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/a*, 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, δ 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

---

[1] After a complete examination of the philological aspects, M. Lambertz, *Glotta* 6, pp. 1-18, considered the word to come from Asia Minor. This view is now generally accepted: cf. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 62, J. B. Hofmann, *Etym. Wb. des Gr.*, p. 63, C. D. Buck, *A Dict. of Selected Synonyms*, p. 1332, H. Frisk, *GEW* I, p. 412 (who refers as well to the comparison by E. Assmann, *Glotta* 9, pp. 94-96, with Assyr. *dullu* «service, work»), M. Lejeune, *Historia* 8, p. 130, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire* I, pp. 294 f., E. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes* I, pp. 358 f. Chantraine in his book *Formation*, p. 239, calls the word a «terme religieux» and compares its formation with that of φίλος. The mystical interpretation of the word still seems to enjoy much favour: cf. I. Chirassi, *Atti Roma*, II, pp. 952 f., with reference to J.-P. Olivier.

[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 International 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.

[3] J. Paulson, *Index Hesiodeus*, Lund 1890. The new Hesiodean fragments (see *Oxyrh. Pap.* XXVIII and XXX, ed. E. Lobel) do not give any example of the word.

538[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[5].

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

There were other IE etymologies, which we can discard: H. Lewy, *IF* 2, p. 446, derives δοῦλος from **λουλος*, cf. λεία; K. F. Johansson, *IF* 3, pp. 231 f., from **do(w)lo-* referring to Skr. *dārāḥ* «wife»; O. Wiedemann, *BB* 27, p. 218, sees a connection with 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 (*Dict.*

---

[4] In all these authors we leave aside derived words like δούλιος, etc. Cf. G. Fatouros *Index uerborum zur frühgr. Lyrik*, Heidelberg 1966, p. 104.

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

[6] This etymology was established by H. Düntzer, *KZ* 16, p. 27, reconstructing a **δοσυλος; G. Curtius, *Grundzüge der gr. Etymol.*, Leipzig 1858, I, p. 200, had already criticized it. Yet we believe that the comparison with *dāsaḥ* is quite correct.

[7] F. Lorentz, *IF* 5, pp. 342 f., W. Prellwitz, *Etym. Wb. der gr. Spr.*[2], p. 120, E. Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue gr.*[4], p. 198.

[8] *IF* 19, pp. 377-391, especially 386 ff.

[9] *Morphol. Untersuch.* 6, pp. 365-367. The phonetical weakness of this explanation was pointed out by Chadwick after the identification of Myc. *do-e-ro*; see below.

étym., 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 δᾱλός, δαβελός «torch» to δαίω, ἀγέλη «flock» to ἄγω, εἴκελος ἴκελος to ἔοικα, δείελος δείλη to δύω, εὐτράπελος to τρέπω, δέελος δῆλος to δέατο; 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 κεφαλή, Goth. *gibla*, OHG *gibil* «top», Toch. A *śpāl-* «head»; besides ἀγκάλη, ON *áll*, *óll* «strap» (< *anhla-*), Toch. A *añcäl* «bow»; besides ὀμφαλός, Skr. *nābhīlam* «pubic region, hollow of the navel», Lat. *umbilīcus*, OIr. *imbliu* (< *embilōn-*), 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», Umbr. f a m e ř i a s «familiae»[12], to which V. Georgiev, *Issledovanija 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(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 *þrael* «servant», from which OE *þrael*, NE *thrall*[13], and in Celtic languages OIr. *cumal* «bondmaid», Bret. *mevel* «servant», which Buck in his *Dict. of Synon.*, pp. 1333

---

[10]   Brugmann, *Grundr.* II 1², pp. 360 ff., Hirt, *Indogerm. Gramm.* III, pp. 137 ff. Cf. also Ernst Fraenkel, «Die indogermanischen -*l*-Stämme», *IF* 63, pp. 168 ff.

[11]   P. Chantraine, *Formation*, pp. 237 ff., E. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, pp. 483-485, C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *Rev. Index*, pp. 354 ff.

[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 χθών χαμαί seems very attractive.

[13]   It is immaterial whether we accept with some scholars (Skeat, E. Klein, Onions) the derivation from *trāgh- trēgh-* (Pokorny, *IEW*, p. 1089), 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 *cuma* «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'irl. anc.*, Paris 1960, M 71)[14].

Now we propose for *do-e-ro*, also transcribed as *dohelos*[15], the root which in Pokorny, *IEW*, pp. 198-200, appear as **dem-, demə-, domə-, dᵒmə-* «to build», properly «to join, put together», and also «to tame»[16].

E. Benveniste, in a study of the «homophony» of these roots[17] 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[18] **demə-*, we have the etymological explanation of δμώς δμῶος «slave», fem. δμωή, δμωΐς, δμωιάς, δμῳάς, in Cretan also

---

[14] A word οἴκελος is found in G. Kisser, *Ergänzungen zu Krutschmur-Locker, Rückläufiges Wörterbuch 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.

[15] C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes*, p. 119 n. 101, A. Heubeck, *Gymnasium* 76, p. 529.

[16] G. Devoto, *Origini indeuropeee*, Florence 1962, likewise distinguishes in the Tabelle Nr. 427 **dem-* «house» and Nr. 901 **demā-* «to tame».

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

[18] See W. Cowgill, *Evidence for Laryngeals*, ed. by W. Winter, The Hague 1965, p. 149, analyzing -δμᾶτος from **dm̥Ato-*, and compare F. R. Adrados, *Estudios sobre las laringales indoeuropeas*, Madrid 1961, pp. 129 ff., 137 ff. Without going into details, Kuryłowicz, in his volume II of the new *Indogerm. Gramm.*, Heidelberg 1968, examines the destinies of resonant+ə, see §§ 289, 304 f., etc.

