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1) **The Question of σκήνος and σκηνή**

In his second extant letter to the Corinthians (5.1), Paul uses the phrase ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνος “our earthly dwelling of the tabernacle” in reference to the humble, lamentable, and transitory state of embodied existence in ultimate hope of a permanent spiritual home. Arising as it does from the conception that what makes the body live is something covered and contained, this expression with the substantive σκήνος n. ‘hut, tent’ relies on a sense shared by its more familiar relative σκηνή ‘tent, booth’. Putting these two sets of senses together, we may observe that at the interface with √σκην- were the notions of covering, containment, and applications relating to such actions. It is in light of this observation that we shall here address the question of the Proto-Indo-European root from which the preform of σκηνή and its arguably copious relatives, both within and beyond Greek, originated.

2) **A Tent is Something Material**

Despite Pokorny’s assignment of its family to a *skāi- (: skēi- : skī-) ‘shimmer’ of its own dubitability (IEW: 917–918), σκηνή (Dor. σκανά) vaguely and non-committally associated with σκαί ‘shadow’ (Ved. chāyā- ‘id.’, OCS sēna ‘shadow’; v. GEW: 727–728; DELG2: 980–981; EDG: 1349), is etymologically unclear. There are two clear reasons for this uncertainty: (1) the derivational histories of the possible preforms of σκηνά, namely *skhijéh- or *skihéh-, are obscure in their own right and distinct from that of σκηνή, which is comparable to words like φερ-νή ‘dowry’, and (2), whereas shadows are solely phenomenal, tents are material objects that do more than just appear.

3) **The Word for ‘Shoe’ and the Hypothesis of *√(s)keh2- ‘cover, contain’**

This materiality lexico-semantically and arguably root-shape diachronically (i.e. σκην–) justify the connection of a Proto-Greek *skānā- with the Germanic word for ‘shoe’ (Goth. skohs m. ‘shoe’, ON skór ‘id.’, OE scóh ‘id.’, etc.), which Pokorny unacceptably assigns to what now would be represented as *√skēh2- ‘cover, envelop’ (: *(s)keu- : (s)key- : (s)kā- ‘bedecken, umhüllen’, IEW: 951–953; Latv. skaūt ‘embrace’ : ON skjól n. ‘shelter’ [< *skēh2-lo-] : OS skūr m. ‘shelter’, OHG scūr ‘lean-to’ < *skūh-ro-). Given its immediate preform *skōža- (“No certain etymology”, Kroonen 2013: 446), the “shoe” word may in all likelihood reflect a *skōh2-ko- or a *skēh2-kō- comparable in form to the ancestor of Latvian spēks m. ‘force’ (: spēt ‘be able’, cf. Ved. pīvah-sphākā- ‘swelling with fat’) and, in lexical semantic development, to Avestan aothra-‘shoe’ (: Lat. induō ‘put on’, *eu- ‘id.’, IEW: 346). As it turns out, there is abundant evidence for a *√(s)keh2- of the meaning ‘cover, contain’.

4) ***skeh2-né-h2- and *skēh2-n-o/es-**

Given the ease of explaining the Proto-Germanic *–ō– beside Proto-Greek *–ā– from *–eh2– and the role of the suffix *-kō- in genitival and thus secondary derivation (v. Nussbaum 2009), it
is conceivable that *skó/-ya - reflects a *skéh2/ko- formed by determinative accent retraction from an adjective in *-kó- derived from a root noun *skéh2-lskh2- ‘covering’ to *√(s)keh2- ‘cover, contain’. This *skéh2-kó- ‘of the covering; kind of covering’ would thus stand beside an imaginable *skéh2-nó- basic to the determinate preforms of both σκηνή and σκήνος, namely, *skéh2-né-hz2- and *skéh2-n-óes- (cf. πηρός ‘disabled’ : Ael. πάρος n. ‘weakness’ [Alc.98]). In terms of derivational semantics, *skéh2-nó- could be based on a *-nó- verbal adjective – in which case its derivatives would have meant ‘the covered place, shelter’ – or the base could have been derived possessively from a *-men- stem (*skéh2-(m)n-ó-) and thus have meant ‘provided with cover, covering’ (adj.). In any case, there is some evidence that a *-men- stem was indeed formed from *√(s)keh2- ‘cover, contain’.

