

### Indo-European \*dem(h<sub>2</sub>)- ‘to build’: *set* or *anif*?

The verbal root in question is usually reconstructed as \*demh<sub>2</sub>- on the evidence of Greek δέμας ‘body’, perf. mid. δέδμᾱ- and the adjective (θεό-/σιό-/έρι-/έύ-/νεό-)δη/ατος. However, many cognate items in Indo-European languages show no laryngeal reflex.

**Root noun \*dom-, \*dem-s** (no †δεμάσποτι- or Old Indic †*dámi*-):

the missing laryngeal reflexes could in theory be explained via *de Saussure*’s law:

Nom. \*domh<sub>2</sub>- > \*dom- (*lautgesetzlich*)

Gen. \*demh<sub>2</sub>-s >> \*dem-s (analogy).

And yet it is noteworthy that in Greek the *de Saussure*’s treatment is more usually leveled out in nominal paradigms than the other way round:

- \*h<sub>2</sub>uolk-/ \*h<sub>2</sub>u|k- ‘furrow’ > Homeric ὄλκα, Attic-Ionic ἀῶλαξ (where *notabene* both laryngeal reflexes are not expected);
- the initial prothetic vowel in ὄνυξ, ὄνυχ- (< \*h<sub>3</sub>nog<sup>wh</sup>-) was restored after oblique \*h<sub>3</sub>neg<sup>wh</sup>- (whatever the morphology: probably not a root-noun).

Such cases as Greek δμῶς, δμῶς ‘slave’ (← \*dom(h<sub>2</sub>)-u-) which show no laryngeal reflex could in theory be explained as analogical to \*do/em- or similarly by *de Saussure*’s law in *o*-grade forms.

**Greek δάπεδον** ‘floor of a chamber, ground’ < \*d̥h<sub>2</sub>-pedo- (not Ionic †δμήπεδον or †μνήπεδον) may be due to a laryngeal loss in a compound (cf. Icelandic *tóft* < \*tum-fetiz).

And yet, this explanation runs counter to such instances, where laryngeal is not lost in the first compound member, e.g. ταλα(-εργός) < \*t̥h<sub>2</sub>-.

## Serious Problems:

### 1. Building wealth in Anatolian:

**Hittite** *dam(m)eta(r)*- ‘abundance’ (Akkadian gloss *duššu* KBo 1.45 i 15) or ‘immovable property’, ‘wealth which is heaped up in an orderly fashion’ (WATKINS 1979).<sup>1</sup>

This word hardly ever had a real geminate:

A selection of spellings:

- <ta-me-ta> KUB 2.2 iii 29 (foundation ritual, OH/NS),
- <ta-me-e-ta> KUB 48.3 7’ (MH copy of OH text<sup>2</sup>),
- <ta-mi-e-ta> KUB 8.22 iii 3 (star omen, NH),
- <ta-me-e-t[a]> KBo 12.42 Rs. 4 (merchant’s epic, *CHD*: pre-NH/ENS<sup>2</sup>),
- <da-me-e-da> KBo 1.45 Rs. 15’ (NH)

⇒ the amount of spellings with single <m> is sufficient to establish the phonological form /damētar/.<sup>3</sup>

Let us suppose that the root had a laryngeal \*-h<sub>2</sub>-:

- if a full-grade of the root \*demh<sub>2</sub>- was involved the result would have been a form with *-mm-* (quasi \*dammetar, cf. \*melh<sub>2</sub>- > *malla-* ‘grind’, MELCHERT 1994: 79), which is at odds with the actually attested spelling.
- *o*-grade \*domh<sub>2</sub>- is no help either: *de Saussure*’s law does not apply in \*-oRh<sub>2</sub>V-: *hanna-* ‘quarrel’ < \*h<sub>3</sub>enh<sub>2</sub>-o- (MELCHERT 1994: 51).
- in case we deal with a reflex of a zero-grade \*d̥mh<sub>2</sub>- we would expect a form with a cluster *-mh-* since in a sequence \*-Rh<sub>2</sub>V- no assimilation takes place, compare \*p̥lh<sub>2</sub>i- > *palhi-* (MELCHERT 1994: 125).

**Conclusion:** whatever the derivational prehistory of *dametar* should be (more on this below), this word (if related<sup>4</sup>) precludes a root-shape \*demh<sub>2</sub>-.

<sup>1</sup> Frequently cited *damet-* ‘exceeds of wealth’ (e.g. LIV<sup>2</sup>: 115) is a mistaken reading (*ta-me-za* for <sup>x</sup>*ga-a-aš-za* KUB VIII 24 Vs. 8’, NEU 1982: 216, Fn. 53).

<sup>2</sup> For this text WATKINS 1979: 280 suggests OH date on linguistic grounds.

<sup>3</sup> Spellings like <dam-me-e-da> KUB 4.5, duplicate KBo 12.73 iii 16 (both Late NH) or adjective <ta-me-tar-wa-an-za> ‘abundant’ (KBo 21.6 Rs. 4) fall under the category of the purely graphic doubling of <m> in NH compositions and copies of OH and MH originals (see MELCHERT 1994: 24 and KIMBALL 1999: 97-98).

<sup>4</sup> J. PUHVEL compares *dam(m)eta(r)*- to Greek δημός ‘fat’ (PUHVEL 1983: 226-227 = 2002: 56-57); he signals the usage in KBo 21.6 Rs. 4 where the adjective *ta-me-tar-wa-an-za* refers to a door-socket (PUHVEL translates ‘well greased’).

