

Greek $\mu\alpha\pi\text{-}$ and its congeners

Alexander Nikolaev

Boston University, (Boston MA, USA); alexander.s.nikolaev@gmail.com

Abstract. Ancient Greek (aor.) $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ ‘to seize’ ([Hes.] *Sc.* 231, 252, 304) has not yet received a satisfactory etymology which this paper aims to provide. Ever since antiquity it has been argued that aor. $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ is a secondary replacement of $*\mu\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ made from nearly synonymous and much better attested verb $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$ ‘seize, overtake, strike’ (for which only sigmatic aorist is attested). This view does not carry conviction; the present paper argues that aor. $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ is real and its root $\mu\alpha\pi\text{-}$ is distinct from that of $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$ for which a new etymological analysis is offered (PIE $*merk^w\text{-}$ ‘snatch, take away’, Toch. A $m\acute{a}rk\text{-}$ ‘to take away’). My proposal is to view $\mu\alpha\pi\text{-}$ as a zero-grade root allomorph $*m\eta\eta p\text{-}$ formed from a full-grade root $*memp\text{-}$ (< $*menp\text{-}$) cf. $\mu\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ (< $*b^h\eta d^h\text{-}$): $\mu\epsilon\nu\theta\text{-}$ (< $*b^h\text{end}^h\text{-}$), $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$ (< $*d^r\acute{k}\text{-}$): $\delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\text{-}$ (< $*derk\text{-}$), etc. The hypothetical full-grade root $*memp\text{-}$ (< $*menp\text{-}$) can be analyzed as a verbal governing compound of PIE $*men\text{-}$ ‘hand’ (Lat. *manus* ‘hand’, OIr. *muin*₂ ‘protection’, OE *mund* ‘hand’, Hitt. *maniyahh-* ‘to hand over’) and the root $*h\eta p\text{-}$ ‘take’ (Lat. *coepi* ‘I began’, *apiō* ‘I tie’, Hitt. *epp-*^{zi} ‘grabs’, Ved. *āpa* ‘has reached’): $*men\text{-}h\eta p\text{-}$ ‘take with one’s hand; seize’. Similar compounds with PIE $*men\text{-}$ ‘hand’ used as the first member are reflected in Lat. *mancipium* ‘laying hold of a thing; ownership’ (*quasi* $*men\text{-}$ + $*keh_2p\text{-}$) and *mandāre* ‘to hand over’ (*quasi* $*men\text{-}$ + $*d^heh_1\text{-}$). This nominal compound underlies the neo-root $*menh_1p\text{-}$; compare Ved. *gup-* ‘to protect’ (based on the compound *go-pā-* ‘cow-herd’), Lat. *crēd-* ‘believe’ (< $*kreds\text{-}d^heh_1\text{-}$) or PIE $*uelh_1b^h\text{-}$ ‘speak lies’ (< $*uelh_1\text{-}b^heh_2\text{-}$). In aor. $*(h_1)e\text{-}menh_1p\text{-}t$ ‘seized’ the laryngeal would be lost in a heavy CHCC cluster by Schmidt-Hackstein’s rule, hence 3 sg. $*(h_1)e\text{-}menp\text{-}t$ (> $*(h_1)e\text{-}memp\text{-}t$ with place assimilation), 3 pl. $*(h_1)e\text{-}m\eta\eta p\text{-}ent$, remade as thematic aorist $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}\text{-}$. A neat parallel to the proposed development may be found in another verbal governing compound of PIE date, namely, $*men(e)s\text{-}d^heh_1\text{-}$ ‘to implement thinking’ > $\mu\epsilon\nu\theta\text{-}$ (remade as $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\text{-}$) which in turn engendered a new zero-grade $\mu\alpha\theta\text{-}$.

Keywords: Greek epic poetry, Greek etymology, compounds, formulaic collocations, laryngeal theory, Hittite, Tocharian.

Acknowledgements. It is a pleasant duty to thank Roberto Batisti, Hannes Fellner, Stefan Höfler, Sergio Neri, Norbert Oettinger, and Michael Weiss for their help and advice. Responsibility for any errors is, of course, mine alone.

