OBAFEMI KUJORE
University of Ibadan, Nigeria

GREEK TEKTΩN. A CASE FOR REDUPLICATION

To anyone who is conversant with Ancient Greek linguistics, one way out of the phonological problems which the form τέκτων 'carpenter, joiner' with its cognates presents would be to postulate the root *teḱ- and interpret the Greek form as a reduplicated noun τέ-κτ-ων ⟨*τέ-τκ-ων (cf. the development of τίκτω ⟨*τι-τκ- : aor. ἔ-τεκ-ον [1]). However, it is observed that in a group of words, which includes Gk. τέκτων, the Indo - European languages show correspondences which do not fit into the pattern so far established : Greek dentals (τ, θ) answer unexpectedly to spirants (s, ṣ, š, ž, etc.) in other languages. For this reason and in spite of the facts now available within and outside Greek, scholars have persistently, it would seem, avoided giving any serious consideration to the reduplication solution for the Greek form in question. Would such a solution appear too 'economic' to merit scholarly attention ? The issue is briefly re-examined here.

Some of the Greek forms found in the troublesome group are given here with their cognates in the related languages : κτάομαι 'acquire', Skt. kṣáyati, Av. xšayati ; κτείνω 'slay', Skt. kṣaṇóti, OPers. axšata- ; ἄρκτος 'bear', Skt. ṛ́kṣa-, Av. arša-, Lat. ursus, Arm. arǰ ; ὄκταλλος (Boeot.) / ὀφθαλμὸς 'eye', Skt. ákṣi- ; τέκτων (cf. τέκταινα, τεκταίνομαι), Skt. tákṣan- (cf. takṣṇí, tákṣati), Av. tašaiti, Lat. texō (cf. textor) ; φθίνω 'decay, wane', Skt. kṣināti kṣinóti, Lat. situs ; φθείρω 'destroy', Skt. kṣárati, Av. γžaraiti ; χθών 'earth', Skt. kṣấh, Av. zå, Lat. humus ; ἐρέχθω 'rend, break', Skt. rákṣas-, Av. rašah-. It will be seen that the Greek dentals (τ, θ) corresponding to, for example, the Sanskrit spirant (ṣ) regularly occur after a guttural, and that the clusters κτ φθ χθ are found in both initial and medial positions.

The dental—spirant correspondence in this group of words has provoked the assumption for Indo—European of dental or interdental spirants by some scholars, and the Greek clusters κτ φθ χθ have thus been supposed to continue

1) See, e. g., Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik I, München 1939, pp. 266, 289, etc. ; Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch II, Heidelberg 1969, s. v. τίκτω.

IE $\hat{k}\phi$ $k\phi$ $g\acute{o}h$ etc. or $\hat{k}^s$ k^s $\hat{g}^zh$ etc. et sim [2]. At the basis of this assumption lies tho inclination to interpret and represent a phenomenon which occurs with some regularity in a group of words in a harmonious phonemic system.

As it is, however, Hittite has now furnished some valuable evidence. The relation of Hitt. tekan, gen. dagnas 'ground' (cf. Tokh. A tkám 'place') with Gk. χθών, Skt. kṣáh, etc. is now generally accepted. Both Hittite and Tokharian facts point to a dental followed by a guttural, suggesting IE *dh(e) ĝhom- [3]. In Greek, it appears, the nil-grade form *dhĝhom- has resulted in a consonantal cluster which is difficult to pronounce and the difficulty has been resolved by metathesis (-θχ-)-χθ-). Also now usually related with Gk. ἄρκτος, Skt. ṛ́kṣa-, etc. is Hitt. hartagga ('bear' ?) which also suggests metathesis in Greek : ἄρκτος ⟨*αρτκος⟨*H_{r}tk- [4]. Now, whatever merits have the theories of interdental spirants, we should no longer require special phonemes to interpret Gk. χθών and ἄρκτος and their cognates. It would now, in fact, appear best to treat each case on its merits. Nevertheless, what is most interesting so far is the Greek procedure in arriving at the attested forms χθών, ἄρκτος, a procedure which goes to strengthen one's suspicion all along about τέκτων [5]. And unless the facts point to the contrary, one wonders whether, for τέκτων at least of all the remaining forms in the group, an interpretation as a metathesized, and so reduplicated, form does not strongly suggest itself as a possibitity.

The reduplicated form *te-$t\hat{k}$-on- of a root *$te\hat{k}$- would serve as the basis of Skt. tákṣan- and, with metathesis (-$t\hat{k}$-) -$\hat{k}t$-), of Greek τέκτων. Now, it is of great interest to note that the radical form *tek- has, in fact, been postulated to account for Osset. taxun 'weave', Arm. tekem 'twist', etc. [6] which agree semantically with Lat. texō. The Latin verb with Skt. tákṣati, Av. tašaiti may now derive from *$te\hat{k}$-s- : with an s-enlargement, cf. Lat. vexō beside vehō, Skt.

