Studies in the languages and language contact in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia

Federico Giusfredi, Zsolt Simon (eds.)

Elena Martínez Rodríguez (editorial assistance)

Studies in the languages and language contact in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia

Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic (IPOA)
Facultat de Filologia
Universitat de Barcelona

Studies in the languages and language contact in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia

Federico Giusfredi, Zsolt Simon (eds.)
Elena Martínez Rodríguez (editorial assistance)

UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA

Edicions

Calidad en
Edición
Académica

Academic
Publishing
Quality

COVER IMAGE
Drawing of the Sun god Tiwad, copied (J. D. Hawkins) from a sculptured slab, Anatolian Civilizations Museum, Ankara.

Table of Contents

Foreword

The study of loanwords and, in general, of the linguistic contacts of Anatolian languages both within and outside Anatolia has always been an important field in Ancient Anatolian studies. The dramatic development of the last three decades in Hittitology and related fields opened new horizons. This is reflected also in current wide-scale research projects, first of all in the "Pre-Classical Anatolian Languages in Contact" (PALaC) in Verona and in the "Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages" (eDiAna) in München and Marburg.

This led the editors of the present volume, Federico Giusfredi (the principal investigator of PALaC) and Zsolt Simon (research fellow at eDiAna), to create a forum where the most recent results of loanword and linguistic contact research in Ancient Anatolia could have been presented and discussed. Although it was initially conceived as a workshop, this could not have been realized under the current conditions. Thus, the editors decided to turn the cancelled event into the present book.

The volume opens with an overview of the origins of the linguistic landscape by F. Giusfredi and Alvise Matessi. This is followed by the analysis of the Luwian word for 'salt' by Ignasi-Xavier Adiego, who argues that it represents an Indo-Aryan loanword. The next two papers are also devoted to the languages of the Luwic group: Valerio Pisaniello explains a Lycian toponym attested only in the Ethnika of Stephanus of Byzantium from an Anatolian word for 'wheat', while Mariona Vernet argues that the Aramaic phrase "the god of Kaunos" in the Letoon inscription is based on Carian.

Moving westwards, the Anatolian–Greek language contacts are one of the most hotly debated issues. This volume presents two contributions to this topic. On the one hand, Filip De Decker argues that despite recent views the Hittite and the Greek modal particles for expressing *irrealis* do not constitute an isogloss, and provides a thorough analysis of the historical syntax of the Greek irrealis. On the other hand, Andreas Opfermann investigates the origin of the word "scandal" via Latin and Greek back to the Luwic languages.

Having arrived to Ancient Italy, the book closes with the paper of Zs. Simon, who, re-investigating the popular theory of Anatolian loanwords in Etruscan, concluded that there is no evidence for this hypothesis.

Finally, the editors would express their gratitude to I.-X. Adiego, who accepted this volume in the series "Barcino Monographica Orientalia. Series Anatolica et Indogermanica", to the European Research Council for funding the PALaC project, as well as to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for funding the eDiAna project that financed the work of some authors, including the editor Zsolt Simon. The editors also thank E. Martínez Rodríguez for her assistance with the formal preparation and formatting of the manuscript.

The publication costs for this open access monograph were covered with the funds of the ERC project PALaC, that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 757299).

The editors
Verona & München, May 2021

Archaeolinguistics and the historical study of contacts in Anatolia

Federico Giusfredi & Alvise Matessi[*]
Università degli Studi di Verona

1. *The origin of things and the Indo-European problem*

1.1. *Introduction*

The query about the origin of things is a dangerous one. It is very rare, in historical sciences, for data to be old enough and complete enough to allow an uncontroversially acceptable reconstruction. Yet the temptation seems to be irresistible for scholars in many disciplines, and historians, archaeologists, and linguists are no exception. While the research carried out by the team of the project PALaC (*Preclassical Anatolian Languages in Contact*) concentrated on the study of linguistic and cultural contacts in the historical ages of the Anatolian and "peri-Anatolian" world, it proved impossible to proceed without facing the problem of the original substrate-superstrate relationships between the Early and Middle Bronze Age cultures in these areas. As a substrate-superstrate model involves an asymmetry both in prestige and in the time of occupation of a contact region, the attempts to model interferences and influences are affected by the problem of establishing the dia-

chronic precedence of a given culture with respect to another one, which, in turn, calls into question the problem of matching pre-literate material cultures with historical ones (by historical, we mean cultures that produced written documents, and whose official linguistic code and identities are, therefore, allegedly known).

The field of research that tries to investigate the proto-history of language-culture pairings is sometimes called "archaeolinguistics". Examples of archaeolinguistic problems include: the identification of a material culture with a historical linguistically-defined civilization (e.g., the Luwians, or the Proto-Anatolians, with Western or South-Western Anatolian material cultures), the identification of the origin of an allegedly intrusive demographic component (e.g., the problem of the *Urheimat* of the Indo-Europeans), or, in some cases, with the involvement of the natural sciences, the attempt at matching not just the linguistic and the material *facies* of an ancient group, but also its genetic material.

In this section, we will concentrate on the first two aspects of the archaeolinguistic agenda, and we will try to offer an overview of its methodological limitations, which, in general, depend on methodological scope of the very disciplines it aims to combine, rather than on the combination thereof.

1.2. *"Proto-Indo-European United": the "sin" of the linguists*

For those who study Anatolia, the query about the origin of things coincides, basically, with the problem of explaining and understanding the meaning of the Indo-European presence in the area. What are the Indo-Europeans? Many definitions may be given, and some, coming from the most optimistic scholars, may contain very precise descriptions of their cultural features: they were selective incinerators, worshipped specific deities, organised knowledge in lists of body parts or other significant taxonomies derived from their exquisite experience of the world, disliked dragons and probably invented poetry.[1] As a matter of fact, this way of thinking is historically dangerous, and it is certainly methodologically shortsighted, if not blind. The Indo-Europeans are a hypothetical cultural group of people who are assumed to have spoken a common language we reconstruct. No one was able to prove any of the hypotheses on their origin based on linguistic criteria, nor is anybody capable of explaining *when* exactly Proto-Indo-European would have

---

1. It would be impossible to provide here a complete list of references. The reader may, however, cf. the *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture* (Mallory – Adams 1997), containing entries such as *Anatomy* (17-19), *Dragon* (169), *God* (230-232), *Goddess* (232-233), *Indo-European Homeland* (290-299), *Poetry* (436-439), *Snake* (529-530).

been an undivided living spoken language. All the attempts to reconstruct the original culture of the Indo-Europeans are based on the individual judgment of scholars about what must have been a conservative ancient feature preserved in written records which, in the best possible scenario, must have been composed at least a couple of thousand years after the age of the "Proto-Indo-European Utd.".

All ancient languages that have been recorded in an age that is *relatively* close to the age of the Proto-Indo-Europeans show traces that indicate interference from much earlier times. Sumerian, for instance, is attested at least one thousand years before the first Indo-European textual record, and yet it is certainly affected by other languages of the Mesopotamian Chalcolithic (ca. 5000-3000 BCE), as demonstrated by the presence of substrate and foreign lexical material.[2] Old Egyptian seems to entertain contacts with the languages of Darfur and Chad.[3] Yet, when dealing with the Indo-European problem, linguists reconstruct the proto-language using – legitimately – the only available method: internal reconstruction. While this is methodologically correct, the limits of the scope should be evident before taking a step too far: the recognition of inherited phonetic and morphological material is solid,[4] but the recognition of cultural content related to it is completely hypothetical, because semantic change is not mechanical and because the choice to consider a concept "old" enough to correspond to an original culture is subject (1) to the individual judgment of the single scholars or schools and (2) to the historically unlikely idea that a unitary culture existed that spoke the pure uncontaminated reconstructed language at a given time and in a given region. If any of this does not hold up (and, as we have argued, we believe much of it may not), the cultural reconstruction becomes extremely speculative, and the very problem of the linguistic definition of a "cultural identity" proves to be much more complex than previously recognised.[5]

2. On the existence of substrata and circulation of foreign lexical material – possibly from more than a single language – in Early Mesopotamia, see the overview and critical discussion by Rubio (1999). While the scholar suggests that the situation was a «complex and fuzzy web of borrowings whose directions are frequently difficult to determine», phenomena of interference unquestionably existed.

3. Cf. Cooper (2017), with reference to previous scholarship.

4. The solidity of the reconstruction of language-internal diachronic change depends on the absolute regularity of context-induced phonetic laws. Other kinds of linguistic change, e.g. those involving semantics and syntax, are less predictable and therefore impossible to reconstruct with certainty.

5. A related problem is, of course, the one regarding the methodological issues we face when trying to identify an original core-lexicon of Proto-Indo-European words (and concepts). For a recent discussion of these further methodological issues, cf. the observations by Simon (2020: 241-242).

Indeed, groups are normally defined by a set of behaviours that leave a trace in the material culture, and this is undeniable, but at the same time they are defined by a shared linguistic code. However, neither can the material culture be regarded to as a mechanical indicator of identity (we will come back to this point later), nor can the linguistic code be regarded as a unique homogenous language, but rather as a mixed-code deriving at the same time from inheritance and interactions. When the interactions cannot be traced back to solid comparanda, because we found ourselves beyond the limits of historical records, any reconstruction is, by definition, speculative (or, if the problem of proto-historical interactions is ignored, inherently flawed).

1.3. *Proto-Indo-European intrusion: the "sin" of the historians*

If the overconfident use of linguistic reconstruction to explore cultural history is highly risky and very problematic, the opposite approach is unfortunately not much better. If one compares the way the Indo-Europeans appear to linguists with the way the historians deal with them, a significant mismatch emerges, which, to our knowledge, has not yet been discussed in literature.

According to Mario Liverani, in his ever-green 1988 book *Antico Oriente: storia, società, economia*, what we can confidently tell about the Indo-Europeans' advent in the areas they will historically (co-)occupy is that with the crisis of the second urbanisation (or of a comparable technological and social wave), new demographic components arrived and took over the same social structures that were produced by the societies that had preceded them. It is funny that the way the linguists describe the role of the Indo-Europeans and the way we historians interpret it are apparently not just different, but actually opposite. Even funnier is the fact that this observation has never been explicitly raised in scholarly literature. On the linguistic side, we would be dealing with an exquisite innovative culture that reshaped the world with its *Weltanschauung*, while on the historical side we are dealing with an intrusive element that mostly reused technical, social, and cultural achievements and structures produced by the former major cultures in the regions affected by the new demographic wave.

If the position defended by the most optimistic linguists who think they can describe the original Indo-European culture has been shown to be methodologically weak, we will now proceed to discuss the symmetrical weakness of the minimalist view that may arise from a reductionist interpretation of Liverani's brilliant observation.

The symmetry of the two flawed approaches is striking. Just as impeccable as the methods of internal linguistic reconstruction, if they remain language-internal, equally impeccable is Liverani's observation about the social reuse of the former structures by the new leading cultures after the *emergence* of the Indo-European element in many areas of Eurasia. The relationship between the Hittite element and the Hattian one resembles that between the Mycenaean and the Minoan ones, as well as that between the Indo-Iranian elements and the non-Indo-European components of Iran and the Indian Subcontinent.[6] Even smaller areas, like Sicily, may have followed this very pattern.

Yet even in this case a methodological leap often occurs when we try to move from the *description of historical data* to the attempt to use them to describe proto-historical patterns.

One thing is to observe that the historical civilizations that used Indo-European languages co-existed with civilizations that did not; another thing is assuming that we can, based on this fact, establish that the presence of the Indo-European element was geographically intrusive with respect to the non-Indo-European one in a given region.

The very fact that we cannot, out of sheer methodological impossibility, identify either the cultural identity frameset or the linguistic identity of proto-historical and pre-historical groups, means that we simply cannot state anything safely as regards the chronology of the arrival of specific cultural and linguistic elements in an area. The fact that the Hattians were not Indo-European does not imply that they were settled in Anatolia before what a migrationist theory would deem the "arrival" of the Hittites and Luwians (or rather Proto-Anatolian), nor can the degree of internal variance in alleged demographic waves in terms of linguistic and cultural "lineage" be safely assessed.

2. *Let's move backwards*

2.1. *The linguistic and cultural map of Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age*

As the imperialistic adventure of the 14th century BCE's Hittite rulers[7] produced a wave of diffusion of the Anatolian linguistic (and epigraphic) traditions

---

6. On the non-Indo-European substrata of the Indian subcontinent see the introduction by Woodard (2008: 3-5).

7. We obviously refer to the formation of the so-called Hittite Empire during the 14th century BCE: while the use of the term "empire" is probably too daring when applied to interregional

outside of their original areas, let's start our journey backwards from the situation we can assess from the early Late Bronze Age (from the 16th century BCE).

The cuneiform sources that are available, and their interpretation by historians, archaeologists, and linguists, allow us to describe at least a few "civilizations" that inhabited Anatolia and modern Eastern Turkey.

The Hattian component is the only linguistically attested non-Indo-European one and we can assume that, at this stage, it coexisted with Hittite at least in the central bend of the Kızılırmak river,[8] with Hittite possibly having spread from the South Eastern parts of Cappadocia (but this is a case of political expansion, not a proto-historical migration!). As for the Indo-European ones, we can place the Hittite area in the same area as the Hattian one (with a wider extension to the lands south of the river, regardless of the direction of such an expansion). The Palaeans were probably settled in the North, somewhere in Bithynia and Paphlagonia,[9] while the Luwians were generically settled both in the Central and Western Anatolia and in Cilicia, where we know from historical sources that the Northern Mesopotamian Hurrian elements were beginning to intrude (again, in terms of political expansion, perhaps producing some sort of mixed culture that might already have had some impact on the local linguistic varieties).

Other components are however more difficult to place in a specific geographical position. This is especially valid for the best attested Iron Age languages: Lycian (A and B), Lydian, and Carian (as well as the later Sidetic and Pisidian) certainly did not appear out of the blue during the 1st millennium BCE.

The geographical collocation of the Bronze Age forefathers of the Lycians (the peoples of Lukka) in almost the same region that the Lycians will occupy during the Iron Age is generally unproblematic, at least if one deals with the issue at a

---

formations that preceded the Neo-Assyrian and Achaemenid ones, the wide geographical horizon of the Hittite influence is what matters for the purpose of the present paper, because it was certainly responsible for the diffusion of the Luwian linguistic element to Syria.

8. For a discussion of a possible wider area of diffusion of Hattian (or, at least, of Hattian toponyms), see Simon (2018: 263-264), with reference to previous scholarship.

9. But see Simon (2018: 263-264) for the possibility of a wider diffusion.

macroscopic level.[10] As for the Carians, whether or not they can be identified with the Bronze Age land of Karkiša remains open to debate.[11]

The problem of the origin of the Lydians on the other hand is extremely interesting, as it represents a fantastic example of how two half-hints should not be considered equivalent to a whole piece of evidence, especially when they do not complete each other but actually represent generalisations within the frameset of different scientific approaches. The "Lydian homeland" would allegedly lie in the northwestern part of the Anatolian peninsula. While the material culture that emerges in the Hermos area around the 12th century BCE[12] may or may not be connected with the Lydian peoples, the idea that their original geographical region extended further to the North derives from surprisingly weak and scattered arguments. First, it has appeared linguistically tempting to consider Lydian as closer to the Luwic languages than to Hittite.[13] While cultural evidence, being late, should not be used to support linguistic genealogical proximity, some other arguments are more technical, and include, for instance, the presence of shared morphological traits. The problem of the filiation of Lydian is complex and we are not going to discuss it here; it will suffice to emphasise that genealogical proximity, if any, does not entail geographical contiguity at all stages of the diachronic development of an area. That the Lydians were probably always settled in the Western area of Anatolia is also historically and archeologically convincing. The problems come when one proposes a northern homeland, such as the one suggested in the following map, based on the one published by Melchert (2003: 9 Map 1):

10. But cf. the outstanding monograph by Gander (2010), with detailed discussion of many specific details that remain problematic.

11. Cf. Simon (2015) for a critical discussion; Hawkins (2013: 36) for a reply to Simon's criticism (the article appeared before Simon's one, but it quotes the original conference presentation). Cf. also Schürr (2018) and Oreshko (2019, in particular 140-144).

12. For an overview see Roosevelt et al. (2018).

13. For a recent overview and proposal regarding the genealogical relationships of the Anatolian languages, see Rieken (2017).

Figure 1: the alleged Lydian homeland

The position of the tentative collocation of the label "Lydian" (duly followed by a question mark) in this map is basically that of the heart of Mysia. Why Mysia? If one ignores the obviously unreliable observation by Strabo (*Geography* XII 8.3, Jones 1928) according to which the Mysian language would have been μιξολύδιον … καὶ μιξοφρύγιον (a mix of Lydian and Phrygian), the only serious reason would be that Lydia proper was probably a part of a Luwian area in the Late Bronze Age.[14] As the southern regions are no viable alternative, because they correspond to Caria and Lycia, a possible solution appears to be to move north.

The biggest problem with this line of thinking is the confusion between the "politically Luwian" area and the "culturally/demographically Luwian" area.[15] Even if the Ephesos/Sardis region was part of a world that was politically dominated by the Luwian-speaking(?) dynasties of Western Anatolia, this tells us little as regards the presence of a local Lydian demographic component, that may very well have been already there.[16] The history of the Ancient Near East is constellated with situations in which substrata are invisible or almost invisible until a catastrophic

14. Another argument that appeared in literature, based on the alleged etymologies of the very toponym Maša, has been convincingly refuted by Simon (2021: 189).

15. The very concept of a politically Luwian area is certainly confusing: we simply use it to refer to a kingdom ruled by a king who bears a Luwian name and acts as an opponent to the Hittite campaigns in Western Anatolia. This would, e.g., apply to Arzawa, but also to the Šeha River Land.

16. For a critical discussion of the evidence for the diffusion or Luwian in Western Anatolia, see Yakubovich (2010), Chapter 2. A lively debate followed, which cannot be discussed in detail, but was very recently critically assessed by Melchert (2020).

socio-political change makes them emerge and reach the surface. The Aramaeans were almost certainly already settled in Syria centuries before the Dark Age crisis overturned the Bronze Age socio-cultural and political constructs, and the same pattern applies to the emergence of the Indo-European elements in Elam or the Chaldean elements in Southern Mesopotamia.

This means that there are no compelling historical reasons to think that the Lydians moved to Lydia from Northern regions. Are there compelling linguistic reasons to think that? As a matter of fact, Lydian shares with Luwian and Lycian at least one important feature that is easily explained as a contact-induced areal shift: the so-called *i*-mutation, changing in /i/ the thematic vowel of the animate nouns and adjectives, only at the direct cases (nominative, accusative). As this change cannot be described in terms of a phonetic sound-law, it is unlikely to be a genetic inheritance (although the possibility, of course, exists), so its areal diffusion (e.g. in Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian, to mention only the major attested languages) would be a very suitable explanation if the area in which these languages were used coincided with what we could indicate as "southern" or "southwestern" Anatolia.

Apart from the cultures and areas we can at least tentatively describe, even for the Late Bronze Age there are portions of Anatolia as well as of the non-peninsular portions of modern Turkey that remain impervious to reconstruction.

Moving from Bithynia towards the Pontus, we first encounter the regions that are commonly identified with Pala and Tummana, the former considered, in principle, to be the area of origin of the population(s) that spoke Palaic. Identifying a clear boundary between the area one may want to reconstruct as culturally Palaic and the areas that were Hattian and later Hittite, is difficult. It is also difficult to establish the extension and diffusion of a culturally Palaic region (or even of a corresponding political entity). In general, Pala is also connected with the area of Hakpiš, which during the Hittite imperial age, was a stronghold against the diffusion of the non-Indo-European and allegedly tribal Kaška peoples (for a synthesis on Pala, Corti 2017). Whether the diffusion of the Kaška should be seen as intrusive – replacing the former Palaic culture – or rather as the emergence of a demographic component that already inhabited the area is impossible to tell, unless one wants to support a hardly believable pan-migrationist model of ancient history.

Figure 2: the map of the Anatolian polities mentioned in the Hittite texts, based on the analysis by Devecchi (2017)

Another problematic area is obviously the North West, at least if one refuses – or at least doubts, as we do – the northern Lydian homeland hypothesis. The identification of a few pretty convincing Luwic loanwords that enter Greek and show a peculiar presence of voiced initial stops led Simon (2017a) to hypothesise that a Luwic language that did not neutralise the sonority opposition of initial stops might have existed somewhere on the northern coast of Western Turkey.[17] This hypothesis, in our opinion, has merit, but it slightly overemphasises the regularity of sound-change and preservation in contact scenarios. This means that if transmission was possible *not only* in case of a peculiar Luwic language with voiced initial stops, the

17. Simon (2017a: 253): «die Region des nördlichen Aktivitätsbereichs der Mykener entlang der Westküste Kleinasiens».

area of transmission of loans like δέπας (a goblet), γάγγαμον (a net), and βορβύλα (a food) could have been any Western Anatolian region with a significant Mycenaean presence (provided that the borrowing happened in the Bronze Age, which can be proven only for Gr. δέπας Myc. *di-pa*, if it is indeed a loan).[18]

In any case, all these problems regard the final centuries of the Late Bronze Age, when historical hints of a Luwian presence exist even in the northern areas of western Anatolia. Especially starting with the 14th century BCE, historical and archaeological data demonstrate that Mycenaean groups were settled in specific sites of Asia Minor too, and the poorly but positively preserved materials from the Hittite diplomatic interactions with the Ahhiyawa polity as well as with the kingdom of Wiluša – the latter being now almost unanimously[19] identified with Homeric Troy – might hint at the fact that the Northern areas of the coasts may have also been an interface area.

Regardless of the details which are unknown, and of the actual intensity of the contacts, which is still debated by scholars,[20] the Late Bronze Age Greek-Anatolian interface scenario seems to result from an eastbound expansion of the sphere of influence of the Mycenaean world. On the contrary, the situation in the first centuries of the Late Bronze Age, which may have resulted in later substrate patterns, is unknown (which implies that trying to connect any later archaeological *facies* with one of the *known* cultures of Western Anatolia, such as the Luwic peoples or the Lydians, is extremely risky).

If different methodological views may lead to a more or less pessimistic attitude towards the reconstruction of the situation in the North-West, the North-East is quite unanimously considered mysterious. The historical data we possess for the Hittite imperial age (starting from the mid 14th century BCE) about lands like Azzi and Hayaša would point to a politically fluid situation, but this may depend on the filter of the Hittite perspective. Indirect linguistic links, such as the hypothetical connection of the toponym Hayaša with the modern name of Armenia (*Hayastan*),[21] might perhaps have some merit, but toponyms are easily maintained even

18. For details see Simon (2017a).

19. For further details, see now Giusfredi (in press), with reference to previous scholarship. For a recent paper arguing against the identification, see also Schürr (2019).

20. Cf. Giusfredi (in press).

21. The connection is doubtful for both formal and historical reasons. On the formal similarity issues, see Kitazumi (2013). Historically, no traces exist of a continuation of the toponym in Urartian (a language that must have existed even during the Bronze Age, even if it is undocumented), where on the contrary, the toponym Armenia might have formally originated as a denomination for the

after large cultural and linguistic shifts, so even the available hints are not really helpful for reconstructing the situation of the Eastern Pontus region at the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. As for Eastern Anatolia, the political formations of Alzi and Išuwa are equally mysterious when it comes to the matter of their population and culture: they acted as interfaces between the Hittite and Hurrian areas of influence. The names of the Išuwean rulers are indeed Hurrian (among others, Ali-Šarruma and Ehli-Šarruma, cf. Devecchi 2017), but also in this case we are dealing with names from the royal élite that do not necessarily reflect the composition of the population. The Luwian names from the Korucutepe sealings (Güterbock 1973) may reflect an imported Hittite élite.

Moving towards south-eastern Anatolia, the same principle applies to the region known as Pahhuwa, where there is virtually no way to formulate hypotheses regarding local linguistic substrata (Devecchi 2017).[22] Onomastic evidence from this region is likewise meagre, and eventually inconclusive. A local, but not necessarily indigenous, functionary attested on the single seal coming from the Late Bronze Age levels of Arslantepe, i.e. Hittite Malitiya, bore a Luwian name, Kurunti(ya) (CERVUS$_3$-ti). Another name attested on a seal certainly dating to the pre-Empire Late Bronze Age, but migrated into Iron Age levels, is *Pi-ti-ku-sà$^?$*, which might contain the Hurrian element *benti(p)-* "rightful, right (velsim.)" as its first element (Mora *apud* Manuelli 2013: 268-269). Throughout the earliest Late Bronze Age phases (Level VB: ca. 17th-15th BCE) archaeological assemblages from Arslantepe display an interesting combination of Central Anatolian elements and local traditions continued from the Middle Bronze Age (Manuelli 2013). Strong contacts with the Upper Euphrates area, roughly corresponding to Išuwa, are evident throughout the Late Bronze Age sequence. This would concur with the historical information to show that the Arslantepe/Malitiya area worked as a sort of buffer zone between the Hittite core and the easternmost peripheries, to be seen in the context of international power struggles first with Mittani and later with the Middle Assyrian kingdom.

mixed Aramaic-Urartian area of the Upper Tigris (KUR *Arme* in the Sarduri texts; cf. Diakonoff – Kashkai (1981: 11), but also the different critical interpretation offered in Schmitt (2008); one may wish to cautiously compare the name of the first ruler of Urartu, *Aramu*, as a proof of the linguistic and cultural cohabitation in the area).

22. The name of Mita, recorded in the Hittite sources, must however be mentioned. Its apparent similarity to the Phrygian name of Midas was already noticed by Gurney (1948: 45-47), but while the comparison might yield historical speculations (Wittke 2004: 61-62), no connection has been proved in a conclusive fashion.

2.2. *The Middle and Early Bronze Age*

A holistic understanding of Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2000-1650 BCE) cultural-linguistic dynamics has to cope with a state of the art that is even more polarised than the one seen for the Late Bronze Age. On one hand, an impressive amount of textual data retrieved from the *kārum* of Kaneš (or Neša)/Kültepe depicts in great detail the commercial activities carried out by Old Assyrian merchants in Central Anatolia (Larsen 2015). These documents also yield abundant background information on the Anatolian socio-cultural scenario that confirms that Indo-European groups were already settled in the region, cohabiting with non-Indo-European Anatolians (e.g. Hattians), as well as with the foreign merchants seasonally or permanently residing in the main commercial stations (Michel 2002; Dercksen 2004; Goedegebuure 2008). Significantly, in later documents, Hittites will call their own language *nešili*, i.e. "Nešaean", thus suggesting that this was the main linguistic component with which Assyrians interacted at Kaneš/Neša. This would align with available onomastic data drawn from the *kārum* tablets that would point to Hittite, or better a variant thereof (Kloekhorst 2019), as the main component among others (see below). On the other hand, the Kültepe texts relate only to a fraction of Anatolia, comprising the Central and Eastern inland regions, leaving other areas completely out of focus. Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence can compensate only in part to this unbalanced situation. In fact, entire patches of land that are also situated outside the Old Assyrian trade network, especially the West, still remain ignored or poorly explored.[23] In this state of the art, any tentative reconstruction of ethno-linguistic interactions aiming to proceed beyond the Old Assyrian epigraphic corpus shall by necessity start from it.

The Old Assyrian trade network in Anatolia was part of a large commercial enterprise financially supported by central institutions, i.e. the palace and temples, as well as influential households residing in the Assyrian capital Aššur, but materially carried out by individual trade agents moving back and forth from different locations abroad and often residing there for relatively long periods. The bulk of the written documentation is thus represented by letters, receipts, and contracts, written in Old Assyrian cuneiform on clay tablets, and exchanged among various stakeholders involved in the network. Notwithstanding the contingent use and mundane matters mostly dealt with, these documents incidentally provide quite a

---

23. It is symptomatic of this state of the art that some of the most recent overviews on Anatolian pre-Hellenistic civilizations (Sagona – Zimansky 2009; Steadman – McMahon 2011) almost completely ignore Western Anatolia in their sections on the Middle Bronze Age.

FEDERICO GIUSFREDI – ALVISE MATESSI

clear picture of the indigenous Anatolian socio-cultural landscape, including geographical information that, compared with the later Hittite documentation and the available archaeological data, enables a quite safe reconstruction of the network's spatial scope (Barjamovic 2011; 2017). We know therefore that Assyrian commercial activities in Anatolia relied on a series of stations, hierarchically organised in *kārum* (main station) and *wabartum* (minor station), associated with major indigenous urban centres. The *kārum* of Kaneš, modern Kültepe (Kayseri province), was the primary node in this system, towards which all commodities and communications converged before flowing in either direction of trade.

The centres directly involved in the Old Assyrian network were distributed over a wide area, extending between the Taurus, the bend of the Halys River, and the Phrygian highlands down to the northern Konya plain. Other areas of Anatolia known for their relevance throughout the Bronze Age remained quite marginal in the Old Assyrian network if not even out of its focus. The most striking among such cases is certainly Cilicia, that yet represents a well-known natural passage and, since early prehistory, one of the main gateways in overland connections between Central Anatolia and the south and east (Renfrew – Dixon – Cann 1966; Palmisano 2018: 141-44). Another important area to consider in relation to trade networks but ignored by Old Assyrian routes is Western Anatolia that throughout the Early Bronze Age had represented the main interface between Aegean and Near Eastern spheres of interaction (Korfmann 2001; Şahoğlu 2005; Efe 2007). Unlike Western Anatolia, arguably too far from the Assyrian merchants' reach to be directly involved in their activities, Cilicia could be easily accessed from the Levant through the Amanus passes and has been part of the Syro-Mesopotamian system of contacts since the Chalcholithic period. Therefore, the exclusion of Cilicia from the Old Assyrian network would require another explanation more than mere geography, taking into account the commercial realities of the Near East during the Middle Bronze Age.

To begin with, it is now clear that the Assyrians were not alone in the commercial landscape of the Near East but part of a wider system of interlocking networks that joined Central Asia to Southeastern Europe (Barjamovic 2018; Massa – Palmisano 2018). In this context, Aššur was just one among several hotspots in Near Eastern trade, others being known from Lower Mesopotamia (Sippar), the Middle Euphrates (Mari, Karkemiš), the Levant (Ebla, Aleppo, Ugarit), and the Aegean (Minoan Crete). Likewise, there are reasons to think that several interacting circuits were active in Anatolia itself. An oft-cited Old Assyrian text warns an Anatolian ruler against dealing with 'Akkadian'-i.e. Babylonian-merchants, thus

incidentally revealing the presence of competing agents operating in nearby networks (Ceçen – Hecker 1995).

A number of elements now convincingly points to the Cilician involvement into one or more of these non-Assyrian networks. A *bulla* with an Akkadian cuneiform inscription unearthed at Tilmen Höyük suggests that in the early 2nd millennium BCE this site participated in trading activities possibly controlled by Babylonian centers (Marchesi 2013). Significantly, Tilmen is located close to the Amanian Gates (Bahçe Pass) giving access to the Cilician Plain, and thus controlling traffic in this direction. In the Cilician Plain itself, cylinder seals belonging to North-West Syrian stylistic traditions have been found at Tatarlı Höyük (Girginer –Collon 2014), while Tarsus has yielded an Old Babylonian seal (Goldman 1956: 230 Fig. 393, no. 28.35810; Palmisano 2018: 72-74). A few kilometres to the west, Sirkeli is now yielding evidence of a very extensive upper and lower town complex dating to the Middle Bronze Age that may well parallel the compound of citadel and *kārum* featuring Kaneš and other Old Assyrian trading posts in Central Anatolia. On the top of that, several finds from the Middle Bronze Age levels at this site seem to attest connections with North-West Syrian centres (Elsen-Novák – Novák 2020).

In turn, Cilicia was certainly well connected with Central Anatolia, as part of a circuit interlocking with the Old Assyrian network. Stamp seals/impressions belonging to Central Anatolian traditions feature at Sirkeli and Tilmen Höyük (Hrouda 1997; Marchetti 2011: 80-81, 94-95 Fig. 4.32). Crescent-shaped loom weights, typical of Central Anatolian weaving practices, are also common in Cilicia (Ahrens 2019, with further literature). Conversely, Cilicia might have worked as a gateway for the diffusion of Old Syrian- and Old Babylonian-style seals/impressions in Central Anatolia (Barjamovic 2019: 76; Palmisano 2018: 72-74). Specimens of Syro-Cilician ware, a class of painted pottery produced in Cilicia and the Levant between the 18th and the 16th century BCE, made their way to the Old Assyrian *kārū* of Acemhöyük and Kaneš, possibly via Porsuk, on the Cilician Gates (Bulu 2017; Matessi [in press]).

Due to its central position and rich settlement history, another major area of interaction during the Middle Bronze Age must have been the Konya plain (Massa et al. 2020; Barjamovic 2019). This region was only marginally involved in the Assyrian trade through the *wabartum* of Uš(š)a, which is, however, poorly attested in the Kārum-period corpus (Barjamovic 2011: 335-336, 370-372; Barjamovic – Gander 2015). Published archaeological record for the Middle Bronze Age in the Konya plain, almost exclusively limited to the glyptic corpus excavated at Konya-

Karahöyük (Alp 1968), supplements some additional material.[24] According to Barjamovic (2019: 75) the main referent of trades carried out in the Konya plain could have been Ebla, a hypothesis supported by the finding of several Old Syrian-style cylinder seals/impressions at Konya-Karahöyük. If so, the Konya plain would have been closely tied with Cilicia, possibly along trajectories of contact already at work in the Early Bronze Age (Efe 2007). As a matter of fact, specimens of crescent-shaped loom weights of Central Anatolian style closely matching Karahöyük examples have been found at Kilise Tepe, in the Göksu valley, which represents the natural link between Cilicia and the Konya plain (Collon – Symington 2007: 464).

In addition to the overland networks, seaborne contacts ought to play into the Middle Bronze Age patterns of interaction in Anatolia (Massa – Palmisano 2018). These mainly involved a Cypriot and an Aegean circuit. The former reached Central Anatolia, at Kültepe, through North Syrian and/or Cilician mediation (Kozal 2017: 88-89, 94). Middle Bronze Age Aegean artifacts do not seem to reach beyond the Minoan colonies on the Ionian coast (Kozal 2006: 185-188). However, some use of Aegean weighting systems is documented at Kültepe, thus indirectly attesting far-reaching connections between the Aegean and the Assyrian trading network (Palmisano 2018: 54-56). Even with the lack of direct archaeological proof, there is little doubt that inland Western Anatolia played a major role in enhancing these relations, nesting upon trajectories of material flow already at play during the Early Bronze Age (Massa and Palmisano 2018). The *kārum* of Purušhattum (Hittite Purušhanda) known from the Kültepe tablets seems to have worked as an interstitial market marshalling the interchange between the Assyrian and the Aegean/Western Anatolian trading circuits (Barjamovic 2011: 357-377).

As already emphasised, the linguistic map broadly arguable from the historical records of the Late and Middle Bronze Ages did not come out of the blue, but had a long incubation in the 3rd millennium BCE, termed the Early Bronze Age, and possibly even earlier. This period is not documented by native records and very little by foreign ones. The (semi-)fictional accounts of Akkadian kings' ventures in Central Anatolia, known only from later versions, concur with the archaeological record to indicate the presence of long-distance trading networks prefiguring subsequent ones (Osborne 2018). A few possible Anatolian names and a suggested loanword in the Ebla tablets would indicate that Anatolian languages were already present in the region and its surroundings by the 24th century BCE (Watson 2008;

---

24. Some scholars identify Konya-Karahöyük with Ušša itself: see Forlanini (1998: 226); Barjamovic – Gander (2015: 507). But see also the later Forlanini (2008: 67), who proposes a localisation in the district of Kadınhanı, northwest of Konya.

Archi 2011). Beside these few hints, in addressing the Early Bronze Age we technically enter into the darkness of a mute prehistory. Therefore, any assessment of linguistic relevance for the Early Bronze Age and earlier periods can only be made by proceeding backwards from later sources and tested whenever possible against the archaeological record. Here we come to a first conundrum in our analysis: how deep in time does the linguistic situation attested in Anatolia during the 2nd millennium BCE have its roots? Given the affiliation of Proto-Anatolian to the Indo-European family, the answer to this question strictly depends on our views on the relationship between Anatolia and Indo-European population groups.

Traditionally, Anatolian is considered to have separated early from the Proto-Indo-European family, because of some features that make the group stand out among related languages. While some aspects of this problem have been convincingly reviewed and revised in recent years (see Melchert [in press] with extensive reference to previous scholarship), a recurring problem is the absence, in Hittite, of some categories that emerge in other branches of the family. There is no need here to delve into the details of this problem, but we consider nonetheless useful to briefly discuss its broader implications.

Some scholars interpret the peculiarities of Anatolian as a simplification from an earlier complexity that was instead retained by the other Indo-European languages (*Schwundhypothese*). Others, on the contrary, retain that Proto-Anatolian preserves a pristine situation that would have evolved later in more complex systems.[25] Advocating the latter view, starting from the 1920s it was proposed that Hittite, and thence Proto-Anatolian as later defined, was not a daughter language of Proto-Indo-European but rather a sister thereof, and that both Proto-Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European branched out from a common ancestor, later termed "Indo-Hittite" by Sturtevant (1933). Until recently (Drews 2001; Carruba 2009; Kloekhorst 2016), this view was considered too maximalist and remained peripheral to the mainstream debate on Anatolian linguistics.[26] Conversely, the identification of Anatolia as a cradle for Indo-European cultural frameworks, more or less inspired by the Indo-Hittite hypothesis, gained much credit in archaeological research. Besides earlier attempts (Childe 1957[6]), the most influential voice in this respect became Renfrew (1987; 2003) with his "language/farming dispersal" model

25. See Cotticelli-Kurras (2009) and Pisaniello (2020: 29-33) for more details on this debate.

26. Giusfredi (2020a: 18) points out that calling the first stage of a proto-language "Indo-European I," "Indo-Hittite," or "Indo-European with Anatolian" is, in fact, merely a labelling issue. As long as one agrees that Anatolia was the first group to separate from the common family, the only merit of using the label "Indo-Hittite" is the iconicity of the compound.

that proposes a correlation of the Indo-European expansion with the spread of farming from South-Central Anatolia to Europe around 6500 BCE. The model is quite simple because it requires a single factor, the increase in productivity allowed by agriculture, to explain the main motors deemed necessary for large-scale language diffusion: the demographic growth of Indo-European communities and the acceptance of their 'superior' economic organization and related socio-cultural features, including language, by receptive populations of indigenous foragers. From a linguistic point of view, Renfrew focuses on a negative evaluation of 'linguistic paleontology' methods but presents comparatively little positive clues in support of his model.

Renfrew's theory did not meet wide acceptance among historical linguists, who generally retain as unlikely the preservation of the strong similarities encountered among Indo-European languages over the long period (ca. 5000 years) between the Neolithic and the earliest documented linguistic evidence; not to mention the latest attestations (1st millennium CE), which would require an additional 3000 years of conservation of early features (Anthony 2007: 75-81; Melchert 2011). Moreover, a substantial vocabulary, coherently shared among several Indo-European languages including Anatolian ones, such as the vocabulary for "wool," "yoke," and "hitch-pole", is deemed to relate to technological innovations of the 4th and 3rd millennia BCE and thus could not find a way into even late Neolithic language families (Sherratt – Sherratt 1988; Darden 2001; Anthony 2007: 75-81).

The "language/ farming dispersal" model is at least defendable for the European cultural scenario, but it loses even more of its explanatory power when dealing with the eastward trajectories, involving Tocharian and, above all, the Indo-Iranian group. Mesopotamian cuneiform tablets document intense relations with the Iran area since the mid-3rd millennium BCE, and yet the earliest secure traces of an Indo-European penetration begin during the 2nd millennium. Leaving aside the problem of the Harappan script of the Indus Valley and the unknown language(s) codified thereby, the earliest attested one in the Iran area is Elamite, a non-Indo-European language spoken in south-western Iran at least until the early first millennium BCE and still used by the Achaemenid Great Kings in their official inscriptions. In order to cope with these obstacles, Renfrew is forced to accept the traditional later dating for the formation of the Indo-Iranian group (3rd millennium BCE; Renfrew 1996; Mallory 2001), which fits poorly into the general picture.

Rejecting on these bases the "language/ farming dispersal" model, and with it the Anatolian homeland hypothesis, philologists and historians generally agree that Indo-Europeans were intrusive into Anatolia and consequently any contact scenarios must have taken place *after* their arrival and settlement in the region. The classi-

cal view, first proposed by Gimbutas (1970), dates the earliest expansion of Indo-European languages and populations between 4500 and 3000 BCE in conjunction with the diffusion across Eurasia of monumental barrow tombs, the so-called *kurgans*, which occurred in multiple waves originating from the steppes of Ukraine and South Russia. The main pillars of this hypothesis are supposed analogies between the 'Kurgan-culture', largely centered on a pastoral economy and characterised by high mobility enhanced by horse riding and carts, and the hypothetical Indo-European culture reconstructed through the Proto-Indo-European proto-lexicon. Successive migration waves, coupled with the military advantage offered by horse riding, would have allowed aggressive Indo-European pastoralists to prevail over indigenous "Old European" agriculturalists, thus leading to the final success of Indo-European languages. In a thorough synthesis, Anthony (2007); (see also the more recent Anthony – Ringe 2015) has revisited and mitigated the *kurgan* hypothesis, in the frame of a more solid theoretical approach on migration processes. The strong militarism of Gimbutas' reconstruction is thus rejected and replaced by a case-by-case analysis of cultural interactions across Eurasia from the Neolithic to the Late Bronze Age (ca. 6000-1500 BCE), taking into account the social and technological means available in this context. The evidence is clearly too patchy to allow following in all details the multiple streams of migration and cultural encounters involved in the revised *kurgan* model, which unavoidably makes many of Anthony's arguments highly speculative. Nonetheless, seen as a whole, this model seems to offer the closest match with the reconstructed historical and linguistic scenario of the Indo-European expansion in both geographic and chronological terms.

A broad consensus among linguists, including those supporting the Anatolian homeland hypothesis, believes that Anatolian languages started to diverge from one another no later than ca. 2300 BCE and probably much earlier, at the turn of the 4th and 3rd millennia BCE (Melchert 2011). This would point to a separation of Proto-Anatolian from the other Indo-European branches within the 4th millennium (Darden 2001; Lehrman 2001), which is broadly compatible with the scenario reconstructed through the revised *kurgan* model. If this is so, we are then confronted with the problem of how did Indo-European groups first enter the Anatolian peninsula and what kind of interactions did they entertain with each other and with the local ethno-cultural environment, including other non-Indo-European populations, e.g. the Hattians. Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence currently at our disposal is unfit to provide a definitive solution to this problem.

