication par *ismsero- et la parenté avec Skt. ismāḥ.”
ήμερος γόσιο (II. 23.153) as well as ἔρος γόσι (II. 24.227), ήμερος στόυ (II. 11.89) and ἔρος στόυ (Od. 24.489). ήμερος (II. 2.751) is an adjective describing places just as is ἔρατος (H. Apoll. 477). But there is at least within the early Greek epic a crucial difference. Consider the following points:

1. ήμερος is often said to be stirred up by someone’s words (the verb used is ὀφεί, Od. 4.113, 4.183; II. 23.14, 23.108, 23.153) or thrown into someone’s θυμος by a god (II. 3.139; H. Aphr: 45, 53, 73, 143). This is never the case for ἔρος.

2. When an attack of ἔρος is over, the formulaic way to express this is: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύς εξ ἔρον ἐντο (II. 1.469 etc.). But when ήμερος is over, it is not expelled but rather leaves of its own accord, e.g., II. 24.514: καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ προκίδων ἡλθ’ ήμερος ἥδ’ ἀπὸ γυνών.

N. van der Ben has recently argued, to my mind persuasively, that ήμερος differs from ἔρος in that the former usually requires immediate satisfaction and cannot be refused.45 So for example in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, the feeling of ἔρος takes hold of Anchises at line 91 after seeing the goddess (Ἀγχίστην δ’ ἔρος εἰλέν). But then after line 143 when Aphrodite puts ήμερος in his θυμός by means of her speech (ὅς εἰποῦσα θεί γλυκὸν ήμερον ἐμβαλε θυμῶ), he proclaims that he must sleep with her immediately and will not be prevented by any god or mortal (149–151): οὔ τε ἐπείτα θεῶν οὔτε θητῶν ἀνθρώπων / ἐνθάδε με σχήσει πρὶν σὴ φιλότητι μιγηναι / αὐτίκα νῦν.

What these points boil down to is this: ἔρος is desire conceived of as subject-internal in its origin and its end. ήμερος, on the other hand, is a compulsive desire of external origin.

This compulsive and external character of ήμερος fits well with its use in contexts of love magic. The most famous example occurs in Iliad 14, the Διὸς ἀπάτη, where Hera goes to Aphrodite and asks for her magical girdle in which ήμερος abides (II. 14.216 ἐν δ’ ήμερος). And when Zeus expresses his feelings for the magically enhanced Hera he says (328): (never have I loved any woman) ὡς σέο νῦν ἔραμα κατ’ με γλυκὸς ήμερος αἵρετ. The contrast here between the middle subject-oriented ἔραμα and the use of ήμερος as the subject of an active verb nicely contrasts the essential difference between the two words, but

naturally, given the early epic overdetermined way of thinking about causation, the feelings of ἰμέρος and ἔρος were not mutually exclusive. Another example is probably to be seen on the famous Nestor cup:

Νέστορος ἐ[στὶ] εὐποτον ποτέριον  
ἥς δ’ ἄν τόθε π[ι]σι ποτέριο σωτίκα κένον  
Ἡμερ[ος] ἡμρ]έσει καλλιστεφάνον Ἀφροδίτην

The contents of the cup, it seems, were imagined as a love potion which gripped whoever drank from it with a compulsive desire.  

In the light of these formal and semantic arguments about ἰμέρος, the root *sih₂-, which internal reconstruction alone has led us to, must be identified with the PIE root *seh₂i-/*sih₂- “to bind” (Sanskrit āsāt “bound,” Hittite išhāi, išhiyanzi “binds,” etc.). The reasons for this are as follows:

