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1 Introduction

• The puzzle: A class of verbal governing compounds (VGC) in several Indo-European languages whose second member of compound (SMC) appears to continue a suffix *-ā. Unlike other PIE formations in *-ā, these compounds are animate masculine nouns, rather than motionsfeminina or neuter/collection nouns:

(1) a. Gk. βαθυ-δινης ‘deep-eddying’
   b. Lat. agri-cola ‘farmer’ < ‘dwelling in the country’

• Two main questions:
  – Do the different IE languages reflect a common type, i.e. is this kind of compound formation inherited?
  – If yes, how is the second compound member to be analyzed? Is this an archaism preserving animate (not strictly feminine) use of *-ā-<*(e)h2-?

2 Compounds in *-ā- in Greek and Latin

2.1 Greek

2.1.1 Denominal compounds

• We often find possessive compounds in -ης/-āς besides compounds with root noun SMC or -o-stem SMC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>root noun</th>
<th>o-adjective</th>
<th>ā-stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(κύλλ-, δεξ-, Αθή-)οψ (Hom., Hes.) ‘-eyed’</td>
<td>δεξ-ωπός (Hes.) ‘fierce-eyed’</td>
<td>κυλ-ωπ-α (Hom., Vsg.) ‘dog-eyed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-οψ ‘-voiced’</td>
<td></td>
<td>βαρυ-ωπ-¯ας (Pi.) ‘having a deep voice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(δί)-ζυκ ‘double-yoked’ (Hom.)</td>
<td>ἕκατό-ζυγος ‘hundred-yoked’ (Hom.)</td>
<td>βου-ζυγ-ης ‘cattle-yoking’ (Att., name of a group of priests)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-)φώρ ‘thief’</td>
<td>ἄθλο-φόρος ‘bearing the prize’ (Hom.)</td>
<td>σαμ-φορ-¯ας ‘San-bearing’ (of horses) (Ar.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ἀμφι-, οἰκ-)τριψ (Ar., Arch.)</td>
<td>(ἀ-)τριβ-ης ‘trained’ (Thuc.)</td>
<td>παιδο-τριβ-ης ‘trainer of children’ (Pi.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.2 Mycenaean:

Leukart 1994: Myc. masculine stems in /-ás/ as individualizations/substantivizations of collective /-ā/ stems (place names, social groups etc.). Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Derivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κρήτ-ā ‘Crete’</td>
<td>→ Ke-re-ta-o, Gsg. of /Krēt-ā/, ‘(male) person from Crete’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ορος ‘mountain’, Myc. *ορήα ‘mountainous region’</td>
<td>→ O-re-a /Orehā/ ‘(male) person from a mountainous region’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*swēt-ā ‘clan’</td>
<td>→ *hwēt-ās ‘individual belonging to the clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(maybe) *νεξνά ‘youth’ (abstr./coll.)</td>
<td>→ νεξνάς ‘young man, youth’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However: This analysis doesn’t work too well for the denominal simplex/possessive compound type, which is also already found in Mycenaean:

- Po-da could be a short form of a compound in -ποδ-ής (Leukart 1994, 211), e.g. ke-u-po-da /geu-pod-ās/ ‘with crooked feet’ (Leukart 1994, 224f.)
- me-ta-ki-ti-ta /metaktitai/ ‘co-settlers, -dwellers’ (Leukart 1994, 66f.)
- E-ru-ta-ra /Eruthr-ās/ ← ἐρυθρός ‘red’
- E-ke-a /Enkēh-ās/ ← ἐγκός ‘spear’

In these cases there is no reason to assume an intermediate step via collectives (i.e. no *(-)ὁπ-ά, *(-)ποδ-, etc.).

The collectives → singulatives derivation requires a different parsing than the compounds:

(2) a. /Krētā/ : /Krētā/-s vs.
   b. -ποδ-ής, -ζυγ-ής, NOT -ποδής-ζ, -ζυγής

The derivational chain for the latter seems to be 2:

(3) || (δ-ı) | -ζυγ-ı | → || (ἐκχτ-έ) | [ -ζυγ-ı ] -ο- | → |||| (βο-υ) | [ -ζυγ-ı ] | -η- |

---

1. Κτιτής was presumably reanalyzed as -κτι-τής very early in Greek, s. Leukart (1994, 47 & 157ff.)
2.1.3 Denominal compounds II: Possessive compounds with synchronic α-stem SMC

