

ὑπτιος

By GEORGE DUNKEL, Princeton

Frisk segments this adjective as ὑπ-τ-ιος. He starts from the preverb ὑπό, apocopated and extended in -τ-; to this, the suffix -ιος is added. The function of the dental element "bleibt indessen unklar"¹⁾; it is in fact completely without parallel in preverbal derivation. This weakens the analysis considerably. To invoke the ultimately nominal origin of the preverbs would not help, since the empty morph *-t- often found in root-nouns is added only to roots ending in a short vowel.

Schwyzler also takes the suffix as -ιος. To account for the -τ-, he follows Sittig's derivation, based on a *-tó- adjective from the root *sweep "sleep", like Ved. *suptá-* "sleeping" (AV+). The original meaning of ὑπτιος would thus have been "in der Stellung des Schlafenden" (*Gr. Gr.* I 270, 304). Since the attested meaning is "lying on the back, supine" (opposed to *πρηνής*), and since no particular posture is overwhelmingly characteristic of human sleep, this derivation is not very convincing either.

The semantics are in fact best accounted for by starting from ὑπό. Although the full form means "under", the shorter form ὑπ-²⁾ has the sense "above, upwards" in derivatives such as ὑπατος, ὑψι, etc.³⁾. The facts of human anatomy make "facing upwards" and "lying on the back" functionally equivalent.

The presumption of preverbal origin also points the way to an explanation of the problematic dental extension. The most productive IE method of deriving adjectives from preverbs was suffixation in *-tyo-. In Greek, W. Schulze identified *πρό(σ)σω*,

¹⁾ *Griech. etym. Wb.* s.v.; repeated by Chantraine, *Dict. étym.* I thank the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung for generous support during 1980-1.

²⁾ For IE *(s)up and *(s)upo preserved side-by-side in another dialect, cf. the two derived verbs in Hittite, *upzi* "rises" < *up beside *uppai* "lifts" (?) < *upo. See "Ämredita and Iteration of preverbs in Vedic and Hittite" *KZ* 96 (1982), fn. 33. Note s-movable before a vowel; cf. Hoenigswald, *Lang.* 28 (1952).

³⁾ Schwyzler-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II 523, where ὑπτιος is also listed, contradicting the analysis in vol. I.

ὀπί(σ)σω, εἶσω, ἔξω, ἐπίσσα, μέτασσα, Ἄντισσα, et al. as belonging to this group⁴).

However, Schulze paid no attention to the effect of Sievers' law on these forms⁵). Thus, whereas πρόσσω, ὀπίσσω, Ἄντισσα etc. are the correct phonologic outcomes of **pro-tyo-*, **op-ityo-*, and **Aont-ityo-*⁶), εἶσω and ἔξω are not directly derivable from **en-tyo-* or **ek-tyo-*, since the suffix would have taken the form **-tiyo-* post-consonantly. εἶσω and ἔξω, then, cannot be old, but must rather have been formed within Greek on the model of πρόσσω and the other post-light formations.

The post-heavy allomorph **-tiyo-*⁷) may indeed be found in Greek. Forssman has suggested, following Risch, that διαπρόσιος is a **-tyo-* derivative from διαπρό⁸); the only⁹) problem here is that the post-heavy allomorph follows a light syllable. The polysyllabicity of the base-form may be responsible, as Forssman has suggested (citing the situation in Lithuanian).

The analysis of ὑπτίος as ὑπ-τιος¹⁰) accounts for both meaning ("facing upwards") and form (preverbal adjective in **-tyo-*). The

⁴) W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* 70ff.; K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze* 497. Other procedures were composition in **Ok^w-o-* (see "reciprocus und Verwandtes", *IF* 84 (1979)) and suffixation in **mno-* (Forssman *KZ* 79 (1965)). For the coexistence of **-tyo-* and **mno-* derivatives, see "πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω" (also to appear in *KZ*), section 7a.

Although common in general, **-yo-* seems not to have formed preverbal derivatives in IE; examples may be found in the individual dialects, but no specific proto-forms are reconstructable. Cf. Brugmann, *Grdr.*² II 1 196–7. In Greek, we find the pair κοινός : ξινός, and ἄπιος. But cf. fn. 11.