To begin with, there is no cultural break in the Anatolian prehistoric record hitherto available from the Early Chalcolithic period onwards that cannot be explained in terms of internal processes. We are thus to exclude at the onset any hy-

pothesis of swift large-scale migration.[27] In the absence or current unavailability of any coherent set of material evidence allowing a systemic approach to the problem of Indo-Europeanisation in Anatolia and its trajectories, scholars have generally preferred to isolate individual features deemed proxies for an "Indo-European" material culture. This approach appears most symptomatic in scholarly evaluations about the Early Bronze Age cemetery of Alaca Höyük, in North-Central Anatolia.

The Alaca Höyük cemetery is a complex of fourteen shaft graves roofed with timber beams that yielded an astonishing wealth of metal and other objects deposited as burial offerings (Koşay 1944; Koşay – Akok 1966; Gürsan-Salzmann 1992). Most graves contained adult individuals facing west in a flexed position, while others displayed secondary inhumations of either articulated or disarticulated bodies. Substantial animal sacrifices accompanied the burials. In particular cattle hides, resulting in patterns of skulls-and-hooves after the skin deterioration, were deposited in pairs on the top of the graves. The highly symbolic value attached to cattle hides, as well as the grave architecture and the rich paraphernalia, bear resemblances to the *kurgan* burials of the Maikop culture, in the North-West Caucasus, and the Yamnaya horizon of the Russian steppe. On this basis, Gimbutas (Gimbutas 1970: 181-182; see also Bachhuber 2015: 13) proposed that the Alaca Höyük tombs and the similar complex of Horoztepe, ca. 170 km north east of Alaca, were the work of Indo-European chiefs coming from the Caucasus. Bronze standards and stag and bull figurines, the most evocative finds in the Alaca Höyük metal assemblage, have been interpreted as fittings for wagons, whose traction could be on the other hand, symbolically represented by the pairings of cattle. On this basis, Orthmann (1967) and others (e.g. Mansfeld 2001) drew parallels with the interment of wagons, as practiced in the 2nd millennium BCE barrow burials at Trialeti in the Caucasus, where pairings of cattle are also represented by skulls and hooves.

The main problem with these proposed parallels is chronological. The contextualization of the Alaca Höyük cemetery has for a long time been at the centre of scholarly debates, with arguments revolving around cross-dating comparisons and often unreliable stratigraphic data (see remarks by Özyar 1999). However, recent radiocarbon dates would bracket the foundation and use of the burials within the earlier phases of the Early Bronze Age, between 2800-2600 BCE (Yalçın 2011). This makes the Alaca Höyük cemetery several centuries younger than the Maikop kurgans, now firmly set around the mid-4th millennium BCE (Anthony 2007: 290,

27. Significantly, recent archaeobiological research also shows a general genetic continuity in Anatolian population groups from ca. 6500 down to the end of the 2nd millennium BCE (Skourtanioti et al. 2020).

with literature), and about one millennium older than the Late Trialeti complex (Sagona 2017: 332-338). The Yamnaya wagon graves of the Pontic-Caspian steppes would offer a closer chronological match (3400-2600 BCE, Anthony 2007: 300-339), but then intermediate geographic links are missing making any cross-comparison a hazardous exercise. Be this as it may, the whole wagon burial argument can be misleading. Considering the good preservation of wooden planks making up the roofs of the Alaca Höyük tombs, one would also expect to find equally well-preserved wagon components were these included in the funerary equipment (Zimmermann 2006: 512-514). As Zimmermann insists, the association of the highly elaborated bronze standards from Alaca with wagons also finds no firm support in either contemporary or later figurative evidence from Anatolia.[28] On the other hand, the ritual association with cattle does not set Alaca Höyük apart from coeval funerary contexts in Anatolia. Cattle hides' patterns of skull-and-hooves feature in the EBA III funerary assemblage from Resuloğlu, not far from Alaca Höyük, while whole bull carcasses have been buried in pairs the necropoleis of Demircihöyük-Sarıket (ca. 2700-2550 BCE) and Çavdarlı Höyük in Central West Anatolia (Massa 2014). In neither of these cases are cattle associated with any evidence of vehicle transportation, and the animal remains are rather interpreted as the result of consumption in funerary feasts celebrated in honour of high-status individuals. Some distant relations of Anatolian cattle burials with sacrificial practices of the northern Pontic steppe or the Caucasus cannot be excluded, but these are no more than vague reminiscences locally reinterpreted within sets of regionally diverse traditions.

Due to the general impossibility of matching a specific assemblage of cultural-material findings with any of the leading hypotheses of an Indo-European original penetration in Anatolia, the identification of an Indo-European area (or, more specifically, a Hittite or a Luwic one) as opposed to a non-Indo-European (e.g. a Hattian one) is precluded. Even the diachronic anteriority of the settlement of one or another linguistic group can only be assumed in a speculative fashion.

Speakers of Indo-European languages are more likely to have entered Anatolia through slow-paced movements of small groups, which are generally more elusive, if not altogether invisible in the archaeological record.[29] This bears consequences as to the possibility to recognise the geographical collocation of the different Anatolian or non-Anatolian cultures that ended up producing the Middle Bronze Age

---

28. But see Bachhuber (2015: 36-37), on objects from private collections said to be originating from near Alaca Höyük.

29. For an archaeological approach to migration see Anthony (1990).

mixed-culture we may reconstruct from the earliest documentary archives. This scenario would also require us to explain sociolinguistic mechanisms of assimilation through dynamic peer-to-peer interactions between coexisting communities of speakers rather than the top-down imposition of a language, or group of languages, over a substratum through military or demographic prevarication (Melchert 2003: 21, with further literature).

3. *Matching linguistic and archaeological data*

A scenario in which the Indo-European and non-Indo-European settlements of Anatolia result from gradual slow-paced movements does not deny migrations as a general model, but it certainly reduces their implications when one comes to the matter of trying to describe the "homelands" of a cultural group that can, at best, be described as the result of a process of speculative reconstruction. This applies not only to the *Frage nach der indogermanischen Urheimat*, but also to any anti-parallel attempts at looking for the Hattians in the cultural-material assemblages of a given northern or eastern peripheral area of the Anatolian region.

This statement, however, should not be taken too pessimistically, as some sort of *crux desperationis*. Indeed, a less polarised situation is certainly a promising scenario when we come to the later phase of the Early Bronze Age and to the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age. Indeed, the picture we begin to be able to draw for the centuries of the Assyrian trading posts in Cappadocia is certainly better, but it should not be projected as a consistent pattern over too large an area. The situation emerging from the epigraphic documents of the *kārum* Kaneš, for instance points to the presence of a number of different peoples in the city, including Hittites and Assyrians (the larger components), a significant minority of peoples with Luwian names, some Hattian names, and a few Hurrian ones (cf. Bilgiç 1954; Garelli 1963: 155-158; Wilhelm 2008; Yakubovich 2010; Kloekhorst 2019; Giusfredi 2020b; Yakubovich 2020). The non-Assyrian networks in Anatolia, hitherto known from archaeological data alone, might have been superimposed on a similarly mixed situation but with different proportions and, perhaps, even different languages. Had we access to larger collections of documents from other gateways of the trading network, e.g. Hattuša, we may expect the situation to be different (perhaps with more Hattian names and fewer Hurrian ones?). Had we access to documents coming from the gateways of the western networks, e.g. Purušhanda, or to some archive in the Konya plain we may expect an equally mixed scenario, but the Luwian onomastic material would in all likelihood prevail over a minority of

Hittite, Hattian, and Semitic names. In Cilicia we might expect a prevalent Hurrian and Luwian melting pot, with very little Hittite or Hattian.

The evidence for a mixed and to some extent multilinguistic society is still overwhelming for Middle Bronze Age Anatolia. Even though some specific details can be challenged, the case made by Goedegebuure (2008) for Hattian-Anatolian linguistic contacts pre-dating the Kārum-period is still solid:

1.   Hattian exhibits some structures that typologically pattern with OV languages and are unusual in VO languages, including the: modifier – noun order; *in situ* wh-element[30] in questions; proper noun preceding common noun in appositions; predicate-copula order in copular clauses.[31]

2.   If the -*šara*- and -(*a*)*šri*- non-grammatical natural feminines of Anatolian are agglutinative-like structures (as argued in Giusfredi – Pisaniello 2020), then they may have been induced by the influence of Hattian natural gender feminines. Assuming this explanation is correct, the structures would have originated before the Kārum-period, because by that time they had already entered the antrhoponomastic material.

3.   Palaic and Hattian may share a free morpheme -*pi* (written by the sign BI) with contrastive function, as opposed to the inherited -*pa* of Luwian and -(*m*)*a* of Hittite.[32] The induction of a morpheme is a kind of borrowing that requires more intense contact than the exchange of lexical loanwords.

4.   Palaic and Hattian may also have shared a labial or bilabial fricative, rendered in cuneiform as WA_a and WU_u in the Hittite scribal praxis. If the feature is shared, it involves structural phonological interference.

---

30. Goedegebuure (2008: 163) speaks of «free placement of question - word».

31. Other examples by Goedegebuure (2008: 163), such as the SOV instead of VSO order in initial clauses and the position of the subordinate clause, are best left out: the former is hard to assess in written-only languages, and the latter may easily depend on the line by line rendering in translation texts. However, they are theoretically impeccable and may be valid as well. It is also worth noticing that language contact is only one of the possible explanations for even the more convincing patterns presented by Goedegebuure: typological universals are not infallible, and languages exist that seem to simply exhibit contradictory patterns such as OV order and head initial prepositional phrases (Latin being the most obvious example).

32. On Hittite -*(m)a* see Hoffner – Melchert (2008: 395-399); on Luwian -*pa* cf. Giusfredi (2020a: 175-177).

Combined with the mixed onomastic material and the traces of linguistic interference coming from the *kārum* archives, the picture appears consistent with a culturally mixed Anatolia that must have existed even in the Early Bronze Age.

This, in turn, has consequences on the way we should assess the mixed nature of the Late Bronze Age Anatolian society. This pattern derives, in all likelihood, from earlier phases in which contacts had been at work for centuries, so that the non-linguistic data we can collect from the pre-literate ages of Anatolian prehistory probably reflect culturally and linguistically fluid situations, rather than "original" polarised *Urheimaten*. That interference may last long and even occur in different waves is after all, demonstrated by the way the Mesopotamian cultural and linguistic elements entered into the world that would eventually become "Hittite". A first known penetration happened during the Middle Bronze Age, with the Old Assyrian trades and with the emergence of Anatolian scribes trained in Assyrian, but with surprisingly little influence on the future status of Akkadian among the Hittites. A second one must have happened between the age of Anitta and the first historical rulers of the kingdom (in this case, probably via the North-Syrian interface, as proven by some Syro-Mesopotamian features of the Akkadian scribal praxis of Old Hittite Hattuša). A third one occurred during the 15th-14th centuries, with a strong role played by the mediation of the Hurrian world. Yet even in a case like this one that involves medium-to-long distance contacts and for which we possess massive historical and documentary evidence, it is sometimes hard or even impossible to establish whether a given cultural or linguistic feature of an element was borrowed during an earlier or a later "wave of interference".

When massive historical and documentary information is *not* at hand in a general context of mixed cultures in constant attrition and contact with each other, there is no reason to assume that a given non-literate cultural *facies* represented some sort of ethnically recognisable group at its pure state. While the details of proto-historical contact cannot be easily described, especially (but not exclusively) when they regard languages, a fluid scenario that involves an early exchange and circulation of cultural material could be particularly fitting in order to explain some open problems of early language contact proper. For instance, there is evidence, in the Kaneš corpus, of Anatolian mixed-names. It deals with compound personal names that contain both an Anatolian element and an unrecognisable one, which, in more than a few cases, also appears unlikely to be Anatolian. Several examples ending with Luwian-*nani*, "brother, sibling" are, for instance, listed by Yakubovich

(2010: 219), and at least one, *té-li-na-ni*, might even have contained, in our opinion, a Hattian word as its first element.[33]

Another even more promising field of application of a framework that involves early contacts pre-dating the historical age by far as well as a quasi-generalised multicultural scenario regards some very specialised elements of the Hittite "political" lexicon, the "origin" of which has been contended between the supporters of an Indo-European explanation and the supporters of a Hattian one. A fresh and recent example is the noun *tuhukanti-*, which indicates the "crown prince". It was traditionally supposed to be a Hattian term, but Rieken (2016) has shown that some of its features (application of an *i*-theme or perhaps even of *i*-mutation, application of derivational suffix *-ahid-*, secondary rendering of a consonantal cluster as both *tahuk-* and *tuhuk-*) would point to Luwian. As a matter of fact, these data do not necessarily point to a Luwian *origin*, but rather to a phase of transmission that involved Luwian (or Luwic).[34] The prevalence of occurrences that pertain to Hattian contexts, combined with Rieken's felicitous observations, may very well be consistent with a model of complex circulation of the word (as well as of the cultural construct it has as a referent) in an early Anatolian world in which many linguistic and cultural components were already interfering with one another. Of course, the framework would be equally fit for the possibility that loans from Anatolian to Hattian also existed, which would allow the combination of the historical-philological and the linguistic evidence as regards two other highly-debated royal titles of the Hittites, the maybe-Hattian-maybe-Luwian *Tabarna* and *Tawannanna*, for which an Indo-European explanation seems now to be almost certain, but which certainly were borrowed into Hattian (and may have been transmitted to the Hittite royal lexicon by contact with the Hattians, in spite of the ultimate Indo-European etymology). The presence of Akkadian loans (Soysal 2004: 179-180) that somehow entered Hattian (e.g. *kusim*, *kušim* 'throne(?)' < *kussûm*, *kussium*; *kazzue* 'cup' < *kāsu*) would also be quite efficiently explained in an early context of complex cultural and linguistic interference.

33. We do not wish to suggest this analysis as conclusive, because the presence of mixed compound names is a very delicate topic. As for the first element of the compound, the form we compare here is *teli*, "great, big", on which cf. Soysal (2004: 313).

34. For a similar view, see Simon (2017b: 386), who accepts the presence of Luwian inflectional features, but correctly points out that «allerdings folgt daraus nur, dass dieses Wort auch im Luwischen vorhanden war, es muss aber keineswegs ein Erbwort sein».

4. *Conclusion*

In this paper, we have examined the problem of how the study of linguistic and cultural contacts during the historical phases of the history of pre-classical Anatolia could and should be connected with the discussion of the prehistorical and proto-historical patterns known from the non-written sources. Moving backwards from the Late Bronze Age, we dealt with the problem of the core and peripheral areas, as well as with the theoretical issue of the alleged "original" location of linguistically-described populations and groups. We illustrated the limits of the most optimistic approaches, and tentatively proposed an alternative framework, in which the groups of people in Anatolia formed a complex mixed-cultural set well before the age of the first written records, which fits well within the archaeological information as well as the existence of very early evidence for language contact involving at least those languages that we are able to recognise.

5. *References*

AHRENS, Alexander (2019): "'Halbmondförmige' Tonobjekte". In: Mirko Novák – Ekin Kozal – Deniz Yasin (eds.): *Sirkeli Höyük: Ein urbanes Zentrum am Puruna-Pyramos im Ebenen Kilikien. Vorbericht der schweizerisch-türkischen Ausgrabungen 2006-2015*. Schriften zur Vorderasiatischen Archäologie 13. Wiesbaden, 359-364.

ALP, Sedat (1968): *Zylinder- und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya*. Ankara.

ANTHONY, David W. (1990): "Migration in Archeology: The Baby and the Bathwater". *American Anthropologist* 92 (4): 895-914.

ANTHONY, David W. (2007): *The Horse, the Wheel and Language: How Bronze-Age Riders from the Eurasian Steppes Shaped the Modern World*. Princeton – Oxford.

ANTHONY, David W. – RINGE, Don (2015): "The Indo-European homeland from linguistic and archaeological perspectives". *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1: 199-219.

ARCHI, Alfonso (2011): "In Search of Armi". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 63: 5-34.

BACHHUBER, Christoph (2015): *Citadel and Cemetery in Early Bronze Age Anatolia*. Sheffield – Bristol.

BARJAMOVIC, Gojko (2011): *A Historical Geography of Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Colony Period*. CNI Publications 38. Copenhagen.

BARJAMOVIC, Gojko (2017): "A Commercial Geography of Anatolia: Integrating Hittite and Assyrian Texts, Archaeology and Topography". In: Mark Weeden – Lee Z. Ullmann (eds.): *Hittite Landscape and Geography*. HdO I/121. Leiden, 311-318.

BARJAMOVIC, Gojko (2018): "Interlocking Commercial Networks and the Infrastructure of Trade in Western Asia during the Bronze Age". In: Kristian Kristiansen – Thomas Lindkvist – Janken Myrdal (eds.): *Trade and Civilisation*. Cambridge, 113-142.

BARJAMOVIC, Gojko (2019): "Silver, Markets and Long-Distance Trade in the Konya Region, 2400-1700 BCE". In: Çiğdem Maner (ed.): *Crossroads: Konya Plain from Prehistory to the Byzantine Period*. Istanbul, 71-81.

BARJAMOVIC, Gojko – Gander, Max (2015): "Ušša". In: *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 14, 507-508. Berlin.

BILGIÇ, Emin (1954): *Die einheimischen Appellativa der kappadokischen Texte und ihre Bedeutung für die anatolischen Sprachen*. Ankara.

BULU, Müge (2017): "A Syro-Cilician Pitcher from a Middle Bronze Age Kitchen at Tell Atchana, Alalakh". In: Çiğdem Maner – Mara T. Horowitz – Allan S. Gilbert (eds.): *Overturning Certainties in Near Eastern Archaeology. A Festschrift in Honor of K. Aslıhan Yener*. CHANE 90. Leiden, 101-116.

CARRUBA, Onofrio (2009): "Indoeuropei ed Anatolia". In: Franca Pecchioli Daddi – Giulia Torri – Carlo Corti (eds.): *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period: New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence. 7-9 February 2007*. Studia Asiana 9. Roma, 1-11.

CEÇEN, Salih – HECKER, Karl (1995): "Ina mātīka Eblum: Zu einem neuen Text zum Wegerecht in der Kültepe-Zeit". In: Manfred Dietrich – Oswald Loretz (eds.): *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament: Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden zum 85. Geburtstag am 19. Juni 1993*. Neukirchen, 31-41.

CHILDE, V. Gordon (1957[6]): *The Dawn of European Civilization*. London.

COLLON, Dominique – SYMINGTON, Dorit (2007): "Miscellaneous Clay Artefacts". In: Nicholas Postgate – David Thomas (eds.): *Excavations at Kilise Tepe 1994-98, From Bronze Age to Byzantine in Western Cilicia*. Cambridge – London, 449-468.

COOPER, Julien (2017): "Some Observations on Language Contact between Egyptian and the Languages of Darfur and Chad". In: N.N. (eds.): *Mitteilungen der Sudanarchäologischen Gesellschaft zu Berlin e.V.* 28. Berlin, 81-86.

CORTI, Carlo (2017): "The North: Hanhana, Hattena, Ištahara, Hakpiš, Nerik, Zalpuwa, Tummana, Pala and the Hulana River Land". In: Mark Weeden – Lee Z. Ullmann (eds.): *Hittite Landscape and Geography*. HdO I/121. Leiden, 219-238.

COTTICELLI-KURRAS, Paola (2009): "La ricostruzione della protolingua indoeuropea alla luce dei dati anatolici". *Incontri Linguistici* 32: 117-136.

DARDEN, Bill J. (2001): "On the Question of the Anatolian Origin of Indo-Hittite". In: Robert Drews (ed.): *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family: Papers Presented at a Colloquium Hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18-19, 2000*. Washington, 184-228.

DERCKSEN, Jan Gerrit (2004): "Some Elements of Old Anatolian Society in Kaniš". In: id. (ed.): *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*. PIHANS 100. Leiden, 137-177.

DEVECCHI, Elena (2017): "The Eastern Frontier of the Hittite Empire". In: Elena Rova – Monica Tonussi (eds.): *At the Northern Frontier of Near Eastern Archaeology. Recent Research on Caucasia and Anatolia in the Bronze Age*. Subartu 38. Turnhout, 283-297.

DIAKONOFF, Igor M. – KASHKAI, Solmaz M. (1981): *Geographical Names According to Urartian Texts*. RGTC 9. Wiesbaden.

DREWS, Robert (ed.) (2001): *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family: Papers Presented at a Colloquium Hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18-19, 2000*. JIES Monograph 38. Washington.

EFE, Turan (2007): "The Theories of the 'Great Caravan Route' between Cilicia and Troy: The Early Bronze Age III Period in Inland Western Anatolia". *Anatolian Studies* 57: 47-64.

ELSEN-NOVÁK, Gabriele – NOVÁK, Mirko (2020): "Eine kārum-zeitliche Route durch Kilikien? Ein Beitrag zu den mittelbronzezeitlichen Handelsrouten". In: Manuel Ceccarelli – Jessica Baldwin – Jana Matuszak (eds.): *mu-zu an-za₃-še₃ kur-ur₂-še₃ ḫe₂-ĝal₂. Altorientalistische Studien zu Ehren von Konrad Volk*. Münster, 49-68.

FORLANINI, Massimo (1998): "L'Anatolia occidentale e gli Hittiti: Appunti su alcune recenti scoperte e le loro conseguenze per la geografia storica". *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 40: 219-253.

FORLANINI, Massimo (2008): "The Historical Geography of Anatolia and the Transition from the Kārum-Period to the Early Hittite Empire". In: Jan Gerrit Dercksen (ed.): *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. Leiden, 57-86.

GANDER, Max (2010): *Die geographischen Beziehungen der Lukka-Länder*. Texte der Hethiter 27. Heidelberg.

GARELLI, Paul (1963): *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce.* Paris.

GIMBUTAS, Marija (1970): "Proto-Indo-European Culture: The Kurgan Culture during the Fifth, Fourth, and Third Millennia B.C.". In: George Cardona – Henry Hoenigswald – Alfred Senn (eds.): *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Philadelphia, 155-198.

GIRGINER, K. Serdar – COLLON, Dominique (2014): "Cylinder and Stamp Seals from Tatarlı Höyük". *Anatolian Studies* 64: 59-72.

GIUSFREDI, Federico (2020a): *A Study in the Syntax of the Luwian Language*. Heidelberg.

GIUSFREDI, Federico (2020b): "I luvi a Kanesh e i loro nomi". *Aula Orientalis* 38 (2): 245-254.

GIUSFREDI, Federico (in press): "On the Aegean-Anatolian interface in the Final Bronze Age: some historical considerations and their cultural and linguistic implications". Forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference *The Aegean Interface, 19. Grazer Althistorische Adventgespräche, 12-13 December 2019*.

GIUSFREDI, Federico – PISANIELLO, Valerio (2020): "Grammatical Categories in Contact: Gender Assignment Criteria in Hittite Borrowings from the Neighbouring Languages". Forthcoming in: Luka Repanšek – Harald Bichlmeier – Velizar Sadovski (eds.): *vácāmsi miśrā krṇavāmahai Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019*, Hamburg, 209-233.

GOEDEGEBUURE, Petra (2008): "Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattian Symbiosis and the Independent Hittites". In: Jan Gerrit Dercksen (ed.): *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. Leiden, 137-80.

GOLDMAN, Hetty (1956): *Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. II: From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age.* Princeton.

GURNEY, Oliver (1948): "Mita of Pahhuwa". *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 28: 32-47.

GÜRSAN-SALZMANN, Ayşe (1992): *Alaca Höyük: A Reassessment of the Excavation and Sequence of the Early Bronze Age Settlement*. PhD dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav (1973): "Hittite Hieroglyphic Seal Impressions from Korucutepe". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 32: 135-147

HAWKINS J. David (2013): "Luwians versus Hittites". In: Alice Mouton – Ian Rutherford – IlyaYakubovich (eds.): *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language*

and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean. CHANE 64. Leiden – Boston, 25-40.

HROUDA, Barthel (1997): „Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungs-ergebnisse auf dem Sirkeli Höyük/Südtürkei von 1992-1996". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 47: 91- 150.

HOFFNER, Harry A. – Melchert, H. Craig (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. LANE 1. Winona Lake.

KITAZUMI, Tomoki (2013): "Zum Problem der Gleichung heth. *Ḫayaša-* = armen. *haykʿ*". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 163: 511-517.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2016): "The Anatolian Stop System and the Indo-Hittite Hypothesis". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121: 213-248.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2019): *Kanišite Hittite: The Earliest Attested Record of Indo-European*. HdO I/132. Leiden – Boston.

KORFMANN, Manfred O. (2001): "Troia als Drehscheibe des Handels im 2. und 3. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend: Erkenntnisse zur Troianischen Hochkultur und zur maritimen Troia-Kultur". In: Manfred O. Korfmann (ed.): *Traum und Wirklichkeit: Troia*. Stuttgart, 355-368.

KOŞAY, Hâmit Zübeyr (1944): *Ausgrabungen von Alaca Höyük: ein Vorbericht über die im Auftrage der Türkischen Geschichtskommission im Sommer 1936 durchgeführten Forschungen und Entdeckungen*. Ankara.

KOŞAY, Hâmit Zübeyr – AKOK, Mahmut (1966): *Alaca Höyük Kazısı: 1940-1948'deki Çalışmalara ve Kesiflere Aitilk Rapor*. Ankara.

KOZAL, Ekin (2006): *Anatolien im 2. Jt. v.u.Z. und die Hinterlassenschaften materieller Kultur aus dem Ostmittelmeerraum, insbesondere Zyperns*. PhD dissertation. Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

KOZAL, Ekin (2017): *Fremdes in Anatolien. Importgüter aus dem Ostmittelmeerraum und Mesopotamien als Indikator für spätbronzezeitliche Handels- und Kulturkontakte*. SVA 11. Wiesbaden.

LARSEN, Mogens Trolle (2015): *Ancient Kanesh: A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*. New York.

LEHRMAN, Alexander (2001): "Reconstructing Proto-Indo-Hittite". In: Robert Drews (ed.): *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family: Papers Presented at a Colloquium Hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18-19, 2000*. Washington, 106-30.

LIVERANI, Mario (1988): *Antico Oriente: storia, società, economia*. Bari – Roma.

MALLORY, James P. (2001): "Gli Indoeuropei e i popoli delle steppe: il modello della sostituzione delle lingue". In: Gianluca Bocchi – Mauro Ceruti (eds.): *Le*

radici prime dell'Europa. Gli intrecci genetici, linguistici e storici. Milan, 138-64.

MALLORY, James P. – ADAMS, Douglas Q. (1997): *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London – Chicago.

MANSFELD, G. (2001): "Die 'Königsgräber' von Alaca Höyük und ihre Beziehungen nach Kaukasien". *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 33: 19-62.

MANUELLI, Federico (2013): *Arslantepe, Late Bronze Age: Hittite Influence and Local Traditions in an Eastern Anatolian Community*. Arslantepe 9. Rome.

MARCHESI, Gianni (2013): "Tilmen Höyük: An Inscribed Bulla from the 1962 Campaign". In: Nicolò Marchetti (ed.): Gaziantep Regional Project Occasional Publications 7. Bologna, 1-6.

MARCHETTI, Nicolò (2011): *Kinku. Sigilli dell'Età del Bronzo nella regione di Gaziantep in Turchia*. Bologna.

MASSA, Michele (2014): "Early Bronze Age Burial Customs on the Central Anatolian Plateau: A View from Demircihöyük-Sarıket". *Anatolian Studies* 64: 73-93.

MASSA, Michele – BACHHUBER, Christoph – ŞAHIN, Fatma – ERPEHLIVAN, Hüseyin – OSBORNE, James – LAURICELLA, Anthony J. (2020): "A Landscape-Oriented Approach to Urbanisation and Early State Formation on the Konya and Karaman Plains, Turkey". *Anatolian Studies* 70: 45-75.

MASSA, Michele – PALMISANO, Alessio (2018): "Change and Continuity in the Long-Distance Exchange Networks between Western/Central Anatolia, Northern Levant and Northern Mesopotamia, c. 3200-1600 BCE". *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 49: 65-87.

MATESSI, Alvise (in press): "LBA Chronology and Painted Pottery in Inland Southern Anatolia". Forthcoming in: Federico Manuelli – Dirk Paul Mielke (eds.): *Late Bronze Age Painted Pottery Traditions at the Margins of the Hittite State*. Oxford.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2003): "Prehistory". In: id. (ed.): *The Luwians*. Leiden, 8-26.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2011): "Indo-Europeans". In: Sharon R. Steadman – Gregory McMahon (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10.000-323 BCE*. Oxford, 704-716.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2020): "Luwian". In: Rebecca Hasselbach-Andee (ed.): *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*. Hoboken, 239-256.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (in press): "The Position of Anatolian". Forthcoming in: Andrew Garrett – Michael Weiss (eds.): *Handbook of Indo-European Studies*. Oxford.

MICHEL, Cécile (2002): "Le commerce des Assyriens en Anatolie Centrale au début du IIe millénaire av. Jésus-Christ". *Méditerranées* 2002: 13-33.

ORESHKO, Rostislav (2019): "Geography of the Western Fringes. Gar(a)gisa/Gargiya and the Lands of the Late Bronze Age Caria". In: Olivier Henry – Koray Konuk (eds.): *Karia Arkhaia: La Carie, Des Origines a la Periode Pre-Hekatomnide*. Istanbul, 139-189.

ORTHMANN, Winfried (1967): "Zu den Standarten aus Alaca Höyük". *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 17: 34-54.

OSBORNE, James F. (2018): "History and Temporality in Bronze Age Anatolia: The King of Battle Narrative in Archaeological and Historical Tradition". *World Archaeology* 50 (5): 706-722.

ÖZYAR, Aslı (1999): "Reconsidering the 'Royal' Tombs of Alacahöyük: Problems of Stratigraphy According to the Topographical Location of the Tombs". *Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi/ Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology* 2: 75-85.

PALMISANO, Alessio (2018): *The Geography of Trade: Landscapes of Competition and Long-Distance Contacts in Mesopotamia and Anatolia in the Old Assyrian COLONY Period*. Oxford.

PISANIELLO, Valerio (2020): *I suffissi verbali ittiti* -anna/i- *e* -šš(a)-*: studio sul sistema aspettuale ittita*. Studi Linguistici Pisani 10. Pisa.

RENFREW, Colin (1987): *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London.

RENFREW, Colin (1996): "Language Families and the Spread of Farming". In: David R. Harris (ed.): *The Origins and Spread of Agriculture and Pastoralism in Eurasia*. London, 70-92.

RENFREW, Colin (2003): "Time Depth, Convergence Theory and Innovation in Proto-Indo-European: 'Old Europe' as a PIE Linguistic Area". In: Alfred Bammesberger – Theo Vennemann (eds.): *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*. Indogermanische Bibliothek 23. Heidelberg, 17-48.

RENFREW, Colin – DIXON, Jacqueline E. – CANN, Johnson R. (1966): "Obsidian and Early Cultural Contact in the Near East". *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 32: 30-72.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2016): "Zum luwischen Ursprung von heth. LÚ*ta/uḫ(uk)kanti-* 'Kronprinz'". In: Henning Marquardt – Silvio Reichmuth – José Virgilio García Trabazo (eds.): *Anatolica et indogermanica. Studialinguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*. IBS 155. Innsbruck, 267-277.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2017): "The Dialectology of Anatolian". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I.* Berlin – Boston, 298-308.

ROOSEVELT, Christopher H. et al. (2018): "Exploring Space, Economy, and Inter-regional Interaction at a Second-Millennium B.C.E. Citadel in Central Western Anatolia. 2014-2017 Research at Kaymakçı". *American Journal of Archaeology* 122: 645-688.

RUBIO, Gonzalo (1999): "On the Alleged 'Pre-Sumerian Substratum'". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 51: 1-16.

SAGONA, Antonio G. (2017): *The Archaeology of the Caucasus: From Earliest Settlements to the Iron Age*. Cambridge.

SAGONA, Antonio G. – ZIMANSKY, Paul E. (2009): *Ancient Turkey*. London – New York.

ŞAHOĞLU, Vasif (2005): "The Anatolian Trade Network and the İzmir Region during the Early Bronze Age". *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 24: 339-361.

SCHMITT, Rüdiger (2008): "Zu der Fremdbezeichnung Armeniens: altpers. *Armina-*". In: Alexander Lubotsky – Jos Schaeken – Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds.): *Evidence and Counter-Evidence. Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt*. Amsterdam – New York, 499-508.

SCHÜRR, Dieter (2018): "Anmerkungen zum Namen der Karer". *Gephyra* 16: 13-17.

SCHÜRR, Dieter (2019): "Ist Troja das Wilusa der Hethiter?". *Gephyra* 18: 33-56.

SHERRATT, Andrew – SHERRATT, Susan (1988): "The Archaeology of Indo-European: An Alternative View". *Antiquity* 62 (236): 584-595.

SIMON, Zsolt (2015): "Against the Identification of *Karkiša* with the Carians". In: Nicholas Stampolidis – Çiğdem Maner – Kostantinos Kopanias (eds.): *NOSTOI. Indigenous Culture, Migration, and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia During the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age.* Istanbul, 791-810.

SIMON, Zsolt (2017a): "δέπας und die anderen: Spuren eines verschollenen luw(o)iden Dialekts?" *Wékʷos*". *Revue d'études indoeuropéennes* 3: 245-259.

SIMON, Zsolt (2017b): "Review of H. Marquardt – S. Reichmuth – J.V. García Trabazo (eds.), *Anatolica et Indogermanica. Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 74: 383-390.

SIMON, Zsolt (2018): "Zentralanatolische Toponyme auf °šna und ein hattisches Suffix: Zum ursprünglichen Verbreitungsgebiet des Hattischen". *Altorientalische Forschungen* 45: 258-268.

SIMON, Zsolt (2020): "Urindogermanische Lehnwörter in den uralischen und finno-ugrischen Grundsprachen. Eine Fata Morgana?" *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125: 239-265.

SIMON, Zsolt (2021): "The *Mopsos* Names and the Prehistory of the Lydians". In: Michele Bianconi (ed.): *Linguistic and Cultural Interactions between Greece and the Ancient Near East: In Search of the 'Golden Fleece'*. Leiden – Boston, 182-196.

SKOURTANIOTI, Eirini et al. (2020): "Genomic History of Neolithic to Bronze Age Anatolia, Northern Levant, and Southern Caucasus". *Cell* 181 (5): 1158-1175.

SOYSAL, Oğuz (2004): *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlie-ferung*. HdO I/74. Leiden – Boston.

STEADMAN, Sharon R – MCMAHON, Gregory (eds.) (2011): *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia, 10,000-323 BCE*. Oxford.

JONES H., Leonard (1928): *Strabo, Geography: Books X-XII*. Cambridge.

STURTEVANT, Edgar Howard (1933): *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Philadelphia.

WOODARD, Roger D. (2008): *The Ancient Languages of Europe*. Cambridge – New York.

WATSON, Wilfred G. E. (2008): "Some Akkadian and Hittite Equivalences". *N.A.B.U.* 2008 (4): 95-96.

WILHELM, Gernot (2008): "Hurrians in the Kültepe Texts". In: Jan Gerrit Dercksen (ed.): *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. OAAS 3, PIHANS 111. Leiden, 181-194.

WITTKE, Anne-Maria (2004): *Mušker und Phryger: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Anatoliens vom 12. bis 7. Jh. v. Chr*. Wiesbaden.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2010): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 2. Leiden – Boston.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2020): "Review of A. Kloekhorst, *Kanišite Hittite*". *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 110 (2): 278-288.

YALÇIN, Ünsal (2011): "Alaca Höyük İlk Tunç Çağı Kral Mezarları Üzerine". *Çorum Kazı ve Araştırmalar Sempozyumu* 1: 55-64.

ZIMMERMANN, Thomas (2006): "Symbols of Salvation? Function, Semantics and Social Context of Early Bronze Age Ritual Equipment from Central Anatolia". *Anodos. Studies of the Ancient World* 6-7: 509-520.

With a Luwian grain of salt[1]

Ignasi-Xavier Adiego
Universitat de Barcelona – IPOA

1. *Introduction*

In Anatolian studies, the Luwian word *lapana-*[2] (and derivatives) has been interpreted in two divergent ways: for some authors, it means 'summer pasture', for others, 'saltlick'. Although this latter interpretation seems to have become dominant among scholars in recent years, the other meaning continues to have its adherents. Two recent translations into German of the same text reflect this: Rieken (2014: 49) translates *lapana-* as 'Sommerweide', while Cammarosano (2019: 64)'s translation of the term is 'Salzlecke'.

In the present paper my goal is threefold: first, in a presentation with a clearly linguistic aim, I collect together the attestations of *lapana-* and derivatives in Hittite and Luwian documents; second, I try to make clear the origins of these two different proposals and to establish the possible actual meaning of the word; and

2. The beginning of the word and derivatives is consistently spelled *la-pa-°* with the exception of one example with scriptio plena *la-a-pa-°* for which I cannot give a clear explanation. As for the form *la-apⁱ-na-al-li-iš* (or perhaps better *la-pa-na-al-li-iš)* in Luwian, see § 2, 4. I use the adaptation *lapana-* throughout the paper.

third I suggest an etymological connection that, to my knowledge, has not been considered until now.

2. lapana-: *the dossier*

Most of the attestations of *lapana-* and derivatives have been found in Hittite contexts. They are therefore Luwianisms, often indicated by the *Glossenkeil* mark – the typical procedure of the scribes of the Hittite empire to mark special words[3] – and sometimes they appear adapted to the Hittite inflection. These attestations in Hittite can be grouped into three different kinds of text: (1) in two closely related treaties, where the forms appear in very similar (though not identical) paragraphs (1a, 1b), to which we should add a further fragment (1c) from one of the treaties; (2) in two cult inventories (2a, 2b); and (3) in a list of tutelary deities (3a and its duplicate 3b). In Cuneiform Luwian we have only one example in a text interpreted as a letter by Starke (1985) (4). Finally, an inscription in Hieroglyphic Luwian offers a verbal form *la-pa-ni-wa/i*, clearly connected to *lapana-* (5).

In what follows, I present all these forms in their respective contexts. The passages are offered in bound transcription (except for the words in question) and accompanied by a translation. The translations are based to a large extent on previous authors, but I will leave *lapana-* and its derivatives untranslated.

1) Two similar passages from treaties (Hittite)
(1a.) KBo IV.10+, obv. 33-35. Treaty with Ulmi-Tešub of Tarḫuntašša. Based on the edition by van den Hout (1995: 30-33).

It contains the forms ⚡ *la-pa-ni*, ⚡ *la-pa-na-li-ya-an-za,* ⚡ *la-pa-na-an*. Note also the Luwianism ⚡ *wa-ni-ya* (cf. infra § 3).

ZAG KUR URU.dU-*ašša kuiš* n=*ašta* LÚ.MÁŠ.GAL ŠÀ KUR*TI lē paizzi mānn*=a *IŠTU* KUR URU.ÍD*Hūlaya šalli* ⚡ *la-pa-ni* ⚡ *wa-ni-ya pennanzi* nu=šši=*kan* ⚡ *la-pa-na-li-ya-an-za lē danzi ANA* LUGAL KUR URU.dU-*tašša=(a)t piyan* MUN=*ma daškiddu* URU*Šarmanann*=a URU-*an IŠTU* A.ŠÀ A.GÀR ´Ú.SAL` *Ù IŠTU RĒT* UDU ⚡ *la-pa-na-an-n*=a *ḫumantan* LU-GAL.GAL *ANA* LUGAL KUR URU.dU-*tašša piḫḫun ANA* MUN URU*Šarmana=kan tamaiš* UN-*aš anda lē p*[*ai*]*ddu*

---

3. For other uses of the Glossenkeil in Hittite text, particularly as an indentation mark, see Pisaniello's recent contribution (2020).

"As for the territory of the country of Tarḫuntašša, let no goatherd enter the country! And if they drive there to the great ⚒ *la-pa-ni* ⚒ *wa-ni-ya* from the country of the Ḫūlaya river, let them not take the ⚒ *la-pa-na-li-ya-an-za* away from him: it has been given to the King of Tarḫuntašša. And let him take the salt [Güterbock – Hoffner (1980): salt lick]! The town of Šarmana with its fields, grounds, and meadow(s), and with sheep pasture and the whole ⚒ *la-pa-na-an* I, the great king, have given to the king of Tarḫuntašša. Let no other man enter the salt [Güterbock – Hoffner (1980): salt lick] of Šarmana!"

(1b) Bo 86/299, ii, 4-15. Treaty of Tutḫaliya with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša (bronze tablet from Boğazköy). Based on the edition by Otten (1988: 16-17). It contains the forms *la-a-pa-ni*, ⚒ *la-pa-na-li-an-za*, ⚒ *la-pa-na-an*. Note also the Luwianisms ⚒ *u̯a-a-a-ni-i̯a* and ⚒ *li-ki-in*.

ZAG KUR URU ᵈU-*tašša=ya kuiš* KUR ᴵᴰ*Ḫūlayaš n=ašta* LÚ MÁŠ.GAL *anda lē paizzi mānn=a* IŠTU KUR ᴵᴰ*Ḫūlaya šalli la-a-pa-ni* ⚒ *wa-a-a-ni-i̯a ūnnanzi nu=šši=kan* ⚒ *la-pa-na-li-an-za lē danzi* ANA LUGAL KUR URU ᵈU-*tašša=(a)t piyan* MUN=*ma daškiddu* URU*Šarmanann=a* URU-*an* URU*Pantarwantan* URU*Maḫrimmann=a* IŠTU A.ŠÀ A.GÀR Ú.SAL *RĒT* UDU ⚒ *la-pa-na-an ḫūmandan* ⚒ *li-ki-in ḫūmandan* ANA ᵐ ᵈLAMMA LUGAL KUR URUᵈU-*tašša* ABU=YA ᵐ*Ḫattušiliš pešta* ᵈUTU^*ŠI*-*i=an=ši* ᵐ*Tutḫaliaš* LUGAL.GAL *piḫḫun n=ašta* ANA MUN URU*Šarmana tamaiš antuḫšaš parā lē paizzi*

"And as for the territory of the country of Tarḫuntašša, which (is) (part?) of the country of the Ḫūlaya river, let no goatherd enter. And if they drive here from the country of the Ḫūlaya river to the great *la-a-pa-ni* ⚒ *u̯a-a-a-ni-i̯a*, let them not take the ⚒ *la-pa-na-li-an-za* away from him. It has been given to the king of Tarḫuntašša and let him take the salt!" And the towns of Šarmana, Pantarwanta and Maḫrimma, with fields, grounds, and meadow(s), sheep pasture, the whole ⚒ *la-pa-na-an* (and) the whole ⚒ *li-ki-in*, my father Ḫattušili gave to Kurunta, the king of Tarḫuntašša, and My Majesty Tutḫaliya, the great king, has given it to him. Let no other man go to the salt of Šarmana!"

