

LAT. *ĀTRIUM*, GR. ANΔΠΟ- AND TERMS
FROM I.-E. **HⁿD^h*-(*ERO*-)

Adolfo Zavaroni

Lat. *ātrium* y *āter* parecen derivar de una base que expresa ‘oscuridad’ como un cambio semántico de ‘caverna, parte inferior e interior’, mientras Etr. **atr-* denota ‘enterrar’ < ‘bajar’. Se puede plantear la hipótesis de que estos términos derivan de una raíz **HⁿD-* ‘debajo, en, abajo’, donde D representa una oclusiva dental variable, cuya variación se debería a la presencia de la nasalización, como se ve por otras oclusivas iniciales nasalizadas **HⁿB-*, **HⁿG-*. Esta formulación incluye la forma tradicional **nd^h*- ‘abajo, bajo’ y explica algunas variaciones tales como Lat. *atr-* y Umbr. **adr-o-* ‘oscuro, negro’ or Gk. ἀνθρο-/ἀνδρο- ‘hombre’, si se asume que en griego también -como en Lat. *homo* etc.- el significado primario de la palabra ‘hombre’ era ‘el que vive abajo, sobre la tierra, la parte más baja del cosmos’. De ahí, la raíz IE **HⁿD-* ‘bajo, debajo, en’ experimentó un desarrollo semántico y produjo términos que significaban 1. ‘tierra, suelo’, 2. ‘hueco, cueva, caverna, hoyo’, 3. ‘hombre’, 4. ‘carbón’, 5. ‘oscuridad’, además de adverbios y verbos que expresan una dirección hacia abajo y hacia el interior.

Lat. *ātrium* and *āter* seem to derive from a basis expressing ‘darkness’ as a semantic shift from ‘cavern, lower and inner part’, while Etr. **atr-* denotes ‘to bury’ < ‘to let down, to lower’. One may hypothesize that these terms derive from a root **HⁿD-* ‘under, in, down’, where D represents a variable dental stop, whose variation would be due to the presence of the nasalization, as we may see for the other initial nasalized stops **HⁿB-*, **HⁿG-*. This formulation includes the traditional form **nd^h*- ‘down, low’ and accounts for some variations such as Lat. *atr-* and Umbr. **adr-o-* ‘dark, black’ or Gk. ἀνθρο-/ἀνδρο- ‘man’, if we assume that in Greek too – as well as in Lat. *homo* etc. – the primary meaning of the word for ‘man’ was ‘he who lives down, on the earth, the lower part of the kosmos’. Hence,

the IE. root **H^oD-* ‘down, under, in’ underwent a semantic development and yielded terms meaning 1. ‘earth, ground’, 2. ‘hollow, cave, cavern, pit’, 3. ‘man’, 4. ‘coal’, 5. ‘darkness, obscurity’, beside adverbs and verbs expressing a downward and inward direction.

1. Latin glossators¹ hand on that Lat. *ātrium* was a word of Etruscan origin. Ernout & Meillet consider this tradition as probable and add that ‘si l’*ātrium* n’est pas étrusque, ce serait un souvenir de l’ancienne maison où la fumée du foyer s’échappait par une ouverture ménagée dans le toit ; il y aurait ici soit un dérivé d’un ancien nom du ‘feu’ soit un dérivé de *āter*’².

As Untermann has already noted³, the thesis⁴ that the original sense of *āter* is ‘blackened by fire’ in virtue of a link with words meaning ‘fire’ (Avest. *ātarš*, genit. *aθrō* ‘fire’, OIr. *áith* ‘stove’, Slav. words as Serb. *vatra* ‘fire’) is untenable. On the other hand, it does not explain the variation *d/t* we find by comparing Umbr. *adro-* and Lat. *atro-* (cfr. Osc. *Aadiriis*, *Aadiriis* also generally considered equivalent to Lat. *Atrius*)⁵. According to our suggestion, Lat. *ātrium* does not derive from a vague name of the fire, but from an Indo-European root, perhaps by means of an Etruscan intermediation in pronunciation (*/d/ > /t/*).

In Lat. *colorō*, *occultus* (from **kel-* of *cella*: cfr. also *καλύβη* and *καλύπτω*) we have the semantic shift ‘covered, hidden’ > ‘dark’. In Lat. *caecus* the original sense ‘dug, hollow’ changes not only into ‘blind’, but also into ‘covered, hidden’ and ‘dark, tenebrous, without light’⁶. An analogous semantic shift is present in OInd. *andha* 1. adj. ‘blind, secret, hidden’; 2. noun ‘obscurity’, *andhu* ‘well, pit’: the direction of the shift is, as we will see, from ‘well, pit’ to ‘obscurity’. We attribute the root of OInd. *andha*, *andhu* to Lat. *āter*, *ātr-* ‘obscure, black’, although such a connection at first sight does not seem to be possible. In order to account for this connection, we may start from the Etruscan words *atrane* and *atrś*.

Etruscan is not an Indo-European language, though, in our opinion was a *lingua franca* which borrowed many Indo-European roots before the adoption of writing, that is before the seventh century B.C. We suggest that Etruscan can supply indications for defining the Indo-European root in question, although interpretation of Etruscan words commonly raises a justified scepticism.

¹ Varro, *L.L.*, 5.161; Fest. p. 12; Serv. *Aen.* 1.726.

² Ernout-Meillet, s. v. *ātrium*.

³ Untermann (2000, 55).

⁴ This thesis is considered probable by Schrijver (1991, 54).

⁵ See bibliography in Untermann (2000, 54-55).

⁶ A. Zavaroni, “Imprestiti indoeuropei con *Lautverschiebung* in etrusco”, *IF* 111 (2006) 149-181.

