

# The Greek and Latin verbal governing compounds in $*-\bar{a}$ and their prehistory

*Etymology and the European Lexicon, Copenhagen, Sept. 17-22 2012*

Hannes A. Fellner (Fellner@fas.harvard.edu)  
Laura Grestenberger (Lgresten@fas.harvard.edu)

Harvard University

## 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  $*-\bar{a}$ . Unlike other PIE formations in  $*-\bar{a}$ , these compounds are animate masculine nouns, rather than *Motionsfeminina* or neuter/collective nouns:
  - (1) a. Gk. βαθυ-δίνας ‘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  $*-\bar{a}$  <  $*-(e)h_2$ -?

## 2 Compounds in $*-\bar{a}$ in Greek and Latin

### 2.1 Greek

#### 2.1.1 Denominal compounds

- We often find possessive compounds in  $-ης/-\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$  besides compounds with root noun SMC or  $-o$ -stem SMC.

root noun	$o$ -adjective	$\bar{\alpha}$ -stem
(χύκλ-, δειν-, Αἰθί-)ωψ (Hom., Hes.) ‘-eyed’	δειν-ωπός (Hes.) ‘fierce-eyed’	κυν-ῶπ-α (Hom., Vsg.) ‘dog-eyed’
$*-o\psi$ ‘-voiced’		βαρυ-όπ-ᾶς (Pi.) ‘having a deep voice’
(δί-)ζυξ ‘double-yoked’ (Hom.)	ἑκατό-ζυγος ‘hundred-yoked’ (Hom.)	βου-ζύγ-ης ‘cattle-yoking’ (Att., name of a group of priests)
(-)φώρ ‘thief’	ἄθλο-φόρος ‘bearing the prize’ (Hom.)	σαυ-φόρ-ᾶς ‘San-bearing’ (of horses) (Ar.)
(ἀμφι-, οἰκό-)τριψ (Ar., Arch.)	(ἄ-)τριβος ‘-worn, -trodden’ (Thuc.)	παιδο-τριβ-ης ‘trainer of children’ (Pi.)

(τρι)-πους ‘measuring (three) feet; tripod’ (Hom.)	(ἐκατόμ)-πεδος ‘measuring (a hundred) feet’ (Hom.)	ἑπτα-πόδ-ης ‘seven feet long’ (Hom.)
[Ved. <i>pari-kṣī-t-</i> ‘dwelling around’ < * <i>tḱ-i-t-</i> ]		περι-κτίται <sup>1</sup> ‘neighbors’ (Hom.)

### 2.1.2 Mycenaean:

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

Κρήτ-ā ‘Crete’	→	<i>Ke-re-ta-o</i> , Gsg. of /Krēt-ās/, ‘(male) person from Crete’
ὄρος ‘mountain’, Myc. * <i>orehā</i> ‘mountainous region’	→	<i>O-re-a<sub>2</sub></i> /Orehās/ ‘(male) person from a mountainous region’
* <i>swét-ā</i> ‘clan’	→	* <i>hwét-ās</i> ‘individual belonging to the clan’ (Hom. Npl. ἔται ‘clansmen’)
(maybe) * <i>veanīā</i> ‘youth’ (abstr./coll.)	→	veanίης ‘young man, youth’

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

- *Ti-ri-jo-qa* ‘Τρίοπαζ’, cp. Hom. κυν-ῶπ-α
- *Po-da* could be a short form of a compound in -πόδης (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* /Enk<sup>h</sup>eh-ās/ ← ἔγχος ‘spear’

In these cases there is no reason to assume an intermediate step via collectives (i.e. no \*(-)ōp-ā, \*(-)podā, etc.).