(1c). A further passage from the treaty in 1a: KBo IV.10+, obv 44-45. The word in question, ⚒ *la-pa*[-*n*]*a-al-la-ḫi-ti* is attested in the fragmentary tablet KUB XL.69, obv. 6, joined to KBo IV.10 by Hoffner. Text based on van den Hout's edition (van den Hout 1995: 36-37):

apāt=ma=šši KARAŠ *ŠA* DINGIR*ᴸᴵᴹ ša*[*ḫḫ*]*ani luzzi* EGIR-*an* SUM-*ir kuin=ši AŠŠUM* ᴸ�ᵘ.ᴹᴱ�Š KISAL.LUḪ*ᵁᵀ⁻ᵀᴵ* EGIR-*an* SUM-*ir kuin=ma=šši AŠŠUM* ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱ�ˢ APIN.LÁ*ᵁᵀ⁻ᵀᴵ* EGIR-*an* SUM-*ir kuin=ma=šši AŠŠUM* ⚔ *la-pa*[*-n*]*a-al-la-ḫi-ti* EGIR-*an* SUM-*ir*

"But those troops they have given back to him for duty and service to the deity. One part they have given back to him for courtyard-sweeping, another part for plowmanship, another part for ⚔ *la-pa*[*-n*]*a-al-la-ḫi-ti.*"

2) Cult inventories (Hittite)

(2a). IBot II.131. (Cult inventory related to the god Pirwa). Text based on the edition of Cammarosano (2018: 264-267), Text No. 6. Translation also based on Cammarosano (2018). It contains five examples of the nominative plural of a stem *lapanalli-* with different variants (adapted to Hittite inflection): ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱ�ˢ*la-pa-na-al-li-e-*[*eš*], ᴸᚢ.ᴹ[ᴱˢ*la-p*]*a-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*š=a*, ⚔ *la-pa-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*uš* (3x).

obv. 42
3 UDU ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱ�ˢ*la-pa-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*uš ŠA* É.GAL *pešker*

"The ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱ�ˢ*la-pa-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*uš* of the Palace used to supply 3 sheep."

rev. 10-12:
nu ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱ�ˢ*la-pa-na-al-li-e-*[*eš*] 1 UDU *ḫūkanzi* ᴸᚢSANGA *ŠA* DUMU.NITA ᴸᚢ.ᴹ[ᴱˢ*la-p*]*a-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*š=a* [*Š*]*A* DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ *nu luššanuanzi*

"The *la-pa-na-al-li-e-*[*eš*] slaughter a sheep. The priest (is on the side?) of the young men, and the [*la-p*]*a-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*š* (are on the side?) of the young women."

rev. 14-19
ᵈ*Pirwan šarā* ME-*anzi n=an=kan parā pedanzi n=an=kan* ⚔ *ḫarpi ŠA* MUN *šarā pianzi nu* ᴳᴵˢMAR.GÍD.DAᴴᴵ.ᴬ *IŠTU* MUN *taeš*⌐*tianzi nu* ᴸᚢ.ᴹᴱˢ ⚔ *la-pa-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*uš* 3 *ME* NINDA.GUR₄.RA *ŠA* MUN 1 *ME* NINDA.ḪI.A 2 DUG KAŠ 20 UDU 10 *EM-ṢÚ* 10 GA.KIN.AG 3 *PA* NAGA=*ya* MU*ᴷᴬᴹ-tili pešker*

"They pick up Pirwa, carry him out, and hand him up onto a pile of salt. They load the wagons with salt. The ⚔ *la-pa-na-al-li*ᴴᴵ.ᴬ-*uš* used to supply yearly 300 loaves of salt, a hundred loaves of bread, 2 vessels of beer, 20 sheep, 10 (portions of) sourdough, 10 cheeses, 3 *PARĪSU*-measures of *soap herbs.*"

rev. 22
[(ca. 3 signs) LÚ.MEŠ] ⚔ *la-pa-na-al-li*^{HI.A}-*uš* ^{URU}*Pulantarišša peš*[*ker*]

"The ⚔ *la-pa-na-al-li*^{HI.A}-*uš* of Pulantarišša [us]ed to supply [...]"

(2b) KpT 1.36 (Cult inventory from Šamuḫa). Based on the edition by Cammarosano (2018: 388-391), Text No. 14, and Cammarosano (2019). Translation based on Cammarosano (2018):

obv. i, 40-41
ANA UDU^{HI.A}=*ma* ^{URU}*Kummarnaš la-pa-na-aš* KUR ^{URU} *Šamuḫašš=a katan tiyanza*

"Whereas for the sheep the *la-pa-na-aš* of Kummarna and the land of Šamuḫa are appointed."

obv. i, 43-45
24 UDU^{HI.A}=*ma* ŠA É.GAL É ^dUTU-*ŠI* 24 UDU^{HI.A} ŠA É.GAL ^{URU}*Karaḫna* ^{URU}*Kumarnaš la-pa-na-aš pešk*[*e*]*zzi*

"Whereas the *la-pa-na-aš* of Kummarna regularly supplies the 24 sheep of the Palace of the House of His Majesty (and) the 24 sheep of the Palace of Karaḫna."

obv. ii, 7-8
ANA UDU=*ma* ^{URU}*Kummarnan* ⚔ *la-pa-na-an katan dāiš*

"Whereas for the (supply of) sheep he appointed the ⚔ *la-pa-na-an* of Kummarna."

obv. ii, 13-15
2? UDU=*ma*=*kan* ^{LÚ}UGULA.10 EGIR-*anda dāiš* [*n*]=*aš*=*kan ANA* LÚ^{MEŠ} ^{URU}*Kummarna* ⚔ *la-pa-n*[*i*] ŠA É.GAL É ^dUTU-*ŠI šarā IṢ-BAT*

"As for the Commander of 10, he fixed (as offering) two[?] additional sheep, and took them up from the people of Kummarna (and?) ⚔ *la-pa-n*[*i*] of the Palace of the House of His Majesty."

obv. ii, 22-24 a passage similar to the preceding one (only the number of sheep changes: here four), but the word in question is missing (restored by the editor: LÚ^{MEŠ} ^{URU}ku-[um-mar-na ⚒ la-pa-ni])

rev. iii, 4
[... ⚒ l]a-pa-na-aš
(Very fragmentary context, but it seems similar to obv. i, 43-45 so it may refer to a supply made by *Kumarnaš la-pa-na-aš*).

rev. iv, 41-42
18 UDU^{ḪI.A}=ma 3 *PA* MUN-ya ^{[L]Ú.MEŠ}la-pa-[na]-li-uš ^{URU}Ḫaryaša peškanzi

"whereas the ^{[L]ÚMEŠ}*la-pa-[na]-li-uš* of Ḫaryaša regularly supply 18 sheep and 3 *PARĪSU*-measures of salt."

3) List of tutelary deities. I follow the edition of McMahon (1991: 110).

(3.1) KUB II.1, rev. iv, 16-17
[^d*A-a-la-aš*] *la-[pa-n]a-aš-ši-i[š]*
[X *ŠÀ L]a-[ba-a]r-na*
"[Ala] *la-[pa-n]a-aš-ši-i[š]* ... of Labarna"

(3.2) KUB XLIV.16 rev. iv, 15. Duplicate of 3.1. Only the final part of the formula is conserved: [… -n]a-aš-ši-eš.

4) KBo XXIX.38 obv. 6 (Starke 1985: 369). Luwian.
A very fragmentary text that shows only isolated words of unknown meaning. Starke (1985: 368) suggests that it is a letter containing "historical-political" affairs, given the reference to Kaška-people in rev. 16. The form attested is currently read *la-ap-na-a-al-li-iš*.[4] In other lines of the obv., sequences as -a]n la-p[a- (obv. 8), and l]a-pa-n[a- (obv. 9) can be read.

---

4. After checking the photograph of the tablet, Giusfredi (personal communication) suggests *la-pa[!]-na-al-li-iš* as a possible reading instead of *la-ap-na-al-li-iš* (which, in any event, ought to be transcribed instead as *la-ap[!]-na-al-li-iš*). Certainly, the photograph seems to point to *pa*. Given that unfortunately the text is not particularly relevant for the interpretation of the word, I maintain the reading, linguistically difficilior, *la-ap[!]-na-al-li-iš*.

1 [   ] *ku-i*[*š*
2 [   ]x-*a-wi₅* ^{GIŠ}*ti*-x-*an-d*[*a*(-)
3 [   ]x-*li-iš ku-iš ti-wa-an*[-
4 [*ti-wa-a*]*n-na-a-al-li-iš pa-a ša-la-a-aš-ši-iš*
5 [   ]x-*a ti-wa-an-na-al-li-iš pa-a pár-li-iš*
6 [   ]x *la-ap-na-al-li-iš* ^{GIŠ}x[
7 [   ]x x-*a*-x x *ti-wa-an-n*[*a-al-l*]*i-zi*
8 [   ]x[-*a*]*n la-p*[*a-*
9 [   ]x x[*l*]*a-pa-n*[*a-*

5) Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription ANDAVAL § 3-4. (Hawkins 2000: 514-516). This is the inscription of Saruwanis, a city-lord of Nahitiya (the modern-day Niğde). The attested form is a verb *la-pa-ni-*, in the first person singular of the present (*la-pa-ni-wa/i*). This edition is based on Hawkins (2000) but note that the transcription of some of the signs has been updated. The translation is also based on Hawkins (2000), but with some modifications.[5]

> ´*a*`-*wa/i* (TERRA+*LA*⁺*LA*)*wa/i-li-ri*+*i-tà-ti* |REL *ARHA* (PES)*u-sa-wa/i a-wa/i* |(EQUUS)*á-zú-wa/i-za za-ti la-pa-ni-wa/i*

"when I (shall) bring (them) out of the plains, I *la-pa-ni-wa/i* to the horses here."

To sum up, this dossier allows us to identify the following forms:
(🏃) *lapana-, lāpana-* c.
 Nom. sg. *la-pa-na-aš*
 Acc. sg. 🏃 *la-pa-na-an*
 Dat. sg. 🏃 *la-pa-ni, la-a-pa-ni*
 Poss. adj. (nom. sg. c.) *la-*[*pa-n*]*a-aš-ši-i*[*š*]
→ (🏃) *lapanal(l)i-, lapnalli-* adj. (> substantivized, pl. c.)
 Nom. sg. c. *la-ap[']-na-al-li-iš* (see note 4)
 Nom. pl. c. (Hittite inflection) ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*la-pa-na-al-li*^{HI.A}*-uš,* ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*la-pa-na-al-li-e-*[*eš*], ^{LÚ.M}[^{EŠ}*la-p*]*a-na-al-li*^{HI.A}*-š(=a),* 🏃 *la-pa-na-al-li*^{HI.A}*-uš,* ^{L]Ú.MEŠ}*la-pa-*[*na*]*-li-uš,* [… *-n*]*a-aš-ši-eš*

---

5. Hawkins (2000) translated the two verbs as futures, but both *ARHA* (PES)*u-sa-wa/i* and *la-pa-ni-wa/i* may have a general present meaning. As for *á-zú-wa/i-za*, I assume that it is simply a plural dative /azuwanz/ 'to the horses'. Hawkins (2000) treated it as a collective neuter form */asuwi(ya)nza/ 'horse-herd'.

→ ⸎ *lapanallaḫit-* n. (abstract noun)
→ ⸎ *lapanaliya-* adj. (> substantivized neuter)
    Acc. sg. ⸎ *la-pa-na-li-ya-an-za,* ⸎ *la-pa-na-li-an-za*
→ *lapani(ya)-* denominative verb
    la-pa-ni-wa/i

3. *The meaning of* lapana-

The meaning "summer pasture" for *lapana-* was proposed for the first time in Güterbock (1956: 122). This proposal was based on "the context of KBo IV 10 obv. 33-37", i.e. from the first reference to *lapana-* in the treaty with Ulmi-Tešub (see above §1, Text 1a). Correspondingly, Güterbock proposed to translate [LÚ.MEŠ]*la-pa-na-al-li*[HI.A]*-uš* (and variants) as "people who go to summer pastures".

Until Otten published the Bronze Tablet Bo 86/299, (Otten 1988), KBo IV 10 obv. 33 ⸎ *la-pa-ni* ⸎ *wa-ni-ya* was incorrectly read as †⸎ *la-pa-nu-u-wa-ni-ya.* It was the comparison of the two texts that led Otten to emend the reading after collation of a photo of KBo IV 10. This alleged †⸎ *la-pa-nu-u-wa-ni-ya* created many problems for Anatolian scholars. So Güterbock (1956) thought of "a dative of an infinitive or verbal noun in *-uwan*" and suggested a German translation 'zum grossen Almaufstieg' for *šalli* †⸎ *la-pa-nu-u-wa-ni-ya.* As we will immediately see, this †°*uwaniya* and later the correct reading ⸎ *wa-ni-ya* played a crucial role in the interpretation of *lapana-*.

Laroche incorporated Güterbock's views in his dictionary of Luwian (Laroche 1959: 62-63): *lapana-* was translated as "alpage (turc *yayla*)", i.e., 'summer mountain pasture', and consequently, *lapanalli-* meant 'pâtre' ('shepherd'). As for the conflictive †⸎ *la-pa-nu-u-wa-ni-ya*, Laroche (1959) interpreted it as †*lapanūwani-* 'troupeau' ('herd'). The first fascicle of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, published in 1980, offered a third meaning for the word in question: *lapanuwani-* was glossed as "summer grazing (area)". As can be seen, there was no doubt about the meaning of *lapana-* but the structure and meaning of the entire form †⸎ *la-pa-nu-u-wa-ni-ya* was controversial.

Beckman (1983: 83) gave a new interpretation of the alleged word †*lapanūwani-*: he proposed that it was a compound whose first element was *lapan(a)-* and the second one *uwani-*. *uwani-*/*wani-*, which had been interpreted (*cf.* Laroche 1959: 106) and continues to be interpreted generally as a Luwian word

meaning 'rock' and related to *wanid-* 'stela', attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian (see for instance Melchert 1993: 256; Tischler 2016: 280-283).[6]

Beckman recalled the fact, well recognized by Laroche (1959) that *uwani-* appears in Luwian as a place that serves as a source of salt. In particular, in a ritual of purification of a house written in Luwian, there is a section ("conjuration de l'eau et du sel", Laroche 1959: 152) where *uwani-* is the origin of the salt mentioned in the ritual (always by means of the Sumerogram MUN):

KUB XXXV.54 rev. 3, 17-21 (based on the edition of Starke 1985: 68).
warša=tta ÍD-*ti* [...]x-*amman*   ([*na-n*]*a-am-ma-an* Melchert 1993: 154)
[M]UN-*ša=pa ālāti uwā*[*niyati*] *upamman*
[*w*]*arša=tta zil*[*a* ÍD-*i*] *anda*
[*n*]*āwa iti* MUN-*ša=pa=*[*tta z*]*ila*
[*ā*]*lī uwaniya nā*[*wa it*]*i*
[*a*]*dduwal=za=pa=tta u*[*tar=ša ḫa*]*lliš=ša*
[*par*]*attan=za appa zā*[*tī*] *parni*
[*zil*]*a niš awit*[*i*]

"the water from the river is ...-d   ([*lea*]*d*, cf. Melchert 1993: 154)
and the salt is granted from the *āla- uwāniya-*
subsequently the water does not go [to the river]
and subsequently the salt does not go to the *āla- uwāniya-*,
and the evil word, the sickness (?),
the impurity does not subsequently come back to this house"

In one of the birth rituals published by Beckman in 1983, *uwani-* also appeared in connection to salt: here as well, the word, adapted to Hittite morphology, seems to indicate the origin of the "salt of the meadow" (MUN *ŠA* Ú.SAL):

KUB XXXIII.67, 24-26. (Beckman 1983: 76).
nu ḫūman kadupāit [EGI(R-*ŠU=ma* MUN *ŠA* Ú.SAL *uwaniy*)*az*] *kadupāit*
Ú.SAL^*LUM* *uw*[(*aniyaz=kan maḫḫan* x *UL zinnattari* [EGIR-*Š*(*U* KUR-*anza*
dandukešnaš D)UMU-*an*] [*uš*^*?*]*kizzi apās=a* [(EGIR-*anda* EGIR-*and*)*a*

---

6. But note the cautious choice of *ACLT: uwani(ya)-* '(landscape feature)', separated from *wani(d)-* 'stele' (and derivatives).

"and (she) consumed (?) everything. [There]after (she) consumed the salt of the meadow from the *uwaniya-*. As the meadow from the *uwaniya-* is not exhausted – [afterward] the land [in]spects the mort[al] – and [may] this one forever after [not be exhausted?!]"

The conclusion of Beckman is that "as a source of salt associated with a pasture, *uwani-* can only be a saltlick" (Beckman 1983: 83) and therefore †*lapanuwanni-* [sic Beckman] was a compound of *lapana-*, 'summer pasture,' and *uwan(n)i-*, that is, 'saltlick of the summer pasture ground' (Beckman *ibid*.).

As we mentioned above, Otten (1988) demonstrated that †*lapanuwani-* was a ghost word, but at the same time confirmed Beckman's intuition that the word *uwani-* was present there. In fact, Otten accepted Beckman's views as he translated *šalli* ⚒ *la-pa-ni* ⚒ *wa-ni-ya* as "zur großen Alm und zur Salzlecke" (Otten 1988: 17). As for *lapanali(y)anza*, also present in both treaties, he proposed a very provisory translation 'Weiderechte'.

A breakthrough was made by Watkins in a paper on *lapana-* (Watkins 1997). Watkins had previously studied the form *uwaniya-* (see particularly Watkins 1987: 424) in the "conjuration de l'eau et du sel" and in other texts, and he was convinced that the meaning of this word was "escarpé ou face de roche plus ou moins verticale", and that the word was in fact identical to Hieroglyphic Luwian *wani(d)-* 'stele', originally '(inscribed) rockface'. Consequently, ⚒ *wa-ni-ya* in *šalli* ⚒ *la-pa-ni* ⚒ *wa-ni-ya* could not mean 'saltlick'. For Watkins, it was *lapana-* that had this meaning. He revised most of the attestations of *lapana-* and derivatives (see here above, § 2) and stressed that the word appeared systematically in connection with salt. Particularly striking is his analysis of the cult inventory for the god Pirwa (cf. supra § 2, text 2a) where the LÚ.MEŠ*lapanalliuš* (and variants) are mentioned. In rev. 17-19, these *lapanalli-* give precisely 300 loaves of salt as the first offering to the deity, and Watkins recalls that in the immediately preceding passage (rev. 14-17, also collected above in 2a), the deity has been delivered onto a heap of salt. As Watkins points out, "it is not easy to reconcile the facts of this whole passage, and the clear discourse prominence of salt, with the meaning 'herdsman (on summer pasture)' for LÚ*lapanalli-* as given in the *CHD*". For this reason, Watkins concludes that *lapana-* is the Luwian word for 'saltlick', and that LÚ.MEŠ*lapanalliuš* must be the 'saltlick wardens'. In the case of the form *lapanali(y)anza* (here above 1a and 1b), Watkins first rightly established the morphological analysis of the form (it was a singular neuter + *-za* neuter particle, not a plural – *contra* Otten and others); second, he proposed the meaning of 'saltlick rights'. This new meaning was evidently

a simple "conversion" of Otten's translation 'grazing rights' to the new sense given to *lapana-* and derivatives.

A further interesting contribution of Watkins's article is the reinterpretation of the verb *lapani(ya)-* in Hieroglyphic Luwian (cf, supra § 2, text 5). For Watkins, a translation of this verb as 'take to the saltlick' (with 'horses' as direct object) is "as plausible as Meriggi's 'la cavalleria qui pascolo' and to my mind somewhat more worthy of being monumentally commemorated." (Watkins 1997: 34).

Finally, Watkins gave an etymology for *lapana-* 'saltlick': he proposed that it came from PIE *leb-* 'to lick', to which English *lip*, Latin *labium*, *labrum* and particularly Hittite (and Luwian?[7]) *lipae-*, *lip(p)-*, *lilip* 'to lick' also belong.

Watkins's interpretation and meanings proposed for *lapana-* and derivatives are fully accepted in Melchert (1993: 125).[8] There, Melchert gives the following entries and meanings:

⚒ *lapan(a)-* 'salt lick'
lap(a)nalla/i- 'salt-lick guard/attendant'
lapanallaḫit- 'position of salt-lick guard'
⚒ *lapanalli*(*ya*)- '(rights) pertaining to salt-lick'

In addition, Puhvel (2001: 60-62) accepts both the meaning and the etymology proposed by Watkins.

Therefore, Watkins's interpretation of *lapana-* has gained increasing acceptance, but some contradictions remain: for instance, in *ACLT*, the Cuneiform Luwian forms present the meaning 'saltlick', but the Hieroglyphic Luwian verb *lapani(ya)-* means 'to provide pasture', possibly under the influence of Hawkins (2000), where the verb was translated as "to (summer-)pasture" according to prior interpretations of *lapana-* (Hawkins 2000: 516).

4. *The previous hypotheses*

The history of the research into the meaning of *lapana-* (and also *waniya-*) is a good example of the difficulties that arise when the sense of a word must be estab-

---

7. Cf. the present third plural form *li-li-pa-an-ti* (KBo XI 14 i 21). However, Melchert (1993: 127) remarks that the stem *lilip-* is Hittite, and that the only Luwian element of the form is the ending *-nti*.

8. Obviously, Watkins (1997) had not yet been published at that time. Melchert refers to Watkins (forthcoming), as he undoubtedly had access to a first unpublished version of Watkins (1997) who, in his turn, quotes Melchert (1993)!

lished from the various contexts in which it appears. Here we can see the co-occurrence of naturally connected concepts, such as salt, saltlick, rocks, meadows, summer pastures... The problem is to establish which word has which meaning. In the texts above, we can introduce either Güterbock-Beckman's or Watkins's proposed meanings for *lapana-* and *waniya-* and they fit equally well. Watkins's argument that the two treaties (1a, 1b) deal with the use of saltlick rights, not with the use of summer pastures rights, may be dangerously circular, as it is based on his own proposal of translating *lapana-* (and derivatives) as 'saltlick', which produces a ubiquitous presence of this term and its derivatives that otherwise would not occur. More convincing is his analysis of text 2a, where the *lapanalli-* men make an offer of salt; but one might respond that in the *conjuration de l'eau et du sel*, what we find is *waniya-* ('saltlick' as for Beckman), and that *lapana-* is absent, despite the clear contextual connection with 'salt', given the use of the logogram MUN 'salt'.

What makes Watkins's interpretation attractive is the fact that it is accompanied by etymological connections, both for *waniya-* and for *lapana-*. The etymological explanation of *waniya-* is in my opinion quite convincing: in fact, already in Laroche (1959), *waniya-* was associated with the same origin as Hieroglyphic Luwian *wanid-* 'stele' and also as the Cuneiform Luwian word ^{NA4}*u-wa-ni-i-ta-im-ma-an.* Although the context of this latter word is obscure, here we have *uwani*° preceded by the determinative NA_4 'stone'. Certainly, a rock can be a salt-rock, and this is why the word *waniyaz* appears as a place of provenance of salt, but the point is that the general meaning of *wani-*, *wanid-* may be simply 'rock, stone', and in any event both 'inscribed stone' and 'salt rock' would be secondary developments. Note that in both cases the word could be translated simply as 'rock' or 'stone': the salt could come from a rock, a text can be inscribed on a rock. It is the context that adds other semantic connotations.

As for *lapana-*, the meaning proposed by Watkins is the result of the combination of two elements: the transfer of Beckman's meaning 'saltlick' for *waniya-* to *lapana-*, and the assumed etymological connection to Hittite (and Luwian?) *lipae-*, *lip(p)-*, *lilip-*.

However, we might wonder whether the meaning of *lapana-* is not a more generic one, as for example 'salt-place' (= place where the salt is found) or, even, simply 'salt' (both adjective and noun, as in English).[9] Although below I will pro-

---

9. I am aware that this interpretation can conflict with the fact that in the Luwian text of *La conjuration de l'eau et du sel* the Luwian word for 'salt' seems to be a neuter and non-thematic noun,

pose an alternative (though not uncontroversial) etymology for *lapana-*, even a more generic meaning would be compatible with the etymology formulated by Watkins; the word for 'salt-place' or 'salt' can derive from a form of its use by livestock, 'to lick', in the same manner as in Lithuanian the word for 'salt', *druskà* comes from a root meaning 'to crumb' (PIE *d^hreu̯s-*), which describes a form of processing salt.

In fact, the problematic point of the translation of *lapana-* as 'saltlick' is that Watkins, although correctly remarking that the two treaties (here § 2, texts 1a-c) deal with salt rather than with transhumance to summer pastures, retained the traditional view that what was regulated was the access of livestock to saltlicks, not *the obtaining and processing of salt*. In Watkins's view, it seems that *lapana-* is only a place where the livestock can be fed salt, not a place where salt can be obtained. In reality, the two uses of a place with salt are fully compatible. If we open up the meaning of *lapana-* and derivatives to a more generic sense, there appear new perspectives of textual interpretation that may be particularly attractive.

My hypothesis, then, is that *lapana-* meant 'salt' and was used, by extension, to indicate a salt-place (saline, salt marsh, salt rock, and so on). Possibly it was an adjective in origin ('salt, salty'), and its substantivized use is secondary. We can draw some interesting consequences from this hypothesis:

(1) The *lapanalli-* men, the 'salt wardens' or 'salt guards', become the 'men of the salt(-place)', and this may make reference to salt workers or salt providers (or, possibly, both things together). In the cult of the god Pirwa (*supra*, text 2a), the god is delivered onto a pile or heap of salt, and he is accompanied by wagons bearing salt. From the text one can infer that all this salt is supplied by the *lapanalli-* men, who make an offer that includes loaves of salt. The idea that we are dealing with producers of salt makes entire sense. In the cult inventory from Šamuḫa, the *lapanalli-* men also regularly supply salt (*supra*, text 2b).

(2) In the inventory list from Šamuḫa, the place name URU*Kummarnaš la-pa-na-aš* is repeatedly mentioned. I think that it is very interesting to trace a parallel with the place name URU*Šarmana-* mentioned in the two treaties with the king of Tarḫuntašša. *Šarmana-* is mentioned as one of the cities that the Hittite kings give to the king of Tarḫuntašša together with, inter alia, the 'whole *lapana-*' (on this, see below, 4). But interestingly, the name of the city is repeated in the statement prohibiting other men from going there, and in this case, the place name is formu-

as it appears as MUN=*ša*. My hypothesis means that one must admit two different stems or even two different words.

lated as MUN ᵁᴿᵁ*Šarmana-* literally 'salt (of) Šarmana'. This seems to allude to a place belonging to *Šarmana-* where salt was obtained and processed. It would be tempting to assume that the name ᵁᴿᵁ*Kummarnaš la-pa-na-aš* from Šamuḫa expresses a similar place. If so, *lapana-* would carry out a parallel function to logogram MUN, and the semantic interpretation as 'salt'. In both cases, the word for 'salt' was used with the meaning of 'salt-place'. In the case of *Kummarnaš lapanaš*, given that the name appears systematically in this way, one might speculate whether this was the entire name of the village, incorporating the reference to salt or salt-place into the name. Cf. the typical place names linked to the presence of salt: Rosières-aux-Salines, S. Mauro di Saline, Peralta de la Sal, etc. Interestingly, another cult inventory tablet (KUB XXXVIII 1+, rev. iv § 11', Cammarosano 2018: 312-313) mentions a city Lapana (ᵁᴿᵁ*La-pa-na*) that may also be a place name based on the word for 'salt-place'.

(3) In the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription ANDAVAL (supra text 5) we find the verb *lapani(ya)-*. We have seen that Watkins adapted its meaning to his new interpretation of *lapana-*: *lapani(ya)-* would not mean 'pasture' (Meriggi 'pascolare'), but 'take … to the saltlick', a rather complex meaning for a verb. If we accept that the meaning of *lapana-* may be 'salt', the interpretation becomes more straightforward: the denominative *lapaniya-* would be equivalent to the English verb 'to salt' in the sense of "to supply (an animal) with salt, to give salt (to an animal)", but constructed with a dative.

⸢*a*⸣-*wa/i* (TERRA+*LA*+*LA*)*wa/i-li-ri+i-tà-ti* |REL *ARHA* (PES)*u-sa-wa/i a-wa/i* |(EQUUS)*á-zú-wa/i-za za-ti la-pa-ni-wa/i*

"when I bring (them) out of the plains, I salt the horses here"

Evidently, by means of this stele, the author of the inscription, the city-lord of Nahitiya Saruwanis, proclaimed his rights to feed salt to his horses, although possibly the salt-place was beyond the limits of Nahitiya.

(4) But where this possible meaning of *lapana-* introduces a new perspective is in the interpretation of the whole passages of the two treaties. As pointed out above, Watkins's idea of saltlick was limited to the use made to feed livestock – not very different from previous formulations when the meaning proposed was "summer pastures". If we open the focus to *lapana-* = 'salt(place)' and we think not just of livestock licking salt but on human exploitation of this mineral, we can interpret the text in a different way. Note this passage, practically identical in both treaties:

"And if they (the goatherds) drive there/here to the great *lapani waniya* from the country of the Ḫūlaya river, let them not take the *lapanaliyanza* away from him: it has been given to the King of Tarḫuntašša, and let him take the salt!"

According to our proposal of translation of *lapana-*, the *šalli lapani waniya* could mean 'the great salt-rock' or 'the great rocky salt-place'. Refining a previous idea in Erdoğu-Özbaşaran (2008: 166), Moga (2009: 186-187) has proposed that *šalli lapani waniya*, interpreted as 'the great cliff-like saltlick', may refer to the edges of the Tuz Gölu, the huge salt lake in central Anatolia, and certainly a description as 'rocky salt-place' would also be appropriate. However, this question is closely related to the very intricate problem of the precise geographical location of the places mentioned in both treaties and thus remains beyond the scope of the present article.

Also important is the possible new meaning of the word *lapanaliyanza*. Watkins's commonly accepted interpretation of *lapanaliyanza* as 'salt-lick rights' is based on the idea of feeding livestock. But if *lapana-* is simply 'salt(-place)', and *lapanalli-* is the name given to salt exploiters, perhaps *lapanaliya-* (literally 'related to *lapanalli-*') refers not to licking salt but to obtaining salt. And this idea seems to be supported by the following phrase, where the use of the logogram MUN = 'salt' permits a clear-cut translation: "let him (= the King of Tarḫuntašša) take the salt!".[10]

After this, the older treaty focuses on the town of Šarmana, and in this case the Hittite king specifies that this town is given in its entirety to the king of Tarḫuntašša, with its fields, grounds and meadows, sheep pasture, and the whole *lapana-*, i.e. the whole *salt(-place)*. Why *the whole*? I think that we must place this statement alongside the reference to the "great salt-rock". In the first case, it seems that the prohibition on goatherds moving to the great salt-rock is to stop them from *taking* the salt, not from salting their livestock. No idea of trespass is established. Here, in contrast, the prohibition also seems to cover the use of the salt-place of Šarmana to feed animals with salt. And this interpretation seems ratified once again with a phrase where MUN 'salt' is used: "Let no other man enter the salt (MUN) (of) Šarmana". Note the differences:

---

10. The translation in *CHD* "let him take the salt lick" is obviously forced by a preconception of the content of the passage.

šalli lapani waniya	*Šarmana*
-*nu=šši=kan* ⚔ *la-pa-na-li-ya-an-za lē danzi.* -*at (=lapanaliyan=za) piyan* -MUN=*ma daškiddu*	-*ANA* MUN ᵁᴿᵁ*Šarmana tamaiš* UN-*aš anda lē p*[*ai*]*ddu* -*lapanann(=a) ḫumantan piḫḫun*

(Great salt-rock)	(Šarmana)
-let them not take the thing-related-to-salt-exploiting from him -the thing-related-to-salt-exploiting has been given *(to the King of Tarḫuntašša)* -let take the SALT *(to the King of Tarḫuntašša)*	-Let no other man enter the SALT of Šarmana -The whole salt I gave *(to the King of Tarḫuntašša)*

In the case of the area from Ḫūlaya-river to the Great Salt Rock, the herdsmen cannot *take* (*lē danzi*) the salt present there, as only the King of Tarḫuntašša can do this, but possibly they can salt the livestock. In the case of the salt-place of Šarmana, no one can *enter* (*lē p*[*ai*]*ddu*): that is, salt cannot be either obtained or licked. For this reason, the *whole* salt is given to King of Tarḫuntašša, both for exploitation and for feeding animals.

The second treaty offers in essence the same statements, the difference being the listing of two other towns (Pantarwanta and Maḫrimma) apart from Šarmana, and the addition of *ḫumandan likin*, 'the whole *liki-*', immediately after the 'whole *lapana-*'. There exists a certain consensus in taking *liki-* as practically a synonym of *lapana-* (Puhvel speaks of "legalese" repetition), but if it is a simple redundancy, the reasons for it are unclear to me. As an explanation, there are two alternative hypotheses: either this *liki-* represents something related to the two new towns mentioned in this second treaty, or it alludes specifically to salt-licking. In favour of this latter hypothesis we should recall that Watkins suggested an etymology *$lei̯ĝ^h$- 'to lick' (cf. Greek λείχω, Lat. *lingere*, Sanskrit *leh-*, Old English *liccian*, etc.) for this Luwian word. This interpretation would be consistent with the idea presented above that, as in Šarmana, both salt-taking and salt-licking were conceded exclusively to the King of Tarḫuntašša.

(5) In accordance with this explanation, the abstract noun *lapanallaḫit-* in § 2 1c alludes not to "salt-guards" but to "salt-workers", "salt-producers". This makes sense in the context in which it appears. In fact, the use here of the abstract nouns is a particularity of the whole passage: it alludes to the tasks mandated to the troops

placed at the service of the deity, and these tasks are presented by means of abstract nouns ascribed to classes of workers: the [LÚ.MEŠ]KISAL.LUḪ 'courtyard-sweepers', the [LÚ.MEŠ]APIN.LÁ 'plowmen' and, consequently the *lapanalli-*, 'those related to the salt', the 'salt-workers'.

(6) As for the rest of examples, they are of little relevance to the semantic discussion: *Alaš lapanaššiš* can be translated as "Ala of the salt(-place)", but 'of the saltlick' was also an acceptable translation. Other instances of *lapana-* and derivatives lack context.

5. *A new proposal*

As noted above, the interpretation of *lapana-* as 'salt(-place)' is compatible with Watkins's etymology. However, I would like to present a different etymological connection, to my knowledge overlooked until now. It is only a very hypothetical one, but, formally and semantically at least, it is quite striking. After presenting this connection, which would clearly imply a process of borrowing, I will try to evaluate the direction of this borrowing, as this is crucial to decide whether Watkins's etymology can be retained or whether a different origin for *lapana-* must be considered.

It is likely that *lapana-* sounded [laβana]- in Luwian,[11] and this phonetic form is very close to the Sanskrit (already in Vedic) word for 'salt', *lavaṇám* (neuter). Sanskrit *lavaṇám* is attested for the first time in the Atharva Veda, in 7, 76, 1 (a hymn against pustules), in the comparison *lavaṇád víkledīyasīḥ* "more dissolving than salt". Interestingly, *lavaṇa-* is used both as a noun ('salt', neuter) and as an adjective ('salt, salty'). Its etymology had long been debated – see Mayrhofer (1976: 93) – but Mayrhofer (1996: 476) opts clearly for Hans Reichelt's explanation (Reichelt 1924: 297), according to which *lavaṇá-* comes from **lavaná-* 'cutting', an *ana*-derivative of the root *lavⁱ-* (present *lunā́ti*) 'to cut' < PIE ** leu̯H-* 'to cut' (cf. Old Norse *lé* 'scythe', Lithuanian *liáutis* 'to be cut, to be mutilated', *launỹs* 'without horns', perhaps also Hittite *luttāi-* 'window'[12]). The presence of the

---

11. The use of intervocalic non-geminate *-p-* in Cuneiform Hittite and Luwian points to a sound that is generally called "lenis" in Anatolian studies. Phonologically and phonetically speaking, "lenis" is a very imprecise term and it should probably be avoided if it is not accompanied by a "precise phonetic specification" (Ladefoged-Maddieson 1996: 99). In my opinion, <p> here may represent a phonetic articulation [β]: I will develop this hypothesis in a forthcoming paper.

12. Eichner (1973: 80), but both Puhvel (2001: 127) and Kloekhorst (2008: 535) give preference to other etymological explanations.

retroflex *ṇ* instead of *n* is explained by Mayrhofer as a case of "spontaneous cere-bralization" in Indo-Aryan, for which see Mayrhofer (1968).[13]

The etymologies proposed respectively for Luwian *lapana-* and Vedic *lavaṇá-* are formally incompatible,[14] so an independently inherited PIE word must be ruled out. This means that if the two words are related, it can only be attributed to a process of borrowing. But which language is the borrower, and which the donor? The immediate response is, of course, to assume that *lapana-* is an Indo-Aryan loan-word in Luwian, whether directly or via another language (Hurrian?) as it would fit perfectly into a wider, well-known context of language contact: the presence of Indo-Aryan people in Near East in the second millennium B.C., particularly in connection with the kingdom of Mitanni. This presence is demonstrated by the relevant examples, both in the common lexicon and in proper names found in cu-neiform sources, which can be straightfordly explained as belonging to an Indo-Aryan dialect very close to Vedic Sanskrit:[15] for instance, the loanwords present in the treatise on hippology written in Hittite by Kikkuli (Kammenhuber 1961, Starke 1995). Forms such as *aikawartana, terawartana, panzawartana, sattawartana, nawartana* (< **nawa+wartana* by haplology) can be explained as compounds meaning 'in one turn', 'in three turns', 'in five turns', 'in seven turns', 'in nine turns' respectively, and analysed etymologically as related to Vedic *éka-* 'one', *tri-*, 'three', *pánca* 'five', *saptá* 'seven', *náva* 'nine' and *vart-* 'to turn'.

Certainly, problems can appear when the adaptation from Indo-Aryan *lavaṇá-* to Luwian *lapana-* [laβana]- is examined more closely: Indo-Aryan *v* would be adapted here as /b/ ([β]), not as /w/ in the loanwords mentioned above. Also rele-vant is the fact that the Luwian form obliges the acceptance of the presence of a *l* in the donor Indo-Aryan dialect: the treatment of PIE *r and *l in Vedic Sanskrit is a complex question, but basically it is generally assumed that the most archaic dia-lect attested in Vedic showed a confluence of *l and *r in *r*, and that this is the type of dialect found in Mitanni, given that *palitá-* 'grey' appears adapted as *parita-nnu* (a colour of a horse) in Akkadian Nuzi texts (cf. Mayrhofer 1966: 19-20).[16]

However, the problems posed by *v* and *l* are not insurmountable: the adapta-tion of *v* by means of [β] could represent a variation due to diachronic, diatopic or

---

13. Particularly for *lavaṇá-* see Mayrhofer (1968: 511).

14. In *lavaṇá-*, Vedic *v* can only reflect PIE *w; in *lapana-*, Luwian <p> can only come from a PIE labial stop.

15. The bibliography on this subject is abundant. I refer here only to the fundamental work by Mayrhofer (1966, 1974, 1982).

16. The case of the retroflex *ṇ* is unproblematic: the adaptation of this sound (absent in Luwian and in Hittite) by means of the nasal dental is to be expected.

diastratic factors.[17] Also, in this case, a possible folk etymology connecting this word to *lip-*, 'to lick'' may contribute to this adaptation. As for *l*, not *r*, the example of *parita-* is very isolated and from a different linguistic context, and we cannot rule out the coexistence of dialectal variations in Mitanni Indo-Aryan. Moreover, although the dialect of Rig Veda (considered the most ancient and nuclear) presented *r* as the result of **l* and **r*, words with *l* already appear in the oldest parts of the RV (cf. Pinault 1987: 36-37).

Therefore, from a phonological point of view, the interpretation of *lapana-* [laβana] as a loanword from *lavaṇá-* would in my opinion be quite acceptable.

However, is an opposite direction of the borrowing possible? Can *lavaná-* be a loanword that arrived in Sanskrit Vedic from Luwian? Phonologically, this hypothesis is equally acceptable: *b* [β] > *v* could be explained taking account of possible dialectal articulations of Vedic *v* as a fricative, the Vedic dialect would show the direct continuation of Luwian *l*, and for the retroflex *ṇ*, it would be a spontaneous cerebralization like the ones described by Mayrhofer (1968) (cf. supra). Of course, once again, it would also be possible to resort to folk etymology, in this case to explain some phonological adjustments in the Indo-Aryan word, in order to bring the word closer to the root *lav*[i]-.

What makes this hypothesis more difficult to accept is the long journey of *lapana-* from Anatolia to India. Note, however, that Witzel (2003) has traced a context of cultural exchange in which this borrowing could have occurred, although we would expect the loanword to appear in languages other than Vedic, and this evidence is lacking. In any event, we cannot definitively rule out this hypothesis if we take account of the problems related to the expression of 'salt' in Indo-Aryan and, by extension, in Indo-Iranian. Reichelt (1924) showed clearly that it is impossible to reconstruct a common Indo-Iranian word for 'salt': in fact, the PIE stem **sal-* which we find in most IE dialects (Greek ἅλς, Latin *sal,* OIr. *salann*, Gothic *salt*, Latvian *sāls*, OCS *solǐ*, Arm. *ał*, Toch. A *sāle*) is absent from Indo-Iranian languages, which use different words for 'salt'. Therefore, *lavaṇá-* appears only in Sanskrit and, as we have seen above, only in a later Vedic period.[18] This isolated character of the form makes a foreign origin plausible, despite the etymology proposed by Reichelt and accepted by Mayrhofer.

