Indo-European *dem(h2)~ ‘to build’
and its derivatives*

0. The Indo-European verbal root meaning ‘to build’ is customarily reconstructed as a set root *demh2~.\(^1\) However, the evidence for the reconstruction of the root-final laryngeal is limited to Greek forms such as δέμας ‘body’ and the middle perfect stem δεμή- (Ionic) / δεμά- (Doric). This paper argues that this root should instead be reconstructed as anit *dem-. In order to substantiate this claim I will first address the evidence which is hard to reconcile with the reconstruction *demh2~ and add to this dossier some examples which in my opinion militate against the assumption of a root-final laryngeal. In the second part of the paper I will offer a novel interpretation of the Greek forms mentioned above: a new derivational history will be suggested for several nominal derivatives of this root (Greek δεμας, Hittite dam(m)etar, Hieroglyphic Luvian tamilha-, Latin materies and some others). Finally, I will demonstrate that no laryngeal is in fact required by the perfect stem δεμή- either. As is often the case in Indo-European reconstruction, answers to phonological questions have to be sought in morphology. This paper is not an exception.

1. As is well known, a number of nominal offshoots from this root show no laryngeal reflex in contexts where such a reflex might have been expected.

In some forms the absence of alleged *h2 is in theory attributable to a specific rule of laryngeal loss. For instance, the only reconstructible form of the Gen. Sg. of the root noun *dom/- *dem- is *dem-s and not

\(^*\) Preliminary versions of this paper were presented at the Harvard GSAS Indo-European Workshop (March 2006) and at the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference (November 2006). I would like to thank the audience at both venues, as well as Jay H. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, Sergio Neri, Alan J. Nussbaum, Martin Peters and Jeremy Rau. I am naturally alone responsible for all conclusions reached here and for any errors of fact or judgment. I would also like to acknowledge support from the RGNF grant, N° 10-04-00293a.

\(^1\) Sihler 1995: 104; \textit{LIV}\(^2\): 114-115; Lipp 2009: xv. An important exception is Hackstein 1995: 138 who concedes that a reconstruction *dem- is a possibility.
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*dem₁-s (there is no trace of Greek ὁδηγεῖσθαι or Old Indic dhāmi); however, this could be easily explained by analogy to Nom.-Acc. *dom(h₁)- where Saussure–Hirt’s law could be held responsible for the absence of *h₂ in an o-grade context. Similarly, the absence of a laryngeal reflex in Greek δάπεδον ‘level surface, floor, ground’ (not Ionic ὁδηγεῖσθαι or ἀνήγεῖσθαι < *dēm₂-pēdo-) may be due to a laryngeal loss in an endocentric compound *dēm-pedo-, where the first member was originally unaccented. And yet, it is much harder to advance an explanation based on laryngeal loss for other derivatives of the root noun *do/em₁, for instance, Greek ὁμοίως, ὁμοιὸς ‘slave’ < *dm₁-ōuʢ (not ὁμοίω < *dēm₁-ōuʢ < *dēm₂-ōu). It is also worth noting that at least in Greek the effects of the Saussure–Hirt’s law were usually leveled out in nominal paradigms rather than generalized throughout the

2 One may argue that in *dem(h₁)s *poti- ‘ruler of the house’ the laryngeal was lost in a pretonic R_TT context by virtue of G. Schmidt’s law (cf. Dat. Sg. *γένην-μή-ή > jātmame; see Schmidt 1973, M. Peters apud Mayrhofer 1981: 436 and Hackstein 2002); however, this argument would crucially depend on the date of univerbation, which in this case seems to be not early enough, judging by the fact that the order of the constituents is still free in Vedic: pāṭīr dān / pāṭi dān vs. dāmpāṭi and Gāthic dāng pāṭiś Y. 45.11.

3 ὁμί- might be expected, if the /i/ in vāja-sāni-, go-sāni- is a regular reflex of root-final *h₂ in *senh₂, which is debatable: Scarlata 1999: 577-586 assumes that these forms result from a contamination with an *i-stem, while (vāja/-go-)sā- is regular; however, no such *i-stem is attested and so -sāni- could be a regular reflex of a root noun *senh₂ (see Praust 2000: 425, Fn. 2). As to Avestan đāmata, Loc. đāmini as the expected reflex of *dēm₁h₂(s) cf. Gāthic tāuṣiš(cā) < *teṇh₂-s-, assī < *h₂ga/est-h₂.

4 δάπεδον occasionally shows a metrically lengthened /ā/ in 5th century poetry (Pr. N. 7, 34; 8, 83; 10, 28; [A.] Pr. 829 – it is very unlikely that γάποξα should be restored at any of these contexts). I do not think that this prosody should be taken at face value: pace Gentili 2000: 13-14 there is no reason to distinguish between δάπεδον (ā) ‘floor’ (*dā-) and δάπεδος (ā) ‘surface of land’ where the first compound member would be identical with the δ of Δάματηρ or Ευφοιοτάς. Gentili’s etymology is rendered even more questionable by the fact that the scarcely attested Greek δά probably meant ‘water’, if Doric ἄρτος could be explained as a vocative syntagm *poetē dās ‘o, lord of the waters!’ (Peters 1989: 208; Janda 2000: 256-258).

5 The antiquity of this compound is confirmed by Germanic, cf. Old Icelandic topt ( > New Icelandic tóft, tótt), ð. < *tum(i)ū < Proto-Germanic *tumfiū < *dēm-pēdeh₂.

6 On the morphology of γοξ see below Fn. 66.

7 *dēm₁-ōuʢ does not fit any of the traditionally recognized contexts for the application of de Saussure’s law or other rules of laryngeal loss. In principle, it may be argued that the absence of the laryngeal in *dēm₁- was transferred from its derivational basis *dom(- < *dom₁-) or *domu ( < *dom₂u) where the laryngeal loss was lautgesetzlich. Alternatively, one may assume a reverse of Lindeman’s law in the Proto-Greek oblique caseforms *dmos-øs, *dmou-i as well as in the presumably frequent Nom.Pl. *dmou-es ( < *dēm₂-ou-es). Neither of these assumptions is particularly easy to motivate.

paradigm. Thus some of the derivatives of the root *dem(h₂)- remain problematic under the standard account.

2. Now I would like to discuss two cases that in my opinion clearly contradict the reconstruction with a final laryngeal (the relevance of these cases for the phonological reconstruction of the root *dem(h₂)- has to my knowledge hitherto not been unnoticed).

2.1. The first word in question is Hittite dam(m)ēta(r)\(^8\) 'abundance'\(^11\) (glossed by Akkadian duššu KBo 1.45 i 15).\(^12\) Based on its use in the merism iyatal damēta, Watkins (1979) translated dam(m)ētara as ‘immovable property’, ‘wealth which is or can be heaped up in an orderly fashion’. In the same paper Watkins proposed an etymology for dam(m)ēta(r) that is now widely accepted: according to him this noun goes back to the same root as Greek δέματα, δέμω. The semantic side of Watkins’ solution is plausible in view of the cognate Tocharian forms: Ašamāta, Bšmetār mean ‘to grow’ (intr.). It is not unlikely that in this case Tocharian and Anatolian turn out to be more archaic than the other (‘inner’ IE) languages in having preserved ‘to grow’ as one of the meanings of the root *dem(h₂)-; in fact, the familiar meaning ‘to build’, certainly present with this root already in the protolanguage, could be an easily conceivable semantic development of trans. ‘to grow (plants), to tend (a field)’ (for a parallel one need only think about English build

\(^8\) Witness *h₂ylk(-) *h₂ylk(-) > Homeric ὁλκα, Attic-Ionic ὄλαζ ‘furrow’ (not ὁλκ-/ ὄλκ-) or *h₂nog(-)\(^10\) *h₂nog\(^9\) - > ὁνύζ, ὁνοζ- ‘claw, nail’ (not ὅνυζ/ الخار). Compare Vine 2002: 208-9 who in his excellent discussion of the root *h₂req(h₂)- emphasized that in Greek anit forms do not typically ost set forms and that early generalization of laryngeal-less variant would be entirely unexpected.

\(^9\) It should be noted that the single *-m- in Germanic *teman ‘build’ (Gothic ga- tinan) is, too, problematic for those who believe that in Germanic posttonic *-RH-clusters were reflected as geminate -RR- (see Lühr 1976; Müller 2007: 88; 302-4); the problem is signaled in \(LIV\)^\(^2\): 115, but no realistic solution is offered. In the present paper, however, this theory is not adopted and therefore Germanic *teman is not mentioned here as a piece of evidence against the reconstruction *demh₂- (my colleague H. Fellner has informed me that he is preparing an extended treatment of the examples cited in support of the Resonantengemination durch Laryngal in Germanic where he intends to show that all of these examples can be explained in a different way).

\(^10\) dam(m)ēta without a final -r is an archaic nom.-acc. pl. form (cf. ḫattata ‘wisdom, wise thoughts’, paprāta ‘acts of impurity’; see Melchert 1988).


\(^12\) Frequently cited damet- ‘exceeds of wealth’ (e.g. \(LIV\)^\(^2\): 115) is a mistaken reading (ta-me-zA for *qa-a-a-zA KUB VIII 24 Vs. 8’, see Neu 1982: 216, Fn. 53).
and German bauen that go back to PIE *bʰuh₂- ‘to grow; to become’). One way or another, it is not implausible to assume that PIE *dem(h₂)- had both the meaning ‘to build’ and ‘to grow’. Thus in the case of Hittite dam(m)eta(r) the meaning ‘abundance’ or more specifically ‘wealth’, ‘immovable property’ could result from an original meaning ‘accretion’. Other etymologies that have been proposed for dam(m)eta(r) are much less appealing. Once this etymology is accepted, it behooves us to examine the philological evidence in order to determine whether the geminate <-mm-> is real or not.

Our word is spelled <ta-me-ta> KUB 2.2 iii 29 (foundation ritual, OH/NS), <ta-mi-e-ta> KUB 8.22 iii 3 (star omen, NH), <ta-me-e-[a]> KBo 12.42 Rs. 4 (merchant’s epic; for this text Watkins 1979: 280 suggests OH date on linguistic grounds; CHD: pre-NH/E/NS), <da-me-e-da> KBo 1.45 Rs. 15’ (NH), <ta-me-e-ta> KUB 48.3 7’ (MH copy of OH text). Although none of the examples just cited come from an assuredly OH manuscript, the number of MH spellings with single <m> is sufficient to establish the phonological /damēdar/; spellings like <dam-me-e-da> KUB 4.5, duplicate KBo 12.73 iii 16 (both Late NH) should not be a matter of concern. We may thus conclude that dametar never had a real geminate.

Now, dametar with a single /m/ is clearly not an expected reflex of *demh₂-: words containing a secured etymological sequence *-VRh₂-V- show a consistent spelling of double resonant, for instance, šalli ‘large; chief’ < *selh₂-i-17 or malla- ‘to grind’ < *melh₂- (Melchert 1994: 79).

13 Old English bold ‘house’. Modern English build goes back to *būþla- < *būþła-; German bauen continues Germanic *bōwwa- (Seebold 1970: 124-128)

14 Two alternatives deserve to be mentioned: J. Puhvel compares dam(m)etar to Greek ἰμπός ‘fat’ (Puhvel 1983: 226-227 = 2002: 56-57); he signals an interesting 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)etar from the root *temh₂- ‘to cut’, Greek τάψυς, τέμυς and suggests an original meaning ‘a cut, a portion of land’ (Weiss 1993: 103, Fn. 18); however, his preform *temh₂-eh₂-t entails the existence of a stative stem, which is not attested elsewhere in Indo-European, and is not compatible with Hieroglyphic Luvi an tanuḫi- (see below in the main text).

15 Note that DAM was not used as a syllabic sign in OH.

16 On 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. The double spelling of /m/ in the adjective dammetarvant- ‘abundant, profuse’ (however, 1x ta-me-tar-wa-anza KBo 21.6 Rs. 4) does not need to be attributed to the effects of H. Eichner’s rule according to which continuants are doubled before short accented vowels (his other examples with consistent <mm> (gimmantas-, gimmì, himmna-) all allow alternative explanations, see Melchert 1984: 127, Fn. 90; 1994: 75; Kimball 1999: 313-314).