К этимологии др.-гр. *μαλ-*

А. С. Николаев

Бостонский университет (Бостон, США); alexander.s.nikolaev@gmail.com

Аннотация. Древнегреческий глагол *μαλέ/ό-* (aor.) ‘хватать’ ([Hes.] *Sc.* 231, 252, 304) до сих пор не получил удовлетворительного этимологического толкования, предложить которое — цель настоящей статьи. Начиная с античности, тематическая аористная основа *μαλέ/ό-* объяснялась как вариант основы **μαρπέ/ό-*, образованной от хорошо засвидетельствованного глагола *μαρπτο* сходного значения ‘хватать, нападать’. Однако глагол *μαρπτο* образует только сигматический аорист, а возможность выпадения *ρ* в гипотетической основе **μαρπέ/ό-* не подтверждается параллелями; столь же маловероятно, что в эпической поэме VI века до н. э. мог сохраниться такой просодический архаизм, как */mρpe/o-/* со слоговым сонантом. В силу этих причин традиционное объяснение не выдерживает критики. В настоящей статье утверждается, что корень *μαλ-* этимологически не связан с корнем глагола *μαρπτο*, для которого предлагается новое сопоставление с тох. А *mārk-* ‘забирать’ (и.-е. **merk^{h2}-*). Аористная основа *μαλ-* рассматривается как отражение алломорфа **m^{h1}ρp-* с нулевой степенью аблаута в корне, образованного от корня **memp-* по модели *παθή/ό-* (< **b^{h2}ηd^{h2}-*): *πενθ-* (< **b^{h2}end^{h2}-*), *δρακέ/ό-* (< **d^{h1}rk-*): *δερκ-* (< **derk-*) и т. д. Корень **memp-* (< **menp-*) восходит к древнему композиту, состоящему из и.-е. **men-* ‘рука’ (лат. *manus*, др.-ирл. *muin₂*, др.-англ. *mund*) и и.-е. **h₁ep-* ‘брат’ (лат. *coepī* ‘я начал’, хетт. *ep^{z1}-* ‘хватает’, др.-инд. *āpa* ‘достиг’). В хеттском языке глагол *ep(p)-/app-* употребляется в сочетании со словом для руки (*kiššarta ep(p)-*), а в латинском языке мы находим *manū capere*, равно как и следы сходной синтаксической конструкции с корнем **men-* в сложных словах *mancipium* ‘покупка, право собственности’ и *mandāre* ‘вручать’. Реконструкция композита **men-h₁p-* ‘брат рукой, хватать’, тем самым, может быть подтверждена на синтаксическом уровне. Этот композит лег в основу корня **menh₁p-*; в качестве параллели к появлению новых глагольных корней из сложных слов можно привести др.-инд. *gup-* ‘защищать’ (из *go-pā-*), лат. *cred-* ‘верить’ (из **kreds-d^{h2}eh₁-*) или и.-е. **uelh₁b^{h2}-* ‘говорить неправду’ (из **uelh₁-b^{h2}eh₂-*). В аористе **(h₁)e-menh₁p-t* ‘схватил’ ларингал был закономерно утрачен согласно т. н. правилу Шмидта — Хакштайна, следствием чего явилась парадигма 3 sg. **(h₁)e-memp-t* (с ассимиляцией по месту артикуляции), 3 pl. **(h₁)e-m^{h1}ρp-ent*, в древнегреческом языке отразившаяся как тематический аорист *μαλέ/ό-*. Предлагаемый в статье сценарий находит полную параллель в еще одном праязыковом сложном слове, а именно, **men(e)s-d^{h2}h₁-* ‘вкладывать

ум' (др.-инд. *medhā* 'мудрость') > др.-гр. μενθ-/μανθ- и аорист с нулевой ступенью аблаута μαθέ/ό-

Ключевые слова: греческая эпическая поэзия, греческая этимология, композиты, ларингалы, хеттский, тохарский.

The root μαπ- 'to seize' is scarcely attested in Ancient Greek and its forms have not yet received a satisfactory explanation. Thematic aorist μαπέ/ό- is attested in the epic poem *Shield of Heracles* traditionally (and wrongly) ascribed to Hesiod, but now usually dated to the first third of the sixth century BCE:¹

- (1) Γοργόνες ἄπλητοί τε καὶ οὐ φαταὶ ἐρρώοντο
 ἰέμεναι μαπέειν
 'The Gorgons, dreadful and unspeakable, were rushing after him
 (*scil.* Perseus),
 eager to catch him.' (*Sc.* 230–1, ed. and trans. Most)
- (2) τοὶ δ' ὠκύποδας λαγὸς ἦρευν
 ἄνδρες θηρευταί, καὶ καρχαρόδοντε κύνε πρό,
 ἰέμενοι μαπέειν², οἱ δ' ἰέμενοι ὑπαλύζαι.
 'Others, huntsmen, were overtaking swift-footed hares,
 and there was a brace of jagged-toothed dogs in front,
 eager to catch them — while the others (*scil.* hares) were eager
 to escape.' (*Sc.* 302–4).

Two more forms of this aorist stem have been tentatively identified in fragments of archaic Greek lyric poetry, but in both cases the text is

¹ The *Shield of Heracles* was probably composed between 570 BCE (according to the scholia, Stesichorus knew the poem, and the name of centaur Melanchaetes on François vase is based on *Sc.* 186 μελαγχαιτήν τε Μίμαντα) and ca. 590 BCE (if Cycnus' demise has anything to do with the fall of Crisa in the Sacred War in 591 BCE); see [Bing 2012: 179] for further discussion and bibliography.

² μαπέειν Ω: μαρπέειν Leid. Voss. Q 59, Ambros. E 39; μαρπέειν Vatic. 1332, acc. to Russo's app. crit.

uncertain in the extreme.³ A reduplicated aorist is found in *Sc.* 252 ὄν δὲ πρῶτον μεμάποιεν[#] ‘whomever they (= Keres) caught first’.

Next to the verbal root *μαπ-* we find the adverb ἐμμαπέως (⁴ ∪ ∪ ⁵) ‘quickly, readily, hastily, promptly, *unverzüglich reagierend*’,⁴ attested from Homer on, e.g. *Il.* 5, 836 ἐμμαπέως ἀπόρουσεν ‘he speedily leapt down’; *Od.* 14, 485 ἐμμαπέως ὑπάκουσε ‘at once he gave ear’.⁵ The connection with *μαπέ/ό-* ‘to seize’ is beyond doubt: for semantics cf. Latin *rapidus* ‘quick’ from *rapiō* ‘to seize’.⁶ Finally, a form of *μαπ-* may be found in Laconian personal name ΣΙΑΦΙΟΜΑΨΟΣ if Wachter [2001: 162] is justified in taking it as ‘the one who seizes silphion’.⁷ Let us take a closer look at all these forms.

³ Archil. 48, 3 West (via P.Oxy. 2311) has *μαπ_ς εκαρ* and a verb meaning ‘to seize’ *vel sim.* appears appropriate in view of the clearly sexual narrative of the poem (for which see [Swift 2019: 270–1]). Alcman fr. 120 [PMGF] (= 177 Calame) is a hopelessly corrupt quotation transmitted by Herodian as τῷ δὲ †σηομυθια κατ’ αν κάρραν μάβως† ἐπίαξε where Martin West (*apud* [PMGF] and [1990: 216]) replaced the unclear †μάβως with *μαποῖσ*’ (but there is no shortage of alternative solutions for which see the app. crit. in Calame’s edition and [Sitzler 1883: col. 932]).