- This type is not found in Mycenaean (or Latin)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplex α-stem</th>
<th>compound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μελιή ‘spear’</td>
<td>ἑῳ-μελιής ‘having a good spear’ (Hom.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τέχνη ‘art’</td>
<td>χλαύτω-τέχνης ‘famous for one’s art’ (Hom.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύρα ‘lyre’</td>
<td>ἑῳ-λύρας ‘having a good lyre’ (Sapph.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρυσομή ‘battle’</td>
<td>ἵππο-χρυσομής ‘battling from a chariot’ (Pi., Hom., Hes.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χόμη ‘hair’</td>
<td>χρυσο-χόμης ‘golden-haired’ (Pi.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No simplex forms *μελιής, *τέχνης etc.

→ This is an inner-Greek strategy for using f. simplex *α-stems in possessive compounds. The parsing has to be:

(4) [[[βαθύ-] [δινή-]] -ς]

2.1.4 Deverbal compounds

- Rüedi 1969: Compounds like Ὀλυμπιο-νίκας ‘winner at the Olympic games’ and βαθύ-δινης ‘deep-eddying’ were formally ambiguous - the SMC corresponded to a synchronic f. α-/η-stem (νίκη ‘victory’, δινή ‘eddy’), but also to the denominal verbs derived from these (νικάω ‘conquer, be victorious’, δινάω/-εω ‘whirl, eddy’). A reinterpretation as verbal governing compounds (= endocentric) became possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplex α-stem</th>
<th>verb stem</th>
<th>compound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δίνη ‘eddy’</td>
<td>δινάω, -έω ‘whirl’</td>
<td>βαθυ-δινής ‘deep-eddying’ (Hom.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγορη ‘assembly’</td>
<td>ἀγορεύω, ἀγοράομαι ‘assemble’</td>
<td>λαβρ-ἀγορης ‘talking boldly’ (Hom.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοά ‘cry’</td>
<td>βοάω ‘cry’</td>
<td>βαρυ-βοάς ‘crying out loud’ (Pi.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόκη ‘judgement’</td>
<td>δικάζω ‘judge’</td>
<td>ἰθυ-δόκης ‘giving the right judgement’ (Hes.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νίκη ‘victory’</td>
<td>νικάω ‘be victorious’</td>
<td>Ὀλυμπιο-νίκας ‘winner at the Olympic games’ (Pi.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μάχη ‘battle’</td>
<td>μάχομαι ‘fight, battle’</td>
<td>πεζο-μάχας ‘foot soldier’ (Pi.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ This is clearly type II reinterpreted as deverbal:

(5) [[[βαθύ-] [δινή-]] -ς → [[[βαθύ-] [δινή-]] -ς]
2.2 Latin

2.2.1 Denominal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base noun</th>
<th>ā-compound</th>
<th>us-stem</th>
<th>Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rēm-ex ‘rower’ (Plaut.); aure-ex ‘charioteer’ (Pau. ex Fest.)</td>
<td>aurīga ‘charioteer’ (CL)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[agō ‘drive’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pēs ‘foot’, -pēs ‘footed’</td>
<td>tremi-peda ‘with trembling feet’ (Varr.); plūmi-peda ‘feather-footed’ (Catul.), Centum-peda ‘centipede’ (Jove epithet, Aug.)</td>
<td>com-pedus ‘fettering’ (Varr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 (Synchronically) deverbal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>compound</th>
<th>root noun</th>
<th>us-stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>capiō ‘hold, seize’</td>
<td>hosti-capas ‘hostium captor’ (Paul. ex Fest.)</td>
<td>-ceps ‘-seizing’</td>
<td>-capus ‘-seizing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caedō ‘cut (off)’</td>
<td>būi-caeda ‘one who is struck with a cowhide’ (Plaut.), cibi-cida ‘breadwaster’ (Lucil.), lapi-cida ‘stone-cutter’ (Varr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[muri-cidus (?) (Plaut.)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colō ‘cultivate’</td>
<td>in-cola m./f. ‘inhabitant’, ac-cola ‘neighbor’ (Plaut.), caeli-cola ‘sky-dwelling’ (Enn.), agricola ‘farmer’ (Lucr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Gk. ξι-πόλος ‘goatherd’, βού-χόλος ‘cowherd’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fugō ‘flee’</td>
<td>lucrī-fuga ‘gain-fleeing’ (Plaut.), trans-fuga ‘deserter’ (Cic.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>luci-fugas ‘light-shunning’ (Verg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gignō, genō ‘beget’</td>
<td>indi-gena ‘native’ (Varr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-genus ‘-born, -originated’ (Varr., Lucr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legō ‘collect, gather’</td>
<td>col-lēga ‘colleague’ (Varr.)</td>
<td>īlēx ‘lawless’ (Plaut.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>petō ‘ask, seek’</td>
<td>agrī-peta m. ‘seeker of land’ (Cic.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumpō ‘break’</td>
<td>lēge-rupa ‘lawbreaker’ (Plaut.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secō ‘cut’</td>
<td>faeni-seca ‘mower, -cutter’ (Varr., Pers.)</td>
<td>faeni-sex ‘mower’ (Varr.)</td>
<td>flucti-secus ‘wave-cutting’ (Sen.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequor ‘follow’</td>
<td>bu-sequa ‘cowherd’ (App.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-sequus ‘following’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veniō ‘come’</td>
<td>ad-vena ‘newcomer’ (Plaut.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convivō ‘eat together’</td>
<td>con-viva ‘table companion’ (Plaut.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-)vīvus ‘alive, living’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**: The Greek and Latin m. verbal governing compounds in -ā- have strong functional and morphological parallels that point to an inherited category.