5) πόμα ‘lid’, κόμα ‘sleep’, and κημός ‘muzzle’

For the sake of etymology, we may note a certain resemblance between the totally obscure κόμα ‘deep sleep’ and the more associative πόμα ‘lid, cover’, the latter of which arguably reflects an *-óé- acrostatic *-men- stem to *√peh2- ‘cover, protect, care for’ (Nussbaum p.c.). In like manner, it is conceivable that *√(s)keh2- formed a nomen actionis *kó/éh2-myx ‘covering’ used to refer figuratively to the experience of being enveloped by sleep – an image arguably echoed by the use of κόμα with καλόπτω in Homer (Ξ359, σ201). If this scenario is insufficiently credible, we are on firmer ground when it comes to κημός (Dor. κάμός) ‘muzzle’. Since muzzles are covers without a shadow of a doubt, it is appealing to assume a possessive *keh2-m(n)-ó- ‘covering’ (adj./subst.) ancestral to the etymologically obscure κημός.

6) The “Root” *kadh-

Another set of obscure forms can be illumined as evidence of our *√(s)keh2- ‘cover, contain’ by appeal to the root noun suggested above. Under a root *kadh- ‘hüten, schützend bedecken’ (IEW: 516), Pokorny has a list of mostly Germanic forms such as Old English hód m. ‘hood’ (: OHG huor ‘hat’), hætt m. ‘hat’ (: Oec. hōtr ‘id.’), and hédan ‘watch, tend to’ (cf. NHG hüten ‘care for’). I would argue that the descriptive *kadh- common to all these forms is also reflected in a set of previously obscure Greek lemmata: κῆθις (-ίος) f. ‘dice-box’, κίθον ‘id.’, κηθάριον ‘voting-urn’, κόθα ‘goblets’ (· ποτήρια [Hsch.]), κόθων (-ονος) m. ‘Laconian drinking vessel’, κάθος ‘big basket’ (· ποτήρις [Hsch.]). Given the comparison of these sets and the morphophonemic oddity of the root underlying them, it is plausible that “*kadh-” actually originated as a secondary root based on a nominal compound arising from a causative periphrasis in which the predicative instrumental was that of a root noun *kéh2/-kh2- ‘covering’ (cf. *shí-éh1 d̪̂e:h1- ‘provide with length, lengthen, elongate’, Merritt 2023b). Accordingly, on the basis of *kh2-éh1 d̪̂e:h1- ‘provide with covering’ was arguably formed a *kh2-d̪̂e:h1-ó- ‘provided with covering, covered’ whose derivatives seem to have inspired the creation of a secondary *√keh2-d̪̂e:h1(h1)- ‘cover, contain’ (n.b. OE hédan < iterative *koh2d̪̂e:h1(h1)-éje/o- ‘protect, guard’).

7) The Family of Gothic haihs ‘one-eyed’

Beside the root noun *kéh2/-kh2- ‘covering’, there is some evidence that *√(s)keh2- ‘cover’ also formed an i-stem *kóh2-ı/-kéh2-ı- and a u-stem *kóh2-u/-kéh2-u- of the same meaning. As I have proposed elsewhere (Merritt 2023b), while stems of this kind in *-ı- and *-u- normally require a
8) Vedic kévala- and Latin cælēbs

The second set of evidence includes Vedic kévala- ‘one’s own, alone, whole’ and probably Latin cælēbs ‘single’, which may be analyzed as the reflex of a compound consisting of an i-stem abstract *kēh₂-i-ye-l-i- ‘solitude, totality’ derived from the preform of kévala- and a nominal form of bʰuh₂- ‘be/become’ representing the anti-causative alternant of the predicative instrumental periphrasis (*kēh₂-i-ye-l-i-h₁ bʰuh₂- ‘be/become alone’, cf. Ved. kevali-kr- ‘make one’s own’, Balles 2006: 98). After the veóryvóς-rule and loss of *u (cf. Lat. probus ‘upright’ < pro-bʰuh₁-ō- ‘with a forthright nature’, Weiss 2020: 173), the stem *keh₂i̯elibʰuh₂- was conceivable leveled to *keh₂i̯elibh₂- (cf. Merritt 2021: 320), resulting in cælib- (cf. aetás ‘age’: aevum ‘id.’, v. EDL: 80). Vedic kévala- would thus reflect a *kēh₂-i-ye-lo- ‘the complete, whole, alone’ presupposing a possessive *kēh₂-i-γ₂- arguably derived from our *kōh₂-i-lkēh₂-i- ‘covering’ and bearing the sense ‘complete’.