⁴ Paraphrased in the scholia as ἐνεργῶς, ταχέως, ἐτοίμως, σπουδαίως, μετὰ σπουδῆς.

⁵ Another adverb often compared with ἐμμαπέως is μάψ ‘in vain, without result, aimlessly, recklessly’ and its derivatives: *μαψίδιος* (ῖ) ‘vain, empty, false’, *μαψιδίως* ‘randomly’ (*Od.* 3, 372), *μαψιλόγος* ‘vainly speaking’ *h. Merc.* 546, *μαψυλάκας* ‘barking for no reason’ *Sapph.* 58, 21+, PN *Μάψιχος (cf. nomen gent. *Μαψιχίδα*, Delos, 3rd cent. BCE [IG 11²: 205 ff.]). While in theory the meaning of μάψ (on which see [Spatafora 1997] and [Radif 1998]) can be reconciled with that of ἐμμαπέως under the assumption that μάψ qualifies an action done in haste and therefore not achieving the desired result, the semantic distance remains considerable; I therefore prefer the interpretation advanced by le Feuvre [2015: 535–533] who argued that the original meaning of μάψ was ‘condemnable’ and derived it from the root of μέφομαι: **mmb^h-s* > *μάψς ‘de façon blâmable’.

⁶ Compare further SCr. *hitar* ‘hastily’, *hitnja* ‘haste’ from the same root as OCS *xitati* ‘seize, snatch’; OE *scēot* ‘quick’ from the same root as Ved. *cud-* ‘to press forth’; OHG *behende* ‘fast’ < *bi hendi* ‘at hand’; Gk. ἐμπλήκτως ‘rashly, madly’ from ἐμπλήσσω ‘at-tack’; or Italian *immantinente* ‘immediately’ < *in manu tenente* ‘while holding in hand’.

⁷ Cypriot PN *ma-pi-so-ni-yo* (Kafizin) is probably non-existent: Neumann [1989: 168–169] suggests]-*ma pi-so-ni-yo*, see also [Egetmeyer 2010: 353].

Adv. ἐμμαπέως ‘quickly’ looks like a derivative made from an *s*-stem adjective *ἐμμαπής (cf. ἀσκελέως ‘stubbornly’ from ἀσκελής ‘withered’). However, *ἐμμαπής does not guarantee a simplex nominal *s*-stem *μάπος (cf. γένος : εὐγενής) since the second members of verbal governing compounds of this type were often formed directly from thematic aorist stems in Greek, cf. θυμοδακής ‘biting the heart’ (aor. δακέ/ό-), δισθανής ‘twice dead’ (aor. θανέ/ό-) or αἰνοπαθής ‘suffering dire ills’ (aor. παθέ/ό-) (see [Meissner 2006]). *ἐμμαπής → ἐμμαπέως is therefore best taken as based on thematic aor. *μαπέ/ό-.⁸

For μεμάποιεν at *Sc.* 252 several manuscripts⁹ offer a different reading, namely, μεμάρποιεν made from a nearly synonymous and much better attested verb μάρπτω ‘seize, overtake, strike’.¹⁰ Even though the form would not scan properly (μεμάρπ- would fill the biceps of the fifth foot), this reading has been accepted by some authorities, notably by Jacob Wackernagel who viewed it as another instance of “ἀνδροτήτα-scansion” (viz. *memyp- ∪ ∪*).¹¹ But a sixth-century poem is an unlikely place to look for a precious archaism of prosody, and the irregular scansion is better explained with Hackstein [2002a: 4, fn. 7] as “*ad-hoc-Flexion*” of verse-final μεμάρπεν used a few lines earlier. This said, the editors of the *Shield* usually print the reading μεμάποιεν of the paradosis at *Sc.* 252, and with

⁸ See [Blanc 2018: 424]: “la dérivation directe à partir du verbe est probable, bien que la maigreur des données ne permette pas de la démontrer.” In theory, ἐμμαπέως could also be *kunstsprachlich* in which case the derivational basis of the adverb would not have to be an *s*-stem (cf. ἀπτερέως or προφρονέως that are not based on *ἀπτερής or *προφρονής).

⁹ See F. A. Wolff *apud* [Ranke 1840: 225]. For the reading μαρπέειν offered by a single codex at *Sc.* 303 see fn. 2 above.

¹⁰ μάρπτω is well attested in early epic, lyric, and tragic poetry; the reliable γλωσσαι κατὰ πόλεις attribute the verb to Cypriot dialect (Κυπρίων. ἔμαρψεν· ἔλαβεν, see [Bowra 1970 (1934): 43]), and Ruijgh [1957: 166] assigned this word to the “Achaean” lexical stock. Egetmeyer [2010: 488] points out that λαμβάνω is not attested in Cypriot inscriptions possibly because it was replaced by μάρπτω in everyday use as the default verb ‘to take’.

¹¹ See [Wackernagel 1914: 113 (= 1955: 1170), fn. 1], following [Ehrlich 1910: 31]; on the problem of ἀνδροτήτα see [Barnes 2011; Maslov 2011].

good reason: verse-final $\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ can be unproblematically taken as a *metri causa* formation created from $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ on the model of $\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ ‘to obtain (by lot)’ : $\lambda\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ ‘to grant’. Given its ambiguity, the reduplicated form is best left aside in the discussion that follows and we can focus on the plain thematic aorist stem.

