I do not propose to add to the long list of «solutions» to this riddle. Most recently, A. J. Van Windekens\(^1\) has added his name to the mournful series. I propose instead to point out where, as it seems to me, the realistic possibilities lie.

The ultimate etymon of the first element seems to me, at the present state of our knowledge, in principle uncertain, perhaps unknowable. It may be pre-Indo-European; it may (with Heubeck) be «pre-Greek», perhaps even (with Pisani and Georgiev) «Illyrian» (whatever that is); it may even be good Greek, either with an otherwise unattested root or with a disguised shape of a well-known root.

Van Windekens agrees essentially with Kretschmer and Frisk in rejecting \(*dem\)- ‘house’, which was advocated by Fick-Bechtel and Ehrlich. Instead, he would replace this by an equally inappropriate guess\(^2\), \(*dē(i)\)- ‘divide, distribute, (ap)portion, etc.’ Hence we would have ‘Mère de la portion, de la nourriture’. The semantic trouble here is that we are faced with a specialization of sense that is by no means certain or motivated.

Formally, in order to justify the necessary pre-forms in the various dialects, Van Windekens must start from \(*dēiā-, *dāiā-,\) and \(*daio-.\) Apart from the fact that he has already dismissed the gemination in the Thessalian form on the weak argument of «expressive gemination»\(^3\), this multiple of sources is less economical as a solution than others which have been proposed.

Other arguments have attributed the etymon to the set represented by \(χθοῦν\), Phrygian \(Γθucción\)-, and the like. If this is so, of course the source must be «pre-Greek»; but then, as will be seen

---

\(^1\) *Die Sprache* 12.94-7, 1966. For references to earlier work, see this last, and the entry in Hj. Frisk, *GEW* 1.379-80.


\(^3\) Op. cit. 95.
below and in agreement with Van Windekens’s objections on the probable fate of -vμ-, there is no trace of the nasal. On this score, it is worth pointing out that the Albanian dhe, often adduced, is by no means of certain affinity here. The Albanian initial is, of course, quite ambiguous; *d(h)- or *g(h)- would do equally well, and alongside Albanian dje ‘yesterday’ an IE *dgh- (Hittite degan, gen. d(a)guna) is phonologically quite without parallel. But what is not normally brought out is that the vocalism and final of the Albanian word are also highly problematic. Alb. e (not diphthongized ie) goes back plausibly to *∂. But there is no trace of the nasal. The usual definite form of this masculine vowel-stem is dheu ‘the earth’. We might have expected, to match χνων, humus, Skt. ksam-, something on the order of *dhem(ε), or Geg. *dhē-ni. Thus, Albanian dhe looks superficially like *dgho- or a longer dissyllable containing some such vocalism and an intervocalic voiced obstruent.

Finally, to make matters worse, γή γε could also be related to Albanian dhe (and then to a pre-Greek Δά-), but it is of course itself quite opaque, as Frisk flatly states.

Let us, then, abandon for now guessing at what this ambiguous etymon might be. Instead, let us inspect the internal Greek probabilities.

Van Windekens insists rightly that we must take full account of the variants attested in the ancient dialects; it is a pity that as yet no sure direct Mycenaean evidence has come to light, but more on this below. But, in speaking of the variants, Van Win-