9) The Family of Gothic hails ‘whole, sound’

This meaning ‘complete’ probably developed via the sense ‘covered, contained, comprehended, enclosed’ observable in the etymologies of various terms for ‘whole’ or ‘all’, such as παζ ‘whole, all’ from *pēh₂-ent- ‘covered’ (: TA puk : TB po ‘id.’ [Kim 2019: 178 with refs.]: *k̚eh₂ ‘cover, protect’) and Hitittic ḥ̣ımant- ‘all’ from *h₂u-hım-ėnt- ‘taken together’ (: *ḥ̣iyem- ‘take’, Kimball 2007). To this group I would add Latin omnis ‘whole, all’, which may reflect a *ḥ̣i̯op-ṇ-i- ‘the taken’ formed from a *-ṇ- verbal adjective to *ḥ̣ẹp̣- ‘grasp, take’ (or *ḥ̣i̯om-ṇ-i- ‘id.’: *ḥ̣iyem-, Nussbaum p.c.), and German ganz ‘whole, all’, which seems to reflect a *g̣̣oṇd-ō- ‘taken, grasped’ analyzable as a patientive τομός-type derivative ultimately of *k̚eh₂i̯elibh₂- ‘grasp, take’ (:  γανόνω ‘take in, contain’, Lat. prahendō ‘take’, v. Nussbaum 2017). The same semantic pathway from ‘covered, contained’ via ‘complete’ to ‘whole, sound’ is arguably involved in the family of Gothic hails ‘whole, sound’ (OE hál ‘id.’: OCS cěb ‘whole’ OPr. kails ‘hail!’; possibly Latv. kāils ‘bare’), which arguably reflects a determinative adjective *kēh₂-i-lo- or *kōh₂-i-lo- ‘the complete, intact, whole’ derived from a *-lō- derivative of the i-stem and basic to a u-stem *kōh₂-i-l-u- ‘the whole, wholeness’ reflected in the Hesychian lemma kòlv (tò kàlòv) and, with more derivational material, in Old Prussian kailüstiskan ‘health’ (acc. sg.). If Latin cælum ‘sky’ is also related (cf. Weiss 2016), it would point to a *keh₂-i-ló- with the original meaning ‘(with) covering’ (cf. Lith. dangiš ‘sky’: deŋtį ‘cover’).

10) The Genesis of *√(s)keh₂- ‘cover’
We are now in a position to consider evidence for the u-stem *(s)kóh₂-u-l(l)s kêh₂-u- ‘covering’ to \*√(s)keh₂- ‘cover’, on the basis of which arose what we may now rewrite as our secondary \*√(s)keyh₂- ‘cover’ alongside an equivalent \*√(s)keydh- ‘id.’ (kötho ‘cover, hide’, MW cudd ‘hiding-place’, etc.). The existence of these secondary roots is a function of a well-known feature of the PIE denominal verbal system, namely that, while periphrasis with light verbs such as *d̥eh₁- and a predicative instrumental was necessarily employed outside the present system, the present system itself could employ stem-formants of instrumentative value. Accordingly, a *(s)keh₂-u-je/o- derived from *(s)kóh₂-u-l(l)s kêh₂-u- ‘covering’ would have meant ‘provide with a covering’. Since this verb’s meaning was equivalent to whatever verb was originally derived from \*√(s)keh₂- ‘cover’, it is conceivable that it was reanalyzed as a primary present derived from a “long-diphthongal” \*√(s)keh₂u- ‘cover’, which would have thus appeared eligible as a base to a -tó- verbal adjective, namely a *(s)kh₂u-tó- ‘covered’. Structurally comparable to the preform of Vedic pūdā- ‘drunk’ (< *pih₂-tō- < *ph₃(-i)-tō-), this *(s)kh₂u-tó- may be assumed to have undergone laryngeal metathesis. The resulting *(s)kuh₂-tó- ‘covered’, arguably basic to the preform of Lithuanian (s)kūd₂s ‘shell, shuck’ (< *(s)kéh₂-tó-), appears to have been pivotal in the creation of a secondary \*√(s)keyh₂- ‘cover’, presumably by an analogy like *kl̥-tó- ‘covered’ : \*√kl- ‘cover’ :: *(s)kuh₂-tó- : x. Once a \*√(s)keyh₂- was inferred, it formed, for example, an adjective in *rō- (*s)kuh₂-rō- ‘covering, covered’ → *skúh₂-ro- [: OS skūr m. ‘shelter’ : Lat. obscūrus ‘obscure’ < *w with a covering to it, covered ‘]), a radical e-grade simple thematic present *(s)kéy₇₂-elo- ‘cover’ (> Latv. skaũt ‘embrace’), and an s-stem *(s)kéy₇₂-o/es- ‘covering’ (→ *kuh₂-s-ō- ‘cover(ed)’ → [ *kō(y)₂-s-o- > ON hauss ‘skull’, Latv. kauss ‘bowl’] → *kǔh₂-s-o- ‘the cover(ed)’ > OE hūs ‘house’).