In the bilingual inscription of the golden A-plate of Pyrgi the sequence *nac atranes zilacal seleitala* ‘after the burying of the bright Rector (= Jupiter)’ corresponds to the Phoenician sequence BYM QBR ‘LM ‘in the day the divinity is buried’⁷. It is not clear if *atranes* is a nominative in *-es* (cfr. the nominatives *fleres* ‘bronze statue’ <‘*flatilis*’, *Artumes*, *Parθanapaes*) or the genitive of *atrane* which appears as a *cognomen* (fem. *atrania* and *atrani*<**atranei*) in some onomastic formulae and pottery seals. On pottery seals *atrane* (nom.) or *atranes* (gen.) or *atranesi* (abl.) are trademarks. In the Pyrgi plate *atranes*, which follows *nac*, could also be a direct case (acc.) instead of an oblique one (gen.), since in another passage of the plate *nac* has the function of a preposition governing the accusative *ci avil* ‘three years’. Formally, *atrane* appears to be a present participle like *uslane*, *vesane*, *acilune*, *ezine*, *nunθene* etc.⁸: therefore *atranes*, as a nominative, could correspond to a Latin noun ending with *-ntia*. As we may infer from comparison with the Phoenician text, *atranes* means roughly ‘burial’, in virtue of the semantic passage we will try to define in the next paragraphs.

At the end of an inscription⁹ on a sarcophagus from Tarquinia, one reads *suθiθ atrśrce*: as the locative *suθiθ* certainly means ‘in the sepulchre’, while *atrśrce* is a preterite in *-ce*, we may interpret *atrśrce* as ‘(he) was interred, laid’¹⁰. In some burial inscriptions of Vulci one finds the formula *hels atrś*. In our opinion, *hels* is a verb meaning ‘*cubat*, *reclinat*’ (from I.-E. *(s)kel- ‘curve’ or *k’el- ‘lean down’), while the word *helsc*<**helsce* of other inscriptions may be translated as ‘*cubuit*, declined>laid down’.

The form *atrś* –where *ś* commonly is the development of /s/ + dental¹¹– may reflect an adverb (a locative ?) **at-(V)r-s-θ*<**at-(V)re-s-θi* ‘below’. We cannot establish whether the preterite *atrśrce*<**atrs-θ-Vr-ce* originates from an agglutinated adverbial form or if it is a compound whose first member should be *atrś* (for example: *atrś* + *er-ce*).

In the ‘Tomba François’ of Vulci we find two equivalent formulae: *hels atrś* ‘*cubat infra* (vel : *intra* ?)’ and *sacniśa aturś* ‘*quiescens* (or: *demissus*, -a ?)’¹² *in-*

⁷ P. Agostini–A. Zavaroni, “The bilingual Phoenician-Etruscan Text of the golden Plates of Pyrgi”, *Filologija* 34 (Zagreb 2000) 3-48, at 35.

⁸ A. Zavaroni, *I documenti etruschi* (Padova 1996) 45.

⁹ M. Pallottino, *Testimonia Linguae Etruscae* (Firenze 1968²), n° 135.

¹⁰ In a late age (2nd-1st century B.C.) the preterite in *-ce* could also act as a past passive participle.

¹¹ A. Zavaroni, “Sulla presunta sibilante palatale in etrusco”, *Incontri linguistici* 25 (2002) 87-102.

¹² In our opinion, in funeral inscriptions *sacniu* is an appellative of *śuθi* ‘tomb’ and means ‘*depositio*’, while *sacniśa* is an adjective referring to the dead. It is not ascertainable if *sacniu* and *sacniśa* derive from the root we attribute to *sacnic-* = *sacnit-*, that is I.-E. *sāg- ‘suchen, acute sentire’ (which yields also Goth. *in-sakan* ‘lay down, deponere’ and ON. *sakna* ‘vermiffen’) or from *sēk- ‘rest, quies’ (cfr. Lat. *sēg-n-is* and gr. ἦκκα, dor. ἀκᾰ(strum.).

fra’, where *aturś* < **atVr-(e)s-θ(i)* would be the locative of a form developed from **HⁿD-(er)-* ‘below, inferior’.

Hence, if Etr. **atr-* and Lat. *ātro-* shared the same root, as Etr. **atr-* seems to mean ‘lower down, put under>inter, bury’, we have to verify whether the meaning ‘dark’ of Lat. *ātr-*, Umbr. *adro* is a metaphor from ‘*infernus*’. Ernout & Meillet observe that *ātro-* ‘implique souvent une idée morale de terreur, de malheur, de mort’¹³. If so, our thesis that Lat. *ātr-* is connected with Etr. *atranes* ‘burial<deposition’ and *atr-* ‘depose, lower down>bury’ appears more probable. The negative value, as we will see, would be due to the fact that originally **ātr-* is equivalent to *infer*.

Although its *a* is brief, Lat. *atrōx* is commonly considered a derivate (or a compound)¹⁴ of *ātr-*. Anyway *ātrōx* has a sense of terror and *fūnus* even more accentuated than *ātro-*. According to Schrijver, *ātrōx* ‘contains the zero grade of the root **HeHt-* found in *āter* “black”, Av. *ātarš* “fire”’¹⁵. But, as we have already observed, such a comparison is unreliable and does not permit a ‘laryngalistic’ approach.

That Etr. **atr-* denotes ‘under, low, down, *infrā*’ (with a secondary sense of darkness, blackness) seems to be confirmed by the fact that in other funeral inscriptions one finds **calu-* instead of **atr-*. In our opinion *calus* means ‘chthonian’ < ‘low’ and derives from *(*s*)*kel-* ‘biegen; Niederung’. It is well-known that *Tinia Calusna* is ‘*Iovis Infernus*’, since this name is written on a vase found in a subterranean cell of the Tempio del Belvedere (Bolsena), dedicated to chthonian divinities. Other derivates from **calu-* are *calusur* (plur.) ‘*exequiae<depositiones*’, *calu* ‘deposed’, *calusin* ‘depose>bury’. I would not exclude that Lat. *calāre* ‘let down, lower’ derived from Etruscan rather than Greek¹⁶.

2. Lat. *īnferus*, *īnfrā* *īnfirmus* point to the group of I.-E. roots commonly formulated as **nd^hos*, **nd^hero* ‘*infrā*’, **nd^hero-* ‘*inferior*’, **nd^hemo-* ‘*infirmus*’. The long initial *i-* seems a Latin phenomenon due to the cluster ‘nasal + spirant’¹⁷. As the formula **nd^h-* seems inadequate to us, we prefer to express it as **HⁿD-* (or

¹³ Ernout - Meillet, s. v. *āter*.