---

4 Op. cit. 94.
5 See Frisk 379.
6 I assert this despite the fact that we actually find in the isolated Geg. dialect of Arbanasi (earlier Borgo Erizzo), near Zadar in Croatia, the form le-ni (C. Tagliavini, L’albanese di Dalmazia, Firenze 1937, 170), and in the Krajina dialects north of Scutari the form le-ni (I. Ajeti, Istorijski razvitak gegijskog govora Arbanasa kod Zadra, Sarajevo 1961, 128-9). These North Geg. dialects have extended the use of -n- in the definite form of such monosyllables, as also in mi ‘mouse’. The plural dheu, Tosk dhera, is a productive type that proves nothing in this regard.
7 GEW 1.303. Tagliavini, op. laud. 170, summarizes the equations made by Meyer, Pedersen, and Barić with γε and with χνόν (the latter preferred) without bringing out these difficulties.
dekens makes the puzzling statement⁸ «...ô en face d’un ancien à n’entre pas dans le cadre des alternances apophoniques». And again⁹ «dans le domaine de l’apophonie ô de Δω- est inconciliable avec à de Δα-, Δη-». Surely, this conclusion is in any case unjustified. If, provisionally, we agree with Van Windekens that Thessalian Δαμμ- represents gemination of some sort, we may equate Attic-Ionic Δη- = Doric Δα- ~ Acolic Δω- ~ Thessalian *Δα- exactly to the series φημί : φωνή : φωτός etc.¹⁰. That is, we have α : ω : ε < *α : δ : ζ, or *α : ζ : η. This is a perfectly respectable IE ablaut series that may be expressed in laryngeal terms as *deHₐ- : doHₐ : dHₐ-. If that were so, the root would be *dα-, or *deHₐ-. But, though this is formally possible, a weakness still remains in the fact that we cannot directly motivate the ablaut alternation any better than Van Windekens’s multiple base-and-suffix formations. For that reason, and because I still find a gratuitous gemination in Thessalian unsatisfying, I reject for the present this possibility.

The Greek forms that must be accommodated are Attic-Ionic Δημήτηρ = Doric etc. Δαιμότηρ, Thessalian Δαματηρ, East Aeolic Δωματηρ. Heubeck, pace Van Windekens, is clearly on solid ground in urging that the Thessalian form points to an assimilated consonant. That is, we have a situation parallel to Thess. Δαμμ- Doric Δαμ-, Attic-Ionic Ημε- ( lst pl. pronoun) < *αςμε; and Lesb. σελάναι, Doric σαλάναι, Attic-Ionic σαλην. Thus, we have, as Ehrlich posited, *Δας-ματηρ; but there is no necessity to follow him in deriving *Δας- from *dms-, genitive of *dēm-.

On the other hand, if we are to harmonize Δω- with this, the only possibility seems to be a contraction of *Δας-. The evidence for this is summarized below, where it is shown that the form must moreover be *Δας- and not *Δας-. Now, a virtue of the analysis *Δας-ματηρ is that it is morphologically and syntactically parallel to δεσπότης, whatever the first elements. I submit, then, that Δωματηρ is best viewed as based on a revised form of

---

⁸ Op. cit. 94.
¹⁰ The first two portions of this complex equation are reflected in the literature, e.g. in Brugmann, Gr.Gr.¹ 1913, 110, fn. 2, with references to earlier literature.
THE NAME OF DEMETER

this archaic genitive; thus, *Δασ-μάτηρ \rightarrow *Δασ-μάτηρ. It might
be objected that in light of Lesb. μήννος < *μήννος (I know of
no clear example of *-σμ- after long vowel) we should expect
*Δασμάτηρ < **Δωμάτηρ. However, it should be noted that
alongside μήννος we find also μήνος, and in Thessalian μείνος
alongside μείνος.

Hence, our multiplicity of forms reduces by well known deve­
lopments to a single original construction *Δα-σ + μάτηρ. The
only way to understand the reshaping to Δας- is by assuming
an original genitive *Δα-σ; otherwise there would have been no
motivation for dismembering what would become a fossilized
simplex. Therefore, with a zero-grade -s ending (a moribund
form in Greek, on which there would have been tremendous
pressure for replacement by -ος), the stem must have been *Δα-σ in
early Greek; cf., for zero-grade in both elements, Av. ἡρᾶ.

This seems to be as far as we can go on the evidence of Clas­
cical alphabetic Greek. From the morphological shape of *Δα-σ- it
seems unlikely that the σ goes back to a syllabic nasal. We will
return presently to the matter of the length of the σ.