---

3 See Lindner 2010.
3 Analysis

3.1 Previous explanations

Three basic strategies:

1. These compounds go back to old collective *eh₂-stems that underwent a semantic shift and/or morphological modification and were then used to designate individuals belonging to the collective (e.g. Klingenschmitt 1992 for Lat. simplex forms like Numa, Proca (PN), Leukart 1994 for Gk./Krētās/ etc.).

2. They go back to old possessive compounds with f. verbal abstracts in *-ā- < *-eh₂- as SMC that were subsequently reanalyzed as deverbal (e.g. Schindler (in class), Rüedi 1969, Lindner 2002, Malzahn In press for Greek) or to determinative compounds with verbal abstracts in *-ā- as SMC that were reinterpreted as concrete nouns (e.g. Klingenschmitt 1992, Weiss 2009).

3. The Latin type goes back to compounds with set-root nouns as SMC, the a-inflection is due to laryngeal vocalization. The Latin type should be kept separate from the Greek one (e.g. Saussure 1909, Bammesberger 1996, Malzahn In press for Latin).

Following Saussure (1909), it is often argued that the Latin type goes back to compounds with root noun SMC:

\[ \ast \text{agro-kv}/\text{olh}_1 \quad (\ast \text{kv}/\text{elh}_1 \text{ ‘turn, move about’}) \rightarrow \text{agri-cola} \]

\[ \ast \text{endo}-\text{gh}_1 \quad (\ast \text{gh}_1 \text{ ‘beget’}) \rightarrow \text{indi-ghena} \]

The -a is said to have then spread to semantically similar formations. Problems for this account:

- Few paradigmatic contexts where (interconsonantal) laryngeal vocalization would be expected in the first place (i.e. Nsg. *CVR/Lh₁-s)
- Laryngeal loss through the ‘νεογν¯ος-rule’ expected throughout much of the paradigm (Mayrhofer 1986, 65; Weiss 2009, 113: -CRH⁻ > -CRV- ‘in non-initial syllables of “long” words (including compounds and reduplicated forms)’; cp. also Kuiper 1961.)
- Many root nouns from anit-roots, but sparse evidence for set-roots:
  - CēH: Gk. àc-γν¯ω-τ-, Lat. sacer-dō-t-, locu-plē-t- etc., cp. esp. Lat. praegnas, -ātis ‘pregnant’ < *\text{gh}_1-t-
  - CēN/RH: Ved. tuvi-svān- ‘roaring loudly’ < *\text{gh}_2, also -svāni-; Ved. āmūr ‘obstacle’ < *merH, also -mūri-.
- Problem of all laryngeal-vocalization accounts: even if particular lexical items did display vocalization, the type must have been established before that - otherwise remodeling is expected.