17. Cf. Spanish *váter* [bater] vs. *güisqui* [gwiski], both loanwords from English words beginning with [w]: *water*, *whisky*.

18. On *lavaṇá-* and the rest of words for 'salt' in Sanskrit see the extensive study by Riccardi (2015).

At this point, it is not easy to decide on the direction of the borrowing. We cannot apply the etymological criterion according to which the donor is the language where the word can be etymologically explained (cf. Campbell 1998: 65), as we have two etymologies of comparable value in Luwian and in Indo-Aryan. Taking into account the existence of other Indo-Aryan borrowings in Anatolia, I would tend to favour the Indo-Aryan origin of the word, but I think that caution is in order and that we should consider this case as doubtful. In any event, the semantic and formal affinities between Luwian *lapana-* and Sanskrit *lavaṇá-* seem to be too strong to be considered a simple matter of chance.

6. *References*

ACLT = I. Yakubovich, *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. http: //web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus.

BECKMAN, Gary M. (1983²): *Hittite Birth Rituals*. StBoT 29. Wiesbaden.

CAMMAROSANO, Michele (2018): *Hittite Local Cults*. SBL-WAW 40. Atlanta.

CAMMAROSANO, Michele (2019): "Kultinventare aus Kayalıpınar (Šamuḫa)". In: Elisabeth Rieken (ed.) *Keilschrifttafeln aus Kayalıpınar 1. Textfunde aus den Jahren 1999-2017*. Documenta Antiqua Asiae Minoris 1. Wiesbaden, 47-109.

CAMPBELL, Lyle (1998): *Historical Linguistics. An Introduction*. Edinburgh.

EICHNER, Heiner (1973): "Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31: 53-107.

ERDOĞU, Burçin – ÖZBAŞARAN, Mihriban (2008): "Salt in prehistoric Central Anatolia". In: Olivier Weller – Alexa Dufraisse – Pierre Pétrequin (eds.): *Sel, eau et forêt. D'hier à aujourd'hui*. Besançon, 163-173.

GÜTERBOCK, Hans Gustav (1956). "Notes on Luwian Studies. A propos B. Rosenkranz' Book". *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Luvischen. Orientalia Nova Series* 25: 113-140.

GÜTERBOCK, Hans G. – HOFFNER, Harry A. (eds.) (1980): *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Volume L-N, Fasc. 1*. Chicago.

HAWKINS, John David (2000): *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I: Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin – New York.

KAMMENHUBER, Annelies (1961): *Hippologia Hethitica*. Wiesbaden.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. LIEEDS 5. Leiden – Boston.

LADEFOGED, Peter – MADDIESON, Ian (1996): *The Sound of the World's Languages*. Oxford – Cambridge.

LAROCHE, Emmanuel (1959): *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1966): *Die Indo-Arier im alten Vorderasien. Mit einer analytischen Bibliographie.* Wiesbaden.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1968): "Über spontanen Zerebralnasal im frühen Indo-Arischen". In: N.N. (ed.): *Mélanges d'indianisme a la mémoire de Louis Renou*. Paris, 509-517.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1974): *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient – ein Mythos?* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse 294/3. Wien.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1976): *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen III*. Heidelberg.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1982): "Welches Material aus dem Indo-Arischen verbleibt für eine selektive Darstellung?". In: Erich Neu (ed.): *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*. Wiesbaden, 72-90.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1996): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-arischen. II. Band*, Heidelberg.

MCMAHON, Gregory (1991): *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*. AS25. Chicago.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1993) *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.

MOGA, Iulian (2009): "Salt Extraction and Imagery in the Ancient Near East". *Journal for Interdisciplinary Research on Religion and Science* 4: 175-213.

OTTEN, Heinrich (1988): *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy. Ein Staatsvertrag Tutḫalijas IV*. Wiesbaden.

PINAULT, Georges-Jean (1987): "Reflets dialectaux en védique ancien". In: Colette Cailla (ed.): *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Paris: 35-96.

PISANIELLO, Valerio (2020): "Glossenkeil and Indentation on Hittite Tablets". *Altorientalische Forschungen* 47: 123–142.

PUHVEL, Jaan (2001): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, *V/L*. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 26. Berlin – New York.

REICHELT, Hans (1924): "Die indoiranischen Benennungen des Salzes". In: N.N. (ed.): *Streitberg Festgabe*. Leipzig, 292-298.

RICCARDI, Chiara (2015): *Le vie del sale. Denominazioni per sale in antico indiano con studio delle attestazioni vediche*. PhD dissertation. Università di Macerata.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2014): "Ein Kultinventar für Šamuḫa aus Šamuḫa und andere Texte aus Kayalıpınar". *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 146: 43-54.

STARKE, Frank (1985): *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift.* StBoT 30. Wiesbaden.

STARKE, Frank (1995): *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden. Eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes.* StBoT 41. Wiesbaden.

TISCHLER, Johann (2016): *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar. Teil IV. 16. Lieferung, W-Z.* Innsbruck.

VAN DEN HOUT, Theo (1995): *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopo-graphische Untersuchung.* StBoT 38. Wiesbaden.

WATKINS, Calvert (1987): "Questions linguistiques palaïtes et louvites cuneiforms". In: René Lebrun (ed.): *Hethitica VIII. Acta Anatolica E. Laroche oblata*. BCILL 37. Louvain-la-Neuve, 423-426.

WATKINS, Calvert (1997): "Luvo-Hittite: *lapan*(*a*)-". In: Dorothy Disterheft – Martin Huld – John Greppin (eds.): *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel I*. Washington, 29-35.

WITZEL, Michael (2003): "Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Exchange in Prehistoric Western Central Asia". *Sino-Platonic Papers* 129: 1-70.

The Lycian toponym Κάδρεμα and the Anatolian wheat[*]

Valerio Pisaniello
Università degli Studi di Verona

1. *Introduction*

In the *Ethnika* of Stephanus of Byzantium (6th c. CE), the Lycian city name Κάδρεμα is attested, currently identified with the modern settlement of Gedelma.[1] Here follows the text, from the most recent edition by Billerbeck (2014: 8):

Κάδρεμα, πόλις Λυκίας, ἄποικος Ὀλβίων. ἑρμηνεύεται δὲ σίτου φρυγμὸς ἡ πόλις. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Καδρεμεύς.
'Kadrema: city of Lycia, colony of the Olbians. The city is explained as "grain parching". The ethnicon is *Kadremeus*.'

Although the text does not explicitly say that Κάδρεμα is a Lycian name, it seems reasonable to assume it.[2] According to Stephanus, the meaning of this city name has to do with 'grain' (σῖτος), but a philological problem involves the head

---

1. 12 km west of Kemer; cf. Şahin (2001: 147-151), Çevik (2008: 207).
2. See Kretschmer (1896: 322-323). Kalinka (1901: 114) also included Κάδρεμα in his index of Lycian words.

noun φρυγμός. Manuscripts[3] have the reading φυγμός, mistakenly replaced by φιγμός[4] in the Aldina edition (Manuzio 1502), also reprinted in the Giuntina (Giunta 1521) and in Xylander's edition (1568: 153). The correction φρυγμός 'parching, roasting', found in van Berkel (1694: 434),[5] de Pinedo (1725: 343),[6] Dindorf (1825: 229), Westermann (1839: 153), Meineke (1849: 346), and Billerbeck (2014: 8), was first suggested by Salmasius (*apud* van Berkel 1694).[7]

A different correction was suggested later by Neumann (1962: 207), who thought of ὀρυγμός 'excavation, pit, mine', assuming that the initial sequence ορ- may have been corrupted in φ, because the meaning "Getreideröstung" seems to be unusual for a toponym and the practice of storing grain in pits was common in ancient Asia Minor.

In what follows, I will first try to clarify the origin of this toponym, based on the Anatolian data currently available and considering the different etymologies suggested. I will then return to the text of Stephanus in the conclusion.[8]

2. *Κάδρεμα and Hitt.* kant- *'wheat'*

Based on the meaning given by Stephanus of Byzantium, which concerns 'grain', the element καδ- in the toponym Κάδρεμα is compared by Neumann (1962: 207-208) with the Hittite noun *kant-* 'Einkorn wheat',[9] assuming a "Na-

---

3. On the tradition of Stephanus of Byzantium, cf. Diller (1938) and Billerbeck (2006: 5*-49*).

4. Not φριγμός, as mistakenly noted by Meineke (1849: 346) and reported by Neumann (1962: 207), Tischler (1977-1983/K: 486), and Zgusta (1984: 211 fn. 217). The Aldina edition (Manuzio 1502) is treated as *codicis instar* by Meineke, but its text seems to depend on manuscript N (= Neapolitanus III.AA.18; cf. Billerbeck 2006: 24*-25*).

5. Also cf. his Latin translation: "CADREMA, urbs Lyciae, Olbiorum colonia. Nomen Urbis frumenti siccitatem denotat. Gentile, Cadramensis".

6. The text has φιγμός, but with the note "Lege σίτου φρυγμός", hence the Latin translation: "CADREMA, urbs Lyciae, Olbiorum colonia: interpretatur vero *frumenti siccitas*. Civitas. Gentile, Cadremeus".

7. Cf. van Berkel (1694: 434-435 fn. 25): "Pessimo errore in omnibus vulgatis excusum legitur φιγμός, sed meliorem vocem ex MSS revocavimus". Also note Holste (1684: 153-154): "MSS. pro φιγμὸς legunt φυγμός. Unde Cl. Salmasius putabat legendum, φρυγμὸς. Saltem aliquo sensu: nam in vulgata est nullus".

8. I will not consider in this paper the mount name *Cadra* occurring in Tac. *Ann.* 6.41 (cf. Zgusta 1984: 212).

9. See Hoffner (1974: 69-73) for the meaning. The etymology of Hitt. *kant-* is controversial and it is generally regarded as an Indo-Iranian loanword or a *Wanderwort* (cf. Avest. *gaṇtuma* 'wheat', Skt. *godhū́ma* 'wheat', and possibly Gr. χόνδρος 'wheat groats', Toch. A *kanti* [a kind of bread], and

salreduktion".[10] The final -εμα is explained as an abstract suffix, matching Hitt. -*ima* or Luw. -*ama*-. Because its Greek cognate suffix is -μός, either φρυγμός or ὀρυγμός would also provide a formal match, as far as derivational morphology is concerned (cf. Neumann 1962: 207 fn. 10). The underlying Lycian form might thus be a compound (something like Gr. *σιτοφρυγμός) or a deverbative noun (like Gr. σιτισμός < σιτίζω 'to feed'), although both solutions are regarded as not entirely satisfactory.

However, Neumann's hypothesis presents two major formal problems:[11]

1) the "Nasalreduktion" is problematic, because the outcome of */Vnt/ is regularly /Ṽt/ = [Ṽd] in Lycian,[12] which is adapted as <Vνδ> in Greek.[13] Therefore, were the base of Κάδρεμα connected with the Hittite noun *kant*-, the toponym would be very unlikely to be Lycian, because the Lycian expected base would be *kãt*- (> Gr. κανδ-);[14]

2) the <ρ> remains unexplained: were Κάδρεμα a compound, it should belong to its second member, which is not positively recognisable, while an explanation as a deverbative noun in -εμα would recommend its belonging to the base, which therefore could hardly match Hitt. *kant*-.

Therefore, a different base should probably be posited.

Ugar. *ḫndrṯ*), which does not exclude an ultimate Indo-European origin (see especially Tischler 1977-1983/K: 486, Puhvel 1997/K: 56, and Rieken 1999: 45, with references).

10. Neumann (1962: 207 fn. 12, with references) notes that such a phenomenon seems to occur before a dental stop in Pamphylian (e.g. πέντε > πεδε). The same phenomenon would also be attested in the Lycian toponym *xadawãti*- 'Kadyanda', which, according to Neumann (1962: 208), matches Hitt. **kant-want-* 'weizenreich' (see also Neumann 1969: 378, while Rieken 1999: 45 reconstructs a preform **g(ʰ)ont-went-*). See also Tischler (1977-1983/K: 486) and Puhvel (1997/K: 56).

11. See also Schürr (2014: 759).

12. Cf. Melchert (1994: 308-310).

13. See data in Réveilhac (2018: 403-407).

14. The hypothesis of a Pamphylian origin would perhaps remain available, because, according to Stephanus of Byzantium, Kadrema was a colony of Olbia, which was located in western Pamphylia (cf. Zgusta 1984: 211 fn. 216; see also Adak 2006). However, it would be problematic to connect Lyc. *xadawãti*- 'Kadyanda' to the same root: note the regular outcome /ãt/ < */ant/ in the suffix, while Lyc. <d> (= /ð/) in the base should be the outcome of PA */d/ (cf. Melchert 1994: 289). Indeed, according to Melchert (2004: 80), the base of *xadawãti*- rather matches Hitt. **ḫātar* (see below).

3. *Κάδρεμα, Lyc.* xadrñna, *and Hitt.* ḫāt(t)ar

The toponym Κάδρεμα has been connected by Kluge (1910: 115) with the Lycian word *xadrñna*,[15] occurring in the inscription TL 150 from Rhodiapolis, in the following context:

(8) … *xssẽñzijaje : hberuse* (9) *zasãni : xadrñna : uhazata : kumezeine*
'*xadrñna* yearly offerings are due to Xssẽñzija's relatives[?] to worship.'[16]

Previous interpretations by Torp (1898: 39) and Meriggi (1930: 459)[17] regarded *xadrñna* as a numeral, 'four',[18] while Carruba (1974: 590) suggested a comparison with Hitt. *ḫatrae-* 'to write' ("la quota annuale (fissata per) iscritto"), though not excluding a connection with the stem *hat-* 'to dry up'. According to Melchert (2004: 80), *xadrñna* is explained as an adjective in *-*wann*(*i*)- derived from an unattested Lycian noun *xadar,[19] matching Hitt. *ḫātar, which should be the reading hidden behind the Sumerographic spelling ZÍZ-*tar* 'spelt',[20] as previously suggested by Watkins (1973: 191-192 fn. 5). Therefore, *xadrñna uhazata* would mean 'yearly offerings of grain' (*vel sim*.).[21]

It should be noted that a Hittite word *ḫāt*(*t*)*ar* meaning a kind of cereal actually exists, although it cannot correspond to ZÍZ-*tar*.[22] Such a noun may be regarded

15. Kluge (1910: 115): "*kadrñna* nur hier [*scil*. in TL 150, 9] St. B. κάδρεμα = (σίτου φρυγμός). (Kal.); der Name ist jedenfalls Eigenname und auch, wenn nicht Stadtname, so doch Ethnikon". The term may also be a place name according to Schürr (2014: 759 fn. 41). See also Carruba (1974: 582 fn. 9).

16. Translation based on the grammatical analysis by Yakubovich in the eDiAna corpus (I. Yakubovich (ed.), Provisional annotation of the Lycian corpus, https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/corpus.php, visited on 2020-11-03).

17. Cf. his translation: "dem *Kssẽñzija* …… vier (quaterna) *uhazata* zu bezahlen".

18. Meriggi compared *kbisñne/i-* and *trisñne/i-*, currently explained as compounds with *-sñne-* (= Hitt. *zēna-* 'autumn') as second member, i.e. 'two-years-old' and 'three-years-old' respectively (see Melchert 2004: 31, 70, with references).

19. Melchert however adds: "but use of suffix would be unique". A different possibility could involve the Lycian cognate of the Luwian suffix *-anna/i-*, forming both diminutives and possessive adjectives secondarily substantivized, e.g. Luw. *:kantanna/i-* 'having wheat' > 'wheat-field' (cf. Melchert 2003: 196; on Luw. *:kantanna/i-* see also Starke 1995: 116-117 fn. 226). See however Schürr (2014: 759 fn. 41), who tentatively regards *xadrñna* as a toponym: "Der Vergleich mit *Arñna* = Xanthos < *Awarna* könnte aber eine Analyse *χad-rñna* nahelegen".

20. See Melchert (2004: 80) s.v. *Xadawãti-*.

21. The meaning 'of grain' is also dubitatively accepted by Yakubovich in the eDiAna corpus.

22. As Watkins (1975: 185) notes, Hitt. *ḫattar* cannot be the reading of the Sumerogram ZÍZ, which is a heteroclitic *r/n*-stem (attested forms include nom.-acc.sg. ZÍZ-*tar*, gen.sg. ZÍZ-*na-aš*,

as a good comparandum for the base of Lyc. *xadrñna*.[23] While the correspondence between Lyc. *x* and Hitt. *ḫ* is not problematic,[24] Lyc. *d* (= /ð/)[25] would require a PA */d/, which cannot be safely reconstructed for the preform of Hitt. *ḫāt(t)ar*. Indeed, for the Hittite word, the following spellings are attested:[26]

ḫa-a-tar-	Bo 3123 iv 6′ (OH/OS)
ḫa-a-a[t-tar-	KBo 25.79 iv[?] 6′ (OH/OS)
ḫa-a-at-tar'(KUR)-	IBoT 2.93 rev. 13′ (OH/LNS)
ḫa-at-tar-	KUB 42.107 iii[?] 10′ (OH/NS)
ḫa-at-tar	KBo 11.14 i 6 (OH/NS)
ḫa-a-tar	KBo 13.119 iii 21′ (MH[?]/NS)

As can be seen, this noun is mostly spelled with <tt>, which points to an original voiceless *t* according to the Sturtevant's Law,[27] although two occurrences with single <t> are found.[28] The issue is relevant for the etymology of the word: if the original form was *ḫa-a-tar*, i.e. /ḫadar/, it would be possible to connect this word to the Hittite verb *ḫat-* 'to dry up' (< PIE *h_2od-), consistently spelled with a

---

dat.sg. ZÍZ-*ni*), because the two nouns occur in the same list of cereals: KBo 11.14 i 6 ZÍZ-*tar še-ep-pí-it pár-ḫu-u-e-na-aš e-wa-an kar-aš ḫa-at-tar* (7) *zi-na-il ku-u-ti-ya-an* (see also Rieken 1999: 315 fn. 1527). As mentioned, before knowing of the existence of the noun *ḫattar*, Watkins (1973: 191-192 fn. 5) himself proposed that **ḫatar* (= Lat. *ador*) could be the Hittite reading of ZÍZ. Note that sometimes *ḫattar* is still indicated as the Hittite reading of ZÍZ; cf. e.g. Tischler (2001: 47, 268), Hagenbuchner (2002: 6), HW[2] Ḫ: 343 s.v. *ḫaršanant-*, 367 s.v. [DUG]*ḫarši*, 372 s.v. [(DUG)]*ḫaršiyalli-* (but not s.v. *ḫat(t)ar* in Lief. 18: *3), and Weeden (2011: 651) (referring to the HW[2]), besides aforementioned Melchert (2004: 80) s.v. *Xadawãti*. According to the HW[2] Ḫ s.v. *ḫat(t)ar* (Lief. 18: *3-*5), the noun may correspond instead to the Sumerogram GÚ.TUR 'pea[?], lentil[?]'. On ZÍZ in Anatolia see especially Hoffner (1974: 65-69) and Del Monte (1995: 126-129).

23. See also Neumann (2007: 109).

24. Cf. Melchert (1994: 286). See also Réveilhac (2018: 329-333).

25. Cf. Réveilhac (2018: 312-316).

26. Cf. Tischler (1977-1983/A-K: 220), Puhvel (1991/H: 247), Rieken (1999: 314), HW[2] Ḫ Lief. 18: *3-*5, Pozza (2011: 173) (but *ḫa-at-ta-ra-an* in KUB 32.117+ iii 16′, 17′ probably does not belong here).

27. I follow the traditional interpretation of the intervocalic single vs. geminate spelling opposition in terms of voice (<VttV> = /t/ < PIE *t* vs. <VtV> = /d/ < PIE *$d^{(h)}$*), as first suggested by Sturtevant (1932). For a different explanation in terms of consonantal length (<VttV> = /tt/ vs. <VtV>) = /t/) see Kloekhorst (2016), recently rejected by Simon (2020).

28. Also note that *ḫa-a-tar* in KBo 13.119 iii 21′ occurs in a very broken and unclear context, so that its belonging here remains uncertain (cf. Berman 1972: 85).

single dental stop.[29] Such a derivation from ḫat- would be very attractive because it would allow the connection of Hitt. ḫāt(t)ar with the Latin noun ador 'coarse grain, spelt', which has been traced back by Watkins (1973) to the same PIE root,[30] given that the Hittite verb ḫat- also referred to drying of cereals.[31] However, Watkins (1975: 184-186) himself excluded that Hitt. ḫattar, written with <tt>, could match Lat. ador, and he envisaged a connection with Lat. āter 'black', assuming that Hitt. ḫattar may perhaps denote something like black beans. He did not know of the occurrence of ḫa-a-tar- in Bo 3123 iv 6′, but only of the one in KBo 13.119 iii 21′, very uncertain due to the fragmentary context.

According to Rieken (1999: 314), the different spellings point to an original form ḫāttar, which would exclude a derivation from the verb ḫat- 'to dry up'. The connection with Lat. āter envisaged by Watkins (1975) is also regarded as a mere "Anklangsetymologie", which cannot be proven until the specific type of cereal is determined. Therefore, she suggests the belonging of ḫāttar to Hitt. ḫatt- 'to pierce, to strike' (< PIE *$h_2$et-/*$h_2$ot-), comparing Hitt. kar(a)š- 'emmer wheat' < PIE *$ĝ^hers$- 'to pierce, to bristle' (cf. Lat. hordeum).[32]

As to the kind of formation, attested forms do not allow the determination of whether ḫāt(t)ar belonged to the r-stems or to the heteroclitic r/n-class, so that Rieken (1999: 315) reconstructs: (1) on one hand, either *h_2e-h_2t-ro-, if ḫāttar is cognate of Lat. āter, or *$h_2$ot-ro-, if it belongs to ḫatt- 'to pierce' (cf. *ḫatra- in ḫatrae- 'to write'); (2) on the other hand, either *$h_2$éh$_2$t-r̥/-n- or $h_2$ót-r̥/*$h_2$ét-n-.

In my view, the possibility of a derivation from ḫat- 'to dry up' cannot be entirely excluded, because spellings with simple <t> are actually attested, already in OS,[33] although they seem to be less frequent (but we are only dealing with six oc-

---

29. Cf. Puhvel (1991/H: 247-248) and Hajnal (1995: 34 n. 20). On Hitt. ḫat- see also Tischler (1977-1983/A-K: 213-214), HW² A: 478-482, Kloekhorst (2008: 328-329).

30. See also Poetto (1976) and de Vaan (2008: 25) (with further comparison with Arm. hat 'grain', haĉar 'barley', and Got. atisk 'grainfield'). The noun is explained by Watkins (1975: 183) as a collective *$h_2$ed-ōr 'dry stuff' (cf. *wed-ōr 'wet stuff' = 'water'), while Poetto (1976: 158-160) reconstructs a neuter s-stem *ados. In de Vaan (2008: 25) both solutions are offered: "Lat. ador probably reflects a neuter collective *ad-ōs or *ad-ōr".

31. See e.g. 3 PA. *eras.* ZÌ.DA ZÍZ ḫa-a-ta-an-da-aš, 'three parīsu of meal of dried spelt' (IBoT 2.93 obv. 12′) and … Z]Ì.DA-aš ḫa-a-ta-an ma-al-la-an, '[… of me]al dried (and) milled' (KBo 16.78+ i 8′).

32. Cf. also Puhvel (1997/K: 75) and Kloekhorst (2008: 444-445), which reconstructs *$ĝ^hersd^h$-.

33. However, according to Kloekhorst (2014: 263), ḫa-a-tar in Bo 3123 should be probably emended to ḫa-a<-at>-tar.

currences, to my knowledge).[34] Therefore, as a working hypothesis, I would tentatively assume that the spelling with single <t> may reflect the original form, while the one with <tt> could be a later – although still ancient – development, possibly through para-etymological association with the verb *ḫatt-* 'to pierce', although, of course, there is no evidence of this, and the opposite path – i.e. from original *ḫāttar* to *ḫātar* via possible para-etymological association with *ḫat-* 'to dry up' – would be perfectly conceivable. Such a solution would provide a good cognate for Lat. *ador* as well as a good base for both Lyc. *xadrñna* and Κάδρεμα. Indeed, the element Καδρ- in the Greek form seems to perfectly reflect the Lycian base *xadr°* found in *xadrñna*, given the consistent correspondence between Lyc. <x> and Gr. <κ> and Lyc. <d> and Gr. <δ>.[35] The Lycian toponym may thus be reconstructed as **xadrm̃me*.[36]

Of course, one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that two similar but different Hittite words – *ḫāttar* (= GÚ.TUR?) and **ḫātar* (= ZÍZ-*tar*) – existed, the latter matching the base of the Lycian words we are dealing with, but such a solution finds no confirmation so far.

Possibly related to the same noun is Lyc. *xθθase* (TL 131, 4), whose form and meaning are, however, not entirely clear. According to Neumann (1974: 113-114), the sequence should be analysed as an adjective *xθθa* < **xadahi-* < **xad(a)-* "Getreide" (= Hitt. *kant-*)[37] and the conjunction *se*, while Carruba (1974: 582) suggested a derivation from **ḫatašši-* "ciò che è secco, disseccato" (> 'fodder') from the root *ḫat-* 'to dry up', without a conclusive explanation for the suffix *-se* (he invoked **ḫatašašt/k/ḫa/i-* or **ḫataššanza* as possible "Luwian" preforms). Hajnal (1995: 34 n. 20) follows Neumann's analysis, but connecting Lyc. **xada-* (i.e. **/ḫad-ā́-/*) to Hitt. *ḫattar*, both < **ḫā́d-ro-* "das getrocknete (sc. Getreide)", with the loss of final *-r* in Lycian. Finally, Melchert (2004: 85) explains *xθθase* as a dat.-

---

34. Also consider that, according to some scholars, Sturtevant's Law cannot be regarded as entirely reliable, because some Hittite words show consistent spellings that do not correspond to the expected outcomes, and examples of alternation between single and geminate stops in the same stem can be sometimes found (cf. e.g. Pozza (2011: 700-713), who also recalls Sturtevant's (1932: 1) own remark: "this tendency can rarely be used to determine the truth of an etymology"). However, most of the alleged problematic examples can be explained in different ways (see e.g. Kloekhorst 2014: 543-596), so that this cannot really represent an argument.

35. Cf. Réveilhac (2018: 312-316, 321-323).

36. For -εμα, with vowel <ε>, matching Lyc. -*m̃me* after /r/, cf. Lyc. *Trm̃mile/i* = Gr. Τρεμιλεῖς (besides Τερμίλαι). Also cf. perhaps the Lycian city name **xuxrm̃me*, indirectly attested in the ethnonym *xuxrm̃mezi* in the inscription N 337, which is however connected by Eichner (*apud* Christiansen 2012: 148-151) to the Hittite personal name *Ḫuḫarmati*.

37. Note however that Lyc. *x* usually matches Hitt. *ḫ*.

loc.sg. of an abstract/collective stem *xθθas-* (etymology and meaning not provided).[38]

4. *The suffix -εμα*

Now that we have made it clear that a base matching Hitt. *ḫā(t)tar* is probably more fitting than *kant-*, the issue of the suffix remains to be addressed. As mentioned, according to Neumann (1962: 207), -εμα could represent the Lycian cognate of the Hittite abstract suffix -(*i*)*ma-* and Luwian -(*a*)*ma/i-*,[39] but this is not the only possibility.

In fact, the toponym Κάδρεμα, allegedly Lyc. *xadrm̃me*, may theoretically reflect at least three possible formations attested in Luwian:[40]

1) a common gender noun built with the suffix -(*a*)*ma/i-* (< *-*mo-*), which forms action nouns from verbs (e.g. *lalama/i-* 'receipt' < *lala-* 'to take'), while the corresponding Hittite suffix -(*i*)*ma-* was also extended to adjectival bases (cf. Hoffner – Melchert 2008: 58-59);[41]

2) an original adjective built with the suffix -*ama/i-* (< *-*mo-*), which forms adjectives of appurtenance from nouns (e.g. LÚ*maššanāma/i-*, a cultic functionary, lit. 'belonging to god'[42] < *maššana/i-* 'god');

3) an original adjective built with the participial suffix -*m*(*m*)*a/i-* (Lyc. -*me/i-*),[43] which was also secondarily extended to noun bases to form possessive adjectives (e.g. *piḫamma/i-* 'imbued with splendour' < *piḫa-* 'splendour').[44]

In my view, the second and the third solutions seem to be the best ones, while I would exclude the first possibility, an abstract noun in -(*a*)*ma/i-*. Of these stems,

---

38. See also Neumann (2007: 135-136, with further explanations).

39. According to Starke (1990: 296: 1010), Luwic languages do not show a cognate of the Hittite suffix -(*i*)*ma-*, because Luw. -*mman-* and Lyc. -*m̃ma-*, with a geminate nasal, point to a different suffix, which also derives nouns from verbs (see Starke 1990: 243-299). However, Melchert (1993: iv; 2014: 208) rightly pointed out that Luwian actually shows a deverbative animate suffix -(*a*)*ma/i-*, with single /m/, matching Hitt. -(*i*)*ma-* (see already Laroche 1956).

40. Cf. Melchert (2003: 195) and Melchert (2014: 206-209).

41. On this suffix, see also Oettinger (2001).

42. See now the entry by A.H. Bauer and Zs. Simon in the eDiAna dictionary (https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1278).

43. This suffix is the outcome of *-*mn-a-*, based on the suffix -*mman* (< *-*men*) that forms neuter action nouns from verbs (cf. Melchert 2003: 197, Melchert 2014: 207).

44. A Lycian example may be *Tesm̃mi-*, denoting a divine agent, which, according to Melchert (2004: 64), is probably a "direct denominative to *tese-*, not participle".

Lycian surely shows participles, while the presence of the other two classes is more difficult to assess.

5. *Conclusion*

Taking it for granted that Stephanus' words on the Lycian city Κάδρεμα meaning something connected to grain are reliable, assuming i.e. that it is not a folk etymology,[45] the toponym can be explained as a derivative of the Lycian cognate of Hittite *ḫāt(t)ar* (a kind of cereal), **xada(r)*[46] or the like (probably indirectly attested in the derivative *xadrñna* in TL 150), while previous connections with the Lycian cognate of Hittite *kant-* should be rejected on phonetic grounds, because the lack of expected /n/ in the Greek form and the unexpected presence of /r/ cannot be accounted for.

As to the suffix, at least two possibilities remain available: Κάδρεμα (= **xadrm̃me*) may represent either an original denominative appurtenance adjective in *-ama/i-* ('of grain'), although such a noun class, certainly existing in Luwian, has not been clearly identified in Lycian, or an adjective built with the participial suffix *-m(m)a/i-* (Lyc. *-me/i-*), secondarily extended to a noun base ('having grain').[47]

While the Lycian etymology of Κάδρεμα, although not entirely clear, may be not very problematic, its exact meaning according to Stephanus remains quite questionable because of a philological problem. Φυγμός, transmitted by codices, cannot be accepted. Both Salmasius' φρυγμός 'parching, roasting' and Neumann's ὀρυγμός 'pit' are quite economic amendments, and both words are actually attested, the first one in Hesychius' *Lexicon* (φ 947: φρυγμόν· καῦσιν), the second one in an inscription from Thebes on Mykale, in Ionia (acc.pl. τοὺς ὀρυγμούς, IK Priene 415, mid 4th c. BC), although the most common form is ὄρυγμα, -ατος.

45. Such a possibility obviously exists. In this case, one should think to a different etymology for Κάδρεμα. Comparison with Hitt. *ḫatrae-* 'to write' may seem attractive, but <t> would be expected in Lycian, which is consistently adapted as <τ> in Greek, except when it follows a nasal, where <δ> is found (cf. Réveilhac 2018: 309-311). In any case, of course, Stephanus' explanation seems to imply the existence of a Lycian word **xada(r)* (*vel sim.*) meaning 'grain' or the like, even if it was not the actual base of the toponym Κάδρεμα.

46. Note that single consonants are generally lost in Lycian in final position (cf. Melchert 1994: 323), but final /r/ may have been preserved in derivative stems like *xadrñna* and **xadrm̃me* = Κάδρεμα (many thanks to H.C. Melchert for this remark).

47. One may also try to explain Κάδρεμα as an action noun directly derived from the Lycian cognate of Hittite verb *ḫat-* (= 'drying'), but the presence of /r/ would remain unexplained.

From a semantic point of view, 'grain pit' may appear as more appropriate for a toponym than 'grain parching', but the physical and climatic characteristics of the area – were the identification with Gedelma correct – rather seem to suggest the latter explanation:

"Eine solche Erklärung des Wortes [*scil*. Neumann's σίτου ὀρυγμός] ist aber wegen des feuchten Bodens des lykisch-pamphylischen Gebiets kaum vorstellbar. Andererseits sind die traditionellen Getreidespeicher dieser Region Holzbauten, die heute im Lande noch überall im Gebrauch sind. Bleiben wir dagegen in der Konjektur σίτου φρυγμός, so würde Gedelma für die Eigenschaft einer 'Getreidedarre' gut in Frage kommen. Denn das Dorf liegt in einem von Felswänden der hohen Bergen umschlossenen Bergkessel […], wo die Luft durch Rückstrahlung der Hitze sehr heiß und ziemlich trocken ist. Ferner weht der Fallwind […] direkt über den Bergkessel von Gedelma hinüber in die Schlucht von Kesme Boğazı hinunter, so daß in dem Ort günstige klimatische Einflüsse entstehen, die dafür sorgen, daß das Getreide in der Aufbewahrung nicht schimmelt, sondern gründlich getrocknet wird (Şahin 2001: 148)."

Furthermore, while I was not able to find any context in which ὄρυγμα is associated with the storage of cereals, the verb φρύγω, base of the derivative φρυγμός, actually means 'to parch' or 'to roast' (despite Hesychius' καῦσιν, which seems to only point to a burning process) and also referred to cereals.[48]

As a final remark, if Hitt. *ḫāt(t)ar*, presumably matching the base of the Lycian city name Κάδρεμα, actually derives from *ḫat-* 'to dry up', one cannot help but notice the curious coincidence that Stephanus' explanation of the toponym as σίτου φρυγμὸς (assuming that Salmasius' emendation is correct) calls into question the parching process. Of course, it could actually be just a coincidence; however, I would not entirely exclude the possibility that a trace of an (alleged) original etymological connection may have survived and been somehow transmitted to Stephanus' sources.

---

48. Cf. e.g. πεφρυγμένας κριθάς, 'parched barley', in Thuc. 6.22.

6. *References*

HW² = Friedrich, Johannes et al. (1975–): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.

ADAK, Mustafa (2006): "Olbia in Pamphylien – Die epigraphische Evidenz". *Gephyra* 3: 1-28.

BAUER, Anna H. – SIMON, Zsolt (2020): "Luwian *massanam(i)*- 'prophet'". In: *eDiAna.* https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1278

BERMAN, Howard (1972): *The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives*. PhD Dissertation. University of Chicago.

BILLERBECK, Margarethe (2006): *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica. I: Α–Γ*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 43/1. Berlin – New York.

BILLERBECK, Margarethe (2014), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica. III: Κ–Ο*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae 43/3. Berlin – Boston.

CARRUBA, Onofrio (1974): "I termini per *mese*, *anno* e i numerali in licio". *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche* 108: 575-597.

ÇEVIK, Nevzat (2008): "Northeast Lycia. The New Evidence – Results from the past ten years from the Bey Mountains Surface Surveys". *Adalya* 11: 189-233.

CHRISTIANSEN, Birgit (2012): "Die lykische Nova N 337 aus Limyra: Ein Vertrag zwischen der Stadt *Zẽmuri* (Limyra) und **Xuχrm̃me*/*i*? Mit einem Exkursus von Heiner Eichner zum neuen lykischen Ethnikon *Xuχrm̃mezi*". In: Martin Seyer (ed.): *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposions. Wien, 3.-5. Dezember 2009*. Wien, 141-153.

DE PINEDO, Thomas (1725 [1678]): Στέφανος. Περὶ πολεῶν / *Stephanus. De urbibus*. Amsterdam.

DE VAAN, Michiel (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages.* LIEEDS 7. Leiden – Boston.

DEL MONTE, Giuseppe (1995): "I testi amministrativi da Maşat Höyük/Tapika". *Orientis Antiqui Miscellanea* 2: 89-138.

DILLER, Aubrey (1938): "The Tradition of Stephanus Byzantius". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 69: 333-348.

DINDORF, Karl Wilhelm (1825): *Stephanus Byzantinus cum annotationibus L. Holstenii, A. Berkelii et Th. de Pinedo*. Leipzig.

GIUNTA, Philippo (1521): Στέφανος περὶ πολεῶν / *Stephanus de urbibus*. Firenze.

HAGENBUCHNER, Albertine (2002): *Massangaben bei hethitischen Backwaren.* DBH 1. Dresden.

HAJNAL, Ivo (1995): *Der lykische Vokalismus. Methode und Erkenntnisse der vergleichenden anatolischen Sprachwissenschaft, angewandt auf das Vokalsystem einer Kleincorpussprache.* Universität Zürich.

HOFFNER, Harry A. (1974): *Alimenta Hethaeorum. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor.* AOS 55. New Haven.

HOFFNER, Harry A. – MELCHERT, H. Craig (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar.* LANE 1. Winona Lake.

HOLSTE, Lukas (1684): *Lucae Holstenii Notae et castigationes postumae in Stephani Byzantii* Ἐθνικά*, quae vulgo* Περὶ πολεῶν *inscribuntur: post longam doctorum exspectationem editae a Theodoro Ryckio.* Leiden.

KALINKA, Ernst (1901): *Tituli Lyciae lingua lycia conscripti.* TAM 1. Wien

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2014): *Accent in Hittite. A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics.* StBoT 56. Wiesbaden.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2016): "The Anatolian stop system and the Indo-Hittite hypothesis". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121: 213-247.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon.* LIEEDS 5. Leiden – Boston.

KLUGE, Theodor (1910): *Studien zur vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft der kaukasischen Sprachen. II: Die Lykischen Inschriften.* Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft 15/1. Leipzig.

KRETSCHMER, Paul (1896): *Einleitung in die Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache.* Göttingen.

LAROCHE, Emmanuel (1956): "Hittite -*ima*-: indo-européen -*mó*-". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 52: 72-82.

MANUZIO, Aldo (1502): Στέφανος περὶ πολεῶν / *Stephanus de urbibus.* Venezia.

MEINEKE, August (1849): *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt.* Berlin.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1993): *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon.* Lexica Anatolica 2. Chapel Hill.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1994): *Anatolian Historical Phonology.* Amsterdam – Atlanta.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2003): "Language". In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.): *The Luwians.* HdO I/68. Leiden – Boston, 170-210.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2004): *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language.* Ann Arbor – New York.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2014): "Anatolian Nominal Stems in *-*(C)o*-". In: Norbert Oettinger – Thomas Steer (eds.): *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der*

Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen. Wiesbaden, 205-214.

MERIGGI, Piero (1930): "Beiträge zur lykischen Syntax. Befehls-, Verbots- und Bedingungssätze". *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1: 414-461.

NEUMANN, Günter (1962): "Beiträge zum Lykischen II". *Die Sprache* 8: 203-212.

NEUMANN, Günter (1969): "Lykisch". In: Bernhard Spuler (ed.), *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. HdO I/2. Leiden – Köln, 358-396.

NEUMANN, Günter (1974): "Beiträge zum Lykischen V". *Die Sprache* 20: 109-114.

NEUMANN, Günter (2007): *Glossar des Lykischen*. DBH 21. Wiesbaden.

OETTINGER, Norbert (2001): "Hethitisch *-ima-* oder: Wie ein Suffix affektiv werden kann". In: Gernot Wilhelm (ed.): *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Wurzburg, 4.-8. Oktober 1999*. StBoT 45. Wiesbaden, 456-477.

POETTO, Massimo (1976): "Di alcune parole indeuropee per 'grano'". *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche* 31: 151-163.

POZZA, Marianna (2011): *La grafia delle occlusive intervocaliche in ittito. Verso una riformulazione della* lex Sturtevant. Lingue, culture e testi 13. Roma.

PUHVEL, Jaan (1991): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary, III/H*. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 3. Berlin – New York.

PUHVEL, Jaan (1997): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary, IV/K*. Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 14. Berlin – New York.

RÉVEILHAC, Florian (2018): *Contact linguistique et emprunts onomastiques entre grec et lycien: apports à la phonétique et à la morphologie*. PhD Dissertation. Sorbonne Université.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (1999): *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden.

ŞAHIN, Sencer (2001): "Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Antalya V. Olbia und einige andere Küstenorte bei Kemer in Westpamphylien". *Epigraphica Anatolica* 33: 145-167.

SCHÜRR, Diether (2014): "Lykische Orte und ihre Namen: drei Namentypen". In: Piotr Taracha – Magdalena Kapełuś (eds.): *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology. Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011*. Warsaw, 743-774.

SIMON, Zsolt (2020): "The Anatolian Stop System and the Indo-Hittite Hypothesis – Revisited". In: Matilde Serangeli – Thomas Olander (eds.): *Dispersals and Diversification. Linguistic and Archaeological Perspectives on the Early*

Stages of Indo-European. Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 19. Leiden – Boston, 236-250.

STARKE, Frank (1990): *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens.* StBoT 31. Wiesbaden.

STARKE, Frank (1995): *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden. Eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes.* StBoT 41. Wiesbaden.

STURTEVANT, Edgar H. (1932): "The Development of the Stops in Hittite". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 52: 1-12.

TISCHLER, Johann (1977-1983): *Hethitisches Etymologisches Glossar*, *A-K.* IBS 20. Innsbruck.

TISCHLER, Johann (2001): *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen.* IBS 102. Innsbruck.

TORP, Alf (1898): *Lykische Beiträge I.* Videnskabsselskabets Skrifter. II. Historisch-filologische Klasse, 1898 No. 4. Christiania.

VAN BERKEL, Abraham (1694[2]): Στεφάνου Βυζαντίου Ἐθνικὰ κατ᾽ ἐπιτομήν / *Stephani Byzantini Gentilia per epitomen, antehac* Περὶ πολεῶν *De urbibus inscripta.* Leiden.

WATKINS, Calvert (1973): "An Indo-European Agricultural Term: Latin *ador*, Hittite ḫat-". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77: 187-193.