Although Mycenaean does not yet show us a reflex for De­
meter, it has shed valuable confirmatory light on the form of the
name of Poseidon. Now Fick long ago hypothesized a relation
between *Ποσι-Δας(-ων) and *Δα-μάτηρ.\(^{11}\) The form of Posei­
don’s name should long ago have been clear to us on the basis
of the abundant dialectal attestations. But the digamma in the
inconsistent Corinthian ΠοσιΔας (disagreeing with ΠοσιΔαν)
misled us where we should have been more rigorous. Thus, the
exemplary Lejeune\(^{12}\) clearly stated: «Devant ω, la longue η s’a­
brège en ε; de plus, en attique, ω se contracte en ω (sauf si l’hiatus
résulte de la chute d’un π)». Note this last, which correctly ac­
counts for νεόν < *νάφων. Yet Lejeune continues: «ion. Ποσι­
δάν, att. Ποσιδών (de -δάν; contracté en attique, malgré le
caractère récent de l’hiatus)». Obviously, the hiatus cannot be
recent, and can only be old, as all the other dialect evidence

\(^{11}\) L. R. Palmer, *Mycenaean and Minoans*, 1965, 138, traces it back only to Kret­
schmer, who elaborated the notion.

\(^{12}\) *Traité de phonétique grecque* 225, § 254.
tends to show. On the other hand, the Attic evidence shows by the loss of the η > ε that the alpha was originally incontrovertably long *ā.

Frisk\textsuperscript{13} gives a full listing of relevant variant forms, a quick survey of the interpretations of the elements in the name, and a good summary set of references to the literature. Yet, following Schwyzer, and with the Mycenaean forms before him, he gives an incorrect account of the implications of the vowel contractions: «Λαις Ποτείδαν (wie Μαξειών, Αρεταίων u.a.; Schwyzer 521) entstand durch Kontraktion -δον, -δαν; daneben -δας». As we have just seen, if a digamma had really been present, we would never find the stage of contraction reached in Attic -δον.

On the basis of Ποσείδαν, Ion. Ποσεπαλων, Hom. Ποσειδανων, Corinthian Ποσειδάνων, Cret. Ποσειδάνων, Lesb. Ποσειδάνων, Bocot. Ποσειδάνων, Arc. Ποσειδανων, we may reconstruct only *Ποτε-δαν. The forms of Myc. po-se-da-o(-nV), po-si-da-i-jo etc.\textsuperscript{14} now bear this out.

Heubeck has tried\textsuperscript{15} to account for the background in the following fashion: The derivative in -a-i-jo shows that we have an old s-stem. Therefore, we start from *potei-da(h)ōn / poti-da(h)os\textsuperscript{16}, with *dns- seen in δηναι.\textsuperscript{17} *poti-da(h)os > *posi-da(h)os, *posi-da(h)i(i)os, which then contaminates *potei-da(h)ōn to *posei-

\textsuperscript{13} GEW 2.583 (1966).
\textsuperscript{14} See A. Morpurgo, Lexicon 258-9.
\textsuperscript{15} IF 64.225-40, 1959.
\textsuperscript{16} Frisk, GEW 2.583, accepts, without justification, the old view that Ποσι- is a more recent form of the vocative Ποτει-. That they are both of substantial age, and, more important, that they are allocated to clear syntactic functions (vocative generalized in the god’s name, and nominative [-accusative] in the phrasally compounded derivative adjective) is shown by the highly consistent Mycenaean forms. Given the phrasal source of these forms and such derivatives as Ποσιδήσος, Ποσιδητών -δεων, Bocot. Ποσιδαχος, one might have reconstructed the same situation without the aid of Mycenaean; but the confirmation should settle all doubt. Kretschmer is correct in rejecting Ποσι- (Pergam. Ποστοίδαν, Arcad. Ποσοι- and the Laconized Πολοιδάν) as an ablaut variant. Morphologically it should not occur in such a range of forms. Instead, it must represent an assimilation to the preceding syllable (not an infrequent phenomenon in Greek) of an earlier Ποτει-.

\textsuperscript{17} Frisk cites this equation with doubt on lexical (semantic) grounds. See below the stronger phonological argument.
The last is then contaminated in the final element by Παιάγον = Myc. *pa-ja-wo > Παιάων, and gives Ποσειδόων > Ποσειδέων. The flaw in this argument, which is certainly unobjectionable as far as the Mycenaean stage, is in the later chronology, involving the cross with Παιάγον. In order to get the long alpha Heubeck is obliged to accept too the digamma. But, as we have just seen, Attic shows us crucially (apart from the other direct but ambiguously manipulable evidence) that the digamma was never there; or else the contraction would have failed to take place.