17 The oblique stem of this word is leveled after the strong stem, otherwise one would expect *šalh₂-éi- > *šalhay- (Melchert 1984: 44-45, Fn. 91). The presence of a laryngeal
Therefore *demh₂- should have given a form with a double -mm-: 'dammetar. An o-grade *domh₂- does not help either: according to Melchert 1994: 51, Saussure’s law does not apply in *-oRh₂V-, so once again, from *domh₂- one would expect an outcome with double -mm-. Lastly, if one starts with a reflex of a zero-grade *drh₂- the expected result is a cluster -mh-, since in a sequence *-Rh₂V- no assimilation takes place, compare *plh₂j- > *palh- (Melchert 1994: 125). We have to conclude that whatever the derivational prehistory of dametar should be (more on this below), this word precludes a root-shape *demh₂-.

2.2. The second piece of evidence which casts doubt on the reconstruction *demh₂- with a final laryngeal is Proto-Celtic *danto- ‘disposition’. On the Goidelic side this reconstruction is supported by a scarcely attested Middle Irish word dét ‘disposition, habitude’ together with its better known derivative détalae ‘brave, venturesome’. DIL (D 49) gives only two occurrences of the noun dét; one of these attestations is cited in full by O’Grady 1926: 555:

* is é as dét do dhremaib [...] 
* mes do chur ar cheird gach fir
‘that which in certain folk is congenital is this:
upon all other men’s productions to set a value of their own’
(trans. O’Grady)

Old Irish dét has a correspondence in Middle Welsh Pl. deint ‘temper, character’; this form is found only once in the poem “Canu y Dewi” by a 12th cent. poet Gwynfarredd Brycheiniog. The Red Book of Hergest, col. 1186, lines 34-35 reads:

is guaranteed by Latin saluus < *salaço- < *s|h₂ȝo-, where the lack of assimilation *-ȝo- > -l- proves that these two consonants were separated by a vowel that was later syncopated in Latin, but is still preserved in Sabellian: Oscan salus Cm 18, 38, 39, ñalañ Lu 40, Marrucinian salus MV 7, Umbrian Acc. Sg. saluom, see Nussbaum 1997: 186-192. (Even if the Italic examples go back to *salaço- < *s|h₂-ȝo-, the vocalization sal- < *s|h₂-V/C- speaks in favor of *selh- against *sel-).

Possibly an u-stem, if plural déuta mentioned in the DIL entry is a real (the form is apparently cited by K. Meyer, but I was not able to verify the attestation).

The second attestation of dét is signaled in the manuscript of P. O’Connell’s unpublished dictionary of the Irish language, but DIL does not provide a full context.
a gotef paualatd derna6d trameint
y gan vorwyn difwyn diwyl y deint⁰
‘to endure an excessive blow of a fist
from a wretched girl with impudent manners?«
(trans. after Vendryes)

J. Vendryes (1929: 252-253) pointed out that this form cannot be a plural of *dant ‘tooth’ and signaled a separate lexeme *dant₂ ‘manières, dispositions’; following him Owen 1994: 482 rendered *deint into Modern Welsh by *arferion, i.e. ‘custom, practice’. As it seems, we are indeed dealing here with a word meaning ‘manners’ or ‘disposition’ for which a derivation from the root meaning ‘to build’ is semantically plausible (compare Mod. Russian nastroenie ‘mood, temper’ from the root of stroit ‘to build’ with a similar reference to a mental make-up).

Now, both Middle Irish dēt and Middle Welsh dant* go back to Proto-Celtic *danto- and this form cannot be derived from a *sef root *demh₂:

– a full-grade *demh₂-to- would give Goidelic *devaθah > Old Irish *demath (cf. *h₂-enh₁-tleh₂ > *anatlā > Old Irish anāl); for Brittonic a telling example is Welsh *dafat ‘sheep’ < *damh₂-to- ‘tamed’ (from the root of Greek δαυνημί).  
– as for the outcome of a putative zero-grade *dmh₂-to- there are two schools of thought:  

– according to the received view -CRH₁T- gives -CRṬ- (e.g. Joseph 1982: 49-55; McConne 1991: 106-107; 1996: 52); this development provides a straightforward account of cases like Old Irish bráth, Middle Welsh brawt ‘judgment’ < *brātu- < *gτH-tu-, Old Irish trúth ‘period of time’ < *trh₂-tu- or gnāth ‘usual’ < *gŋh₂-tó- and corresponds to the development of -CRH₆N-, cf. Old Irish grán, Middle Breton greun ‘corn’ < *gŋrh₂-no- or Old Irish slán ‘healthy’, Lepontic SLANIAI < *σlḥ₂-no-. Instances with a short vowel can be interpreted as containing a super-zero-grade.

⁰ <deint> is the reading of Jones, Williams, Pughe 1870: 194 and Owen 1994; facsimile edition of Llyfr Coch Hergest is Evans 1911, Vol. 1 and the manuscript image is available at: http://image.ox.ac.uk/show?collection=jesus&manuscript=ms111.

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

²¹ The Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru (890) regards dant, Pl. deint (glossed ‘manners, disposition’) as a special semantic development of dant ‘tooth’, but it is hard to see how one can get from ‘tooth’ to ‘disposition’ or ‘manners’.
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– according to another view, -CRH₃T- regularly gives Celtic -CRaT-; this development is assumed on the basis of isolated lexical items such as Old Irish raith ‘fern’, Gaulish ratis < *(s)pH-ti- or flath ‘prince’ < *ʄH-ti- (Schrijver 1995: 168-191; Schumacher 2004: 136-137). 22

Whatever the development of Indo-European -CRH₃T- in Celtic might have been, 23 in any event neither of the two options discussed above (*dmātah / *dmatah < *dph₂-to-) can produce *dantah. Now, if we reconstruct an Indo-European *dmp-to- with no laryngeal, the phonological derivation is quite unproblematic: compare *kemptom > *kantom (Celtiberian cantom, Middle Welsh cant) > *kantan > *kēタ > *kēタ > Old Irish cēт ‘hundred’. Since there are indications that Middle Irish dēт was a u-stem (above, Fn. 15), a more complicated derivation can be envisaged: *dmpτο- ( > Middle Welsh dant*) → *dem-tu- ( > Middle Irish dēт). A derivational process that would generate subst. *dem-tu- from adj. *dmp-to- is well known; a good parallel is *ph₁-to- ( > Vedic pūrṇa-, Old Irish lān ‘full’) → *pleh₁-nu- > Old Irish lín ‘full comple-

22 In principle, one more option could be taken into account, namely, *-CRH₃T- > *-CaRT- (Joseph 1982: 49-54). The single best example of this development is Old Irish bard ‘singer’, Middle Welsh bardd, which according to Campanile 1970-1973 goes back to *g₂TH₂-dβ̣h₁-to- (cf. Old Indic gnā́ ‘to praise’, gūrtā-, Latin grātus). Celtiberian arðnas, traced back to *ph₁-nā́ by Eichner 1990: 44 (Old Irish rann, Welsh rhan ‘part’), is irrelevant, since it is now recognized that Celtiberian d (=s̪) cannot reflect Indo-European *s̪- (Untermann 1997: 382, Fn. 23, 395-396; Wodtko 2000: 34).

In any event, the development attested in Old Irish bard can result from a metathesis of the same sort one finds in Old English hors < *hross, iernan < *rīñnan and it is hardly reasonable to expect a metathesis that is found with liquid + ŋ to operate in the cluster nasal + ŋ. Thus in my opinion the metathesis that took place ins bard does not allow assuming similar development for Old Irish dēт and Middle Welsh dant* and a scenario *dph₂-to- > *dmātah > *dmatah < *dantah > *dantah (> dant) > *dantah > *dēтah > *dēтa > dēт is therefore improbable.

23 It might be potentially interesting that in some cases cited in favor of -CRH₃T- > -CRaT- there is no real comparative evidence for a laryngeal: neither the rather numerous cognates of raith meaning ‘feather’/ ‘fern’ (OCS pero, Albanian fier and o-grade forms OHG farn, Vedic puरa-, Younger Avestan pārma-, Lithuanian spaņnas, that are less significant since Saussure–Hirt’s law would have eliminated a laryngeal reflex anyway), nor the reflexes of the verbal root *(s)per- ‘to fly’ (LIV²: 579) indicate the former presence of a laryngeal. OCS aor. prē does not have the ending -tn, but pace LIV all this shows is that this Proto-Slavic aorist was immobile; the absence of the dental ending in the aor. prē does not show that the root did (or did not) have a final laryngeal (a new examination of the so-called von-Wijk’s rule and the correspondences OCS pīn ‘drank’ = Scr. pi (= Latvian pīt) vs. OCS bī ‘hit’ = Scr. bī ‘hit’ (*pēh₁-s̪) - and *VējH- in LIV, resp.) is a desideratum; the Slavic data and references to earlier treatments are now conveniently available in Dybo 2000: 304-309).

24 For the phonological development in Goidelic compare *sentu- (Gothic sinþs ‘time; passage’) > *sēt-us (Middle Welsh hýnt) > *sētuh > *sēdu > sēт ‘road’
ment’ or *ajisto- ‘hot’ (Old English āst ‘oven’) → *ajistu- ‘heat’ (Latin aëstus). It seems therefore that Celtic *dantah is another piece of evidence against a reconstruction *demh₂-

2.3. Let us take stock of what we have learned so far. We have seen that a number of derivatives from the root *dem(h₂)- show no laryngeal reflex. In some cases laryngeal loss could be accounted for, but often at the cost of invoking rather complex apparatus. Some cases present serious problems (δάμωδον, supposedly with a laryngeal loss in the first member of a compound, vs. τάλατ(-εργός) without it). Lastly, there are cases which simply cannot be reconciled with the reconstruction *demh₂- and require an anṭit root *dem- (Hittite dameta(r), Middle Irish dēt, Middle Welsh deint – supposing both these etymologies are correct). Thus it behooves us to scrutinize the evidence in favor of a reconstruction *demh₂-

3. Final *h₁ is reconstructed for the root *demh₂- on the basis of Greek evidence alone: δέμας ‘body’, perf. mid. δέδημη- and (θέω/- σιώ/- ἐπί/- εὼ-/) νεω-δηµή̯/άτος. The basic thrust of this proposal (to be critically discussed below) is that δέµας (= *demh₂-s-) is structurally parallel to *ğerh₂-s- in Greek γῆρας ‘old age’ / γέρας ‘prize of honor’ while -δηµή̯/άτος ( = *dmh₂-to-) is morphologically equivalent to *grh₂-no- in Vedic jārṇa-, Latin grānum.

---

26 Beekes 1969: 198 argued that Old Indic dāma- (RV, AV, VS) with a short vowel in the root points to a set root, too, since otherwise ’dāma- would have been expected in accordance with Brugmann’s Law. I do not think this argument is compelling: on the one hand, analogy could play its part, cf. Vedic plavā- < *plauṣ-; on the other hand, dāma- and Latin domus need not be a complete match to Greek δόμος ‘house’ < *dōmo-. Meier-Brügger 1977 suggested that unexpected feminine gender of the Latin word and somewhat unexpected distribution of the attested forms can be explained by assuming that Old Indic dāma- and Latin domus are not old thematic nouns, but rather innovative forms back-formed to the locative form of the root noun *dom- / *dem- (Latin domi, Old Indic dāme < *dem-o); same strategy is employed by Volkart 1994: 2.

Latin dominus can be straightforwardly traced back to *domh₂-no- ( > Proto-Italic *domano-) with an exocentric suffix -no- (e.g. Greek πυκνός ‘dense, firm, compact’ derived from a root noun, a fossilized reflex of which is found in Greek πύκνος). However, the reconstruction *domh₂-no- is not beyond question; it is equally possible to posit *domh₁n-o- with a thematicized Hoffmann’s suffix (J. Schindler and H. Eichner apud Peters 1980: 172, Fn. 124; see Nussbaum 1996; 1998b for *h₁) or a delocatival *dom-en-o-, which would be derivationally related to the Greek στ(ή)-stem δούμα, δοματος. Similarly, Old Indic dāmānas- cannot be cited in support of a laryngeal, since an -s stem derived from a thematic stem *domh₂u-no- ( > *domuh₂-no-) is not the only possible analysis: under the theory of decasulative possessive derivation one might think of *domuh₂-no- ‘having *domu-, the head of the household’ (see Pinault 2000).
3.1. Let us begin by considering δέμας ‘body’ which at first glance may indeed seem a strong argument in favor of the reconstruction *demh₂: δέμας can be straightforwardly parsed as *demh₂-s-, an s-stem, derived directly from the verbal root. There can be little doubt that the declension in -ας, -ος (δέμας Pl. Pae. 6.80) is original in this word, since the general tendency is for the -as-stems to be replaced (or partly replaced) by normal -es-stems and not other way round. 27 Of course there are cases where the less ordinary -as- inflection seems to have spread at the expense of -es- (one such case is Homeric κόας ‘fleece’, Pl. κόντα, beside Mycenaean ko-wo /kōmos/), but these can as a rule be explained by a formal or semantic point of contact with another -as- stem (in case of κόας words from adjacent semantic field are κρέας ‘flesh’ and κέρας ‘horn’). In the case of δέμας it is not immediately obvious that a word with the meaning ‘bodily frame’ could be conceived of as belonging to the group of words denoting body parts: apparently the oldest meaning of δέμας is just ‘form’ (e.g. P 323 δέμας Περίφαντι ξοικός ‘taking upon him the form of Periphas’), and the same meaning is found in the adverbial usage ‘in form like X’ attested from the Iliad onwards. 29 It is thus unlikely that an original *δέμος was reshaped into δέμας under the influence of such words as κόας, -πέλας or κρέας and so the antiquity of the -ας stem declension of δέμας seems to be securely established.