M. WEISS derives *dam(m)eta(r)*- from the root \*temh<sub>1</sub>- ‘to cut’, Greek τέμνω, τέμενος and suggests an original meaning ‘a cut, a portion of land’ (WEISS 1993: 103, Fn. 18); however, his preform \*t̥mh<sub>1</sub>-eh<sub>1</sub>-t̥ presupposes a stative stem, which is not attested elsewhere in Indo-European, and it does not explain Hier. Luvian *tamihit-*, on which see more below.

## 2. Building a Celtic character:

**Middle Irish** *dét* ‘disposition, habitude’ (*u*-stem? Pl. *déuta*) and its derivative OIrish *détlae* ‘brave, venturesome’. This word has a Brittonic correspondence:

MWelsh *dant* ‘temper, character’, attested only once in plural in the poem “Canu y Dewi” by Gwynfardd Brycheiniog (*The Red Book of Hergest*, col. 1186, lines 34-35)

*a gotef paluaðd dernaðd trameint*  
*y gan vorwyn difwyn diwyl y deint<sup>5</sup>*

J. VENDRYES (1929: 252-253) argued that this word is not a plural of the word meaning ‘tooth’ and signaled a separate lexeme ‘manières, dispositions’.<sup>6</sup> The GEIRIADUR PRIFYSGOL CYMRU (890) apparently regards *dant*\*, Pl. *deint*, which is glossed ‘manners, disposition’, as a special semantic development of *dant* ‘tooth’, but I do not see how can we get from ‘tooth’ to ‘disposition’ given the positive meaning of the Welsh word (via a “gnawing” feeling??).

If these Celtic words have nothing to do with IE ‘tooth’ and should be derived from \*dem(h<sub>2</sub>)-,

what would the phonology of that be?

— a full-grade \*demh<sub>2</sub>-to- is ruled out, because it would result in \*deṽaθah > Old Irish †demad

(cf. \*h<sub>2</sub>enh<sub>1</sub>-tleh<sub>2</sub> > \*anatlā > OIrish *anáil*); \*damh<sub>2</sub>-to- ‘tamed’ > Welsh *dafât* ‘sheep’).

— as to the outcome of a putative zero-grade \*dm̥h<sub>2</sub>-to- there are two schools of thought:

– according to a received view -CR̥H<sub>x</sub>T- > -CRāT-: OIrish *bráth*, MWelsh *brawt* ‘judgment’ < \*brātu- < \*g<sup>w</sup>ṽH-tu-, OIrish *tráth* ‘period of time’ < \*tṽh<sub>2</sub>-tu- or *gnáth* ‘usual’ < \*ḡnh<sub>3</sub>-tó-. Cf. the development of -CR̥H<sub>x</sub>N-, cf. OIrish *grán*, MBreton *greun* ‘corn’ < \*ḡrh<sub>2</sub>-no- or OIrish *slán* ‘healthy’, Lepontic SLANIAI < \*s]h<sub>2</sub>-no-.

(MCCONE 1991: 106-107; 1996: 52).

– according to another view -CR̥H<sub>x</sub>T- gives Celtic -CRāT-; this development is assumed on the basis of isolated lexical items such as OIrish *raith* ‘fern’, Gallic *ratis* < \*(s)pr̥H-ti- or *flaith* ‘prince’ < \*u]H-ti-.

(SCHRIJVER 1995: 168-191; SCHUMACHER 2004: 136-137).

Whatever the direct development of Indo-European -CR̥H<sub>x</sub>T- in Celtic might have been, in any event **neither** of these options (> \*dmātah/\*dmatah) can produce \*dantah, required by MWelsh *dant*\*.

<sup>5</sup> <deint> is the reading of JONES, WILLIAMS, PUGHE 1870: 194 and OWEN 1994; facsimile edition of *Llyfr Coch Hergest* is GWENOGVRYN EVANS 1911, Vol. 1 and the manuscript image is available at <http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=jesus&manuscript=ms111>.

<sup>6</sup> VENDRYES translates the passage as follows:

et supporter un soufflet de la part d’une servante  
sans courtoisie, aux manières impudentes (trans. VENDRYES).

OWEN 1994: 482 renders *deint* into Modern Welsh by *arferion*, i.e. ‘custom, practice’.

VENDRYES also assumed that this word might underlie the compound *yrddant* (R. 1432; 1419); finally, he surmised one more attestation to be contained in *The Black Book of Carmarthen* 8, 3, where, however, an emendation of actually transmitted <teint> is required (JARMAN 1982 emends to [i]t eint).

For the sake of fairness a third option could be taken into account:

\*-CR<sub>h</sub>T- > \*-CaRT-, supported by OIrish *bard* ‘singer’, MWelsh *bardd* < \*g<sup>w</sup>rH<sub>x</sub>-d<sup>h</sup>(h<sub>1</sub>)o-  
(CAMPANILE 1970-1973, the root of Old Indic *grnāti* ‘to praise’, Latin *grātus*).

EICHNER’s (1990: 44) suggestion to trace Celtiberian **ardnas** back to \*p<sub>r</sub>h<sub>3</sub>-snā- (Old Irish *rann*, Welsh *ghan* ‘part’) is irrelevant, since Celtiberian **ḍ** (<S>) does not seem to reflect Indo-European \*-s- (UNTERMANN 1997: 382, Fn. 23, 395-396).