3.1.1 Verbal abstracts in *-ā- as SMC?

(6) \[ \| X \| Y-\ast \bar{a} \rightarrow \text{Bahuvarli} \rightarrow \text{VGC?} \]

or

(7) \[ \| X \| Y-\ast \bar{a} \rightarrow \text{Determinative compound } \rightarrow \text{VGC?} \]

Counterarguments:

- PIE seems to have had a restriction against using verbal abstracts in *-ā as SMC of possessive compounds or determinative compounds with a nominal first member (AiG II,2, 249: ‘Gemäß einer wohl grundsprachlichen Regel sind Abstrakta auf -a- nicht üblich hinter Nominalstämmen.’, cp. also Debrunner 1917, §139, §145, Leumann 1977, 281)
Only scattered and mostly late examples of (always determinative, i.e. endocentric!) compounds with an *a*-stem SMC (mostly a concrete noun) in the individual branches:

- Vedic: *māṃsa-bhiṣa* f. ‘request for meat’, *dur-hāṇa* f. ‘harm, disaster’ (*han*)
- NB even if such abstracts become concrete nouns, they usually stay grammatically feminine (see the Appendix for OCS *vojevoda, gospoda*, cp. also MHG *Bedienung, Eminenz*, etc.

What if we want to form a possessive or prepositional governing compound with a synchronic (abstract or concrete) *a*-stem SMC?

→ Replace the suffix.


The only apparent exception: Gk. *χλυντο-τέχνης* etc.

→ BUT: Many of these also have o-stem compounds beside them:

| *χλυντο-τέχνης* ‘famous for one’s art’ (Hom.) | *χακό-τεχνος* ‘using bad art’ (Hom.) |
| *χρυσο-κόμης* ‘golden-haired’ (Pi.) | *ιππό-κομος* ‘adorned with horsehair’ (Hom.) |
| *Ὀλυμπιο-νικας* ‘winner at the Olympic games’ (Pi.) | *ψιλό-νικος* ‘fond of victory’ (Pi.) |
| *πεζο-µάχας* ‘foot soldier’ (Pi.) | *ιππό-µαχος* ‘fighting on horseback’ (Hom.) |

This suggests that the derivational history was originally:

(8) *τεχνή* : *-τεχνος* adj. ‘having *τεχνή*’ → *x-τέχνης* ‘one having *τεχνή*’

... with the expected replacement of *-¯a-* by *-o-.*

**Conclusion:** No evidence that PIE/Proto-Greek had possessive compounds of the structure

(9) | X | | Y-*ā | -o |

### 3.2 *-eh₂ as ‘individualizing’ suffix

- Leukart (1994): Starting from ‘singulatives’ like /Krētās/, Gk. *-ās* was extended to other nominal bases to create singulatives/individuatives

- Nussbaum (2010): PIE *eh₂* made 1) collectives, 2) adjectival abstracts and 3) endocentric substantivizations of adjectives (cp. the Germanic ‘weak’ adjectives) → these tended to become re-adjectivized and gave rise to the adjectival *ā*-feminine in most IE languages:
(10) *-o- → *-eh₂:
Possessive adj. -o- → Adj.abstr. (f.) -eh₂:
yéro- ‘true’ (adj., Lat. vĕrus) *yĕreh₂- ‘truth’ (e.g. OHG wara f.)

→ substantivization/‘weak adjective’ -eh₂:
yĕreh₂- ‘true one’ → ‘true’ (f. adj.) (e.g. Lat. vēra)

• Nothing predicts that function 3) (endocentric substantivizations) will develop exclusively into a feminine marker - if it was originally simply +DEFINITE (+ANIMATE?), we would expect to see the occasional development into a masculine individualizing suffix.

3.2.1 Lycian
Hajnal (1994), Melchert (2011): Lycian -(a)za- < *-tjeh₂- preserves the individualizing function of *-eh₂-.

The derivational pattern: *tjo-adjective → *tjeh₂-substantive (animate). NB these have developed into designations of professions.

(11) Lycian -(a)za-:
  c. subst.       ze-adj.       za-subst./profession
  Luv. kumma- ‘sacred’ (subst.) Lyc. *kummeze- ‘sacred’ Lyc. kumaza- ‘priest’

Other examples include maraza- ‘judge’, wasaza- a kind of priest, zxxaza- ‘fighter’, zddaza- ‘slave’ etc.

