ETYMOLOGIES OF SOME HOMERIC WORDS.

The etymologies of Homeric words have been considered too much in the light of later Greek. The following suggestions are, so far as I am aware, new. I express them briefly for economy of space.

We are so much accustomed to thinking of the Homeric age as a time when war was the normal state of existence that we are deluded into looking for etymologies connected with prowess, feudal nobility, or personal descriptions suitable to heroes. Yet behind all the exploits of the *Iliad* there lies that social life of the people of which we get numerous glimpses. The words here put together have nothing to do with war. They mean respectively 'landed men' (or 'yeomen'), 'land-owners of three generations,' 'householders' (or 'husbands'), and 'settlers' (or 'persons with a seat'). It is only in these respects that the terms are distinctive, and in part honorific. Most honourable, of course, is $\tau \rho \iota \chi \acute{a} \iota \kappa \epsilon_s$ 'A $\chi \alpha \iota o \acute{\iota}$.

'A χαιοί=*à-χα-F-μοι, from *sm-ghou-io-. The notion is that of 'associated landed people.' With this we may compare the Celtic combroges, whence the name of the Cymry. The second element of the word is to be found in the χαῶν τῶν ἐπάνωθεν of Theocritus, in Gothic gawi ('stretch of land'), gauja ('inhabitant'), Ger. Gau, O.E. géaman (E. yeoman). It ceases therefore to be necessary—even if it is historically plausible—to assume that Achaia derived its name from a special migration of 'the' 'Aχαιοί.

 $\tau \rho \iota \chi \acute{a} \iota \kappa \epsilon_s = *\dot{\tau} \rho \iota \cdot \chi a F \cdot \iota \kappa \cdot \epsilon_s =$ ' thrice landowners' (cf. $\tau \rho i \delta o \iota \lambda o s$). The third component is from $* \check{\epsilon} i \mathring{k}$ - ('own,' 'possess') of O.E. $\acute{a}gan$, Eng. own. The sense is thus virtually that of $\chi a \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi \acute{a} \nu \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$.

 $\Delta \alpha \nu \alpha \circ i$: from *dm- (as in $\delta \alpha \pi \epsilon \delta \rho \nu$ and probably Eng. toft) compounded with the $\nu \alpha \sigma$ - of $\nu \alpha i \omega$ ($\ell \nu \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha$): i.e. * $\delta \alpha - \nu \alpha \sigma - \iota \sigma$ -. The word thus = 'house-dwellers' or 'house-holders,' and is equivalent to O.E. $h \omega s b o n d a$.

"Ελληνες = *'Εδλῶνες, from *'έδλῶ, Lacon, ἔλλα ('seat'), Lat. sella, Goth. sitls, O.E. setl. We may call this 'settlers,' in the sense of 'possessed of a seat' (or 'abode'). Cf. O.H.G. sedal='seat,' 'dwelling,' sidilo='farmer,' 'settler.' The diffusion of such 'settlers' in the various parts of Greece will explain the fact of the name becoming the one accepted for all the cognate tribes.

 $\pi \circ \lambda \nu \bar{\alpha} i \kappa \circ s \pi \circ \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \iota \circ$. The derivation from $\delta i \sigma \sigma \omega$ has never been attractive. Rather from * $\sigma \bar{a} F \bar{\iota} \xi = a$ 'wound' or 'hurt' (for the termination cf. $\sigma \mu \bar{\omega} \delta \iota \xi$). The root is * $s \bar{a} \mu$, from which comes $d \bar{a} \bar{\tau} \sigma s$ ('unhurt')=* $a - \sigma \bar{a} F - \bar{a} - \tau \sigma s$. So $d \bar{a} \beta a \kappa \tau \sigma \iota$ (i.e. * $d - \sigma a F \alpha \kappa \tau \sigma \iota$) = $d \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i s$ (Hesych.). Here also belongs Lat. saucius, from a *s a u x (formed like *f a u x of f a u c e s).

 θ á λ a σ σ á τ ϵ $\dot{\eta}$ χ $\dot{\eta}$ ϵ σ σ a. Commonly regarded as the 'noisy' or 'roaring' sea (with $\dot{\eta}\chi\dot{\omega}$). Preferably with Got. $w\bar{e}gs$ ('storm,' plur. 'waves'), wagjan ('set in motion,' 'stir,' 'shake'), the sense being that of the 'stormy' or 'billowy' sea.

"A $\rho \gamma o s$. There were various flat stretches of the name, and the probable etymology is * $r\hat{g}$ -es- from * $r\tilde{e}\hat{g}$ - ('stretch out,' 'extend'). The Latin equivalent is regio.