1. The magical power of binding is very well established for the ancient world—and for the modern world as well if we just think about our own idiom spellbind and spellbound. In Greek δέω “bind,” κατάδεω “bind down” frequently mean “cast a spell” in defixiones which are, of course, known as κατάδεσμοι (Artem. 1.77) in Greek. Particularly noteworthy is the occurrence of this metaphor in magical aphrodisiac contexts, e.g., Papyri Graecae Magicae XV:47 Ἐπιδήσω σε Νῖλε... ἄλλα πιλήσεις με Καπετωλίναν. And, this is also very familiar from Virgil’s Eclogue 8.78: necte Amarylli, modo et “Veneris” diē “vincula necto.” The image of the bond of love is also found outside of explicitly magical contexts, e.g., in Anacreon fr. 346 P with the restoration of Lobel, ἰμονία ἴππας ἰππικά [v] ἰππάσκο ἰππάσκο “latch,” ἰμος from *sih₂-mn-, a nearly exact cognate of Hittite išhiman- “rope.” But, more

---

46 On the form of this “curse” and the necessity of taking this text as a magical aphrodisiacal spell, see Christopher A. Faraone, “Taking the ‘Nestor’s Cup Inscription’ Seriously: Erotic magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters,” forthcoming in Classical Antiquity. Many thanks to Professor Faraone, who was kind enough to send me a manuscript version of this paper. Thanks also to Andrew Garrett and Leslie Kurke for bringing this valuable work to my attention.

than the bare fact of the existence of this root in Greek, it is interesting to note that the connections of this root with magic and, indeed, erotic magic can be clearly shown. Part of the evidence comes from a well known sixth-century inscription in the Elean dialect (Buck no. 61).48 The inscription regulates the exaction of penalties and the officials in charge of exacting them. Towards the end of this inscription we find the curious provision: αἱ ζὲ τὶς τὸν αἰτιοθέντα ζικαίὸν ἰμασκοί, ἐν ταῖς ζεκομναίοι κ’ ἐνέχοιτο, αἱ φειζότες ἰμάσκοι “If anyone imask-s someone accused in a matter of fines, let him be held to a fine of ten minas, if he imask-s knowingly.” These lines have proved problematical, since the limitation αἱ φειζότες ἰμάσκοι must mean that the punishable action in question could be committed unwittingly. For example, in a fifth-century inscription from Teos those who wittingly shelter pirates are punished by death (ληστὰς ὑποδέχομαι ἐκδοτ).49 It is easy enough to see how one could unwittingly shelter pirates, but how could one unwittingly flog someone, to follow LSJ’s translation of imaskei? On the other hand, we know from Demosthenes’ speech against Aristogeiton (26.80) that at least some forms of magic were prohibited by law, in fact, punishable by death.50 Furthermore, we know that one of the commonest sorts of defixiones was one intended to cast a spell on one’s legal opponent. So the use of magic against an αἰτιοθέντα would hardly be surprising. And finally, we know from Plutarch’s little essay Περὶ τῶν καταβασκαίνειν λεγομένων that it was entirely possible for some people to cast an evil eye despite their best intentions. Thus fathers could unwittingly give their children the evil eye, and Eutelidas is said to have cast a spell on himself. As Plutarch says, κυνούμενοι δ’ οὕτως δ’ πεφύκασιν οὐχ δ’ βούλονται ποιούσιν. In the light of these observations it seems probable that the relevant lines of the Elean inscription should be translated: “if anyone ‘spellbinds’ someone in a matter of fines, let him be held to a fine of ten minas, if he ‘spellbinds’ knowingly.”

This example proves the relevance of the root *sih₂- to magical contexts in Greek, but another, much better known passage demonstrates

49 Buck, Greek Dialects 187.
50 τὴν φαρμακίδα καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸ γένος πᾶν ἀπεκτέινοτε. Note that the phrasing is clearly drawn from a law. Cf. the punishment of those who make φάρμακα δηλητηρία in a Teian law: κένον ἀπόλλυσθαι καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γένος τὸ κένδ. Buck, Greek Dialects 186.
the specifically love-magical use of the same root. For ἴμας is precisely the vox propria for the magical garment of Aphrodite which Hera borrows in Book 14 of the Iliad in order to seduce Zeus (14.214–217):

*H, καὶ ἀπὸ στήθεσιν ἐλύσατο κεστῶν ἴμαντα
ποικίλον, ἕνθα τε οἱ θελκτήρια πάντα τέτυκτο·
ἐνθ’ ἐνι μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ’ ἵμερος, ἐν δ’ ὀριστύς
πάρφασις, ἥ τ’ ἔκλεψε νόον πῦκα περ φρονεόντων.

