ANTONIO TOVAR

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY OF do-e-ro

The word δοῦλος is generally considered a foreign loan\(^1\). The frequent presence in the Mycenaean documents of do-e-ro/α, whose identity with δοῦλος δῶλος is beyond doubt\(^2\), seems to call for a fresh discussion of its etymology. The Mycenaean forms, both masculine and feminine, compensate for the rarity of the word in primitive Greek literature: it appears twice in Homer (Γ 409, 8 12) in the feminine; it does not occur at all in Hesiod\(^3\); a feminine form is recorded once in the old lyric poets, Theognis


\(^2\) It would not be correct of course to give to the Mycenaean word do-e-ro all the meanings and connotations of the historical word δοῦλος. We may agree with F. J. Tritsch, *Minoica*, pp. 412 ff., who maintains that a translation «servant» would be more convenient than «slave». Bennett in his paper read to the Third Internaional Congress of Class. Studies (*Nestor*, 1959, pp. 73 f.) tentatively interprets do-e-ro as indicating the «relationship of dependence upon another person», who can also be a god. Similar care is shown by L. R. Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 414, G. P. Shipp, *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek*, pp. 14 f., and Gisela Wickert, *Gnomon* 39, pp. 587-604, esp. 596 ff., in her review of a Russian book where slavery is assumed for Mycenaean times only on the basis of the term do-e-ro. At any rate, there is no doubt about the lexical identity of do-e-ro and δοῦλος.

538\textsuperscript{4}. The explanation is perhaps that in the Sub-Mycenaean age, which was that of a social and economic recession, domestic service was considerably reduced and male servants were not employed any more\textsuperscript{5}.

Before thinking of foreign origin scholars tried Indo-European etymologies: one was Skr. \textit{dāsah} as related to Gr. \textit{δῆω}\textsuperscript{6}; another was IE *\textit{deu- du-} (a rather difficult root, s. Pokorny, \textit{IEW}, pp. 218 f.) from which Goth. \textit{täujan}, OHG \textit{zouwen} «to do, prepare», assuming \textit{δῦλος} some kind of \textit{nomen agentis}\textsuperscript{7}. This explanation was refined by Brugmann in his important paper on the names of servants in IE\textsuperscript{8}, comparing also ON, OE \textit{töl} «tool» and explaining its meaning as «reßam tätig, geschäftig» (Kretschmer, \textit{Glotta} 5, p. 307, called it «begrifflich zu wenig zwingend»), but there are also phonetic difficulties, since both \textit{δῦλος} and \textit{δῆλος} cannot be derived from IE *\textit{döl-}, and Brugmann had to postulate another form *\textit{ðůul-}\textsuperscript{9}.

There were other IE etymologies, which we can discard: H. Lewy, \textit{IF} 2, p. 446, derives \textit{δῦλος} from *\textit{λουλός}, cf. \textit{λείω}; K. F. Johansson, \textit{IF} 3, pp. 231 f., from *\textit{do(w)lo-} referring to Skr. \textit{dārāb} «wife»; O. Wiedemann, \textit{BB} 27, p. 218, sees a connection with \textit{δόμος}, which according to him means «das feste».

Thus it is understandable that Boisacq, after accepting the explanation of Lorentz, in the additions to his last edition (\textit{Dict.})

\textsuperscript{4} In all these authors we leave aside derived words like \textit{δούλος}, etc. Cf. G. Fatouros \textit{Index verborum zur frührgr. Lyrik}, Heidelberg 1966, p. 104.

\textsuperscript{5} G. M. Calhoun in \textit{A Companion to Homer}, ed. by A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings, London 1963, p. 442, thinks that the word \textit{δῦλος} in Homer «though evidently well known is definitely avoided; this is clearly because of its connotations and is the more striking because Homer is not given to euphemism».

