

The Belly of an Indo-European: Some Greek and Iranian Cognates of PIE *merǵ-* ‘to divide, cut’*

LAURA MASSETTI

Universität zu Köln

Summary

1. Introduction: PIE **merǵ-* ‘to divide, cut’. 2. Hitt. *mārḱ-/mark-bhi* ‘to separate, butcher’. 3. Gk. μάργος ‘mad, greedy’, Myc. *ma-ka* ‘?’ (‘large repast?’): derivation and formal issues. 4. Gk. μάργος: meaning and semantic paths. 5. Provisional summary. 6. YAv. *mərəzāna-* ‘belly’, YAv. *maršū-** ‘belly’: meaning and possible derivation. 7. Conclusion.

1. It has long been recognized that PIE **merǵ-* ‘to divide, cut’ lies at the basis of various words in several branches of Indo-European. The present contribution will argue for identifying Gk. μάργος ‘mad, greedy’, YAv. *mərəzāna-* ‘belly’, and YAv. *maršuuī-** ‘id.’, words of uncertain etymology, as Greek and Iranian cognates of the root. The goals of the paper are twofold: (1) to expand the dossier of the derivatives of PIE **merǵ-* by means of terms that are usually kept apart; (2) to elucidate the derivational patterns of putative congeners and the semantic changes they may have undergone.

It is generally assumed that some words belonging to the semantic field [(BORDER)LAND] ultimately go back to PIE **merǵ-*. In the following, only the main instances of the dossier will be mentioned:

YAv. *marəza-* ‘borderland’ (Vd. 4.53) may conceal a resultative (**mórǵ-o-* ‘divided → delimited [land]’) or an agentive substantive

* For critical remarks and comments on this paper, I would like to thank Andrea Covini, Chiara Frigione, Riccardo Ginevra, Stefan Höfler, Joshua Katz, Daniel Kölligan, Joseph Nagy, Daniel Petit, Jeremy Rau, Matilde Serangeli, Prods Oktor Skjærvø, and José Luis García Ramón, with whom I discussed the article in detail. For his help in improving my English I would like to thank R. Tegethoff. I also would like to thank the editors of the volume, David Goldstein and Stephanie Jamison, for their valuable comments and suggestions which considerably improved my paper. All remaining mistakes are, of course, my own responsibility.

The translations of the Greek passages are taken from Most 2007 (Hesiod); Murray and Wyatt 1999 (Homer, *Iliad*), Murray and Dimock 1995 (Homer, *Odyssey*); Race 1997 (Pindar); West 2003 (*Homeric Hymns*); the German meanings of IE roots are from LIV².

(**morġ-ó-* ‘divider → border[land]’). In addition, the term is related to M-NPers. *marz* ‘district’, which lives on as a loanword in Arm. *marz-pan* ‘governor of a province’.

Lat. *margō*, *marginis* ‘border’ is usually thought to conceal **mġġ-ōn-* or **morġ-ōn-* with delabialization of *-o-*: **morġ-* > **marġ-* (Schrijver 1991: 459).

Gmc. **mark-* ‘borderland’ can be reconstructed on the basis of several words, such as ON *mǫrk-* ‘forest, (border)land’ (Griepentrog 1995:265–86).

Celt. **mrog-* in OIr. *mruig* ‘borderland’ (< **mrogis*, as per Weiss 2013:342) and Welsh *bro* ‘region’ may reflect a metathesized *o*-grade, due to the influence of Celt. **mrig-*; cf. MIr. *brí* ‘field’.¹

The interpretation of the putative Tocharian A congener *mārkam*^o (*mārkam-pal-* ‘*dhárman-*’, ‘law’) remains an open question. Since the term has been traced back to PToch. **mārka-* (Pinault 2008:50) or **mārkana-* (Lühr 2000:154), an etymological connection with **merġ-* seems plausible. Moreover, a development from [DIVIDE/CUT/DISTRIBUTE] to [LAW] beside [LAND] finds at least one good parallel in the minimal pair Gk. νόμος ‘usage, law’ beside νομός ‘place of pasturage, region’ (Hom.+) from νέμω ‘to allot’.

2. Hitt. *mārk-/mark-*^{bhi} ‘to separate, allot, butcher’ may also belong to PIE **merġ-*, as first proposed by Alfonsina Braun.² The verb is attested in three different collocations, namely:

(a) DISENTANGLE – YARN_{ACC}: KBo 17.3 iv 30 (CTH 630, rit., OH/OS)

gāpinan kalulupizmit haḫḫallit mārkaḫhi ‘I separate the yarn from their fingers with the *haḫḫallit*’ (CHD s.v. *mark-*).

1 Schindler 1972:34–5: “si on ne veut pas postuler une racine biforme **merġ-* : **mreġ-* [...] il faut admettre qu’en celtique, à cause de l’existence d’une forme **mrig-* (i.-e. **mġġ-*) aux cas faibles, *morg-* par métathèse devint **mrog-*. Cette supposition s’appuie sur le fait que **mrig-* est effectivement attesté par m.irl. *brí* [‘field’].”