Thus we need no intervention of Παιάγον (a gain in itself), and we must start directly from *potei-da(h)ôn | poti-dâ(h)ôs. Underlying this, we posit a phrase, often heard in the vocative, naturally, *potis das ‘Lord of (the) Da’.

Now let us return to Demeter. To explain Aeolic Δω- we invoked *Δαιω-. That is *δδ yields Aeolic ω (e.g. Boeot. σουλάντες, as in verbs in -ως). The assumption of this contraction also helps to explain as hyper-forms such Lesbian formations as πονάω, πτοάω, and άξιάω in expected -ώ and -ώ types. On the other hand, *δδ yields Aeolic ω, Attic-Ionic (s)ω (e.g. Lesb. ἃς, Boeot. ἃς, Att.-Ion. ἓς, though this is probably from *ἀσις; gen. pl. Lesb. Thess. Boeot. -ᾶν, Ion. -ών, Att. -ών < *-άς). Therefore Δωμήτηρ cannot be explained at all by starting directly from a pre-form *Δειω-. We must, for maximum economy and explanatory power, posit *Δαις + μήτηρ > *Δεις + μήτηρ.

On the other hand, we have just seen that the name of Poseidon requires an origin in *Ποτις + δης. It should be clear, then, that the first element of Demeter and the final element of Poseidon cannot be, in simple terms, identical; that is, they are not in origin the phonetically same form of the same word. They could thus easily be unrelated.

---

18 Many given names in modern Romanian, Bulgarian, and Serbo-Croatian are frozen vocatives. There is a rich and dispersed Balkanist literature on this. Cf. also the Boeotian hypocoristic names in -εί, thought also to be frozen vocatives.
19 If Albanian were to continue this we would expect *dua do-, or perhaps (from an old sandhi form) *dua dho-.
20 This, of course, eliminates on strong phonological grounds Heubeck’s suggestion of *dhs: δαήμων.
However, this does not prevent them, if they are morphologically Indo-European,21 from being regular variants of the same word. In that case, we would have \( *-\delta\delta\varsigma < *\delta\dot{\alpha}s, \) and \( *\Delta\varsigma-<*\delta\dot{\alpha}s. \) In laryngeal terms of IE ablaut these would be \( *deH\varsigma's \) and \( *dH\varsigma's \) respectively. Now both these have been analyzed earlier as being old genitives; and so they may well have been regarded by prehistoric Greeks. But, if the root was actually \( *deH\varsigma's, \) it might have had a declension of the form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Declension</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>( *deH\varsigma's )</td>
<td>( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>( *dH\varsigma's-(e/o)s )</td>
<td>( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s, \delta\dot{\alpha}s, \delta\dot{\alpha}s(s) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combining form</td>
<td>( *dH\varsigma's- )</td>
<td>( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s- )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, unless we assume vocalic levelling in the paradigm, \( \Pi\sigma\tau\varsigma \Delta\dot{\alpha}s \) could have meant the (titular) ‘Lord Das’22, while \( *\Delta\dot{\alpha}s-\mu\nu\tau\eta\rho \) could have meant ‘the Das-mother’ or ‘the mother of Das’. If that were so, \( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s- \) would have no obvious known common-noun meaning.

If such a noun lies behind the forms of Demeter, it is even possible that \( \Delta\nu- \) and \( \Delta\eta- \) etc. are equally old. For \( *\Delta\dot{\alpha}s-\mu\nu\tau\eta\rho \) could contain the combining form \( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s- \), while \( *\Delta\dot{\alpha}s + \mu\nu\tau\eta\rho \) could reflect the old genitive \( *\delta\dot{\alpha}s- \).

Finally, if the latter reasoning is correct, on grounds of morphological and syntactic argument, but in ignorance of the original semantics, Demeter was the mother of Poseidon.
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---

21 Either by inheritance or by very early prehistoric assimilation that would be by definition without distinctive chronological characteristics.

22 The syntax would be the same as Jupiter, but the order (which has been suggestively linked with the Semitic Levant) would be different.