Ever since antiquity,¹² $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ has been taken as a secondary replacement of $*\mu\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ made from verb $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omega$, mentioned in the previous paragraph, even though only sigmatic aorist stem is attested for the latter verb in Greek. In support of this view Friedrich Schwarz [1932: 81–82] marshalled the parallel context in a Hesiodic fragment describing sons of Boreas yearning to catch the Harpies: $\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\] \mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\psi\alpha\iota$ (fr. 150, line 29 Merkelbach–West = fr. 98 Most = fr. 63 Hirschberger).¹³ But even if the poet of the *Shield* used the verse from the *Catalogue* as his model and adopted the phrase with verse-initial $\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota$ (> -αι) from it, why did he replace $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\psi\alpha\iota$ with a different yet synonymous aorist infinitive? An additional problem with Schwarz’s view is that an infinitive in -έειν can only be made from a light monosyllabic root, cf. $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ [Nikolaev 2013], and while the poet of the *Shield* is ostensibly quite fond of the distended ending (cf. *Sc.* 240 $\pi\rho\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, 332 $\lambda\pi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, 337 $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$), in order to use it here he would have to create a root $\mu\alpha\pi-$ from $\mu\alpha\rho\pi-$ by dropping the medial -ρ-, which defies belief as it would be an unparalleled poetic license. We do not expect the poet of the *Shield* — who is deeply steeped in traditional epic language — to engage in bold linguistic experiments or create completely artificial forms.

Since a linguistically compelling scenario for either a change of (unattested!) aor. $*\mu\alpha\rho\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ to $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}-$ or a creation of root allomorph $\mu\alpha\pi-$ from $\mu\alpha\rho\pi-$ does not present itself,¹⁴ and the adverb $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$

¹² For Ioannes Peditasimus (*scholia paraphrastica* on *Sc.* 231) $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ comes “ἀπὸ τοῦ $\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\omega$ ” with “ἀποβολῆ τοῦ ρ”; this formulation is mirrored by Curtius [1873: 26] who speaks of an “Ausstossung eines ρ”.

¹³ Mason [2015: 30] similarly argues that the poet of the *Shield* adapted the line from the *Catalogue*; he even suggests that it may have been the same poet [2015: 310].

¹⁴ To cite one example of an unconvincing solution, Mahlow [1926: 404] assumed the following analogical proportion: $\lambda\alpha\mu\beta(\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega) : \lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{\omicron}- = \mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi(\tau\omega) : X$, where X is

independently confirms the existence of a root $\mu\alpha\pi-$, it appears prudent to accept the linguistic reality of aor. $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ and view it as etymologically distinct from $\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$.¹⁵ It remains entirely possible that these two very similar-sounding roots were confused in early Greek and the meaning of $\mu\alpha\pi-$ was secondarily adjusted to match the semantics of $\mu\alpha\rho\pi-$, but due to the scarce attestation of the former root this hypothesis cannot be verified.¹⁶

What is the etymology of the root $\mu\alpha\pi-$ ‘seize’?¹⁷ Since zero grade of the root is the canonical ablaut marker of thematic aorist in Greek, the default assumption is that aorist stem $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ goes back to either $*m\acute{N}p-\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ or $*m\acute{N}k^w-\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ made from the root $*meNp-$ or $*meNk^w-$,¹⁸ cf. aor. $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ ‘to see’ (< $*d_r\acute{k}-$): prs. $\delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ (< $*der\acute{k}-$), aor. $\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ ‘to leave’ (< $*lik^w-$): prs. $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\epsilon/\acute{o}-$ (< $*lej\acute{k}^w-$), aor. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ ‘to come’ (< $*h_1lud^h-$): fut. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon/\acute{o}-$ (< $*h_1leud^h-$), etc. The hypothetical root

resolved as $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$, the relationship between $\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\beta}\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ and $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}/\acute{o}-$ having been reinterpreted by the speakers as showing a loss of root-internal consonant in the aorist stem.

¹⁵ Cf. [Beekes 2010: 903]: “[i]n spite of its semantic agreement with $\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$, $\mu\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ can hardly be connected with it in formal terms.”

¹⁶ The verb $\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\tau\omega$ has no etymology: ancient connection with (non-existent) $\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta$ ‘hand’ can be safely discarded, while Egetmeyer’s hesitant comparison with $\acute{\mu}\acute{\alpha}\rho\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$ < $*merh_2-$ is a counsel of despair [2010: 488]. I would like to draw attention to Toch. A $\acute{m}\acute{a}rk-$ ‘to take away’ (which is etymologically distinct from B $\acute{m}\acute{a}rk-$ ‘to besmirch’, see [Malzahn 2010: 755–756]; perhaps from $*h_2\beta\acute{m}er\acute{g}-$ ‘to touch’, Ved. $m\acute{r}j-$): a privative compound $sne-\acute{m}\acute{a}rklune$ (A 359.15) translates Skt. $ah\acute{a}ry\acute{o}$ ‘not to be taken away’ and pret. III $mark\acute{a}s$ is found in A 120 b 5: $t\acute{a}m\ pra\acute{s}t\ penu\ sundari\ nandes\ p\acute{a}p\acute{s}une\ mark\acute{a}s$ “Zu dieser Zeit hatte Sundari das sittliche Verhalten des Nanda weggenommen ...” (trans. by Carling [2000: 285]). PIE $*merk^w-$ ‘to snatch, take away’ would be expected to give PToch. $*\acute{m}\acute{a}rkw-$ > A $\acute{m}\acute{a}rk-$ with elimination of labial coarticulation before another consonant: 3 sg. aor. $*m\acute{e}rk^w-s(t)$ > Toch. A pret. III $mark\acute{a}s$, cf. $*h_3\acute{o}k^w-s$ ‘eye’ > Common Tocharian $*\acute{e}k$ > Toch. A ak , B ek (for the phonology see [Pinault 2008: 456–457]). The reconstruction $*merk^w-$ is found in [Kösling 1998: 247], but it is not supported by any comparative material.