11) The Origin of Hoard

This s-stem appears to have been used in the causative periphrasis. If we start out with *kéy₇₂-es-eh₁ d̥eh₁- ‘provide with covering’ (or *kuh₂-s-éh₁ d̥eh₁- ‘id.’), it is possible to imagine a compound *kuh₂-s-d̥h₁-ō- ‘provided with cover, covered’ (cf. μισθός ‘payment’ < *mi-s-d̥h₁-ō- ‘provided in exchange’), whose *h₂ was arguably lost in the coda of a superheavy syllable (*kuh₂s.d̥h₁-; cf. Skt. kūsth- m. ‘cavity of the loin’ [Skt. koṣṭha- m. n. ‘receptacle, belly, storeroom’ < *kōṣṭh₁zo- ← ] *kusth₁zo- < *kuh₂-s-t₂-h₂-ō- ← *kuh₂-s-te₂-h₂- ← *kuh₂-s-t₂-ō- ← *kēy₇₂-o/es- ‘covering’). The resulting *kuṣd₂h₁-ō- ‘covered, hidden, hidden stuff, treasure’, which seems to have germinated its own Caland system (*kuṣd₂h₁- → MW cwthr ‘anus, rump; rectum; womb; matrix; vagina; belly’ [IEW: 953]: κόσθος ‘pudenda muliebria’), would be (1) the base of a determinate *kōṣd₂h₁-o- ‘the covered place, house, building, tower’ (Av. aṣṭa.kaoḍa- ‘with eight turrets’ [used of pushā- ‘diadem’], Khotanese kūṣḍa- ‘palace’, v. Bernard and Chen 2022), (2) the preform of Gothic huzd ‘treasure’ (: PDE hoard), and (3) the base of the instrumental *kuṣd₂h₁-ō-h₁ ‘with hidden stuff, with treasure’ basic to a determinate *kuṣd₂h₁-o-h₁-d- ‘the one with the hidden stuff’ ancestral to Latin custōs, custōdis ‘guard’ (cf. Nowicki 1978).

12) The Genesis of *√(s)keydh- ‘cover’