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

- (2) a. /Krētā/ : /Krētā/-s vs.  
b. -ποδ-ης, -ζυγ-ης, NOT -ποδη-ς, -ζυγη-ς

The derivational chain for the latter seems to be<sup>2</sup>:

- (3) [[ (δί-) ] [ -ζυγ- ] ] → [[ (ἐκατό-) ] [ -ζυγ- ] -ο- ] → [[[ (βου-) ] [ -ζυγ- ] ] -η- ]

<sup>1</sup>-κτίτ-ης was presumably reanalyzed as -κτι-της very early in Greek, s. Leukart (1994, 47 & 157ff.)

<sup>2</sup>Analysis based on Fellner (2011).

### 2.1.3 Denominal compounds II: Possessive compounds with synchronic $\bar{\alpha}$ -stem SMC

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

Simplex $\bar{\alpha}$ -stem	compound
μελίη 'spear'	ἐϋ-μελίη-ς 'having a good spear' (Hom.)
τέχνη 'art'	κλυτο-τέχνη-ς 'famous for one's art' (Hom.)
λύρα 'lyre'	ἐϋ-λύρα-ς 'having a good lyre' (Sapph.)
χάρμη 'battle'	ἰππ(ι)ο-χάρμη-ς 'battling from a chariot' (Pi., Hom., Hes.)
κόμη 'hair'	χρυσο-κόμη-ς 'golden-haired' (Pi.)

- No simplex forms \*μελίη-ς, \*τέχνη-ς etc.

→ This is an inner-Greek strategy for using f. simplex \* $\bar{\alpha}$ -stems in possessive compounds. The parsing has to be:

(4) [[βαθυ- ] [ δίνη- ] ] -ς

### 2.1.4 Deverbal compounds

- Rüedi 1969: Compounds like Ὀλυμπιο-νίκη-ς 'winner at the Olympic games' and βαθυ-δίνη-ς 'deep-eddy' were formally ambiguous - the SMC corresponded to a synchronic f.  $\bar{\alpha}$ -/ $\eta$ -stem (νίκη 'victory', δίνη 'eddy'), but also to the denominal verbs derived from these (νικάω 'conquer, be victorious', δινάω/-έω 'whirl, eddy'). A reinterpretation as verbal governing compounds (= endocentric) became possible.

Simplex $\bar{\alpha}$ -stem	verb stem	compound
δίνη 'eddy'	δινάω, -έω 'whirl'	βαθυ-δίνης 'deep-eddy' (Hom.)
ἀγορή 'assembly'	ἀγορεύω, ἀγοράομαι 'assemble'	λαβρ-αγόρης 'talking boldly' (Hom.)
βοά 'cry'	βοάω 'cry'	βαρυ-βόας 'crying out loud' (Pi.)
δίκη 'judgement'	δικάζω 'judge'	ἰθυ-δίκης 'giving the right judgement' (Hes.)
νίκη 'victory'	νικάω 'be victorious'	Ὀλυμπιο-νίκας 'winner at the Olympic games' (Pi.)
μάχη 'battle'	μάχομαι 'fight, battle'	πεζο-μάχας 'foot soldier' (Pi.)

→ This is clearly type II reinterpreted as deverbal:

(5) [[ βαθυ- ] [ δίνη- ] ] -ς → [[ βαθυ- ] δίνη- ] -ς

## 2.2 Latin

### 2.2.1 Denominal

Base noun	$\bar{a}$ -compound	<i>us</i> -stem	Verb
<i>rēm-ex</i> ‘rower’ (Plaut.); <i>aure-ax</i> ‘charioteer’ (Paul. ex Fest.)	<i>aurīga</i> ‘charioteer’ (CL)		[ <i>agō</i> ‘drive’]
<i>pēs</i> ‘foot’, <i>-pēs</i> ‘footed’	<i>tremi-peda</i> ‘with trembling feet’ (Varr.) <sup>3</sup> , <i>plūmi-peda</i> ‘feather-footed’ (Catul.), <i>Centum-peda</i> ‘centipede’ (Jove epithet, Aug.)	<i>com-pedus</i> ‘fettering’ (Varr.)	

### 2.2.2 (Synchronically) deverbal

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

**Conclusion** : The Greek and Latin m. verbal governing compounds in  $\bar{a}$ - have strong functional and morphological parallels that point to an inherited category.