¹⁷ Cf. [Beekes 2010: 903]: “etymology unknown”; [Blanc 2018: 424]: “pas d’étymologie”.

¹⁸ Since the root is not attested in Mycenaean, the choice between root-final $*k^w$ and $*p$ cannot be made on Greek-internal grounds.

**memp-* (< **menp-* with place assimilation) can be given an Indo-European etymology. I propose to analyze it as a verbal governing compound with PIE **men-* ‘hand’¹⁹ as its first member (Lat. *manus*, *-ūs* ‘hand’, OIr. *muin_z* ‘protection’, OE *mund* ‘id.’ (< **m_h-to-*), Hitt. *maniyah_h-* ‘to hand over’ and perhaps *maninkuwa-* ‘near, close’²⁰) and PIE **h₁ep-* ‘take’ as its second member (Hitt. *epp^{-zi}* ‘grabs, seizes’, Lat. *apīscor* ‘I seize’, *coepeī* ‘I began’, Ved. *āpa* ‘has reached’, OAlb. *ep* ‘gives’, [LIV²: 237]).

Even though the meaning of the postulated verbal governing compound **men-h₁p-* ‘take with one’s hand’, ‘seize’²¹ is fairly trivial, this reconstruction would still look more plausible if it were supported with evidence for a *syntagma* parallel to this compound. Such evidence may be available in Latin, Hittite, and Old English although, as usual with formulaic collocations, both constituent parts of the collocation have been subject to lexical renewal.²² In Latin where the root *cap-* encroached

¹⁹ For this root see the detailed discussion by Rikov [2003] not all of whose conclusions are endorsed here, as well as [Neri 2013]. The reconstruction **meh₂-r*, **meh₂-n* ‘hand’ ([Kroonen 2013: 375–376], with many predecessors) seems hardly viable to me: εὐμαρής ‘easy’ can be explained without positing any etymological connection with the word for ‘hand’ (see [Blanc 1992]), while alleged Pindaric μάρη ‘hand’ is a *vox nihili* (see [Forssman 1966: 135–140]), despite its resuscitation by Puhvel [2004] who compared it with Hitt. ^(GIS)*māri-* ‘weapon’ (which may in reality be Luw. *marit-*, see [Starke 1986: 162]); [Opfermann et al. 2022] take Hitt. *māri-* from PIE *(*h₂*)*moh₁-ri-* ‘cutter’).

²⁰ Čop [1964: 64] was the first to compare the root of Hitt. *maninkuwa-* with PIE **men-*, Lat. *manus*. The suffix of *maninkuwa-* has been compared to Lat. *-inquus* (e.g. *propinquus* ‘near’), Gk. *-απος* (e.g. *ἀλλοδαπός* ‘belonging to another people or land; foreign’ < **al̥iod-_hk^{wo}-*) and Ved. *-āñc* (e.g. *pratyāñc-* ‘turned towards’) ever since Benveniste [1954: 41]. An alternative analysis of *maninkuwa-* has recently been proposed by Frotscher et al. [in press] who have posited a nasal-infixed stem **maninku-* ‘to shorten’ made from PIE **menk^{w-}* ‘to lack’.

²¹ According to Jochem Schindler’s theory, this type of verbal governing compounds developed from original possessive compounds (‘*Erfassen mit Hand habend*’ > ‘*mit Hand erfassen*’), see [Lindner 2018: 52–54].

²² For a methodological discussion see [Gercenberg, Kazansky 2005: 1085–1087] and [García Ramón 2010].

on *ēp-/ap-* in the meaning ‘to take’,²³ we find *manū capere* (e.g. Verg. *G.* 3, 420; Liv. 33, 7; Plin. *Nat.* 13, 19, 8, etc.); in Latin legal language we also find *mancipium* ‘laying hold of a thing; ownership’ (cf. Var. *L.* 6, 85 *mancipium, quod manu capitur*) and *manceps* ‘contractor, renter’ (*quasi *men-* + **keh₂p-*). In Hittite the default word for ‘hand’ is *ke/iššar*,²⁴ and the verb *ep(p)-/app-* is frequently construed with it to form phrases meaning ‘take with one’s hand’.²⁵ Finally, the root **h₁ep-* ‘take’ was lost in Germanic, but the second member of the Old English compound *mund-gripe* (m.) ‘grasp, grip of the hand’ may be viewed as its “*Ersatzkontinuant*”.²⁶

On the basis of this data we can theorize that beside the well-established PIE collocation ‘to place in one’s hand’ (**ǵ^hes-* + **d^heh₁-*: Ved. *háste / hástayoh dhā-*, YAv. *zastaiiō dā-*, Gk. ἐν χειρὶ / χειρὶ θη-, Hitt. *kiššari dā-*;²⁷ **men-* + **d^heh₁-*: Lat. *mandāre*, Osc. *manafum* ‘to hand over’²⁸) Proto-Indo-European had a collocation with the opposite meaning, namely, **men-* + *h₁p-* ‘take with one’s hand’. It served as the basis of an (originally possessive) compound **m(e)n-h₁p-* which, in turn, evolved into a neo-root **menh₁p-* ‘take hold of, seize’. This process would be fully parallel to the development of PIE collocation **kred(s)-* + **d^heh₁-*²⁹ that served to express the trust between strangers in a hospitality

²³ In accordance with Kuryłowicz’s Fourth Law of Analogy, Lat. *ēp-/ap-* was relegated to a secondary semantic function reflected in *apiō* ‘fasten’, *coepī* ‘began’, etc.

²⁴ Even though Anatolian preserved a reflex of PIE **men-* in Hitt. *maniyah_h-*, etc., see above.