Returning to the relation between *√(s)keyh₂- ‘cover’ : *√(s)keydh- ‘id.’, let us bear in mind that the expression corresponding to *(s)keh₂-u-je/o- ‘provide with a covering’ was *kēh₂-u-h₁ d̥eh₁- ‘id.’, on the basis of which was formed a compound *kh₂-u-d̥h₁-ō- ‘covering, covered’ basic to
the *khzéudʰh₁-ô- or *khzóudʰh₁-ô- ‘the covering, cover’ ancestral to Avestan xaôda- ‘cap, helmet’ (ὑδαν ‘conceal’). In light of Old English hýdan ‘conceal’, it is conceivable that a *kuhzdʰh₁-ô- produced by laryngeal metathesis was the base of an i-stem *kuhzdʰh₁-i- ‘covering’ (→ *kuhzdʰh₁-i-je/o- ‘provide with covering’) or a *je/o- present itself (i.e. *kuhzdʰh₁-ô-je/o- ‘render covered’). In any case, this *kuhzdʰh₁-ô- was definitely basic to an s-stem *kéhzdʰh₁-o/es- ‘covered-ness, concealment’ subject to Hackstein’s (2002) rule of laryngeal deletion (*CH.CC > *C.CC). Since radical é-grade s-stems existing in Caland systems beside radical e-grade simple thematic presents might have provided a model for the formation of thematic presents on the basis of s-stems originally derived from compound thematic adnominals (*gwhér-ô/es- ‘warmth’ [θέρος ‘summer’] : *gwhér-e/o- ‘(be) warm’ [θέρομαι ‘id.’] :: *pleh₁(-)dʰh₁-ô/es- ‘fullness’ [← *p(h₁)dʰh₁-ô- ‘rendered full’] : *pleh₁(-)dḣh₁-ô/o- ‘be/become full’, v. Merritt 2023a 181–190), the resulting *kéydh₁-o/es- ‘hiddenness’ (> κεῦθος ‘hiding-place, depth, hole’) seems to have inspired the creation of a radical é-grade simple thematic present *kéudʰh₁-ô/o- ‘make hidden’ (> κεῦθος ‘hide’) as a derivative of a secondary *skeuḍˡ- ‘cover’ (cf. Mlr. codal f. ‘skin’ < *kudʰ(h₁)-le-h₂- ‘covering’ ← *kudʰ(h₁)-ló- ‘covered’; Goth. skauda-raips ‘shoe-strap’ < *skouḍʰh₁-ê-h₂-; κούθον ‘seed’).

13) The Question of σκεῦς and σκευή

Now that we have found extensive evidence that a *√(s)keh²- ‘cover, contain’ both existed and formed a u-stem, let us at length consider what are arguably two reflexes of stems derived from a thematic derivative of *skeuḍu⁻u/-l(s)kēh²-u- ‘covering, containment’. These two reflexes are σκεῦς n. ‘vessel, implement’ and σκευή ‘equipment, attire, apparel’ (σκευάζω ‘prepare, dress’). Putting these two sets of senses together, we may observe that at the interface with σκευή were the notions of covering, containment, and applications relating to such actions. Despite Pokorny’s assignment of σκεῦς and its family to a *skeu- ‘herrichten, ausführen’ of its own dubitability (IEW: 950–951), there is general agreement that σκευή is etymologically obscure (GEW: 727; DELG²: 980; EDG: 1348–1349). A major cause of this obscurity is the difficulty in accounting for the prevocalic diphthong. While Peters (1980: 131) provides some possibilities for the preform of σκευή, namely *skeusjézh²- and *skeuhjézh²-, it is doubtful that either preform would regularly develop to what is attested, and it is unclear from what root and in what way either preform would be derived.

14) The Unfeasibility of Derivation from *√skeuh²- ‘cover’

As far as the root is concerned, an initial hypothesis, given the lexical semantics discussed above, is a connection with what we have represented as *√skeuh²- ‘cover’. It is at least conceivable that preforms *skéuh²-ô/es- and *skeuh²-ô-h²- derived from an adjective in *-ô- would regularly develop to the attested forms. Since, however, there is no evidence for such an adjective and since it is imaginable that the laryngeal would have a vocalic reflex, it is necessary to pursue another path.

15) A Serious Comparandum

This path may be taken with the observation that the prevocalic diphthong is also encountered in the substantive χεῦη ‘joke, jest’, and thus with the suggestion that the same morphological and
phonological processes necessary for its explication may also be involved in the background of σκότος, whose comparandum finds itself among the forms listed under Pokorny’s *ǵhleu- ‘fröhlich sein, scherzen’ (IEW: 451). These items may be divided into three sets: (1) a “simple” set consisting of OE glēo(w) ‘glee’, ON glý ‘joy’, and χλεόη itself, (2) a dental set represented by Old Lithuanian gláuda ‘mirth’ (: gláudas ‘id.’), and (3) a *-mo- set comprising OCS glumь ‘idle talk, mockery’ (RCS ‘noise, amusement’, Derksen 2008: 167) and Proto-Germanic *glauma- ‘joy, mirth’ (: OE gléam ‘joy, revelry’, ON glaumr ‘noisy merriment’). Given the connection of humor with joy, and of the latter with luminescence, it is conceivable that, as Pokorny himself suggests, we are dealing ultimately with what we may represent as *ǵhe- ‘shiny’ (cf. IEW: 429–434).