 $\mathring{a}\mu\beta\rho \circ \sigma \acute{\iota} a, \mathring{a}\mu\beta\rho \acute{\sigma} \iota \circ s, v\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau a\rho.$ The ancients were undecided as to which was the food, and which the drink, of the gods. The confusion was natural, since $\mathring{a}\mu\beta\rho\sigma\sigma\acute{\iota} a$, as well as $v\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau a\rho$, was either or both. Both words are equivalent in meaning to unguntum. Readers of The Golden Bough will be well aware of the manner in which fetish objects and early altars and effigies were 'smeared' with blood or oil as a means of feeding the numen in the case. The custom, though not understood, persisted in the Greek world (cf. Theoph. $\Delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota \delta \iota \iota \mu\nu$, Paus. 10. 24, Clem. Alex. Strom. 7. 483). Hence doubtless the word $\ell \iota \delta \iota \mu\nu$, with Goth. $\ell \iota \delta \iota \rho$, E. $\ell \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$, is derived from *m $\ell \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$ (from Teutonic), $\ell \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$, E. (dial.) seam ('lard,' 'grease'). It is easy to understand from this how Goth. and O.E. $\ell \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$ make sacrifice,' Goth. $\ell \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$ treis = 'worshipper,' O.E. $\ell \iota \delta \iota \delta \iota \rho$ (consecrate with blood.'

In $d\mu\beta\rho\sigma\sigma(a)$ (=*a\mu\beta\rho\sigma(a)\$ we have nothing to do with immortality, but with $\beta\rho\delta\tau$ os ('blood'), $\beta\rho\sigma\tau\delta\epsilon\iota$ s ('bloody'). This does not imply that the 'smearing' was necessarily any more that of blood than that of oil or grease, but $\beta\rho\delta\tau$ os (like $a\tilde{\imath}\mu\alpha$ and blood) itself once meant 'smeared (or smeary) stuff.' The ultimate root is the *(s)mer- of Lit. smarsas ('fat'), Goth. smair\rho a ('fat'), O.E. smeoro ('fat'), Eng. smear and (provincial) mart ('lard'), and, no less, Lat. merda. The lengthened root was *m(e)r-et-. The first element of the Greek word may represent $d\mu$ - (i.e. * $d\mu$ - $\mu\rho\sigma\tau(a) = d\nu a$ -, but it is perhaps better to recognize an early Greek d- as = 'on' or 'around' (cf. $d\beta o\lambda\epsilon\hat{\imath}s$: $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta o\lambda\epsilon\hat{\imath}s$ of Hesychius, and abolla). The food and drink of the gods consisted of such 'smeared' stuff. Though the real meaning of the word was naturally lost, the sense of 'unguent' is apt to assert itself. Hence the frequent attempts to relate the word to something suggestive of fragrance. Hence also $d\mu\beta\rho\delta\sigma tos$ as applied to the hair. [Probably $d\mu\beta\rho\sigma\sigma ta$ $v\dot{v}\dot{\xi}$ denoted the dank or dewy night.]

Meanwhile the relations of $v\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\rho$ (= * $v\epsilon\gamma$ - $\tau\alpha\rho$) are with ungo, unguo from *eneg-*eneg- μ -, whence Skt. $a\tilde{n}janam$ ('unguent'), anakti ('besmears'), O. Pruss. anktan ('butter'), O.H.G. ancho ('butter'). Thus $v\epsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\rho$ = unguentum. [Perhaps here also belongs E. nasty, M.E. naxty, originally meaning 'smeared' or 'slubbered,' 'dirty.']

 $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ δα $\dot{\iota}$. The word *δα $F\dot{\iota}$ has nothing to do with fire. The sense is 'action,' work,' and the expression = $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\psi$. The root is * $d\bar{\epsilon}u$ - * $d\nu\dot{\iota}$ - = 'put forth energy,' 'strive,' 'work,' to which belong Skt. duvas ('work performed'), $duv\bar{a}$ - ('striving forward'), Goth. taujan ('work,' 'do'), O.E. tawian ('work at,' 'maltreat'), E. toil (* $tu^{2}\cdot\dot{\iota}$ -: cf. boy, which should, I think, be derived from * $bhu\ddot{\iota}$ -i-). Here also may belong $ind\bar{u}tiae$ (properly 'inaction'), and industria (=*in-doues-tria, with in- in the other sense of 'into'). Our own use of 'action' = 'battle,' and that of $\ddot{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ $\pi\tau \circ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu o$ 0 represent the same notion. From an extended *deu-el- comes duellum (bellum), and, in connexion with this, Eng. tool (* $d\bar{o}ul$ -), as also δοῦλοs (Dor. δ ω λοs). The original sense is seen in perduellis, which simply = 'acting wrongfully.'