However, the development attested in OIrish *bard* can result from a metathesis of the same sort one finds in OEnglish *hors* < \*hross, *ierman* < \*rinnan or -op- / -po- in Greek; it is hardly reasonable to expect that this metathesis will also operate in the cluster nasal + ə.

Thus in my opinion *bard* does **not** allow a scenario:

\*d<sub>mh</sub>₂-to- > \*dmātah > \*damtah > \*dantah (> *dant*) > \*dæntah > \*dētah > \*dēda > *dét*.

Now, note that Indo-European \*d<sub>mt</sub>o- with no laryngeal will do the job:

\*k<sub>mt</sub>om > \*kantom (Celtib. *cantom*, MWelsh *cant*) > \*kæntan > \*kētan > \*kēda > OIrish *cét* ‘100’.

If MIrish *dét* is indeed an *u*-stem, a more complicated derivation can be envisaged: \*d<sub>mt</sub>o- (⇒ \*d<sub>mt</sub>o<sup>-m</sup>, n. > MWelsh *dant*\*) → \*dem-tu- (> MIrish *dét*);

cf. for phonology in Goidelic: \*sentu- (Gothic *sinþs*) > \*sint-us > \*sētuh > \*sēdu > *set* ‘road’.

Substantivization process \*d<sub>mt</sub>o- → \*dem-tu- is well known (NUSSBAUM 1998: 527-528):

\*p<sub>lh</sub>₁no- (> Vedic *pūrṇá-*, OIrish *lán* ‘full’) → \*pleh₁nu- > OIrish *lín* ‘full complement’.

Let us take stock:

- a number of derivatives from the root \*dem(h<sub>2</sub>)- show no laryngeal reflex;
- in some cases the absence of the laryngeal can be accounted for, but often at the cost of invoking complicated phonological machinery and a lot of analogy;
- some cases present serious problems (δάπεδον, supposedly with a laryngeal loss in the first member of a compound, vs. ταλα(-εργός) without it);
- lastly, there are cases which in my opinion cannot be reconciled with the reconstruction \*demh<sub>2</sub>- (Hittite *dam(m)eta(r)*, MIrish *dét*, MWelsh *deint*).

Thus it behooves us to scrutinize the evidence in favor of a reconstruction \*demh<sub>2</sub>-.

## Greek evidence. Part I: Mycenaean *de-me-o-te*

\*h<sub>2</sub> for out root can be assumed on the basis of Greek evidence only: δέμας, (δέ)δμᾶ-.

All other evidence is irrelevant:

- OIndic *dāma-* (not †*dāma-*) is not decisive (*pace* BEEKES 1969: 198): on the one hand, analogy could be involved, cf. Vedic *plavá-* < \*ploúo-; on the other hand, *dāma-* and Latin *domus* probably ≠ Greek δόμος < \*dómo-, if these are innovative forms built to the locative of the root noun \*dom-/ \*dem-: MEIER-BRÜGGER 1977; VOLKART 1994: 2.
- Latin *dominus* and OIndic *dāmūna-* need not go back to \*domh<sub>2</sub>-no- and \*domh<sub>2</sub>u-no- with a possessive \*-no- (πυκνός ‘dense’ ← πύκ(α)); under the theory of decasuative possessive formations (NUSSBAUM 1996; 1998a) one might think of \*domuh<sub>1</sub>-no- and \*dom-h<sub>1</sub>n-o-.

But before we proceed to the Greek examples we cannot fail to notice that even within the Greek *Averbo* our root shows deviant phonology, for Mycenaean Nom. Pl. Part. Fut. *de-me-o-te* (PY An 35) speaks against \*demh<sub>2</sub>-; this form needs a discussion.

R. LIPP (*LIV*<sup>2</sup>: 115, Fn. 7) is hardly correct in claiming that this form shows a “productive \*-eso-”:

- it is true that Greek often restores *e*-vocalism in productive morphological categories, witness *u*-stem declension (πλατύς, πλατέος, fem. πλατέια vs. Πλαταιαί), contract verbs (κομέω vs. κάμνω, ἔκαμον < \*kēmh<sub>2</sub>-), and, lastly, future forms such as ὁμῆται from \*h<sub>2</sub>emh<sub>3</sub>- or καμῆται from \*kēmh<sub>2</sub>-.
- but on the other hand such restoration is particularly hard to motivate in a future participle: substitution of ordinarily looking modern forms of the type ὁμῆται for \*ὁμοῦται (Cretan OMO-TAI) must have been a relatively late process. And, crucially, the unusual paradigm in -οῦμαι (-ō-) : -ῆται (-ē-) resulting from this substitution could have been tolerated because a complete and perfect **analogy** for such a pattern was supplied by -ομαι (-ō-) : -ηται (-ē-) and thematic futures βαλοῦμαι, βαλεῖται (as A. J. NUSSBAUM (2002) and B. FORSSMAN (2002) have pointed out); no such analogy was available for a future participle.
- Lastly, the *-ao-* future is altogether not so badly preserved in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium Greek, as it might appear, cf. in Homer: δαμάα, περάαν, κρεμόω H 83 (with usual *Zerdehnung*), ἐλάαν ε 290, ἐνγελᾶ, ἀντιάων (ᾶ), etc.; thus a remodelling of original \*demahe/o- is not something one necessarily expects.