<sup>3</sup>See Lindner 2010.

## 3 Analysis

### 3.1 Previous explanations

Three basic strategies:

1. These compounds go back to old collective  $*eh_2$ -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  $*-ā-$  <  $*-eh_2-$  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:

$$\begin{array}{ll} *agro-k^u e/olh_1- (*k^u elh_1 \text{ 'turn, move about'}) & \rightarrow \text{agri-cola} \\ *endo-ĝenh_1- (*ĝenh_1 \text{ 'beget'}) & \rightarrow \text{indi-gena} \end{array}$$

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.  $*CVR/Lh_1-s$ )
- Laryngeal loss through the ‘ $\nu\epsilon o\gamma\nu\acute{o}\zeta$ -rule’ expected throughout much of the paradigm (Mayrhofer 1986, 65; Weiss 2009, 113:  $-CRHV-$  >  $-CRV-$  ‘in non-initial syllables of “long” words (including compounds and reduplicated forms)’; cp. also Kuiper 1961.)
- Many root nouns from *ani* $\bar{t}$ -roots, but sparse evidence for *set*-roots:
  - *CeH*: Gk.  $\acute{\alpha}\text{-}\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\text{-}\tau$ -, Lat. *sacer-dō-t*-, *locu-plē-t*- etc., cp. esp. Lat. *praegnas*, *-ātis* ‘pregnant’ <  $*ĝnh_1-t$
  - *CeN/RH*: Ved. *tuvi-ṣván-* ‘roaring loudly’ <  $*s_2enh_2$ , also *-sváni-*; Ved. *āmúr* ‘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?

$$(6) \quad [[ X ] [ Y-*ā ] -\emptyset ]: \text{Bahuvrīhi} \rightarrow \text{VGC?}$$

or

$$(7) \quad [[ X ] Y-*ā ]: \text{Determinative compound} \rightarrow \text{VGC?}$$

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  $-ā-$  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  $\bar{a}$ -stem SMC (mostly a concrete noun) in the individual branches:

- Vedic: *māṃsa-bhikṣā́* f. ‘request for meat’, *dur-hāṇā́* f. ‘harm, disaster’ (*han*)
- Greek: οἶνο-χόη ‘wine pitcher’ (Hes.), but: ἄ-βουλίᾱ ‘indecision’ ← ἄ-βουλος, vs. βουλή ‘decision’, etc.
- 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)  $\bar{a}$ -stem SMC?

→ Replace the suffix.

- with *-o-*: Gk. τιμή ‘honor’ : ἄ-τιμος ‘dishonored’; ζώνη ‘belt’ : ἐύ-ζωνος ‘well-girded’; etc.; Ved. *usríyā-* ‘cow’ : *priyósriya-* ‘cow-loving’; *jyā́-* ‘bowstring’ : *ṛtá-jya-* ‘having a good bowstring’; *śraddhā́-* ‘belief’ : *a-śraddhá-* ‘unbelieving’ etc.
- with *-i-*: Gk. ἀλκή ‘strength’ : ἄν-αλκίς, -ιδος ‘defenseless, weak’; Lat. *barba* ‘beard’ : *imberbis* ‘bearless’; *lingua* ‘tongue’ : *trilinguis* ‘having three tongues’; *arma* ‘weaponry’ (plurale tantum!) : *inermis* ‘unarmed’; etc.

The only apparent exception: Gk. κλυτο-τέχνης etc.

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

κλυτο-τέχνη-ς ‘famous for one’s art’ (Hom.)	κακό-τεχνος ‘using bad art’ (Hom.)
χρυσο-κόμη-ς ‘golden-haired’ (Pi.)	ἵππο-κομος ‘adorned with horsehair’ (Hom.)
Ὀλυμπιο-νίκας ‘winner at the Olympic games’ (Pi.)	φιλό-νικος ‘fond of victory’ (Pi.)
πεζο-μάχας ‘foot soldier’ (Pi.)	ἵππο-μαχος ‘fighting on horseback’ (Hom.)