16) The Preferability of *ǵhe- ‘shiny’

This root, often reconstructed as *ǵhelh3- ‘yellow(-green)’ in light of χλορός ‘yellow-green’ and some Indo-Iranian material (cf. Ved. hírī-smāra- ‘golden-bearded’ : Av. zari- ‘tawny’, EWAia II: 805–806), should instead be reconstructed as *ǵhe- ‘shiny’ for three reasons: (1) the meanings of many derivatives point to more than just ‘yellow-green’, ‘golden’, or ‘tawny’ (e.g. OIr. gel ‘shining, white’, Lith. glodūs ‘smooth, polished, even, well-fitting’), (2) the Balto-Slavic evidence points to *ǵh reflected with Gutturalwechsel (Lith. gelus ‘yellow’ : East. Lith. želias ‘gold-colored’), and (3) there are forms and correspondences that heavily favor an anit-root (e.g. non-acute Serbo-Croatian žut ‘yellow’ < *ǵʰ-tó- : Av. zārā- ‘gall’ : χλός ‘wrath, biliousness’ < *ǵʰol-o- ‘yellow stuff’; χλάδη ‘luxuriance’ < *ǵʰl-i-dē-h2- ‘splendor, glitziness’; PGk. *khōwā [ : χλόη ‘young greenery’]; Scr. žuć ‘bile’ < *ǵʰl(-k)-i- : χάλκος ‘copper, bronze’ < *ǵʰl(-í)-jō- ‘shiny-yellowish (stuff)’, cf. Georgiev 1936). Accordingly, I suggest that the laryngeal reflected in forms such as χλωρός and Lithuanian glodūs ‘smooth, polished, etc.’ was of suffixal origin.

17) The Emergence of *ǵhelh2- ‘shiny’

Given that our *ǵhe- ‘bright, shiny, clear’ was an adjectival root like *meg- ‘big’ (Nussbaum 2022: 218–220), it is reasonable to suppose that, just as *meg- formed a primary protokerinetic *-h2- stem of determinate meaning (*meg-h2- ‘the big; bigness’ : méγα ‘great’ : FCM ἀγα- ‘with great x’ : ἀγαθὸς ‘good’ < *ǵʰg-h2-ðh1-ō- ‘provided with greatness’), *ǵhe- formed an adjectival abstract *ǵHEL-h2-|ǵHEL-h2- ‘the clear, clarity’ employable in the causative periphrasis *ǵHEL-h2-|ǵHEL-h1- ‘provide with clarity, (make) clear’. Since this common construction required a case characterized, exceptionally for protokerinetics, by zero-grade of the stem and full-grade of the ending (cf. Ved. gerunds in -tvā < *-ty-éhi ‘with x-ing’), it is conceivable that *ǵH-h2-ěh1 was reanalyzed as the instrumental singular of a root noun *ǵhleh2-|ǵhleh2- ‘shininess’. Since, moreover, *ǵhleh2-, the a-grade of which, incidentally, would be reflected in χλωρός (< *ǵʰlohr2- : *ǵʰl-h2-rō- : *ǵʰl-h2-řō- : χλάρος ‘joyous’ Pl.); cf. *ǵhel- ‘glänzend, weiß’ [IEW: 118–120] : błówah2-ros ‘light-colored’ [Lat. flórus ‘light-colored’ (of hair, Acc. +), Mfr. blár, MW blawr ‘grey’] ← *błówah2-, Weiss 2020: 304], was the full-grade of this secondary root, it is understandable that, when the causative periphrasis inspired the creation of a thematic compound *ǵhlohr2-ðh1-ō- ‘rendered clear, shiny, smooth, bright’ (> PGmc. *glada- ‘shiny, smooth, glad’ [: OE glad ‘glad, bright’, ON gládr ‘id.’, NHG glatt ‘smooth, even, sleek, shiny’] → *ǵhleh2-ðh1-u- Lith. glodūs ‘smooth, polished, even, well-fitting’ [ : OCS gladukъ ‘smooth, even’]), which arguably germinated a tertiary *ǵghelh2-ðh1- ‘clear, smooth, etc.’ (→ *ǵglohr2-ðh1-řō- : Lat. glaber
‘smooth, bald’), the *–l– was always assigned to the onset. Accordingly, just as *√(s)keh2- formed both a root noun and a u-stem, it is reasonable to suppose that *√gleh2- ‘shiny’ formed both the root noun reflected in the “glad” family and a u-stem of the shape *g’hléh2-u-lg’léh2-u- ‘brightness’.