If *de-me-o-te* actually preserves something old, it might point to a root \*demh<sub>1</sub>- or (more likely in my opinion) to an expected reflex of a desiderative form \*dem-h<sub>1</sub>s-e/o-.

The implication of this analysis is that *de-me-o-te* may be regarded as an indication of *aniť* character of \*dem-, which cannot be inferred otherwise from the verbal system of this root in Greek.

However, a root \*demh<sub>1</sub>- would do the same, as will be shown in more detail later.

⇒ Either way, *de-me-o-te* casts doubt upon setting the preform for δέμας as \*demh<sub>2</sub>-s-.

## Greek evidence. Part II. δέμας: A Phantom Menace?

Prerequisites for analysis: declension in -ας, -αος (δέμαι Pi. *Pae.* 6.80) seems old in this word and is hardly analogical:

- no traces of -ε(h)- in the suffix;
- not easy to motivate a semantic point of contact with another -ας- stem, i.e. words for body-parts (case of κῶας vs. *ko-wo*): one of the oldest meanings of δέμας is just ‘form’, in adverbial usage ‘*instar*’ (Λ 596 δέμας πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο, etc.).

Deverbal \*demh<sub>2</sub>-s-? But beside formal problems (*de-me-o-te*) semantics are not particularly good (\*‘building’? ‘Bau’?). An alternative analysis is desirable.

A relevant fact is that some α-s in this type of s-stems are clearly secondary:

- σέβας ‘awe’ < \*tjeg<sup>w</sup>-s-, whereas Old Indic root *tyaj-* has no *seŕ* features whatsoever;
- δέρας ‘skin, hide’: no laryngeal in the root of δέρω, Lithuanian *derù*.<sup>7</sup>

Thus formal and semantic considerations make an analysis with \*-h<sub>2</sub> as a derivational morpheme and **not** as part of the root a viable and potentially promising alternative.

Is there any way to substantiate this analysis?

**1.** Independent support for the hypothesis of suffixal \*-h<sub>2</sub>- may come from laryngeal-induced effects, other than vocalization: aspiration T > T<sup>h</sup> / \_h<sub>2</sub>.<sup>8</sup>

Under this theory ψέφας ‘darkness’ is particularly illustrative:

$$*k^w\text{sep-h}_2\text{-s-} \leftarrow *k^w\text{sep-h}_2\text{-} \leftarrow *k^w\text{sep- ‘night’}$$

(no laryngeal in Old Indic *kṣáp-*, Avestan *xšap-* and Hittite *išpant-*)

The relationship between \*k<sup>w</sup>sep- and \*k<sup>w</sup>sep-h<sub>2</sub>- is the same as that of ἀλκ- (in ἀλκί πεποιθώς E 299+) to ἀλκή; Old Indic *vís-* to οἴκαδε (‘ins Heimwesen’); Old Indic *ís-* to Vedic *írā- / íḍā- / ílā-*, Gāthic *ižā-*.

**2.** Another way of proving the existence of an intermediary \*-h<sub>2</sub>-stem are derivatives:

\*lep- (λέπω) ⇒ \*lep-h<sub>2</sub> ‘mass of peeled stuff’<sup>?</sup> (⇒ \*lep-h<sub>2</sub>-ed- > λεπάδ- ‘limpet’)

⇒ λέπας ‘(scalped) rock’

<sup>7</sup> See PRAUST 2000 on the alleged *seŕ* morphology in Indo-Iranian (YV+ *díryate*, ŚB *dṛṇīyāt* and intensives 1 Sg. *dardarīmi*, 3 Sg. conj. *á dardírat*).

<sup>8</sup> 1) σχάω ‘to cleave’ < \*skh<sub>2</sub>-eje/o-, ISEBAERT 1988: 355, Fn. 16 (cf. /a/ in σχάσις);

2) ὄρεσθ- vs. ὄρεστ(ā)- < \*(h<sub>1/3</sub>eres-)stéh<sub>2</sub>-s-, sth<sub>2</sub>-és, PETERS 1991-1993;

3) καθαρός ‘pure’, καθαίρω ‘purify’ ~ Old Indic *śithirā-*, *śratharyāti* < \*ṛth<sub>2</sub>ró-, \*ṛth<sub>2</sub>r-je/o- (\*kroth<sub>2</sub>ró-, \*kroth<sub>2</sub>er-je/o-?) with a dissimilatory loss of first /r/, PETERS 1993: 95-101;

4) πλάθωνον ‘a mould for baking’, RASMUSSEN 1989: 83;

5) ἀστεμφής ‘steadfast’ < \*ḥ-stembh<sub>2</sub>-és (RASMUSSEN 1992 = 1999: 535),

6) πένθος ‘grief’ < \*k<sup>w</sup>enth<sub>2</sub>-e/os- (A. J. NUSSBAUM *apud* NERI 2005: 220, Fn. 72)

7) σφήν ‘wedge’ < \*sph<sub>2</sub>-ēn- (VINE 2002[2006]);

8) the 2 Sg. Perf. ending -θα.

**Suggestion:** the suffix \*-s- here is the same well-known substantivizing suffix as in:

Old Indic *páriṇas-* ‘wealth’  $\Leftarrow$  \*p̥h₁nó- (*pūrṇá-* ‘full’) or

Greek αἶθος ‘heat’, Old Indic *édhas-* ‘id’  $\Leftarrow$  \*h₂ejdʰ-ó- ‘burning’ (cf. αἶθος, *édha-* m.).