Further considerations of morphology lead us to another previously unidentified member of the family of *seih2-/*sih2- in Greek. As I noted above, *sih2-mero-, the ancestor of ἵμερος, must have a morpheme boundary between sih2- and -mero-. But this observation naturally leads to the question what is -mero-? Now there is no identifiable simple suffix -mer- in Greek or elsewhere, and this leads us to the possibility that -mero- is a thematic derivative of an originally athematic suffix *-mer-. This athematic suffix *-mer- could be compared with the suffix -μαρ from *-mr seen in τέκμαρ. τέκμαρ, though it is indeclinable in Greek, once belonged to -r/-n-stems. Cf. also ἦ-μαρ, -ατος, Armenian awr “day” < *āmōr.51 ἦ-μαρ, -ατος is clearly a *-mr/-men-stem to the root *h2ēh1/3 seen in Palaic ᥬ宪i “is warm.”52 For the semantics, cf. Germanic *dagaz “day” ~ Skt. dāhati “burns.”53 Nouns with complex -r/-n- suffixes inflect proterokinetically.54 In our particular case then, the -r/-n-stem ancestor of ἵμερος must have looked like this:

nom. acc. séh2i-mr
gen. sih2-mén-s55

and would have been a verbal abstract meaning “magical binding.” A particularly interesting and close parallel to our reconstructed -mr/-men-stem from a “long diphthong”/i-present root meaning “bind” would be Hittite tiyam(m)ar “rope” from the root *deh1(i)- if this is not

51 See Chantraine, DELG 412.
53 deVries, Altnordisches 72.
merely an inner-Hittite replacement of an original neuter -men stem as Melchert has suggested.\textsuperscript{56} From an -r/-n-stem like the one we have reconstructed there are two ways of making a derivative meaning “spellbinding” (adjective). First, one may add the thematic vowel -o- to the r variant of the stem.\textsuperscript{57} Examples of this sort are very commonly, but not exclusively, found in compounds, e.g., *wédör “water” > *udró- “having the water” (Skt. udrá-, “aquatic animal,” Mod. Eng. otter). From the -mr/-men-stem above one gets by this process and with generalization of the zero-grade of the root *sih₂merō- “attractive” or “spellbinding,” then by substantivization with accent shift ūμερός “spellbinding (force).”\textsuperscript{58} For the full grade of the suffix combined with the r variant in a derivative of an -r/-n-stem, cf. ημέρα ← ḫμωρ. For the accent shift with substantivization compare λευκός “white fish” vs. λευκός “white,” and to demonstrate that the nominalizing accent shift could move the accent from the last syllable to the first syllable of a three syllable word, cf. δολιχός “long” vs. δόλιχος “the long course.”

If the adjective which I have reconstructed had survived into the historical period as *ίμερός “spellbinding, attractive,” it would have undergone Wheeler’s law of accent retraction whereby oxytone words of dactylic shape shift the accent one syllable to the left.\textsuperscript{59} Thus *ίμερός would have become *ίμερος.\textsuperscript{50} Compare μυρίος < *μυρίς (cf. Hittite mūri- “bunch”).\textsuperscript{61} The accent of the feminine, following the


\textsuperscript{57} I have discussed the evidence for this claim in detail in M. Weiss, “On the Non-verbal Origin of the Greek Verb νιφειν ‘to be sober’,” \textit{HS} 107.1 (1994) 95.

\textsuperscript{58} As for the semantic change from “external attraction” to “internal desire,” which one can observe taking place within the documented history of Greek, cf. OE fār “danger” ~ Modern English fear; Latin poena “punishment” > English pain; Latin odium “hatred,” but originally “repugnance” as Franz Skutsch showed “Odium und Verwandtes,” \textit{Kleine Schriften}, ed. Wilhelm Kroll (Berlin 1914) 389–405.