²⁵ E.g. KBo 25.1 a 2 LÚ-aš āššu *kiššarta epzi* ‘the man takes good by hand’; KUB 12.63 Vs. 26 UR.BAR.RA *kiššarta epten* ‘catch a wolf by hand’; KUB 45.3 i 10–11 nu^{LÜ} AZU GÙB 1 MUŠEN *epzi ZAG-it-ma=z kiššarit* ‘the magician grabs one bird with his left hand’; KBo 3.13 rev. 14 ŠU-mit *eppūn* ‘I seized with my hand’.

²⁶ E.g. *Beowulf* 380: *Ðæt hé þrittiges manna mægen-cræft on his mundgripe hæbbe* ‘he possesses the might of thirty men in the grip of his hand’.

²⁷ For the reconstruction of this collocation see [Gercenberg 1972: 113; Schutzeichel 2014: 211–214].

²⁸ On Lat. *mandāre* see [Neri 2013: 198 with fn. 105].

²⁹ On which see [Weiss 2020: 269–280].

relationship:³⁰ in Indo-Iranian we find both the collocation (e.g. Ved. *śrad* ... *dhatta* ‘trust’) and the compound (Ved. *śraddhā-*, OAv. *zrazdā-*), while in Italic and Celtic **kreds-d^heh₁-* developed into new roots (Lat. *crēdere* ‘to believe’, OIr. *creitid* ‘id.’) which spawned further morphological derivatives³¹.

We have thus arrived at a neo-root **menh₁p-* ‘take hold of, seize’.³² For a root with a punctual meaning like this we expect a root aorist:³³ in 3 sg. **(h₁)e-menh₁p-t* the laryngeal would be lost in a heavy CHCC cluster by Schmidt-Hackstein’s rule,³⁴ hence **(h₁)e-menp-t* ‘seized’ (> **(h₁)e-memp-t* with place assimilation). 3 sg. aorist served as the *forme de fondation* from which the root allomorph **memp-* / **mṃp-* spreads to the rest of the paradigm, giving 3 pl. **(h₁)e-mṃp-ent*, etc.³⁵ On the way

³⁰ For this analysis of Vedic *śraddhā-* see [Jamison 1996: 176–184] who elaborated on Paul Thieme’s proposal.

³¹ See [Weiss 2020: 272, 274] for an explanation of **-s-* in **kred-s-* and for the demonstration that in Italic and Celtic reflexes of **kreds-d^heh₁-* retained their compound identity.

³² In the discussion of the adverb *ἐμματαίως* above, it was suggested that it can be analyzed as a formation based on the thematic aorist stem **ἐμματαε/ο-*, but as Sergio Neri kindly points out to me, there is another possibility: *ἐμματα-* may go back to PIE compound **en-mṃ-h₁p-* ‘having in the hand’ whence ‘immediately’, cf. Italian *immantinate* and other semantic parallels cited in fn. 6 above.

³³ Root aorist is reconstructed for the base root **h₁ep-* in [LIV²: 237].

³⁴ See [G. Schmidt 1973; Hackstein 2002b]. For this laryngeal loss after a sonorant (**-menh₁p-t* > **-menp-t*) one may compare, for instance, the inflectional paradigm of **ǵenhi-mṃ* ‘birth’, dat. sg. **ǵenhi-mn-ej* > **ǵen-mn-ej* > Ved. *jánmane* (with analogical full-grade suffix) or its derivative **ǵenhi-mn-ó-* → **ǵenhi-mne-h₂-* ‘birth, lineage’ > **ǵen-mne-h₂-* > **ǵenneh₂-* (*aśnō*-rule, see [J. Schmidt 1895: 87–159]) > Gk. (Dor.) *γέννῶ* [Hackstein 2002b: 2–3]. Another one of Hackstein’s examples is Lat. *verbum*, Hsch. *ἔρθεν φθέγγεται* < **uerh₁-d^hh₁-o-*. In principle, one may also posit a laryngeal loss in composition: **m(e)n-h₁p-* > **men-p-* > **memp-*.

³⁵ I would to thank Stefan Höfler for discussing this scenario with me; in addition, Höfler points out to me that the lack of the laryngeal reflex in Ved. *valh-* ‘to speak in riddles’ (cf. Gk. *ἐλεφαίρομαι* ‘deceive’ and Lith. *vilbinti* ‘to lure’, [Gotō 1995]) may be attributed to the same sound law: **(h₁)e-uelh₁b^h-t* > **(h₁)e-uelb^h-t*, hence

to Greek this root aorist would be remodeled as a thematic aorist (see [Willi 2018: 344]), hence **m̥h̥p-é/ó-* > Greek *μαπέ/ό-*³⁶.

A neat parallel to the proposed development may be found in another verbal governing compound of PIE date, namely, **m(e)ns-d^hh₁-* ‘to implement thinking’ (cf. OAv. *mazdā-* (f.), Ved. *medhā-* ‘wisdom’)³⁷ reflected in Greek as a neo-root **ment^h-* ‘to come to know, to understand’ (cf. *μενθήρη* ‘concern’)³⁸ with a zero-grade **m̥h̥t^h-* that we find in the thematic aorist *μαθέ/ό-*.³⁹

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; adv. — adverb; aor. — aorist; dat. — dative; f. — feminine; pf. — perfect; pl. — plural; pret. — preterite; prs. — present; sg. — singular.

Dor. — Doric; Gk. — Greek; Hitt. — Hittite; Lat. — Latin; Lith. — Lithuanian; Luw. — Luwian; OAlb. — Old Albanian; OAv. — Older Avestan; OCS — Old Church

Proto-Indo-Aryan **ualb^h-* dissimilated as *valh-*. [AleW: 1434] tentatively takes the secondary root **uelh₁b^h-* from a compound **uelh₁-b^heh₂-* ‘*Täuschung sagen*’ (cf. Lith. *vilti*, Latv. *vīlt* ‘trick, beguile’): this attractive analysis is structurally quite similar to the one proposed in this paper for **men-h₁p-* (> **menp-* > **memp-*).