Nonetheless, the analysis of δέμας as an s-stem, derived directly from a set root *demh₂ is not fully satisfactory. In fact, in the small group of the neuter s-stem nouns in -ας there are only two (in fact, one) noun that

27 E.g. γέρας, Mycenaean ke-ra (PY Eb 416; Ep 704) vs. plural τέρας in Ionic prose or τέρας, plural τέρατα, vs. τέρατα (Hdt. 8.37.8) and τέρατα (with a metrical lengthening) in Homer and in IG 4(1).129.9. We find a similar replacement of -αo- by -eo- in denominative verbal stems in -αυο-, for instance in Delphic -τιμόντες (The suffix -αυο- goes back to *-αιο- < *-αι-je-αιο- and the shortening is either analogical to primary *h₂-o-conjugation i-present where the sequence -αιo- with a short /a/ is due to the AHH rule (e.g. δεκαo from *drek₂-i; see Jasanoff 2003: 110-111) or is morphologically driven, based on forms from stems in *-h₂- (> -ι) that had -αι- by sound law, e.g. adjectives in -αιος < *αιιο-< *αιο-< *αιιο- or Loc. Sg. forms in *-αι such as found in μεσατίπος, etc.), see Peters 1980: 175, Fn. 126). This replacement of -αo- by -eo- can be explained in two ways: either we are dealing with an Ionic and Western Greek sound law -αo- > -eo- (thus Schmidt 1889: 326; Forsman 1966: 157) or the change is sporadic and analogical (Méndez Dosuna 1985: 221-225, followed by Nussbaum 2002).
28 See Hackstein 1989: 51-53 on the variations of this formula (δέμας + Dat. + ξοικός / ἐκονια / ἐκτητοῦ / ἵππε). 29 A 596 δέμας πυρός αθιμόνου ‘as it were a flaming fire’; cf. also Ν 763, Π 366, Σ 1 (see Schwyzer 1950: 551); note the ancient explanation (Sch. b'T ad Σ 1): τινὸς δέμας τὸ σῶμα, τὸ δὲ σῶμα εἴδος, εἴδος δὲ ὁ τρόπος.
can be analyzed as a primary s-stem derived directly from a root in final laryngeal: this is Greek γήρας ‘old age’ and γέρας ‘prize of honor’, both from *gěrh₂-s-, the root of Vedic júrayati-, Greek ἔγκραπ (LI1² 165). All other s-stem nouns in -ας seem to have a different derivational history.

The first thing to notice is that /a/ in the -ας stems does not always go back to a final laryngeal of the root: some α’s in this class are clearly secondary, witness σέβας ‘awe’ from the root *tjeg*- (the Old Indic root tvaj-) has no set features whatsoever: titiks-, atyāksam31 or δέρας ‘skin, hide’ (there is no evidence for a laryngeal in the root of δέρας, Lithuanian derū, Tocharian A tsretār, B tṣratār). However, the structure of δέμας cannot be meaningfully explained by a mere reference to these cases (obscurum per obscursus!). The other, and more promising alternative, is to argue that in the case of δέμας we are dealing with *h₂ as a derivational morpheme.

The hypothesis that at least some -ας stems contain a reflex of *h₂- which is not a part of the root finds independent support in phonology. As is well known, laryngeal-induced effects in Greek are not limited to vocalization; another important phonological reflex is the aspiration of voiceless consonants by a following *h₂ (T > Tʰ /h₂).32 The Indo-European word for ‘night’ provides a particularly illustrative example: Old Indic kṣāp- and Avestan xšap- (YAv. xšapan-) go back to a root

---

30 Another commonly cited case of a primarily s-stem made to CERH root is Greek κράας ‘(raw) meat’ (= Old Indic kravīṭ), but here the situation is possibly more complex (see Nussbaum 1986: 149). In short, the issue depends on the correct evaluation of the enigmatic form κρᾱά (synchronically a plural to κράας), which may go back to Proto-Greek *kreása with hyphaeresis (Sommer 1957), provided the rule is formulated in a way that would allow hyphaeresis to apply in Nom.-Acc. *kreása, but not in Gen. Pl. *kṛēsā/sin (kṛēsā / kṛēsā).

31 σοβάρ(‘qw9ς’scaring birds away’ is a bit of a problem, but it hardly renders a *tjeg*h₂- likely: most probably, -α-grade is due to σοβάρς, and -αρ- is a productive suffix; use of -αρ- might have been triggered by analogy to γεράς: γέρας, cf. σοβάρς in the sense ‘pompous, swaggering’.

32 See Praust 2000 on the alleged set morphology in Indo-Iranian (YV+ dūrayate, ŚB drñyāt and intensives 1 Sg. dādarinī, 3 Sg. conj. dādārat).

33 It is unclear whether or not this aspiration was operative already in Proto-Indo-European (nevertheless, compare 2 Sg. perf. act. ending in Old Indic vēthta = Greek olōθa). A discussion of Indo-Iranian examples is available in Mayrhofer 1986: 135-139 and Mayrhofer 2005: 110-115. For Greek the aspiration process can be claimed on the basis of the following examples: 1) σγᾶω ‘to cleave’ ~ Old Indic -χψάτ < *skrēh₂-s- / *skh₂-s- (Isaebart 1988: 355, Fn. 16); 2) ὀπροθ< vs. ὀπροθδος < *(h₁-ores)-tēθ-s, sīh-ēς (Peters 1991-1993); 3) κουδρὰς ‘pure’, κουδρό ‘purify’ ~ Old Indic sīthārə-, sṛathārət < *krh₂-s-, *krth-j-e-o- (<Krth₂-s-, *Krth-j-e-o-?) with a dissimilatory loss of first /i/ (Peters 1993: 95-101); 4) πλάθουν ‘a mould for baking’ < *plh₂-no (Rasmussen 1989: 83); 5) πύθος ′grief’ < *kʰemh₂-β-os (A. J. Nussbaum apud Neri 2005: 220, Fn. 72); 6) σφῆ ‘edge’ < *sph₂-ën- (Vine 2002[2006]).
*k*sep- ‘night’ and show no laryngeal reflex; the absence of a laryngeal
is further confirmed by Hittite ḫuspended.34 A Greek word that in
my opinion certainly belongs in this family is the neuter s-stem in -ας ψέφας
‘darkness’ (Pi. Fr. 324 Schroeder).35 The protoform for ψέφας can be
straightforwardly reconstructed as *k*sep-h₂-s- and the aspirated /pʰ/ can
be explained as an outcome of *-ph₂-; this stem is derived from
*k*sep-h₂- by addition of a suffixal *-s- (on which see below).36 The
form *k*sep-h₁ would be a collective plural to the root noun *k*sep-37, but
while in late Proto-Indo-European *k*sep-h₂ (as other collective
plurals of animate nouns) functioned as part of the inflectional
paradigm of *k*sep-, at an earlier stage *k*sep-h₂ and similar
formations had a derivational status and as such could serve as a basis
for secondary derivatives of different kinds. The following derivational
chain can thus be posited:

root noun *k*sep- ‘night’
→ *h₂-stem *k*sep-h₂ ‘(collection of) nights’ (coll.)38
→ s-stem *k*sep-h₂-s ‘single night’.

34 On the morphology of this group see Nussbaum 1998b, Rau 2007a: 289 and
Nikolaev 2009.
35 Galenus cites the word as Pindaric: τὸ γάρ σκότος ψέφας εἰρήθαι καὶ παρὰ
Πυθαῖο (16.763 Kühn). O. Schroeder included this quotation into his edition as fr. 324,
while B. Snell and H. Maehler refer the reader to Nem. 3, 41 (assuming that Galenus
was commenting on the adj. ψεφην used in that ode). The word ψέφας was known to
Herodian and Theognostus, who have included it in their lists of -ας stems (De prosodia
catholica, Grammatici Graeci 3, 1, 392, 5 Lenz; Canones sive de orthographia 448, 4
Cramer). The lexicographers were familiar with this word as well: we find ψέφας, τὸ
σκότος in Hesychius’Lexicon (κ 1529; ψ 139). Several derivatives of ψέφας are also
attested: ψεφην, ψεφαῖον and ψεφαρ. Therefore despite the absence of literary
attestations there are no reasons to doubt the existence of the word ψέφας.
36 In my opinion, ψέφας is very unlikely to be a remodeling of *τ/ν-stem *ψέφαρ
(Benveniste 1935: 33); Benveniste’s theory was in great part based on the idea that a
*-ro- derivative should be ultimately based on a *r-stem, hence his reconstructions
*ψέφαρ (beside ψεφην) and *ψέφαρ (beside ψεφην), but this view has been shown to
be without foundation, since in Proto-Indo-European there was an independent
adjective-forming suffix *-ro- that was derivationally unrelated to *τ/ν-stems
37 The root noun *k*sep- was animate and it had a regular count plural *k*sep-ες
‘individual nights’ and a dual *k*sep-h₁; however, given its semantics, it could also
have a collective plural meaning ‘nights’. See Eichner 1985, Melchert 2000 and Rau
2009b: 43-45 for a discussion of the four-way number contrast in animate nouns in
Proto-Indo-European.
38 The relationship between the root noun and its ablauting *h₂- derivative is the
same as between ἀληθής ‘strength’, ἀλήθει in PN vs. ἀλήθει (in ἀλήθει πεποιθός E 299+).
Similar cases are Vedic ḫarē / ḫā / idā-, Gāthic īzā- vs. Vedic īr-, Avestan īr- or Old
Indic viṣ-, Avestan viṣ-, and Greek οἶκων(ε) (‘ins Heimwesen’ according to J.
Wackernagel, whose solution was recently supported by Larsson 2007).
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The existence of an intermediary *-h₂-derivative in the derivational prehistory of several -ας stems can be supported on the morphological side as well. One relevant case is τὸ λέπας ‘rock’, where an *-h₂-derivative *lep-h₂ can be posited on the basis of λεπάς -άος ‘limpet’. λεπάς is derived according to the following pattern:

verbal abstract (h₂-stem) *bʰug-eh₂- (> φυγή)
   → o-stem *bʰug-h₂-o-
   → d-stem *bʰug-h₂-ed- > φυγάς, φυγάδος. 39

We can posit the following derivational chain:
root noun *lop/-lep- (> λόψ (?))
   → h₂-stem *lep-h₂- ‘what is peeled’ (collective)
   → o-stem *lep-h₁-o-
   → d-stem *lep-h₂-ed- > λεπάς -άος.
   → *lep-h₂-s- ‘what is peeled’ (singulative) > ‘a single scalped rock’ > λέπας -ας

Both λέπας -ας and λεπάς -άος are thus based on *lep-h₂ derived from the root noun *lop/-lep- (cf. Greek λέπω), which did not have a final laryngeal.

This analysis can be extended to a number of Greek stems in -ας and cannot be pursued here in detail. My general claim is that at least some stems with this suffix are products of secondary derivation and result from addition of a suffix *-s- to a stem in *-h₂-.