\textsuperscript{59} In fact, this adjective does seem to have survived into Greek to judge from the Hesychian gloss ἱμεροῦν · ποθεινοῦ κτλ. Unfortunately the accent of the adjective has been contaminated with that of the noun.

\textsuperscript{60} See, E. Schwyzer, \textit{Griechische Grammatik} (Munich 1939) 379.

\textsuperscript{61} See M. Weiss, “Greek μυρίος countless, Hittite mūri- ‘bunch (of fruit)’,” \textit{HS} 109.2 (1996) 199–214. It is interesting to note that adjectives in -τος are normally recessive. When such an adjective is not recessive, i.e., when it is oxytone or paroxytone by Wheeler’s Law, it is invariably a sign that there is a morpheme boundary between the τ and the ο, e.g., δέξιος, < δέξι-φός (Myc. de-ki-si-wo KN C 908).
accent of the masculine, would have been *Ἰμέρα and this, in my opinion, has been substantivized as Ἰμέρα, the name of the Sicilian city founded in Greek colonial times. The length of the first syllable of the place name is established by two dactylo-epitrite passages in Pindar (Ol. 12.2, Py. 1.79).  

But one may also make an internal derivative of an -r/-n-stem by switching from the proterokinetic to the amphikinetic pattern. When an amphikinetic derivative was made from an -r/-n-stem, it was often the -n-stem form which was generalized. This seems especially to be the case when the internal derivative has adjectival force, e.g., πωρ > πῶν. Therefore from the noun σέχύμ-μς, gen. σιχύμ-νς reconstructed above an internal derivative would have had the shape *σέχυμν, which would by regular Greek sound law give αἰμων.  

Therefore from the noun σέχυμ-μς, gen. σιχύμ-νς reconstructed above an internal derivative would have had the shape *σέχυμν, which would by regular Greek sound law give αἰμων.  

And this word is precisely what we have at II. 5.49-51:

\[
\text{ｃιδον δὲ Στροφίσιο Σκαμόνδριν, αἰμώνει θήρης}
\]

\[
\text{‘Ατρείδης Μενέλαος ἔλεγχει ὀξύόντι,}
\]

\[
\text{ἐσθλὸν θηρητήρα.}
\]

Menelaos, Atreus’ son, took with his sharp spear Scamandrios, the son of Strophios, who was eager for the hunt, the good hunter.

Formally the word is exactly what we have just predicted and the meaning too is an admirable match to our theory. The meaning “(spell)binding, attractive,” which the possessive internal derivation would lead us to predict for this form, has undergone the same internalization that has been noted in the development of the closely related ἴμερος.  

This interpretation of αἰμων is bolstered by several other pieces of data. As was seen already by Günert, αἰμων stands in the same relationship to αἰμύλος / αἰμύλιος as ἄγκων does to ἄγκυλος.

62 It is true that the naming of a city and a river from the same stem, as in the case of Ἰμέρα and Ἰμέρας, is a well established Italic practice, but it is also found in Greece, e.g., Πίσσα and Πίσσας (Xenoph. frg. 2B); Τευθέα and Τευθέας (Strab. 8.3.11 p. 342). See Wilhelm Schulze, Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen (Berlin 1964) 538.

63 Again see Weiss (above, n. 57) 95.

64 The LSJ gives the sense “eager.” The explanation of the Grammarians as = δαίμων for δαίμων is clearly just a folk-etymological guess. Chantraine, DELG 35 is skeptical of all interpretations of αἰμων.

65 See above, n. 56.

66 H. Günert, Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister (Halle 1921) 103. Günert rightly rejects the putative connection of αἰμύλος with OHG sein < Proto-Indo-European *seih'timo- “thick, liquid honey” since the original meaning of the ancestor of sein was
αἰμύλος is an adjective used to describe the “spellbinding” words by which one gets someone to do something he/she doesn’t or shouldn’t want to do. A particularly fine example of this is Od. 1.56: αἰεὶ δὲ μαλακοῖς καὶ αἰμυλίσει λόγοις / θέλει. Compare this with the formula H. Aiphr. 143: ὃς εἴποσα θεὰ γλυκὸν ἱμερὸν ἐμβαλε θυμῷ.