ο \mathring{v} λ ο \mathring{s} δ ν ε ι ρ ο \mathring{s} . The sense is not 'baleful' (as if with όλοός), but 'crooked, 'deceitful.' The root is *(ε)μεl- ('twist'), cognate to volvo, and is to be found in ο \mathring{v} λος ('curly'), ο \mathring{v} λαμός ('confusion'), \mathring{v} λή ('worm' = 'wriggler,' like vermis and \mathring{v} λμις), and also in Lat. ad \mathring{u} lor, properly used of the fawning or wriggling of a dog. [Similarly dream is cognate to fraus.] Nearly all words of 'lying' relate themselves to similar notions of crookedness.

Σκάμανδρος = 'crooked river.' From *(s)qām- *(s)qām- 'twist,' 'bend.' Cf. σκαμ(μ)ωνία ('bindweed'), κάμπτω, Lat. camur, O.Ir. camm ('crooked'), Goth. hamfs ('crippled'= 'crooked'). Add Eng. sham (properly= 'go crooked'). The termination -ανδρος (from -ανρος) as in Μαίανδρος, Mod. Gk. νερό ('water'), from *εηξικόν '(Νηρεύς). It is possible that the abnormal short vowel before Σκάμανδρος indicates alternative *Κάμανδρος which has been lost from our texts.

 $\tau a \mu \iota \sigma \acute{o}$: 'rennet.' Properly 'coagulating stuff,' from * $t \check{e}m$ - 'thicken,' 'confuse' (also 'muddle') of Lat. $t \check{e}m \check{e}tum$ and tenebrae (when, as Shakespeare has it, 'light thickens').

i θ \dot{v} s: 'straight.' From*sēi-dh-= 'lay out, stretch out, extend' (compare the history of Lat. rectus and Eng. straight). The connexion is with O.E. sid ('long,' extensive'), provincial side ('lay out,' 'set in order,' 'straighten' = iθ \dot{v} νω). Similarly the Eng. noun side properly = the 'length' or 'stretch' (cf. Lat. latus), while Goth. and O.E. sidus ('habit,' 'custom') represents either extended or ordered usage. Here, I believe, should come Lat. considero and desidero, which have nothing to do with the stars. Considero is equivalent either to our 'look at a question on all sides, in all its bearings,' or (less probably, I think) to 'dwell long' upon. Desidero answers to our 'long for,' the notion being that of a feeling long drawn out (cf. indulgere dolori with ἐνδελεχήs). Praesidero should be explained in the same way, despite a natural popular etymology.

όλοφώιος: 'deceitful.' With ἐλεφαίρομαι. An *elebh-= 'go crooked' (cf. οδλος above), 'twist.' The connexion is with E. elf (O.E. αlf, a dwarf goblin both crooked and deceptive), the original sense being clear in elf-locks ('twisted,' tangled'). ὑ άκίνθος. Not with iuvenis, but from *συ-Fακ-ινθος, where συ-= 'well,' 'very.' Cf. Skt. su- ('well'), ὑγυής. The root is *uaq- 'twist,' 'bend' (= 'curl'): cf. vaccinium,

vac(c)illo.

 $\mu \, \epsilon \, \rho \, o \, \pi \, \epsilon \, s$. I venture to think that this originally meant 'clear-faced,' 'bald-faced'—a characteristic distinguishing man from other animals. The relation is with Lat. merus. So probably $\ddot{a}\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ with $\ddot{a}\nu \theta \rho \alpha \xi$.

T. G. TUCKER.

ON A LATIN PHONETIC RULE.

It is a familiar statement that, when in a primitive Latin word of the scansion $- = \pm$ the first syllable is long by position before a geminated consonant (as in *mammilla, *offella, *farrīna), the tendency is to omit one of the consonants and produce the scansion $0 = \pm$ (as in mamilla, ofella, farīna). No such shortening occurs in words of the same scansion when the initial syllable is either naturally long or made long by other groups of consonants.

It might fairly be assumed that a phenomenon which occurs in a number of manifest instances has occurred also in others less obvious. That is to say, it might legitimately be supposed that at one stage of the language it was the phonetic rule. And such it almost certainly was. To words of later formation, or to those in which the consciousness of the etymology remained fully alive (as in summōtus and the like), the rule would naturally not apply. Curūlis would follow the rule, but e.g. affīmis, commūnis would not. Whether omitto is for *ommitto (=ob-mitto), or from a primitive preposition-adverb *o, is open to some doubt. [It is an error to speak of ὀμόργυνμι as a case of 'prothetic anaptyxis']. If we suppose it to represent ob-mitto, we have another example of the rule. To this word I would add others formed in the same way (whichever it may have been). Assuming ob-:

(a) Opertur is related in sense to opportunus, importunus. The sense of *per-etis that of the English verb further (='help, cause to prosper or advance'), and is