**Brent VINE**

**Att. εἰρόταο: Phonology vs. Morphology**

Att. εὐβοδόθ, Ion. εἰρόταο 'ask' is a close derivational relative of Att. εὐρομαί, Ion. εἰρομαί 'ask, inquire' (*εὐρω-ε-, εὐρ-ο-η,-ο-η*), but the source of the -ο- in εὐρόταο is obscure (Chantraine: "dérivation ... inexpliquée"). Two solutions have recently been proposed, both phonological. This approach has fundamental weaknesses, leaving room for alternative explanations. Recent work by A. Nussbaum on secondary "decasuative" formations (e.g., "de-instrumental" adjectives based on instrumental case forms) suggests an attractive morphological solution to this long-standing crux of Greek word-formation.

J. Rasmussen has suggested (1986) that while εὐρομαί, εὐρ-ο-η require stem-forms (Pr.-Gk.) *εὐρω-ε-, *εὐρω-ο-η < IE *h₁röw-o-η, *h₁röw-ο-η (cf. Rix 1970), the -ο- of εὐρόταο could be explained via two assumptions: (1) Greek inherited forms with laryngeal "enlargement" or "root extension" *-h₁-, i.e., Greek has both *h₁röw- and *h₁röw-η, the latter supported by the *(H)růH-nā-h₂ of OIr. rún, OHG ru:na 'secret, rune"), and (2) a zero-grade *h₁ru-η-C would regularly yield Pr.-Gk. *εὐρω-ο-η, via the "Lex Francis-Normier". Rasmussen later (1990/91) added that ο-grade formations like ON rauna 'investigation' would have lost the internal laryngeal, which might explain the Greek forms that lack it.

This explanation is ingenious but problematic. The "Lex Francis-Normier" remains controversial, and no account of εὐρόταο that depends on it can be compelling. It is also troubling that all the Greek material (besides εὐρόταο) excludes a final laryngeal: besides εὐρομαί, εὐρ-ο-η, note ereunáο 'search after', Cret. ereutaí 'ζητεία', and Myc. e-re-u-te-re (PY), if this means 'inspector' or the like. Nor is the comparison with OIr. rún etc. ironclad.

Another solution involving a root-final laryngeal (E. Tichy ap. LIV) takes e(i)ṟόταο as denominative to a *εὐρόταο: < *h₁röh₁-táh₂, with eréò and εὐρομαί from *h₁rh₁-, since Hom. aor. ...erésthai# excludes digamma and "für eree- und eire- ist *w nicht gesichert". This derivation avoids the Lex Francis-Normier, but substitutes an improbable morphological entity. Nor is the lack of digamma in Hom. ...erésthai# problematic (Kimball 2000), and the digamma in eire- is independently supported (cf. Hdt. εὐρόταο). Worse, a basis *h₁rh₁- separates this material from ereunáο and Cret. ereutaí.

A derived iterative like e(i)ṟόταο should begin from a participial *e(i)ṟότος; and this should be based on the plain *h₁r(w)e- attested in eréò, εὐρομαί, ereunáο. As Nussbaum has shown (1996, 1998), many IE formations in -V:to- derive from "possessive instrumentals", i.e. substantival instrumentals in *-V-h₁ (e.g., o-stem *-o-h₁) which are then "adjectivized" via *-to-, as in kʰolóntós 'angry': kʰólos 'anger'). For e(i)ṟόταο, one need only assume an o-grade action noun *h₁r(w)-o- 'act of inquiring', a well-developed type in Greek. According to one scenario, *h₁r(w)-o- could have had a collective *h₁rw-άh₂ 'inquiry'; the instr. sg. *h₁rw-oh₁ 'by inquiry' (with zero grade from the collective) then serves as the basis for an adjectivization (Pr.-Gk.) *εὐρω-τός (cf. kholóntós), whence iterative e(i)ṟόταο.