This suggests that the derivational history was originally:

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

... with the expected replacement of  $*\bar{a}$ - by  $*-o-$ .

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

(9) [[ X ] [ Y- $*\bar{a}$  ] - $\emptyset$  ].

### 3.2 $*-eh_2$ as ‘individualizing’ suffix

- Leukart (1994): Starting from ‘singulatives’ like /Kṛētās/, Gk.  $*\bar{a}s$  was extended to other nominal bases to create singulatives/individuatives
- Nussbaum (2010): PIE  $*eh_2$  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  $*\bar{a}$ -feminine in most IE languages:

(10) \*-o- → \*-eh<sub>2</sub>:

Possessive adj. -o-	→	Adj.abstr. (f.) -eh <sub>2</sub> :
uēro- ‘true’ (adj., Lat. <i>vērus</i> )		*uēreh <sub>2</sub> - ‘truth’ (e.g. OHG <i>wāra</i> f.)
	→	substantivization/‘weak adjective’ -eh <sub>2</sub> :
		*uēreh <sub>2</sub> - ‘true one’ → ‘true’ (f. adj.) (e.g. Lat. <i>vēra</i> )

- 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- < \*-ti<sub>h</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>- preserves the individualizing function of \*-eh<sub>2</sub>-.

The derivational pattern: \*ti<sub>h</sub>o-adjec-tive → \*ti<sub>h</sub>eh<sub>2</sub>-substantive (animate). NB these have developed into designations of professions.

(11) Lycian -(a)za-:

c. subst.	ze-adj.	za-subst./profession
Luv. <i>kumma</i> - ‘sacred’ (subst.)	Lyc. * <i>kummeze</i> - ‘sacred’	Lyc. <i>kumaza</i> - ‘priest’

Other examples include *maraza*- ‘judge’, *wasaza*- a kind of priest, *zaxaza*- ‘fighter’, *xddaza*- ‘slave’ etc.

### 3.2.2 Syntactic evidence for individualizing \*-eh<sub>2</sub>

- 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) Π.15.728-9:  
θρηῦν ἐπταπόδην (cp. below)

(13) Π.1.571:  
τοῖσιν δ’ Ἡφαίστος 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...’

– *silvicola*

- (16) Naev., *Belli punici carmen*, 1,10:  
*silvicolae homines bellique inertes*  
‘mountain-dwelling men, unskilled in war’

- Are there traces of definite use of masculine  $*\bar{a}$ -stems vs. indefinite/non-specific use of root noun compounds/*o*-stem compounds?

## Greek

– -ποδης vs. -πους

- (17) Il.15.728-9:  
ἀλλ’ ἀνεχάζετο τυτθόν, οἴομενος θανέεσθαι, θρηῆνυν ἐφ’ ἑπταπόδην ...  
‘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:  
διὰ παντὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄλλο ὄρυγμα εἰκοσίπηχυ βάρους ὀρωρυκται, τρίπουν δὲ τὸ εὖρος ...  
‘...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:  
ὄλμων μὲν τριπόδην τάμνειν, ὕπερον δὲ τρίπηχυν, ἄξονα δ’ ἑπταπόδην, μάλα γάρ νύ τοι ἄρμενον οὕτω: εἰ δέ κεν ὀκταπόδην, ἀπὸ καὶ σφῦράν κε τάμοιο.  
‘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  $*\bar{a}$
  - As a class, these cannot be explained as having developed out of compounds with f. abstract/collective SMC (either possessive or determinative compounds)
  - Greek in particular suggests that they rather reflect ‘individualizing’ use of  $*\text{-eh}_2$  in derivational chains such as
- (20) a.  $*x\text{-pod-}$  ‘*x*-footed’ ( $\rightarrow *x\text{-pod-o-s}$  ‘*x*-footed’)  $\rightarrow *x\text{-pod-eh}_2(-)$  ‘one who is *x*-footed’  
b. Gk. -πους ( $\rightarrow$  -πεδος)  $\rightarrow$  -πόδης
- (21) a.  $*x\text{-yug-}$  ‘*x*-yoked/yoking’ ( $\rightarrow *x\text{-yug-o-s}$  ‘*x*-yoked/yoking’)  $\rightarrow *x\text{-yug-eh}_2(-)$  ‘one who is *x*-yoked/yoking’  
b. Gk. -ζυξ (Ved. -yuj-)  $\rightarrow$  -ζυγος  $\rightarrow$  -ζύγης
- While this function of  $*\text{-eh}_2$  gave the thematic adjectival feminine in most IE languages, *agricola*/βαθιδίνης-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 *here-toga* 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  $\bar{a}$ -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 *\*eh<sub>2</sub>*-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)
- OCS *gospoda* ‘gentlemen, nobility’; ‘hostel, inn’ → ‘host, lord/lady’; ‘inn’ (OCz., Pol.), ‘landlord’ (SC)
  - OCS *junota* ‘group of young men’ → ‘young man, youth’
  - OCS *sluga* ‘servant’ ← *\*‘service’* (cp. Gm. *Bedienung* ‘water/waitress’ < ‘service, attendance’)