2 Braun 1936:397, Schindler 1972:34–5, Lühr 2000:154, Kloekhorst 2008 s.v. *mārk-*¹: **mōrġ-ei*, **mġġ-ēnti*. Oettinger (2002:425–6) proposed a different equation with Skt. *marcāyati* ‘hurts’, which, in my view, is related to Gk. βλάπτω (**melk-* ‘behindern, schädigen, zerstören’). The proposal made by Puhvel (2004 s.v. *mārk-/mark-* [**merk-*, cf. Lat. *merces*, *mercāri*]) is, in my opinion, semantically weak. The etymology of de Lamberterie (1990:156–9) remains possible: PIE **merġ-*; cf. Gk. βραχύς ‘short’, Ved. *mūhur* ‘in an instant’, YAv. *mərəzu.jūti-*; *mərəzu.jva-* ‘having a short life’, etc.

(b) ALLOT – FOOD/DRINK_{ACC}: KBo 3.34 i 6, dupl. KUB XXXVI 104 Vs. 4 (CTH 8.A, anecdotes, OH/NS)

NINDA.ERĪN.MEŠ *marmuanna marakta* ‘he distributed ‘troops bread’ and lager(-beer)’ (CHD, s.v. *mark-*).

(c) BUTCHER – ANIMAL_{ACC}: KBo 11.17 ii 15–18 (CTH 434, rit., NH/NS)

SILÁ^a*ma=kan arkanzi namma=kan SILÁ hūmandan pittalwandan markanzi* ‘they parcel the lamb and then carve up the whole lamb plain’ (Puhvel 2004 s.v. *mark-*). The latter meaning occurs in ritual texts, in which the verb is combined with the particles *skan* and *sašta* and denotes a meat-carving process in opposition to the preliminary butchering, described by *ark-*^{bhi} ‘to butcher, cut in pieces’.

3. My etymological proposal is that PIE **merġ-* is continued in Greek by μάργος ‘greedy for food, greedy/insatiable, mad’, a term related to μαργαίνω ‘to rage (in battle)’, μαργάω ‘id.’, and commonly thought to have no etymology.³ According to an internal Greek pattern a verb pair -αίνω :: -άω points to a feminine noun; cf. ύφαίνω ‘to weave’ (Hom.+) : ύφάω ‘id.’ (Hom.+) : ύφή ‘web’, whence similarly μαργαίνω ‘to rage’ (Hom.+) : μαργάω ‘id.’ (A.) : *margā** ‘(large) repast’.⁴ On the assumption that *margā** is its plausible starting point, the derivational chain of μάργος would match the pattern that Schindler (1984) hypothesized for explaining Ved. *rātha-* ‘chariot’, namely **CoC-eh₂-* → **CoC-h₂-ó-* (→ **CóC-h₂-o-*), i.e., **rot-eh₂-* ‘wheel’ (Lat. *rotā*) → **rot-h₂-ó-* ‘wheeled’ (: Ved. *rātha-*, Av. *raθa-* ‘chariot’), and accordingly **mġġ-éh₂-* (**morgéh₂-*), PGk. **margā-* ‘(large) meal, repast’ (cf. μαργαίνω, μαργάω) → *mġġ-(h₂)-ó-** ‘having (large) meals’ → **mġġ-(h₂)-o-** ‘eater’ (: μάργος), which came to be used as an adjective meaning ‘greedy’.⁵ The representation of the zero-grade as μαργ-, instead of the expected

3 DELG s.v. μάργος: “Mot peut être populaire, en tout cas sans étymologie”; GEW: “unerklärt”; EDG: “Pre-Greek (Variant).”

4 In the Mycenaean tablets *ma-ka* is the recipient of great amounts of barley; cf. below. Thus, it is possible to assume a meaning ‘large repast’.

5 On the one hand, the semantic development from a core meaning ‘to cut, divide’ to a substantive ‘(large) meal’ parallels that of Gk. έρανος ‘banquet’, which IE **h₁erh₂-* ‘to divide’ underlies. On the other hand, a possessive adjective like ‘having (large) meals’*, with a structural intensive nuance, might evolve into ‘greedy’; cf. Gk. έπατίζω ‘to be greedy after’, which ultimately goes back to IE **h₁erh₂-* ‘to divide’ (Weiss 1998:35–47).

outcome *βραγ-, is secondary and analogical to that of the full-grade *morġ-⁶ (like Myc. *ka-po* : καρπός; cf. PIE *kerp-), which is attested by two glosses belonging to the semantic field [LAND]:⁷ Hsch. μ 1648 L μόργιον· μέτρον γῆς “*morgion*: measure of land”; μ 1649 L μόργος· φραγμός [...] “*morgos*: fencing in.” In addition, the same outcome seems to be already attested in Mycenaean, as the noun *ma-ka* may conceal /*margā*-. This term appears in the new Thebes tablets (series TH Fq, Gp) in connection with a great amount of barley and once possibly with a delivery of wine (Gp 201.1), e.g.,⁸

TH Fq 254

1 *de-go-no* ἩϞRD T 1 V 2 Z 3 *o-te, a-pi-e-qe, ke-ro-ta*
2 *pa-ta, ma-ka* HORD T 1 V 2 Z 2 *a-ko-da-mo* V 2