3.2.2 Syntactic evidence for individualizing *-eh₂
• Cp. definite determination in other languages, Hajnal (1997):
  − Gmc. strong adjectives (indefinite, predicative/attributive) vs. weak adjectives (< *-(o)n-, definite, attributive)
  − Balto-Slavic ‘long forms’ of adjectives (*-ijo-): definite, specific
• Both in Greek and Latin we find attributive use in the earliest attestations:

Greek
(12) Il.15.728-9:
θρηνον ἔπταπόδην (cp. below)

(13) Il.1.571:
τοῖς δ’ Ὑψιστος κλυτοτέχνης ἐρχ’ ἀγορεύειν
‘and among them Hephaestus, famed for his craft, began to speak’

Latin
  − indigena
(14) Verg., Aeneid 12,823:
  ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
  ‘Let not the native Latins lose their ancient name’

(15) Plin., Naturalis historia, 14,8,72:
  ... dixisse hospiti de indigena vino...
  ‘...[he] spoke to the host about the native wine....’

7
Are there traces of definite use of masculine *ā-stems vs. indefinite/non-specific use of root noun compounds/o-stem compounds?

Greek

-ποδης vs. -πους

(17) Il.15.728-9:
ἀλλ’ ἀνεχαζετο τυτθον, οζόμενος θανέσθηκα, θρήνυν ἐφ’ ἐπταπόδην ...
‘Forboding death, he recoiled a little along the bridge of seven feet...’
(definite - the bridge is already known from previous discourse)

(18) Hdt.Hist.3.60.2:
δια ταιντας δε αυτων ἄλλα ὀρυγμα εἰκοσίπετυρ βάθος ὀρωμυκται, τριπουν δε τὸ ἐμος ...
‘...but throughout the whole [tunnel] a channel of twenty cubits in depth is dug, and three feet in width...’
(indefinite - a new topic, the ditch in the channel, is introduced)

On the other hand:

(19) Hes., Work and Days 423-5:
ὀλμον µεν τριποδην τάμενον, ὑπερον δε τριπηχυν, ἄξονα δ’ ἐπταπόδην, µάλα γάρ νυ τοι ἀρµενον αὑτω: ει δε κεν ὀκταποδην, ἀπο και σφυραν κε τάµων.
‘Cut a mortar three feet wide and a pestle three cubits long, and an axle of seven feet, for it will do very well so; but if you make it eight feet long, you can cut a beetle from it as well.’

4 Conclusion

• Greek, Latin, and maybe Armenian (see Appendix) continue verbal governing compounds with agentive SMC in *-ā

• As a class, these cannot be explained as having developed out of compounds with f. abstract/collection SMC (either possessive or determinative compounds)

• Greek in particular suggests that they rather reflect ‘individualizing’ use of *-eh₂ in derivational chains such as

(20) a. *x-pod- ‘x-footed’ (→ *x-pod-o-s ‘x-footed’) → *x-pod-eh₂(-) ‘one who is x-footed’
b. Gk. -πους (→ -ποδος) → -ποδης

(21) a. *x-iug- ‘x-yoked/yoking’ (→ *x-iug-o-s ‘x-yoked/yoking’) → *x-iug-eh₂(-) ‘one who is x-yoked/yoking’
b. Gk. ζυγος (Ved. -yuj-) → ζυγους → ζυγης

• While this function of *-eh₂ gave the thematic adjectival feminine in most IE languages, agricola/βαθυδήπης-compounds preserve traces of the non-gendered use of the suffix

• Lycian seems to provide independent evidence for this use
A Appendix

A.1 Germanic

OHG heri-zoho/-zogo, OS heri-togo, OE heretoga etc. ‘dux’ (also OHG magu-zoho ‘tutor, mentor’): usually explained as a loan translation of the Gk. military title στρατηλάτης. However:

- The type has n-stem inflection, no traces of an a-stem in the SMC
- The SMC is therefore much more likely to reflect a root noun or o-stem; these were routinely extended with the suffix */-an/-*jan- (RGA, s.v. Herzog; Schaffner 2001, 569ff.);

Conclusion: No reason to assume that OHG herizogo etc. reflect compounds with *eh₂-stem SMC.

A.2 Slavic

OCS voje-voda ‘leader of the army’ is the only relevant form.