WATKINS, Calvert (1975): "Latin *ador*, Hittite ḫat- Again: Addenda to *HSPC* 77, 1973: 187-193". *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79: 181-187.

WEEDEN, Mark (2011): *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship.* StBoT 54. Wiesbaden.

WESTERMANN, Anton (1839): *Stephani Byzantii* Ἐθνικῶν *quae supersunt.* Leipzig.

XYLANDER, Guilielmus (1568): Στέφανος. Περὶ πολεῶν / *Stephanus. De urbibus.* Basel.

ZGUSTA, Ladislav (1984): *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen.* Beiträge zur Namenforschung N.F. 21. Heidelberg.

The Letoon Trilingual revisited:
some notes on the 'King of Kaunos'

Mariona Vernet
Universitat de Barcelona – IPOA

1. *Introduction. The theonyms in the Letoon trilingual*

This paper will focus on the Letoon trilingual, in particular on the main theonym documented there, the 'King of Kaunos'. First, I carry out a philological analysis of this god name in the Lycian, Greek and Aramaic versions (§2). Second, I centre on the Aramaic inscription in order to offer a fuller analysis of this theonym, taking into account the correspondences of the place name 'Kaunos' and the gentilic 'Kaunian' in the epichoric languages (Carian and Lycian) as a basis for further study. Then (§3), I give a new morphological explanation for the sequence in Aramaic KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ʾᵉlâhâ Kbidšay/ 'Kandawats, the god of Kaunos': in my view, the word KBYDŠY /Kbidšay/ should be analysed as a recharacterization of the Carian place name of 'Kaunos' in genitive singular followed by the Aramaic gentilic suffix in -Y. Finally (§4), I compare this Aramaic sequence with some parallel passages found in the Greek inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos, which record 'Βασιλέως Καύνου τοῦ θεοῦ' ('the King of Kaunos, the god') and 'Βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ' ('the King, the god').

As is well known, the Letoon trilingual, written in Lycian, Greek and Aramaic,[1] was made in order to establish a new cult among the Xanthians and their

---

1. The Lycian and Greek versions of the trilingual were inscribed on the two widest faces of the stele, but the Aramaic inscription appears on one of its narrow sides and is considerably shorter than

neighbours: the worship of two deities, *the Kaunian King and Arkkazuma the king*.[2] In the curse in the final paragraph the trilingual also mentions the local divinities, of which archaeological evidence has been found in the sanctuary of Letoon: Leto and her children (Artemis and Apollo), and the nymphs.[3] In Aramaic, instead of Apollo we find the theonym *Ḥšatrapati* ('Lord of Power'), a *hapax legomenon* of Iranian origin. The use of *Ḥšatrapati* instead of Apollo in the Aramaic inscription has been a matter of debate among scholars. This theonym may be the first instance of the Apollo-Mithra syncretism (Dupont-Sommer 1974 and Mayrhofer 1979: 185).[4]

2. *The 'King of Kaunos' in context*

Leaving these divinities aside, I will focus my attention on the main deity of the trilingual, the *King of Kaunos*, for which we do not have any archaeological evidence. Let us see first how this theonym appears in the three inscriptions of the trilingual. In the three versions, the 'Kaunian King' is always followed by the name of another divinity, the god 'ArKKazuma', of controversial origin and unknown identification.[5]

The first reference to these two theonyms appears at the beginning of part 2 of the inscription, that is, at the beginning of the decree itself.[6] Let us look at the name of these divinities in context:[7]

---

its Lycian and Greek counterparts. From a palaeographical point of view, both the Lycian and the Greek versions are extremely well written and meticulously inscribed in stoichedon style. This cannot be said of the Aramaic version, which does not follow this style and even contains some epigraphical errors and a less accurate ductus (Dupont-Sommer 1974: 134-135 and 1979: 163-165).

2. Two dates have been proposed for the inscription: 358 BC (according to Dupont-Sommer 1974: 135 and 1979: 166; Teixidor 1978: 181) and 337 BC (according to Badian 1977).

3. From an archaeological point of view, the sanctuary of Letoon contains three temples from the Hellenistic period dedicated to Leto, Artemis and Apollo. But according to Metzger (1979), there are archaeological remains from the fifth/fourth centuries BC (Lycian and Persian period) when the Letoon Trilingual was written: a first temple, and a sacred fountain dating from the fifth century BC.

4. But the oddity of this *hapax legomenon* has not been satisfactorily explained. In my view, the scribe who wrote the name *Ḥšatra-pati* in the Letoon Trilingual may have been influenced by a very similar passage in the Xanthos Stele (TL44c) (see Vernet 2021).

5. As Laroche (1979) and Lemaire (1995) suggested, however, it seems very likely that Lyc. *ArKKazuma* (Gr. Ἀρκεσιμα) is of Carian origin; however, this issue needs further research and I will not explore it further here.

6. The Letoon trilingual clearly shows three different parts shared by the three inscriptions: (1) a preamble (corresponding to L. 1-6a, G. 1-5a and A. 1-5), (2) the decree itself (corresponding to L 6b-

L.
1. ubedẽ : arus : sejepewẽtlm̃mẽi : arñ-
2. nãi : m̃maitẽ : kummezijẽ : θθẽ : x̃ntawa-
3. ti : xbidẽñni : sejarKKazuma : x̃nta-
4. wati : sẽñnaitẽ : kumazu : mahãna : eb-

"and the Xanthian *perioikoi* built a sacrificial installation/dedication to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma the king" (transl. of Melchert 2018).

G.
5. τὴν Ἀρτεμηλιν. Ἔδοξε δὴ Ξανθίοι-
6. ς καὶ τοῖς περιοίκοις ἱδρύσασθ-
7. αι βωμὸν Βασιλεῖ Καυνίῳ καὶ Ἀρ-
8. κεσιμαι, καὶ εἵλοντο ἱερέα Σιμί-

"the Xanthians and the *perioikoi* decided to erect an altar/shrine for the *Basileus Kaunios* and *Arkesimas*" (my transl.)

A.
6. ʾTʿŠTW BʿLY ʾWRN
7. *K/DR/NPʾ* LMʿBD LKNDWŠ
8. ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY WKNWTH

"The 'citizens' of Orna have contemplated *instituting a cult/making a chapel* (?) to the god Kandawats Caunian and his colleagues" (transl. of Lemaire 1995: 430)

According to these three passages, these two divinities correspond exactly to:

34a, G 5b-32a, A 6-20), and (3) the final paragraph or curse (corresponding to L 34b-41, G 32b-35 and A 20-27).

7. In this article I will follow the canonical editions of the Letoon trilingual. For Lycian, I will follow Laroche (1979) (taking into account the two epigraphical emendations observed by Adiego in 2012). In the case of the Greek version, I will follow the canonical edition of Metzger (1979). As for the Aramaic text, in addition to the edition by Dupont-Sommer of 1979 (and his preliminary edition of 1974), the edition of Lemaire (1995) should also be mentioned since it provides new readings and interpretations of the inscription. I will use the edition of Lemaire (1995), but in the instances in which different readings exist, I will also mention the edition of Dupont-Sommer (1974 and 1979).

Lyc. (l. 7b-9a) xñtawati : xbidẽñni : sejarKKazuma : xñtawati (in dat.)

"to the King Caunian and Arkkazuma the king"

Gr. (l. 7-8) Βασιλεῖ Καυνίωι καὶ Ἀρκεσιμαι (in dat.)

"to the Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas"

Aram. (l. 7b-8) L-KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY WKNWTH (preceded by the prep. *le-* 'to')

"to the god Kandawats Caunian and his colleagues" lit. "to Kandawats, the god, the Caunian and his colleagues" (transl. of Lemaire 1995: 430)

The other passages in which these two theonyms appear are the following:[8]

I
Lyc. (l. 17b-18a) xñtawatehi : xbidẽñnehi : sejarKKazumahi (in nom. pl.)

"(And the buildings/structures are of/belong to) the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma" (transl. of Melchert 2018)

Gr. (l. 15b-16) Βασιλέως Καυνίου καὶ Ἀρκεσιμα

"(and all that surrounds this field and the houses in order to be (possession)) of the Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas" (my transl.)

Aram. (l. 12) L-KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ (preceded by the prep. *le-* 'to')

"(and there is a property which the 'citizens' of Orna gave) to the god Kandawats" (transl. of Lemaire 1995: 430)

II
Lyc. (l. 23b-25a) xñtawataha : xbidãñnaha : serKKazumaha (in nom. pl., with the correction of Adiego 2012)

---

8. With I, II and III I would like to refer to three clearly differentiated passages of the trilingual, together with its correspondences in Lycian, Greek and Aramaic.

"(And they made sacred as belonging to) the King of Kaunos and to Argga-zuma (however much is written on this stele)" (transl. of Melchert 2018)

Gr. (l. 22b-23a) Βασιλέως Καυνίου καὶ Ἀρκεσιμα

"(and all that has been inscribed in the stele, all has been consecrated in order to be) of the Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas" (my transl.)

Aram. (this passage is not documented)

III
Lyc. (28b-29a) xñtawati : xbidẽñni : sejerKKazuma (in dat. sg.)

"(One shall sacrifice monthly as a rite with a sacrificial sheep and as a yearly offering with a steer) to the King of Kaunos and Arggazuma" (transl. of Melchert 2018)

Gr. (l. 29b-30a) τοῖς θεοῖς τούτοις

"(and the Xanthians and *perioikoi* will do exactly all what is inscribed in the stele) for these gods" (my transl.)

Aram. (l. 16) L-KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ (preceded by the prep. *le-* 'to')

"(This priest will sacrifice) to the god Kandawats (a sheep for the new moon)" (transl. of Lemaire 1995: 430)

In the Aramaic version the theonym appears documented on two more occasions, but not in the corresponding passages of the Lycian and Greek versions:

A. (l. 21) KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ
A. (l. 22b-23ª) KNDWS ʾLHʾ WKNWTH[9]

9. Notice, however that in the last example, KNDWS is written with samekh and not tsadê. I think that the variation in KNDWṢ/S should be considered just as a scribal error. If we look at the Aramaic inscription in more detail, we see that the word for KNDWṢ appears in four passages (l. 12, 16, 21 and 22), whereas the variant with samekh (KNDWS) appears in only one (l. 22). Bearing in mind that the Aramaic inscription contains several palaeographical errors (Dupont-Sommer 1974:

"(Furthermore, if ever someone takes (anything) away from) the god Kanda-wats (or from this priest, let him be taken away by the) god Kandawats and his colleagues" (transl. of Lemaire 1995: 430)

In the next section, I will focus on the name 'King of Kaunos' and discuss this theonym from a morphological and etymological point of view.

3. *The 'King of Kaunos': a morphological and etymological analysis*

Taking the first passage as an example for my analysis, we can deduce from these correspondences that the first theonym in Lycian, *xñtawati xbidẽnni* 'the King of Kaunos' (lit. 'the King Kaunian'), is composed by a substantive in dative, *xñtawati*, the word for 'king' in Lycian, and an ethnic adjective also in dative, *xbidẽnni* 'Kaunian' (< *xbide-* 'Kaunos' + gentilic suffix *-ñni*). In the Greek inscription we find an exact correspondence of the Lycian nominal syntagm translated into Greek, also in dative: Βασιλεῖ Καυνίωι. Aramaic shows KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ʾelâhâ Kbidšay/[10] which literally means 'Kandawats, the god, the Kaunian' which at first sight seems to follow Lycian *xñtawati xbidẽnni* 'the King Kaunian' very closely. As we have seen in the case of Greek (which translates the Lycian word for 'king', *xñtawati* into 'Βασιλεῖ' 'king'), Aramaic could have also translated the Lycian word *xñtawati* into MLKʾ, the word for 'king' in Aramaic. In fact, this word MLKʾ 'king' appears in the second line of the Aramaic version (ʾRTḤŠSŠ MLKʾ 'Artaxerxes, the King'). But the Aramaic scribe seems to have deliberately avoided this, preferring to maintain the epichoric name *kndwṣ* instead of MLKʾ. In my view, one possible reason for this would be the fact that the use of the title 'King' for a god is practically non-existent in Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions. Instead, the term 'Lord' or 'Lady' (*Baʿal, Baʿalat*) applied to a deity in the northwest Semitic inscriptions of the first millennium B.C. played a very important role (see Teixidor 1978: 183). According to this, the Ara-

---

134-135 and 1979: 163-165), in this case, we can consider that the case of KNDWS with samekh should be interpreted in the same way: that is, as a scribal mistake.

10. As is well known, Aramaic used a consonantal alphabet. The vocalization of the Aramaic words, like in the case of Hebrew, came much later, from the vocalization Masoretes did in order to fix the holy text (6th-10th centuries CE). But even in this case, through the comparative grammar, the internal reconstruction, the transcriptions of the Aramaic words in other languages (such as Neo-Assyrian, Greek, etc.), and even the use of the matres lectionis in Aramaic, we can assume how the vocalisation in Aramaic was (see Lipiński 1997: 87-92). In this article I will use the canonical vocalization of Aramaic used by scholars such as Lipiński (1997) and Segert (1990).

maic scribe preferred not to translate KNDWṢ as MLKʾ in order to avoid misinterpretations, since the word for 'king' in Aramaic was not used as an epithet for 'god'. Moreover, in my opinion, the scribe wanted to make it clear that the word KNDWṢ was a theonym, and wrote the Aramaic word for 'god', /ʾᵉlâhâ/ ʾLHʾ, in apposition to KNDWṢ and between the substantive 'KNDWṢ' and the gentilic KBYDŠY /Kbidšay/ in order to make it clear that the word 'KNDWṢ' must be interpreted as a divine name, and not as the common noun for 'king' which is its literal meaning. Notice that this word for 'god' appears only in the Aramaic version: we do not find this word in either the Lycian or the Greek.

In 1995 Adiego proposed a Carian origin for the sequence KNDWṢ KBYDŠY /Kandawats Kbidšay/ in the Aramaic version of the trilingual. According to him, Carian seemed to be a better candidate than Lycian (as suggested previously by Dupont-Sommer 1979: 145 and Lemaire 1995: 425), because Lycian *xñtawati xbidẽnni*, although sharing a lexeme with Carian, presents a different ending in these words that makes it difficult to explain a direct correspondence for Aramaic KNDWṢ KBYDŠY /Kandawats Kbidšay/: in the first case because Aram. *kndwṣ* does not have a clear correspondence with the Lycian stem *xñtawat(i)-*,[11] and in the second case because the ethnonym for Kaunos in Aramaic, KBDŠY, had a suffix in -ŠY which does not correspond to the Lyc. suffix -*ñni* used to build ethnonyms.

According to Adiego (1995), the sequence may be a Carian syntagm with the meaning 'the *King Kaunian*' (see also, in this sense, Schürr 1998: 145-147). In the case of KNDWṢ, Adiego compared this word with a Carian word found in a Carian inscription of Abu Simbel E.AS 7 which contains the word for 'king' in Carian:[12] *esakʾδowš*, probably a compound noun, from which a substantive stem *kδow-* 'king' can be deduced.[13] This word is probably the same as the one found in anoth-

---

11. In my view, KNDWṢ cannot be the Lycian word for 'king' due to the sibilant: in the declension of the word for 'king' in Lycian we do not have any case ending in a sibilant: dat. sg. *xñtawati*, abl.-instr. *xñtawatedi*, gen. adj.: nom. sg. c. *xñtawatehi*, nom. pl. c. *xñtawatehi*, nom./acc. pl. n. *xñtawataha*. In TL 35,1 *xñtawati* has been explained as nom. sg. (Melchert 2004: 84), but also as '*unklare[r] Kasus*' by Neumann (2007: 128). I will not enter into further details here (see in this sense Melchert 2004 and Neumann 2007 *s.v.*). Furthermore, Carian must be considered a better candidate than Lycian since Carian shows examples with sibilants (similar in value to Aram. *tsadê*, see below) and Lycian does not.

12. Notice, as a curiosity, that Stephan of Byzantium documented another word for 'king' in Carian: γέλα (s.v. Σουάγγελα: "…γέλαν δὲ τὸν βασιλέα"; see also Adiego 2007: 11 and 455).

13. For an updated edition of this inscription, see Adiego (2007: 118 and 293f.). This compound was formerly transcribed as *esaγʾδowš* (Masson 1979, Pl. IV/3; Adiego 1994: 240 and 1995: 19-20). Schürr (2001: 108), followed by Adiego (2007: 118), transcribed it with *kʾ* instead of *γʾ*. Notice, however, that whatever the reading is, in both cases the word for 'king' remains: even if we accept the

er inscription from Egypt (E.Bu 1)[14] in genitive *kδouś*. In E.AS 7, the word *esakʾδowš* appears very near to the Pharao's name Psammetichus (*Pismaśk*). Furthermore, in a large Greek inscription from Abu Simbel (Bernand – Masson 1957, inscription nº 1:) one reads '*Basileos Psametikhos*', 'the king Psammetichus' and also the name of a 'commander Psametichos' is mentioned: for these reasons it is very plausible that we are in front of the word for 'king' or 'commander' in Carian (see in this sense, Adiego 2007: 293-294). In a similar way, in E.Bu 1, the word *kδouś* appears once again very near to the Pharaoh's name Psammetichus (*Pismaśk*) and as in the case of E.AS 7, it is very likely that we are in front of the word for 'king' in Carian. What in my view is striking, moreover, is the fact that in two different Carian inscriptions, both *esakʾδowš* and *kδouś* appear very near to the Pharaoh's name Psammetichus. In my opinion, this is not a mere coincidence: both inscriptions, together with the Greek inscription of Abu Simbel speak in favour of the fact that it is very likely that we are in front of the word for 'king' or 'commander' in Carian.[15]

Another related word is *kδuśolš* (C.xx 4, C. xx 5),[16] which seems to contain the same element *-kδouś-* comparable to Lycian *xñtawat(i)-* 'king', and also Luwian *handawatt(i)-*.[17] Finally, in an inscription from Hyllarima the Carian word *kδuśo* 'reign' is attested (see Adiego 2019, who identified the word and the meaning).[18] This word seems to be etymologically related to *kδouś* (see Adiego 2019), although the morphological analysis of the word is not clear.[19]

What seems clear is that the ending *-ṣ* in Aram. KNDWṢ /kandawats/ corresponds to a [-*ts*] ending. It would fit the Car. genitive ending in -ś (in *kδouś* in E.Bu

---

former reading *esaγʾδowš* [esan-gndowš], the <γ> can be explained as a voiced stop < voiceless stop *k*: **esan-kndowš > esan-gndowš*, and hence, we still have the word for 'king'. What I would mean is that the lecture *esakʾδowš* or *esaγʾδowš* is not relevant here, because in both cases the word for 'king' appears as the second member of the composite.

14. For an updated edition of this inscription, see Adiego (2007: 120).

15. For a different view, see Simon (2020a), who defends an unknown meaning for this word in Carian.

16. See Schürr (1998: 145-147) and Adiego (2007: 162-163 and 163) respectively.

17. See in this sense, Schürr (1998: 145-47) who translated *kδuśolš* as an adj. "königliche" (nom. pl.). However, more interpretations have been proposed: Neumann (Zahlhaas – Neumann 1994: 164-165) interpreted *kδuśolš* as a PN; Hajnal (1997: 148 n. 10), as two diferent words: *kδuś olš* "die Armreife der/des *kδ(o)u-*". For more details, see Simon (Nunn – Simon *forthcom.*: 4), who remains skeptical and does not recognize Car. *kduś* as the Carian word for 'king'.

18. The word is followed by the king's name in genitive *(piĺipuś)*.

19. It was analysed by Adiego by a locative sg. of an *a*-stem (Adiego 2019: 18-19), but Simon (2020b) prefers to analyse it as a dative of an *o*-stem.

1), since Car. -*ś*, in its use in *pismaśk* could represent a palatal fricative [ç] or even an affricate [ts] (see Adiego 2007: 251). But, in my view, it could also represent a dative -*s* ending in Carian (see the Aram. variant KNDWS in this sense),[20] which would fit well in Aramaic because the syntagm in Aramaic is preceded by the preposition *l*- 'to' of the indirect object, but since the -*s* dative in Carian is quite problematic (see Adiego (2007: 314) who remains sceptical, unlike Schürr (1992: 153-154) and Melchert (2010: 7), who interpret -*s* as a dative singular ending), this hypothesis should be treated with caution.[21] Another possibility, suggested by Molina (2016: 30) in this case, is to consider a Carian nominative in -*s* of a dental theme in -*t*, or even as a derivational suffix (comparable with Lycian -*za*), used in the formation of nouns that designed professions (s. Molina 2016: 30).[22] In my view, this is much more doubtful since, in the first case, the nominative singular ending in Carian is systematically -Ø (< *-*s*), and in the second case, as already seen, one would expect to find a case ending different from the nominative, because the word is preceded by the Aram. preposition of dative -*l* (in this case, KNDWṢ should be interpreted as a derivate substantive KNDWṢ+ nom. sg. Ø).

Regarding Aram. /Kbidšay/ KBYDŠY, Dupont-Sommer (1979:145) and Adiego (1995) as a point of departure suggested a gentilic adjective in Carian, *kbid-si 'Kaunian', where -*si* would originally be an ethnicon suffix in Carian, the same as the one found in Aram. /Kbidšay/ KBYD-ŠY. This ethnicon suffix in -ŠY could not be Aramaic, because in Aramaic the ethnicon suffix is indicated by -Y (-*ay*) (s. Segert 1990: 156, Lipiński 1997: 223-224), not by -ŠY. In his 1995 article, Adiego, following Melchert, based this supposition on examples such as the Carian name *iβ(a)r-si* = Ιμβαρσις, which would mean 'the inhabitant (with the gentilic suffix -*si*) of the steppe' (Luw. *im(m)ara-*).[23] This explanation was offered in 1995, a year before the discovery of the Kaunos bilingual (C.Ka 5).

20. One must take into consideration that in a loan, the rendering of phonemes between one language to another is not always perfect and some phonetic inaccuracies can occur. A clear example can be observed in the case of KNDWṢ itself: as we have seen, in the Letoon trilingual a variant KNDWS is also documented. This means that maybe the Aramaic scribe was unsure when rendering this sound.

21. Notice, however, in favor of this hypothesis, that Lycian and Greek also show the word for 'king' in dative: *xñtawati* (l.3) and Βασιλεῖ (l.7).

22. Such as Lyc. *kuma-za* 'priest'.

23. Schürr (2018: 14) also observed that the Aramaic suffix -ŠY is attested in another Aramaic ethnic term, 'PŠŠY (= Lyd. Ipsimšiš) 'Ephesian', implying that the suffix -ŠY is not Carian. In my view, this form 'PŠŠY could be interpreted as 'PŠŠ-Y, being Y the typical *nisba* suffix in Aramaic. The two ŠŠ in the Aramaic form belong to the stem of the word, as Lyd. *Ipsimš*-, assuming that in Aramaic there has been an assimilation of the former -*s*- into -*š*-.

The discovery of the Kaunos bilingual is important in this research because, in my opinion, it contains an interesting clue that allows us to take a step forward in the analysis of the Aramaic form KBYDŠY /Kbidšay/. This bilingual documents for the first time the gentilic of Kaunos in Carian, *kbdyn-š* (in acc. pl.) 'Kaunians', whose meaning is assured by the Greek part of the bilingual. The Carian form is an ethnic noun derived from the city name *kbid-* 'Kaunos' by means of a suffix *-yn-* which corresponds to Lycian *-ñni*, Milyan *-wñni-* and CLuwian *-wanni-* (also Car. *kbdyn-š < *kbd-wani-s*), and to Lyc. ethnic *xbidẽñn-* documented in the Letoon trilingual. Note also that the name of the city of Kaunos is attested in Carian, in the same inscription, as *kbidn* (C.Ka 5, l. 1), corresponding to Lycian *xbide*. Although the morphological analysis of the Carian form is unclear, the most widely accepted interpretation among scholars (Melchert 1998: 37, Hajnal 1997: 149 and Adiego 2007: 371) is that *kbidn* is the Carian name for the city of Kaunos.

In my opinion, the Kaunos bilingual sheds light on the case of the analysis of the Aramaic form /Kbidšay/ KBYD-ŠY which also has consequences for the later morphological analysis of the -ŠY suffix. In the bilingual, two particular facts have caught my attention:

1) In Carian, the ethnicon for 'Kaunians', *kbdyn-š* (in accusative plural) differs considerably from the Aramaic form KBYD-ŠY /Kbid-šay/, both in the stem and in the ending; and, more importantly for my analysis,

2) if we separate the case endings of the city name of 'Kaunos', in both Carian and Lycian, we find the same stem *kbid-* which matches the Aramaic word in the trilingual /Kbid-š-ay/ KBYD-Š-Y, as can be seen in the following table:

	'Kaunos' (city name)	*'Kaunian' (gentilic)*
Carian	*kbid-n*	*kbdyn-š* (acc. pl.)
Lycian	*xbid-e* (dat.-loc. sg. or pl? TL44a,51, 44c,2, 44c,6c)	*xbidẽñn-i* (dat. sg.)
Aramaic	KBYD-Š-Y	

Table 1: 'Kaunos' and 'Kaunian' documented in Carian, Lycian and Aramaic

In my opinion, these data argue against the analysis proposed by the scholars in 1995: if the Aramaic form is seen as a gentilic of Carian origin, as they postulated, in Aramaic we would rather expect another word, something like **KBDYN-ŠY, which would truly match the Carian ethnonym, but this is not the case. In my view, this means that Aramaic KBYD-Š-Y /Kbid-š-ay/ is not an ethnic adjective but rather a place name: the city name of 'Kaunos' in Carian in the genitive. As the

table above shows, the Aramaic stem KBYD- matches exactly the Carian city name of Kaunos *kbid-* (= Lyc. *xbid-*).

My view is that the sequence in Aram. KBYDŠY /Kbidšay/ could be interpreted as KBYD-Š-Y /Kbid-š-ay/ 'of Kaunos', KBD-Š /Kbid-š/ being the genitive of the Carian substantive for 'Kaunos', followed by a suffix -Y used in Aramaic to build the gentilics (called *nisba* in the terminology used by Semitists, Segert 1990: 156 and Lipiński 1997: 223-224). This form KBYDŠY /Kbidšay/ in Aramaic should be considered a recharacterization of the Carian genitive in Aramaic. Let us look at these two suffixes in more detail, one by one.

In my view the ending -Š represents the Carian genitive case. In Carian, it is known that the genitive ending is -ś. There is a general agreement that <ś> was palatal, but the details are unclear (see Schürr 2001: 94ff.; Melchert 2002: 305ff.; Adiego 2007: 250-51). The palatal character of this case ending in Carian fits very well with the example we found in Aram. KBD-Š-Y, since Aramaic <š> (shin) represents a voiceless postalveolar fricative [ʃ] (Segert 1990: 85).

As for the Aramaic suffix -Y, it is the one that is most used for building ethnic nouns. In Aramaic the phonetic shape of this suffix is [-*ay*] and is rendered with a *yod* in writing: *kśd-y* /Kaśday/ 'Chaldean', *nkr-y* 'foreigner' (Segert 1990: 156 and Lipiński 1997: 223-224). This gentilic suffix, together with the allomorph -*iy-* > -*ī*- is found in all Semitic languages: Ar. *Miṣrī* 'Egyptian', Hebr. *Ṣīdōnī* 'Sidonian' (Lipiński 1997: 223-224).

But why would the Aramaic scribe have introduced this gentilic ending -Y in a Carian word which was already inflected in the genitive? In my view, this recharacterization can be explained if we take into account that in the sequence KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ᵃᵉlâhâ Kbidšay/, the word that immediately precedes the gentilic /Kbidšay/ KBYDŠY is in fact the Aramaic word ʾLHʾ /ʾᵉlâhâ/ 'the god' used in apposition to KNDWṢ /Kandawats/. Since the sequence runs Carian-Aramaic-Carian (/Kandawats - ᵃᵉlâhâ - Kbidšay/), it is natural to think that the Aramaic scribe used a recharacterization at the end of the sequence in order to make it clear that the last word of the sentence should be understood as a gentilic for an Aramaic reader unfamiliar with Carian. This recharacterization would have helped an Aramaic reader with no knowledge of Carian to interpret the syntagm.[24]

---

24. The question whether the Aramaic scribe knew Carian or not is controversial because cannot be proved. However, according to Zsolt Simon (personal communication) one can suggest, alternatively, that the Aramaic scribe did not know Carian well enough and thus, he did not recognize the -Š Carian ending and interpreted that it was part of the theonym, and thus, he added the Aramaic gentilic suffix.

4. *The 'King of Kaunos' in the Greek inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos: a parallelism with the Aramaic sequence of the Letoon trilingual*

The hypothesis I have presented here can be corroborated by some very interesting parallels documented in one inscription from Cos and in three Greek inscriptions from Kaunos, where the theonyms "Basileus of Kaunos, the god" and "Basileus, the god" appear respectively.[25] In this article I have already drawn attention (§3) to the fact that Aramaic KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ʾᵉlâhâ Kbidšay/ presented two differences with respect to the Lycian and Greek parallel passages of the Letoon trilingual:

  a) the word ʾLHʾ 'god' documented in the middle of the sequence in apposition to KNDWṢ 'Kandawats' appears in the Aramaic sequence but not in the Lycian or Greek, and
  b) KBYDŠ-Y 'of Kaunos' appears with the place name 'Kaunos' (KBYDŠ would be the Carian genitive 'of Kaunos' followed by the Aramaic -Y suffix) whereas the Lycian and Greek versions of the trilingual present the gentilic adjective 'Kaunian': *xbidẽñni* and Καυνίωι)

As far as the first difference is concerned (the presence of the word 'god' in apposition to *Kandawats*), it should not be considered as an oddity in the Aramaic sequence of the Letoon trilingual: the same word used in apposition of the Kaunian god appears also in an inscription from Cos (ca. 300-250 BC, almost contemporary with the Letoon trilingual)[26] and in three Greek inscriptions from Kaunos (from the Roman imperial era). Let us look at the passage of these four inscriptions in its context:

Cos (PHI Greek Inscriptions: Cos and Calymna; IG XII,4: 548; SEG 14.528; Paton – Hicks num. 53; Bean 1954: 96). Foundation of a sanctuary by the order of the god Basileus of Kaunos, ca. 300-250 BC.

1   Φιλήρατος Ἀριστείδα, <u>Βασιλέως Καύνου</u>
<u>τοῦ θεοῦ</u> προστάξαντος, τὸ ἱερὸν ἱδρύσατο.[27]

---

25. I would like to thank Ignasi-Xavier Adiego for providing me with these interesting examples of the inscriptions, just as I was about to finish this article.
26. For the dating of the Letoon Trilingual, see n. 2.
27. "Phileratos, Sohn des Aristeidas, hat das Heiligtum auf Befehl des Gottes 'Basileus Kaunos' gebaut" (transl. of Marek 2000: 196).

Kaunos 10 (PHI Greek Inscriptions: Kaunos 10 = I. Kaunos 35; SEG 14.639, 16.632, 36.991 and 37.865; Bean 1954: no. 38; Marek 2006: 35 C and 35 E). Roman law concerning customs, reign of Hadrianus,117-138 A.D.

C.15(…) vacat ἀπογράψονται δὲ οὗτοι τὴν ἡμέραν μόνον διὰ τῶν
ἀρχείων καὶ τὸν τόπον δι' οὗ ἰσήγαγον ἐπὶ τοῦ στεφανηφόρου <u>Βασιλέως τοῦ</u>
<u>θεοῦ</u>[28]
[με]τὰ [τ]ὸ [κ]αταγαγ[εῖ]ν ἐν ἄλλαις ἡμέραις τρισίν, προσγράφοντες καὶ τὸν
ἐπηγγελμένον[29]
E.3 ͞ΙΙ[..]ΙΙΛΙ[— ἀπογράψονται] καὶ τειμήσονται ἐπὶ
[τοῦ] τότε [στεφ]ανηφό[ρ]ου [<u>Βασιλέως τοῦ</u>] <u>θεοῦ</u> τὴν ποσότητα καὶ τὰ εἴδη
τῶν φορτίων [μ]όνων ὅσα μὴ ὑποκ[είμενα] τῶν μονοπωλίων κωλύεται· καὶ[30]

Kaunos 40 (PHI Greek Inscriptions: Kaunos 40 = I. Kaunos 142; Bean 1954 no. 37.b; SEG 14, 649.b; Marek 2006: no. 142). Honorary inscription for Zenon Agreophontos of Kaunos [by the demos of Kaunos], Imperial era.

1 [ὁ δῆμος ὁ Καυνίων στεφανοῖ χρυσῷ]
στεφάνῳ, τειμᾷ δὲ καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκ[ῇ]
Ζήνωνα Ἀγρεοφῶντος τοῦ Ἀντιπ[ά]
τρου Καύνιον, ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν
5 ἐκ προγόνων καλῶν καὶ φιλοδόξων,
πατρὸς στεφανηφόρου, στεφανηφ[ο]-
ρήσαντα <u>Βασιλέος τοῦ θεοῦ</u> καὶ γυ-
μνασιαρχήσαντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ
ἱερασάμενον τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ στ<ρ>α-[31]

28. In all the Greek inscriptions from Kaunos the sequence 'Βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ' in gen., refers to the substantive στεφανηφόρος. The 'Stephanephoros of the god Basileus' was presumably the title of a high officer from Kaunos related to the maritime customer (s. Marek 2006: 188).

29. "Es genügt, wenn diese Händler innerhalb von 3 Tagen bei den Behörden das Datum und den Ort der Einfuhr beim **Stephanephoros des Gottes Basileus** registrieren lassen, mit zusätzlichem Eintrag de[r Klasse und Quantität der gemeldeten Waren?--------]" (transl. by Marek 2006: 185).

30. "Sollen sie beim Stephanephoros des Gottes Basileus die Quantität und Warenklasse registrieren und bestimmen lassen, soweit es sich nicht um Ware handelt, die den Monopolen unterliegt und" (transl. by Marek 2006: 185).

31. "Das Volk der Kaunier bekränzt mit einem goldenen Kranz und ehrt mit einem Bronzestandbild Zenon, Sohn des Agreophon, Enkel des Antipatros, Kaunier, einen trefflichen und guten Mann, von trefflichen und greigebigen Vorfahren abstammend. Sein Vater war Stephane-

Kaunos 139 (PHI Greek Inscriptions: Kaunos 139; SEG 56.1194; Marek 2006: 139 IIIa and IIIc) Monument of Quintus Vedius Q. f. Capito. Late reign of Hadrianus/reign of Antoninus Pius.

IIIa.1 [Καυνίων ἡ β]ουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Φλαμινίαν
[— — —] Φλαμινίου θυγατέρα Μαξίμαν,
[(?)ἀδελφὴ]ν Ποπλίου [Φλαμινί]ου Φρόντωνος,
[γυναῖκα] δὲ Κοΐντου Οὐηδίου Ποπλίου υἱοῦ
5 [Καπίτωνος, μητέρα δὲ Κοΐντου Οὐηδίου Κοΐν]-
[του υἱοῦ Καπίτωνος, στεφανηφόρου <u>Βασιλέως</u>]
[<u>τοῦ θεοῦ</u> καὶ γυμνασιάρχου τετράκις, ξένου]
[αὐτοκρατόρων, πατρὸς καὶ προγόνων] χειλι-
[άρχων ἀρχιερέων στεφανηφόρων] γυμνασιάρ-
10 [χων ξ]ένων [αὐτοκρατόρων βασι]λέων ἀνθυπά-
[των] ἡγεμόνων, ζή[σ]α[σα]ν σεμνῶς καὶ σωφρό-
[νως κ]αὶ φιλάνδρως καὶ πάσῃ ἀρετῇ διενέγκασαν.³²

IIIc.1 [Καυνίων ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Κοΐντον Οὐήδιον Ποπλίου υἱὸν Καπίτωνα]
[τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Κοΐντου Οὐηδίου Καπίτωνος, — — — — — — — — —]
[— — — — — — —] ἐπισήμως καὶ μεγαλοψύχως παρεσχημένον, στεφαν[η]-
[φορήσαντα <u>Βα</u>]σιλέ[ως τ]οῦ <u>θεοῦ</u> [εὐσεβῶς, γ]υμνασιαρχήσαντα [πά]-
5 [σης ἡλικίας κα]ὶ τύχης τετράκις μόνον καὶ πρῶτον καὶ τῆς γερουσίας ἑ[ξά]-
[κις (?) δω]ρεάν, γυμνασιαρχήσαντά τε καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐγγόνου Φλαουίου
Καπίτωνος δωρεὰν καὶ ἀναδόντα τοῖς γερουσιασταῖς τὰς ἐκκειμέ-³³

phoros, er selbst Stephanephoros des Gottes Basileus und Gymnasiarchos auf eigene Kosten, er war Priester der Augusti und Strategos" (transl. by Marek 2006: 330).

32. "Rat und Volk der Kaunier (haben geehrt) Flaminia, Tochter des ------- Flaminius, Maxima, [? Schwester des] Publius [Flaminius] Fronto, [Frau] des Quintus Vedius, Sohnes de Publius, [Capito], [Mutter des Quintus Vedius, Sohnes des Quintus, Capito] des Stephanephoros **des Gottes Basileus** und viermaligen Gymnasiarchen, Gastgebers von Kaisern, dessen Vater und Vorfahren Militärtribune, Oberpriester, Stephanephoroi, Gymnasiarchen, Gastgeber von Kaisern, Königen, Proconsuln und Gouverneuren waren, die fromm und züchtig und ihrem Mann ergeben lebte, hervorragend in jeder Tugend." (transl. by Marek 2006: 322).

33. "[Rat und Volk (haben geehrt) Quintus Vedius Capito, Sohn des Publius, den Vater des Quintus Vedius Capito, den sich] hervorragend und großherzig zeigenden Sponsor, [frommen] Stephanephoros **des Gottes Basileus,** Gymnasiarch jeder Altersklasse und jeden Standes, als einziger und als erster überhaupt viermal (in diesem Amt) und Gymnasiarch) der Gerusia, [sechsmal (?)]

Before Bean (1954), the editors of the inscription from Cos (Paton – Hicks 1891: 109 no. 53) supposed that 'Aristeidas' was a 'King of Caunus' and they understood, following Rayet's suggestion, that the god in question was Asclepius. But Bean (1954: 95-96) proposed an interesting new interpretation for this inscription in view of the three inscriptions from Kaunos (Kaunos 10, 40 and 139 already mentioned, see above), which became the standard interpretation in the sense that the inscription is considered as a 'foundation of a sanctuary by order of the god Basileus of Kaunos' (see PHI Greek inscriptions). According to Bean (1954: 96), the meaning of the inscription from Cos should be 'at the behest of *King Caunos the God*' and observed that it was the same god who appears in the inscriptions from Kaunos (Βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ). As Bean already pointed out, in Kaunos, his title was simply Βασιλεὺς ὁ θεός since it was not necessary to specify the name of the City, but outside Kaunos, as in the case of Cos (and now I would also add here the Aramaic instance of the Letoon trilingual, as we have already seen, §3), the city name of Kaunos was introduced in the sequence, in order to mention the divinity's provenance. According to Bean (1954: 96), these inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos indicate the existence of 'a cult of the legendary eponymous founder and king, Caunus, the son of Miletus' and hence, the scholar interpreted the 'King Caunos the God' as a divinized king. However, in my view, instead of Bean's translation '*King Caunos the God*', the sequence 'Βασιλέως Καύνου τοῦ θεοῦ' of Cos could also be understood as 'Basileus of Kaunos, the god'. Theoretically both options are correct from a syntactical point of view: all the words in the sequence are in genitive, which means that in this context 'Καύνου' could be interpreted as a divinized personal name in apposition to Βασιλέως ('King Caunos' according to Bean's interpretation) or as a dependent place name of 'Βασιλέως' in genitive ('Basileus of Kaunos' according to my proposal). In this second case, both nouns build a genitival construction, and 'Basileus' would be the head noun of the construction. Although the two options are equally valid from a theoretical and syntactical point of view, I think that, in view of the Aramaic sequence of the Letoon trilingual, the second proposal is better than the one proposed by Bean, since the sequence in Aramaic KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ʾᵉlâhâ Kbidšay/ 'Kandawats, the god, of Kaunos' shows that there is no apposition between KNDWṢ 'Kandawats' and KBYDŠY 'of Kaunos' since the first one is in nominative or dative case, and the second, in genitive. Moreover, KBYDŠY 'of Kaunos' must be considered as a place name and not a personal (divinized) name.

kostenlos, auch für seinen Enkel Flavius Capito hat er das Amt des Gymnasiarchen kostenlos ausgeübt…" (transl. by Marek 2006: 322).

But leaving this consideration aside, in my view, the really interesting features of the Greek inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos for my purposes is the strong resemblance they bear with the Aramaic sequence of the Letoon trilingual. As we have already seen, in the Greek inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos, the name of the divinity *Basileus* 'King' (Βασιλεύς) is accompanied by the common name 'the god' (τοῦ θεοῦ) which functions as an apposition of the theonym: this is the same sequence we already saw for the Aramaic passage of the trilingual: KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ 'Kandawats, the god'.

And finally, regarding the second difference already mentioned (the use of the substantive 'Kaunos' in genitive in the Aramaic sequence of the trilingual instead of the gentilic 'Kaunian'), this is not unprecedented. A very similar passage is documented in the inscription from Cos mentioned above: Βασιλέως Καύνου τοῦ θεοῦ 'the King of Kaunos, the god'. In this inscription from Cos, the city name of 'Kaunos' appears in genitive, and not with the gentilic. It is the same as we find in the Aramaic sentence of the trilingual where, according to my hypothesis, KBYDŠ-Y represents the city name of Kaunos in genitive in Carian (KBYDŠ) and not the gentilic. In my view, the inscription from Cos is particularly interesting here, since it is very close both in context and in time to the Letoon trilingual: the inscription from Cos represents the foundation of a sanctuary by the order of the 'god Basileus of Kaunos' some decades after the introduction of the cult of Basileus of Kaunos in the Letoon. In other words, in these two inscriptions from the Letoon and Cos, we would have the same allusion to the 'King, the god of Kaunos': in the first case, in Aramaic, in the second, in Greek. In both instances, the city place 'of Kaunos' appears in genitive in order to specify the provenance of the god, and in both cases we also find the word 'god' in apposition to 'King' ('Kandawats' and 'Basileus' respectively) in order to make it clear that 'Kandawats'/ 'Basileus' was the proper name of the divinity of Kaunos.