- some -ας stems result from a substantivization of proterokinetic adjectival \*-h₂-stems;
- same suffix could derive -ας stems from \*h₂-stems with substantival meaning (abstract and collective nouns) and in this case it assumed an additional singulativizing/concretizing function, cf. σκέπας ‘shelter, specific kind of covering’ (ε 443) vs. σκέπη ‘protection’ (τὰ δεόμενα σκέπησ ‘assailable body-parts’) and Acc. Pl. σκέπᾶ (Hes. *Op.* 532).

Thus for δέμας ‘bodily frame’ a derivational morpheme \*-h₂- can be assumed; structurally \*dem-h₂-s- is comparable to κέρας < \*ker-h₂-s- derived from an *aniť* root \*ker-.

However, this parallel will only become attractive if a comparable derivational chain can be demonstrated.

**The Missing Link:** Is there an evidence for \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-, \*dmeh<sub>2</sub>-s?

Crucial evidence comes from Hieroglyphic Luvian *tá-mi-ḫi-šá* (KARATEPE 296) Acc.Sg. neut. ‘abundance, prosperity’ (MORPURGO-DAVIES and HAWKINS 1987: 272-275).

Phonology: a sequence \*-eh<sub>1</sub>- will give not Luvian /i/, but /a/ (MELCHERT 1989: 41, Fn. 28), cf. *wa-a-ar-ša* ‘water’ < \**ueh<sub>1</sub>ɾ*.

Word-formation: The usual shape of the frequent Luvian denominative (rarely deverbal) abstract suffix is *-aḫit*, and *tamiḫit-* is quite unique in respect to its suffixal vocalism. As WATKINS (1975) has shown, *-(a)ḫit* is a usual Luvian way of treating Indo-European \*-eh<sub>2</sub>- stems. It follows that *tamiḫit-* is likely to be based on a \*-h<sub>2</sub>- stem, too.

Now, it is noteworthy that the suffix of Hittite *dametar-* discussed above is equally unique and not easy to explain.<sup>9</sup> It seems more than natural to subsume these two words of identical meaning under the analysis in terms of Indo-European hysterokinetic \*dmēh<sub>2</sub>-, \*dmh<sub>2</sub>-és, independently enlarged with further collective suffixes.

Note that that Luvian *-aḫit* is the exact equivalent of Hittite *-atar* with respect to both function and derivational morphology: *annarumaḫit* = *innarauwatar*, *ḫattulāḫit* = *ḫaddulatar*.

The stem \*dmēh<sub>2</sub>- is best explained as an internal derivative of proterokinetic \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-.

**\*do/em-** ⇒ \*dem-h<sub>2</sub> → \*dmēh<sub>2</sub>- > Hier.-Luv. *tamiḫit-*, Hittite *dameta(r)*  
⇒ \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-s- > Greek δέμας

which is paralleled by:

root \***ker-** ⇒ \*ker-h<sub>2</sub>- ‘horn (material)’ (Myc. *ke-ra*) ⇒ \*ker-h<sub>2</sub>-s- ‘a (single) horn’ > κέρας  
→ \*kr-ēh<sub>2</sub>- > κάρη ‘head’  
(NUSSBAUM 1986: 149-152)

The reconstruction of proterokinetic \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>- can perhaps be further motivated by external derivatives:

- Indo-Iranian \**dmāna-*, n. ‘dwelling place’ (Old Indic *māna-*, Old Avestan *dāmāna-*, Younger Avestan *nmāna-*) < \*dm(e)h<sub>2</sub>-no-<sup>m</sup> (a substantivized *Romānus*-type adjective);
- Latin *māteriēs* < \*dmeh<sub>2</sub>-tes-ih<sub>2</sub>- ⇐ \*dmeh<sub>2</sub>-te/os- ⇐ \*dm̄-h<sub>2</sub>-to-.<sup>10</sup>

However, these forms cannot serve as a decisive proof of a proterokinetic \*-h<sub>2</sub>- stem, since other interpretations are possible.

<sup>9</sup> There is no supporting evidence for an \*-eh<sub>1</sub>- stative verbal stem from this root in other Indo-European languages (not in Tocharian class III/IV present according to JASANOFF 2003: 155-157) and contrary to E. RIEKEN (1999: 256) a sequence \*-eh<sub>1</sub>- will give not Luvian /i/, but /a/<sup>9</sup>, cf. *wa-a-ar-ša* ‘water’ < \**ueh<sub>1</sub>ɾ*.

<sup>10</sup> The root etymology by OSTHOFF 1893 is provided here with a modern morphological interpretation.

## Breaking the camel's back: acrostatic \*domh<sub>2</sub>- and Greek δῶ.

Problem: under this theory both external (\*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-s-) and internal (\*dm-ēh<sub>2</sub>-) derivatives of proto-kinetic \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>- are substantives.

⇒ \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>- can be interpreted as adj. 'heaped up, build'

(noun<sub>1</sub> → noun<sub>2</sub> with exocentric meanings is hard to motivate here).

If this is correct, structural reasons demand an acrostatic \*domh<sub>2</sub>- (subst.) → \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-.