Pour le banquet ORGE 14 l., lorsque on fit mention de tous les honorables de la *ke-ro-si-ja*, pour la *margā*-pour *Margas* ORGE 13.6 l., pour *Arkho-damos* 3.2. (García Ramón 2010:79–80)

Since *ma-ka* parallels human and non-human recipients in TH Fq 254, two possible explanations for the term are (a) /*Margāi*/ ‘for Margas’, dative of a MN */*Margās*/; cf. Gk. Μαργίτης (Arist., Plb.), Μάργος (*RE* I Achaia, *IG* IV.1.729 II.3 Argolis), Μαργύλος (*IC* 2.8; 230); (b) /*margāi*/ ‘for the *margā**’, dative of a feminine stem */*margā*- ‘(large) repast’.⁹ The latter assumption has recently been confirmed by M. Del Freo (2014:78), who stressed that in TH Fq 254 the amount of barley allotted to the *ma-ka* was calculated in the same way as that assigned to the *de-go-no* and might therefore be destined for common use. The relevance of this putative */*margā*- ‘repast’ to μάργος, etc., and the possible semantic relationship between them, will be discussed immediately below.

6 For instances of the phenomenon in Mycenaean and alphabetical Greek, cf. García Ramón 1985:216–26.

7 Cf. βράζαι· συλλαβεῖν· δακεῖν· καταπιεῖν “*braksai*: to seize, to bite, to swallow down” (Hsch. β 1048 L) may not belong to the same root, as some glosses beginning with βρα- show reciprocal lexical contamination; cf. βράψαι· συλλαβεῖν “*brapsai*: to seize” (Hsch. β 1083 L), βράζαι· συλλαβεῖν “*braksai*: to seize” (Hsch. β 1048 L).

8 Gp 201.1 is written by hand 306, usually connected with deliveries of wine; cf. Killen 2006:101.

9 García Ramón 2010:87. The interpretation /*māi gāi*/ “pour la mère terre” (Ruijgh 1996:454) is hardly convincing; see García Ramón 2010:87 for discussion. The attempt to transliterate *ma-ka* as /*magāi*/ ‘for the kneading’ (as per Palaima 2000–2001:481; 2006:145) is incompatible with the alleged comparandum μάζα ‘barley-cake’ (**magia*-), μάσσω ‘to knead’.

4. The semantics of Gk. μάργος ‘greedy, mad’ and μαργαίνω ‘to rage’ deserve closer consideration, in the light of their possible Mycenaean relative. The uses of these words belong to two main semantic areas, namely (a) [VORACITY] and (b) [RAGE].

(a) Gk. μάργος describes characters who are “intemperate” in eating and/or drinking. So the expression γαστέρι μάργη “with a greedy belly” (Hom.) characterizes a person “eating and drinking constantly” in *Od.* 18.2–3 μετὰ δ’ ἔπρεπε γαστέρι μάργη / ἀζηχῆς φαγέμεν καὶ πῖεμεν “he (sc. Iros) was known for eating and drinking without end with his greedy belly.” In a Hesiodic fragment, the effects of the ‘raging’ (μάργος) wine on the drunk are described like those of a love-charm; cf. Hes. fr. 239 MW ὅστις ἄδην πίνῃ, οἶνος δέ οἱ ἔπλετο μάργος, / σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε / δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι [...] “whoever drinks his fill, **the wine rages at** him; it binds together his feet and his hands and his tongue and his mind with invisible bonds.” This passage can be connected to a Hesychian gloss, which would otherwise be obscure, namely μ 265 L. μαργαίνων· μαινόμενος. δεσμῶν. ὑβρίζων. δεσμός γὰρ ἢ μαργάς “*margainōn*: raging, binding (*desmōn*), committing outrages; in fact the *margās* (binge) is a *desmós* (kind of charm).” The explanation of μαργαίνων as δεσμῶν is indeed understandable only if referring to Hes. fr. 239 MW, where the lexicon of the κατάδεσμος applies to the binge.¹⁰

Moreover, the rare Pindaric compound γαστρίμαργος ‘glutton’ should be taken into account for the semantics of μάργος. On the formal level, the compound contains the same lexical material as the phrase γαστέρι μάργη (*Od.* 18.2) and may be understood properly as a *tatpuruṣa*-compound ‘intemperate in belly/for the belly’, as the comparison with other compounds with second member °μαργος shows; cf. δορίμαργος ‘raging / intemperate with the spear’ (*A. Th.* 687), which corresponds to μαργαίνων δόρει ‘raging with the spear’ (*A. fr.* 99** .20 R).

Pi. *O.* 1.47–57a

ἔννεπε κρυφᾶ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων,
ὔδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέοισαν εἰς ἀκμάν
μαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη,
τραπέζαισι τ’ ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν

10 The κατάδεσμος is a ‘binding spell’, by means of which a lover can metaphorically tie down and submit his/her beloved to his/her own will (cf. Faraone 2001:42, Sadoski 2012:334f.). The formulation σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε can denote the enchaining of the “body and soul” of a lover in κατάδεσμος-contexts.

σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον.
 ἔμοι δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαρ-
 γον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν. ἀφίσταμαι
 ἀκέρδεια λέλογχεν θαμινὰ κακαγόρους.
 εἰ δὲ δὴ τιν' ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποὶ
 ἐτίμασαν, ἦν Τάνταλος οὗτος· ἀλ-
 λὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι
 μέγαν ὄλβον οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρω δ' ἔλεν
 ἄταν ὑπέροπλον.

One of the envious neighbors immediately said in secret that into water boiling rapidly on the fire they cut up your limbs with a knife, and for the final course distributed your flesh around the tables and ate it. But for my part, I cannot call any of the blessed gods a glutton—I stand back: impoverishment is often the lot of slanderers. If in fact the wardens of Olympus honored any mortal man, Tantalus was that one. He, however, could not digest his great good fortune, and because of his greed he won an overwhelming punishment.

The juxtaposition of κόρος and μάργος in the same context recurs in another Pindaric passage: *O.* 2.95–7 ἀλλ' αἶνον ἐπέβα κόρος / οὐ δίκᾳ συναντόμενος, ἀλλὰ μάργων ὑπ' ἀνδρῶν, / τὸ λαλαγήσαι θέλων [...] “upon praise comes tedious excess, which does not keep to just limits, but at the instigation of greedy men is eager to prattle [...].” In addition, the reference to [CUT] (μαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη, v.47) and to [DISTRIBUTE] (κρεῶν σέθεν διεδάσαντο, vv.50–1) in proximity to γαστρίμαργος is remarkable, because it recalls the meanings of Hitt. *mārk-/mark-^{bhi}* ‘to distribute’, ‘to butcher’.¹¹

The Pindaric use of γαστρίμαργος and μάργος confirms that μάργος denotes ‘intemperate (in eating and drinking)’ and, metaphorically, ‘mentally intemperate → raging, furious’. Finally, the structural agreement of compounds like γαστρίμαργος, δορίμαργος and the corresponding collocations (γαστέρι μάργη, μαργαίων δόρει) speaks for a connection between ‘greedy’ and ‘raging’ *e Graeco ipso*.

11 Obviously, no relation can be demonstrated between the Pelops episode and the Hittite texts in which *mārk-/mark-^{bhi}* appears. The Pelops episode in *Pi. O.* 1 may be explained as a reflex of an ancient ritual; cf. Burkert 1983:93–103, Nagy 1986:79–80. The occurrence of γαστρίμαργος in proximity to μάχαῖρα in Pindar strikingly recalls ἐγγαστριμάχαῖρα (*Hp. fr.* 128 W), interpreted by Faraone (2004:226) as a compound name given to a destructive famine demon. I thank Joshua Katz for this bibliographical reference.

(b) Gk. μαργαῖνω ‘to rage furiously’ (probably *‘to be μάργος [raging, furious]’) is predictable of warriors; cf. *Il.* 5.881–2 ἦ νῦν Τυδέος υἱὸν ὑπερφίαλον Διομήδεα / μαργαίνειν ἀνέηκεν ἐπ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι “now she has incited the son of Tydeus, rash Diomedes, to vent his rage on immortal gods.”

The rich polysemy that Gk. μάργος and μαργαῖνω apparently display points to a two-step path from the core meaning ‘to divide, cut’, first leading to (i) [VORACITY], and then (ii) from [VORACITY] to [RAGE]. Both typological parallels and phraseological evidence support such developments:

The shift ‘to divide/cut’ → ‘voracious’ mirrors that of some IE roots meaning ‘to cut, share’, for instance, PIE **b^hag-* ‘to get a share’, underlying both Ved. *bhaj* ‘to allot’ (: Av. *baž* ‘id., to distribute’) and Gk. ἔφαγον ‘(I took a share →) I ate (up)’ (cf. LGk. φάγος ‘glutton’), or PIE **h₁erh₂-* ‘to divide’, which is reflected by Hitt. *arhāš* ‘border’, Gk. ἔραμαι ‘to desire eagerly’, ἐρατίζω ‘to lust for’ (cf. *infra*) and ἔρανος ‘meal’ (Weiss 1998:35–47).

The strongest support for the association between the ideas of [VORACITY] and [RAGE] is provided by the phraseological evidence. In traditional hexametrical poetry, warriors are said to be ‘insatiate of war/of battle’, whereby ‘insatiate’ is expressed by ἀκόρητος or ἄατος, e.g., *Il.* 12.335 ἐς δ' ἐνόησ' Αἴαντε δύο πολέμου ἀκορήτω “and he caught sight of the two Aiantes, insatiate in war”;¹² *Il.* 22.218 Ἔκτορα δηῶσαντε μάχης ἄατόν περ ἐόντα “having slain Hector, insatiate of battle though he is.”¹³

Additionally, in the *Iliad* Menelaos and Aias are compared to hungry lions craving for meat:

Il. 11.548–57

ὡς δ' αἶθωνα λέοντα βοῶν ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο
 ἐσσεύαντο κύνες τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἀγροιώται [...]