¹⁴ Discussion of this dilemma is not important here: anyway, see Ernout and Meillet, s. v. *atrōx*.

¹⁵ Schrijver (1991, 54).

¹⁶ According to Ernout - Meillet, 88, Lat. *calō* is a borrowing from Gr. χαλάω.

¹⁷ Meiser (1998, 78) cites *cōnsul*, *īnferī* [EIMFERIS in *CIL* XV 6265, where EI is for *ī*], *sānctus*, *conīūnx*, *quīntus*, etc.

**H^onD-*) on the analogy of the writing **H^mB-* (or **H^omB-*) we have adopted for three roots denoting the following semantic grids¹⁸:

1) **H^mB-* (generally >**h₂mb^h-*/**h₂mp-*) ‘join; together; pair’: it gives rise to Gr. ἀμφω, ἀμφί, Lat. *amb-*, *ambō*, OIr. *imb-*, Etr. *ame*, OInd. *am-ā*, and also to Lat. *amor*, Gr. ὀπτύω (<**h₃mp-*) ‘I marry’ and βιπέω ‘I have intercourse’, Etr. *puia* ‘uxor’, Lat. *par*; *apiscor*, *aptus*, Germ. **ibna*, **imna* (Goth. *ibns* ‘even’ etc.) and **ba-* (Goth. *bai* and *bi*, etc.).

2) **H^mB-* (generally >**h₃mb^(h)-*/**h₃mp-*) ‘swelling, growing round’: it gives rise to many terms, among which Lat. *umbō*, *umbilicus*, Gr. ὀμφαλός, Germ. **no-bhelo-*, OIr. *imbliu* ‘navel’. For instance, the *apple*-names derive from the *l*-enlargement **h₂mb-el-*/**h₂mb-ol-*/**h₂mb-^ol-*: Gr. μῆλον, Lat. *mālum*, Alb. *mollë* and Germ. Celt. Balt. Sl. **ablu-*, **abVl-*.

3) **H^mB-* ‘buzz; bee; mumble’, etc.: the laryngeal was vocalized in Gr. ἐπίς ‘mosquito, horsefly larva?’, OHG. *imbi* (‘ältester Beleg *impi pīano*’), MHG. *imbe* ‘Bienenschwarm, Bienen-Stock’ (‘erst spät-mhd. “Biene”’¹⁹), OE. *imbe* ‘swarm of bees’ and also in Lat. *apis* ‘bee’, where the nasal sound has disappeared.

If we adopt the formulation **HⁿD-* instead of **^ond^h-*, a series of unexpected connections appears. But first it should be considered that:

1) the formulation **HⁿD-* tends to show the existence of the prenasalized obstruents at an old stage of the Indo-European which, as Martinet had noted, allows us to explain ‘l’alternance de **-m-* et de **-bh-* aux cas obliques du pluriel’²⁰. As an example of a prenasalized stop in an initial position Martinet mentioned only the case of **H₂mb^h-i* (> **amphi*), but analysis shows that his intuition is productive, if applied to the roots mentioned above.

2) Writing **HⁿD-*, we have to assume that *H* can develop into any laryngeal and hence into any vowel, the zero grade (suppression of the vowel itself) included. *D* points out that we have to expect any dental obstruent, whatever the development of the root. Effectively, we can observe a variation of the obstruent after a nasal in several roots ending with *-NC-* (*C* = any stop). Such a variation was even more possible when the root began with a laryngeal or with an aspiration requiring a certain initial phonic energy, causing the instability of the stop after the nasal.

¹⁸ A. Zavaroni, ‘I.-E. “apple”, Hamito-Semitic “genitals” and Roots beginning with **HmB-*’, *HSF* (forthcoming).

¹⁹ *IEW* 311.

²⁰ We adopt the concept of ‘phonème pré-nasalisé’ that A. Martinet, *Des steppes aux océans. L’indoeuropéen et les Indo-européens* (Paris 1986) 176, applies to Lat. *amb-*, Gr. ἀμφ-, Gaul. *amb-*. See also A. Martinet, ‘Des pré-nasalises en indoeuropéen?’ in *Studies in Greek Linguistics, a Festschrift for John Chadwick*, 27-29 april 1987, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki (Thessaloniki 1987) 31-32; A. Martinet, ‘Finales nasales mobiles et pré-nasalises indo-européennes’, *BSL* 86 (1991) 361-365.

Contrarily to the common development of single obstruents, the results of the group ‘laryngeal + nasal + labial (or dental or velar) stop’ do not appear constant in every language: therefore the general formulas $*H^mB-$ and $*H^nD-$ (or $*H^omB-$ and $*H^onD-$) are an easy way of denoting variations. The group $*H^mB-$ produces various developments that are commonly exchanged for beginnings of different roots: $*VmB-$, $*VB-$, $*B-$, $*m-$ and, by reduplication, $*B+V(m)B-$ ($V = \text{any vowel}$). Analogously, from $*H^nD-$ (or $*H^onD-$) we should expect $*VnD-$, $*VD-$, $*D-$, $*N-$ and $*D+V(n)D-$.

We can then explain in a simple way why the dental of Lat. *ātro-* is different from that of Umbr. *adro-* (and probably Osc. *Aadiriis = Ātrius*), without resorting to the thesis that not only *ātrium*, but also *ātro-* derive from Etruscan. Given the Etruscan *Lautverschiebung* (I.-E. [d] > Etr. [t]), Etr. $*atr-$ could better correspond to Umbr. *adro-*. Anyway all these forms may be traced back to $*eh_2D-ero-$, a denasalized form with compensatory lengthening of $*H^nD-ero-$, of which $*end^h-ero-$ > $*īnfero-$ is a parallel realization.