Parallel: \*moġ-h<sub>2</sub>- (Tocharian A *māk*, B *māka*)

→ \*meġ-h<sub>2</sub>- / \*mġ-eh<sub>2</sub>-s (Old Indic *māhi*, Greek μέγα)

The reconstruction \*domh<sub>2</sub>- can yield some interesting results:

Homeric δῶ, Mycenaean TH Of 26.2 (*k̄q-ḏe-wa-o*) *do-de*, TH Of 33 (*o-34-ta-o*) *do-de*

It appears plausible to regard this form as an archaic form of Indo-European \*dem-.

This form cannot be a particle in postposition (~ allative δε): δῶ governs another noun and it can be used with an adjective (χαλκοβατές) and preverbs (κατά, ἀνά, ἐς).

Already in the protolanguage \*domh<sub>2</sub> > \*dōm (Szemerényi's Law).

Two ways of deriving δῶ from \*dōm:

- 1) either \*dōm > \*dō in the protolanguage without restoring the nasal on the way to Greek, because the form was no longer analyzable as a nominal stem of the type χεῖμῶν (this also explains the circumflex, since adverbs and particles are often reaccentuated in Greek).
- 2) or in the form \*dōm the stem-final \*-h<sub>2</sub>- is restored by analogy (oblique \*demh<sub>2</sub>-) and then \*dōmh<sub>2</sub>- > \*dōh<sub>2</sub>- (modified "Brandenstein's Law"):

$N > \emptyset / \bar{V} \_ \{s/H\}_\sigma$

(Old Indic *māmsá* ~ *māh* 'meat'; Acc. Pl. \*g<sup>w</sup>ōs < \*g<sup>w</sup>ōns < \*g<sup>w</sup>ōms;

Nom. Sg. of Indo-Iranian \*-uant- stems: \*-uās < \*-uē/ōns < \*-uē/ōnts).

If we extend this rule to \*h<sub>2</sub>, we might expect \*C $\bar{V}$ m-h<sub>2</sub> > \*C $\bar{V}$ -h<sub>2</sub> and thus \*dōh<sub>2</sub>- > δῶ.

Thus we have made a full circle; the complete derivational chain runs as follows:

\*do/em- ⇒ \*dom-h<sub>2</sub> > Greek δῶ

→ \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>

→ \*dmē<sup>h</sup>-h<sub>2</sub> ⇒ Hier.-Luv. *tamiḥ(it-)*, Hittite *dame(ta(r))*

⇒ \*dem-h<sub>2</sub>-s- > Greek δέμας

⇒ \*dm<sub>h</sub>-h<sub>2</sub>-to- ⇒ \*dmeh<sub>2</sub>-tes- ⇒ \*dmeh<sub>2</sub>-tes-ih<sub>2</sub> > Latin *māteriēs*

⇒ \*dom-u- 'of the house' → \*dm-ou- 'the one of the house' > Greek δμῶς

⇒ \*dom-uh<sub>1</sub>-no- > Old Indic *dāmūna-*

### Verbal \*dmā-

The verbal system of the root \*dem- in Greek is trickier to explain: it comprises a present stem δέμω, a future stem in Mycenaean *de-me-o-te*, discussed above, an aorist stem ἔδειμα (from \*(e)-dem-s-, as it were) and a middle perfect stem δέδημη- (Ionic-Attic). The perfect stem and the adjectives in -δημη/ἄτος require a laryngeal which could in theory have been \*-h<sub>1</sub> or \*-h<sub>2</sub>; Mycenaean *de-me-o-te* requires \*-h<sub>1</sub> or no laryngeal.

### /a/ in Western Greek:

Doric δέδμανθ' (Theoc. 15.120) is not decisive: can be an attempt to render an Ionic (Homeric) form in Doric literary koine by a mere substitution of /ā/ for /ē/. Cf. τμαθείς / τμᾶμα in Archimedes from a root \*temh<sub>1</sub>- (τέμενος, Mycenaean *te-me-no*).

Such substitution of Doric /ā/ for Ionic /ē/ is particularly easy to motivate for the perfect middle stem: Doric has preserved the \*ā-aorist (JASANOFF 1983): Laconian ἀπεσσύα, Cyrenaean conj. μιᾶι, Hsch. ἐφθιᾶ· ἀπέθανεν, Calymnian ἐγρυᾶι. Such forms could have facilitated a substitution of \*dedmē- by δεδμā- by proportional analogy (extended to the perfect stems):

Ionic aor. ἐρρύην (perf. ἐρρύηκα): Doric aor. ἐρρύᾶ = Ionic δέδημη- : X, X = δεδμā-

Prime example of this process is Ionic γεγένημαι vs. γεγεναμένον Pi. *Ol.* 6, 53

This scenario will explain δέδμανται

(note an additional trigger in Ionic δέδημημαι 'to overpower' : Doric \*-δμā-)

-το- participles could have copied the vocalism of the perfect middle stem; in addition, it is noteworthy that the mss. evidence for Doric -δμᾶτος is often vacillating (especially at Pi. *O.* III, 7, where <η> is read in six mss., including the oldest and most reliable ones): this is an indication of the fact that forms with /a/ were not really embedded in the transmission.

Thus Doric δέδμα- does not vouchsafe a root-final \*-h<sub>2</sub>, and a reconstruction \*demh<sub>1</sub>- can account for the entire *Averbo*. The only form which does not fall neatly under this analysis is aor. ἔδειμα.

**The simplest strategy:** sigmatic aorist was secondarily supplied to the thematic present stem (Doric ἄξε to ἄγω, Hsch. ἔφερσεν to φέρω)

**But:** since Mycenaean *de-me-o-te* can also be accounted for without any laryngeal it behooves us to investigate whether the apparent *set* character of the perfect forms could be secondary.