5. *Conclusions*

To summarize, in the sequence KNDWṢ ʾLHʾ KBYDŠY /Kandawats ʾelâhâ Kbidšay/ in the Aramaic version of the Letoon trilingual, the word /Kbidšay/ KBYDŠY should in my view be analysed as a recharacterization of the Carian place name of 'Kaunos' in genitive singular followed by the Aramaic gentilic suffix in -Y. This hypothesis is supported by four findings:

1) the stem of this word, KBYD- /Kbid-/, corresponds directly to the stem of the place name 'Kaunos' in Carian *kbyd*-,

2) it cannot be analysed as an epichoric gentilic because it clearly differs from the stems of the ethnic adjectives found in Carian (*kbdyn-*) and Lycian (*xbidẽñn-*),

3) the case ending <-š> in Aramaic corresponds to the genitive case in Carian, which is also a palatal fricative <-ś> [ç],

4) there are four Greek inscriptions from Cos and Kaunos that corroborate the hypothesis proposed here, since they show very similar parallelisms with the Aramaic sequence: 'Βασιλέως Καύνου τοῦ θεοῦ' ('the King of Kaunos, the god') and 'Βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ' ('the King, the god').

6. *References*

eDiAna = Olav Hackstein – Jared L. Miller – Elisabeth Rieken (eds.): *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München – Marburg. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de

PHI = *Searchable Greek Inscriptions. A Scholarly Tool in Progress. The Packard Humanities Institute.* Cornell University and Ohio State University https://inscriptions.packhum.org/ (last update: July 13, 2020).

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (1994): "Les identifications onomastiques dans le déchiffrement du carien". In: Maria E. Giannotta – Roberto Gusmani – Lucia Innocente et al. (eds.): *La decifrazione del cario. Atti del 1° Simposio internazionale, Roma 3-4 maggio 1993*. Roma, 27-63/239-240.

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (1995): "Contribuciones al desciframiento del Cario". *Kadmos* 34: 18-34.

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (2007): *The Carian Language*. Boston – Leiden.

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (2012): "Two Reading Notes to the Lycian Text of the Letoon Trilingual Stele". *Kadmos* 51: 93-98.

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (2019): "A kingdom for a Carian letter". In: Ignasi-Xavier Adiego – José Virgilio García Trabazo – Mariona Vernet – Bartomeu Obrador-Cursach – Elena Martínez Rodríguez (eds.): *Luwic Dialects and Anatolian. Inheritance and Diffusion*. Barcelona, 11-50.

BADIAN, Ernst (1977): "A Document of Artaxerxes IV?". In: Konrad Kinzl (ed.): *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Pre-History. Studies Presented to Fritz Schachermeyr*. Berlin, 40-50.

BEAN, George Ewart (1954): "Notes and Inscriptions from Caunus". *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 74: 85-110.

BERNAND, André – MASSON, Olivier (1957): "Les inscriptions grecques d'Abu Simbel". *Revue des Études Grecques* 70: 1-46.

DUPONT-SOMMER, André (1974): "La stèle trilingue récemment découverte au Létôn de Xanthos: le texte araméen". *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 118: 132-149.

DUPONT-SOMMER, André (1979): "L'inscription araméenne". In: Henri Metzger (ed.): *Fouilles de Xanthos VI. La stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris, 129-178.

EICHNER, Heiner (1983): "Etymologische Beiträge zum Lykischen der Trilingue vom Letoon bei Xanthos". *Orientalia* 52: 48-66.

HAJNAL, Ivo (1997): "Die karisch-griechische Bilingue 44* aus Kaunos: Ein erster Augenschein". *Kadmos* 36: 141-166.

LAROCHE, Emmanuel (1979): "L'inscription lycienne". In: Henri Metzger (ed.): *Fouilles de Xanthos VI. La stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris, 49-127.

LEMAIRE, André (1995): "The Xanthos Trilingual Revisited". In: Ziony Zevit – Seymoyr Gitin – Michael Sokoloff (eds.): *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots. Biblical, Epigraphic and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Winona Lake, 423-432.

LIPIŃSKI, Edward (1997): *Semitic Languages. Outline of a Comparative Grammar*. Leuven.

MAREK, Christian (2000): "Wer war der Basileus Kaunios?". In: Cengiz Işık (ed.): *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens und des ägäischen Bereiches. Festschrift für Bakı Öğün zum 75. Geburtstag*. Bonn, 195-199.

MAREK, Christian (2006). *Die Inschriften von Kaunos*. München.

MASSON, Olivier (1979): "Remarques sur les graffites cariens d'Abou-Simbel". In: N. N. (ed.): *Hommages à Serge Sauneron II. Égypte post-pharaonique*. Cairo, 35-49.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1979): "Die iranischen Elemente im aramäischen Text". In: Henri Metzger (ed.): *Fouilles de Xanthos VI. La stèle trilingue du Létôon*. Paris, 179-185.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1998): "Carian *mdoΩun* 'we have established'". *Kadmos* 37: 33-41.

MELCHERT, H. Craig. (2001): *Lycian Corpus.* http://www. linguis- tics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/lyciancorpus.pdf (last accessed 29-10-2020).

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2002): "Sibilants in Carian". In: Matthias Fritz – Susanne Zeilfelder (eds.): *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für G. Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Graz, 305-313.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2004): *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*, Ann Arbor – New York.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2010): "Further thoughts on Carian nominal inflection". In: Riet van Bremen – Jan-Mathieu Carbon (eds.): *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia – Oxford, 29 June - 2 July 2006*. Bordeaux, 177-186.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2018): *The Trilingual Inscription of the Létôon, Lycian Version*. http://www.achemenet.com/pdf/lycian/lyletoon.pdf (last accessed 29-10-2020).

METZGER, Henri (1979): "L'inscription grècque". In: Henri Metzger (ed.): *Fouilles de Xanthos VI. La stèle trilingue du Létôon.* Paris, 29-42.

MOLINA, Carlos (2016): "What do we know about the Letoon? A Study of a Sanctuary during the Period of Achaemenid Rule over Lycia". In: María de la Paz de Hoz – Juan Pablo Sánchez – Carlos Molina (eds.): *Between Tarhuntas and Zeus Polieus. Cultural Crossroads in the Temples and Cults of Graeco-Roman Anatolia*. Leuven – Paris – Bristol, 15-46.

NEUMANN, Günter (2007): *Glossar des Lykischen*. Wiesbaden.

NUNN, Astrid – SIMON, Zsolt (in press): "Zwei Armreife mit karischer Inschrift aus der Archäologischen Staatsammlung in München". Forthcoming in: Wouter Henkelman et al. (eds.): *Festschrift for N. N.*

PATON, William R. – HICKS, Edward L. (1891): *The Inscriptions of Cos*. Oxford.

SCHÜRR, Diether (1992): "Zur Bestimmung der Lautwerte des karischen Alphabets 1971-1991". *Kadmos* 31: 127-156.

SCHÜRR, Diether (1998): "Kaunos in Lykischen Inschriften". *Kadmos* 37: 143-162.

SCHÜRR, Diether (2001): "Karische und lykische Sibilanten". *Indo-germanische Forschungen* 106: 94-121.

SCHÜRR, Diether (2018): "Anmerkungen zum Namen der Karer". *Gephyra* 16: 13-17.

SEGERT, Stanislav (1990⁴): *Altaramäische Grammatik*. Leipzig.

SIMON, Zsolt (2020a): "Carian *kδouś* '(unknown)'". In: *eDiAna.* http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1071 (last accessed: 29-01-2021).

SIMON, Zsolt (2020b): "Carian *kδuśo* 'reign'". In: *eDiAna.* https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1072 (last accessed: 29-01-2021).

TEIXIDOR, Javier (1978): "The Aramaic Text of the Trilingual Stele from Xanthos". *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37: 181-183.

VERNET, Mariona (2021): "The theonyms 'Leto, Artemis and H̱šatrapati' in the Letoon Trilingual: a parallelism with a passage from the Xanthos Stele". In:

Lluís Feliu – Adelina Millet – Jordi Vidal (eds.): *Sentido de un empeño. Volum d'Homenatge a Gregorio del Olmo Lete.* BMO 16. Barcelona, 527-540.

ZAHLHAAS, Gisela – Neumann, Günter (1994): "Zwei neue karische Inschriften aus München". In: *Kadmos* 33: 160-168.

A Look at an Alleged Morpho-syntactic Isogloss between Greek and Anatolian: The Modal Particle in Epic Greek

Filip De Decker
Università degli Studi di Verona

1. *Introduction*

In their recent discussion of the (alleged) Graeco-Anatolian *Sprachbund* Domenica Romagno listed three and Michele Bianconi four possible morpho-syntactic isoglosses between Anatolian and Greek (Romagno [2015: 436-440], Bianconi [2015: 149-160]).

In this extensive article I address one of them: the use of a modal particle (MP henceforth) to indicate potential, futurative and counterfactual meaning (in the terminology of Classical Philology the term "irrealis" is used), in Greek this is ἄν and in Hittite *man*.

By focusing on the Homeric evidence, I will show that the assumption of a *Sprachbund* is not supported by the evidence. For my analysis I focus on epic Greek, and use *Iliad* 16 as basis, and when that book does not have sufficient instances, a corpus of 5267 verses from the *Iliad* (books 1, 5, 9, 11, 16, 22, 24). After pointing out some general problems in equalling the Hittite and Greek "modal particles" (§2), I will show that the MP had deictic and emphatic value in epic Greek and was used predominantly in speeches, and did not convey modal meaning (§3), that a sharp distinction between possibility, remote possibility and unreality cannot be made in epic Greek, that the optative was the original mood in the counterfactual and potential constructions, that it was the mood that communicated the notion of (remote) possibility and contrafactitivity and that the use of the indicative mood

was an inner-Greek innovation that had not yet been completed at the time of epic Greek (§4).[1]

2. *General observations on the evidence used*

Before discussing the issue in detail, some important observations have to be made regarding the (im)probability and/or even (im)possibility of language contact in analysing the modal particle (MP). As was stated above, Romagno and Bianconi compared the use of the particle *man* in Hittite to convey non-realis meaning to the verb forms in the past to that of ἄν in Greek, which marks potential, futurative and counterfactual[2] meaning.[3] There are three problems with this equation. In their descriptions, Romagno and Bianconi used the description of Attic Greek as if it were "Greek" *tout court*, but the linguistic data of Attic Greek differ significantly from those of epic Greek and the other Greek dialects. First, even if we assume that the comparison is valid, the time depth poses problems. Attic Greek prose is attested from the 5th century BC, but Hittite texts are attested until the 12th century BC. Second, even if we agree that the difference between realis and not-realis in both Hittite and Greek was related to the MP, the constructions are still different: Hittite uses *man* in both main and subordinate (conditional) clause, while Greek never uses ἄν with the indicative in the conditional clause (not even in Homer this use is attested, contrary to the subjunctive and the optative, which can be used with the MP in the conditional clause). Third, the question of the moods and modal mean-

2. In Classical Philology, especially in non-Anglophone scholarship, the term "irrealis" is used to refer to the counterfactual (*irréel*, *Irrealis*). This will be discussed in more detail in §4.

3. Romagno (2015: 435-436), Bianconi (2015: 149-150). Bianconi considered the use of the MP as a borrowing by Greek or as *Sprachbund*-feature, though not excluding that it is a typologically common occurrence, while Romagno interpreted it as a *Sprachbund*-feature.

ings in Greek and Hittite is fundamentally different as well. As Hittite has only two moods (indicative and imperative), the mood alone cannot mark modality and therefore the particle *man* is used,[4] but Greek has a rich system of moods, the indicative, injunctive,[5] subjunctive, optative and imperative, and the question is whether the mood, the modal particle or both convey the modal meaning. Moreover, while the use of the modal particle ἄν is rigidly regulated in Attic Greek (although exceptions are occasionally transmitted), the use of the modal particles in epic is less straightforward and the Attic uses are the product of a grammaticalisation process within Greek. In my opinion already on methodological grounds this isogloss should not be used as evidence for the *Sprachbund*.[6] I now proceed to the analysis of the epic Greek data. First, I discuss the use of the MP in epic Greek and then I proceed to a discussion of the potential and counterfactual constructions.

3. *The use of the modal particle in epic Greek, based on the data of Iliad 16*

In this subchapter I analyse the MP in epic Greek. I use the data of a large corpus of 5267 verses with 625 instances of a subjunctive or optative without MP and 267 with it, and discuss the data of *Iliad* 16 in more detail. This book has 867 verses, being one of the longest books of Homer, and provides 107 instances of indicatives, subjunctives and optatives that could have been used with an MP. First, I provide an overview of the existing scholarship. Second, I determine the instances, I catalogue them per mood, tense and type of sentence and in a third step, I proceed to the actual analysis. I will analyse the use of the MP in epic Greek and compare it with that of *man* in Hittite starting from the research hypothesis that the MP does not change the meaning of the mood, but has particularising and emphasising value and is incompatible with a deontic and jussive meaning.

4. Hoffner – Melchert (2008: 314-316, 366-374, 419-423).

5. I consider the injunctive to be a living mood in the oldest Greek texts: it was attested in Mycenaean (there are virtually no augmented forms) and in epic Greek, there are more unaugmented froms (injunctives) than augmented forms, and there is a difference in meaning between them: for the injunctive use in Hesiod one can refer to West (1989), Clackson (2007: 130-132) and De Decker (2016).

6. For a more skeptical approach of the contact issue, see Yakubovich (2010: 140-157), Hajnal (2014, 2018), Oreshko (2018), Simon (2018), Giusfredi (forthcoming).

3.1. *Previous scholarship*

According to the standard Greek grammars,[7] the use of the MP ἄν is governed by the following strict rules in Classical Greek prose: it is mandatory in the main clause and any other subordinate clause (except the conditionals) with a potential optative, a counterfactual indicative and an iterative indicative and forbidden with the same forms in a conditional clause (exceptions are attested, but generally corrected by the different editors);[8] it is mandatory with a subjunctive in any subordinate clause, except in the purpose clauses (where it can appear) and clauses after *verba timendi* (where it never appears); it is forbidden with a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause (instances of these uses are attested, but they are generally to be corrected by the editors).[9] In Homeric Greek, not only ἄν is used as MP, but also κεν; moreover, a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause can be used with an MP as well and so can optatives in conditional clauses and, inversely, the MP can also be left out. The differences between the presence and absence of the MP have not been conclusively explained.

The following explanations have been given for the use of the MP in Homer.[10]

---

7. Goodwin (1865: 54-64), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 200-260, 1904: 347-557), Gildersleeve (1900: 168-190), Smyth – Messing (1956: 491-527), Humbert (1960: 110-132, 182-246), Delaunois (1988: 76-134), and Rijksbaron (2002: 39-94), van Emde Boas et al. (2019: 438-550). Recent treatments of the particle in Attic are Goldstein (2012), dealing with the repetition of the particle, and Beck – Malamud – Osadcha (2012), discussing the use in conditional clauses. A recent historical Greek syntax is still missing, the only ones still being Stahl (1907) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950); Chantraine (1964) has very little observations on syntax and Rix (1976, 1992) is limited to the morphology and phonology.

8. The standard grammars follow this editorial practice, but some grammars are more cautious and point out that the many exceptions cannot simply be disregarded as transmission errors (Schwyzer – Debrunner [1950: 324-325], Humbert [1960: 120], Crespo [1997: 50], Montanari [2015: 127]). Even Stahl (1907: 298-302) who argued for the correction of the instances where the particle was missing, nevertheless voiced some doubts, as he admitted that the amount of instances to be corrected was relatively high.

9. Hermann (1831) provided a monumental analysis of all instances of Greek literature known at that time; since that work, a canonical use seems to have been established and deviations from what Hermann explained were no longer accepted (see already Hartung [1833: 281] for criticism: "allein ist das seltene Vorkommen einer Erscheinung ein Grund zu ihrer Tilgung" – words still valid today).

10. The most recent surveys are Gerö (2000), Colvin (2012) and De Mol (2015). It was not addressed in the Oxford or Cambridge Commentaries. In the new *Basel Kommentar*, instances with MP are discussed (as e.g. *Iliad* 1,60 and 1,64), but the absence is not (see following note).

1.   "Dubitative".

1.1. One of the first suggestions was that the particle could be used to add some doubts to the statement.[11]

1.2. This explanation might explain the use of the particle, but not its absence.

2.   "Conditional".

2.1. The second explanation was that it described the conditions under which the action occurred and that it was used in sentences with a conditional meaning.[12]

2.2. The problem with this assumption is that it does not explain why the particle is missing in some conditional clauses and relative clauses with a quasi-conditional meaning.

3.   Specific versus generic.

3.1. The third explanation was that the particle was used in sentences that referred to a specific instance and that it remained absent in generic statements. This explanation, first made by Hartung and von Bäumlein,[13] was reiterated by Delbrück (who added that the prospective subjunctive could be used with an MP, but the voluntative one – i.e. the one used in wishes and exhortations – could not)[14] and accepted by the standard Homeric grammars of Monro and Chantraine and scholars after them.[15]

3.2. This explanation seems convincing, but the number of exceptions is considerable and they cannot all be emended away by changing τε into κε and vice versa (as Monro tried to do).[16] Ruijgh showed that many instances Monro consid-

---

11. This had been noted in the very early treatises by Devarius (1587: 45, edited by Klotz in Devarius – Klotz [1835: 26]) and Hoogeveen (1769, edited by Schütz in Hoogeveen – Schütz [1813: 30-34]) and in Buttmann (1810: 496-497; 1819: 323) and Aken (1861: 55-56, about the potential and unreal in the indicative). It has been reiterated by Latacz – Nünlist – Stoevesandt (2002: 51, "*betont die Potentialität noch stärker als ohne*").

12. See already von Thiersch (1818: 533-538), Matthiae (1826: 981, 1195), Bernhardy (1829: 397), Hermann (1831) and in 1832 in the *Philological Museum* on page 102 (the author is only known by his initials H.M.), Ahrens (1852: 194-195), Aken (1865: 27-30), Wilhelmi (1881: 23).

13. Hartung (1832: 294-297), von Bäumlein (1846: 208-245, especially 219-220).

14. Delbrück (1871: 83-86), but his explanation was somewhat unclear as he also spoke about "das Eintreten der Handlung", but on page 86 he stated that the particle was much more absent in generic statements than in specific ones. See also Gildersleeve (1882), who applied it to Pindar.

15. Monro (1891: 250, 259, 266, 327-335), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 208), Leaf (1900: 17), Brugmann (1900: 499), Chantraine (1948: 279; 1953: 210-211), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 305-306), Valgiglio (1955: 50), Ruijgh (1971 *passim* but especially page 275 and pages 286-302; 1992: 80-82), Dunkel (1990; 2014: 33-35, 397, 430), Wakker (1994: 207-209 with reference to Monro, Basset and Ruijgh).

16. Monro (1891: 259, 266-267).

ered to be generic and to be in need in for correction, were not (but this does not explain all the exceptions).[17] Assuming a common origin for τε and κε (cf. supra) does not solve this issue either and would only account for the fact that these two particles never co-occur.

4. Very early on, there were doubts as to the exact meaning and use. Already von Bäumlein, who argued that there was a distinction between generic and specific instances, stated that there were many contexts in which one could not distinguish between the forms with and without MP.[18] The validity of this "particularising theory" was doubted, because there were too many exceptions to the rule,[19] and therefore the use of the MP was considered to be "poetic" or "metrically motivated".[20] The metrical explanation can always be invoked in Homer[21] and there are several instances in which the particle is not metrically secure; yet, this theory does not explain why in some instances κ(ε) was used and in other τ(ε), both being metrically equivalent. Many commentaries and lexica mention "wohl, zwar" as meaning, but do not discuss when it was used and when it remained absent.[22]

5. Emphatic value.

5.1. Other scholars assumed the MP (especially ἄν, cf. supra) had an emphatic value.[23] Camerer ascribed an "emphatischen Grundwert" to ἄν and Gerö analysed it as "intensional" (*sic*).[24] This was also assumed for non-Homeric Greek: in her

---

17. Ruijgh (1971: 286-288).

18. Von Bäumlein (1846: 216-217)

19. Howorth (1955), Basset (1988a: 29; 1989: 205); Willmott (2007: 199-210). See also above. Many exceptions involve the use of the so-called *τε-épique*. Chantraine (1953: 349) had some reservations on the "particularising" meaning (in spite of his own analyses), as did Gonda (1956: 147-148), but he did not ascribe his doubts to the number of exceptions.

20. Already Devarius (1587: 46; Devarius – Klotz [1835: 27]), Hermann (1831: 143) and later Ebeling (1885: 692) had observed this. Wakker (1994: 207) admitted that the metre played a role, but did not consider it to be the sole factor.

21. The metre has been used as explanation for the augment use, the use of the tenses and the use of the dual. In all of these instances, the metre played – in my opinion – only a limited role.

22. A good example is Ebeling (1885: 691-735), who described all the uses but did not discuss the absence. The commentaries by Faesi (1858a, 1858b, 1860) and Ameis (1868:12) described the meaning as "wohl", but do not speak about the examples where the MP is missing.

23. As can be seen in Faesi's explanation of *Iliad* 1,137: "die kecke doch gemessene Zuversicht des Sprechenden" (Faesi [1858a: 50]); see also Camerer (1968). The emphatic value seems also accepted in Buttmann (1810: 496-497; 1819: 323) and Latacz – Nünlist – Stoevesandt (2002: 50, 52) where they stated that the MP strengthened the potential value of the optative when used in a protasis and emphasises the expected outcome, when used in a relative clause with final nuance.

24. Gerö (2000).

study on the ὅπως clauses in Attic, Amigues argued that ὅπως ἄν with the subjunctive was more emphatic and outspoken than the simple ὅπως with the subjunctive.[25]

5.2. There is one important shortcoming, however: if the meaning were indeed intensive or emphatic, one would expect the particle to occur with exhortative subjunctives and in wishes, but these subjunctives are almost never constructed with an MP. Moreover, Amigues's explanation of ὅπως ἄν as being the more emphatic form is not necessarily correct: as many instances occur in legal texts (inscriptions) and in oratory, an explanation of the MP as particularising is also possible.[26]

6.   Main versus subordinate clauses.

6.1. Howorth observed that the "specific instance theory" had too many exceptions and could therefore not be correct, and suggested that the MP was originally only used in main clauses with verbs referring to a future action; then it could appear in a subordinate clause, but still referred to the verbal action of the main clause.[27] Finally, it would have spread to the subordinate clauses that did not depend on future actions anymore and it became generalised. In Attic, certain clauses generalised the use, while in others the absence became the rule.[28]

6.2. This cannot account for the examples in which the MP is missing in the main clause nor does it explain why in Homer the MP could be missing and present within the same category (although one could argue that the transition was still in progress). If Howorth's explanation were correct, one would expect the vast majority of instances in the main clause to have an MP (including the wishes and desiderative forms, cf. infra), but this is not the case.

7.   Confronted with the exceptions of the particularising theory, Basset adapted the explanation to state that the MP was only used when an action near to the speaker was related (*actualité du locuteur*), but not when actions in a remote past or future were described.[29]

8.   Finally, Willmott argued that the particles did not contain any additional meaning and were in the process of being grammaticalised as part of the eventual and potential constructions.[30] This is only partly true; as she stated herself, the MP

25. Amigues (1977: 142-169).

26. See already Kühner – Gerth (1904: 385-386) and Ruijgh (1971: 276). For the use of ὅπως ἄν in inscriptions, see Meisterhans (1885: 109). For criticism of Amigues's theory, see also Bers (1984: 164-165).

27. Howorth (1955).

28. Howorth (1955).

29. Basset (1988a; 1989: 204-205).

30. Willmott (2007: 199-210). Probert (2015: 85) referred to Willmott to state that the presence or absence of the MP did not change the meaning of the relative clause.

was used much less in the relative clauses with a generic meaning than in those with a specific meaning and in the purpose clauses of the *Odyssey* the MP was more often absent than present.[31]

9.   Independent from the exact meaning, it was also noted that in a sequence of optatives and subjunctives the MP usually only appeared with the first form.[32] This is a sort of *conjunction reduction*: if one verb is already marked for particularity, it is not necessary to mark it with the following verb forms.[33]

3.2. *Working hypothesis*

Limitations in time and space prevent me from discussing the scholarship on the *Grundbedeutung* of the optative and subjunctive and the difference in meaning between these two modes,[34] but Allan distinguished three dimensions on which Greek moods are used: deontic (obligation, permission) vs. epistemic (beliefs of the speaker regarding the proposition) modality, speaker vs. event oriented modality and the scale of modality (realis, necessity, possibility and counterfactuality).[35] The Greek subjunctive and optative mood can convey one or more of these meanings, with the exception of the notion "realis", which is limited to the indicative only.

In what follows, I will investigate in which of Allan's three axes the MP is allowed and will use as working hypothesis a combination of the explanations by especially Monro and Basset, which can be summarised as follows: the MP was

31. Willmott (2007: 202-204); the data of the purpose clauses could be found in Weber (1884) already, but she did not quote that book.

32. Madvig (1847: 152), Krüger (1859: 181), Buttmann (1854: 401), Aken (1861: 42, pointing out that this is by no means an absolute rule), Frohberger (1863), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 248-249), Goodwin (1865: 63-64), Smyth – Messing (1956: 400), Ruijgh (1971: 767), Adrados et al. (1986: 26), Gerö (2001: 193).

33. This principle was first noted for Greek by Kiparsky (1968), but he did not discuss the MP among the instances of possible reductions.

34. The literature is large, see most recently Greenberg (1986), Tichy (2006) and Willmott (2007), and earlier, Delbrück (1871, 1879), Masius (1885), Mutzbauer (1903a, 1903b, 1908), Methner (1908), Walter (1923), Gonda (1956), Brunel (1980), besides the discussions in the standard grammars of Kühner – Gerth (1898: 217-289) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 301-338, with a bibliography until 1950).

35. Allan (2013), building on Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca (1994), Palmer (2001), Nuyts (2006) and De Haan (2006); see also van der Auwera – Plungian (1998) for a discussion and definitions. For an application of modality to the Greek moods, see Horrocks (1995), Willmott (2007), Allan (2013), Veksina (2017), Méndez Dosuna (2018: 271).

used in specific instances with a link to the present situation, and was omitted in a generic instance or an instance referring to the more remote future or past.

3.3. *Determining the instances of* Iliad 16

1.   Before I proceed to the actual analysis, I first have to determine when the (absence of) MP is secure. In my analysis, I will start from the transmitted text, but it is necessary to discuss the instances where the metre does not guarantee the use of the MP (as was stated above, especially Monro suggested to change the text and add/remove the particle when needed). One can always change τε into κε and vice versa, τ᾽ into κ᾽ and vice versa, (ὅς/ἥ) τις into (ὅς/ἥ) κεν and vice versa, αἴ κε into αἴ θε, αἴ κ᾽ into αἴ θ᾽ and sometimes one can subsitute κεν for καί or vice versa. Moreover, instances with ἐπειδήν, ἐπήν or ἥν are insecure when a word starting with a consonant follows, because in that case ἐπειδή, ἐπεί or εἰ (without particle) could also have been used; in case a word with a vowel follows, the MP is secure, because otherwise we would have an hiatus and the "Attic" forms ἐπειδήν or ἐπήν could contain an older ἐπεί κ', ἐπειδή κ' or εἴ κ'.[36] In those latter instances the MP is metrically secure (albeit the exact form is not).[37] Wackernagel argued that ἐπὴν δή was only found in the *Odyssey* and would be the normal order, since ἄν takes precedence over δή; ἐπειδάν would have been Attic and would have replaced the Homeric ἐπεί κεν.[38] I discuss one example:

> (EX.03.01) αὐτὰρ *ἐπὴν δὴ / ἐπεὶ δὴ* τόν γε λίπῃ ψυχή τε καὶ αἰών (*Iliad* 16,453).
> "But when his soul and life have left him, …"[39]

The codices have both the reading with MP (ἐπὴν δή) and without MP (ἐπεὶ δή), but the metre does not allow to distinguish between the variant readings and therefore this instance is insecure. The same applies for *Iliad* 16,39 and 95.

---

36. See van Leeuwen (1885 *passim*) for a detailed study on the oldest forms of the MP (but see following note).

37. I am very skeptical about reconstructing the *Urform* of the poems, as has been attempted by Fick (1883, 1885, 1887) and Tichy (2010). In my opinion the transmitted text should serve as basis, with the metre as confirming factor, whenever possible, but I do not think that one should start changing the text or rewriting it into an older form (as has been done in West's editions as well).

38. Wackernagel (1916: 191-195), but see preceding note.

39. Unless noted otherwise, the translations are my own.

By applying this method, I obtained 25 instances of a metrically secure MP in *Iliad* 16 and 276 in the large corpus.

2.   A second problem is the distinction between the future indicative and the subjunctive aorist. As is known, the subjunctive aorist of the sigmatic aorist is metrically equivalent to the future indicative (unless the verb is a semi-deponent or belongs to the *verba liquida*) and those forms would have been written the same in the most alphabets anyway: λύσω can be either future indicative or subjunctive aorist, and λύσωσι and λύσουσι are metrically equivalent and would have written ΛΥΣΟΣΙ in the oldest Greek alphabet and in that of Athens from before 403 BC.[40] Chantraine argued that one should make a difference between the two forms based on the transmission (thus distinguishing λύσωσι from λύσουσι),[41] and consider the form a subjunctive, when an MP is used,[42] but in my opinion this fails to take into account the transmission problems (as in several cases both forms are found in the codices) and the fact that in Homer's time one could not have differentiated between the forms (at least in writing). The verbs without an aorist or with a non-sigmatic aorist build their future on the Indo-European desiderative *-(h₁)s-:*[43] the verb ἄγω has a reduplicated aorist ἤγαγον with a subjunctive aorist ἀγάγω, but has a future form ἄξω which is built on *$h_2e\hat{g}$-s-*. The same applies to the semi-deponent future forms.[44] For that reason I catalogued the forms of the type λύσω as a special category "future-subjunctives". In my classification I use the following categories: subjunctives (present, aorist, perfect), future-subjunctives (those subjunctive aorist and future indicative forms that have the same metrical form, type λύσω and λύσωσι and λύσουσι), future-desiderative forms (type ἄξω and the so-

40. This was also noted in De Mol (2015: 10-11). In 403/2 BC the Athenian arkhon Eukleides, on suggestion of Arkhinos, suggested to adopt the Ionic alphabet with its 24 letters (including the eta and the omega, which the Athenians did not use until then). It is that alphabet that will become the "Greek" one in use until today.

41. Chantraine (1953: 225).

42. Chantraine (1953: 206-212).

43. For the present investigation it is irrelevant whether the suffix was *-s-* or *-h₁s-* or whether or not both suffixes existed.

44. Contrary to e.g. Willi (2011, 2018: 441-447) I believe that the Greek future continues both the subjunctive and the desiderative, or better said, that the old desiderative and the subjunctive of the sigmatic aorist merged in the Greek future. The first one to state that the future originated in the subjunctive were Buttmann (1830: 398; 1854: 396) and also Aken (1865: 13), whereas Franke (1861) stated that all future forms were in origin present forms. I cannot address that issue in detail here (already Brugmann (1880: 58-64) stated that the issue could not be solved), nor the question whether there is a difference in meaning between the future and the subjunctive aorist forms.

called semi-deponents of the type ἀκούσομαι), optatives (present, aorist, perfect) and rarely, in case of the counterfactuals, indicatives (imperfect, aorist, pluperfect).

3.   The root *h_3ek^w- is a problem, because one could interpret the form ὄψομαι as a desiderative form (as is done in the Rix 2001[2]),[45] but given the fact that there is a present ὄσσομαι (from *h_3ek^w-ye/o-), one cannot exclude that the form was in origin a subjunctive aorist (although the aorist is only attested in a fragment of Pindar and in Sophokles, but not in epic Greek).[46] For that reason I catalogued the form as a special category.

4.   The root *h_1ed- poses a special problem, because it is attested as a "normal" present, but in the middle forms its apparent "present" conjugation is used as a future. There is one such instance in *Iliad* 16:

(EX.03.02) ἦμαρ ἀναγκαῖον· σὲ δέ τ᾽ ἐνθάδε γῦπες ἔδονται (*Iliad* 16,836).

"(I will ward off) the day of fate, but here the vultures will eat you."

In this verse the form ἔδονται refers to the future and is in all likelihood an old subjunctive.

There is one instance in which the subjunctive seems to be used with an MP:

(EX.03.03) (41) σχέτλιος· αἴθε θεοῖσι φίλος τοσσόνδε γένοιτο
(42) ὅσσον ἐμοί· τάχα κέν ἑ κύνες καὶ γῦπες ἔδονται
(43) κείμενον· ἦ κέ μοι αἰνὸν ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἄχος ἔλθοι· (*Iliad* 22,41-43).

"A hard man. Ah, were he loved inasmuch by the gods as he were by me. Soon the dogs and the vultures will eat him (lying there) and a sharp pain would go away from my chest."

In these lines, Priam describes that he hoped the gods would love Akhilleus in the same manner as he did, because in that case he would soon be eaten by dogs and vultures and his sorrows would be solved. All codices have the middle subjunctive ἔδονται, but Aristarkhos changed it into the optative ἔδοιεν (ἔδοιεν and

---

45. Rix (2001[2]: 297).

46. As was suggested by Ruijgh (1992: 76) and Kölligan (2007: 256) with a detailed argumentation as to why this is better interpreted as a subjunctive aorist. For the aorist form in Pindar and Sophokles, see Veitch (1873: 495, 504); Kölligan (2007: 256); the sigmatic aorist forms are not mentioned in Chantraine (1968-1980: 812, 832) nor in Rix (2001[2]: 297).

ἔδονται are metrically equivalent). La Roche, Allen and West adopted the correction, while Van Thiel preserved the transmitted text. La Roche argued that τάχα κέν was almost always used with the optative and Leaf, Richardson and De Jong admitted that the future could be used with an MP, but argued that Priam only imagined Akhilleus' death and the optative would be more in line with the optatives used by Priam in the other lines.[47] As Van Thiel noted, a transition of optative into subjunctive is not uncommon, so that the transition from one mood to another could have occurred here as well.[48] Besides this fact, it should be noted that not only the optative ἔλθοι is transmitted, but also the subjunctive ἔλθῃ, so that stating that the optative ἔδοιεν has preference over ἔδονται because it would be in line with the other optatives, is not convincing. One could, at least theoretically, imagine that Priam considered it not impossible that Akhilleus be killed. For other alternations in moods, I refer to e.g. *Iliad* 24,565-566.

5.   The root $*g^w(e)ih_3$- has a similar problem, because the verb βέ(εί)ομαι has an apparent present indicative conjugation, but has future meaning and thus seems to be a subjunctive present.[49]

(EX.03.04) οὔ θην οὐδ᾽ αὐτὸς δηρὸν βέῃ, ἀλλά τοι ἤδη (*Iliad* 16,852).

"Indeed, you will not live long yourself anymore, but already (black Fate) …"

The form βέῃ could formally be both a present indicative as a subjunctive, but the meaning is a future.[50]

---

47. La Roche (1876: 286: "*τάχα κέν omnibus fere locis cum optativo iungitur*"), Leaf (1888: 352), Richardson (1993: 110), De Jong (2012: 69-70), West (2000: 42). The commentaries by La Roche (1871: 32, 142) and Ameis – Hentze (1906: 6) adopted Aristarkhos' correction, but did not discuss it.

48. Van Thiel (2011: 422), with reference to Chantraine (1953: 225) and to Leaf's commentary, but Leaf nevertheless agreed with the correction.

49. Veitch (1879: 130) and Ameis – Hentze (1885: 95-96) catalogue it as a present indicative with future meaning, but Chantraine (1968: 176), in spite of his skepticism in (1948: 452-453), Janko (1992: 248), Beekes (2010: 216-217) and Brügger (2018: 371) see it as a subjunctive form; Rix (2001²: 215) states that the subjunctive evolved into a future. Schwyzer (1939: 780) interpreted it as a subjunctive aorist of ἐβίων, but did not address why these forms were middle (Schwyzer – Debrunner 1950: 265 only catalogued the form as a subjunctive, not as a subjunctive aorist). The issue is not discussed in Rix (1992²: 225-226) and Frisk (1960: 238) is agnostic ("kann indesssen nicht als sicher betrachtet werden").

50. There is no need to change the form into βέε' with elision of the diphthong -αι (as done in West's edition), which is not impossible, but still quite unusual before the bucolic caesura (having

6.   There are also many instances where the optative and the subjunctive are metrically equivalent: this is the case for the paradigms of the verbs in -μι, and for the active optative forms in -ειε and the subjunctives in -ησι, the optatives in -οι- to the subjunctives in -η/ω-, and, especially at the end of the verse, the optative in -οιτο and the subjunctive in -ηται. I always use the transmitted form as basis, but sometimes, both forms are transmitted, and in such instances, determining which of the variants is the most likely one is only possible by a detailed study on the moods of this book, but space constraints prevent me from performing such a study here.

7.   In six instances it is impossible to determine the tense: ἀμύνης (32), ἀγείρω (129), τείνη (365), κρίνωσι (387, in this passage, the form κρίνωσι was preceded by the aorist χαλεπήνη, so that κρίνωσι could very well be an aorist), ἐποτρύνω (525) and ἐποτρύνησι (690) can be aorist and present, and therefore I tagged them only for mood but not for tense.

3.4. *The facts and figures of the MP in* Iliad 16

1.   The figures for the large corpus are:

Overall data for the MP use in speech and narrative in the large corpus

Speech	260	524
Narrative	16	100
Total	276	624

2.   The overall data for *Iliad* 16 are:

Data of MP use in *Iliad* 16

Speech	22	58
Narrative	3	24
Total	25	82

both an elision of a diphthong and an elision before this caesura make West's reading unnecessary; moreover, it is not the editor's task to recover the oldest linguistically possible text, but to edit the text as it is most likely to have been composed by the poet and/or writer).

3. The figures for mood and tense for *Iliad* 16 are:

MP use per mood and tense in *Iliad* 16

Form	With MP	No MP
Aorist subjunctive	8	16
Present subjunctive	1	11
Perfect subjunctive	0	2
Subjunctive, tense undetermined	2	4
Aorist optative	6	13
Present optative	0	7
Perfect optative	0	1
Optative, tense undetermined	0	0
Future-subjunctive	3	13
Future-desiderative	0	10
Indicative aorist	5	4
Indicative imperfect	0	0
Indicative pluperfect	0	0
Double particle use	0	0
The root *h_1ed-	0	1
The root *g^wieh_3-	0	1
Total	25	82

4. The data per type of sentence is as follows:

The MP use per type of sentence in *Iliad* 16

Wish with αἲ γάρ	0	2
Negative purpose/negative wish	0	9
Purpose clauses	2	16
Conditional clauses	7	14
Temporal clauses	2	9
Relative clauses	2	7
Deliberative (indirect) questions	0	7

Exhortative	0/1 (cf. infra)	2
Other main clause instances	11	14[51]
Total	25	82

I now proceed to the actual analysis of *Iliad* 16. As the figures show that there are much more instances without MP, I will start by discussing the categories without it.

3.5. *The actual analysis: the instances without MP*

1.   Before proceeding to the actual analysis, it is necessary to observe that in many instances it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide which explanation is possible: especially in cases with a verb in the first person singular or plural, it can be difficult to distinguish between exhortative or simple future meaning, or between a deliberative or simple future meaning.

(EX.03.05) οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ <u>νεώμεθα</u> ποντοπόροισιν (*Iliad* 16,205).

"Let us return / We will return home with the ships that carry (us) over the seas."

In this instance the verb form νεώμεθα can be conceived as a simple subjunctive present "we will return" or as an exhortative subjunctive "let us return".

2.   The MP is missing in exhortative clauses, but there are only two certain instances of this (16,60 and 16,205), and as was stated above, one could also interpret them as simple future forms.

(EX.03.06) ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι <u>ἐάσομεν</u>: οὐδ᾽ ἄρα πως ἦν (*Iliad* 16,60).

"But we shall let / let us leave this (to) be things completed before, it was not my intention (to be enraged forever)."

---

51. In *Iliad* 16,456 and 674 the different editors (and manuscripts) differ on the interpretation of the sentences and use different punctuation, and depending on their interpretation of the sentences as subordinate or main clauses. I have therefore left them out from the data.

In this verse, it is more likely to interpret ἐάσομεν as exhortative "let us leave this", but a plain future meaning "we shall let this" cannot be excluded either.

In one instance, a subjunctive form is used with an MP, but could be exhortative as well:

(EX.03.07) (128) μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται
(129) δύσεο τεύχεα θᾶσσον, ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν ἀγείρω (*Iliad* 16,128-129).

"That they do not take or ships and that they (the ships) do not become impossible to flee in (i.e. that we can no longer flee by using them), dress yourself quickly in the battle gear and I will / let me gather the soldiers."

This passage describes how Akhilleus notices the dramatic situation of the Greek army and agrees with Patroklos' suggestion to have him (P) dressed in Akhilleus' battle gear to relieve the Greeks and frighten the Trojans. The subjunctive ἀγείρω (aorist or present, the distinction cannot be made) is combined with an imperative δύσεο (of the desiderative stem) and is combined with two negative purpose clauses, so that one could argue that ἀγείρω meant "let me gather" and not "I will gather".

3.   The same applies to the so-called deliberative questions, be they direct or indirect.[52] They can be explained as plain future-referring subjunctives "I will do this" or optatives after a verb of a past tense, but also as being exhortative "Let me do this" or being deliberative "should I do this?". They also occur after verbs of thinking and asking, especially in the past and in those cases the optative is used.[53] I analyse one example:

(EX.03.08) (435) διχθὰ δέ μοι κραδίη μέμονε φρεσὶν ὁρμαίνοντι,
(436) ἤ μιν ζωὸν ἐόντα μάχης ἄπο δακρυοέσσης
(437) θείω ἀναρπάξας Λυκίης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ,
(439) ἦ ἤδη ὑπὸ χερσὶ Μενοιτιάδαο δαμάσσω. (*Iliad* 16,435-438).

---

52. The instances are *Iliad* 16,437 (θείω, aorist subjunctive), 438 (δαμάσσω, future-subjunctive), 650 (δηώσῃ, future-subjunctive), 650 (ἕλται, aorist subjunctive), 651 (ὀφέλλειεν, present optative), 713 (μάχοιτο, present optative), 714 (ὁμοκλήσειεν, aorist optative).