Lat. *humus* ‘earth, soil’ and *homō* ‘man < terrestrial’ are supposed to derive, as Meiser notes²¹, from “uridg. $d^heḡ^hōm$, Gen. Sg. $d^heḡ^hmes$ ‘Erde’”, since “die ursprüngliche Folge ‘Dental + Palatal’ ist noch erkennbar in heth. >te-e-kan<, tochar. A *tkam* (B *kem*) und wohl in den italischen Etyma lat. *homō*, osk. HUMUNS ‘homines’, umbr. HONDRA ‘unterhalb’ < $*g^hom-terā$ < $*d^heḡ^hōm$ - vorausgesetzt, ebenso in got. *guma* ‘Mann’”. Therefore, there should be a metathesis in Gr. $\chi\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, OInd. *ksām-* ‘earth’, Gaul. (TEVO)-XTONION [dewo-gdonion] (gen. pl.), while in OIr. *dú* (acc. *don*) ‘earth’ and *duine* ‘man < terrestrial’, $ḡ^h$ would have fallen after metathesis.

A new and important italic attestation is given by the South-Pic. verb *hemat*. In a recent re-examination of the Belmonte stele, we have also deciphered the sequence *las manes abīt sue cum hemat* ‘Lar Manis abīt, secum humat’. The object of *hemat* ‘*humat*’ is the dead person mentioned at the beginning of the inscription. South-Pic. *hemat*, together with *nemō* < $*ne\ hemō$, proves that the glosse of Paul. Fest 89 *hemonem hominem dicebant* is worthy of faith.

Here we would underline the semantic convergence (or equivalence?) between ‘earth’ and ‘low, inferior, under’, already remarked by Ernout and Meillet: at first they quote a passage of Varro (*L.L.* 5.23) containing also the sentence *et dicitur humilior qui ad terram demissior, infimus humillimus, quod in mundo infima humus*; then they note that “en tenant compte de [lat. *humilis* et gr. $\chi\theta\alpha\mu\text{-}\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ et $\chi\alpha\mu\eta\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$], et de lit. *žėmas* ‘bas’, *zemyn* ‘en bas’, lette *zem* ‘sous’, v.pruss. *semmai* ‘en bas’, on admettrait un radical $*hom-$ ‘terre’ pour expliquer l’adverbe osco-ombrien attesté par ombr. *hondra*, **hutra** (et [o.] **huntrus**?) ‘infra’, *hodomu*

²¹ Meiser (1998, 97); see also Gamkrelidze-Ivanov (1995, 720).

‘infimō’, osc. *hu(n)truis* ‘inferis’; il s’agirait, comme dans *infrā*, d’un mot artificiel, créé pour des raisons religieuses...”²².

The religious reasons could, at most, have strengthened a sense, but they could not yield it. The concepts of ‘earth, ground’ and ‘low, down, under (-ground)’ were already intimately bound *ab antiquo*, in the sense that the ‘earth’ is ‘what is down, under’. For instance, the Hitt. adverb *dagan* = *tagan* ‘under, in the ground’ is an “Endungloser Lokativ” of *tekan* ‘earth, soil’. Since we do not see how the meaning ‘down, below’ could develop from a term containing **kom* ‘cum, with’, we wonder whether Gr. *κατά, κάτω* and Hitt. *katta*, whose primary sense is ‘down, under’ (Hitt. *kattera-* ‘inferior’) really derive from **k^omta* < **kom-ta* – as one commonly reads²³ – or are the result of an epenthesis in **kta-* < **g^hd^ha-* (by relaxation of the aspiration in Greek). In the latter case, as Hitt. *katta* (and derivatives) and *dagan*, both meaning ‘under’, would have the same root, we could not say if **g^hd^ha-* derives by metathesis from **d^hg^ha-* or vice versa.

3. Pokorny lists OInd. *ní*, Avest. *nī* ‘nieder(wärts)’, Arm. *n(i)-* ‘nieder’, OInd. *nitarām* ‘unterwärts’, Avest. *nītama-* ‘der unterste’, and the derivatives from Germ. **niþra-* ‘nieder’ and **niþanō* ‘unten’ under the root **ni-, nei-* ‘nieder’ (Komparativ **nitero-* ‘nieder’)²⁴. The *w*-extension **nei-w-, ni-w-* is commonly attributed to Gr. *νεῖατος, νέατος*, ‘der unterste’, *νείθευ* ‘von unten’, OE. *neowol, nihol* ‘pronus’, MLG. *nigel* ‘niedrig’ etc. According to our thesis, **ni-, nei-* is one of the developments of **HⁿD-i-, *HⁿD-ei-*, while **nitero-* (< **n’ni-tero-* < *HⁿD-i-tero-*) is the comparative in *-tero*, a parallel form of **Hⁿd^h-ero-* which yields Lat. *īnferus*, OInd. *ādharma-* ‘inferior, lower’, Avest. *aðara-* ‘inferior, more westwards’, Goth. *undar, undaro*, OHG. *untar, untari* etc.

According to our suggestion, also the terms listed by Pokorny under the root **ner-* ‘unten’ > **ner-tero-* ‘unterer’ derive from **HⁿD-er-*: while Pokorny suggests a ‘mögliche Verwandtschaft von *n-er-* mit **n-ei-*’²⁵, we think that **ner-* < **HⁿD-er-* is a crystallized comparative redetermined by the addition of *-tero-*. In *ἐνέρτερος* ‘inferior, underground’ (parallel form of *νέρτερος*) and *ἔνεροι* ‘those who are underground; the dead; infernal deities’ the laryngeal *h₁* has changed into a stable *e-* (*ἔνερο-* < **h₁nnero-* < **HⁿD-ero-*).

The stem **ner-tero-* is also attributed to Umbr. *nertru* ‘left’, OIcel. *norðr*, OE. *norð* etc. ‘North; northward’, OE. *norðerra* ‘more northern’. The reason for

²² Ernout - Meillet, s.v. *humus*.

²³ Cf. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1973), s. v. *κάτα*; *IEW* 613; Beekes (2003), s.v. *κάτα*.

²⁴ *IEW* 312.

²⁵ *IEW* 765-766.

the sense ‘North’ is merely astronomic: after setting in the west, the sun is certainly ‘underground’ (for the old geographers) when, in its apparent inclined orbit, it proceeds towards the north. In Umbr. *nertru* and Osc. *nertrak* the meaning ‘left’ is a secondary sense of ‘low, inferior’: perhaps it is due to a reference to an augural orientation.