Αἴμων, of course, also occurs as a proper name, the most noted Αἴμων being the son of Creon of Thebes. In Sophocles, of course, he meets a tragic end at his own hand. But in the pre-Sophoclean Oedipodia he had an equally unhappy fate in the jaws of the Sphinx. All that is known about this earlier Αἴμων is what the poet tells us: ἀλλ' ἐτι κάλλιστόν τε καὶ ἱμερόστατον ἄλλων | παῖδα φίλον Κρέοντος ἀμύμωνος Αἴμωνα δίον. Is the use of the epithet ἱμερόεις, only rarely used of persons in early epic,67 to qualify Αἴμων merely a coincidence or does it preserve a memory of long obscured etymological connection?

APPENDIX: THE NAME OF THE THESSALIANS

The name of the Thessalians shows an interesting variety of forms in the Greek dialects. In Ionic and Doric the form is Θεσσαλοῖ (Hom. +). In Attic the form is, as one would expect, Θετταλοῖ.68 But in Boeotian, the form, attested as a personal name, is Φετταλός (IG 7.2430.8).69 Now the correspondence between Θ in Doric and Attic-Ionic and Φ in Boeotian, an Aeolic dialect, can only be explained as variant dialectical outcomes of a Proto-Indo-European *gʷh-, i.e., a voiced aspirated labiovelar which, as is customary for labiovelars before e, has ended up as a dental Θ in the non-Aeolic dialects, but has become a labial Φ in

not “sweet stuff” but rather “thickish liquid” as is shown by the cognates Welsh hufen “cream” < *soh₂imen- and Greek αἷμα “blood” < *seh₂im(e)n-.

67 There are two other instances of ἱμερόεις as an epithet of persons in early epic: Hes. Th. 359 of Καλνυψώ and Hes. fr. 291.3 of Φαιώ. Usually ἱμερόεις is an epithet of song or marriage.

68 For the evidence see L. Threatte, The Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions (Berlin 1980) 538. It is worth noting that Θετταλός is an apparent exception to Wheeler’s Law whereby dactylic oxytones retract their accent to the penultimate syllable. Perhaps one may suppose that in an ethnic name the nominative plural Θετταλοί, which was not a dactyl, was the forme de fondation. Of course, exceptions to Wheeler’s law—of various analogical explanations—are by no means uncommon, e.g., ὁμφανὸς, δεξιός etc.

69 Otherwise the Attic or Atticized form Θετταλοῖ is used.
the Aeolic dialects (Boeotian, Thessalian, and Lesbian). For another example of this distribution, compare Ionic Ἐρμόθεστος (Colophon) “prayed for from Hermes” vs. Boeotian Θιόφε(ε)τος “prayed for from a god” both from the very root *gʷhedh- “pray” which we have just been discussing. The contrast between ο for Ionic and Doric and τ for Attic and Boeotian would seem to point to an earlier sequence of voiceless dental plus y. Compare Attic μέλιττα, Ionic μέλισσα “bee” both from *melitya, and for Boeotian χαρίεττα < *khariwetya which = Ionic χαρίεσσα. Thus by comparison of the Attic, Ionic, and Boeotian forms we are led back to the reconstruction of a proto-form *kʷhethyal-0 from earlier *gʷhedh-yalo-. Now this form, as has long been seen, may be explained as derived from the present stem *gʷhedh-ye- of the verbal root *gʷhedh- “pray” with the addition of the suffix -alo-. Normally, of course, this suffix is added not to the present stem of a verb but rather to its root. But there are some examples of the suffix -alo- being added to a characterized present stem, e.g., Ionic and Doric πάσσαλος (Od. +), Attic πάτπαλος “peg” which must be derived from *pakyalo- built to *paky- a characterized present stem