³⁶ A different way of arriving at the same result would be to posit a present stem **menh₁p-je/o-* or **menh₁p-ne/o-* in which the laryngeal would likewise be lost by Schmidt-Hackstein’s rule; the aorist stem **m̥h̥p-e/o-* > *μαπέ/ό-* would be back-formed to this present stem (**memp-je/o-* > unattested **μέμπτω* or **memp-ne/o-* > unattested **μεμπάνω*).

³⁷ See [Schindler 1975: 266; Scarlata 2001: 256–258; Wodtko, Irslinger, Schneider 2006: 493–496].

³⁸ Possibly with analogical restoration of *-n-* (**menst^h-* > **mest^h-* >> **ment^h-*), see [Hackstein 2002a: 227–228] who also discusses the secondary allomorph **mant^h-* (*μανθάνω*).

³⁹ Another parallel may be found in Vedic where denominative verb *gopāyá-* ‘to protect’ (from compound *go-pá-* ‘cowherd’ > ‘protector’, see [Scarlata 2001: 303–304], cf. Iran. **gau-pāna-* ‘id.’, the ultimate source of Slavic **gъpanъ* > Polish *pan*) was reanalyzed as made from a verbal root *gop-* and forms with zero-grade *gup-* were back-formed to this neo-root (pf. *jugup-*, p.p.p. *guptá-*, pass. *gupya-*), see [Mayrhofer 1986–2001: 1499–1500].

Slavonic; OE — Old English; OIr. — Old Irish; OHG — Old High German; Osc. — Oscan; PIE — Proto-Indo-European; PToch. — Proto-Tocharian; SCr. — Serbo-Croatian; Skt. — Sanskrit; Toch. — Tocharian; Ved. — Vedic; YAv. — Younger Avestan.

References

- AleW = *Altltauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. W. Hock, R. Fecht, A. Feulner, H. Helene, E. Hill, D. S. Wodtko (eds.). Version 2.0. URL: <https://alew.hu-berlin.de>.
- Barnes 2011 — T. G. Barnes. Homeric ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 2011. Vol. 131. P. 1–13.
- Beekes 2010 — R. S. P. Beekes. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Benveniste 1954 — É. Benveniste. Études hittites at indoeuropéennes. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*. 1954. Vol. 50. P. 29–43.
- Bing 2012 — P. Bing. A proto-epyllion? The Pseudo-Hesiodic Shield and the poetics of deferral. M. Baumbach, S. Bär (eds.). *Brill's companion to Greek and Latin epyllion and its reception*. Leiden: Brill, 212. P. 177–197.
- Blanc 1992 — A. Blanc. La distribution des biens et des maux: εὐμαρής et la racine *smer-. *Revue des Études Grecques*. 1992. Vol. 105. P. 548–556.
- Blanc 2018 — A. Blanc. *Les adjectifs sigmatiques du grec ancien: un cas de métamorphisme dérivationnel*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 2018.
- Bowra 1970 — C. M. Bowra. Γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις. C. M. Bowra. *On Greek Margins*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970. P. 27–45 (a revised version of the article originally published in *Glotta*. 1959. Vol. 38. P. 43–60).
- Carling 2000 — G. Carling. *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Curtius 1873 — G. Curtius. *Das Verbum der Griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1873.
- Čop 1964 — B. Čop. Zur hethitischen Schreibung und Lautung. *Linguistica*. 1964. Vol. 6. P. 37–76.
- Egetmeyer 1992 — M. Egetmeyer. *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syl-labar. Unter Berücksichtigung einer Arbeit von Almut Hintze*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 1992.
- Ehrlich 1910 — H. Ehrlich. *Zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte*. Königsberg, 1910.
- Frotscher et al. (in press) — M. Frotscher, G. Kroonen, J. Barðdal. Indo-European inroads into the syntactic–etymological interface: A reconstruction of the PIE verbal root *menkʷ- ‘lack’ and its argument structure. *Historische Sprachforschung*.

- García Ramón 2010 — J. L. García Ramón. Reconstructing IE lexicon and phraseology: Inherited patterns and lexical renewal. S. W. Jamison, H. C. Melchert, B. Vine (eds.). *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, October 30th and 31st, 2009*. Bremen: Hempen, 2010. P. 69–106.
- Gercenberg 1972 — L. G. Gercenberg. *Morfologičeskaja struktura slova v drevnikh indoevropejskikh jazykakh* [The Morphological Structure of the Word in the Ancient Indo-European Languages]. Leningrad: Nauka, 1972.
- Gercenberg, Kazansky 2005 — L. G. Gercenberg, N. N. Kazansky. Prajazykovaja rekonstrukcija: obščie problemy [Reconstructing a Proto-Language: General Issues]. *Vestnik Rossijskoj Akademii Nauk*. 2005. Vol. 75. No. 12. P. 1077–1088.
- Gotō 1995 — T. Gotō. Griechisch ἐλεφαίρομαι. W. Smoczyński (ed.). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume. Part One*. Cracow: Universitas, 1995. P. 365–370.
- Hackstein 2002a — O. Hackstein. *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen: Faktoren morphologischer Variabilität in literarischen Frühformen: Tradition, Sprachwandel, Sprachliche Anachronismen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2002.
- Hackstein 2002b — O. Hackstein. Uridg. CH.CC > C. CC. *Historische Sprachforschung*. 2002. Vol. 115. P. 1–22.
- IG — *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. 1–. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1873–.
- Kösling 1998 — P. Kösling. *Die griechischen primären Jotpräsentien untersucht und dargestellt nach Formenbestand, Aktionsarten und Etymologie*. Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, 1998.
- Kroonen 2013 — G. Kroonen. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Le Feuvre 2015 — C. le Feuvre. *Homēros dysgnōstos: réinterprétations de termes homériques en grec archaïque et classique*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 2015.
- Lindner 2018 — Th. Lindner. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Vol. IV/2: Komposition im Aufriss*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2018.
- Mahlow 1926 — G. Mahlow. *Neue Wege durch die Griechische Sprache und Dichtung*. Berlin; Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1926.
- Malzahn 2010 — M. Malzahn. *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Maslov 2011 — B. P. Maslov. The metrical evidence for pre-Mycenaean hexameter epic reconsidered. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology*. 2011. Vol. 15. P. 376–389.
- Mason 2015 — H. C. Mason. *The Hesiodic Aspis: Introduction and commentary on vv. 139–237*. D.Phil. Thesis. Oxford University, 2015.
- Mayrhofer 1986–2001 — M. Mayrhofer. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindooarischen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1986–2001.