The function of the s-stem formant can be termed “singulativizing”. 40
As a parallel compare *peku-s- in the Latin s-stem pecus, pecoris

40 The term “singulativizing” is due to Johan Caspar Zeuss (1871: 294) who coined it in order to describe the situation in Brittonic languages that is surprisingly close to the scenario proposed here for Proto-Indo-European: cf. Breton pesk ‘fish’ → pesked-enn ‘the fish’ (collective) → peskedem-ou ‘several heads of fish’ (plural of singulative). Importantly, some nouns that feed singulative derivation in Breton are syntactically singular (as an *-h₂-derivative would be in Proto-Indo-European), for instance, dero ‘oak-wood’ → derv-enn (see Trépos 1968: 67).
As a further typological parallel compare the situation in Arabic: baṭar ‘cattle’ → baṭ-ū ‘a cow’ (Tripoli Arabic), baṭar-u ‘cattle’ → baṭar-at-u ‘a cow’ (Classical Arabic). Similarly to Breton, Arabic singulatives can be pluralized (Classical Arabic baṭar-at-u ‘several cows’) and the collective base, too, can have a plural (Classical Arabic abqar-at ‘different kinds of cattle’), see Acquaviva 2008: 195-233 for a discussion from a theoretical perspective. Differently from Breton, however, Arabic...
‘lifestock; a single animal’ (the latter meaning is probably original) which is derived from the *peku- ‘cattle’ (Old Indic pāṣu-/paśū-, Lithuanian pėku-) or Cuneiform Luvian tāruš- ‘statue’ (*‘a single piece of wood’) derived from *doru- ‘wood (material)’ (Cuneiform Luvian Gīšāru-, Old Indic dāru-). A further example which is particularly close to the case of δέμας is the s-stem κέρας ‘horn’ (< *Ker-h2-s) which, according to the analysis developed by Nussbaum 1986: 149-153, was derived from a proterokinetic stem *Ker-h2- ‘horn (material)’ (continued by Mycenaean kerā and Hittite karā-).\(^1\)

We have thus seen that δέμας ‘bodily frame’ could be analyzed as a secondary derivative from a stem *dem-h2- where *-h2- is a derivational morpheme; structurally *dem-h2-s would then be comparable to κέρας < *Ker-h2-s which is ultimately derived from an anīt root *Ker-. However, this parallel can only become attractive if a comparable derivational chain is demonstrated.

3.2. Now the question is whether there is any evidence for a nominal stem *dem-h2- ‘what is build, amassed, grown’ or the like. This evidence is available in Anatolian: the crucial form is Hieroglyphic Luvian tā-mi-hi-sā (karatepe 296) Acc.Sg. neut. of a stem tamiḥiṭ- ‘abundance, prosperity’.\(^2\) Ever since this word was first read and correctly interpreted it was compared to Hittite dam(m)etar (discussed above), but an important point has been ignored: tamiḥiṭ- matches dam(m)etar not only in meaning, but also in the uniqueness of its suffixal vocalism, since the usual shape of abstract/collective suffixes in Hittite and Luvian is -ātar and -āḫiṭ, resp.\(^3\) As Eichner (1973: 59-60)

collective is not an inflectional category and is not productively derived from singulars of any sort.

\(^1\) The singulativizing semantics can be further illustrated by the word σκέπας ‘shelter, covering’; this word refers to a specific kind of covering, for instance, in the Odyssey (i: 442-5) σκέπας describes a shelter from the wind. The meaning of σκέπας is thus different from the meaning of σκέπη which means ‘protection’ in general: τά δεύμα τῶν σκέπης ‘assailable body-parts’ (Xen. iii.10.9.4), ἐν σκέπη τοῦ φῶτον ‘out of danger’ (Hdt. i.143.2). The etymology of σκέπας is unknown, but, importantly, we find a possible reflex of a collective plural in *-h2 in the form σκέπα (Hes. Op. 532), unless the form is a (nom.-acc. pl. from a neuter stem in -ας (i.e. a substitute of *σκέπα / *σκέπη) formed after κρῖς : κρῖα (on which see above) and γιρα : γιρά (itself possibly secondary to γρά), see Sommer 1957: 147.


\(^3\) In Hittite -ātar / -ān derives collectives (e.g. antuḫḫa- ‘man’ > antuḫšatār ‘population, people’, ḫaššatar ‘family’) and abstract nouns, from nouns (e.g. LŪ ‘man’ > LŪ-nūtar ‘manhood’), from adjectives (e.g. palḫi- ‘broad’ > palḫātar ‘broadness’, aššu- ‘good’ > aššāyātar ‘the good’) and from verbs (ēpp- / app- ‘take, seize’ > appātar
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and Watkins (1975: 364) have shown, -(ā)ḥit is a usual Luvian way of treating Indo-European *-(e)h₂- stems and the same is true for the Hittite suffix -(ē)tar. It is therefore a priori plausible to assume that taniḥit- and dam(m)etar, too, have an *-h₂-stem in their derivational prehistory.

There is a competing account which, however, is beset with difficulties: prior to the identification of the Luvian form Watkins (1979: 657) cautiously derived Hittite dam(m)etar from a static verbal stem *dm-eh₁- (he was followed by Eichner 1986: 446 and Rieken 1999: 256). There are three problems with this account.

First of all, there is no supporting evidence for a stem with a static suffix *-eh₁- made from the root *dem(h₂)- in any Indo-European language. A stem *demh₂-eh₁- is reconstructed in LIV² 115 on the

1. taking'). See Kammenhuber 1954: 418-436; Rieken 1999: 380-382. Instances of -ātar are also found in Cuneiform Luvian (e.g. ḫārat(u)tar ‘offence’) and Lycian (wawādra ‘herd’, see Hajnal 1993: 137).

The same is true for Luvian -āḥit, with the important exception that -āḥit is not used for the derivation of verbal abstracts; compare Cuneiform Luvian adūqalāḥit- ‘evil’ (subst.), āsūlāḥit- ‘femininity’, Hieroglyphic Luvian ḫasuqalāḥit- ‘kingdom’. Note that Luvian -āḥit is the exact equivalent of Hittite -ātar with respect to both function and derivational morphology: Luvian annarumaḥit = Hittite innarawatar, Luvian ḫattulāḥit = Hittite šaddalatar, etc., as has been noted ever since Larocchi 1959: 139. A list of Luvian stems in -āḥit is available in Starke 1990: 153-176, who, however, views this type as “nomina actionis”, not recognizing that this suffix is exclusively denominal.

4² A relic *-eh₂ stem not extended by further collective/abstract forming suffixes in Hittite is *miyāḥ- ‘maturity, growth’ in *miyāḥant- (LÚŠU.GI-ant-) and its verbal derivatives miyāḥ(s)uandaḥṭ- / miyāqant- ‘to make old’, miyāḥante- ‘to become old, to live long’ and miyāḥuntešš- ‘to grow old’ (Eichner 1973: 59).

4² The origin of the suffix -āḥit is an old crux (see Bernabé 1981 (with extensive bibliography), Hajnal 1993 and Ledo-Lemos 2003) and most recently Rau (2009: 48-49 Fz. 35). At least from a synchronic point of view, we evidently have to do mostly with determinative formations (out of thirty stems in -āḥit that I am aware of only Cuneiform Luvian *warrāḥit ‘help’ and annarumaḥit ‘virility’ are interpretable as verbal abstracts); this seems also to be acknowledged by Rau, i.e., who otherwise seems to accept Starke’s claim of an (original) deverbative function. For this reason, I would like to adopt the second of the two diachronic explanations suggested for this suffix by Rau, viz. “that the stem type developed directly out of the substantivization of i-stem adjectives or agentive i-stem substantive” made to stems in -h₂. Note in any event that Palaic yarlaḫiš ‘?i’ and purtaḫiš ‘flaw’ signaled by Watkins (1975: 217) may in theory be precisely the instances of i-stem substantives in *(eh)₂-, viz. the putative intermediate stage from which abstracts in -āḥit (><*-eh₂-it) are derived by a substantivizing i-stem suffix (less attractive is Eichner’s (1973: 59-60) comparison to Greek -āi-). It is worth mentioning that the problematic element *(e)j- found in Greek γυνικ-, Phrygian κυνικ-, Albanian (pl.) grë and Armenian kanavš ‘women’ most probably does not have anything to do with the problem at hand: Oettinger (2004) has recently traced this stem to a hysterokinetic internal derivative of the i-stem found in Indo-Iranian and Germanic; alternatively, we may simply accept a superaddition of “devi” suffix *(e)h₂-k-) to a lexicically feminine item (compare Latin mātrix ‘dam’).
evidence of Tocharian present stems A šamantār (class IV), B tsmetār (class III) ‘grows’ and preterite I B tsama⁴⁶; however, even though the meaning of the Anatolian forms tamīhit- and dam(m)etar may seem close to the meaning of the Tocharian verb, this reconstruction lacks conviction. The editors of LIV endorsed the view proposed by W. Cowgill and D. Ringe and later revived by J. Harðarson, according to which the Tocharian class III/IV presents go back to derived stative presents with a suffix *-h₁-je/o- (containing a zero-grade of the stative suffix *-eh₁-).⁴⁷ The phonological and morphological inadequacies of the “Cowgill-Ringe” explanation of Tocharian class III/IV presents and other formations cited in support of a reconstruction *-h₁-je/o- have been recently discussed by Jasanoff (2002-3) and there is no need to repeat his argumentation here. Other explanations have been proposed for these presents: Jasanoff (2002-3: 140-1; 2003: 157) traced them back to a pre-Tocharian thematized middle type characterized by non-alternating thematic vowel *-o-⁴⁸ and Pinault (2008: 578-580) in his recent outline of a historical grammar of Tocharian made a persuasive case for seeing at least a subpart of this class as denominative in origin.⁴⁹

As far as preterite I tsama is concerned, it, too, can be viewed as an argument in support of a reconstruction *dem(h₂)-eh₁- only under a rather complex set of assumptions. It is now nearly universally acknowledged that the historical nucleus at least of the one subclass of the Tocharian preterite I that had a root ablaut pre-Proto-Tocharian *-e-/ø were PIE root aorists from laryngeal final roots (from which the root-

⁴⁶ See the exhaustive documentation in Malzahn 2010: 984-987.
⁴⁸ See also Jasanoff 1978: 36-47.
⁴⁹ Developing an earlier suggestion of Cowgill (apud Ringe 1988-90: 87), Pinault suggests that the stem vowel in class III and IV presents (which he reconstructs as Common Tocharian *-æ-) can result from a contraction of *-āæ-, *-ēæ(ā)æ- or *-ā(ā)æ- and a whole slew of Indo-European verb formations (not necessarily denominative only) could thus be viewed as the starting point of Tocharian class III/IV presents (compare Hackstein’s (1998: 226) derivation of B orttoār, A arār ‘praise’ from *ārā(ā)æ- < *h₂rath₂-je/o- (with a “Lex Rix” type development of the initial *h₂-)). In this perspective the reflex of a lengthened grade vowel in Tocharian A reflex of our root, namely class IV present šamantār, is no longer puzzling, nor should it necessarily be particularly interesting from the morphological perspective: šamantār can be traced back to a proto-form *dēm-eh₂-je/o- of the same intensive type as Latin célāre, Greek πηδ(ʔ)ω (with an inner-Greek transformation *āe/o- > -ae/o-) or Latvian lēkāju ‘I jump about’ (I would like to use this opportunity to correct my earlier assessment in Nikolaev 2005).
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final pre-Proto-Tocharian *-a then could spread by analogy).\textsuperscript{50} It has also been argued convincingly that preterital formations with a suffix *-\text{e}(\text{h}2) > pre-Proto-Tocharian *-\text{a}- contributed to the Tocharian preterite I as well; the crucial evidence for this claim are the preterite participles belonging to class I preterites of the type B *kālpau, obl. *kālpọs ‘obtained’, which seem to presuppose pre-Proto-Tocharian *-āgos-.\textsuperscript{51} Several questions remain for further study, but whatever the precise function and history of the suffix *-\text{e}(\text{h}2) in the Indo-European verb may have been, it is not clear to me how Tocharian preterite I tsama can support the reconstruction of a verbal stem with a stative suffix *-\text{e}h1-.\textsuperscript{52}

While the jury may still be out on the questions of Tocharian verbal morphology, there are two more grave problems with the derivation of Luvian tamiḥit- and Hittite dam(m)etar from a stative stem *dem(\text{h}2)-eh1-. First, while in Hittite the suffix -\text{ā}ṭar / -\text{ā}nn- can be used to derive deverbal nouns\textsuperscript{53}; Luvian -\text{ā}ḥit- is exclusively denominal.\textsuperscript{54} Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, a sequence *-\text{e}h1- will not give Luvian /i/, since the expected reflex of *-\text{e}h1- in Luvian is /a/ (via a Luvo-Lycian *-\text{e} in Melchert’s reconstruction).\textsuperscript{55} Therefore the only way to reconcile morphologically unique suffixes of Luvian tamiḥit- and Hittite dam(m)etar is to posit a Proto-Anatolian *\text{e} in the suffix.