70 Lejeune, Phonétique 47-48.
71 See F. Bechtel and A. Fick, Die griechischen Personennamen (Göttingen 1894) 112, 143, 145.
72 There are, in fact, five theoretical Proto-Greek reconstructions which could lead to Att. θετ-, Ion. θεσ-, and Boeotian φετ-. These possibilities are 1) *kʰeth-, 2) *kʰet-, 3) *kʰetw-, 4) *kʰek-, 5) *kʰek-. The initial aspirated labiovelar makes it highly likely that we are dealing with an Indo-European root. For, although it seems clear that one (or more) of the Pre-Greek languages had labiovelars or labiovelar-like stops (see Ph. M. Freeman, “New Evidence for the Pre-Greek Labiovelars,” JIES 17 [1989] 171-176; K. T. Witzak, “Notes on Cretan Place-names in the Linear B Tablets,” Kadmos 31 [1992] 161-163.) no evidence, to my knowledge, has been presented for Pre-Greek aspirated labiovelars. Possibilities 2, 3, and 4 can therefore be eliminated, because the Proto-Indo-European preforms for these [2] *gʷhet-, 3) *gʷhet-, 4) *gʷhek- would violate the well known root-structure constraint noted by A. Meillet, Introduction a l’étude comparative des langues indo-européennes (Paris 1934) 174, which prohibits roots from containing both a voiced aspirated and a voiceless stop. Possibility 5 from a PIE *gʷegh- is not ruled out by this criterion. But there is, to my knowledge, no such root. This leaves *kʰeth- as the only plausible Proto-Greek reconstruction.
73 Lejeune, Phonétique 104.
74 F. Bechtel, griechischen Dialekte 1.154 has made the connection with the root of θεσ-. He, however, suggests that the name derives from the aorist stem. But the Attic and Ionic forms present difficulties for this account, since *-t-s- should give s in both Attic and Ionic. In order to uphold this account, one would have to assume a complicated loan hypothesis. See Lejeune, Phonétique 106.
of the root *pak- “fix.” Since πάσσαλος can plausibly be taken to mean “fixed (thing),” one can infer that *gʰedh-yalo- meant at first “prayerfully desired” and *gʰedh-yalia “prayerfully desired land.” For the semantics one might simply compare the clearly archaic Homeric and Hesiodic adjective ἥραννός “lovely” which is used exclusively as an epithet of land, e.g., Il. 9.531 Καλλιδώνος ἥραννης, Il. 9.577 πεδίον Καλλιδώνος ἥραννης, Od. 7.18 πόλιν ... ἡραννή; Hes. fr. 70 line 37 γαῖαν ἥραννή, fr. 10 a 3’Ἀγγος ἥραννόν. Note that the double ν from *sn of this adjective points to its Aeolic origin and therefore to the existence and appropriateness of the idiom “desired land” in these dialects.

But there is a small problem with this explanation in that the most straightforward interpretation of the name of θεσσαλία is as the “land of the Θεσσαλοί,” and if it is the name of the tribe that we must start from, then the parallel of Ἄργος ἥραννόν is really not apposite. There would be various ways out of this bind, if this proved to be the only available theory, but a real monkey wrench is thrown into this account by the name that the Thessalians called themselves. For since Thessalian is a dialect which normally shows -σ- for forms having -τ- in Attic and Boeotian, e.g., πρασσέμεν (Schwyzer 590 l. 17 Larissa) = Attic πράττειν, the form we would hope to find in conformity with our theory would be *θεσσαλοί. Alas, no such form exists. What we find instead is Πετθαλοί (IG IX 2.258.1 [Kierion], etc.) and on coins from the towns of Pherai, Skotoussa, and Methylion the abbreviations ΦΕΘΑ, ΦΕΤΑ, ΦΕ which obviously stand for Φετθαλοί.76 The peculiar

75 This present stem has not otherwise survived in Greek; cf., however, Latin paciscor (Plt. +) “agree to” built to *pacio as nanciscor (Plaut. +) “acquire” ← nuncio (XII) (same meaning). Another example of an -alo- derivative from a characterized present stem is διδάσκαλος, (H.Herm. +) “teacher” from διδάσκω “teach” (Il. +). It is quite likely that the spread of this suffix to characterized present stems was the result of analogy, e.g., αἰθο: αἰθαλος: διδάσκω: Χ, Χ = διδάσκαλος. These -alo- forms were originally quasi-participial adjectives with either active or passive diathesis. Many of these originally adjectival forms were then substantivized.