- Meissner 2006 — T. Meissner. *S-stem nouns and adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European. A diachronic study in word formation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Nikolaev 2013 — A. Nikolaev. The aorist infinitives in -έειν in early Greek hexameter poetry. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. 2013. Vol. 133. P. 81–92.
- Neri 2013 — S. Neri. Zum urindogermanischen Wort für ‘Hand’. A. I. Cooper, J. Rau, M. Weiss (eds.). *Multi nominis grammaticus: Studies in Classical and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor; New York: Beech Stave, 2013. P. 185–205.
- Opfermann et al. 2022 — A. Opfermann, D. Sasseville, R. Süssenguth. Hethitisch *māri*-‘Sichelschwert(?)’ aus archäologischer, philologischer und etymologischer Sicht. *Altorientalische Forschungen*. 2022. Vol. 49. P. 104–122.
- Pinault 2008 — G.-J. Pinault. *Chrestomathie tokharienne: textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- PMGF — M. Davies (ed.). *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Puhvel 2004 — J. Puhvel. Vox ex nihilo: Greek ἔγχος. D. Groddek, S. Rößle (eds.). *Šarnikzel: Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer 19.02.1894–10.01.1986*. Dresden: Verlag der technischen Universität Dresden, 2004. P. 531–532.
- Radif 1998 — L. Radif. Significato e funzione di alcuni avverbi omerici in -ξ -ψ. U. Rapallo, G. Garbugino (eds.). *Grammatica e lessico delle lingue «morte»*. Alessandria: Ed. dell’Orso, 1998. P. 33–46.
- Ranke 1840 — C. F. Ranke. *Hesiodi quod fertur Scutum Herculis ex recognitione et cum animadversionibus Fr. Aug. Wolfii*. Quedlinburg; Leipzig, 1840.
- Rikov 2003 — G. T. Rikov. Cornish *manal* ‘sheaf’, Latin *manus* ‘hand’ and connected problems. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*. 2003. Vol. 8. P. 149–157.
- Ruijgh 1957 — C. J. Ruijgh. *L’élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen: van Gorcum, 1957.
- Scarlata 1999 — S. Scarlata. *Die Wurzelkomposita im R̥g-Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1999.
- Schindler 1975 — J. Schindler. Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen. H. Rix (ed.). *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1975. P. 259–267.
- Schmidt 1895 — J. Schmidt. *Kritik der Sonantentheorie*. Weimar: Böhlau, 1895.
- Schmidt 1973 — G. Schmidt. Die iranischen Wörter für “Tochter” und “Vater” und die Reflexe des interkonsonantischen *H* (ə) in den idg. Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. 1973. Vol. 87. P. 36–83.
- Schutzzeichel 2014 — M. Schutzzeichel. *Indogermanische Funktionsverbgefüge*. Münster: Monsenstein und Vannerdat, 2014.

- Schwarz 1932 — F. G. Schwarz. *De Scuto quod fertur Hesiodi: quaestiones ad compositionem et dicendi genus maxime pertinentes*. Berolini: Pilz & Noack, 1932.
- Schwyzer 1939 — E. Schwyzer. *Griechische Grammatik. Vol. 1: Allgemeiner Tell. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München: Beck, 1939.
- Spatafora 1997 — G. Spatafora. Sul significato di μάψ e dei suoi derivati in età arcaica e classica. *Parnassos*. 1997. Vol. 39. P. 247–254.
- Sitzler 1883 — J. Sitzler. Review of T. Bergk. *Poetae lyrici Graeci III*, 4th ed. Leipzig 1882. *Philologische Rundschau*. 1883. Vol. 3. Fasc. 30. P. 920–938.
- Starke 1986 — F. Starke. Review of Chicago Hittite dictionary, vol. 3, fasc. 2. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. 1986. Vol. 43. P. 157–165.
- Swift 2019 — L. Swift. *Archilochus: The poems. Introduction, text, translation, and commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Tichy 1976 — E. Tichy. Gr. δειδέχαστο und idg.*dēkti, déktoi. *Glotta*. 1976. Vol. 54. P. 71–84.
- Wachter 2001 — R. Wachter. *Non-Attic Greek vase inscriptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Wackernagel 1914 — J. Wackernagel. Akzentstudien III: Zum homerischen Akzent. *Göttingische Gelehrte Nachrichten*. 1914. Vol. 1014. P. 97–130 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955. Vol. 2. P. 1154–1187).
- Weiss 2020 — M. Weiss. The inner revolution: old but not that old. M. Serangeli, Th. Olander (eds.). *Dispersals and diversification: Linguistic and archaeological perspectives on the early stages of Indo-European*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020. P. 263–288.
- West 1990 — M. L. West. Review of Greek Lyric 2. *The Classical Review*. 1990. Vol. 40. P. 214–216.
- Wodtko, Irslinger, Schneider 2008 — D. S. Wodtko, B. Irslinger, C. Schneider. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2008.