Now, since Hittite -\text{t}ar and Luvian -\text{i}t are ordinarily added to Anatolian reflexes of Indo-European *-\text{h}2-stems (see above), the conclusion is almost inescapable that in this case, too, the derivational basis was an *-\text{h}2-stem: Luvian tamiḥ- and Hittite dam(m)e- must then go back to *dmēH-, a reflex of a hysterokinetic collective stem *dmēh2-, *dmh2-ēs, independently enlarged with further suffixes in Hittite and Luvian. This hypothesis has the advantage of explaining the stem formant and the vocalism of the root of Luvian tamiḥit and Hittite dam(m)etar simultaneously.


\textsuperscript{51} These participles preserve a reflex of Proto-Tocharian *-\text{a}- < *-\text{e}h2-, while in the finite forms stem-final *ā was regularly and completely replaced by *-\text{e}h2- (which itself may have had different sources). See Jasanoff apud Förhallsdóttir 1988: 206; Ringe 1988-90: 95 and Pinault 2008: 598; the relevant forms have now been collected by Fellner 2007.

\textsuperscript{52} Note that Tocharian preterits I are usually listed in \textit{LIV} as reflexes of root aorists – save for tsama.

\textsuperscript{53} E.g. hūgatar ‘slaughter’ or infinitives in -\textit{anna}.

\textsuperscript{54} See Melchert 1989: 41, Fn. 28; I would like to thank H. C. Melchert for a most helpful discussion of the relevant Anatolian forms.

\textsuperscript{55} Melchert 1994: 265.
The hysterokinetic stem *dm-ēh₂- can now be analyzed as an internal derivative of the same proterokinetic stem *dem-h₂- which was posited above as a derivational basis of *dem-h₂-s- (to give Greek δέμας). The coexistence of an external derivative *dem-h₂-s- and an internal derivative *dm-ēh₂- finds a complete parallel in the following derivational chain (Nussbaum 1986: 149-152):

root *ker-
→ *ker-h₂- ‘horn (material)’ (> Myc. ke-rā)
→ *ker-h₂-s- ‘a (single) horn’ > κέρας
→ *kr-ēh₂- > κάρη ‘head’

Similarly:
root *dem- ‘to build; to grow’
root noun *do/em- ‘that what has (been) grown/built’
→ *dem-h₃- ‘a mass of things that have (been) grown/built’
→ *dem-h₂-s- > Greek δέμας
→ *dm-ēh₂- > Luvian tamēi- and Hittite dam(m)etar

3.3. The reconstruction of a *-h₂-stem made from the root *dem- can be further supported by Indo-Iranian *dmāna-, n. ‘house, dwelling place’ (Old Indic māna-, Old Avestan domāna-, Younger Avestan nmāna-). While several accounts of the form *dmāna- are in theory possible, the most likely explanation in my opinion is to trace this form back to a Romānus-type adjective, substantivized as a neuter *dmēh₂-no-”. It is impossible to say with certainty whether the adjec-

56 Note also the Indo-Iranian verbal stem *(d)māna- ‘to dwell, to remain’ (YAvestan maṇa-tāt, Choresmian m ny- ‘to live’); while it is likely that in Iranian the reflexes of *dmāna- blended with those of *man- ‘to wait’, it is less desirable to derive all of the verbal forms from a causative-iterative stem *(d)menje- *(meh- ‘to wait’) unattested in Old Indic or other Indo-European languages and so a denominative (d)māna- is a likely option (see Cheung 2008: 74).

57 The Old Persian hapax māniyam (DB i.65) is potentially interesting for the understanding of the meaning of Indo-Iranian *dmāna-: the word is attested in a phrase gaīθāmča māniyamča, where gaīθā- is likely synonymous with its Avestan cognate gaēθā- ‘livestock, herd’. The passage runs:

adam niyačārayam kārahayā abicarīš gaīθāmča māniyamča vitbīšēča
’I restored to the people the pastures, the livestock, the māniyam, and the houses’ (DB i.64-66; the exact meaning of abicarīš is unknown).

In this context vīth- can only mean ‘house’ and not ‘tribe’ or ‘court’; the presence of vīth- in this enumeration suggests, in turn, that the meaning of the word māniyam is not simply ‘household’ or ‘house’. Indeed, Bartholomae in his dictionary translated māniyam as ‘liegende Gabe’ and Gray (1900: 16) as ‘real estate’ (Lühr 1997 posited a more specialized meaning ‘Hausgesinde’). Therefore it is not implausible to assume that...
tival stem was *dmeh₂-nó- or it had a zero grade of the root (in which case the full grade of subst. *dmeh₂-nó- would result from a vowel insertion accompanying the shift of accent in the substantivization process).\(^{58}\)

Another word for which a similar derivation can be entertained is Latin māteriēs / -ia ‘wood as building material, timber’ (contrasted with lignum ‘firewood’), later ‘any substance of which a physical object is made’. The comparison to māter ‘mother’ was advocated by reputable scholars and persists in etymological dictionaries\(^{59}\), but even though a connection between māter and māteriēs was sensed in the antiquity (cf. Lucretius’ word pun terra mater… materies (1.166-171; 2.993-1002)), the semantic side of this comparison remains unsatisfactory.\(^{60}\) I find the alternative solution proposed by Osthoff 1893 (who was followed by Kent 1932: 90) much more plausible: Osthoff suggested that māteriēs is related to the root *dmeh₂- and traced the Latin word back to a derivative from an agent noun *dmāter- ‘Erbauer’, with the meaning ‘die zum Zimmermann zugehörige Masse’.

I believe that the root connection is correct, but the morphological details of this reconstruction can be improved. Under assumption that -eriēs contains a rhotacized *-s-, māteriēs can be plausibly analyzed as a derivative of an s-stem abstract noun *dmātees-; compare for this type of derivation Old Indic tāvīś- ‘strength’ = Gāthic touīšī ‘id.’ derived from an -s-stem *tauīš- (Gāthic touīš- ‘violence, force’ Y. 29.1).\(^{61}\) For

gaiθāmčavmāniyamča is an inherited poetic figure that was borrowed from a different (possibly, Avestan) text and was remastered and amplified for the purposes of the Old Persian royal inscription (the ungrammaticality of instr.-abl. pl. viğiš used with a connector čā speaks in favor of this suggestion). gaiθāmčavmāniyamča is thus a merism the meaning of which is essentially equivalent to the meaning of Hittite iyatá damēta or English goods and chattels and māniyam can thus be viewed as a link between Iranian *dmāṁa- and Hittite dametar.

58 Compare *h₂érto ‘truth; cosmic order’ (Gāthic aša-) derived from adj. *h₂ṛtō- ‘ordered, established’ (Vedic ṛt-, n.).


60 Most uses of ‘mother’ in the jargon of construction workers cited by Bréal and Solmsen in defense of the derivation of māteriēs from māter are based on two semantic notions: 1) the idea of the chief element in a construction (e.g. Russian dial. matka ‘main beam, supporting girder’) and 2) the gender metaphor: a screw nut (e.g. German Schraubenmutter) is a female counterpart to the screw. Neither of these ideas leads to māteriēs ‘timber’.

61 Importantly, most Latin verbal or adjective abstracts in -iēs/-iās- apparently go back to Indo-European “dev(?F)” declension in *-iēh₂-/*-iēh₂, even though the nominative ending -iēs possibly continues a hysterokinetic *-jiēh₂-s (see Steinbauer apud Mayrhofer 1986: 133): compare Latin māciēs ‘leaness’ < *mač-ih₂, prōgeniēs ‘offspring’ < *-genh₁-ih₂- vs. Old Indic sāč- ‘might’ < *kek-ih₂-, Germanic *agaīō- ‘edge’ < *h₂ek-
Latin possible derivational parallels are limited to two examples: *(in)temperiēs* ‘(in)moderateness’, the derivational basis of which is likely to be *tempus, -oris* and *caesariēs* ‘lock of hair’ if this word should be analyzed as a compound **kajkro-kseh₂-es-* (Pinault 1998). The derivational basis *dmātes-* (viz.*dmeh₂-tes*) ‘lumped mass’ would be an abstract of an adjectival stem *dm(e)h₂-to-*; this derivational model is known from examples such as Old Indic *pārīṇas-* ‘riches’ vs. *pūrṇā-* ‘full’, *πηρός* ‘disability’ vs. *πηρός* ‘disabled’, Old Indic *dравinas-*; Avestan *draonah-* n. ‘movable property’ vs. Old Indic *dравīna-* n. ‘wealth, property’ (almost certainly derived from *dравіна- ‘opulent’).

We have thus reconstructed a stem *dm(e)h₂-to-* ‘lumped together’ which is best interpreted as a *barbātus* type derivative with a possessive *-to*-suffix ‘having *dmeh*’. This meaning is close to the meaning of Greek *δέμας*; on the whole, Osthoff’s etymology of *māteriēs* provided here with a modern morphological interpretation is more attractive than the standard comparison to *māter*.

Neither Indo-Iranian *dmāna-* nor Latin *māteriēs* by themselves can be seen as evidence adequate to establish the existence of a nominal stem *dm-h₂*, since several alternative analyses are possible in either case. Nevertheless, the proposed morphological interpretation of these two cases squares nicely with the reconstruction *dm-h₂ → DM* that is required by Hieroglyphic Luvian *tamih(it)-*, Hittite *dame(ta(r))* and looks very plausible for Greek *δέμας*.

### 3.4.

We have thus come full circle. It is now possible to sketch a complete derivational history and account for the change of meaning at every derivational cycle. The derivational chain runs as follows:

---

ih₂, etc. Indo-Iranian *tāğišā* is therefore directly comparable to our *(d)meh₂-tes-ih₂. On the function and derivational morphology of Latin -iē- / -ī- stems see Klingenschmitt 1992: 127-128 and Weiss 2009: 323.

62 Leumann 1977: 285 posits adv. *(in)temperi ‘zur (Un)zeit’ as an intermediate stage: while not necessary morphologically, this insight is useful for the understanding of the semantics of *(in)temperiēs.*


The nominal derivatives from the root ‘to build’ therefore provide no serious evidence in favor of a reconstruction of a sej root *demh₂-.

4. We are now at last in a position to turn to the verbal system of the root *dem- in Greek: it comprises a present stem δέμευ(h)/o- (attested in Mycenaean), an aorist stem ἐδέμα (from *(e)-dem-s₂, as it were) and a middle perfect stem δέδομη- (Ionic-Attic) / δεδομη- (Doric).

65 This u-stem is directly reflected in OCS domъ- and indirectly in Old Indic dāmēnas (see Pinault 2000) and in Armenian tanow(tér) ‘master of the house’ (Olsen 1999: 674). Latin domus shows occasional u-stem forms, but these mostly do not appear in Old Latin. Nevertheless, the Latin word merits a longer discussion; its unexpected feminine gender as well as the distribution of the forms have led several scholars to wonder whether the word really continues an inherited thematic stem *dómo- (Greek δόμος, Nomen Rei Actae). M. Meier-Brügger (1977) suggested that Latin domus with its thematic declension is an innovation based on the locative of the root noun *dom/- *dem- and Volkart 1994: 2 argued for a similar scenario for Old Indic dāma (see above, Fn. 26). In the light of these analyses the u-stem forms of domus should be revisited: while it is possible to assume that due to its anomalous gender the original thematic stem domus was secondarily transferred to this declension, it is more likely in my opinion that such isolated forms as the ablative domū Pl. Mi. 126 preserve an inherited inflectional pattern of a u-stem (on this issue see Wackernagel 1912 (1953): 17 (984), Fn. 1, Sommer 1948: 404-405; Hofmann 1931).

As far as the origin of this *domu- is concerned, the meaning of this stem seems to be identical to that of *domu/- *dem- and it is therefore unlikely that we are dealing with derivation in this case; it is more probable that *domu- was back-formed to a locative *dm-øy sel sim. (so Brugmann 1906: 180 and, following him, Widmer 2008: 624-625, Fn. 20).