Fraenkel (1912, 118f.): The Slavic masculine a-stems go back to old abstracts; in some cases the development feminine abstract → masculine concrete noun is attested very early on:

(22) a. OCS gospoda ‘gentlemen, nobility’; ‘hostel, inn’ → ‘host, lord/lady’; ‘inn’ (OCz., Pol.), ‘landlord’ (SC)

b. OCS junota ‘group of young men’ → ‘young man, youth’

c. OCS sluga ‘servant’ ← *’service’ (cp. Gm. Bedienung ‘water/waitress’ < ‘service, attendance’)

voievoda itself inflects as f. in OCS (pl. vojevode), but as a m. o-stem later in Slov.

Vasmer (1953-58): vojevoda = calqued on Gmc. *harja-tuga underlying the n-stem herizogo. But:

- Nothing presupposes a *-tuga in the Gmc. forms (see above)
- No reason why a calque based on a Gmc. *on-stem should have taken on f. a-inflection in Slavic

voievoda triggers f. agreement in adj., m. a-stems in other languages (Greek, Latin) trigger m. agreement:

(23) a. OCS dżěv vojevode ‘two generals’

b. Lat. vel cavillator facetus vel conviva commodus item ero (Plaut., Mil.3,1,50) ‘Either the merry banterer likewise, or the agreeable boon-companion will I be’

Conclusion: vojevoda belongs to a small group of inner-Slavic concretizations of abstract/collective *a-stems. These should be kept apart from the Greek and Latin forms discussed below.

A.3 Tocharian

Type TB kärtsce-rita ‘searching the good’: TB -rita ‘searching X’; TB -lyaka, A -lyak ‘seeing X’; B -tsaika, A -tsæk ‘shaping X’; TA -pālk ‘shining X’ etc.

- The SMC behave like other Tocharian agent formations in TB -a, TA -a.
- Only a-character roots appear as SMC of these compounds. Verbal governing compounds from verbs with a-character are in complementary distribution with verbal governing compounds from verbs without a-character (Malzahn 2012)
- PT *-a found in these compounds cannot go back to PIE *eh₂

4The communis opinio assumes a development of PIE *eh₂-/pre-PT *-ā- in internal position to PT *-ā- > TB -o-, TA -a- (e.g. PIE *gāst-u- > PT *wāstā > TB ost, TA wast ‘house’ (Ved. wāstā- ‘house’)). There is, however, no consensus on the development of PIE *eh₂ in final position. Malzahn (2011), following Peters (1991), suggests a development of PIE *eh₂ > PT -o- > TB -a, TA -a. We are assuming, however, that PIE *eh₂ gave PT *-ā in final position. The strongest argument in favor of the latter development comes from the adjectival nom.pl. *eh₂-es, acc.pl. *eh₂-na > PT -ā and neuter nom./acc.pl. *eh₂ > PT -ā. This PT -ā was later recharacterized by adding the morpheme *-na (< *-nh₂, cp. Ved. -n). This recharacterization must have taken place after the sound law of *eh₂ > *-ā- in internal position had run its course. See Fellner (2012) for more details.
Conclusion: The Tocharian type kārtse-rita does not go back to compounds in PIE *-eh₂. Like in Germanic, the core of the type seems to go back to *-(o)n-stem derivatives (cp. Lat. Catò) of verbal governing compounds with o-stem or root noun SMC (see Fellner 2012, cp. Gmc. above).

A.4 Armenian

- *pta-ber, -berac ‘fruit tree’, lit. ‘fruit carrier’ (berem ‘carry’), translates Gk. καρποφόρος
- bare-gorc, -gorac ‘benefactor’ (gorcem ‘do, act’)
- *tʰag-a-wor, -aworac ‘crown-bearer; king’ < *bʰor-ā
- Olsen (1999): Armenian continues very few simplex *eh₂-stems

“Compounds ending in a verbal root with the function of agent noun [...] are regularly inflected as a-stems. Beside the possible influence from Iranian loanwords which should never be underestimated there are two potential sources: the type of OChSl. vojevoda, i.e. original possessive compounds whose final member is a feminine ā-stem abstract, and compounds in a root noun accidentally ending in a (vocalized) laryngeal, the type of Lat. agricola.’ (Olsen 1999, 61)

- Meillet (1914): These compounds reflect the same Indo-European type as Lat. agri-cola, Gk. βακτροφόρος, Sl. voje-voda

Conclusion: The type is highly productive in agentive compounds and probably reflects a parallel development to Greek.
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