\textsuperscript{6} This etymology was established by H. Düntzer, \textit{KZ} 16, p. 27, reconstructing a *\textit{δοῦλος}; G. Curtius, \textit{Grundzüge der gr. Etymol.}, Leipzig 1858, 1, p. 200, had already criticized it. Yet we believe that the comparison with \textit{dāsah} is quite correct.

\textsuperscript{7} F. Lorentz, \textit{IF} 5, pp. 342 f., W. Prellwitz, \textit{Etym. Wb. der gr. Spr.}\textsuperscript{9}, p. 120, E. Boisacq, \textit{Dict. étym. de la langue gr.}, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{8} \textit{IF} 19, pp. 377-391, especially 386 ff.

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Morphol. Untersuch.} 6, pp. 365-367. The phonetical weakness of this explanation was pointed out by Chadwick after the identification of Myc. \textit{do-er-wo}; see below.
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Etim., p. 1107) takes up again Lambertz’ suggestion of the foreign origin of the word, showing that the problem was as yet unsolved.

It is from the Mycenaean form *do-e-ro* that we have to start.

Derivatives in the IE languages are formed with a -lo suffix\(^10\). In Greek\(^11\) we find formations which are connected with verbs: for instance δῆλος, δαβέλος «torch» to δαίω, ἀγέλη «flock» to ἄγω, ἐκέλος ἐκέλος to εἶκεια, δεῖλος δείλη to δῦω, εὐτράπελος to τρέπω, δέελος δῆλος to δέστο; but derivations are also found from non-verbal roots and seem very old since they have parallels in other IE dialects: thus besides νεφέλη, Lat. nebula, OHG nebul; besides κεφσολη, Goth. gibla, OHG gibil «top», Toch. A ἱπά- «head»; besides ἀγκάλη, ON áll, óll «strap» (< *anhl₃₃), Toch. A aṅcāl «bow»; besides ὀμφάλος, Skr. nābhilam «pubic region, hollow of the navel», Lat. umbilicus, OIr. imbliu (< *em-bilōn), OHG nabalo, OE nafela.

Of special interest, because of the suffix, is the comparison of *doero* with the Italic forms Lat. famulus, familia, Osc. famel «servant», famelo «family», Umb. f a m e r ĭ a s «familiae»\(^12\), to which V. Georgiev, Issledovania po sravnit.-istor. jazykozn., Moscow 1958, p. 61; Linguistique Balkanique 1, 1959, p. 73, calls our attention. He hesitates between two explanations, that of *dō-1(u)-*, given by Lorentz, and that of *dhō-* as in Lat. sacer-dōs (with «Pelasgian» phonetics).

It will be useful to point to a few other IE words for «servant» which show the same suffix: ON próel «servant», from which OE þræl, NE thrall\(^13\), and in Celtic languages OIr. cumal «bondmaid», Bret. mevel «servant», which Buck in his Dict. of Synon., pp. 1333


\(^{12}\) The suggestion of V. Pisani, Saggi di linguistica storica, Turin 1959, p. 142 (previously in Rhein. Mus. 95, 1952) explaining famulus, familia as Oscan loans, and O. famel as from the same root as χθῶν χομαί seems very attractive.

\(^{13}\) It is immaterial whether we accept with some scholars (Skeat, E. Klein, Onions) the derivation from *trēgh- trēgh-* (Pokorny, IEW, p. 1069), or with Buck, loc. cit., that from *trenk-* (Pokorny IEW, p. 1093). The interesting thing for us is to find the same suffix in all these forms.
and 1335, explains respectively from *cumā «grief» (in the same way Fick-Stokes, Brugmann, and Pokorny, *IEW*, p. 157) and from *magu- «young man» (see for this word J. Vendryes, *Lex. étym. de l'irlandais ancien*, Paris 1960, M 71).

Now we propose for *do-e-ro*, also transcribed as *dohelos*, the root which in Pokorny, *IEW*, pp. 198-200, appear as *dem-, dema-, doma-, dom- «to build», properly «to join, put together», and also «to tame».