---

2) See Brugmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen I, 2nd ed., Strassburg 1897—1916, pp. 790 ff. ; Benveniste, Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris, 38 (1937), 139 ff. ; further references in Schwyzer, op. cit., p. 326 ; on τέκτων and cognates, cf. Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I, Bern 1959, pp 1058 f.

3) See Kretschmer, Glotta, 20 (1931), 66 f.

4) See Burrow, Journal of American Oriental Society, 79 (1959), 85 ff., where the Sanskrit treatment of the unmetathesized -$t\hat{k}$- cluster is fully discussed. On the Latin development (ursus ⟨ *$\text{r}\hat{k}$-yo), see Szemerényi, Fachtagung für indogermanische und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Innsbruck 1941, 180.

5) Metathesis has also been assumed by Burrow (loc. cit., 255 ff.) for Gk. φθίνω, φθείρω.

6) Pokorny, op. cit., p. 1058, who yet adopts the interdental spirant for τέκτων, tákṣan, etc. (see reference in note 2 above). Note that IE palatal ($\hat{k}$) and velar (k) seem sometimes to carry no functional distinction (see, e. g., Pokorny, op. cit., pp. 573 f.). With *te-$t\hat{k}$- as an IE nominal reduplication, cf. *$k^{\text{w}}e$-$k^{\text{w}}l$-o- (root *$k^{\text{w}}el$-) ⟩ Skt. cakrá- beside secondary Gk. κύκλος.

váhati, Gk. (ϝ)έχω (*weĝh-(s)-); Gk. αὔξω beside Lat. augeō (*H$_2$eu-g-(s)-); Gk. ἀ(ϝ)έξω beside Lat. vegeō (*H$_2$u-eg-(s)-) [7]. The related noun τέχνη usually derived from *τεκτ-εσ-νᾱ [8], may not phonetically go beyond *τεκ-σ-νᾱ (cf. λύχνος⟨*λύκσνος beside Av. raoxšna-, OPers. lauxnos [9]). If τέκμαρ -ωρ belong to this word-group [10], their antecedent may be τεκ-μ- (cf. ἀκ-μή) rather than τεκτ-μ- [11].

Again it is observed that within the Greek verbal system instances of reduplicated present forms (type μί μν-ω, γί-γν-ομαι [12]) with -ε- for -ι- in the reduplicative syllable are not frequent. When such forms are not drawn from those already existing in the other tenses (as are, e.g., κέκλομαι [13], δεδοίκω [14]) or subjected to some phonetic pressure which has necessitated the hange from the more usual -ι- to -ε- (as is (ϝ)ε(ϝ)ίσκω [15], they seem to be based on reduplicated nouns. τέτραμος (Hp.) is the basis of τετραμαίνω (Hp., etc.), cf. τρέμω. τετραίνω (aor. ἐτέτρηνα in Homer ; συν- Aesch., etc.), cf. τείρω(⟨ *τερ-$_1$ω), beside a later present τιτραίνω (Thphr.) is not clear, but may be based on a lost *τέτρων (?) [16] ousted by τέρετρον. τεκταίνομαι (since Homer) based on τέκτων (since Homer) may now be added [17]. It seems that the interpretation of τέκτων as a reduplicated form should now stand even if as a rival to a solution by the interdental spirant.

---

7) Note that Lat. tēla 'web' is usually derived from *te$\hat{k}$slā (=Slav. tesla, OHG. dehsala) — see Pokorny, op. cit., p. 1058; cf. Leumann, Lateinische Grammatik, 5th ed., München 1926—1928, p. 159.

8) See Schwyzer, op. cit., p. 326 with reference.

9) Cf. Frisk, op. cit., II, s.v. λύχνος.

10) See Schwyzer, ibid. ; Pokorny, ibid.

11) Schwyzer, ibid.

12) Cf., e.g., Schwyzer, op. cit., p. 690.

13) Cf. Schwyzer, op. cit., p. 749

14) Cf. Schwyzer, op. cit., p. 767.

15) See Schulze, Kleine Schriften, Göttingen 1933, p. 305.

16) Or *τέτρος *τέτρον ?—see the sceptical suggestion in Frisk, op. cit., II, s.v. τετραίνω.

17) The originally non—reduplicated πέπων πεπαίνω (⟨*pek^{w}, cf. Skt. pácati) may have come later in the Greek mind to be associated with this group.