66 *dm-øy- may thus be an internal genitival derivative of *dom-u-, see Neri 2003: 106, Fn. 278. However, genitival derivatives are normally not produced by internal yodification and therefore an alternative solution would assume the root noun *do-em- as the derivational basis of *dm-øy-; cf. *ph₂-ter- ‘father’ → *ph₂-øy- ‘ascendant kinsman on the father’s side’ (gloss after Rau [forthcoming] which should as well be consulted for the suffix *-øy-). This approach to the morphology of δόμος was taken by Widmer 2008, who regards the stem *dm-øy- as a hypostasis on a locative *dm-øy (from the root noun *do/em-). Under either morphological analysis this derivation accounts for the phonological shape of Greek δόμος, see above, Fn.7.
4.1. First it should be mentioned that pres. δέμω, aor. ἔδειμα, fut. (*δεμέω) is a highly atypical *Averbo for a set root of the structure CeRH: normally roots of this type appear in Greek with a thematic aorist or a sigmatic aorist in -"V(σ)-" (where "V = ε/α/ο"), a future in -"V(σ)-ε/ο-" and a nasal present or a present in -"V-ε/ο-".  

4.2. Moreover, the fut. (*δεμέ(ψ)ε/ο- (Mycenaean Nom. Pl. Part. Fut. de-me-o-te 'going to build' PY An 35) shows deviant phonology: /demos/ontes/ cannot go back to *demh-. R. Lipp (LIV²: 115, Fn. 7) argued that this form shows a "productive *-eso-", but this assumption is unlikely to be correct. While the Mycenaean data is too scanty to allow any definite conclusions regarding the productivity of *-eso- (at the expense of *-aso- and *-oso-), one may wonder why da-ma-o-te[ (KN X 1051), a future participle from the root of δάμνημα (IE *damh₂) did not undergo a similar change. In general, the -"ao-" future is altogether not so badly preserved in 1st millennium Greek, as one would think, consider the following sample from Homer: δάμα 'overpower', περίαν 'sell', ἐλάαν 'drive', ἐνετελα 'mock', ἀντίαν (Ü) 'encounter' plus κρῆμω 'hang' (with Zerdehnung).  

It seems therefore that a remodelling of original *demhe/o- is not something one necessarily expects.  

More importantly, one wonders what could have triggered such a replacement of *-aso- (from *-h₂-(h)so-) by -"eso-" in this case. It is of course true that Greek often restores e-vocalism in productive morphological categories, for instance in the u-stem declension (πλατάς, πλατέα from the root *pleth₂) or in the futures (e.g. καμέττα, which belongs with κάμνο, ἅκματος, root *kemh₂) but the substitution of ordinarily looking forms of the type ὀμείται for (*)ομούται (Cretan OMOTAI, root *h₂emh₂) was well supported by the regular patterns of the language: the alternations -όμαι : -έται and


68 Future, according to Meister 1921: 94, Fn. 1.


71 As is well known, the expected outcome of *plh₂-ε- with a laryngeal coloration is found in the place name Πλαταια.

72 See Bile 1988, Nr. 2; OMOTAI was first interpreted as a verbal 3 Sg. form by Galavotti 1977: 130-135.
-ωματ : -ηται were already available in the system and hence -οματ (-ο-) : -είται (-ε-) could have been tolerated.\(^{72}\) It is hard to find a comparable pattern that would have supported a replacement of 3 Sg. fut. *demahetoι by *(*)demehetoι in Mycenaean.\(^{75}\)

It is therefore not unreasonable to speculate that Mycenaean de-me-o-te may actually preserve something old; the question is what exactly this form points to. Based on de-me-o-te, several scholars have advocated a reconstruction *demh₁-, assuming that a root shape *deme- was remade into *dema- after *dama- ‘overpower, subdue’ in later Greek.\(^{76}\) While such an analysis is in principle not impossible, in my opinion it is equally likely that the form de-me-o-te reflects a stem *dem- with a desiderative suffix *(h)E₁- added to it and thus goes back directly to *demh₁sE/o-o-, a straightforward case of a “liquid” future (compare *stel-E/hE/o- ‘will send’ (στελ(?'qw'ω) from *stel- or *men-E/hE/o- ‘will remain’ (μεν(?'qw'ω) from *men-).\(^{77}\)

The implication of this analysis is that de-me-o-te may be regarded as an indication of an anit character of *dem-, which cannot be otherwise inferred from the verbal system of this root in Greek, but would be compatible with other evidence we have seen thus far. Nonetheless, the form de-me-o-te is also compatible with a reconstruction *demh₁-. The point to emphasize so far is that the form de-me-o-te casts doubt upon

\(^{72}\) As was pointed out by A. J. Nussbaum (2002) and B. Forssman (2002) independently from one another.

\(^{75}\) Moreover, it is remarkable that the actually attested form de-me-o-te is a participle, where one would least expect to find the effects of such a remodeling: non-finite forms of the verb are notoriously more resistant to morphological change than other parts of the verbal paradigm. This can be illustrated by participles of some -αι verbs in West Greek, where a long /a/ (as a contraction result of an earlier *(h)αι-) is found in such forms as ὀπτάντες (Epich. fr. 164.2 Kaibel) or ἐπαγγείλαξεν (Sophr. fr. 60 Hordern); this phenomenon can be explained with Peters (1988-1990: 618) as an inherited property of factitive verbal stems in *(h)αι- (the newaẖi type) which in Proto-Greek had a long vowel *(h)αι as a stem marker (3 Sg. *neq̱ai, Pl. *neq̱aimai, *neq̱ai, *neq̱ante, see Rau 2009a): while West Greek (just like Attic-Ionic) in general replaced the inherited newaẖi-type by a reflex of the (likewise inherited) *(h)αι-je/o- denotative type and eliminated the long vowel in the present tense in favor of a short vowel (see above, Fn. 27), the long vowel was retained in these non-finite forms. That a form like ὀπτάντες originally belonged to the newaẖi type is clear from the morphology of the stem: ὀπταν/ο- is a factitive in -(h)αι/-o- derived from a *(h)αι- participle (the type of Slavic *πτειν 'make grow' (~ Toch A. pyäš-; < *pip̱h₁-h₁s-t-e-h₁-< -η+e-o-) ← *pih₂-h₁s-to-).

\(^{76}\) Ruijgh 1970: 316; Morpurgo-Davies 1985: 77, 103; Forssman 2002: 165.

\(^{77}\) Besides the “futurum atticum” the reflexes of *(h)αι- after liquids and nasals are preserved in Old Indic (3 Sg. Fut. Ind. Act. vanīṣyati < *(h)en-h₁s-je/o-, 3 Sg. Desid. Ind. Act. vivāṣati < *(h)ai-y̱h₁s-e/o-), in Celtic (Old Irish Fut. célaín, céla < *kiklāse/o- < *(h)ai-h₁s-e/o-), and in the Hittite iterative suffix -šš(a)-, e.g. ıšša- ‘perform’ (Jasanoff 2003: 134-135).
explanations of δεδμη- and -δμητος as direct reflexes of *de-dhm-t- and *dmt-t-, respectively. Equipped with this insight we may now proceed to the perfect forms.

### 4.3. As was mentioned in the beginning of this paper, “Doric” δεδμανται (Theoc. 15.120) and -δμητος in melic poetry are customarily cited as the prima facie evidence in support of a reconstruction *demp2- with a final *h2. However, if it can be shown that the /a/ in these forms does not go back to Proto-Greek and should rather be seen as “hyper-Doric”, the proper explicandum (and ultimately the most problematic form for the reconstruction of an ant *dem-pursued in this paper) will instead become the Homeric Ionic δεδη-. This middle perfect stem would still point to a laryngeal-final root, but δεδη- is ambivalent between *demp2- and *demp-1- and Mycenaean de-me-o-te would only be in agreement with the latter. The present task is therefore to examine the diagnostic value of δεδμανται and -δμητος.78

Any evidence coming from Theocritus is notoriously hard to use for any kind of linguistic inquiry. The manuscripts and the papyri alike are in a dialectal mess and, more importantly, the poet’s careful choice of dialect forms always carries implications for poetic meaning: Theocritus skillfully uses dialects to obtain the desired literary effect. The non-pastoral Idyll 15, where δεδμανται is attested, is a special case: it features two Syracusean women, resident in Alexandria, and we may therefore be tempted to search for genuine Doric forms in the poem (some such forms are indeed found, for instance, the third person plural pronoun ψε (v. 80) has recently been revealed by PHamburg 201).79

Further on, this idyll is remarkable for its metalinguistic awareness: when the women, Gorgo and Praxinoa, are criticized by an unnamed man in the crowd for their characteristic broadening of vowels, they retort by saying:

Πελοποννασιστι λαλείμες  
Δωρισδειν δ’ ἔξεσοι, δοκό, τοίς Δωρίσσεσι  
‘We are speaking a Peloponnesian dialect,  
and I suppose Dorians may talk Doric’ (v. 92-3)80

---

78 I am grateful to M. Peters for several important suggestions concerning the argument presented in the following section of this paper.  
79 See Hunter 1996: 121. This form is also found in Sophr. fr. 90 Hordern and Epich. fr. 113.381 Kaibel and may represent a sample of genuine Syracusean. See Hunter 1995: 155-157 for other possibly Syracusean forms in the idyll.  
80 It has not gone unnoticed that the nameless man who asks the women to be quiet, too, speaks in Doric: unless Syracusean Doric sounded “too broad” for speakers of other dialects.
This seems to indicate that δδῆμαται (which is nearly unanimously transmitted\(^{81}\)) is not likely to be a result of an editorial interference, i.e., a later superficial dialect normalization (“Doricising”) of the kind responsible for nonce forms such as ποιμάν (1.13; 8.9) or περ φαλάμεν/φάλασσα in Theocritean tradition. Whatever exactly the native dialect of Theocritus may have been\(^{82}\), it seems reasonable to regard δδῆμαται as a form that the poet actually used.\(^{83}\)

Nevertheless the form may still be a hyperdoricism dating back to the poet himself. Such cases are well known; one of them is the reflex of PIE *sēmi- ‘half’: while ἵμν- is well attested in epichoric Doric (e.g. ἤμισγονον in the Heraclean Tables, I 20), Archimedes constantly uses ἵμν- and ἰμνος.\(^{84}\) Other telling examples are νάφε ([(Epich.] fr. 250)\(^{85}\) and ἄβστων (Call. Hy. 5, 109).\(^{86}\) Similarly, in our case the perfect middle stem δδῆμα- can be viewed as an attempt to render an Ionic (Homeric) form in Doric by a mere substitution of /ā/ for /ǭ/; as a close parallel to this process compare τμάθεις/τμάμα in Archimedes (e.g. τμαμάτων I 270,19), derived from a root, which on the evidence of τέμμων, Mycenaean te-me-no should be reconstructed as *temh₁.\(^{87}\) (The parallel with τμα- is particularly instructive since in Theocritus’ other Doric idylls we find νεόματος (7.134) and ἔτμαξεν (8.24; compare τμαξε: Balb. SEG VIII 716.9), which further discredits the evidence of δδῆμαται).

It is precisely in a perfect middle stem that such substitution of Doric /ā/ for Ionic /ǭ/ can perhaps be additionally motivated. Based on Doric

\(^{81}\) Gow and Latte do not note any variant readings, but Ahrens’s apparatus reports a reading δδῆμηθ in two manuscripts: 9 (sec. manu) and 23 (= Gallavotti’s L (Parisinian gr. 2831) and W (Laurentian conv. Soppr. 15)). Both are members of Gallavotti’s family δ and so δδῆμηθ has to be posited for the archetype.

\(^{82}\) In an influential study Magnien (1920) has argued that the literary Doric of Theocritus (and in particular the language of the Idyll 15) had its origins in the fifth-century Syracusan dialect. Ruijgh 1984 has advanced a different hypothesis according to which Theocritus wrote in a “hypothetical” Cyrenaean dialect of Alexandria (see the critical appraisal by Molinos Tejada 1990 and Abbenes 1996).

\(^{83}\) Despite the fact that the form δδῆμαται is found not in either of the women’s speech, but instead in the Adonis hymn, sung at the festival: the style of this song shows occasional influence of epic, but its language is not too different from the language of the beginning and the end of the Idyll.

\(^{84}\) For the language of Archimedes see Heiberg 1884: 549.

\(^{85}\) See Weiss 1994 who shows that forms of ἰόρῳ ‘be sober’ are in fact based on the nominal stem ἰόρον < *p-h-g'môn.

\(^{86}\) For a careful discussion of this form see Cassio 1993.