E. Benveniste, in a study of the «homophony» of these roots has tried to establish three different fields with as many independent roots: besides «to build» and «to tame» he proposes, as a third unit, «house» as a «fraction sociale et familiale». But the border lines of these lexemes are not clear. On the other hand, the idea of subsuming all the meanings under one word has been followed by many scholars, as Benveniste, *BSL* 51, p. 15, points out: Walde-Pokorny I, p. 788, Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I, p. 370, and Pokorny himself, who at the end of his entry *dem- «bauen» quotes Walde-Pokorny: «Eine alte Abzweigung unserer Wz. ist *demā- «zähmen», ursprüngl. wohl «ans Haus fesseln, domestizieren»."

Once we assume the unity of the root *dem-, or better, with laryngeal* *dem-,* we have the etymological explanation of διώς διώκειν «slave», fem. διωχή, διωκός, διωτός, διωχός, in Cretan also

---

14 A word οικέλος is found in G. Kisser, *Ergänzungen zu Kratschmer-Locker, Rückschlagiges Winterbuch der griech. Sprache*, Göttingen 1963, p. 707, but unfortunately I was unable to locate it, either in the *Addenda to LSJ* or in the other sources which Kisser, p. 686, indicates.


17 *BSL* 51, pp. 15-29. See also the new book by Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* I, pp. 293 ff., chapter on *dem- «house», a root to be distinguished from *dem(a)- «build» and *dom(a)- «tame».

This also explains the apparently incompatible meanings of ευδήμητος «well built», θεόδημητος «god-built» on one side, and on the other ἀδήμη, ἀδήμητος «unwedded (a maid), unbroken, unsubdued», νεόδημη, νεόδημητος «newly tamed». Benveniste, BSL 51, p. 18, compares μεσόδήμη, μεσόμην «tie-beam, box amidships, shelf» and Mycenaean terms like to-ko-do-mo τοιχοδομοι and de-me-o-te de-méontes. We may add the Hesychian gloss μεσόδημον γυνή, a compound like μεσόγαιος and μεσόχθουν «inland», and whose meaning is explained by μεσόδομος, a term which appears in the scholia of Aristophanes to explain κατηλίψις, something variously understood as «ladder, roof-beam, upper story».

If we accept this root, other etymologies become equally clear: δεμάλη, δέμος, δόμος, δός, δόμα, δέμιος, δέμιον, which, like δόμορτις γυνή (Hesychius), must be considered derived from it.

To put do-e-ro in the same chapter as all these derivations from *dem(ə)- we have to assume either an ablaut form with o or a reduced form *dme-s-. The possibility of ο as a result of η is confirmed in Greek dialects (so Arc. ἔκοτόν) and also found in the Mycenaean tablets: see the contributions of Georgiev and Heubeck to this Colloquium and the monograph of Anna Morpurgo, «L’esito delle nasali sonanti in Miceneo», Rendiconti Ac. Lincei, Scienze mor., ser. 8, 15, 1960, pp. 321-336. Examples like pe-mo σπέρμα, a-mo-ta pl. of ἐρμα, e-ne-wo-pe-za of ένεα are absolutely sure. The form do-po-ta has been understood from the beginning to be an equivalent of δεσπότης, perhaps with the root in a grade