ὁ δὲ κρειῶν ἐρατίζων
 ἰθύει, ἀλλ' οὐ τι πρήσει [...]

ὡς Αἴας τότε ἀπὸ Τρώων τετιημένος ἦτορ
 ἦε πόλλ' ἀέκων· περὶ γὰρ διε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

And just as a tawny lion dogs and country people drive from the fold of the cattle [...] but he in his lust for flesh goes straight on, yet accomplishes

12 Cf. also *Il.* 13.640 Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν “the Trojans are insatiate of battle.”

13 Cf. also Hes. *Th.* 714 Γύγης τ' ἄατος πολέμοιο “Gyges, insatiable of war.”

nothing [...] so Aias then gave way before the Trojans, sullen at heart and much against his will, for greatly did he fear for the ships of the Achaeans.¹⁴

Strikingly, the collocation κρειῶν ἐρατίζων only occurs in this Iliadic context and in the fourth *Homeric Hymn*, referring to the inappropriate appetite of Hermes; cf. *h.Merc.* 64f. [...] ὁ δ' ἄρα κρειῶν ἐρατίζων / ἄλτο κατὰ σκοπιῆν εὐώδεος ἐκ μεγάροιο “craving meat, he sprang out from the fragrant mansion to the peak.”¹⁵ Moreover, the same state of affairs may underlie the Homeric image of the “mouth of bloody war” (Daniel Kölligan, p.c.); cf. *Il.* 19.313 πρὶν πολέμου στόμα δύμεναι αἱματόεντος “until he entered the mouth of bloody war,” whereby Ibycus describes the mouth of the battle strife as “μάργος” cf. *Ibyc. fr.* 30a.1 P Ἐριδός ποτε μάργον ἔχων στόμα “having the greedy mouth of battle-strife.”

5. To sum up the Greek facts:

- (1) μάργος ‘greedy, mad’ (cf. μαργαίνω, μαργάω) may be traced back to PIE **merǵ-* as a thematic derivative of an **-eh₂-* stem (from **mǵ̑-eh₂-* ‘meal’ with secondary syllabification PGk. **marg-*), which may actually be attested in Myc. *ma-ka* in the Thebes tablets.
- (2) The semantic shift from ‘to divide, cut’ to ‘greedy, voracious’ and the association of voracity and rage can be considered plausible in the light of similar semantic shifts in ancient languages as well as on the strength of Greek poetic phraseology.

6. In regard to PIE **merǵ-* and the semantic field of meals and eating, it can be noted that two Young Avestan putative congeners of the root, *mərəzāna-* and *maršū-*, mean ‘belly’.

YAv. *mərəzāna-* is preserved in a gloss of *Frahang-ī oīm*, in which it is translated as *murā*:

F. 11 *mərəzānāi. murā čiyōn* (KLSE) [= *aškamb*]

mərəzānāi: murā (belly), like (or: e.g.) *aškamb* (belly, womb) (P. O. Skjærvø, p.c.)

The term can be interpreted as a derivative of the *Romānus*-type on an **-eh₂-* stem **mǵ̑-eh₂-* (: Myc. *ma-ka*).

¹⁴ Identical to *Il.* 17.656–65.

¹⁵ The appetite of Hermes seems inappropriate because gods usually eat nectar and ambrosia.

Another Young Avestan passage attests a different word for ‘belly’, i.e., *maršū-*:

Y. 11.1ek

gāuš zaotārəm zauuaiti
uta buiiā afrazaintiš
uta dēuš.srauuā hacimnō
yō maqm xʷastqm nōi baxšahe
āaṭ maqm tūm fšaonaiiehe
nāiriiā vā puθrahe vā
haoiiā vā +maršuiiā

Das Rind flucht dem Opferer:—Du sollst ohne Nachkommenschaft und von Schande verfolgt sein, der du mich (nämlich die Milch), wenn ich zubereitet (d.i. gemolken oder gekocht) bin, nicht austeilst, sondern für deine Frau oder deinen Sohn oder deinen eigenen Wanst verfütterst. (Lommel 1927)

YAv. *maršuiiā* is usually understood as a genitive of *maršū-* (*AirWb.* s.v.), a Daēuic word glossed as Skt. *duṣṭodaram* ‘bad’ belly’. The form is commonly thought to belong to the same root as *mərəzāna-* and was reconstructed by Güntert (1914:26–7) as **smersū-*; cf. OHG *smero* ‘fat’. This interpretation, in my view, is to be rejected in favor of an etymological connection with PIE **merǵ-*. In order to propose the etymology of the term and to give an account of its derivation, some apparent mismatches need to be cleared up:

(1) As a genitive, YAv. *maršuiiā* has to belong to an *ī*-stem, not to an *ū*-stem, for which ⟨*uō*⟩ would be expected (cf. YAv. *tanū* ‘body’ : gen. *tanuō*, *hizū* ‘tongue’ : gen. *hizuō*). Thus, the form may reflect the genitive of a feminine *u*-adjective (*devī*-type); cf. YAv. *vañhī-* ‘good’: *vañhuiiā*.