## Facts Are Stubborn Things, But Statistics Are More Pliable

Curiously, the statistics in Homeric epics do not support the hypothesis of a secondary origin for (ἔ)δειμα:

– aor. ind. act. appears four times in the Iliad (H 436, I 349, Ξ 32, Φ 446); all attestations are all verse-final except I 349 (at *κατὰ τρίτον τροχάϊον*); all participate in a formulaic juncture *τείχος [...] ἔδειμα(ν)*.

– short-vowel aor. subj. appears in

H 337 ἄκριτον ἐκ πεδίου· ποτὶ δ' αὐτὸν δείμομεν ὦκα  
πύργους ὑψηλοῦς

which looks akin to:

H 436 ἄκριτον ἐκ πεδίου, ποτὶ δ' αὐτὸν τεῖχος ἔδειμαν  
πύργους θ' ὑψηλοῦς

– aor. ind. mid. ἐδείματο appears twice in the Odyssee (ζ 9, ξ 8).

Contrast the scanty attestation of the present stem which makes its appearance only at ψ 192 *τῶι δ' ἐγὼ ἀμφιβαλῶν θάλαμον δέμον ὄφρ' ἐτέλεσσα* in addition a pres. participle *δέμων* shows up at *h. Merc* 87.

This whole situation suggests that ἔδειμα is actually much better embedded in Homeric diction than its present δέμω, which means that an alternative account of ἔδειμα is desirable. Since in Greek there is plenty of analogy going on in *s*-aorists to the roots in final resonant, analogy may have come in play in this case too.

A promising option is the rhyming present νέμω ‘to dispense; med. to possess, to hold land, to dwell’; the meaning ‘to cultivate’ is a point of contact between the meanings of these verbs: νέμω is attested with this meaning already in Homer (with ἄλσεα, ἔργα, πατρώια), δέμω is used in this sense at *h. Merc*. 87: *δέμων ἀνθοῦσαν ἀλώην*.

Now, the statistics for νέμω and ἔνειμα in epics are just the reverse:

– Pres. νέμω is abundantly attested in Homer (E 777, Z 195, M 313, O 631, Σ 186, Υ 8, 185, 177, ζ 188, θ 470, ι 233, 449, κ 357, λ 185, ν 407, ο 140, τ 132 (ἀμφι-), υ 164, 336 + twenty five instances in B: *κατάλογος τῶν νεῶν*).

– Its aorist (ἔ)νειμα is on the contrary represented rather modestly: Γ 274, E 447, I 216-217 (= Ω 625-626), η 179 (= ν 50), ξ 210, 436, 449, υ 253-254.

νέμω + δέμω = ?

Now, as M. PETERS has shown (1997[2002]: 114, Fn. 32), νέμω goes back to a *seǵ*-root, as can be inferred from:

1) νέμεσις < \*nemh<sub>1</sub>-ti-

2) the accentuation of Latvian *neĩt* ‘he takes’

3) perf. νενέμηκα, νενέμημαι < \*ne-nemē- < \*ne-nmē- < \*ne-nmh<sub>1</sub>-

(with an adjustment of the root ablaut in order to avoid a metathesis \*ne-nmē- > \*ne-mnē-).

This makes aor. ἔνειμα a problem, and an analogical explanation seems unavoidable.

It is possible that these two verbs with similar-looking present stems mutually influenced each other:

1. original situation		2. situation after the two verbs level their <i>Averbo</i> -s after each other	
Pres. *deme/o-	*neme/o- < *nemh <sub>1</sub> e/o-	Pres. *deme/o-	*neme/o-
Aor. *dem-s-	?	Aor. *dem-s-	*nem-s- ( <b>new</b> )
Perf. *deda-	*ne-nmē- < *ne-nmh <sub>1</sub> -	Perf. *dedmē- ( <b>new</b> )	*ne-nmē- >> *ne-nemē

As a result two similar sets of forms emerge: δέμω, ἔδειμα, δέδημαι and νέμω, ἔνειμα, νενέμημαι. The perfect stem \*dedmē- is thus secondary and so is the adjective -δη/ατός ‘built’ based on it.

Thus there is no evidence that the verbal root \*dem- ‘to build’ ever had a root final laryngeal.