53. As stated already, I cannot discuss the so-called *Grundbedeutung* of both moods nor can I address the issue of the so-called *optativus obliquus*. For a discussion of the last type, see Mein (1903).

"In my breast my heart is divided in two, while I ponder whether I should take him alive out of the tearbringing battle and put him in the fertile land of Lykia or let him be tamed by the hands of the son of Menoitios."

In this passage Zeus ponders whether he should save his son Sarpedon from Patroklos' hands or have fate take its course and let him die. Here the deliberative question refers to the present and the subjunctive is used. The aorist subjunctive θείω and the future-subjunctive δαμάσσω can be interpreted as indirect deliberative questions depending on ὁρμαίνοντι, but one could also argue that they are independent main clauses.[54]

4.   In negative wishes, negative purpose clauses,[55] and after the *verba timendi* the MP is not used. The difference between a negative purpose clause and a negative wish is very small and the *verba timendi* might very well have been negative wish clauses in origin and many negative wishes have a notion of fear in them.[56] There 9 negative purpose clauses without MP.[57] I give one example:

(EX.03.09) (80) ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς Πάτροκλε νεῶν ἄπο λοιγὸν ἀμύνων
(81) ἔμπεσ' ἐπικρατέως, μὴ δὴ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο
(82) νῆας ἐνιπρήσωσι, φίλον δ' ἀπὸ νόστον ἕλωνται. (*Iliad* 16,80-82).

"In that way fall down on them strongly, Patroklos, warding off the destruction from the ships, lest they do set the ships ablaze with the burning fire and take away our beloved homecoming!"

---

54. I cannot address the origins of subordinations nor the degree to what extent subordinate clauses in Homer are still older paratactic constructions.

55. Weber (1884: 32-38), Monro (1891: 262), Chantraine (1953: 266-273). The only in-depth investigation of the Homeric purpose clauses is Weber (1884); for an historical comparison between the Homeric and the RigVedic final clauses, see Hettrich (1987) and for Attic Greek, see Amigues (1977).

56. Aken (1865: 64-65), Delbrück (1871: 23), Weber (1884: 4-9), Kühner – Gerth (1904: 390-391), Hentze (1907: 368), Chantraine (1953: 208-209, 288), Brunel (1980: 251). See also Ameis – Hentze (1901: 87), Chantraine (1953: 208) and Fernández Galiano (1992: 186) on *Odyssey* 21,324.

57. The instances are *Iliad* 16,30 (λάβοι, aorist optative), 80 (ἐνιπρήσωσι, future-subjunctive), 80 (ἕλωνται, aorist subjunctive), 94 (ἐμβήῃ, aorist subjunctive), 128 (ἕλωσι, aorist subjunctive), 128 (πέλωνται, present subjunctive), 446 (ἐθέλῃσι, present subjunctive), 545 (ἕλωνται, aorist subjunctive), 545 (ἀεικίσσωσι, future-subjunctive).

In these verses Akhilleus wants Patroklos to push back the Trojan army and save the ships, so that the Greeks can still sail home. In this instance the future-subjunctive ἐνιπρήσωσι (the aorist subjunctive ἐνιπρήσωσι and the future indicative ἐνιπρήσουσι are metrically equivalent and would have been written ΕΝΙΠΡΕΣΟΣΙ by Homer, hence the cataloguing as future-subjunctive) and the subjunctive aorist ἕλωνται appear in a negative purpose clause or negative wish "may they not" or "lest they". The difference between negative purpose and negative wish is very thin.

5.   Positive wish clauses do not have the MP either. In *Iliad* 16 there are only 2 instances where we can state with absolute certainty that we are dealing with a positive wish (267 and 722, but for that instance see later); in the larger corpus there are 20. Given the close link between conditional clauses and wishes (cf. infra), many instances of a conditional clause with an optative could be old wish clauses as well. I give one example of a wish.

(EX.03.10) ἀσκηθής μοι ἔπειτα θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἵκοιτο (*Iliad* 16,247).

"May he come (back) unharmed to the fast ships!"

In this instance Akhilleus prays to Zeus that Patroklos may return home safely after his expedition against the Trojans. The aorist optative ἵκοιτο is used without MP.

Reversely, the instances of a conditional clause with αἴ κε could be interpreted as old wish clauses as well and in those instances the use of the MP can only be explained as a grammaticalisation of the MP in conditional clauses. It be noted that αἴ κε is only used with the subjunctive and not the optative (the mood of possibility and wish).

6.   The MP is also very rarely used in positive purpose clauses. There are 16 instances without MP and 2 with it.[58] I give one example.

(EX.03.11) ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεῦθε νόῳ, ἵνα εἴδομεν ἄμφω (*Iliad* 16,19).

"Speak up, do not hide it in your heart, so that we know it both!"

58. The instances without MP are *Iliad* 16,10 (ἀνέληται, aorist subjunctive), 19 (εἴδομεν, perfect subjunctive), 83 (θείω, aorist subjunctive), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive), 86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive), 100 (λύωμεν, present subjunctive), 243 (εἴσεται, future-desiderative), 243 (ἐπίστηται, present subjunctive), 273 (γνῷ, aorist subjunctive), 423 (δαείω, aorist subjunctive), 525 (ἐποτρύνω, subjunctive, could be present or aorist), 526 (μάχωμαι, present subjunctive), 568 (εἴη, present optative), 576 (μάχοιτο, present optative), 655 (ὤσαιτο, aorist optative), 655 (ἕλοιτο, aorist optative).

In the two instances in a purpose clause with an MP, an alternative explanation is possible.

(EX.03.12) (83) πείθεο δ᾿ ὥς τοι ἐγὼ μύθου τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω,
(84) ὡς ἄν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος ἄρηαι
(85) πρὸς πάντων Δαναῶν, ἀτὰρ οἳ περικαλλέα κούρην
(86) ἂψ ἀπονάσσωσιν, ποτὶ δ᾿ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα πόρωσιν. (*Iliad* 16,83-86).

"Obey, so that I can put the purpose of this word in your heart, so that / in a way that you obtain the greatest honour and fame among all the Danaans and that they can indeed bring home the very beautiful girl and provide in addition shining gifts!"

In these verses, one could argue that the two purpose clauses are in fact old relative clauses and especially in the second example ἄρηαι, this seems possible. In that case one would have to translate "that I put in your mind the purpose in such a way that you should obtain glory", but if this is an old relative clause, it certainly has a purpose nuance as well.[59] One could even argue the first sentence contains an older paratactic construction *πείθεο·τώς τοι ἐγὼ μύθου τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω "Obey. That way I will put in your mind the purpose of this word in such a way that …". In that case θείω would belong to the main clause and ἄρηαι would be part of the relative clause (in which case the absence of the MP with θείω would require an explanation, unless one interprets it as exhortative). The fact that the future-subjunctive ἀπονάσσωσιν and the aorist subjunctive πόρωσιν are used without an MP might be due to the fact that they occur in a purpose clause (in which case the use of ἄρηαι with MP would require an explanation) or could be due to the so-called "reduction rule" (cf. infra).

(EX.03.13) (270) ἀνέρες ἔστε φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς,
(271) ὡς ἄν Πηλεΐδην τιμήσομεν, ὃς μέγ᾿ ἄριστος (*Iliad* 16,270-271).

"Friends, be men and remember your furious strength, so that we / that way we will honour the son of Peleus, who the most powerful …"

59. These instances were not discussed in Probert (2015).

In this instance the future-subjunctive τιμήσομεν could belong to a purpose clause "so that we will honour", but it can also be interpreted as a main clause "this way we will honour".

As will be discussed later on in the subchapter of the relative clauses, several purpose clauses could be interpreted as relative clauses with purpose nuance, or even as simple relative clauses.

7. The future-desideratives rarely have the MP. In *Iliad* 16 there are no instances with it,[60] and in the larger corpus we have 145 instances of a future-desiderative without MP and only 2 with it. The notion of desire and wish explains the absence of the MP, as was the case with the (negative) purpose clauses and (negative) wishes.

8. The same applies to the future-subjunctives, but the figures are less outspoken: 13 instances without it and 3 with.[61] In the larger corpus, there are 137 instances of a future-subjunctive without it and 28 with it. Although the future-subjunctives clearly have a notion of wish and desire in them, in *Iliad* 16 there are other explanations possible for the absence of the MP: ἀναπνεύσωσι (42) is preceded by another verb form that is already marked by the MP (cf. infra), ἐάσομεν (60) could be interpreted as exhortative, ἐνιπρήσωσι (82) appears in a negative purpose/wish clause, ἀπονάσσωσιν (86) is preceded by another verb form that is already marked by the MP, κινήσῃ (264) appears in a simile with an undefined subject τις (and is thus less specific, cf. infra), δαμάσσω (438) appears in an indirect deliberative question, ἀεικίσσωσι (545) appears in a negative purpose/wish clause, χωρήσουσι (629) appears in a negative sentence (cf. infra), 650 (δηώσῃ), 674 (ταρχύσουσι). For κινήσῃ (298), ἀντήσω (423) and ταρχύσουσι (456, 674) there is no other explanation than that they are future-subjunctives, the first one appears in a temporal clause in a simile (cf. infra), while the three other instances refer to specific instances in the main clause. The 3 instances with the MP appear twice in a conditional clause (πέμψῃς, 445 and συλήσωσι, 500) and once in a purpose clause that could have been an original relative clause (τιμήσομεν, 271, cf. supra).

60. The instances of the future-desideratives are *Iliad* 16,31 (ὀνήσεται), 90 (θήσεις), 239 (μενέω), 243 (εἴσεται), 444 (ἐρέω), 449 (ἐνήσεις), 499 (ἔσσομαι), 629 (καθέξει), 673 (θήσουσ᾽), 851 (ἐρέω).

61. The instances of the future-subjunctives without MP are *Iliad* 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι), 60 (ἐάσομεν), 82 (ἐνιπρήσωσι), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν), 264 (κινήσῃ), 298 (κινήσῃ), 423 (ἀντήσω), 438 (δαμάσσω), 456 (ταρχύσουσι), 545 (ἀεικίσσωσι), 629 (χωρήσουσι), 650 (δηώσῃ), 674 (ταρχύσουσι); those with it are 271 (τιμήσομεν), 445 (πέμψῃς), 500 (συλήσωσι).

9.   The old subjunctive forms of the roots *h_1ed- and *$g^wi(e)h_3$- are also used without MP. Given the fact that they appear in the middle in the subjunctive present and in the active in the indicative, it is possible that the middle form (and thus the notion of more subject-related and desiderative involvement) was incompatible with the MP.

10.   As was stated above, the MP is often missing with verb forms if the form was preceded by another form with an MP on the same syntactic level. There are five instances of this in *Iliad* 16, and no exceptions.[62] In the large corpus we find 34 indicatives (injunctives), optatives and subjunctives without an MP, because they are preceded by another form with an MP on the same syntactic level and 15 instances where this rule is broken.[63]

62. The instances are *Iliad* 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, future-subjunctive, preceded by ἀπόσχωνται, with MP), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive preceded by ἄρηαι, with MP), 86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive preceded by ἄρηαι, with MP), 273 (γνῶ, aorist subjunctive, preceded by τιμήσομεν with MP), 725 (δώῃ, aorist subjunctive preceded by ἕλῃς, with MP).

63. The instances are *Iliad* 1,510 (ὀφέλλωσιν, present subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive τίσωσιν with MP), 5,211 (ἐσόψομαι, without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive νοστήσω with MP), 9,501 (ἁμάρτῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ὑπερβήῃ with MP), 9,510 (ἀποείπῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀνήνηται with MP), 9,610 (ὀρώρῃ, perfect subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive μένῃ with MP), 9,703 (ὄρσῃ, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the perfect subjunctive ἀνώγῃ with MP), 11,194 (δύῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,194 (ἔλθῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,210 (δύῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,210 (ἔλθῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,310 (γένοντο, injunctive aorist without MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔην with MP), 11,668 (κτεινώμεθ᾿, present or aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive θέρωνται with MP), 11,800 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀπόσχωνται with MP), 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀπόσχωνται with MP), 16,86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἄρηαι with MP), 16,86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἄρηαι with MP), 16,273 (γνῶ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive τιμήσομεν with MP), 16,725 (δώῃ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἕλῃς with MP), 22,113 (ἔλθω, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive καταθείομαι with MP), 22,114 (ὑπόσχωμαι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive καταθείομαι with MP), 22,257 (ἀφέλωμαι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive δώῃ with MP), 22,350 (ὑπόσχωνται, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive στήσωσ᾿ with MP), 22,388 (ὀρώρῃ, perfect subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive μετέω with MP), 24,38(κτερίσαιεν, aorist optative without MP, preceded by the aorist optative κήαιεν with MP), 24,77 (λύσῃ, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the

3.6. *The actual analysis: the instances with an MP*

1.   So far we have focused on the absence of the MP and what is striking is that most of these instances belong to Allan's axis of "jussive / deontic". I want to discuss the instances where it is used and below I also treat the instances that do not belong to the deontic/jussive axis. As was stated above, my starting hypothesis is that the MP was used with specific instances close to speaker and hearer, and absent in mythical stories, repeated actions and undefined instances. This explains why of the 25 instances where the MP is used, 22 appear in a speech and the 3 instances in narrative all appear with an indicative in a counterfactual main clause (which is an innovation, as will be shown in the next subchapter).[64] In the larger corpus we have 276 instances with an MP, of which 260 appear in speeches and only 16 in narrative, and 624 instances without an MP, of which 100 in narrative and 524 in a speech. This confirms what we noted for *Iliad* 16, namely that the MP

aorist subjunctive λάχῃ with MP), 24,116 (λύσῃ, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive δείσῃ with MP), 24,151 (ἄγοι, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative ἰθύνοι with MP), 24,180 (ἄγοι, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative ἰθύνοι with MP), 24,222 (νοσφιζοίμεθα, present optative present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative φαῖμεν with MP), 24,264 (ἐπιθεῖτε, aorist optative without MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἐφοπλίσσαιτε with MP), 24,665 (δαινῦτο, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative θάπτοιμεν with MP), 24,667 (πολεμίξομεν, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present optative θάπτοιμεν with MP), 24,688 (γνώωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive γνώη with MP).

    The "violations" are *Iliad* 1,256 (κεχαροίατο, optative aorist with MP, preceded by the optative aorist γηθήσαι with MP), 5,484 (ἄγοιεν, present optative, with MP, preceded by the present optative φέροιεν, with MP), 5,887 (ἔα, imperfect indicative, with MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔπασχον, with MP), 9,359 (μεμήλῃ, perfect subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive ἐθέλῃσθα, with MP), 9,619 (μένωμεν, present subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive νεώμεθ᾽, with MP), 9,702 (μένῃ, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive ἴῃσιν, with MP), 11,311 (πέσον, aorist injunctive, with MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔην, with MP), 22,43 (ἔλθοι, aorist optative (cf. infra), with MP, preceded by the subjunctive ἔδονται (optative,cf. infra), with MP), 22,246 (δαμή/είη, aorist optative or subjunctive (both are transmitted) with MP, preceded by the present indicative φέρηται, with MP), 22,253 (ἀλοίην, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἕλοιμι, with MP), 24,566 (λάθοι, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative τλαίη, with MP), 24,567 (μετοχλίσσειε, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative τλαίη, with MP), 24,566 (γένηται, aorist subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἐξείποι, with MP), 24,665 (θάπτοιμεν, present optative, with MP, preceded by the present optative γοάοιμεν, with MP), 24, 666 (ποιήσαιμεν, aorist optative with MP, preceded by the present optative γοάοιμεν, with MP).

    64. The ones in a speech are *Iliad* 16, 16, 32, 41, 45, 63, 72, 84, 88, 129, 246, 271, 445, 455, 500, 618, 621, 625, 723, 725, 747, 848, 861 and the ones in narrative 639, 687, 698.

is more common in speech than in narrative. It is remarkable that 13 out of the 16 instances of the MP (in the large corpus) in narrative occur in (past) potential or counterfactual contexts,[65] and in 10 of those instances the indicative or injunctive is used.[66] It can therefore not be ruled out that the MP "intruded" first in these contexts and/or it grammaticalised there first. The 3 other instances occur in a simile (against 35 where it was missing). I will now show how most of these instances in *Iliad* 16 indeed have a specific meaning and that the instances without it can be explained by the elements quoted above. Of the 22 instances only the following three could pose some problems: 84, 129 and 246, but they have been discussed above (129 could be exhortative or specific, and 84 and 246 belong to a purpose clause, but could have been a relative clause as well or even a main clause). The 58 instances without MP can be explained by the factors mentioned above,[67] with the following (possible) exceptions, which will be discussed below:

65. The instances are *Iliad* 5,22 (ὑπέκφυγε, aorist injunctive), 5,85 (γνοίης, aorist optative), 5,311 (ἀπόλοιτο, aorist optative), 5,388 (ἀπόλοιτο, aorist optative), 5,679 (κτάνε, aorist injunctive), 11,310 (ἔην, imperfect indicative), 11,311 (πέσον, aorist injunctive), 11,504 (χάζοντο, present injunctive), 16,639 (ἔγνω, aorist indicative), 16,687 (ὑπέκφυγε, aorist injunctive), 16,698 (ἕλον, aorist injunctive), 22,202 (ὑπεξέφυγεν, aorist indicative), 24,714 (ὀδύροντο, present injunctive). The other three instances occur in a simile: 11,269 (ἔχῃ, present subjunctive), 22,192 (εὕρῃ, aorist subjunctive), 24,480 (λάβῃ, aorist subjunctive).

66. The instances are *Iliad* 5,22, 5,679, 11,310, 11,311, 11,504, 16,639, 16,687, 16,698, 22,202, 24,714.

67. The instances are *Iliad* 16,10 (aorist subjunctive in a purpose clause), 19 (perfect subjunctive in a purpose clause), 30 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 31 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 41 (future-subjunctive in a conditional clause preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 53 (present subjunctive in a temporal clause with iterative meaning or debated), 54 (perfect subjunctive, debated), 60 (future-subjunctive in a main clause, possibly exhortative), 73 (perfect optative in a conditional clause), 82 (future-subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 82 (aorist subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 83 (aorist subjunctive, debated), 86 (future-subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 86 (aorist subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 90 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 94 (aorist subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 98 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 99 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 100 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 128 (aorist subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 129 (present subjunctive negative wish / negative purpose clause), 205 (present subjunctive, exhortative in the main clause), 239 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 243 (future-desiderative in a purpose clause), 243 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 245 (present subjunctive in a temporal clause, debated and/or unexplained), 247 (aorist optative in a positive wish), 273 (aorist subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an future-subjunctive with MP), 423 (future-subjunctive in a main clause), 423 (aorist subjunctive in a purpose clause), 437 (aorist subjunctive in a deliberative

(EX.03.14) (52) ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἱκάνει,
(53) ὁππότε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι
(54) καὶ γέρας ἂψ ἀφελέσθαι, ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ: (*Iliad* 16,52-54).

"But this sharp pain comes to my heart and spirit, namely whenever a man wants to rob his equal and steal his gift, when he exceeds him in power."

In this instance Akhilleus complains about his mistreatment by Agamemnon and states that he regrets that a man robs his equal only because he himself is in a stronger (hierarchical) position. Both ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ and ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκει have been transmitted, but the unaugmented pluperfect form is less likely here in the context of a generic statement referring to the present. As such, we have two subjunctives in this passage, both without MP. At first sight, this seems unexpected, because Akhilleus is speaking about his specific situation and compares his own experience to that of another person mistreated by his superior. In this interpretation, it would be near to the speaker and one would therefore have expected the MP. The generalising subjunctive without MP would then come as a surprise.[68] It is possible to "correct" the problem, by reading the perfect προβέβηκε (which does not violate the metre) or by adding the MP, reading ὁππότε κεν τὸν instead of ὁππότε δὴ τὸν and ὅτ' ἄν κράτεϊ (or even ὅ κε κράτεϊ) instead of ὅτε

---

question), 437 (future-subjunctive in a deliberative question), 444 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 446 (present subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 449 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 456 (future-subjunctive in the main clause or in a relative clause, depending on how one interprets it), 499 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 525 (subjunctive, present or aorist, in a purpose clause), 526 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 545 (aorist subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 545 (future-subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 569 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause), 570 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause), 571 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause, unless this form is the main clause, in which case the absence is unexplained), 618 (aorist indicative in a conditional clause), 623 (aorist optative in a conditional clause), 629 (future-subjunctive in the main clause), 629 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 673 (future-desiderative in a relative clause), 674 (future-subjunctive in the main clause or in a relative clause, depending on how one interprets it, cf. 456), 722 (present optative in a wish), 725 (aorist subjunctive in a conditional clause preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 746 (aorist optative in a conditional clause), 748 (present optative in a conditional clause), 846 (present subjunctive middle of the root *h_1ed- in the main clause), 847 (aorist indicative in a conditional clause), 851 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 852 (present subjunctive middle of the root *g^wieh_3- in the main clause).

68. That the subjunctive was unfit here was noted by von Christ (1880:234), also quoted in Ameis – Hentze (1881: 42).

κράτεϊ, but in doing so we would be changing the text simply to make it conform to our own rules, and that is not a sound scientific practice. These verses can also be interpreted as a generic statement. The first subjunctive is used with the undefined / generalising relative ὁππότε and not with ὅτε. More important in this discussion is the fact that Akhilleus used generic statements to refer to his own situation before as well. In the discussion about Agamemnon's intention to take Briseis away from Akhilleus, he described Agamemnon's abuse of power as follows:

(EX.03.15) (229) ἦ πολὺ λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν
(230) δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον <u>εἴπῃ</u> (*Iliad* 1,229-230).

"Indeed it is better throughout the broad army of the Akhaians to take away the gifts of anyone who speaks back at you."

In this case, one would expect a modal particle to occur, because Akhilleus is referring to his specific situation, but he describes the situation as in more generic terms, and states that Agamemnon always takes the gifts from people who dare to stand up to him.[69] This is seen in the (iterative) present form ἀποαιρεῖσθαι[70] instead

---

69. Ameis – Hentze (1884: 19), Latacz (2000b: 98).
70. Ameis – Hentze (1884: 19), Kirk (1985: 77). I agree here with Chantraine (1953: 183-197) and with van Emde Boas – Huitink (2010) and García Ramón (2012) that the difference in tenses in subjunctive, imperative, optative and infinitive was aspect-based and not random or metrically motivated, as Fournier (1946: 60-65), Chantraine (1966) and Basset (2000a, 2000b) have argued for. For recent studies in Homeric aspect, see Romagno (2005) and Napoli (2006). It has been noted very early on already that Homeric aspect and that of Attic Greek differ, and that the difference between imperfect and aorist might not have been so rigid in Homer. For this see already von Thiersch (1826: 516-518), Matthiae (1826: 957-958), Buttmann (1854: 391), Krüger (1859: 90-91), Goodwin (1865: 7-8), Kühner (1870: 123-124, 144), Monro (1891: 64-65), Brugmann (1900: 487-489), Wackernagel (1924: 182-184). Kühner – Gerth (1904: 143-144) also noted that the use of the imperfect in Homer differed from that in later Greek and referred to Delbrück (1879: 105-106; 1897: 302-306), who argued that his were remnants from a period when the imperfect was still the only narrative tense. Recently, Hollenbaugh (2018) followed Delbrück and argued that the imperfect in Homer could be used for all the different past meanings whereas the aorist only referred to the recent past (Delbrück [1876: 6]: "durch den Aorist bezeichnet der Redende etwas als eben geschehen"). See also Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 280-282), but they did not go as far as to say that the original past tense form for Homer was the imperfect. I am not certain that Hollenbaugh and his predecessors are right, but the issue needs a more thorough investigation and I cannot perform this here. Hollenbaugh uses the *verba dicendi* as evidence for the fact that aorist and imperfect were not always distinguished, but a closer look at the speech introductions and conclusions in Homer shows that the aorist and imperfect are not interchangeable: in speech conclusions, the aorist is used when the speaker proceeds to something

of the expected aorist, in the use of the generic ὅς τις,[71] and in the subjunctive εἴπῃ without modal particle. As such, Agamemnon's behaviour is not interpreted as an individual *faux pas* but an illustration of his systemic abuse of power. Ruijgh noted that the modal particle was used with the relative ὅς, but much less often with the indefinite relative and generic ὅς τις.[72] This agrees with the specifying value of the modal particle: when a specific person is referred to, the modal particle is used, but not when a generic situation is described.

Just as in *Iliad* 1,229-230, one could argue that Akhilleus used a generic statement here in *Iliad* 16,52-54 as well and the absence of the MP would be in agreement with that.

There is one last element that needs to be discussed in this instance. The codices have ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ and this was printed by Van Thiel, but most editions (La Roche, Monro, and West) adopted ὅ τε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ. When reading ὅ τε we would have a pronoun ὅ instead of the more common ὅς and a *τε-épique* which would then explain the more general nature of the example.[73] In my opinion this is not necessary, because one can also explain the sentence by interpreting ὅτε as a temporal conjunction,[74] and it is always better to maintain the transmitted text instead of "improving" it.

The instance 16,83 (related to that of 16,84, where the MP was used) has been discussed above. If it is a purpose clause, the absence is expected, but when it contains an older main clause or relative clause, the absence is irregular.

(EX.03.16) μαίνονθ᾽, ὁππότ᾽ ἐγώ περ ἴω μετὰ μῶλον Ἄρηος. (*Iliad* 16,245).

"(His hands) rage, whenever I go to Ares' turmoil."

---

else (and the action is then completed), whereas the imperfect is used when the speech "receives" or provokes a reaction. See De Decker (2015: 195-211, 2018, forthcoming) for more details. The first to notice this were von Naegelsbach (1834: 249-252) for Homer, Blass (1889) for Attic and Svensson (1930) for all Greek dialects. See also Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 277-278), Chantraine (1953: 192), Hettrich (1976: 59-60 states that "der PSt [Präsensstamm – FDD] bezeichnet a) den Akt des Sagens unter Einschluß des fortwirkenden Zustandes, der durch diesen Akt hervorgerufen wird, bis zur Reaktion des Angesprochenen; b) den Akt des Sagens allein in seiner Erstreckung") for Herodotos, Braswell (1988: 107) and Hummel (1993: 240) for Pindar, and Rijksbaron (2002: 18-19) for Attic Greek. This applies to other verbs, such as πέμπω as well.

71. Kirk (1985: 77), Latacz (2000b: 98).
72. Ruijgh (1971: 448-449), Basset (1989: 204-205). See also De Decker (2015: 219, 319).
73. See already La Roche (1870: 108), Ameis – Hentze (1885: 6), Brügger (2018: 44).
74. For a recent defence of the transmitted text, see Janko (1992: 323).

In this verse, the subjunctive ἴω appears in a temporal clause and at first sight, we would have expected the MP, but the subjunctive refers to a repeated action here,[75] and as such, the absence of the MP is logical. The relative/temporal adverb ὁππότε means "whenever".

There are two instances with the middle subjunctives of the roots *h_1ed- and *$g^wi(e)h_3$- (quoted and discussed above), which both lack the MP, probably because the middle marks a more desiderative meaning (as was the case with the semi-deponent future forms as well).

2. There are 2 instances of a relative clause with an MP (455, 622) and 7 without an MP, of which 6 appear in narrative and one in a speech. The one in the speech is a desiderative form (θήσουσ᾽, 673), of the 6 other forms, 5 belong to a simile (for the absence of the MP in the *similia*, cf. infra),[76] and in the instance below two explanations are possible:

(EX.03.17) πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὅπη <u>φύγοι</u> αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον (*Iliad* 16,283).

"Everyone was looking sharply how he could escape sharp death."

In this instance both the subjunctive φύγῃ and the optative φύγοι are attested in the codices. One can explain the optative as an optative of indirect speech and that this form would have been a deliberative subjunctive in direct speech "how shall I escape". In that case the absence of the MP would be expected. One can also argue that the MP is missing, because the relative clause describes a potential optative in a repeated action: each Trojan is looking to escape death. We are thus not dealing with a single action, but with a repeated action and an undefined subject ἕκαστος. These two explanations (the deliberative and the iterative one) do not exclude each other.

As 3 cases in a speech (2 with MP, 1 without it) are not enough to allow for a solid judgement, I will analyse the large corpus. There are 45 instances of a relative clause in a speech with an MP and 35 without an MP, and in narrative there are 19 instances without MP and none with an MP. I will now focus on the instances where the MP is missing in a speech. The rules described above, apply to the relative clauses as well (for generic and gnomic statements, and the *similia*, see later):

75. For this interpretation, see Ameis – Hentze (1885: 19) and Brügger (2018: 117).
76. The instances are *Iliad* 16,260 (ἐριδμαίνωσιν, present subjunctive), 387 (κρίνωσι, subjunctive, but it could be an aorist or a present), 388 (subjunctive aorist ἐλάσωσι), 429 (μάχωνται, present subjunctive), 590 (ἀφέῃ, aorist subjunctive).

the MP is therefore absent, when a future-desiderative or future-subjunctive is used,[77] when the verb is preceded by another verb with an MP,[78] and when repeated actions are described.[79] When the relative clause is dependent on a main clause with an optative expressing a wish or potentiality, it often takes the optative without an MP and seems to have the meaning of a subordinate conditional clause (as we will see below, conditional clauses with the optative take the MP much less than those with the subjunctive). Alternatively, one could argue that in those cases *attractio modalis* occurred, but given the fact that the optative in those instances can be explained as an optative of wish or potentiality, that assumption is not necessary.[80] The examples are:

(EX.03.18) οὔ κεν ἀλήϊος εἴη ἀνὴρ ᾧ τόσσα γένοιτο (*Iliad* 9,125 = 9,267).

"Not without possessions would the man be, to whom so many (possessions won by the horses) came."

γένοιτο is dependent on the potential optative εἴη and the relative clause could be translated as a conditional clause "if so many (possessions) came to him."[81]

In the following instances, the optative clearly has the nuance of a wish:

(EX.03.19) ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὃς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι (*Iliad* 22,348).

"So there will not be anyone who may/will/can ward off the dogs from your head."

---

77. The instances are *Iliad* 1,164 (future-subjunctive), 1,211 (future-desiderative), 9,25 (future-subjunctive), 9,302 (future-subjunctive), 16,673 (future-desiderative), 22,61 (future-subjunctive), 22,341 (future-desiderative), 24,154 (future-desiderative), 24,181 (future-desiderative), 24,731 (future-subjunctive).
78. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,510, 11,194, 11,194, 11,209, 11,209, 11,668, 24,38, 24,151, 24,180.
79. The instances are *Iliad* 1,543, 1,554.
80. For this use of the optative, see Monro (1891: 282-283, 296) and Chantraine (1953: 222-224, 248, 299). Willmott (2007) did not discuss the issue of the *attractio modalis* in detail, but assumed that the optatives in contexts where this attraction could have occurred, had maintained their "optative" meaning (e.g. on page 165, where she discussed such instances in the purpose clauses), a statement I agree with.
81. Chantraine (1953: 248).

Akhilleus threatens Hektor that there will be no mortal who can save his body from being defiled. The optative contains a notion of a wish "may there be no-one …". Alternatively, one could try to change γε into κε, but that does not solve the underlying problem and would violate Wackernagel's Law, as κε would have to follow ὅς and not σῆς. Chantraine seemed to imply that the optative should be corrected into a subjunctive,[82] but that would not solve the problem of the absence of the MP. The same nuance of wish is expressed in the following verse:

(EX.03.20) (212) ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἧπαρ <u>ἔχοιμι</u>
(213) ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα· τότ᾽ ἄντιτα ἔργα γένοιτο (*Iliad* 24,212-213).

"Near a very strong man, whose liver I wish I could grasp the middle of and eat it. That would be vengeance (for my child)."

In these lines, Hekabe states that she wishes she could eat Akhilleus' liver: ἔχοιμι appears in a relative clause with the nuance of a wish.

In the following instance, the nuance is that of a wish and/or an exhortation:

(EX.03.21) τῇδ᾽ εἴη· ὃς ἄποινα <u>φέροι</u> καὶ νεκρὸν ἄγοιτο (*Iliad* 24,139).

"So may it be, let he who brings the ransom, also carry home the body."

The optative φέροι is dependent on the exhortation or wish in ἄγοιτο, but one could argue that the nuances of ἄγοιτο are present in φέροι as well. In this instance, one codex has the indicative φέρει, which cannot be excluded either.

3.   In *Iliad* 16, there are 2 temporal clauses with an MP and 3 without one in the speeches and in the large corpus there are 14 instances of a temporal clause in a speech without an MP against 30 instances with MP; in narrative there are 2 instances with an MP and 19 without. The same distinctions as noted for the relative clauses apply to the temporal ones as well: the MP is missing, when the verb form is preceded by another verb with an MP,[83] when a repeated action is described,[84] or

---

82. Chantraine (1953: 248).
83. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,501, 9,703, 22,388.
84. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,489 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 16,245 (cf. supra), 22,502 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 22,502 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 24,417.

when an undefined character is the subject.[85] Besides the gnomic and/or generic instances and the *similia* (which will be discussed below), there is only one exception:

(EX.03.22) (780) πέμπων μ᾿ ὧδ᾿ ἐπέτελλε μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν
(781) μὴ πρὶν πημανέειν πρὶν δωδεκάτη <u>μόλη</u> ἠώς. (*Iliad* 24,780-781).

"(Akhilleus) sent me and confirmed that there will be no sorrow from the black ships, before the tenth dawn has come."

In these verses Priam informs the Trojans that Akhilleus has guaranteed them that there will be no warfare for nine days. When the tenth day comes, the Greeks will resume fighting. The subjunctive μόλη is not undefined and refers to something that is close to both hearer and speaker, and yet the MP is missing. This absence is unexplained.

4.   Normally, the MP would be missing in a generic statement and would be used in specific instances, but in case of the general truths, this distinction is problematic, because a description of a general truth (often called *gnome*) could be interpreted as a generic statement, but also as a specific instance when it is used as illustration for one's argument. This problem occurs in both temporal and relative clauses, both in narrative and in the speeches as well. As was argued above, Akhilleus sometimes uses generic descriptions when he is speaking about his own situation (*Iliad* 1,230 and 16,53-54, discussed above, which are not gnomes), but not always, as can be seen in the lines below:

(EX.03.23) ὅς κε θεοῖς <u>ἐπιπείθηται</u> μάλα τ᾿ ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 1,217).

"He who obeys the gods, to him they (the gods) do indeed listen (when he prays)."

In these lines, he agrees with Athene's suggestion to not kill Agamemnon and states that the man who obeys the gods, will have his prayers fulfilled. This could very well be a generic statement.

(EX.03.24) (529) ᾧ μέν κ᾿ ἀμμίξας <u>δώη</u> Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
(530) ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ᾿ ἐσθλῷ·
(531) ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν <u>δώη</u>, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε,
(532) καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει,
(533) φοιτᾷ δ᾿ οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν (*Iliad* 24,529-533).

---

85. *Iliad* 24,369.

"To whom Zeus, who enjoys the thunder, gives after mingling (in the jars), he makes him meet evil on one occasion and prosperity on another. The person to whom he gives from the painful jar, him Zeus makes hated and pitiful misery sends him over the shining earth, and he wanders around, not being honoured by gods or humans."

In these verses Akhilleus tells Priam that the gods know no suffering, but that mortals have to endure what the gods send them. Zeus has two jars, one with happiness and one with misery and he takes and sends what he wants; if he wants to honour a human being, he does so, but if he decides to put misery on someone, the mortal man can only endure it, even if it means living in infamy. The two subjunctives δώῃ have gnomic meaning and describe general truths, and are thus very close to the world of both Akhilleus and Priam. Both verbs are thus constructed with an MP (the same explanation is valid for the augment in ἔθηκε). One could, however, also argue that they are generic and that they should have been constructed with τε-*épique* and there does not seem to be much difference with the generic examples, unless one assumes that he deliberately wanted to stress that Agamemnon constantly overstepped his boundaries, while Priam is not to blame for the misery that strikes him so hard.

In the large corpus, there are 7 instances of a gnomic statement without MP and 7 with it.[86] At first sight, such a distribution does not allow to make a judgement, but upon closer inspection, most instances can be explained by the factors above: either because they are preceded by another gnomic form with an MP,[87] or because they are a future-subjunctive form.[88] This is best illustrated by the following passage:

(EX.03.25) (508) ὃς μέν τ᾽ <u>αἰδέσεται</u> κούρας Διὸς ἆσσον ἰούσας,
(509) τὸν δὲ μέγ᾽ ὤνησαν καί τ᾽ ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο·
(510) ὃς δέ κ᾽ <u>ἀνήνηται</u> καί τε στερεῶς <u>ἀποείπῃ</u>,
(511) λίσσονται δ᾽ ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαι
(512) τῷ ἄτην ἅμ᾽ ἕπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ. (*Iliad* 9,508-512).

86. The instances with MP are *Iliad* 1,217, 9,407 (a future-subjunctive!), 9,501, 9,510, 11,409, 24,529, 24,531; the ones without are *Iliad* 1,80, 1,81 (in a conditional clause), 9,117, 9,313, 9,501, 9,509, 9,510.
87. The instances are *Iliad* 9,501, 9,510.
88. The instances are *Iliad* 1,80 (temporal clause), 1,81 (conditional clause), 9,117 (relative clause), 9,508 (relative clause).

"Who shows respect to the daughters of Zeus when they come nearer, him they favour greatly and hear his prayers; who spurns them and harshly refuses them, for him they go to Zeus and plead that (fatal) blindness follows him, so that he be hurt and pay the price."

In these verses, Phoinix tries to warn Akhilleus that one should not challenge the Fate Goddesses nor refuse their gifts when one receives them, because refusing respect to the gods will eventually hurt every mortal man. At first, the use of the MP could seem random, but αἰδέσεται is a future-subjunctive and has therefore no MP, while ἀνήηται is an aorist subjunctive and has an MP, and ἀποείπῃ, also an aorist subjunctive, has no MP, because it is preceded by another verb form with an MP.

There is one instance in which the presence cannot be explained:

(EX.03.26) (406) ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,
(407) κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδές τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα,
(408) ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λεϊστὴ
(409) οὔθ’ ἑλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν <u>ἀμείψεται</u> ἕρκος ὀδόντων. (*Iliad* 9,406-409).

"Cattle and rich sheep can be taken away as booty, tripods and the fair heads of horses can be acquired, but the soul of a man cannot be acquired or be taken to (make it) come back, once it has left the fence of the teeth."

In these lines, Akhilleus responds to the Greek embassy and states that booty and goods can be won anywhere, but once one's life has gone, it will not return. In this instance, the MP is used in a gnome with a future-subjunctive (ἀμείψεται) against the rules described above.

There is one instance, in which the absence cannot entirely be accounted for:

(EX.03.27) (312) ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν
(313) ὅς χ’ ἕτερον μὲν <u>κεύθῃ</u> ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ <u>εἴπῃ</u> (*Iliad* 9,312-313).

"Equally hated to me as the gates of Hades is he who hides one thing in his heart, but says another."

In these verses, Akhilleus scathingly rebukes Odysseus for being not truthful and accuses him of having the possibility to think one thing and say another. There is no agreement as to whether this passage is generic or specific. Chantraine argued that the meaning was generic, because Akhilleus expressed his disapproval by a

maxim but also specific at the same time, because it involved a specific instance,[89] while Ruijgh argued that the presence of μοι made the statement clearly personal and individual and that this explained the use of the MP.[90] The presence of the MP is not entirely metrically secure, because one could argue that the particle had been inserted after the *h* of ἕτερον ceased to operate as a genuine consonant and that the MP was nothing more than a *Hiatustilger*.[91] One could therefore remove the MP, but that would be a case of solving difficulties by discarding them. Given the presence of the pronoun μοι, I would tend to agree with Ruijgh's explanation, and if the MP were present with κεύθη, the absence with εἴπη would be explained by the fact that εἴπη is preceded by another verb with an MP but as the MP is not secured by the metre, we cannot be certain. In general, we could therefore state that the use of the MP in the gnomes is in agreement with what has been noted before.

5.   More problematic is the fact that the MP is very often missing in the *similia*, both in the relative as in the temporal clauses. In the large corpus, there are 35 optatives and subjunctives without MP and only 4 with it,[92] and in *Iliad* 16 there are 11 subjunctives in a simile and none of them has an MP. The absence is not easily explained, especially since *similia* compare the story to scenes of everyday life and are thus close to the world of the speaker, hearer and narrator, and do not belong to the remote past nor future (reason why the augment is so common in these passages). In many debated instances, one could, with Monro, change the text (cf. supra), but that does not solve the problem and there are also (a few) instances of *similia* in the speeches. We note, however, that the *similia* occur mostly in narrative (where the MP tends to be absent much more often) and that the poets use τε-*épique* and not the MP, because they describe what Ruijgh called *un fait permanent*.[93]

89. Chantraine (1953: 247).

90. Ruijgh (1971: 286-287).

91. Surprisingly enough, this was not noted by Ruijgh (1971: 286-287), in spite of the fact that he was one of the first scholars to note that Homer sometimes preserved the *h* as a full consonant as was the case in Mycenaean.

92. The instances without MP are *Iliad* 5,6, 5,91, 5,138, 5,138, 5,161, 5,501, 5,524, 5,598, 9,323, 9,481 (in a speech), 9,592 (in a speech), 11,68, 11,116, 11,293, 11,415, 11,477, 11, 478, 11,559, 16,212, 16,260, 16,264, 16,298, 16,365, 16,386, 16,387, 16,388, 16,429, 16,590, 16,642, 22,23, 22,93, 22,163, 22,189, 22,191, 24,43; those with it are *Iliad* 9,324 (in a speech), 11,269, 22,192, 24,480.

93. Ruijgh (1969, 1971 *passim*).

6.   In addition to the problems mentioned above, often it is not straightforward to decide whether one is dealing with a relative, temporal or purpose clause, or a relative clause with a final nuance.[94] One example makes this clear:

(EX.03.28) (575) οἳ δ᾽ ἅμ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆϊ ῥηξήνορι πέμπον ἕπεσθαι
(576) Ἴλιον εἰς εὔπωλον, ἵνα Τρώεσσι <u>μάχοιτο</u> (*Iliad* 16,575-576).