76 A. Heubeck has dealt with these problems in “Zum Volksnamen der Thessaler” in Studia Ling. in hon. V. I. Georgiev (Sofia 1980) 301–309, reprinted in Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur, ed. by B. Forssman, S. Koster, and E. Pohlmann (Erlangen 1984) 306–314. He argues that one must start from the autochthonous form of the name, i.e., Φετθαλο- (307). This form he interprets as deriving from *kʰwθhalo- with the gemination of stops found in proper names. (Although he admits that this kind of gemination is most commonly found in hypocoristics, cf. Ατθις if from ’Αθηνα). *kʰwθhalo- is then interpreted as a -lo- derivative of the state I full-grade of the root kʰwθha- from a putative PIE *gʰwθdh₁ with otherwise appears as the state II
jumping around of aspiration is not problematic. Compare Ionic ἀχαν-τος = ἀκανθος and for assimilation of aspirates compare Thess. Φερσεφόνα = Περσεφόνη. Thus we are justified in assuming that *Φετταλό- became Φετθαλό- which became Πετθαλό-. But the problem of ττ for expected σσ remains. There are, as I see it, two ways out of this difficulty.

First, I was careful to say above that Attic and Boeotian ττ normally correspond to Thessalian σσ. In fact, there are several noteworthy exceptions where Thessalian also has ττ. The best known example is Thessalian πέττορας "four" (SEG 13.394.4 +) = Attic τέττορας. Furthermore the ancient grammarians also claim that Thessalian had some cases of ττ for σσ. In the light of this evidence one may simply claim

*Rkwhthd- < *gθdhheh2- > aor. ἐ-θην, pres. θάνω “anticipate.” This interpretation would make the Thessalians into a bronze-age version of the Oklahoma Sooners. But I find his account unconvincing for a number of reasons. First, it is by no means a given that the autochthonous form in any given case is ipso facto the most archaic. One need only think of Finnish kuningas “king,” a loan word from Proto-Germanic, which preserves a more archaic form than even the oldest Germanic languages. Second, it is typically the last consonant of the stem that is geminated in a hypocoristic; cf., e.g., the Thessalian personal name Πεταλλίς ← πέταλον. Third, the ss forms of the name of the Thessalians, which are well anchored in both the earliest Ionic (ll. 2.679) and Doric (Pindar Ol. 13.35 as a personal name), must be explained as the result of a hyper-Ionic or hyper-Doric version of an Attic or Boeotian *kwettalo-. Fourth, there is no real evidence for a state I full-grade to the root *θην. All other forms point clearly to *gθdhheh2-. Nor is there any reason to suppose that -lo-derivatives require the “schwebeablauting” form; cf. ζήλος < *dyeh2-los ~ ζήσμα not *deih2-los. Fifth, there is no evidence that the root of θάνω was ever part of the Greek onomastic lexicon. There are no names recorded in the classical period containing this root. For all these reasons, I am not inclined to believe Heubeck’s account, ingenious though it may be.

77 Buck Greek Dialects 60 and SGDI 1132, 33. The same metathesis of aspiration is seen in Thessalian and Boeotian *ένθι < *henti “they are” which probably lies at the source of the Thessalian and Boeotian 3rd pl. ending -νθ. Bechtel, griechischen Dialekte 1.162. The alternative explanation of the verbal endings in -νθ- offered by M. Peters in his review of W. Blümel, Die aiotischen Dialekte, Sprache 30.1 (1984) 85, i.e., that these forms are hypercorrections resulting from the dialect mixture of a West Greek dialect in which th was deaspirated after t or n (Bechtel, griechischen Dialekte 2.79, 841) with Aeolic, would be more convincing if one could point to hypercorrect -νθ- outside the third plural of finite verbs. The present participles, for example, in both Boeotian and Thessalian are stems in -ντ-, e.g., from Larissa [Τογ]ἐντόντου in Buck, no. 32, line 1, p. 220 in an inscription which also has νθ, e.g., ἑγένοθο, line 12, and from Thesbes Buck, no. 40, p. 229, ἀξοντος l.17 vs. [συμβάλ]όνθo line 21. Note also ὁγδόεκοντα in line 10 of the same inscription.