4. Lat. *homō* derives from a root that, beside denoting ‘earth’, expresses also ‘to be low, to be under’. In order to suppose that Gr. *ἀνδρο-* too denotes ‘he who is down, low’, it is sufficient to connect it to **HⁿD-ero-*. While there are not phonological problems in connecting *ἀνθρ-(ωππος)* with **Hⁿd^h-ero-* of Lat. *īnfra, īnferus*, OInd. *ádharma-*, Avest. *aðara-*, Goth. *undar, undaro*, OHG. *untar, untari* etc., for *ἀνδρο-* we must assume that the variation *δ/θ* is due to the presence of the nasal. In *δρ-ώψ = ἀνθρ-ωππος* both the laryngeal and the nasal are dropped. It is uncertain if *ἀθερίζω ‘spernō, uile faciō’* derives from **Hⁿd^h-ero-*²⁶. If it were, we should have a development **HⁿD-er > ἄθερ-* by denasalization; but it is no less possible, in our opinion, that *ἀθερίζω* derived from *ἄθερ-* ‘arista, awn, straw, chaff’ and its original meaning was ‘to consider somebody as much as an arista, a straw, a chaff’.

After a questionable distinction between ‘man 1’ = ‘human being’ and ‘man 2’ = ‘vs. woman’ and after recalling that the etymology of *ἄνθρωπος* is very disputed, Buck adds: “But the old analysis *ἄνθρ-ωππος* ‘man-faced, man-like’, from the stem of *ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός* remains the most probable; cf. Hesych. *δρῶψ· ἄνθρ-ωππος* [...]. The change of *ἀνδρ-* to *ἀνθρ-* is due to [the *spiritus asper*] in the second element, which does not belong properly to the root *ὀπ-* but may be due to the influence of *ὀράω*”²⁷.

This thesis²⁸ is also mentioned by Pokorny who lists *ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός* under the root **ner-(t-), aner- (ener-?)* 1. ‘(magische) Lebenskraft’, 2. ‘Mann’; **neryo-* ‘männlich, kräftig’.²⁹ According to Beekes, “as no IE explanation has been found, the word [*ἄνθρωπος*] will be a substratum word”³⁰, given that Myc. *-oq-* does not prove IE origin, as the substr. language had labio-velars (*βασιλεύς*). It seems to

²⁶ Beekes (2003), s.v. *ἀθερίζω*.

²⁷ C. D. Buck, *A Dictionary of selected Synonyms in the principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago-London 1949) 80.

²⁸ Buck and Pokorny attribute it to Kretschmer.

²⁹ IEW 765.

³⁰ After recalling the approachment between *ἄνθρωπος* and Hitt. *antuhša-* (*antuwahha-*, *antuhha-*) ‘man’ suggested by Kretschmer, Beekes (2003, s.v. *ἄνθρωπος*) adds: “Improbable [according to] Ruijgh, *Lingua* 25 (1970) 312; Szemerényi, *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 655f. Kuiper gave a substr. interpretation on the basis of *δρῶψ*, *FS Kretschmer*, 1, 211f; *Lingua* 21 (1968) 275f.; defended by Beekes, *Glotta* 73 (1995/6) 13-15”.

us that Beekes assigns to a (nebulous) substratum all the words he is not able to bring into the ambit of the Indo-European phonology encoded according to the rules formulated by glottologists. As we think that the frame of laws formulated by linguists till now could not always be exact, often we prefer the old formula ‘unknown etymology’ rather than the label ‘substratum’. Beekes rightly considers ‘vague and differring’ terms as ‘Mediterranean’ and ‘foreign’,³¹ but the ‘substratum’ he often mentions is no less vague.

According to Bader, ἄνθρωπος contains the name of the ‘man’; besides, “le *-th-* d’*épenthèse* est dû à l’action de **h*₂ : le traitement de **h*₂*°n-* y est comparable à celui de **sn-* (à ceci près que **°n-* > *an* au contact de **h*₂): assourdissement de la nasale au contact de *h*₂ sourd, et report du trait aspiré de cette dernière, d’où le *-th-* d’*épenthèse*; celle-ci est *d* dans la flexion, type *andr-ós*, de **h*₂*°n-r-*, par nivellement sur les caforts [?], ou la prothèse de **h*₂*ner-* entraîne une syllabation *a|ner*, laissant intacte la nasale, sonore et non aspirée”³².

It seems to us that Bader tries to formulate the difference between *ανθρ-*, *ανδρ-* and *ἀνήρ* in more precise phonological terms, but she gives an explanation *ad hoc*, without searching for the cause of the difference. We doubt that the explanation can concern only a phonological development. The roots that Pokorny transcribes as **ner-*(*t-*), **aner-* ‘Lebenskraft’ and **ner-* ‘unten’ (**nertero-* ‘unterer’) could have undergone a certain interference and contamination due to the fact that **Hner-* ‘fortis’ – which could be phonologically mistaken for **ner-* ‘low, under’ – was used for designating a class or category of **homines* ‘those who stay low, down on the earth’ > men’.

Pokorny posited the variant **aner-* (**aner-*) in order to account for Arm. *ayr*, Gr. *ἀνήρ* ‘man, vir’, *εὐ-ήνωρ* ‘brave, strong’, *ήνωρέη* ‘vigor’, NeoPhryg. *αναρ* and Luv. *annar* ‘man’³³. Hitt. *innarawatar* and Luv. *annarumahit* ‘Rüstigkeit, strength’, Hitt. *innarawant-*, Luv. *annarummi* ‘strong’ are now added to those forms justifying the hypothesis of a root **Hner-* ‘power, vigor, gallantry’³⁴.

In western Indo-European languages, where forms beginning with a vowel are not attested, **ner-* denotes ‘to be strong, powerful’ and not ‘to be human’. Svetonius (*Tib.* 1,2) informs us that the Sabinian name *Nerō* means ‘*fortis ac strenuus*’. The name *Neriō*, *-enis* of the partner of Mars means *Fortitudo*; Umbr. *nerf* (acc. pl.) and South-Pic. *niir* differentiate from *viro* (pl. acc.) ‘*virōs*’ in order to

³¹ Beekes (2003: introductory page).