\(^{87}\) Forssman 1966: 159-160; Joseph 1982: 36-37
aorist forms such as Laconian ἀπεσσά, Cyrenaean conj. μὴν, ἐσθάνομαι, ἀπέθανον. Epidaurian ἐσθάνομαι, it has been suggested that Doric has preserved the reflexes of an Indo-European preterital formation in *-ā* as intransitive (passive) aorist, which had the same functions and semantics as the Proto-Greek *ē*-aorist. (In other words, Ionic aor. ἐσθάνομαι and its Doric counterpart ἐσθάνοι may both be Proto-Greek inheritance). The existence of these forms in Doric (regardless of whether or not they in fact continue *-ā*-preterites) could have facilitated a substitution of *dedē.IDENTITY- by *dedē- by proportional analogy, which, predictably, was extended from intransitive aorists to perfects. Ionic aor. ἐσθάνοι (perf. ἐσθάνη): Doric aor. ἐσθάνῶ = Ionic (δε)δέμη - X, where X is resolved as (δε)δέμ. Primary example of this process is Ionic perfect middle γεγένημαι vs. Pindar’s γεγεναμένον (O. 6, 53).

88 See Schulze 1928. McCullagh 1992: 72, Fn. 50 reconstructs the root as *meiԽv-, which, if correct, would eliminate μὴν from this list, but despite McCullagh and Hackstein 2002: 270 adj. μημορίς ’defiled’ alone is insufficient to base such a reconstruction on (μημορίς and μημόνω are likely to be offshoots of a heteroclitic *μΗ-ρ/ι-, see Peters 2001-2). See also Blanc 2001: 170-1 who interprets μὴν as pres. subj. of *μημορίς.

89 ἐσθάνοι < *εφθήναι with a Doric accent movement one mora rightwards: ἀλκάμιν < *ἀλκαμίσθαι < *ἀλκαμίσθαμ, ἄλλων < *ἀλλόν, σοφός < *σοφῶ. However, it should be borne in mind that the accentuation in Codex Venetus Graec. 851, the only manuscript of Hesychius’ lexicon, is highly unreliable.


91 See Forssman 1966: 55-59. Hackstein 2002: 266-272 tries to explain all these forms as a result of a sound change – unsuccessfully, in my opinion.

92 Primary ε-perfects (viz. those that were not associated with presents in -ασ/α or -ετ/η-α) invariably show a zero-grade in the root, just as the likewise intransitive ε-aorists, so the only difference between those two stems is effectively the reduplication. See below.

93 Hsch. ἐγένοι, Calyumann εγένοι, Laconion ρυξέτος.

94 One more circumstance which could have possibly triggered the substitution of /I/ by /a/ in this case is the fact that the Doric counterpart of another Ionic δέδημα from *dahm-, the root of δέδημα, hence a proportion Ionic δέδημα from ’to overpower’: Doric δέδημα = Ionic δέδημα from ’to build’: X, X = Doric δέδημα - (pointed out to me by M. Peters).

95 Molinos Tejada 1990: 46 finds additional evidence for Doric aor. *ἐγένναν in the form παραγενάθεντες from Entella to which Peters 1997[2002]: 113, Fn. 32 hesitantly adds a corrupt gloss from Hesychius ἐγένναν ἐγέννα (differently on ἐγέννα Tremblay 2005: 642); aor. γενάθη- is found in pseudopythagorean works (e.g. γενάθημαν Ps.-Archyt. 9.15 Thesleff).

96 Another instructive example of the same substitution of Proto-Greek *ē* by Doric â is provided by the perfect participle μεμονόκοις (7x in Archimedes) and Argolic ἐπιμενέοικοι (if this form is a perfect of μένω and not of an (unattested) lengthened-grade iterative *μήνας) vs. Attic μεμύνηκα, the perfect of μένω ’stand fast’. The root of μένω is customarily reconstructed as PIE *men- and the stem *(me)men- can be seen as based on the ē-stative stem found in Latin manēō (< *-e-h₁-je-ō; see Barton 1990-1991: 45), even though no intransitive ē-aorist from this root is attested in Greek.
As far as compounded *-δῆμος found in Alcman, Pindar and Bacchylides is concerned, it is worth pointing out that in some instances the mss. evidence for <ω> is vacillating, showing that -δῆμος was present in the Hellenistic editions of these poets. Melic -δῆμος may therefore be regarded as a case of later dialect normalization (“Doricising”) in order to conform to beliefs about the genre. However, if the poets were familiar with a “Doric” perfect middle δηδῆμ- (the origin of which was discussed above), they might as well have used a form -δῆμος which then would not have to be a “scribal” hyperdoricism: it would be natural for a speaker to align the stem of a verbal adjective in -το- to the aorist passive / perfect middle stem (-)δῆμ-. 

4.4. We have thus seen that Doric δηδήμ- and -δῆμος is a very slender piece of evidence in support of a reconstruction *demh₂-, with a final second laryngeal. Nevertheless, our ultimate goal has not been achieved yet: the Ionic middle perfect stem δηδήμ- still calls for an explanation. A straightforward laryngeal solution (*de-δημητ-) is possible, but it would fly in the face of all arguments against any root-final laryngeal in our root that were presented above. The question is therefore whether or not we should posit a Proto-Greek root *deme-/*dmē-, going back to PIE *demh₁-?

(probably because of homonymie fâcheuse with ἡμην ‘he is mad’); the other thinkable alternative is that the root in question should be reconstructed as *menh₁- in which case μεμήν / μεμήνα (first attested at Dem. 18.321) would directly continue an inherited *me-mηητ- (interestingly, the Modern Greek present from this root is μνηκο (see Cole 1975: 107; I owe this reference to Martin Peters), which can be seen as an argument in favor of the reconstruction *menh₁-). Either way, Doric μνινα- shows a substitution of η by Doric â in a perfect stem, similar to that postulated above for Theocritean δηδήμ-

97 Alcm. fr. 2 b 5 Calame; Pi. O. 3, 7; 6, 59; P. 1, 61; 9, 10, 12, 3; 1. 4, 62; 6, 11; fr. 33c, 1; 35c; Bacch. 8, 54; 10, 58; 12 (17'), 7; 13 (12?), 163.
98 Especially at Pi. O. 3, 7, where <η> is read in six mss., including the oldest and most reliable ones; in Pi. P. 1, 61 this reading is supported by two mss. This vacillation in the transmission of -δῆμος / -δῆμος was duly noted by Brugman 1878: 62 and Beekes 1969: 291.
99 No variant readings are obviously known for Alcman’s σιμομαντον as the form is known only from one papyrus (P. Oxy 2389); note in any event that the form is immediately followed by δηδήμ[ηo] in the following line.
100 Compare βλητός: βλλήθην, παστός: πασσίθην, etc. The homonymous root *dmā-‘to overpower’ may have played a role once again (see above, Fn. 94): Ionic (-)δῆμος ‘subdued’: Doric (-)δῆμος (E.g. Αδήμος Epidaur. IG IV², 195) = Ionic (-)δῆμος ‘built’: Doric X, X = (-)δῆμος.
Such a reconstruction will surely account for the entire *Averbo in Greek: since the future stem found in Mycenaean *de-me-o-te is compatible with *dēm(h₁)- and the present stem δεµο/- can likewise continue *dēm₁(-e/o/-), the only problematic form is the aorist δεµ- (i.e. /dēm-/ from *dēm-s-). The simplest strategy would be to assume that the stem δεµ- has no probative value for the question of the final laryngeal in the root *dēm(h₁)- and that the sigmatic aorist was secondarily supplied to the thematic present stem, as is often the case in Greek (to cite just two outlandish cases where a sigmatic aorist was created for verbs that had no aorist at all in the Proto-Indo-European: Doric ἀξαι to ἄγω and Hsch. ἐφερέων ἐκύψης to φέρω).

The necessary conclusion under this theory is that the verbal root *dēm₁- ‘to build; to be heaped up, to grow (med.)’ was phonologically different from the nominal root *dēm- which had no final laryngeal: the pair *dēm₁h₁- ~ *dēm₁- would then be comparable to *dej₁h₁- ‘to shine’ ~ *dej₁- ‘day’. But since on the one hand Mycenaean de-me-o-te can also be accounted for as a regular reflex of *dēm₁h₁,- from an anit root and on the other hand positive evidence in favor of any root-final laryngeal (beside the Greek middle perfect stem δόµη- which is exactly the form under discussion) has now been shown to be lacking altogether, it behooves us to investigate whether the apparent set character of the middle perfect stem in Greek could be secondary.\(^{101}\)

One possible way to generate a Greek middle perfect stem extended by *ē is to assume an influence of an intransitive aorist in -η.\(^{102}\) This

\(^{101}\) The _elargissement_ option was explicitly endorsed by Watkins 1979: 283, Fn. 23; however, despite Watkins, the case of *dēm(h₁)- is not entirely parallel to *men- ~ *mneh₂- (the best known example of a root extension in laryngeal): first, this comparison is undermined by the fact that in the case of *dēm(h₁)- our only option for a reconstruction with a final laryngeal is *dēm₁h₁- and not *dēm₂h₁- (as we have seen above), therefore neither *mneh₂- nor *dej₁h₁- are really parallel (unless one is ready to accept that any laryngeal could be used as a root extension at random), and secondly, the pair *men- ~ *mneh₂- exhibits Schwebeablaute, while putative *dēm- ~ *dēm₂h₁- does not.

\(^{102}\) Sometimes such influence can be inferred from the phonological structure of a perfect stem: thus, for instance, the perf. τρώη- ‘be sorrowful’ (Homeric part. τρώης) is best explained on the basis of a an intransitive aorist stem *k”i-eh₁- (see Hackstein 1997: 25, 31) and similarly the Attic-Ionic perfect βεβιοκατά (together with Heraclean ένδεικνυτίκα, see Francis 1973) can be plausibly accounted for by analogy to the aor. ἐβιο ‘was alive’. Incidentally, one wonders whether Thessalian perfect forms καταπεπλωτίσκα and καταπεπλωκαν (see García-Ramón 2008: 202), too, owe their *-o- to the influence of the pattern aor. *e-g”iō : perf. *g”e-g”iō(k). (Since my main concern here is an inner-Greek development, namely, the interaction between perfect and aorist stems, it is immaterial for the present argument whether ἐβιο continues a stem *g”i-h₁-eh₁- or – as I find more likely – a root aorist).
process can be illustrated, for instance, by perf. (post-Epic) κεχάρημα, κεχάρημα, Homerian and Arcadian) κεχαρήματα beside aor. ἐγάρη, perf. δεδάημα, δεδάημα, δεδάημα beside aor. ἐδάην (< *(h2e)-δευ-εh2-)

or perf. ἐβαήμα beside aor. ἔσβη 'went out'. So a scenario according to which perf. δεδάημα loses its -η- to an intransitive aorist *ἔδη(α)μή 'it is built, it has grown' would be at least conceivable. However, this approach is effectively rendered moot by the fact that while perf. middle δεδάημα is amply attested from Homer onwards, a perfect active *δεδάημα or a participle *δεδήμ(κ)ός are in fact unknown. This is fatal because finite forms with "inserted -η-" such as δφάλημα, τετύχημα, άοημα, etc. are best interpreted as back-formations based on active perfect participles in -η(κ)ολς; in fact, whenever an "inserted -η-" is found in the perfect, it primarily appears in the participles: Homerian βεβαρήμετα, κεχαρίματα, τετυχήμετα, λελάβημα, Boeotian απελείβοντες, Arcadian κατηνθηκότες, λελαβήκοτες. But even more important is the fact that, in the case of δεδήμ-, such analysis is

Root aorists from laryngeal final roots must have supported the tendency to align the stem of the perfect to that of the intransitive aorist: these forms, too, were mostly intransitive (except ἔγνοι), they could be analyzed by the speakers as having a zero-grade in the root (e.g. ἔβαη 'anticipated' as ἔ-φθ-η) and they had a predesinential long vowel both in aorist and perfect, compare ἔστη 'took a stand': perf. ἔστηκε, ἔβή 'went': perf. βεβή; it is not impossible that precisely based on this model an aor. ἐθελ 'ended' was created to match the perf. τέθληκε (see Francis 1974: 28; differently Malzahn 2004: 57; ἔβη: ββήλης: ββήλαη see McCullagh 2002 and Peters 1997 [2002]: 113, Fn. 32). Lastly, the same tendency could find support in the pattern exhibited by -σε/ε- presents where, too, perfect and (σ-)aorist show an -η- (πείνης, πεινήη).