---

19 Frisk, GEW I, p. 403, and Chantraine, Dictionnaire, pp. 289 f., both seem to incline towards an etymology that connects the word with δόμος, as already M. Bréal MSL 7, pp. 448 f. (who for the meaning referred to Lat. famulus) and Boisacq, p. 193. Similarly Ernst Fraenkel, Glotta 32, pp. 23 f. But G. Curtius, Grundzüge, p. 232, and P. Kreischmer, KZ 31, p. 406, derive δέμος from δέμημη.
20 Cf. also δέμας and δέμωνής.
21 Georgiev, Klio 38, p. 69, agreeing with Benveniste, BSL 51, p. 22, and others.
22 Benveniste, BSL 51, p. 17 f., refers to the meaning «course of bricks» for δόμος (Herodot) and ἔδον δέμιον «uiam sternere» (likewise in Herodot) as an explanation for δέμιον, which should be compared with Lat. stramen, stratus.
23 See the reference to Anna Morpurgo on this page.
The *dems- of δεσπότης has usually been explained as a genitive (so Frisk GEW I, p. 371, with E. Risch, IF 59, pp. 12 f., and others), but E. Benveniste, Origins, pp. 66 f., maintains that we simply have to do with an enlarged form of the root, just as in Lat. domes-ticus. The objections of F. Specht, Gnomon 14, p. 33, to this point do not seem cogent, and I think we can consider an s-extension of *dem-. Specht in his book Der Ursprung der idg. Dekl., pp. 199 ff., 233 ff., presents many examples of s added to a root: Sl. vetz-x-ž, Lith. vėtu-s-as, Lat. uetu-s-tus and dozens more. If we compare with *dm-s- the form *dom-n- (cf. W. Porzig, IF 42, p. 239) we find that this combination s/n is the same studied by Specht, passim, in his great book, especially p. 339, as he puts together Skr. pāru-s/-parv-an- «knot, joint», Gr. ἀδών/ἀτρις, Skr. ḍyus-, OHG i-s «ice»/Lith. ž-n-is «hoar frost», Gr. χεῖλος < *ghel-s-/ON gjølnar < *ghelu-n-, Skr. i-s-ā «shaft»/Lith. ie-n-a «thill», Serb. klī-s «split»/OCS klī-n-z «wedge», ON ber-s-e/OHG bero «bear», etc. It is strange that he insisted against Benveniste on the interpretation of the first element of δεσπότης as a genitive. Anyhow his review of Benveniste is years older than these collections in his book, in which he does not mention δεσπότης.

We believe that we find a confirmation of the connection of do-e-ro with *dem- if we recall on the one hand a series of difficult Mycenaean words, on the other some facts of Sanskrit vocabulary.

The group du-ma, du-ma-te, da-ma-te, me-ri-du-ma-te, me-ri-da-ma-te, po-ro-du-ma-te, po-ru-da-ma-te remains enigmatic, and I will

---

24 Such is the first proposal of Anna Morpurgo, Rend., p. 328, for do-po-ta, although she leaves open the possibility of the reduced form. At the beginning L. R. Palmer, Eratos 53, 1955, p. 12 n. 2, thought of δω-.

25 This reduced grade *dm- underlies δάπεδον (studied by E. Risch, IF 59, p. 14) and da-ko-ro ζακόρος.

26 G. Curtius, Grundzüge I, p. 200, compared already δέμας (*dems) with domes-ticus. Verbs based on the root *dem- extended by s are, as E. Polomé, Language 28, p. 450, points out, Hitt. da-ma-at-zi and Gr. δέμασσα.

27 -da-ma-te/-du-ma-te are identical in the compounds; is this also the case with du-ma, du-ma-te / da-ma-te? For the various interpretations of da-ma-te see Lydia Baumbach, Studies, pp. 148 f. Perhaps it is better to leave aside this form.
not try to decipher it. But I will make use of the explanation given by Anna Morpurgo, *PaP* 13, pp. 322 ff., comparing *du-ma* with the word δωμας and Hitt. *dam-ma-ra* «an inferior cult servant»; the connection of these words with δωμης, Skr. *dāmyati* is evident for her. Similarly V. Georgiev, *Slovor* `krito-mikenskix nadpisej*, Sofia 1955, p. 29, compared *du-ma* with δωμας.

It is clear that the vacillation αυ in all these words would be best explained by reduced forms of the type *dmā-. In historical Greek this type is very rare (cf. Schwzyer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, pp. 424 f.), but on the basis of the compounds me-*ri-da-ma-te*, po-*ru-da-ma-te*, which are similar to οιστροπλής, κερσυνοβλής, ἄνδροθνής, λιμοβής, ἄνδροκμής, δουρωκής and other later developments, it is possible to admit the existence of a *δμε̥-* in the Mycenaean texts with the meaning «servant».