³² F. Bader, “Une traversée menée à terme: noms de conquérants I.E. en étrusque”, in S. Marchesini and P. Poccetti (eds.), *Linguistica e storia: scritti in onore di Carlo de Simone* (Pisa 2003) 36-37.

³³ *IEW* 765.

³⁴ Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 703) assume that the initial *inn-* of itt. *innara-* is the development of **Hn-*.

denote the ‘*potentes, maiores*’. To our mind, Etr. *neri* too has this root and means ‘*validitas, potentia*’: in the *Liber linteus Zagradiensis* it refers to the validity of the haruspicy result³⁵.

Gamkrelidze & Ivanov transcribe the root into the form **Hner-(tʰ)*-³⁶, attributing to it the semantic value ‘life force, male strength’. They translate OW. *nerth* and OIr. *nert* as ‘manliness’, drawing our attention to ‘masculinity’ rather than ‘strength, power’. But the real primary sense of **ner-(t)-* is, in our opinion, ‘strength’. After defining OIr. *nert* and OW. *nerth* as ‘force (au moral comme au physique), vigueur, puissance, vertu’, Vendryes affirms that “tous ces mots sont dérivés, au moyen d’un suffixe *-to-*, d’un radical **ner-* désignant la force, particulièrement la virilité”³⁷. If for ‘masculinity, manliness’ we mean ‘to have physical and psychic qualities of a male (such as physical strength and courage) in opposition to female qualities, we may share the idea that **ner-(t)-* defines also ‘masculinity, manliness’. But we think that **ner-(t)-* could not merely signify ‘to be of male sex’. Dwelly, who is free from etymological cares, gives the following list of meanings of Gael. *neart*: ‘strength, power, might, energy, pith, force, vigour; plenty, abundance, many, number; the greater part of anything; valour; (rarely) miracle’; the word ‘manliness’ is absent³⁸. If one assumes Vendryes’ point of view, it appears logical to suppose that OIr. *near* ‘wild boar’ and OW. *ner* ‘sir, head’ are “specialisations d’un ancien nom du ‘mâle’”; but that a wild boar may be considered ‘the virile, manlike one’ rather than ‘the strong one’ should arouse perplexity. On the other hand Celtic too could use the correspondent of Lat. *vir* (OIr. *fer* etc.) and the respective derived terms in order to denote *virilitas* and *virtus* in opposition to ‘human being’ (OIr. *duine* etc.).

Ernout & Meillet *s.v. Nerō* recall that “l’indo-européen avait, pour désigner l’homme mâle, le guerrier, deux mots, l’un qui le désignait purement et simplement, **wiro-* (v. lat. *uir*), l’autre qui le désignait en évoquant sa qualité, **ner-*”³⁹. Since it is commonly assumed that *vir* has the same root as Lat. *vīs* etc., an at least partial semantic overlap between **h₂ner-* and **wiro-* may be noted. The latter base, anyway, being also attested in Sanskrit, Avestic, Gothic, Lithuanian and Tocharian, was spread over a wider geographical area⁴⁰. Possibly, in origin the pubertal male man, reached the age in which he could get married and fight, was

³⁵ A. Zavaroni, *I documenti etruschi* (Padova 1996) 274.

³⁶ Gamkrelidze and Ivanov does not follow Brugmann’s consonantal system, but own glottalic theory.

³⁷ *Lexique étimologique de l’irlandais ancien* (eds. J. Vendryes, E. Bachellery, P.-Y. Lambert) (Paris 1959-Dublin), N-10-11.

³⁸ E. Dwelly, *Gaelic-English Dictionary*, Glasgow (1901-1911) [reprint 1977⁹], *s.v. neart*.

³⁹ Ernout-Meillet, *s.v. Nerō*.

⁴⁰ Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995, 391, n.4).

considered **h₂ner-* ‘*potens, valens*’ and this appellative ended by replacing **wiro-* in the Ario-Armenian-Greek area.

It appears logical to compare the Celtic base **ner-t-* ‘strength, power’ to the Germanic divine names *Nerthus* and ON. *Njörðr*. Tacitus (*Germ.* 40) writes that the peoples of a region probably situated in the South of Denmark, *in commune Nerthum, id est Terram matrem, colunt*. A *castum nemus* was dedicated to this goddess on an island of the Ocean. *Njörðr* < **Nerthuz* has certainly the functions of an archaic *Potisdan = Poseidon* : as we may infer from his prerogatives, he reigns on both land and sea; he is as rich as *Dīs* and is as munificent with his crops as Saturn. In other words, *Njörðr* is the echo of an European chthonian god of the Bronze Age.

Following Tacitus to the letter, we may say that *Nerthus* means ‘Earth’: therefore *Njörðr* is a sort of *Tellumo* or *Tellurus*, the husband of the goddess Earth. As words for ‘earth’ can also express ‘low, under’, we might suggest that reciprocally 1) **ner-* < **HⁿD-er-* ‘*inferior*’ denotes ‘earth’; 2) the root of Germ. **ner-β-u-* is **ner-* ‘under’ as well as for Germ. **nor-β-*.

Hence, as the root of Lat. *homō* expresses also ‘earth, low, below’, one may suggest that the original meaning of Gr. *ἀνδρο-* was ‘he who stays low’ and that a term signifying ‘man’ (< ‘*humi vivens*’) instead of ‘(vir) *potens*’ and deriving from a different root was introduced into the declension of *ἀνήρ, ἀνδρός*. In fact the epic declension retains the gen. *ἀνέρος*, the dat. *ἀνέρι* and the nom. pl. *ἀνέρες*. This datum may be considered a clue that *ἀνδρ-* did not develop from **ἀνρ-<*ἀνερ-*, since in *ἀνέρος* the *έ*, being tonic, is less subject to elision. On the other hand, even the persistence of *o* in *ἠνορέη* (Dor. *ἀνορέα*), *εὐ-ἠνορος* (gen.), etc. shows that the thesis of a development **ἀνρ-<*ἀνερ-* is questionable.