(2) While *mərəzāna-* may point to **merǵ-*, ⟨*š*⟩ in *maršuiiā* contains a sibilant, which might be reflected by the putative Greek loanwords Μαρσύας (Hecat.+), and μάρσιπ(π)ος ‘pouch’ (X.+).¹⁶ On the one hand, Greek ⟨*σ*⟩ can stand for a “rukied”-*s*- (e.g., Gk. κέρσα ‘coin’ : OPers. *krša-* ‘balance weight’, cf. Brust 2005:335–7). On the other, two late sources might reflect an association between Μαρσύας, μάρσιππος, the image of a [BELLY] and the idea of [VORACITY]: according to Nonnus of Panopolis Marsyas’s skin was hung from a tree to form a

¹⁶ The name of Marsyas was first interpreted as such by Buck 1909. Frigione 2015 has argued for a connection between ‘Marsyas’ and ‘belly’ as well as for an etymological relation with μάρσιππος ‘pouch’.

swelling fold (Gk. κολπόω ‘to form into a swelling fold, to make something belly’); Hesychius glosses μαρσίπειοι as ‘gluttonous’.

Nonn. 1.42–3

ἐξ ὅτε Μαρσύαιο θεημάχον αὐλὸν ἐλέγξας
δέρμα παρηώρησε φυτῶ κολπούμενον αὔραις

Since he humiliated the god-fighting flute of Marsyas and hung his skin on a tree, to belly in the breezes.

Hsch. μ 320 L

μαρσίπειοι· γαστρίμαργοι [ἢ σάκκοι]
marsipeioi: gluttonous [or bags]

Tracing both *mərəzāna-* and *maršuuī-** back to **merġ-* is possible only under the assumption that *maršuuī-* reflects a cluster /palatal + sibilant/, which was reduced to YAv. *-š-*, according to a standard Young Avestan phonological rule: PIE **-ġ-s-* > **-j-š-* > YAv. *-š-*; cf. Av. *aš°* ‘great’ < **mj-š* (cf. *maz-* ‘great’), YAv. *arš* ‘truly’ < **Hrj-š* (cf. *ərəzu-* ‘straight’).¹⁷ Moreover, given that *maršuuī-** may reflect a zero- or a full-grade, a neuter *s*-stem **mérġ-es-* is a plausible starting point for the derivational chain which led to *maršuuī-**. Such a stem is indeed reconstructable on the basis of a gloss:

Hsch. μ 869 L

μέργιζε· ἀθρόως ἔσθιε
mergize: eat at once!

As is well known, Greek verbs in *-ίζω* that display *e*-grade in the root may be denominative formations built on *s*-stems (Risch 1974:299); cf. κτερείζω ‘to bury with due honors’ (Hom.+): κτέρεα ‘funeral gifts’ (Hom.); ὀνειδίζω ‘to make a reproach’ (Hom.+): ὀνειδος ‘reproach’ (Hom.+); τειχίζω ‘to build a wall’ (Hom.+): τεῖχος ‘wall’ (Hom.+); μελίζω ‘to celebrate in song’ (Pi.): μέλος ‘song, melody’ (*h.Hom.*). Similarly, μέργιζε points to **mérġ-es-*, for which a meaning ‘food, portion, mouthful’* is easily conceivable.

Accordingly, the derivational chains that have generated *maršuuī-** may be sketched as follows:

(1) **CéC-es-* → **CC-s-ó-* (adj.) → **CC-s-u-* (subst.) → **CC-s-u-ih₂-* (*devī*-type):

17 Cf. Skjærø 2007:897.

The derivation of a zero-grade thematized adjective from a neuter *s*-substantive with *e*-grade is a synchronically operative device. In a further step, the **CC-s-ó-* adjective may have been substantivized by means of the morpheme *-u-*, from which a *devī*-type was in turn derived:

**mérġ-es-* ‘food, mouthful’* (cf. Gk. μέργιζε) → **mrġ-s-ó-* ‘having food/eating’* → **mrġ-s-u-* (subst. → adj.) ‘the eating one’*/‘having fullness’*? (YAv. **maršu-*) → Av. **maršu-ih₂-* ‘belly’/‘the full one’ (: YAv. **maršuuī-*)

Two instances of this derivational chain may be invoked at this point in support of the explanation proposed above:

OIr. *rus*: **h₁réud^h-es-* ‘redness’, Gk. ἔρευθος ‘redness, flush’ → **h₁rud^h-s-ó-* ‘red’, Lat. *russus* → **h₁rud^h-s-u-*, OIr. *rus* ‘cheek’ (Stifter 1998:210).¹⁸

Lat. *luxus*: **dléuk-es-* ‘sweetness’, Gk. γλεῦκος ‘new wine’ → **dluk-s-ó-* ‘sweet’ → **dluk-s-u-*, Lat. *luxus* ‘la dolce vita,’ ‘extravagant living’ (Höfler [forthcoming]).