Now two Sanskrit words at least prove the relationship of *do-e-ro* to *dem-*: *dāsāh* «demon, enemy; infidel, barbarian; slave, servant»29, and *dāṣyuh* «demon, enemy of the gods, barbarian, impious mad», cf. Av. *dahyu-* «subdued enemy land»30. Both must be explained, we believe, from *dm̥-s-, with or without the vrddhi, cf. A. Debrunner, p. 843 of vol. II, 2 of the *Altind. Grammatik* of Wackernagel.

The etymologies so far proposed for *dāsāh*, which also can be compared to Pers. *dāh* «servant», are most favorable to our position. Thus R. Pischel, *Ved. Stud.* II, pp. 103 ff., explained *dām-patiḥ* from a root meaning «richten» (which he distinguished from that of *dam-* «house»). His references to Avestan words favor (even if we obviously reject his root *dens-*) the existence

---

28 The oldest forms seem to be those containing a preposition or negative α- as first element such as ἐνμής «bolt» in Homer, or the above cited ἄδμης. See Ernst Fraenkel, *Gesch. der gr. Nomina agentis* Strassburg 1910, pp. 80 f.

29 Note that this is the order of meanings in Mayrhofer and in Monier-Williams; in Böhtlingk we find as the first meaning «enemy, a bad demon», the second is «slave, servant», while the fem. *dāst* shows the original meaning «female slave», whence «harlot».

30 Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire* I, p. 358, maintains that Av. *dahyu-* would be another word than Skr. *dasyu-*, with the meaning «human collectivity». But it seems that his interpretation is somehow biased by the idea of «des quatre cercles de l'appartenance sociale». 
of *dem-s-. The criticisms of M. Mayrhofer, Kurzgefü. etym. Wb. II, pp. 20 and 39, are based on the radical distinction of both roots, «build» and «tame», but we are convinced of the inseparability of forms and meanings. We believe with E. Polomé, Language 28, p. 450 n. 51, that Pisani is right in deriving dásáh from the root «tame». In his objections Mayrhofer leaves open the possibility of a connection between do-e-ro and dásáh as indicated by J. Chadwick, TPhS 1954, p. 14, who is taking up a suggestion made by H. W. Bailey. Chadwick was right in pointing out that the form do-e-ro excluded the traditional connection with Goth. taujan.

I will refrain from discussing Skr. dáráh, whose eventual connection with Gr. δῶμα is very tempting. Another Skr. word, dámünāh «householder, master», whatever the difficulties about its formation, also belongs to this chapter: see Mayrhofer II, pp. 19 f.

Our conclusion would be that do-e-ro δουλός proceeds from the root *demos- which had the meanings «build» and «tame, subdue», not so different for a more primitive society than ours. The root was extended by an s, and the word derived by a suffix -e-lo-: *dm-selo-. A translation «servant, domestic» would be the best in so far as it is neutral with regard to the slavery in Mycenaean times. May I insist on my old explanation of the Pylos tablets of series E as referring to the jobs in the royal palace, and not to archaeologically fantastic and non existent temples?

---

21 Let us recall ON mund «hand» and mundr «purchase-money of the bride», OE mund «hand» and «protection, guardianship», and of course Lat. manus, in the normal meaning manu quærere, manu sata, manus Praxiteli, since the hands are multarum artium ministrae (Cicero), and in the legal expressions manus inicion, in alterius manu, manu mittere. And to take a non Indo-European example, in Quechua, the tongue of the Incas of Peru, ati «destiny» and ati «possibility» are obviously the same, since the verb atiy means «poder, tener la facultad o medio para ejecutar una cosa; tener fuerza o capacidad para superar». A transitive atikuy is «make easy», a derived noun atipa means «victory» and an adjective atittylla «factible, no dificultoso, fácil de emprender o de ejecutar». Cf. J. A. Lira, Diccionario Kkechuwa-Español, Tucumán 1944.