

Κῆρες, Κάρες: root nouns of the type \*Cēr, \*Cārós?

1. To explain η/ᾱ (which cannot have Ionic-Attic η < ᾱ) in ψῆρ, ψᾶρ 'starling' (for the details see the etymological dictionaries) J.SCHMIDT assumed an original \*ψᾶρ, \*ψᾶρός (KZ 25,1881, 20). Homer has ψῆρας but ψᾶρών. The latter is explained as having short α, here used long because the word would otherwise not enter the hexameter. Att. ψᾶρ however is explained from levelling after ᾱ had become η. In the first place this would mean that the long α in Attic has another explanation than that in Homer. (The long α might be an older form, though P 755 seems not a typical formula.) Secondly, in the period after ᾱ > η we would have had \*ψῆρ, \*ψᾶρός. Here levelling ('ausgeglichen') to \*ψῆρ, \*ψᾶρός (and hence to ψᾶρ, ψᾶρός) is improbable: it would have given ψῆρ, ψῆρός. Then we would have to assume that a new nominative ψᾶρ was formed to \*ψᾶρός. Thus EHRLICH, KZ 39 (1906) 558f (with intermediate \*ψαρος; directly KRETSCHMER, Glotta 4, 1913, 336). This is not very probable either: 'ablaut' η/ᾱ was well known in the dialects where ᾱ had become η.

Neither way seems very probable, but more essential is the starting point. For J.SCHMIDT this was ᾱ/ᾶ. This ablaut is well known in PIE, but in the form eh<sub>2</sub>/h<sub>2</sub>, and \*pseh<sub>2</sub>r<sup>1)</sup> is not a probable PIE form (for a root noun). This may be the reason why J.SCHINDLER (Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen, Würzburg 1972, 104) considers \*psēr. We shall see below that \*psēr, \*psārós is improbable. Here we may add that there is a good chance that the word is non-IE: 1) it has no good IE etymology; 2) it is a birds name; 3) the η/ᾱ discussed here; 4) many Greek words with ψ- are non-IE, and IE words with \*ps- are very rare.

2. In Κῆρες an η is found everywhere, but ᾱ occurs also. Here too κῆρ, \*κᾶρός has been assumed (KRETSCHMER, KZ 31, 1892, 354)<sup>2)</sup>. Here this can only have been κῆρ with η from ē (explicitly only SCHINDLER,

1.c. 86). If one thinks that κήρ, \*κḗρ<sub>2</sub> could have given κᾶρ (which I think is improbable), the question is what the PIE basis could have been.

3. The connection with κερᾶίζω would give \*kērh<sub>2</sub>(s), \*krh<sub>2</sub>-ós, of which the latter gives \*κḗρ<sub>2</sub>ós, but the first can hardly have resulted in κήρ. Also this etymology has now been given up (LEE, Glotta 39, 1961, 191ff; RAMAT, AGI 50, 1965, 121ff).

When we neglect the possibility \*kēh<sub>2</sub>r > κηρ (with ēh<sub>2</sub> > ē), \*kh<sub>2</sub>r-ós (see n. 1), the only possibility seems \*kē̄r, \*kr-ós. The question is whether this type really existed.

4. I collected all root nouns ending in a resonant and beginning with one consonant from SCHINDLER's book (cited § 1). They are in Indo-Iranian (p.73; excluded are those that have laryngeal after the resonant): gav-, dam-, vi-, Av. gav- 'hand?', Av. ham- 'summer', van-; 'Gemeinarisch' tan-, ran-. In Greek we have (p.106f): θήρ, φῶρ, εἶρ, ἦρα, ψήρ, κᾶρ<sub>2</sub>?, κήρ, ὄρες, φθειρ? None of these presents evidence for a genitive of the type CR-ós. (This is well known for most cases; it can be easily checked in SCHINDLER's discussions.) TISCHLER, MSS 35 (1976) 122f, gives \*ghē̄r, \*ghrós, but Lat. ē̄r, ē̄ris 'hedgehog' and the glosse χήρ· ἐχῦνος give no evidence for \*ghrós.

5. I know of no evidence to the contrary either, but I think the burden of proof rests with those assuming CR-ós instead of CR-ós. An indication may be the genitive of the word for 'earth' in Sanskrit, kṣmās, gṃās, jṃās. (Whether the word is a root noun or not seems not relevant; essential is that it has -Rós after one or two consonants that could not be vocalised.) A form in \*-m̄os > Skt. -amas would no doubt have been preserved<sup>3)</sup>. Greek has χ(θ)αμ-, but for these forms (χαμαί, χθαμαλός) no direct PIE antecedent has been found (cf. BEEKES, KZ 87 (1973) 218f), and it is not at all certain that this form comes from the m-stem.

6. The conclusions may not be too insignificant to justify these pages, as they regard PIE morphology and the history of a culturally important word.

1) There is no evidence for a genitive type CR-ós. We would expect CR-ós, and Skt. jmás seems to confirm this.

2) The explanation of ψήρ/ψᾶρ and κήρ/κᾶρ- from a noun \*Cēr, \*Crós is very improbable. The first word seems non-IE for several reasons. The other therefore is probably non-IE too. The connection with κέρω, advocated by LEE and RAMAT (11. cc.), does not explain η/ᾶ.

#### Notes:

- 1) \*Psēh<sub>2</sub>r might have become \*psār, or \*psēr if EICHNER, MSS 31 (1973) 53-107 is correct. However, this would be the first instance of ēh<sub>2</sub> > ē outside Hittite. On \*psēr see the text below.
- 2) That ἐν κερός αἴση contained this genitive has now been generally abandoned. - I don't understand why CHANTRAINE, Dict.étym. s.v., thinks that in the glosses κερῶσαι etc. 'l' a doit être bref'.
- 3) Therefore disyllabic zəmō Y 51,12a cannot be from 'earth' as INSLER, The Gāthā's of Zarathustra, takes it (Y 51 has verses of 7 + 7 syllables without exception).