⁵) Although his study of **-tyo-* appeared a full ten years after Sievers' original presentation in *PBB* 5 (1894), already booked in its proper place by e.g. Wackernagel, *AIG* I (1896) 204; Streitberg, *Urg. Gram.*³ (1896) 62, et al.

⁶) On the segmentations, see the appendix to "πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω".

⁷) Cf. e.g. Hitt. *andurziya-* < **en-dhur-tiyo-* (rather than from *andurza*).

⁸) *Op.cit.* 14 fn. 4. Risch's original suggestion in *Wortbildung d. hom. Sprache*¹ was deleted from the new edition.

⁹) πρό vs. πρῦ- is no problem, in view of inherited allomorphy such as **apo* : **apu*, **k^wo-* : **k^wu-*, Hitt. *apas* : *apun*, *asi* : *uni* (Laroche in *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (edd. Meid and Neu, Innsbruck 1979) 147ff.), etc. In the face of this comparative evidence, Hamp's inner-Greek phonological explanation of πρῦ- and πν- (*MSS* 29 (1971)) is needless. More on this suppletion elsewhere.

¹⁰) The nearest precursor to this analysis is Saussure's derivation from **ὑπό-τιος*, with syncope to avoid the sequence of shorts (*Recueil* 470). All the more remarkable for antedating Schulze's study of **-tyo-* by twenty years, the weakness of this interpretation is that it ignores the semantics of ὑπ- vs. ὑπό in Greek.

problematic dental extension disappears at the same time¹¹). Finally, the contrast *πρόσω: ὕπτιος* provides us with another perfectly preserved relic from that time when Sievers' law was a functioning morphophonemic principle of Indo-European.

σύν, ξύν

By GEORGE DUNKEL, Princeton

1. In every Greek etymological dictionary, the entry *σύν* consists entirely of a cross-reference to *ξύν*. The latter is universally taken as the original and inherited form of the preverb, and *σύν* as secondary and derived within Greek¹).

The unanimity is perplexing, since this view yields neither morphological advantages nor any etymological connection: "ohne sichere außergriechische Verwandte" (Frisk *s.v.*), "pas de parenté assurée hors du grec" (Boisacq *s.v.*), "sichere Beziehungen innerhalb oder außerhalb des Griechischen fehlen" (Schwyzer-Debrunner *Gr. Gr.* II 487), etc.²).

The simplification $\xi > \sigma$, though usually accepted without discussion³), is also extremely dubious. This cluster was stable in all Greek dialects; Schwyzer can cite only sporadic instances of $\xi > \sigma(\sigma)$ on some Attic vases⁴). Such a late and localised development can hardly account for pan-Greek *σύν*.

¹¹) Sievers manipulations alone could dispense with the dental: **hup-yos* (cf. Gothic *ufjo* "περισσόν") $> *ῥπτος$; **hup-iyos* $> *ῥπτος$; contamination produces *ῥπτιος*. But **hup-iyos* is unmotivated.

The non-assibilation of *-τιος* points to the Aeolic origin of this element of the Homeric dialectal mix.

¹) So too (besides the dictionaries) Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I 329; still Hamp, *Études Celtiques* 14 (1974) 470.

²) So too Wackernagel, *Vorl. über Syntax* II 155. Chantraine, *Dict. étym.* offers nothing new. Schwyzer's connection with *ξύω* (*Gr. Gr.* II 487 fn. 7) has found no followers.

³) Risch, *MH* 21 (1964) 7–8 calls it "satzphonetisch bedingt".

⁴) *Gr. Gr.* I 308; 211. The pre-consonantal simplification of the preverb *ἐξ*, into innovatory *ἐς* in Central Greek (cf. "Mycenaean and Central Greek", *Kadmos* 20 (1981), section 2a ii and fn. 26) vs. archaic *ἐκ* elsewhere (Schwyzer *Gr. Gr.* I 335–6) is of course irrelevant for putative $\xiύν > σύν$.