The hypothesis that *ἀνθρο-/ἀνδρο-* means ‘he who stays low’ and derives from **HⁿD-ero-* can arouse perplexity on semantic grounds rather than phonological ones, since we also attribute the stem **HⁿD-er-* to Gr. gr. (έ)νέρ- ‘*inferior, inferus*’. The root **Hner-* ‘*infrā*’ seems to express ‘to be or to go under a surface’ rather than ‘to stay low, but on the earth’: cfr. also Skr. *naraka* ‘*infernus*’. In fact **ner-* yields also terms meaning ‘plunge, penetrate, hideout, hollow’⁴¹. In Armenian the nom. *ayr* ‘hollow’ (gen. pl. *ayriç*: < **antr-*) coincides with the nom. *ayr* ‘man, human being’ (gen. *arñ*). Rus. *norá* ‘excavation, hollow, hole’ derives from **ner-* < **nner-* < **HⁿD-er-* as well as OSl. *nora* ‘den, *latibulum*’, Serb. *nòrac* ‘diver’, Rus. OSl. *nyrjati*, Lith. *neriù* ‘(se) *immergere*’ etc.

The very fact that *ἐνεροί* are the ‘*inferi(ores)*, those underground’ leads us to attribute to *ἀνθρο-/ἀνδρο-* a slightly different sense, that is ‘those staying low’, in opposition to ‘those staying upper, high’ (heavenly deities). On morphological

⁴¹ IEW 766.

grounds this could implicate that the termination -ρο- of ἀνδρο- is not due to the archaic Indo-European suffix of comparison -er-⁴², but is the formant -(ε)ρο- of many Greek adjectives and nouns: it would be applied to a base **and- < *HⁿD-* ‘under’. To such a base we may refer Luv. *annan* and Lyc. *ēnē* ‘*infra*’⁴³, Toch. *āñc* [*< *ants*], OInd. *ad^há* ‘under’ and –we suggest– Lat. *dē*, Osc. *dat*, OIr. *dī*, OW. Bret. *dī* (preposition and preverb: *< *HⁿD-a-i*), Gaul. *innis* ‘*dēmissio*’ (in the calendar of Coligny), OIr. **in(n)-* ‘*descendere*’, *fu-in* ‘*occasus, mors*’ and other compounds of **in(n)-*, from **ind- < *HⁿD-*. According to our thesis, Lat. *dē* is the denasalized form and OInd. *ni-* –which has the same functions of Lat. *dē-*– is the result of the loss of the dental: both of them are a development of **HⁿD-* + vowel suffix. Lat. *īmus* and Osc. *imad* ‘*ab ī mō*’ seem to go back to **in(d)m-o-*, while *infimus* –as Ernout & Meillet note– “aurait été refait ensuite, sur le modèle de *intimus, extimus, citimus, ultimus*, etc., pour rétablir la transparence étymologique”⁴⁴.

Our point of view leads us to the unexpected conclusion that the first member of ἀνθρ-ωπος has the same root as ἀνθραξ. The comparison of some terms denoting ‘coal’ seems to give interesting results. OInd. *aṅgāra*, NPers. *aṅišt*, Lith. and OPruss. *anglis*, Rus. *úgolj*, Pol. *węgiel* and the other correspondent Slavic terms⁴⁵ show that the name of the coal has the same root **ang-/ank-/* as terms denoting ‘curve, bend; corner’. Analogously Germanic terms like ON. *kol*, OHG. *kolo*, OE. *kōl*, etc. could go back to **kūla-* and be comparable with OIr. *gúal*,⁴⁶ from the root **gewH-* ‘curve’ of Gr. γωλεός ‘cavern, cave’ and γύαλον ‘bowing > hollow, cavern, cave, sinking’.

In the above-mentioned languages, hence, the coal is ‘that of/from the cave’. This sense is pertinent not only for the pit-coal extracted from mines, but also for the charcoal obtained in covered charcoal pits. Lat. *carbō*, then, could be connected with *scrōbis* ‘pit, hole’, from **(s)kerb^(h)-* ‘cut, scrape off, dig’ and denote ‘that

⁴² According to Szemerényi, *Introduzione alla linguistica indeuropea* (Milano 1985) 257, the forms **^ondh-er-o-*, **^up-er-o-*, **^ant-er-o-*, certainly starting from adverbs of place, are compounded with **er-* ‘earth’ (Gr. ἔρα, Goth. *airþa* etc.). Two brief observations: 1) one should not separate the discussion on the formation of the comparative (**^ondh-er-o-*) from that of the superlative (**^ondh-^omo-*), since we cannot think that the necessity of denoting comparatives has risen in a stage of I.-E. different from that in which superlatives started to be expressed: if **^ondh-^omo-* does not contain a term for ‘earth’, hardly, in our opinion, **^ondh-er-o-* could contain it; 2) study of the suffixes of union and instrument **-bhi < *^omB-i* invites us to suggest that the adverbs containing *-er-* ‘terra’ presumed by Szemerényi more probably must begin and not end with *-er-*, as in ἔραζε or γῆθεν.

⁴³ V. I. Georgiev, *Introduzione alla storia delle lingue indoeuropee* (Roma 1966) 231.

⁴⁴ Ernout-Meillet, s. v. *īmus*.

⁴⁵ Pokorny (*IEW* 779) assigns to them a root **ong-* ‘(besser **ang-*)’ yielding a noun **angelo-* ‘coal’.

⁴⁶ According to Kluge/Seebold, s. v. *Kohle*, Germ. **kula-* n. (**kulōn* m.) “vielleicht gehört weiter dazu arm. *krak* ‘Feuer, glühende Kohlen’ (aus **gu-rā-*). Weitere Herkunft unklar”. The approachment to Arm. *krak* seems to be suggested by the Gothic name of the coal (*hauri*: from **kerH-* ‘burn, glow’?).

from the pit'. If *ἀνθραξ* means 'that from the pit', it probably has the same root as *ἀντρον* 'cave', since 'cave' and 'mine' convey the idea of being or going 'underground'. The possibility that *ἀνθραξ* and *ἀντρον* have the same root is another thesis according to which in a root of **HⁿD*-type the dental after the nasal can vary. Besides, if we observe that *ἀνδηρον* '(Wein)beet, (Garten)beet, (flower-)bed, (river-)bank' has the meanings of certain words derived from **b^hed^h-* 'dig, excavate' (yielding Lat. *fodiō*, OHG. *betti*, Gaul. *bedo-* etc.), we may assume that *ἀνδηρον* too has the root of *ἀντρον* and *ἀνθραξ*.