*vojevoda* itself inflects as f. in OCS (pl. *vojevodě*), 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.  $\bar{a}$ -inflection in Slavic
- *vojevoda* triggers f. agreement in adj., m.  $\bar{a}$ -stems in other languages (Greek, Latin) trigger m. agreement:

- (23)
- OCS *дѣвѣ vojevodě* ‘two generals’
  - 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 *\* $\bar{a}$* -stems. These should be kept apart from the Greek and Latin forms discussed below.

### A.3 Tocharian

Type TB *kärtse-rita* ‘searching the good’: TB *-rita* ‘searching X’; TB *-lyaka*, A *-lyak* ‘seeing X’; B *-tsaika*, A *-tsek* ‘shaping X’; TA *-pälk* ‘shining X’ etc.

- The SMC behave like other Tocharian agent formations in TB *-a*, TA *-ø*.
- 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 *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>The *communis opinio* assumes a development of PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>*-/pre-PT *\*- $\bar{a}$* - in internal position to PT *\*- $\bar{a}$* - > TB *-o-*, TA *-a-* (e.g. PIE *\*uást-u-* > PT *\*wástü* > TB *ost*, TA *wast* ‘house’ (Ved. *vástu-* ‘house’). There is, however, no consensus on the development of PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* in final position. Malzahn (2011), following Peters (1991), suggests a development of PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* > PT *\*-a* > TB *-a*, TA *-a*. We are assuming, however, that PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* gave PT *\*- $\bar{a}$*  in final position. The strongest argument in favor of the latter development comes from the adjectival nom./obl.pl. f. TB *-ona*, TA *-ana*, which goes back to the merger of the feminine nom.pl. *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-es*, acc.pl. *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-ns* > PT *- $\bar{a}$*  and neuter nom./acc.pl. *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* > PT *- $\bar{a}$* . This PT *- $\bar{a}$*  was later recharacterized by adding the morpheme *\*-na* (< *\*-nh<sub>2</sub>*, cp. Ved. *-ni*). This recharacterization must have taken place after the sound law of *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>-* > *\*- $\bar{a}$* - in internal position had run its course. See Fellner (2012) for more details.

**Conclusion:** The Tocharian type *kärtse-rita* does not go back to compounds in PIE  $*-eh_2$ . Like in Germanic, the core of the type seems to go back to  $*(o)n$ -stem derivatives (cp. Lat. *Catō*) of verbal governing compounds with *o*-stem or root noun SMC (see Fellner 2012, cp. Gmc. above).

