

# The two ordinary words for ‘woman’ in Proto-Indo-European

by Thales Simões (University of Pavia)

PIE possessed two roots that can be ascribed to the lexeme woman, but their distribution in the daughter languages is by no means equal. While one is widely attested from the far east (Indo-Iranian, Tocharian) to the far west (Celtic, Germanic) of the IE world (left), the other appears in specific compounds or as a suffix, implying it must reflect an older layer of the proto-language.

## \*g<sup>w</sup>en-

### PROTEROKINETIC WITH *h*<sub>2</sub>-SUFFIX

Paradigm: \*g<sup>w</sup>én-*h*<sub>2</sub>- ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>n-é*h*<sub>2</sub>-

Tocharian: śām (A) śānā (B) < \*ćānā

Indo-Aryan: gnāḥ, gnaḥ (Skt.) < \*gnaHs

Iranian: gənāh, gənah (OAv.) < \*gnaHh

Hellenic: γυνή, γυναικός (Att.), ku-na-ja (Myc.) < \*g<sup>w</sup>on- + -keh<sub>2</sub>

Armenian: kin, knoġ

Slavic: žena (OCS) < \*génā

Baltic: genno (OPr.)

Germanic: qinō (Got.), kona (ON) < \*kwenō (+ nasal suffix)

Celtic: ben, mná (OIr.) < \*benā

Anatolian: wānā- (CLuw.) < \*benā

### ACROSTATIC WITH *i*-SUFFIX

Paradigm: \*g<sup>w</sup>én-*i*- ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>én-*i*-

Indo-Aryan: jāni, janyur (Skt.) < \*jani-

Iranian: jaini (OAv.) < \*jani-

Germanic: qēns (Got.), cwēn (OE) < \*kwēniz

But note that the Indo-Iranian forms can also go back to \*janH- or an o-grade (like Greek) with analogical \*j-.

### POSSIBLE ROOT NOUN?

Harðarson (2014): \*g<sup>w</sup>ōn ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>én-s

On the basis of OIr. neuter n-stem *bé*, *ben* and Hitt. MUNUS-*anza*, supposing the latter denotes /k<sup>w</sup>āns/ but Jasanoff (1989) rather proposes *bé* < \*g<sup>w</sup>ēn < \*g<sup>w</sup>en-*h*<sub>2</sub> (following a law that VRH# > V̄R# in PIE) and Kloekhorst (2008) explains MUNUS-*anza* as from \*g<sup>w</sup>en-*h*<sub>2</sub>-*os* (i.e. \*g<sup>w</sup>en-*h*<sub>2</sub> + analogical -*s*) by assuming the Proto-Anatolian to Hittite rule \*VnHsV > \*VnzV also works in word final position.



AI-generated image of a Yamnaya woman. Made with <https://openart.ai/>.

## \*sor-

### ATTESTATIONS

\*swe-*sor*- ~ \*swe-*sr*-

From \*swe ‘own’ + \*sor ‘woman’, i.e. ‘woman from one’s own (clan)’. Since IE society was gyno-exogamous, there was a need to differentiate the women tied to the clan by blood as opposed to those that are so by marriage.

Tocharian: šar (A) šer (B)

Indo-Aryan: svásr- (Skt.)

Iranian: x<sup>v</sup>ānhār (OAv.)

Hellenic: ěop (Att.) ‘cousin’s daughter’

Armenian: k’oyr

Slavic: sestra (OCS)

Baltic: swestro (OPr.)

Germanic: swistar (Got.), sweoster (OE), systar (ON)

Celtic: siur (OIr.), chwaer (Welsh)

Anatolian: wānā- (CLuw.)

### Young Avestan *hāirišī*- ‘woman’

Harðarson (2014) derives this term from PII \*sāirišī-, an *i*-stem \*sēri ~ *seri*-, identical in form to \*g<sup>w</sup>ēni- ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>éni-.

### Latin *uxor* ‘wife, married woman’

Harðarson (2014) reconstructs \*h<sub>1</sub>uks-*sor* ‘house woman’, with the first element being the compound-form for \*h<sub>1</sub>euke/*os*- ‘house, home’. Pinault rather suggests it is a reanalysis of the o-grade of a locative in -*er* : \*h<sub>1</sub>uk-s-*ér* >> \*h<sub>1</sub>uk-s-*ór*.

### Cuneiform Luwian *ašra/i*-\*

Attested in acc.sg. *aš-ru-la-a-ḫi-šā* /asrulahit/= *ašrulahit*- (n.) ‘femininity’ (n.) and acc.sg.c. *aš-ru-li-en* /asrulin/ = *ašruli*- ‘female’ (adj.). Harðarson (2014) reconstructs \*h<sub>1</sub>éh<sub>1</sub>-*sor*- ~ *h<sub>1</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>-sr*-’ with the first element being the ins.sg of the pronominal stem \*h<sub>1</sub>e- ‘here’. This solution has good correspondence in YAv \*āṇhairī-, thematic *vrddhi*-derivative \*h<sub>1</sub>oh<sub>1</sub>-*ser-o*- > PII \*ā-sar-a- > YAv. \*āhara- ‘female’ (adj.) >> YAv. \*āharī- ‘female’ (n.).

### Anatolian motion suffix

In Hittite, the root \*ser- survives as a motion-suffix. It is attested in e.g. *išḫāššārā*- ‘lady, mistress’ from *išḫār*- ‘lord’ or *ḫaššuššara*- ‘queen’ from *ḫaššu*- ‘king’. This motion suffix is also attested in CLuw *nānāšrā/i*- ‘sister’ from *nānā/i*- ‘brother’.

## Semantics

The semantic distinction between the root \*g<sup>w</sup>en- and \*sor- can be found in the function of each in the lexicon. While \*g<sup>w</sup>en- referred to any adult woman (as opposed to a pre-pubescent girl) and found its antonym in \*wiHrós ‘adult male’ (Skt. *vīrá*-, Lat. *vir*, OIr. *fer*, Got. *wair*, Lith. *výras*, etc.), \*sor- must have denoted the general quality of being ‘female’ as opposed to ‘male’. The latter probably lacked a proper antonym, because the male gender was considered unmarked (cf. \*d<sup>h</sup>ǵ<sup>h</sup>món ‘human (male or female)’, a male noun).

## Sources:

- Harðarson, J. A. (2014). "Das andere Wort für ‘Frau’ im Urindogermanischen". Leiden: Brill, 23-55.
- Jasanoff, J. H. (1989). “Old Irish Bé ‘Woman.’” *Ériu* 40: 135-41.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008). Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon. Leiden: Brill, 501-505