78 R. Meister, Die griechischen Dialekte (Göttingen 1882) 265, n. 1 quotes Aelius
that some sub-dialect or adstratum of Thessalian was of the ττ type, and that it is from this particular sub-dialect that the Thessalians took their name.

But one more possibility comes to mind. The form Φετταλοι is, in fact, entirely appropriate to one and only one dialect, and that is, as we have already seen, Boeotian where labiovelars become labials before e and which also has ττ. Furthermore recall, as we have said above, that the root *γ"wshedh- which lies at the base of our account of the name of Thessaly means not simply “desire” but “pray,” i.e., “to desire that which can be obtained only by the action or permission of someone else,” and that the verbal noun derived from this root *γ"wshedhos > πόθος came to mean “desire for that which is not at hand.” Thus the derivative *γ"wedhyalo- would not mean simply “desired,” as I have glossed it above, but rather “prayed for” or “desired in absentia.” But what sense would it make for the Thessalians to call themselves “the people desired in absence” and their land “the land of the people desired in absence” or perhaps “the land desired in absence”?

With these two observations we can combine a third. In Book 1.12 Thucydides relates the following story:

Now on the archaeological evidence which could be mustered either for or against the historical reality of this account, I am unqualified to pass judgment. But from the linguistic point of view it has some inherent plausibility, because Boeotian and Thessalian are, in fact, closely

\[\text{Dionysius apud Eustathius 813.48: θετταλοί καὶ Κιτιεῖς ... θάλατταν ἔλεγον καὶ πίτ-
ταν ... ὅσα σωδαμοῦ Ἀττικά νομίζονται ἀλλὰ τῶν γειτόνων, φησί, Βοιωτῶν.}\]

\[\text{79 M. Peters, Sprache 30.1 (1984) 84, following F. Solmsen, “Thessaliotis und Pelasgi-
otis,” RhM 58 (1903) 612, has suggested that the source of the ττ treatment in Aeolic, Thessalian, and Boeotian is to be sought in Northwest Greek. However, the evidence for the ττ treatment in Northwest Greek is slight, basically reducing to the Aetolian toponym Βο(υ)ττός and the ethnic adjectives Βοιττός, Ἐπίττος, and Ἔρματτος. See J. Mendez Dosuna, Los dialectos dotios del nordeste (Salamanca 1985) 128–129. In any case, the ultimate origin of the ττ treatment is irrelevant for my claim that the ττ forms of Thes-
salian derive most immediately from the ancestor of Boeotian.}\]
related dialects and they could not always have been separated by the West-Greek-speaking Phocians and Locrians who separated the two groups in Classical times. Furthermore there are some notable examples of cults which are found in both Thessaly and Boeotia, e.g., the cult of Itonian Athena and of Homoloian Zeus.

By reference to this story we can, I think, offer a plausible account of the name of the Thessalians. For it is precisely from the point of view of the exiled Boeotians that the name of the Thessalians makes sense. Perhaps, one may suppose that the first ἀποδοσιμός of the Boeotian diaspora coined the name Φετταλαῖοι to refer to their longed-for brethren who remained in their original homeland. These in turn transmitted this name to their successors in Thessaly, i.e., the Thessalians of the Classical period, as well as the few other ττ forms which are found in that dialect. This second account is, to my mind, more compelling, since the arguments drawn from linguistics and from early Greek lore seem to complement each other well.
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80 Cf. the common and exclusive innovation γίνωμαι. See Bechtel, *griechischen Dialekte* 186–187 and also n. 76 above.


82 For the transfer of an ethnic name from an original group of inhabitants to a group of newcomers, one might compare the history of the word Yankee, which originates in the Dutch diminutive Janke "Johnny." This name originally applied to the Dutch colonists of New York and subsequently to their English-speaking successors. See the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. by J. A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weisner (Oxford 1989) 20.692.