Alternatively:

(2) **CéC-es-* → **CC-s-ó-* (adj.) (or **CeC-s-ó-*) → **CóC-s-u-/***CéC-s-u-* (subst.) → **CéC-s-u-/***CC-s-éu-* (adj.) → **CC-s-u-ih₂-*

From a neuter *s*-substantive, a zero- or full-grade thematized adjective can be derived and, further, substantivized by means of the morpheme *-u-* in an acrostic substantive. From this a proterokinetic adjective may be in turn derived, which may be the base for building a feminine, cf.

mérġ-es-* ‘food, mouthful’* (cf. Gk. μέργιζε) → **mrġ-s-ó-* ‘having food/eating’* → **mórġ-s-u-/mérġ-s-u-* ‘the eating one’* → **mérġ-s-u-/*mrġ-s-éu-* ‘eating’*/‘fullness’ (?) (YAv. **maršu-*) → Av. **maršu-ih₂-* ‘belly/the full one’* (: YAv. **maršuuī-*).

This derivational chain can be compared with the one recently proposed by S. Höfler to explain some Hittite *u*-adjectives:

Hitt. *genzu-* ‘womb’: **ġénh₁-(e)s-* ‘procreation’, Gk. γένος → **ġnh₁-s-ó-* ‘having procreation’, Gk. → **ġónh₁-s-u-/***ġénh₁-s-u-*, Hitt. *genzu-* (Eichner 1973:55, 86)

Hitt. *tepsu-* ‘diminished’: **d^héb^h-(e)s-* ‘diminution’ → **d^hb^h-s-ó-* ‘having diminution’ → **d^hób^h-s-u-/***d^héb^h-s-u-* ‘diminution’ → **d^héb^h-s-u-/***d^hb^h-s-éu-* ‘diminished’, Hitt. *tepsu-* (Höfler 2015a:228–9)

18 Stifter 1998:210 also mentions the possibility of **h₁rud^h-tu-* > OIr. *rus*.

Hitt. *daššu-* ‘firm, heavy’, Gk. δασύς ‘hairy, shaggy’: **dém-(e)s-* ‘Zusammenfügung’ → **d̥m-s-ó-*, Lat. *dēnsus* ‘Z. habend’ → **dóm-s-u-/dém-s-u-* ‘Dichtheit’ → **dém-s-u-/d̥m-s-éu-* ‘Dichtheit habend’, Hitt. *daššu-*, Gk. δασύς (Höfler 2015a:228–9).¹⁹

To summarize the Avestan facts: YAv. *mərəzāna-* ‘belly’ and *maršuuī-** ‘id.’ may be interpreted as derivatives of PIE **merǵ-*. The explanation of *maršuuī-** as an *s*-stem derivative clarifies the origin of the cluster /palatal + sibilant/ and thereby eliminates the phonological discrepancy between the sibilant of *maršuuī-** and the palatal consonant of *mərəzāna-*. Therefore, YAv. *mərəzāna-* and *maršuuī-** display identical meanings because they are etymologically related.

7. In conclusion:

- (1) PIE **merǵ-* means ‘to divide, cut’ and, as a verb, may have appeared in collocations in which [GOODS], such as [FOOD, DRINK] and [LAND], were its object. Semantically, **merǵ-* parallels PIE **h₁erǵ-* ‘to tear up, to split’, which was specialized in association with [LAND] and [FLESH]; cf. Hitt. *ark-^{hbi}* ‘to butcher’, Lat. (*h*)*erciscō*, *-ōr* ‘to divide a possession among the heirs’, Lith. *aršyti* ‘to tear up’ (cf. Petit 2004). Strikingly, *mārk-/mark-^{hbi}* and *ark-^{hbi}* occur in Hittite rituals in order to denote different stages of the meat-carving process; cf. SILÁ₂*ma=kan arkanzi namma=kan SILÁ hūmandan pit-talwandan markanzi* ‘they parcel the lamb and then carve up the whole lamb plain’ (see §2 (c) above).
- (2) Some cognates of the root belong to the semantic field [LAND] (YAv. *marəza-*, Gk. μόργιον, μόργος, Lat. *margō*, Gmc. **mark-*, Celt. **mrog-*), others to that of [FOOD] and [DRINK], e.g., Hitt. *mārk-/mark-^{hbi}* ‘to separate, distribute, butcher’, Gk. μάργος (μαργαίνω, μαργάω, MN Μαργίτης, Μάργος, Μαργύλος), μέργιζε, and possibly Myc. *ma-ka* (?), YAv. *maršuuī-** ‘belly’, YAv. *mərəzāna-* ‘belly’.

References

AirWb. = Christian Bartholomae. 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg: Trübner.
Braun, Alfonsina. 1936. *Il lessico ittita nei suoi riflessi indoeuropei*. Venice: Ferrari.

¹⁹ Gk. δξύς might be a further example for the derivational chain (Höfler 2015b).