#### A.4 Armenian

- *ptla-ber*, *-berac*<sup>c</sup> ‘fruit tree’, lit. ‘fruit carrier’ (*berem* ‘carry’), translates Gk. καρποφόρος
- *bare-gorc*, *-gorcac*<sup>c</sup> ‘benefactor’ (*gorcem* ‘do, act’)
- *t<sup>c</sup>ag-a-wor*, *-aworac*<sup>c</sup> ‘crown-bearer; king’ <  $*b^h or-\bar{a}$
- Olsen (1999): Armenian continues very few simplex  $*eh_2$ -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  $\bar{a}$ -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.

## References

- AiG II,2 = Debrunner, Albert. 1954. *Altindische Grammatik*, volume II,2: Die Nominalsuffixe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1996. Die maskulinen *a*-Stämme und der Verbaltyp *occupāre*. In *Akten des VIII. internationalen Kolloquiums zur lateinischen Linguistik*, 50–60. Heidelberg.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1917. *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fellner, Hannes A. 2011. Theoretical perspectives on IE nominal compounding. Unpublished Harvard Univ. ms.
- Fellner, Hannes A. 2012. Studies in Tocharian adjective formation. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1912. *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*, volume II. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1994. Die lykischen *a*-Stämme. In *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, ed. J.E. Rasmussen, 135–71.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1997. Definite nominale Determination im Indogermanischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102:38–73.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1992. Die lateinische Nominalflexion. In *Latein und Indogermanisch*, 89–135. Innsbruck.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1961. Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. *Die Sprache* 7:14–31.
- Leukart, Alex. 1994. *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Herkunft und Ausbreitung (unter Vergleich mit den Nomina auf -eús)*. Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: H.C. Beck, 5<sup>th</sup> edition.
- Lindner, Thomas. 2002. *Lateinische Komposita. Morphologische, historische und lexikalische Studien*. Innsbruck [IBS 105].
- Lindner, Thomas. 2010. Textkritische Probleme bei lateinischen Nominalkomposita. In *Latin linguistics today: Akten des 15. internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen Linguistik, Innsbruck, 4.-9. April 2009*, ed. P. Anreiter and M. Kienpointner. Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [= IBS 137].

- Malzahn, Melanie. 2011. Speaking on tongue - the Tocharian B nouns with an oblique singular *-a*. *TIES* 12:123–49.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2012. Verbale Rektionskomposita im Tocharischen. In *Iranistische und indogermanistische Beiträge in Memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944-1994)*, ed. V. Sadovski et al. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Malzahn, Melanie. In press. Nominal compounding. In *Handbook of Indo-European studies*, ed. M. Weiss and A. Garrett. Oxford University Press.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik*, volume I, 2. Halbband: Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1914. De la composition en arménien. *MSL* 18:245–70.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2011. PIE *\*-eh<sub>2</sub>* as an ‘individualizing’ suffix and the feminine gender. In *Kollektivum und Femininum: Flexion oder Wortbildung? Zum Andenken an Johannes Schmidt.*, ed. R. Schuhmann and S. Neri.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 2010. Feminine, abstract, collective, plural: disconnected remarks on each. Paper presented at the *Jenaer Indogermanistisches Kolloquium: Kollektivum und Femininum: Flexion oder Wortbildung? University of Jena, 28-29 July 2010* .
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999. *The noun in biblical Armenian*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Peters, Martin. 1991. Ein tocharisches Auslautproblem. *Die Sprache* 34:242–4.
- Rüedi, Eve Helga. 1969. *Vom Ἑλληνοδίκαζ zum ἀλλαντοπόλῆζ. Eine Studie zu den verbalen Rektionskomposita auf -αζ/-ηζ*. Zürich: Juris.
- RGA = H. Jankuhn, H. Beck et al., ed. 1968-2008. *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*. De Gruyter.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1909. Sur les composés latins du type *agricola*. In *Philologie et linguistique. Mélanges offerts à Louis Havet*, 459–71. Paris.
- Schaffner, Stefan. 2001. *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck [IBS 103].
- Vasmer, Max. 1953-58. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Weiss, Michael. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Beech Stave Press.