μνωΐτης, μνοΐτης, μνώτης, and fem. μνωία, μνοΐα, μνώα[19] This also explains the apparently incompatible meanings of εὔδμητος «well built», θεόδμητος «god-built» on one side, and on the other ἀδμής, ἄδμητος «unwedded (a maid), unbroken, unsubdued»[20], νεοδμής, νεόδμητος «newly tamed». Benveniste, *BSL* 51, p. 18, compares μεσόδμη, μεσόμνη «tie-beam, box amidships, shelf» and Mycenaean terms like *to-ko-do-mo* τοιχοδόμοι and *de-me-o-te* δε-μέοντες. We may add the Hesychean gloss μεσόδμα· γυνή> ⟨ὡς Λάκωνες⟩, a compound like μεσόγαιος and μεσόχθων «inland», and whose meaning is explained by μεσόδομος, a term which appears in the scholia of Aristophanes to explain κατῆλιψ, something variously understood as «ladder, roof-beam, upper story».

If we accept this root, other etymologies become equally clear: δαμάλη, δέμας, δόμος, δῶ[21], δῶμα, δέμνια[22], also δάμαρ[23], 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 *dəm-s-*. The possibility of *o* as a result of *m̥* is confirmed in Greek dialects (so Arc. ἑκοτόν) 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 ἅρμα, *e-ne-wo-pe-za* of ἐννέα 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[4], p. 193. Similarly Ernst Fraenkel, *Glotta* 32, pp. 23 f. But G. Curtius, *Grundzüge*, p. 232, and P. Kretschmer, *KZ* 31, p. 406, derive δμώς from δάμνημι.

[20]   Cf. also ἀδάμας and ἀδαμνής.

[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 ὁδὸν δέμειν «uiam sternere» (likewise in Herodot) as an explanation for δέμνιον, which should be compared with Lat. *stramen, stratus*.

[23]   See the reference to Anna Morpurgo on this page.

o (*doms-[24] instead of *dems-), but both for *do-po-ta* and for *do-e-ro* a reduced form **dm̥-s*- is possible[25].

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, *Origines*, pp. 66 f., maintains that we simply have to do with an enlarged form of the root, just as in Lat. *domes-ticus*[26]. 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-z*, Lith. *vėtu-š-as*, Lat. *uetu-s-tus* and dozens more. If we compare with **dm̥-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. *páru-s-/parv-an*- «knot, joint», Gr. αἰών/αἰές, Skr. *áyus*-, OHG *i-s* «ice»/Lith. *ý-n-is* «hoar frost», Gr. χεῖλος < *ghel-s-/ON *gjǫlnar* < *ghelu-n-, Skr. *i-ṣ-á* «shaft»/Lith. *ie-n-a* «thill», Serb. *klȋ-s* «split»/OCS *kli-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*[27], *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, *Eranos* 53, 1955, p. 12 n. 2, thought of δω-.

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

[26] G. Curtius, *Grundzüge*[1] I, p. 200, compared already δέμας (*demas) with *domesticus*. Verbs based on the root *dem- extended by *s* are, as E. Polomé, *Language* 28, p. 450, points out, Hitt. *da-ma-aš-zi* and Gr. δάμασσα.

[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, *PdP* 13, pp. 322 ff., comparing *du-ma* with the word δάμαρ and Hitt. *dam-ma-ra* «an inferior cult servant»; the connection of these words with δάμνημι, Skr. *dāmyati* is evident for her. Similarly V. Georgiev, *Slovar' krito-mikenskix nadpisej*, Sofia 1955, p. 29, compared *du-ma* with δάμαρ.

It is clear that the vacillation *a/u* in all these words would be best explained by reduced forms of the type **dmā-*. In historical Greek this type is very rare (cf. Schwyzer, *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 οἰστροπλήξ, κεραυνοβλής, ἀνδροθνής, λιμοθνής, ἀνδροκμής, δουρικμής and other later developments[28], it is possible to admit the existence of a **δμᾱ-* in the Mycenaean texts with the meaning «servant».

Now two Sanskrit words at least prove the relationship of *do-e-ro* to **dem-*: *dāsáḥ* «demon, enemy; infidel, barbarian; slave, servant»[29], and *dásyuḥ* «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 *dāsáḥ*, 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 *dámpatiḥ* 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 ἀ- as first element such as ἐπιβλής «bolt» in Homer, or the above cited ἀδμής. 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. *dāsī* 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 «les quatre cercles de l'appartenance sociale».

of *dem-s-*. The criticisms of M. Mayrhofer, *Kurzgef. 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 *dāsáḥ* from the root «tame». In his objections Mayrhofer leaves open the possibility of a connection between *do-e-ro* and *dāsáḥ* 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. *dārāḥ*, whose eventual connection with Gr. δάμαρ is very tempting. Another Skr. word, *dámūnāḥ* «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* δοῦλος proceeds from the root *demə-* which had the meanings «build» and «tame, subdue», not so different for a more primitive society than ours[31]. The root was extended by an *s*, and the word derived by a suffix -*e-lo-*: *dm̥-s-elo-*. 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[32], and not to archaeologically fantastic and non existent temples?

---

[31] 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 quaerere, manu sata, manus Praxitelis*, since the hands are *multarum artium ministrae* (Cicero), and in the legal expressions *manus iniectio, 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 *atiylla* «factible, no dificultoso, fácil de emprender o de ejecutar». Cf. J. A. Lira, *Diccionario Kkechuwa-Español*, Tucumán 1944.

[32] «Talleres y oficios en el palacio de Pylos: *teojo doero, -ra* 'doméstico -a del rey'», *Minos* 7, 1961, pp. 101 ff.