- Brust, Manfred. 2005. *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Buck, Carl. D. 1909. Greek Notes. *IF* 25.257–64.
- Burkert, Walter. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Transl. by P. Bing. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- CHD = Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner (eds.). 1989. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. L–N. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, Sigrid, and Oswald Panagl (eds.). 2006. *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben: Ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur. Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.–6. Dezember 2002*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Del Frio, Maurizio. 2014. The Allocations of HORD to *ma-ka* and *de-go-no* in the Fq Tablets from Thebes. *Kadmos* 53/1–2.71–8.
- DELG = Pierre Chantraine. 1968–80. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- EDG = Robert S. P. Beekes. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mēhur*. *MSS* 31.53–107.
- Faraone, Christopher A. 2001. *Ancient Greek Love Magic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. Hipponax Fragment 128W: Epic Parody or Expulsive Incantation? *Classical Antiquity* 23/2.209–45.
- Frigione, Chiara. 2015. Ipotesi per una connessione etimologica tra gr. μάρσιππος e gr. Μαρσύας. Paper presented 23 March at the conference Ancient Greek Linguistics, Rome.
- García Ramón, José Luis. 1985. The Spellings *Ta* and *Ta-ra* for Inherited **T₁* in Mycenaean: Sound Law, Phonetic Sequence and Morphological Factors at Work. *Minos* 19.195–226.
- . 2010. Espace religieux, théonymes, épiclèses: À propos des nouveaux textes thébains. In Isabelle Boehm and Sylvie Müller-Celka (eds.), *Espace civil, espace religieux en Égée durant la période mycénienne: Approches épigraphique, linguistique et archéologique. Actes des journées d’archéologie et de philologie mycéniennes tenues à la Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée – Jean Pouilloux, les 1er février 2006 et 1er mars 2007*, 73–92. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- GEW = Hjalmar Frisk. 1960–72. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I–II*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Griepentrog, Wolfgang. 1995. *Die Wurzelnomina des Germanischen und ihre Vorgeschichte*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

- Güntert, Hermann. 1914. *Über die ahurischen und daēvischen Ausdrücke im Awesta: Eine semasiologische Studie*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Höfler, Stefan. 2015a. Denominale Sekundärderivation im Indogermanischen: Eine Ochsentour, *MSS* 69/2.219–44.
- . 2015b. Die anatolischen *s*-Stämme: Flexivischer Archaismus oder Kategorie im Zerfall? Paper presented 23 September at the 14. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Marburg.
- . Forthcoming. “*La dolce vita*” and the etymology of Lat. *luxus* ‘extravagant living’.
- Killen, John T. 2006. Thoughts on the Functions of the New Thebes Tablets. In Deger-Jalkotzy and Panagl 2006, 79–110.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lamberterie, Charles de. 1990. *Les Adjectifs grecs en -ός: Sémantique et comparaison*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- LIV*² = Helmut Rix and Martin J. Kümmel (eds.). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*². Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Lommel, Herman. 1927. *Die Yäst's des Awesta*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Lühr, Rosemarie. 2000. *Die Gedichte des Skalden Egill*. Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Most, Glenn W. (ed. and trans.). 2007. *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Murray, Arthur T. (trans.), and George E. Dimock, Jr. (ed.). 1995. *Homer: Odyssey II: Books 13–24*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Murray, Arthur T. (trans.), and William F. Wyatt (ed.). 1999. *Homer: Iliad. 2 vols.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1986. Pindar's Olympian 1 and the Aetiology of the Olympic Games. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116.71–88.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 2002. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbklassen*. Dresden: Verlag der TUD Dresden.
- Palaima, Thomas G. 2000–2001. Review of *TFC I. Minos* 35–6.475–86.
- . 2006. *FAR?* or *ju?* and Other Interpretative Conundra in the New Thebes Tablets. In Deger-Jalkotzy and Panagl 2006, 139–48.
- Petit, Daniel. 2004. À propos du verbe hittite *ark-*. *Die Sprache* 44/1.1–25.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne: Textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 2004. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary VI: Words Beginning with M*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Race, William H. (ed. and trans.). 1997. *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Risch, Ernst. 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Ruijgh Cornelius J. 1996. La “déesse mère” dans les textes mycéniens. In Ernesto de Miro, Louis Godart, and Anna Sacconi (eds.), *Atti e memorie del secondo congresso internazionale di micenologia I. Roma – Napoli, 14–20 ottobre 1991*, 453–7. Rome: Gruppo editoriale internazionale.
- Sadovski, Velizar. 2012. Ritual Spells and Practical Magic for Benediction and Malediction: From India to Greece, Rome, and Beyond (Speech and Performance in Veda and Avesta, I). In Velizar Sadovski and David Stifter (eds.), *Iranistische und indogermanistische Beiträge in memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944–1994)*, 321–50. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972. L’apophonie des noms-racines indo-européens. *BSL* 67/1.31–8.
- . 1984. Einiges über indogermanische *o*-Stämme. Handout, Vienna.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Skjærvø, Prods Oktor. 2007. Avestan and Old Persian Morphology. In Alan S. Kaye (ed.), *Morphologies of Asia and Africa II*, 853–940. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Stifter, David. 1998. Study in Red. *Die Sprache* 40/2.202–23.
- Weiss, Michael. 1998. Erotica: On the Prehistory of Greek Desire. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98.31–61.
- . 2013. Interesting *i*-stems in Irish. In Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau, and Michael Weiss (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus: Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, 340–56. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- West, Martin L. (ed. and trans.). 2003. *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.