Our thesis, hence, opposes Beekes' suggestions according to which 1) *ἀντρον* "cannot be connected with Arm. *ayr* 'grotto'" and "may be a substratum word"; 2) "substratum origin is clear" for *ἀνθραξ*, whose form cannot be compared with that of Arm. *ant'-el* 'charcoal'⁴⁷. Recording also *ἀνθρουσκον* 'chervil, *Scandix australis*' (*ἔνθρουσκον* Pherecr.) and the glosses 1) *ἀνθρίσκιον λάχανον ἔχον ἄνθος* (,) *ὡς ἄνηθον* (,) *ἠ τὸ ἄνηθον* (Hesych.); 2) *θύσκα ἄγρια λάχανα*, Beekes observes that according to Furne *θύσκα* is a mistake for *ἀνθρουσκα* whose substratum origin "seems certain". But (*ἄν*)*θρουσκ(ον)* and *ἀνθρούσκιον* seem to be synonyms of *λάχανον* 'legume' which in its turn recalls *λαχαίνω* 'I dig'. We suggest that the terms *λάχανον* and *λαχαίνω* are connected with ON. *lágr* 'low' (<**lēǵ^h-*: **lǵ^h-*)>OE. *lāh*>E. *low*. Pokorny wonders whether **lēǵ^h-*: **lǵ^h-* 'am Boden kriechen, niedrig' (Baltic, Slavic, Germanic) is a variant of **leg^h-* 'lie down, *deponere*, *iacēre*'⁴⁸. We are inclined to answer affirmatively. Besides, we consider the sense 'dig' of Gr. *λαχαίνω* as a secondary development, by virtue of the passage 'bed, lying'>'den, cavity' (OIr. *lige*) which may be seen in OE. *leger* and Toch. *lesto* (<**leg^h-sth₂-oleh_a-*) 'lair, nest, den'⁴⁹. The semantic grids of **d^hen-* and **leg^h-*, **lēǵ^h-* overlap partially: cfr. E. *den* = E. *lair*, MLG. *denne* 'Niederung; Waldtal' and ON. *lægð* 'niedrige Stelle'>Shetl. *lowd* 'kleines Tal', OFris. *dann(e)* '(Garten)beet' (= gr. *ἀνδηρον*). Lat. *legūmen* and *legarica* 'legume' go back to **leg^h-*: it is uncertain, though, if their primary sense was 'that of the (garden-)bed' or 'that of the shell (<of the shelter, lair)'.

With reference to earth or water the distinction between the concept of '*infra*' and the concept of '*intra*' is weak. In Kluge⁵⁰, *sub voce* 'unter', one reads 1) a root **nd^her* for Germ. **under* "in der Bedeutung 'unterhalb'", OInd. *ad^há* 'unten', *ád^hara-* 'der untere', Toch. *āñc* [<**ants*], Lat. *infrā*; 2) a root **nter* for Germ. **under* "in der Bedeutung 'zwischen'", OInd. *antáh* 'innen, zwischen', Lat. *inter*, OIr. *eter*, *etir* ecc. But we find both meanings 'under' and 'between' in Alb. *ndër* 'between, under, by' and OPers. *atr*, *antar* [prep.] 'through, under, in', while in

⁴⁷ Beekes (2003), s.v. *ἀντρον* and *ἀνθραξ*.

⁴⁸ *IEW* 660.

⁴⁹ D. Q. Adams (1999: s.v. *lesto*).

⁵⁰ Kluge/Seebold, s.v. *unter*.

Sanskrit there is a similar ambiguity in *antar* (prep.) ‘inter, inside of, in the middle of; under, below; away from’ and in the nouns *antara* ‘interior; interval; distance; hole; difference’, *antariya* ‘underclothes’, *antarbhūmi* ‘underground’⁵¹. Hence, both semantic and phonetic interferences were possible between the expressions of ‘infra’ and ‘intra’. We may then justify Pokorny who reconstructs the terms **ni-* **nei-* ‘nieder’, *nitero* ‘nieder’, listing them under the root **en* ‘in’⁵². From our point of view **nei-* is one of the possible developments of the base **HⁿD-a-i* (-i locative) that we attribute also to Lat. *dē*, Osc. *dat*, OIr. *dī* (preposition, preverb), Bret. *dindan* ‘(des)sous’.

To conclude, a root **HⁿD-* ‘under, in, down’ could undergo a semantic development which yielded terms meaning ‘earth, ground’ (the earth is under our feet), ‘hollow, cave, cavern, pit’ (where one goes down and in), ‘coal’ (that of/from the pit or mine), ‘darkness, obscurity’ (the colour of a cavern), ‘man’ (living down on the earth: *homo* in opposition to a *caelestis superus*), beside adverbs and verbs expressing a downward and inward direction. As *D* od **HⁿD-* would denote a varying dental stop, whose variation would be due to the presence of the nasalization, we might trace back to the same root words apparently very different such as Lat. *ātrium* and Gr. ἀνθρο -/ἀνδρο-.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

- D. Q. Adams, *A dictionary of Tocharian B* (Amsterdam-Atlanta 1999).
 R. Beekes, *Greek Etymological Dictionary* [Leiden 2003], at <http://www.indoeuropean.nl>.
 A. Ernout-A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris 2001⁴).
 Th. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*, I (Berlin-New York 1995).
 IEW = J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern-München 1959).
 Kluge/Seebold = F. Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (Berlin-New York 1999). 23. erweiterte Auflage bearbeitet von E. Seebold.
 G. Meiser, *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt 1998).
 P. Schrijver, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin* (Amsterdam-Atlanta 1991).
 J. Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Heidelberg 2000).

⁵¹ E. Burnouf, *Dictionnaire classique sanscrit-français* (Paris 1866), s. vv.

⁵² IEW 312.