## Bibliography

- Campanile 1970-1973 — E. Campanile. L'étymologie du celtique \*bard(h)os. Ogam – tradition celtique. T. 22-25. 235-236.
- Forssman 2002 — B. Forssman. Kretisch OMOTAI und das Futur von ὄμυυμ. In: M. Fritz und S. Zeilfelder (hrsgg.). *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Grazer vergleichende Arbeiten 17). Graz. 157-168.
- Gwenogvryn Evans 1911 — The poetry in the Red Book of Hergest. Reproduced and edited by J. Gwenogvryn Evans. Vol. I. Llanbedrog, N. Wales.
- Isebaert 1988 — L. Isebaert. La formation de latin *domāre*. In: Y.L. Arbeitman (ed.). *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic and other Indo-European Languages* (BCILL 42). Louvain-la-Neuve. 349-359.
- Jarman 1982 — Llyfr du Caerfyrddin : gyda rhagymadrodd, nodiadau testunol, a geirfa. Ed. by A.O.H. Jarman. Caerdydd.
- Jasanoff 1983 [1984] — J. H. Jasanoff. The IE “*ā*-preterite” and related forms. IF 88: 54-83.
- Jasanoff 2003 — J. H. Jasanoff. *Hittite and Indo-European Verb*. Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Williams, Pughe 1870 — O. Jones, E. Williams, W. O. Pughe (eds.). *The Myvyrian archaology of Wales: collected out of ancient manuscripts*. Denbigh.
- Kimball 1999 — S. Kimball. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck.
- McCone 1991 — K. McCone. *The Indo-European Origins of the Old Irish Nasal Presents, Subjunctives and Futures*. (IBS 66). Innsbruck.
- McCone 1996 — K. McCone. *Towards a Relative Chronology of Ancient and Medieval Celtic Sound Change*. (Maynooth Studies in Celtic Linguistics 3). Maynooth.
- Melchert 1989 — H. C. Melchert. *New Luvo-Lycian Isoglosses*. HS 102: 23-45.
- Melchert 1994 — H.C. Melchert. *Historical Anatolian Phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- Morpurgo Davies and Hawkins 1987 — A. Morpurgo Davies, J. D. Hawkins. *The Late Hieroglyphic Luwian Corpus: Some New Lexical Recognitions*. *Hethitica* 8 (Acta Anatolica E. Laroche oblata): 267-295.
- Neri 2005 — S. Neri. *Riflessioni sull'apofonia radicale di proto-germanico \*namōn 'nome'*. HS 118: 201-250.
- Neu 1982 — E. Neu. *Hethitisch /t/ im Wortauslaut*. In: J. Tischler (Hrsg.). *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. (IBS 40). Innsbruck. 205-225.
- Nussbaum 1986 — A. J. Nussbaum. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. (Studies in Indo-European Language and Culture 2). Berlin; New York.
- Nussbaum 1996 — A. J. Nussbaum. *Latin acētum, aurītus, acūtus, avītus: Four of a Kind?* Talk at the 15<sup>th</sup> East Coast Indo-European Conference (Yale University, New Haven).
- Nussbaum 1998 — A. J. Nussbaum. *More on “Decasulative” Nominal Stems in Indo-European*. Talk at the 17<sup>th</sup> East Coast Indo-European Conference (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
- Nussbaum 2002 — A. J. Nussbaum. *Homeric OPHAI (Od. 14.343) and OMEITAI (Il. 9.274): Two of a Kind?* In: *Colby Quarterly* Vol. 37, Number 2 (Essays on Homeric Epic): 175-196.
- Osthoff 1893 — H. Osthoff. *Lateinisch māteriēs*. In: E. Kuhn (Hrsg.). *Festgruss Rudolf von Roth zum Doktor-Jubiläum 24. August 1893 von seinen Freunden und Schülern*. Stuttgart. 126-128.
- Owen 1994 — M. E. Owen (ed.). *Gwaith Llywelyn Fardd I ac eraill o feirdd y ddeuddegfed ganrif*. Caerdydd.
- Peters 1991-1993 — M. Peters. 'Ορεσθ- neben 'Ορεστ(ā)-. *Die Sprache* 35/1: 135-138.
- Peters 1993 — M. Peters. *Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie*. In: L. Isebaert (éd.). *Miscellanea linguistica Graeco-Latina* (Collection d'études classiques 7). Namur. 85-113.

- Peters 1997[2002] — M. Peters. *Indogermanische Chronik* 35. Teil III. *Die Sprache* 39/3: 94-129.
- Puhvel 1983 — J. Puhvel. *Homeric Questions and Hittite Answers*. *AJPh* 104: 217-227 (= *Epilecta Indoeuropaea. Opuscula Selecta Annis 1978-2001 Excusa Imprimis ad Res Anatolica Attinentia*. (IBS 104). Innsbruck, 2002. 47-57).
- Rasmussen 1989 — J.E. Rasmussen. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache* (IBS 55). Innsbruck.
- Rasmussen 1992 — J. E. Rasmussen. *Winter's Law of Balto-Slavic Lengthening: An unnatural fact?* *Copenhagen Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 63-77 (перепечатано в кн.: = *Selected Papers on Indo-European Linguistics. Part 2*. Copenhagen, 1999. 527-540).
- Rieken 1999 — E. Rieken. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. (StBoT 44). Wiesbaden.
- Schrijver 1995 — P. Schrijver. *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 5). Amsterdam; Atlanta.
- Schumacher 2004: 509 — S. Schumacher. *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon*. Unter Mitarbeit von B. Schulze-Thulin und C. aan de Wiel. (IBS 110). Innsbruck
- Vendryes 1929 — J. Vendryes. *Remarques de vocabulaire*. *Revue Celtique* 46: 252-267.
- Volkart 1994 — M. Volkart. *Zu Brugmanns Gesetz im Altindischen*. (Universität Bern. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Arbeitspapier 33). Bern.
- Watkins 1975 — C. Watkins. *Die Vertretung der Laryngale in gewissen morphologischen Kategorien in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens*. In: H. Rix (Hrsg.). *Flexion und Wortbildung: Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*.
- Watkins 1979 — C. Watkins. *NAM.RA GUD UDU in Hittite: Indo-European poetic language and the folk taxonomy of wealth*. In: E. Neu, W. Meid (hrsgg.). *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*. (IBS 25). 269-304.
- Weiss 1993 — M. Weiss. *Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Cornell