103 Statistics are quite telling in this case: in the iliad forms from the aor. δαε- are attested 8 times (ἐδάην 1x, δαείζο 3x, δαύμεν 1x, δάδημε 3x), while no other forms from the root δα- are attested at all; it is only in the Odyssey that we find perf. δαδήμ- (3 times) and fut. δάδημε/ε- (2 times). For part. δαδώς see Hackstein 1997: 35-36 who argues that this form may go back to an earlier *δαδήμος by hyphaeresis.

104 On this root in general and in particular for the interpretation of ἔσβη as an intransitive ἔ-aaorist see lasanoff 2008.

105 The active perfect δεδήμα cited by Herodian is certainly a grammarians' invention.

106 Peters 1997 [2002]: 113, Fn. 32; Hackstein 1997: 38; Peters 2007: 268, Fn. 35. At least in the case of τετύχημα a viable alternative proposed by Hackstein (1997-8: 28) deserves to be mentioned: since τυγάνω has two aorists in Homerian epic, ἔτυχε and ἔτυχημα, a perfect stem τετυχήματα- could have been generated according to the following proportion: s-aor. πονη-: perf. πεπνη- = s-aor. τυρη-: perf. X, where X is resolved as τετυχήματα.

107 See on these forms Spech 1935: 59, de Lamberterie 1982 and an important treatment by Hackstein 1997-8, who successfully demonstrated that neither the -η- in these Homerian perfect participles, nor their active endings should be seen as products of the Dichtersprache.
vitiated by the absence of any other evidence for a stative stem *dm-eh₁-
elsewhere in Indo-European.

A different way of explaining δέδημ- would be to assume analogy to
another verb that shows a perfect with é-extension; in fact, a promising
option is offered by another rhyming present, namely, νέμω (aor. ἐνέμα, perf. νενέμηκα, νενέμημα). The meaning of this verb is ‘to
dispense, to allot’, but also ‘to pasture, to graze; med. to possess, to hold
land, to dwell’¹⁰⁸, particularly noteworthy is the meaning ‘to cultivate’,
which is a point of semantic contact between the two verbs: νέμω is
attested with this meaning already in Homer and Hesiod (with ἀλέκα,
ἐργά B 751, Op. 119, πατρίοια ν 336)¹⁰⁹, δέδημ is used in this sense at h.
Merc. 87: δέδημον ἀνθρώποιν ἄλωθην.¹¹⁰

Now, νέμω goes back to a set-root *nemh₁-*, as can be inferred from¹¹¹:

1) νέμεσις ‘distribution of what is due’ < *némh₁-ti-
2) the accentuation of Latvian nemī ‘to take’¹¹²
3) the archaic looking perfect νενέμηκα, νενέμημα¹¹³

The perfect stem is particularly interesting: as M. Peters has sug-
gested¹¹⁴, νενέμη- is best explained as a continuation of an inherited
stem *ne-nmē- (such an adjustment of the root ablaut was necessary in

¹⁰⁸ For a detailed survey of the meanings of νέμω see Chadwick 1996: 198-207.
¹⁰⁹ Note further the derivative νομᾶ ‘habitation, dwelling-place’ (e.g. Pi. O. 7.33).
¹¹⁰ This meaning of δέδημ is likely to be inherited, since ‘to cultivate’ is a natural
development of ‘to grow’ (trans.), and the meaning ‘to grow’ is ascertained for PIE
*demh₁- by its Tocharian reflexes.
¹¹¹ Since the view that posttonic resonant+laryngeal clusters were reflected in
Germanic as geminates is not adopted by the author (see above, Fn. 9), any predictions
based on this theory are orthogonal to the argument pursued here (note that the
adherents of this view should expect Germanic *timman as a reflex of an alleged root
*demh₁-). Therefore the absence of a geminate *nm- in Germanic *nem is not a coun-
terargument to the reconstruction *nemh₁-.

The attempts to connect Germanic *neman and Greek νέμω to the root of Latin emō
and OCS ime- (*h,em)- have little to recommend them. In particular, the ingenious
reconstruction of a nasal present *h₁h₁-ne-m- as the starting point of *nem-e/o- proposed
by Lindeman (2003) is unlikely in the extreme (according to Lindeman, 3 Pl. *(h₁)h₁em-
entį regularly developed into *em-enti already in the proto-language, a view which
remains entirely without justification).¹¹²

¹¹² nemū is only found in the dialects; the form in the standard language is nemt
(palatalized 囡 is due to the contamination with jemt, see Forssman 2001: 94). The
“Dehnton” cannot be due to Hirt’s law in this case and faithfully reflects initial accent
on an acute diphthong (*em- < *-émH-C-).

¹¹³ νενέμησι X. Σύρ. 4.5.45; νενέμημα Pl. Prm. 144d.
¹¹⁴ Peters 1997[2002]: 114, Fn. 32 (and p.c.).
order to avoid a metathesis *ne-nmē- > *ne-mmē-). The stem *ne-mmē- is of course a perfectly regular and expected outcome of (preconsonantal) allomorph *ne-nmph1-.

The aor. ἐνεμά stands out in the Averbo of νέμω as the only form that cannot be straightforwardly explained from the root *nemh1- and should be viewed as an innovation. This situation is strikingly reminiscent of the Averbo of δέμω, where, too, aor. ἐδείμα is the only form that is not immediately compatible with the reconstruction *demh1-. (The difference between the two verbs is of course that while in the case of *nemh1- the reconstruction of a root-final laryngeal is vouchsafed by both Greek material (νέμαςις) and external data (Latvian nemīti), the reconstruction of a final laryngeal in the root *demh1- rests on a very shaky basis).

On the surface, both ἐδείμα and ἐνεμά are unproblematic: all that needs to be assumed is that aorist stems *dem-s- and *nem-s- (> Ionic /dēm/- and /nēm/-) are recent creations and were built to match the present stems *deme/o- and *neme/o- which did not exhibit any laryngeal reflexes. Indeed, in the case of *nem-s- this hypothesis looks plausible: the present stem νέμε/o- is abundantly attested in Homer, while the aorist stem of this root is represented much less frequently (the ratio is 4 (pres.): 1 (aor.)). However, the distribution of the forms of pres. δέμε/o- and aor. δέμι- is quite different and the statistics in the Homeric epics do not support the hypothesis of a secondary origin for δέμι-: on the contrary, the aorist seems to be better embedded in the poetic diction then the present.115 This situation suggests that an alternative account of the aor. δέμι- (< *dem-s-) is desirable.

To summarize briefly before going on to make a final proposal, several conclusions about the forms of δέμω and νέμω now have emerged.

115 Aor. ind. act. appears four times in the Iliad (H 436, 1 349, Ξ 32, Φ 446); all attestations are all verse-final except 1 349 (at κατὰ τρὶν τροχαίον); all participate in a formulaic juncture τέχος [...] ἐδείμα(v). A short-vowel aor. subj. δέμομαι appears once in the verse H 337:

ἀκριτὸν ἐκ πεδίου· ποτὶ δ’ αὐτὸν δέμομαι ὥκα
πόργους ὑψηλός
which is clearly a modification of H 436:

ἀκριτὸν ἐκ πεδίου, ποτὶ δ’ αὐτὸν τέχος ἐδείμαν
πόργους θ’ ὑψηλός.

In addition, aor. ind. mid. ἐδέμημερο appears twice in the Odyssey (ξ 9, ξ 8). It seems therefore unlikely that this aorist stem was built to match the inherited present stem δέμε/o- (which, by contrast, makes its appearance only at ψ 192 (τὸ δ’ ἐγὼ ἀμφιβαλόν θάλαμον δέμον ὑφ’ ἐπίλεσσα) and a present participle δέμων is attested at h. Μερκ. 87).
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– Firstly, this is a pair of rhyming verbs whose forms are essentially identical.
– Secondly, some of their meanings are similar enough to make an analogical remodeling of one verb after the other a plausible hypothesis.
– Thirdly, νέμω continues a set-root *nemh₁-, of which the present νέμω and the perfect middle νένεμη- are the expected outcomes; the aorist νειµ- should be viewed as an innovative form, built to match the present stem, which is confirmed by the distribution of the aorist forms in Homer.
– Lastly, δέμω may or may not continue a set-root *demh₁-; one way or the other, the present δέμω is a regular continuation of the inherited thematic stem *demh₁-e/o- or *dem-e/o- (Hieroglyphic Luvian ta-ma-ri, Germanic *teman), but its aorist δειµ- does not make an impression of a novel creation, based on the present stem.

Once a certain formal and semantic affinity between these two rhyming verbs is recognized, a scenario can be elaborated which involves an interaction between the Averbo-s of these roots:

Step 1: an aorist stem νειµ- was created to match δειµ- (following the general morphological pattern of roots in a final resonant with thematic present stems and thus increasing the “learnability” of the class as a whole).  

Step 2: when both the present and the aorist stems of the two verbs became nearly identical, a middle perfect stem δεδµη- was created to match *νενµη- ( >> νενεµη-), replacing an earlier *δεδα- (?): νέμω : ένειμα : *νένεµηµα = δέµω : έδειµα : X, X = δεδµηµα.  

As a result two similar sets of forms emerge:

116 It is possible that an aorist stem *νεµεσ(σ) once existed in the system, but differently from cases like ἐκέρασ(σ)α ‘mixed’ (*kerh₁-) or ἐπέρασ(σ)α ‘sold’ (*perh₁-) an aorist *ἐνέµεσ(σ)α was not correlated with a present stem of the right kind and thus could not be retained.

117 Note that under assumption that the root *dem- was anit, its inherited middle perfect stem *δεδα- < *dedµ- would have called for a remodeling, since it was homophonous with the perfect of διάκερα.

118 That the speakers perceived pres. *Cem-e/o-, aor. *Cēµ- and perf. Ce-C(em)mē- as an established morphological pattern is confirmed by the fact that another rhyming verb with a stem-final -m, namely, τρέµω (that had no inherited aorist or perfect), was provided with a perfect τετρέµηµα (EM 606.50).
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Indo-European *dem(h₂) - 'to build' and its derivatives

1. original situation
   Pres. *dem(e)/< *nemh₁/ - e/o
   Aor. *dem-s/< *nemh₁-s
   Perf. *de-d/ - *ne-nmē/< *ne-nmph₁

2. situation after analogy
   Pres. *dem(e)/< *nemh₁/ - e/o
   Aor. *dem-s/< *nemh₁-s
   Perf. *de-d/ - *ne-nmē/< *ne-nmph₁

Under this scenario the perfect stem δεδμη- no longer has to go back to an inherited *de-dmph₁-. The last bit of evidence that seemed to support the reconstruction of the root *demh₁- with a final laryngeal has now been eliminated.

5. We have thus come to the end of our survey of the derivatives of the IE root 'to build'. None of the forms studied above present sufficient evidence based on which this root should be reconstructed as a set root *demh₁- (or *demh₁-); on the contrary, there are offshoots of this root that can only continue *dem- with no final laryngeal (Hittite dametar, Middle Irish déit, Middle Welsh deint). The first major conclusion of this paper was that Greek δέμας cannot be analyzed as an s-stem derived directly from a laryngeal final root; rather, as several other stems with the suffix -ας, δέμας is likely to continue a secondary derivative from a stem *dem-h₂- with a suffixal *h₂-. This reconstruction yields an internally consistent explanation for Hittite dam(m)etar and Hieroglyphic Luvian tamiḥt#: these forms continue a hysterokinetic collective stem *dmēh₂-, *dmh₂-ēs, independently amplified with further suffixal material. Hysterokinetic *dmēh₂- is a product of internal derivation from *dem-h₂-, while *dem-h₂-s-, the precursor of Greek δέμας, is its external derivative. As to the perfect stem δεδμη- / δεδμα-, we have seen that the evidence for Doric δεδμα- does not hold water, while Ionic δεδμη-, when seen in context of other Greek perfect stems in long -ē-, can be explained by analogy. The second conclusion of this paper is, therefore, that the future (Mycenaean de-me-o-te < *dem-h₁,s-) and, possibly, the aorist stem (ēδεμα < *dem-s-) preserve the original situation in the Greek Averbo of the root that goes back to Indo-European *dem- – just the way it was reconstructed hundred years ago.

---

119 The adjective (-)δημητός is of course by itself unproblematic and could be formed at any point, based on the proportion κάκηματι : (-)κημητός = δέδηματι : X, where X is δημητός.
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