18) The Origin of χλευη ‘joke, jest’

This u-stem was (1) the basis of an adjective in *-mó- (*g’hleh2-u-mó- ‘bright, glad’ → *g’hléh2-u-mó- ‘gladness’ (PGmc. *glauma- ‘merriment’, OCS glumъ ‘idle talk, mockery’), (2) employed in the causative periphrasis *g’hléh2-u-h1 d’eh1- ‘provide with brightness, gladden’ (: *g’hleh2-u-d’h1-o- ‘brightened, glad’ → *g’hléh2-u-d’h1-e-h2- ‘gladness’ > Old Lithuanian gláuda ‘mirth’; cf. *g’éh2-u-i-h1 d ’eh1- ‘provide with brightness, gladden’: *geh2-u-i-d’h1-o- ‘gladden, glad’: Geh2-u-i-d’h1-ijo- ‘gladdening, gladness’ > Lat. gaudium ‘joy’, Merritt 2024), and (3) subject to genitalic derivation with lengthened grade of the root and a simple thematic suffix (v. Nussbaum 2009). Just as Vedic párśu- m. ‘rib’ is the base of a vṛddhi-derivative pārś(u)va- ‘(region) of the ribs’, it is plausible that *g’hléh2-u- ‘brightness, gladness’ was the base of a *g’hleh2-u-o- ‘of the gladness’, which, like pārś(u)va- (trisyllabic at RV 4.18.2), was subject to Sievers’ Law. The variant *g’hleh2-u-o- was arguably the ancestor, via Osthoff’s Law, of a Proto-Germanic *glewwa- ‘mirth’ ([→ *gliuwvia- > ON glý ‘joy’] > OE gleow ‘glee’), and basic to an *-h2- stem *g’hleh2-u-o-e-h2- ‘that which is of gladness, humor’ ancestral to a k’hlejµâ- ancestral, also via Osthoff’s Law, to a k’hleyµâ- ancestral to χλευη ‘joke, jest’.

19) Treasure in Tents and Jars

In like manner, therefore, let us propose that *(s)kôh2-u-l(s)kêh2-u- ‘covering, containment’ was the base of a genitalic adjective *skêh2-u-o- ‘of the covering’ subject to Sievers’ Law. The resulting *skêh2-u-o- was the base both of the *skêh2-u-o-es- ‘kind of covering, container’ ancestral to skêŏs n. ‘vessel, implement’ and of the *skêh2-u-e-h2- ‘kind of covering, container’ ancestral to skêh2 ‘equipment, apparel, clothing’. Though skêŏs presupposes the sense ‘containment’ rather than the sense ‘covering’ underlying skêŏs ‘tent’, it is, in conclusion, interesting to observe that, in the same Pauline letter with which we began this discussion, skêŏs like skêńos is not only employed in comparable reference to precarious corporeality with precious contents (ἐν ὄστρακίνοις σκέψιν “in jars of clay” [4.7]), but also, as I argue, a derivative ultimately of the same verbal root – one of the greatest accessible antiquity and comprising a vast corpus of lexical treasure (e.g. Lith. kûnas ‘body’ < *kuh2-no- ‘covering’: *√skejuh2- ‘cover’, v. Charpentier 1907: 23–24; cf. Latv. kûnis ‘pupa, larval form of an insect’, Smocyński 2018: 631).
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