TELLUS ('earth')

The noun tellūs -ūris is known to have a unique shape; therefore any theory of its origin is hard pressed to find parallels. There are two principal problems, the geminate ll and the constant long \bar{u} ; and there is one perfectly clear characterizing feature, the correlation of the meaning with the first syllable tel-.

When we recall the semantics of Skt. pṛṭbivi 'earth' (: Greek πλατύς 'flat, broad', πλατεῖα 'street, flat of the hand', Πλάτσια the place name, πλάτη 'oar blade', πλάταμών 'flat stone or beach', πλάθανον, πλαθάνη 'platter', all from "pltH_a-) and its gender, and the semantics and base of Old Irish talam 'earth'l), OCS tola Slovene tlà (pl. tantum) 'ground', Armenian t'at 'district', t'atar 'ear-

¹⁾ See A. Bammesberger, Études celtiques 18, 1981, 117-9.

Miszellen 361

then'2), Skt. talam 'plain, flat of the hand', OPruss. talus 'floor', Latv. tilês 'floor-boards of boat', ONorse pilja OE pel, 'plank', it is clear that we will do well to derive the first syllable of tellūs (feminine) from *tel H_a - 'support' (:τλῆναι, imper. τλῆθι), which early embraced the semantics of a flat location upon which one stood or found oneself.

The presence of the matching gendered pair $Tell\bar{u}s$ (fem.) and $Tell\bar{u}m\bar{o}$ (masc.) gives the strong impression that a single concept with a single base, susceptible however of more than one derivational formation, has been mythologically alloted by a sort of mitosis to both male and female. It is easy then to understand how the medial consonantism (and the vowel?) of $Tell\bar{u}m\bar{o}$ could have been assimilated to that of $Tell\bar{u}s$. I assume therefore that we have been misled in seeking complex or exterior sources for $Tell\bar{u}m\bar{o}$; we have simply $*Telum\bar{o} < *telamon-< *tell_a-mon-= telaufov (= <math>\pi\lambda\alpha\tau$ toutoù in formation).

Likewise meditullium would have undergone contamination with tellūs, and must be the archaic formation, as Ernout and Meillet recognized, which we revise

slightly as *medi-tol-iom, with *telHa- in the o-grade.

This brings us back to $tell\bar{u}s$. The only principled solution for both the geminate ll and the long \bar{u} is the assumption of an old compound which resulted in a situation that produced syncope. I therefore propose *tela-lous gen. tela-lous-os > -es. The final element would be formed like $i\bar{u}s$ $i\bar{u}ris$ (= Avestan $yao\bar{z}-d\bar{a}$), and must represent some ancient verbal noun. A possible cognate now offers itself in Hittite luluwai- 'sustain', lulu dat.-loc. luluti 'state of thriving'; on these lexemes see now the Chicago Oriental Institute Hittite Dictionary, vol. 3,1 (1980). We would therefore have in origin a feminized compound adjective 'support-sustaining' vel sim. It is possible even that the second element, the verb base, was reduplicated³) as in the Hittite forms, and then reduced by a Latin haplology⁴). Thus, *telH_a + lulVus- > *telalulVus- > *telalous- > *tellous- > tellūr-.

Semantically in this compound it is possible that the final element was intended to replicate the semantics, in large part, of $*telH_a$. Thus the resulting compound would have the structure of a transformed cognate accusative construction. The feminine gender of course matches that of Skt. prthivt; the gender of $Tell\bar{u}m\bar{o}$ was determined by that of the noun formation.

University of Chicago

Eric P. Hamp

²⁾ I have shown elsewhere that the regular Armenian reflex for Brugmann's long syllabic resonant, i.e. *RH, is aRa, and hence ara and ata. For another example note k'atak' 'city', Annual of Armenian Linguistics 6, 1985, 52. For the present semantics note also t'atel 'bury' (\leftarrow 'earth').

³⁾ See T. Burrow, The Sanskrit Language (1959=1955) 212-3 for such formations with final verbal element.

For my formulation of the regularity of the Latin haplology rule see Journal of Indo-European Studies 1, 1973, 218.