Two roots for 'woman' in Proto-Indo-European



Thales Simões, University of Pavia

6TH PAVIA SUMMER SCHOOL FOR INDO-EUROPEAN LINGUISTICS

PIE possessed two roots that can be ascribed to the lexeme WOMAN, but their distribution in the daughter languages is not equal. One is widely attested from the far east (Indo-Iranian, Tocharian) to the far west (Celtic, Germanic) of the IE world, while the other is mostly restricted to compounds forms and a motion suffix.

*gwen-

PROTEROKINETIC h2-STEM

*qwén- h_2 - ~ *qwn-é h_2 -

Anatolian: $*g^w$ óneH-> wānā- (CLuw.), kãna- (Lyd.)

Tocharian: * ćänā > śäm (A) śānā (B)

Indo-Aryan: *qnaHs > qnā- (Skt.)

Iranian: *qnaHh > gənā- (OAv.), yənā- (YAv.)

Greek: * q^w anā ~ q^w nā-ik- > γυνή, γυναικός (Att.), ku-na-ja (Myc.) Slavic: *ženà > žena (OCS/ORu.)

Cowgill's law

Baltic: *genaH > genno (OPr.)

Germanic: *kwenō ~ kwenōn - > qinō (Got.), kona (ON)

Celtic: *bena > bé, ben- (OIr.)

etc.

THE CASE OF INDO-IRANIAN AND GERMANIC

The forms found in Skt. $j\bar{a}ni$ -, OAv. $j\bar{a}[i]ni$ -, conflated with Goth. qēns, OE cwēn, ON kvæn (PGmc. *kwēniz) point to an acrostatic istem $*g^{w}e^{n}-i-$. However, the Indo-Iranian forms can also go back to *janH- (with vocalized laryngeal) or an o-grade (like Greek) with analogical *j- and Brugmann's law. The Germanic form has been suggested by Kroonen as a vrddhi-gerundive to a lost strong verb $*k^w\bar{e}nanq$ (< PIE thematic present), cf. ON participle úkvæntr 'unmarried', but this is highly speculative.

*gwen- AS A ROOT NOUN?

Schindler and Harðarson have proposed a root noun $*q^w \delta n \sim$ $*g^w\acute{e}n$ on the basis of an OIr. invariable noun $b\acute{e}(n-)$, of restricted useage, and Hitt. MUNUS-(an)za, assuming the latter 3, f stands for /kwāns/. I argue against this based on:

- analogical formation with the \bar{a} -stems).
- Kloekhorst's suggestion that MUNUS-anza = /kwānts/ $*g^wen-h_2+s$ by assuming the PIE to Hittite rule *VnHsV >VnzV also works in word final position (*VnHs# > Vnz but *Vns# > Vš). The acc. MUNUS-nan is analogical to the gen. MUNUS-naš (*qwén- h_2 -m > pre-Hitt. *kwān > Hitt. kuwānan*).



AI-generated image of a Yamnaya woman. Made with https://openart.ai/.



All sources mentioned can be found by scanning this QR code.

*sor-

*swe-sor ~ *swe-sor ~ *swe-sr - 'sister'

From *swe 'own' + *sōr 'woman', i.e. 'woman from one's own (clan)'. Since IE society was gyno-exogamous, there was a need to differentiate the women tied to the clan by blood as opposed to those that are so by marriage.

⇒ from acc. stem, with haplology Tocharian: * saser > sar (A) ser (B)

Indo-Aryan: *swásr- > svásṛ-(Skt.)

in Slavic and Old Prussian, an Iranian: *hwāhar- > x^v āŋhār (OAv.) epenthetic stop was inserted Greek: *hwéhōr > $\check{e}o\rho$ (Att.) to break the sequence -sr-. Slavic: *sestrà > sestrá (ORu.)

Baltic: *swesrā > sèsuo (OLith.), swestro (OPr.)

Italic: *swezor > soror (Lat.)

Celtic: *swesūr > siur (OIr.), chwaer (Welsh) Germanic: *swestēr > swistar (Got.), sweostor (OE), systir (ON)

Already in (pre-)PGmc., the stem seems to have been remodelled after the PIE kinship terms in $-t\bar{e}r$ (esp. $*duht\bar{e}r$)

NUMERALS IN INDO-IRANIAN AND CELTIC

In Indo-Iranian and Celtic, the numerals 'three' and 'four' have a distinct feminine form with a formant *-sr-.

Welsh Vedic Skt. Avestan Old Irish θrāiiō, θrī tráyah, tri-3, m/n tri tišrtéoir tişráh, tişr-3, f tair 3, m/n catváraḥ, catur- caθβār-, caturcethair pedwar cethéoir pedair cátasraḥ, catasr- cataŋrō, cataŋr-

Clearly, the first /r/ of the fem. numeral 'three' underwent dissimilation at an early stage. Harðarson resconstructs • Matasović's more economical account for the Irish form as |*treisor-~t(r)i-sr-, but the daughter languages only show zero the regular reflex of PCel. *bena (leaving ben, mná as an grade reflexes of this noun, implying the weak stem must have been generalized earlier.

ANATOLIAN MOTION SUFFIX

In Hittite, the root *ser- survives as a motion-suffix. It is attested in e.g. išhāššara- 'lady, mistress' from išhā- 'lord' or haššuššara- 'queen' from haššu- 'king'. This motion suffix is also attested in CLuw $n\bar{a}n\bar{a}\check{s}r\bar{a}/i$ - 'sister' from $n\bar{a}n\bar{a}/i$ - 'brother'.

CUNEIFORM LUWIAN *ašra/i-

Derivatives like ašrula/i- 'female', ašrulāḫit- (n.) 'feminitiy' beg for the reconstruction of unattested C.Luw. *ašra/i-'woman sim vel.'. I oppose Steer's reconstruction of an initial laryngeal in order to account for the anlaut vowel. Following Melchert the sequence #sR- was not phonotactically possible in Luwian, so the initial vowel must be prothetic.

OTHER ATTESTATIONS

The same root also appears as the second element of the Lat. compound uxor, uxōris, which Harðarson reconstructs as $*h_1uks$ -sor 'housewife', with the compound form of $*h_1euke/os$ -'house, home' (cf. Skt. ókas- 'house'). The attempts to connect Gr. $H\rho\bar{\alpha}$ and YAv. $h\bar{\alpha}iri\tilde{s}\bar{\imath}$ to this same root are unconvincing.

Reconstructing Semantics

The semantic distinction between the root $*g^wen-$ and *sor- can be found in the function of each in the original lexicon. While $*g^w\acute{e}n-h_2$ referred to any adult woman of fertile age (as opposed to a pre-pubescent girl or an aged woman) and found its antonym in *wiHrós 'adult male' (Skt. vīrá-, Lat. vir, OIr. fer, Got. wair, Lith. výras, etc.), *sōr must have denoted the general quality of being 'female' as opposed to 'male'. The latter probably lacked a proper antonym, because the male gender was considered unmarked (cf. $*d^h\acute{g}^hm\acute{o}n$ 'human (male or female)', a male noun in most daughter languages).