"They sent him to follow Akhilleus, the breaker of men, towards Troy, rich in horses, where he would/was going to fight the Trojans."

In these verses one can interpret ἵνα μάχοιτο as "where he was going to fight", "where he was going (with the intention) to fight", "where he would fight" or "to fight with". Instances such as these (or with ὄφρα) seem to confirm that many subordinate clauses could be explained as original relative clauses. Initially, it was assumed that PIE did not have subordinate clauses,[95] but it now seems accepted that it had at least relative clauses,[96] and that from those, the other ones (such as purpose and temporal clauses) were created.[97]

7.   The last issue is the use of the MP in conditional clauses. There are 7 instances with an MP (all in a speech) and 14 without one in *Iliad* 16 (of which 3 occur in narrative) and in the large corpus, there are 65 with it and 67 without it and in speeches there are 65 with it and 55 without, and in narrative there are no instances with MP and 12 without MP. At first sight there seems to be no real distinction, but when we look at the data per mood, as shown in the table below, a difference becomes clear (the figures between brackets indicate the numbers in narrative):

94. See already Weber (1884) for a discussion of the purpose clauses.
95. Windisch (1869), Hermann (1895).
96. This was first noted by Delbrück (1900: 295-417). See the discussion of the scholarship on co- and sub-ordination in PIE in Hettrich (1988: 1-35), Viti (2007, 2008, 2013, 2015) and Probert (2015: 6-20). Many scholars now believe that PIE had subordinate clauses, see e.g. Lehmann (1980, although in 1974: §4.9 he seemed to argue otherwise), Lühr (2008: 122), but also see the works by Viti on this issue (2007, 2008, 2012, 2015). For different viewpoints on historical syntax, see the contributions in Ramat (1980). More recently, Fykias – Katsikadeli (2013) provided a survey and discussion of Hermann (1895), and an analysis of the Greek evidence from indirect speech.
97. Delbrück (1900: 295-345), Leumann (1940), Jeffers – Pepicello (1978), Hettrich (1987), Lühr (2000, 2012), but they did not agree on the details. See also Kiparsky (1995: 151) and Keydana (2018: 2213-2214).

	MP	No MP
Subjunctive	47	11 (3)
Optative	9	26 (3)
Indicative (past)	0	5 (6)
Future-desiderative	0	5 (0)
Future-subjunctive	9	6
Root *h_3ek^w-	0	2 (0)
Totals	65	55 (12)

The optative prefers not to "have" an MP in conditional clauses, contrary to the subjunctive. At first sight there seems to be no real explanation for this fact, but when we look at the origins of the conditional clauses in Greek, we can solve this problem. Many conditional clauses, final and indirect questions introduced by εἰ were in origin independent wish clauses (this will be discussed in the subchapter on counterfactual and unreal clauses),[98] and this explains why they often have no MP. In many cases with the optative, they can still be interpreted as an old wish. The instances with the subjunctive seem more conditional-like and thus more prone to adhere to the rules of specific/non-specific. In *Iliad* 16 there are 11 conditional clauses in a speech without an MP and of those, 7 are in the optative and they can all be considered old (un)fulfillable wishes, "if only",[99] and 2 in the indicative with unreal/counterfactual meaning (which is an innovation);[100] the 2 instances of the subjunctive are preceded by another subjunctive with an MP.[101] Of the 11 subjunctive forms without MP in a speech in the large corpus, 7 are preceded by another form with an MP,[102] 1 is used in a generic context,[103] 1 is preceded by ποτέ "whenever" and is thus more undefined and less specific,[104] and in 2 instances the absence of the MP seems problematic, because they refer to a specific context, near to speaker and hearer. These two problematic instances are

---

98. Lange (1872, 1873). See also Monro (1891: 290-294), Chantraine (1953: 274-276), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 557, 682-684). Tabachovitz (1951), followed by Hettrich (1992: 265-266) argued that the conditional clauses had always been subordinated and were never independent paratactic wish clauses.

99. The instances are *Iliad* 16,73, 559, 560, 561 (if it is not the main clause), 623, 746, 748.

100. The instances are *Iliad* 16,618, 847.

101. The instances are *Iliad* 16,42, 725.

102. The instances are *Iliad* 11,800, 16,42, 16,725, 22,113, 22,114, 22,257, 22,350.

103. *Iliad* 1,81.

104. *Iliad* 1,341.

(EX.03.29) (257) τούτω δ' οὐ πάλιν αὖτις ἀποίσετον ὠκέες ἵπποι
(258) ἄμφω ἀφ' ἡμείων, εἴ γ' οὖν ἕτερός γε <u>φύγῃσιν</u>. (*Iliad* 5,257-258).

"The two fast horses will not carry away these two from us, even if one or the other might escape."

These verses belong to Diomedes's angry exhortation to Sthenelos: after convincing him that they should face Aineias and Pandaros, he explains that maybe one of the enemies might successfully escape, but certainly not both of them. In this instance the ancient scholar Didymos stated that he had heard that there was also a reading κ'οὖν. If that were indeed the correct reading, the problem of the absence would be solved. In these verses one could argue that ἕτερός γε is somewhat undefined and that could explain the absence of the MP.

(EX.03.30) (86) σχέτλιος· εἴ περ γάρ σε <u>κατακτάνῃ</u>, οὔ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε
(87) κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι φίλον θάλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή (*Iliad* 22,86-87).

"Hard one, if indeed he kills you, not even I will weep for you on the dead bed, my beloved offspring, whom I bore myself."

After seeing the raging Akhilleus Hektor's parents urge him not to face him and to remain inside. In these verses Hekabe shows her breasts to Hektor and implores him not to go to battle, because if Akhilleus kills him, they will not even be able to mourn him anymore. The verses clearly refer to something specific in the near future and something near to the *actualité du locuteur*, and yet the MP is missing.

Now that I have addressed all problematic instances of the speeches, I will focus on some problematic general issues.

8.   Besides being absent in the negative purpose clauses / negative wishes, the MP is also often missing in clauses with a negative element. In *Iliad* 16 there are 2 instances with MP and 3 without it in a negative sentence, but in the large corpus there are 26 instances in which an MP appears in a negative sentence and 69 in which an MP is missing. Of these 69, 28 have a desiderative form (and they would not have had the MP anyway) and 29 have a future-subjunctive form (which is also rarely used with an MP), so that only 11 instances without an MP remain. Of the 26 instances with an MP, 22 occur in a speech. What is remarkable, is that 21 of them have a clear link with a (remote) possibility or even with the irrealis (as we will see later on, these two notions are not so clearly distinguishable in epic Greek): 9 occur in the combination οὔ κεν or οὐκ ἄν with a (potential or counter-

factual, cf. infra) optative and 7 with the same optative (but with οὐδέ κεν or another variant), and 4 with a counterfactual indicative against 1 with οὐκ ἄν with a subjunctive, 4 with a subjunctive in another context, and one instance, we have a future-subjunctive (*Iliad* 9,60 where ἀτιμήσει and ἀτιμήσῃ are both transmitted, but where most editions adopted Barnes' correction ἀτιμήσει᾽,[105] i.e. an optative with elision before the caesura). The reason for this is that the negation removes the link with the speaker and hearer. A negative fact is something that by definition cannot have been close to the speaker or hearer, and therefore, the MP is more often absent in those contexts. As such, the connection between negation and absence of the MP seems clear, but some questions remain: do the future-subjunctives lack the MP because they are negated or because they have the notion of desiderative in them or both, do the negative wishes lack the MP because they are negated or because they have the notion of wish in them or both, and why is the MP so common in negated remotely possible and/or counterfactual contexts?

3.7. *Conclusion*

In this subchapter I addressed the use of the MP in Homeric Greek, analysing the aforementioned large corpus and providing a more detailed investigation of *Iliad* 16. My analyses showed that the MP was mostly used in speeches and only rarely in narrative. It is incompatible with the deontic and jussive axis as described in Allan 2013: this is the reason why it is missing in negative purpose/wish clauses, in positive wishes and purpose clauses, in deliberative (indirect) questions and with future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms. It is used when a specific instance in the near future and close to the speaker and hearer is related (in Basset's words, close to the *actualité du locuteur*). This explains why almost all instances can be found in speeches and not in narrative, and why it is not used in negative contexts, in descriptions of repeated actions (both in the optative and the subjunctive) and in generic and generalising statements (where the poet preferred the so-called *τε-épique*). The only mood where the MP could add modal meaning is the indicative in the so-called past potential and counterfactual constructions, but as will be discussed in the next subchapter, this use is not universal in Homer and is also an inner-Greek innovation. The MP thus does not add modal meaning to the different moods, contrary to *man* in Hittite. As such, the use of an MP to convey modal meaning cannot be considered a morpho-syntactic isogloss between Greek

---

105. Barnes (1711: 320).

and Anatolian. I will now show that there are also differences between Greek and Anatolian in the remotely possible and counterfactual constructions.

4. *The counterfactual ("irrealis") constructions in epic and later Greek*

In this subchapter I discuss the Greek counterfactual constructions, focusing on the differences between epic and later Greek, using mostly examples from the large corpus of 5267 verses. By analysing the Homeric data I will show that the use of the past indicative with an MP to mark the counterfactual is an inner-Greek innovation and cannot be equated with the Hittite use of *man* and the past indicative, and that the original Greek construction was that of the optative in both main and conditional clause. The transition from optative into indicative had already started in Homer, but had not been completed yet and even in Attic Greek, there are still relics of the older optative construction. I first briefly discuss the terms (past) potential(is), irrealis and counterfactual, show that the boundaries between these terms are not always clear in Homer, then I describe the Homeric data based on the larger corpus, discuss previous scholarship on the use of indicative and optative in the counterfactual constructions and finally analyse the instances from *Iliad* 16 and occasionally also from the larger corpus. I argue that one cannot adequately distinguish between present potential and potential of the past, and counterfactual of the present and past, that the differences between these constructions are more based on the aspect than on the past/presence reference (and I will show this for all instances quoted) and that the optative was the oldest construction for all types of (remote) possibility ranging from possible to unreal.

4.1. *Terminology and examples from Homer*

In Classical Philology and non-Anglophone Indo-European scholarship the term irrealis is mostly used to refer to what in general linguistics is called "counterfactual" (German *Irrealis*, French *irréel*), while *irrealis* in general linguistics refers to everything that is not realis (often including the future).[106]

With the exception of Anatolian, many old Indo-European languages have counterfactual/remote possibility-constructions that contain the Indo-European

---

106. The term *irrealis* itself is debated among linguists as well, for an overview with (some) references, see De Decker (2015: 205-206), but the list is not exhaustive, since the literature on the concept *irrealis* is very large.

optative or forms that continue old optative forms,[107] such as Germanic (originally the perfect optative),[108] Tocharian,[109] Indo-Iranian (originally the perfect optative),[110] Celtic,[111] and Italic (even in Old Latin).[112] Starting from earlier scholars who noted that all these languages use different constructions, Hettrich concluded that the PIE verbal system used the optative for both present and past potential without distinguishing between past potential and present counterfactual and without having a past counterfactual.[113] He suggested the term *fiktiv*, which referred to something unreal but did not indicate the degree of "un-reality".[114] Although I cannot provide here a detailed discussion of the exact meanings of the Greek moods, I still think that the traditional description of a continuum with the indicative being

---

107. For an overview of the scholarship, see the references in Hettrich (1998) and also De Decker (2015: 222-223).

108. Delbrück (1897: 405-409; 1904: 201, 262-264), Slotty (1915: 86-87), Krisch (1986: 10), Euler (1994), Dahl (1997: 104-107).

109. This was observed by Thomas (1952: 43-46; 1970: 466-469), Krause – Thomas (1960: 192) and by Pinault (1997: 475-477), who pointed out that the present counterfactual was expressed by remnants of the optative and the past counterfactual by the gerund and the optative of copula "be".

110. Renou (1952: 372), Hoffmann (1967: 47), Brunel (1980: 258-259), Krisch (1986: 11-12), Hettrich (1988: 365; 1992: 270-274; 1996: 133; 1998: 264), Euler (1994: 35-38), Lazard (1998: 240), Kümmel (2000: 89-90), Tichy (2002: 194), Knobl (2007: 110), Dahl (2010: 393 for the potential of the past, and 2010: 399-401 for counterfactuals), Mumm (2011: §2.3), Rieken (2012: 411-417). For Avestan, see Jolly (1871: 34), Reichelt (1909: 323-324), Lazard (1975; 1998: 240, limiting it to the past counterfactual), Kellens (1984: 423, limiting it to the past counterfactual), Rieken (2012: 415). For Old Persian see also Kellens (1985: 121). Jamison (2009: 39-40) was very skeptical about the Indo-Iranian evidence.

111. Krisch (1986: 11), Hettrich (1998: 264); Rieken (2012) is the most thorough investigation of conditionals in Old Irish.

112. Draeger (1874: 280-284; 1878: 692-704), Delbrück (1897: 401), Nutting (1901), Bennett (1910: 190-207), Brunel (1980: 259), Harris (1986: 265-269), Hettrich (1992), Meiser (1993: 183).

113. Delbrück (1871: 28-29; 1897: 371, 401), Brugmann (1916: 861-863; 1925: 215), Greenberg (1986: 248), Hettrich (1988: 365; 1992; 1998), Strunk (1997: 148), Tichy (2002: 194; 2009: 98), Mumm (2011: §2.3).

114. Hettrich (1988: 365), adopted by Tichy (2002: 194) and Mumm (2011: §2.3). Cristofaro applied the term *irrealis* to the Greek (for both Homeric and Classical Greek) optative (2012: 132-133 and 142-143), but did not distinguish between present potential, past potential and *optativus obliquus*. Already Delbrück (1871: 28-29) had shown that the optative could be used for all nuances of (un)likelihood. The term *modus fictivus* had been used already in Lattmann (1903). I refer to the editors' note before Harris 1986: "however, <u>the boundary between potential and unreal conditionals is less clear-cut than between real and either of them</u>, and the time parameter is less clear-cut in potential and unreal conditions than in real conditions" (underlining is mine).

the most "realistic" and the optative the least certain explains the data the best.[115] In that continuum, the optative expressed a wish and a possibility in all nuances (likely, possible, unlikely).[116] Below I will illustrate with examples that the distinction between potential of the present and past and the present and past counterfactual is not so straightforward as one would think. I will therefore consider the optative the mood of (remote) possibility and wish.[117]

(EX.04.01) (255) ἦ κεν <u>γηθήσαι</u> Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
(256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν <u>κεχαροίατο</u> θυμῷ
(257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα <u>πυθοίατο</u> μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

"Now Priam would feel happiness and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

In this instance, Nestor laments that the current rift between Agamemnon and Akhilleus would create great joy among the Trojans, if they knew about it. As it is unclear how (un)likely Nestor considered this to be,[118] the optatives could have potential or contrafactual meaning. Moreover, all verbs are in the aorist, but they do not refer to the past alone. In these verses I believe that the choice for the aorist

---

115. This is sometimes referred to as "Greenberg's irrealis continuum" (based on Greenberg 1986: 247-248 – such a continuum had been suggested before already, see e.g. Aken [1865: 21] or Seiler [1971]), but in these continua, however, the modal indicative is at the outmost extreme and as will be shown, this is an innovation. Greenberg discussed Classical Greek and did not treat Homeric nor non-Attic Greek. For the optative being *irrealis* see Cristofaro (2012: 132-133, 142-143). For a continuum in Homeric Greek with the optative as the most unlikely, see Vogrinz (1889: 267-274). Willmott (2007) explained the optative as *negative epistemic stance*, but maybe *uncertain epistemic stance* would have been more accurate. In spite of what she argued herself, there is not so much difference between her analysis of the optative and that of the more traditional or earlier scholars, such as Delbrück, Kühner – Gerth, Schwyzer – Debrunner or Chantraine.

116. As had already been noted by Delbrück (1871: 28-29; 1897: 371). For Homer, see also Gerth (1878), van Pottelbergh (1939: 8), Chantraine (1953: 218), Brunel (1980: 240), Strunk (1997: 148), and Willmott (2008). Surprisingly enough, Monro (1891: 275) claimed that there was no difference between the Homeric optative in the main clause and that of later Greek (this had been argued for by Wilhelmi 1881 as well).

117. I refer for more details to De Decker (2015: 205-210 and 221-240).

118. See also Wilhelmi (1881: 11) for the uncertainty: *incertum est, num discordiam Troiani comperiant*.

stem was based on the aspect (the single notion of hearing and starting to rejoice) and not on the notion of present or past potential or counterfactual.

(EX.04.02) (444) ὡς ἂν ἔπειτ᾽ ἀπὸ σεῖο φίλον τέκος οὐκ ἐθέλοιμι
(445) λείπεσθ᾽, οὐδ᾽ εἴ κέν μοι ὑποσταίη θεὸς αὐτὸς
(446) γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσειν νέον ἡβώοντα, (*Iliad* 9,444-446).

"So I would not want to be separated from you, my beloved child, not even if a god himself came and stood next to me, scraping away old age to make me a fresh young man again."

In this instance Phoinix states that he would not want to be left alone by Akhilleus, not even if a god promised him to make him young again. The notion expressed by ὑποσταίη, the divine intervention, is clearly only remotely possible (if possible at all), while the statement expressed in ἐθέλοιμι is clearly much more likely. As such, we have a construction in which the same mood is used twice with distinctively different meanings. The difference in tense is based on aspect: ὑποσταίη refers to a single divine intervention and is put in the aorist (reason why the participle ἀποξύσας is in the aorist as well), while ἐθέλοιμι is in the present, because it describes the continuous preference of Phoinix not to be separated from Akhilleus.

(EX.04.03) (565) οὐ γάρ κε τλαίη βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ᾽ ἡβῶν,
(566) ἐς στρατόν: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν φυλάκους λάθοι, οὐδέ κ᾽ ὀχῆας
(567) ῥεῖα μετοχλίσσειε θυράων ἡμετεράων. (*Iliad* 24,565-567).

"No mortal man would have dared to come here to the army, not even if he was young and strong. Nor would he have escaped the guards, nor would he easily have removed the bolts of our doors."

In this instance, Akhilleus expresses his surprise that Priam had been able to enter the Greek camp and his own tent without being noticed and assumed that a god had helped him. The optatives could be potential or unreal, but they clearly refer to the past. The use of the aorist is not because of the past reference, but because of the aspectual value: the opening of the doors, the entering of the camp and the misleading of the guards happened only once.

(EX.04.04) ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. (*Iliad* 1,232).

"Indeed, son of Atreus, you would then have committed your last outrage."

In this instance Akhilleus attacks Agamemnon for his arrogance and threatens him that it could have been the last time that he acted so arrogantly. As Akhilleus did not actually kill Agamemnon, his statement "you would have committed your last outrage" is known to be false, and is yet considered a past potential, although there is no reason why one could not state that this is a counterfactual. The use of the aorist here is again only aspectual and has no temporal notion (one can commit his last outrage only once).

(EX.04.05) Τυδεΐδην δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν <u>γνοίης</u> ποτέροισι μετείη
ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς. (*Iliad* 5,85-86).

"You would not be able to know / You would not have known to whom of both sides the son of Tydeus belonged, whether he was fighting on the side of the Trojans or with the Greeks."

In this instance the potential optative γνοίης could refer to the past "you would not have known", but could also be interpreted as a present potential "you would not be able to know". The tense use is aspectual and does not indicate temporal reference. A sentence such as "you could have seen the son of Tydeus fighting" implies "if you had been present, you could have seen him fighting", but in most cases the addressee was not there. Some argue that a counterfactual is a past potential that had been proved to be non-realised:[119] a sentence as "you could have noticed" is considered past potential, while "you could have noticed it, if you had been there" is counterfactual, because you were not there, but that distinction is very thin.

(EX.04.06) (388) κούρην δ᾽ οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο
(389) οὐδ᾽ εἰ χρυσείη Ἀφροδίτῃ κάλλος <u>ἐρίζοι</u>,
(390) ἔργα δ᾽ Ἀθηναίῃ γλαυκώπιδι <u>ἰσοφαρίζοι</u>: (*Iliad* 9,388-390).

"I will not marry the daughter of Agamemnon, son of Atreus, not even if she competed in beauty with golden Aphrodite and equalled Athene in (household) works."

In this instance Akhilleus refuses the gifts presented to him by the Greek embassy and emphatically states that he will not marry Agamemnon's daughter, not

119. Athanasiadou – Dirven (1997: 74), Verstraete (2005: 230-243).

even if she equals Aphrodite in beauty and Athene in household capabilities. The question is whether Akhilleus considers this to be a (real) possibility or simply suggests this as a mere hypothesis or even as an unreal event. The present stem is used here, because the verbs refer to the characteristics of Agamemnon's daughter and they are (almost by definition) durative and not punctual.

Reversely, there are also examples in the indicative which supposedly had past potential and counterfactual meaning, but which could be interpreted as being "real" or at least possible:

(EX.04.07) (638) οὐδ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(639) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,638-639).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

In this specific instance, the potential of the past with the indicative could be interpreted as a present potential (note that ἔγνω and γνοίη are metrically equivalent). The use of the aorist here is aspectual, as the recognition is conceived as a punctual action.

(EX.04.08) (202) πῶς δέ κεν Ἕκτωρ κῆρας ὑπεξέφυγεν θανάτοιο,
(203) εἰ μή οἱ πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἤντετ᾽ Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 22,202-203).

"How would Hektor have escaped the fate-goddesses of death, if Apollon had not been near him for the uttermost and last time?"

In this instance Homer described that Hektor could not have escaped death if he had not received help from Apollon for the last time, but as this is an event that actually occurred, one could argue that this is in fact a potential and not a counterfactual. The aspectual differences apply here as well: ὑπεξέφυγεν is an aorist, because it refers to the last time that Hektor escapes death and ἤντετ᾽ is an imperfect (present stem), because Apollon's support is described in its duration (Apollon had been supporting and protecting Hektor for a very long time).

The examples quoted above serve as illustration for the fact that there are no clear distinctions in the notions of potential and unreal. It might therefore be better to assume that Greek only possessed a potential with different degrees of

(im)possible and/or (un)likely realisation and different aspectual values,[120] and to use a term such as Hettrich's *Fiktiv* (or Lattmann's *modus fictivus*) and argue that the differences in tense usage are only aspect-based, but for the sake of uniformity, I will use potential and counterfactual.

4.2. *The data in Homeric Greek*

As had been noted already, Homer uses both the optative and the indicative in the counterfactual and the potential of the past (as is the rule in Attic Greek). In Homer, one can thus find:

a) a "past potential" in the optative:

(EX.04.09) (85) Τυδεΐδην δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη
(86) ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς. (*Iliad* 5,85-86).

"you would not be able to know / you would not have known to whom of both sides the son of Tydeus belonged, whether he was fighting on the side of the Trojans or with the Greeks."

b) a "past potential" with the indicative:

(EX.04.10) (438) οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(439) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,438-439).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

c) a counterfactual with an optative in the main and a preposed conditional clause:[121]

(EX.04.11) (515) εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ δῶρα φέροι τὰ δ' ὄπισθ' ὀνομάζοι
(516) Ἀτρεΐδης, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἐπιζαφελῶς χαλεπαίνοι,
(517) οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγέ σε μῆνιν ἀπορρίψαντα κελοίμην (*Iliad* 9,515-517).

---

120. Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 346-347). Delaunois (1975; 1988: 96-106) and Basset (1988b; 1989: 224-226) stated that there was only a past potential, while Wakker (2006) argued for only a counterfactual in Greek. This is simply a terminological discussion.
121. This example was also discussed in Hettrich (1992: 267).

"If Atreus's son were not bringing you gifts, but still called you names and forever carried a heavy grudge (against you), I would not advise you to give up your wrath."

In this instance, Odysseus tried to persuade Akhilleus to let go of his anger, by arguing that Agamemnon was not angry with him but was even offering him rich gifts. The present stem is used, because the offering, scolding and advising are durative actions (as is confirmed by the presence of αἰέν "always" and ὄπισθ' "further on").

d) a counterfactual with an optative in the main and a postposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.12) ἦ σ᾽ ἂν <u>τισαίμην</u>, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε <u>παρείη</u>. (*Iliad* 22,20).

"I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."
Akhilleus complained here that Apollon stopped him from killing more Trojans. The statement is in all likelihood unreal, because Akhilleus knows that he cannot challenge the god. The aspectual difference is clear: τισαίμην is an aorist, because the punishing is conceived as a single act, while παρείη is a present, because the presence of physical force is more durative (this example will be discussed later on as well).

e) a counterfactual with an optative in the main clause and an indicative in the postposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.13) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ <u>ἐξήγγειλεν</u>: ὃ δ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

In this passage Homer related how Ares would have died, if Eeriboia had not called on Hermes to save him, which he did by removing him from the battle scene. The aorists refer to the single actions of the dying, warning and stealing. The aorist ἐξήγγειλεν is remarkable, because *verba dicendi* usually appear in the present stem, as they imply the effect of the speech on the audience (one could argue that the imperfect and aorist were metrically equivalent and that Homer would have

written °ΗΓΕΛΕ with single writing for double consonants and no indication for spurious diphthongs, but this does not explain why only the aorist was transmitted). It is possible that ἐξέκλεψεν is coordinated to ἐξήγγειλεν and is still part of the subordinate conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή, but it can also be a new independent main clause (the aorist is used because of the punctual notion).

f) a counterfactual with an optative in the main clause and an indicative in the preposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.14) (220) εἰ μὲν γάρ τίς μ᾽ ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων <u>ἐκέλευεν</u>,
(221) ἢ οἳ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκόοι ἢ ἱερῆες,
(222) ψεῦδός κεν <u>φαῖμεν</u> καὶ <u>νοσφιζοίμεθα</u> μᾶλλον: (*Iliad* 24,220-222).

"If any other man of the mortals had told me this, or the soothsayers, offering-seers or priests, we would have called it a lie and rather rejected it."
In this instance the verbs are in the present stem, because the *verba dicendi* often appear in the imperfect, indicating the durative effect of the speaking: the speaking is not considered on its own, but seen together with its consequences (reaction of the addressees).[122] In this instance, several codices have the aorist ἐκέλευσεν instead of the imperfect ἐκέλευεν.

g) a counterfactual with an indicative in the main and postposed conditional clause:[123]

(EX.04.15) (713) καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
(714) Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες <u>ὀδύροντο</u> πρὸ πυλάων,
(715) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι <u>μετηύδα</u> (*Iliad* 24,713-715).[124]

"And now they would have wailed for Hektor, in front of the gates shedding tears the entire day until the setting of the sun, had not the old man addressed the people from his chariot."

122. See De Decker (2015: 195-211; 2018, forthcoming) for a more references and a detailed study (cf. n. 74).
123. For this example see De Decker (2015: 207, 238).
124. De Decker (2015: 207).

In this instance, the imperfect is used, although there is a clear reference to the past.[125] The use is not tense, but aspect-based: the *verba dicendi* appear in the imperfect to indicate a lasting effect on the audience (cf. supra). The aspectual difference also applies to the main clause: ὀδύροντο is an imperfect, because it refers to the durative wailing and mourning by the Trojans.

h) a counterfactual with an indicative in the main and preposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.16) (897) εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν <u>γένευ</u> ὧδ᾽ ἀΐδηλος
(898) καί κεν δὴ πάλαι <u>ἦσθα</u> ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανιώνων (*Iliad* 5,897-898).

"If you had been born from any other god and had been so destructive, you would have become lower than the gods of the Ouranos a long time ago (i.e. thrown out of the group of the gods)."

In this instance Zeus chastises Ares for his warmongering and fighting and states that he would have been thrown out of the Olympos long time ago, if he had not been his own son. The aspectual difference is clear here as well: one can only be born once and can only be thrown out of the Ouranos once. ἦσθα is an imperfect, but has aoristic value (there is no formal aorist for the root *h_1es- in Greek).

4.3. *Some examples from post-Homeric Greek*

We see that in Homer many different types of constructions with both the optative and the indicative are used. For Attic Greek, most grammars argue that the present counterfactual is expressed by the imperfect of the indicative, while the aorist indicative was used for the past counterfactual.[126] As the imperfect and aorist (and also the pluperfect) can all refer to the past and have no relative chronology towards each other but are only distinguished by their aspectual value (cf. supra), this rigid distinction would be surprising. Even in later Greek – in Ionic prose, mostly in Herodotos, and in Attic drama and prose – there are still instances of the

---

125. Hettrich (1992: 267).
126. Krüger (1845: 190-191), Madvig (1847: 116-117), Aken (1861: 47-48), Gildersleeve (1900: 169), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233; 1904: 468-472), Goodwin (1965: 93-94), Bizos (1961: 158-161, but see also below). This was recently stated by Greenberg (1986: 249), Rijksbaron (2002: 73). Van Emde Boas et al. (2018: 442-443) accept the aspectual difference, but nevertheless state that the aorist usually refers to the past counterfactual, while the imperfect refers to the present.

optative, but the Attic prose examples are often corrected into indicatives.[127] Two examples for a past potential taken from Herodotos are:[128]

(EX.04.17) εἴησαν δ᾽ ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες (Herodotos 1,2).

"That could have been Cretans."

(EX.04.18) ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν εἴποιεν (Herodotos 9,71).

"But they might also have said that also out of envy."

Two *Paradebeispiele* of a counterfactual in the optative from Attic drama are:[129]

(EX.04.19) οἶκος δ᾽αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, σαφέστατ᾽ἂν λέξειεν (Aiskhylos, *Agamemnon* 37-38).

"The house itself woud have said it most clearly, if it had had a voice."

(EX.04.20) φαίη δ᾽ ἂν ἡ θανοῦσά γ᾽, εἰ φωνὴν λάβοι. (Sophokles, *Elektra* 548).
"The dead woman would have said it (herself), if she (still) had a voice."

Two examples from Attic prose are:[130]

(EX.04.21) οὐκ ἂν οὖν νήσων ἔξω τῶν περιοικίδων, αὗται δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλαὶ εἶεν, ἠπειρώτης ὢν ἐκράτει, εἰ μή τι καὶ ναυτικὸν εἶχεν (Thoukydides 1.9,4).

---

127. The examples are taken from Aken (1861: 44-45), Gerth (1878, accepting the corrections), Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175, accepting the corrections as well), Kieckers (1926: 35-36, 53-58), Chantraine (1953: 213).

128. Other Herodotean examples can be found in 1,70; 2,98; 5,59; 7;180; 7,184; 7,214; 8,136; 9,71. See von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), Koppin (1878: 125-126), Gerth (1878), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233) and Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175) for a discussion of these passages.

129. The commentaries by Fraenkel (1950: 24) and Page – Denniston (1957: 70) printed the optatives, but did not discuss the use of this mood. The example from Aiskhylos was discussed in Greenberg (1986: 259-260), but he did not explicitly state that this was a counterfactual or not, nor did he discuss the peculiarity of the optative here.

130. For more examples from Attic prose, see von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), Gerth (1878), Koppin (1878: 125-126), Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175) and Gerö (2001).

"He, being an inhabitant of the mainland, would not have ruled (for so long) over the islands outside the ones near him, there would not have been many, if he had not had a fleet as well."

In this instance, Thoukydides combined an optative for the past potential with an imperfect for the counterfactual of the past. The use of the imperfects is clearly durative, "he would not have ruled (for so long)" and "if he had not held for a long time".

(EX.04.22) εὖ γὰρ ἂν εἰδείην ὅτι ἐπ᾽ ἐκείνοις ἦν καὶ ἐμὲ τιμωρήσασθαι καὶ αὐτοῖς μηνύσασιν ἐλευθέροις γενέσθαι. (Lysias 7,16).

"I should have known that it was in their power to enact vengeance on me and obtain their freedom by denouncing me."[131]

The optative εἰδείην was transmitted, but was changed into the pluperfect forms ᾔδειν by Emperius and into ᾔδη by Hude.[132]

While the use of the optative in the Ionic and dialectal examples is generally accepted,[133] the Attic examples are corrected in most editions, but by doing so, one removes a syntactic peculiarity and archaism from the text in order to make the text fit into the Procrustean bed of the prescriptive grammar.[134]

These examples show that the optative and the indicative could appear in contexts with varying degrees of (im)possibility, but the questions are: how can their use(s) be explained or put differently, is there a difference between them, which construction was the oldest (if they have different meanings, they might be both original) and how did the indicative become the standard construction for the unreal events.[135]

---

131. This translation is based on that by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

132. As can be seen in the apparatus of Carey (2007 on this passage).

133. Delbrück (1871: 201), Monro (1891: 301-302), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233), Mutzbauer (1908: 172), Slotty (1915: 73-74, 132), Stahl (1907: 264-267), Dubois (1986: 222-223), Crespo (1997: 56, for Homer and Herodotos), Rijksbaron (2002: 71, for Herodotos).

134. Gerö (2000, 2001). The term *Procrustean* was used by Gerö (2001: 183). See also the words by Hartung (1833: 281, quoted above already: "allein ist das seltene Vorkommen einer Erscheinung ein Grund zu ihrer Tilgung?").

135. For the fact that this change occurred, see Gerth (1878), Brugmann (1890: 191-194), Monro (1891: 293-294), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 344-345), Chantraine (1953: 229: "nous observons dans ces faits le développement de l'emploi irréel qui prend la place de l'optatif"), Brunel

4.4. *Different explanations*

The use of the indicative in a sequence that is presented as contrary-to-fact is surprising, because the indicative is "the mood of reality", or is at least modally neutral, i.e. it does not have the nuance of fear, hope, expectation or wish.[136] Although I cannot address the issue in detail here, the tenses used in these constructions are past tenses and it is not uncommon that they are used in counterfactual or non-realis contexts.[137]

How can this situation be explained? Six different suggestions have been given.

1.   The first explanation focused on the temporal reference and perceived the difference between optative and (past) indicative in the fact that the indicative could only refer to past actions, while the optative could theoretically refer to present, future, and also the past. Starting from the assumption that the past indicative originally referred to something that had not happened, Aken and Wilhelmi argued that the constructions with the indicative clearly referred to (unreal or possible) events in the past that had not happened (*Nichtwirklichkeit*), while those events described the optative could theoretically also refer to the past, but mostly had present or future reference (*das rein Gedachte*), and that the construction of the indicative was the past variant of that of the optative.[138] In their opinion a construction with the indicative described an action that most certainly never happened, while one with the optative could maybe refer to the past, but could theoretically still have happened. Wilhelmi illustrated the difference by these two examples:[139]

(EX.04.23) (255) ἦ κεν <u>γηθήσαι</u> Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
(256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν <u>κεχαροίατο</u> θυμῷ
(257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα <u>πυθοίατο</u> μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

(1980: 240-245), Horrocks (1995: 161-162) and Wathelet (1997: 260-262), but most scholars offered an explanation of how the substitution could have happened. This issue is not addressed in Jacquinod (2017).

136. Kühner – Gerth (1898: 202), Brugmann (1900: 513), Chantraine (1953: 205), Strunk (1975: 233, 1992: 29-30), Rijksbaron (2002: 6: "the speaker represents the state of affairs as a fact"), Jacquinod (2017: 687).

137. See the discussion in De Decker (2015: 206) with some references (the list is obviously not exhaustive). One of the first to note this was Aken (1861: 45-48).

138. Aken (1861: 26-48), Wilhelmi (1881, especially page 11 where he discussed *Iliad* 5,679-680 and 1,257-259).

139. Wilhelmi (1881: 11).

"For sure Priam would now feel happiness, and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

(EX.04.24) (679) καί νύ κ᾽ ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων <u>κτάνε</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
(680) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ <u>νόησε</u> μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ: (*Iliad* 5,679-680).

"And now shining Odysseus would have killed many (more) of the Lykians, if great Hektor with the waving helmet had not sharply noticed."

In *Iliad* 5,679-680 the indicative was used because Odysseus did not kill the Trojans and the action thus did not occur, while in *Iliad* 1,255-257 the optative was used, because it was unclear if the Trojans had heard about the Greek rift.

This explanation is difficult for instances such as:

(EX.04.25) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ <u>ἐξήγγειλεν</u>: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

If the above mentioned scenario were correct, the optative ἀπόλοιτο would be unexpected because it is very unlikely that a god would die (cf. infra). In the Aken-Wilhelmi-scenario this would need to be expressed by the indicative. Wilhelmi tried to explain this by assuming that the optative was either wrongly expanded from another instance or used ironically.[140]

It be noted that according to Aken this distinction had only become rigid in Attic Greek, but that Homeric Greek was still more supple in its application.

This explanation is less far-fetched than it might seem, as that many languages use one or more past tenses as a marker for the unreal, but it is debated whether pastness alone is sufficient to mark contrary-to-fact situations.[141] It is true that not all counterfactuals refer to the past, but many of them do. Moreover, there are sev-

---

140. Wilhelmi (1881: 12).
141. See De Decker (2015: 206) with a discussion of (some) the literature on this issue. As is the case with conditionals, the literature on counterfactuals and on "irrealis" is immense.

eral examples of an optative that refers to the past and there are instances in the indicative and optative where both present and past reference are possible (cf. the use of γνοίη(ς) and ἔγνω(ς) discussed above). In spite of their emphatic statements, both Aken and Wilhelmi admitted that the optative could be used in instances that referred to the past and Aken added that the different constructions became only rigidly separated in Attic and were not the original ones in the oldest Greek.[142] As such it would seem to me that, at least implicitly, Aken assumed that a change occurred within Greek itself (and that the past reference was the pivotal element)?

2. Koppin and Brugmann argued that the optative initially expressed the potential and counterfactual nuance, but that it was replaced by the indicative of the past in those instances that referred to a past event: as the optative could refer to past, present and future,[143] it did not allow for a clear temporal distinction, while the indicative did allow for a distinction to be made between "this could happen (in the present or future)" and "this could have happened (in the past)".[144] Debrunner added that a parallel evolution occurred in later (post-Classical) Greek with the iterative optative of the past: a past iterative action in a subordinate clause could be expressed by the optative, but in later Greek the optative was replaced by a past indicative when the action was clearly situated in the past (sometimes this even occurs in Homer: occasionally, one can find iterative forms with -σκ- instead of the optative in subordinate clauses, as in *Iliad* 5,788 or 24,752).[145] The past indicative

142. Aken (1861: 27).

143. That the optative could refer to the past in Homer, was first noted by von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), see also Koppin (1878: 124-131), Vogrinz (1889: 273-275), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 225, 231-233), Brugmann (1904:584), Mein (1903: 6), Chantraine (1953: 220-221) and n. 119. This is not discussed in Wachter (2000). Neisser (1927: 283) and Benveniste (1951) argued that the optative could be used as a past tense in Indo-Iranian, while Benveniste (1951) and Evangelisti (1955) also thought that the past tense in Armenian could be traced back to the optative. This cannot be discussed here. See also Brunel (1980).

144. Koppin (1878: 126-131), Brugmann (1890: 191-194, 1904: 584, 586), Brugmann – Thumb (1913: 590-591), Debrunner (1921), Chantraine (1953: 226-228: "Mais, pour marquer plus nettement le passé, on a commencé a à se servir de l'imparfait ou de l'aoriste de l'indicatif, à qui la particule conférait une valeur modale"), Brunel (1980: 236). Brunel (1980: 236) agreed, but did not mention any of these scholars. This suggestion was not addressed in Krisch (1986), Ruijgh (1992) nor in Hettrich (1998). Willmott (2007: 48-52) only discussed Ruijgh, but did not mention the others.

145. For the co-occurrence of optatives and iterative forms, see especially Stolpe (1849: 36-39), Týn (1860: 677-681, 685-686), Delbrück (1897: 62-63), Kluge (1911: 56-57), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 335-336, explaining this form as a past potential), Zerdin (2002: 117-118), and Pagniello (2007, also interpreting this form as a past potential). Monro (1891: 279, 282-283) described the iterative use of the optative, but did not link it with the iterative forms, while Chantraine (1953: 223-

was used to stress the pastness of the action.[146] This scenario is the simplest one, has the advantage that it can point at a similar evolution in later Greek and explains the use of the past tense as simply indicating the past tense and not as a counterfactual marker, as Aken and Wilhelmi had already argued for. There is only one problem with this scenario, namely that the conditional and the main clauses use both the indicative and the injunctive (although I cannot address the issue here, I believe that epic Greek still distinguished between the augmented indicative and the injunctive when referring to the past).[147] As such, the transition would have been from optative into the tenses referring to the past. A detailed study would have to analyse when the indicative and when the injunctive was used.

3.   Krisch argued that the Greek indicative went back to an older injunctive that had replaced the Indo-European optative.[148] In his opinion the augment could be removed from almost all modal indicatives, and as such, they were original injunctives. He started from the postposed conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή,[149] and considered the verbal form in the εἰ μή-clause to be an original injunctive. The original meaning of these sentences was "Y should have done something, or else X would have happened", from which the conditional sequence "X would have happened if Y had not done this" was extracted.[150] The injunctive was then reinterpreted as unaugmented indicative and the indicative was subsequently extended to the entire construction to distinguish the potential optative from the counterfactual constructions.[151] Ruijgh and Hettrich criticised this, because in their opinion Greek did not have a productive injunctive category anymore.[152] Hettrich added that the modal injunctive referred to the present or future and was not used in counterfactu-

224) was more hesitant and ascribed to the optatives in such constructions the meaning of "possibility" rather than the notion of repetition.

Willmott (2007:174-184) discussed the so-called iterative notion of the optative and subjunctive, but argued that it was not the mood per se, but the context that determined the iterative notion.

146. Debrunner (1921).

147. For the difference between augmented ("indicative") forms and unaugmented ("injunctive") forms in Greek, see Koch (1868), Platt (1891), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b, 1913), West (1989), Bakker (1999, 2001), Mumm (2004), De Decker (2016, 2019, 2020).

148. Krisch (1986).

149. That they were the starting point for the creation of the conditional counterfactual constructions had been noted by Gerth (1878) and Mutzbauer (1902) already, cf. infra. For a discussion of negative conditionals, see Koppers (1959).

150. Krisch (1986: 17-19).

151. Krisch (1986: 29).

152. Ruijgh (1992: 81), Hettrich (1998: 262).

scenario would have the advantage that the Greek indicative was a syntactic archaism shared with Hittite and would thus be dating from Indo-Hittite. There are some problems with it, however. While it cannot be ruled out that there would have been three different modal particles, Forbes's explanation of ἄν, κε and κεν as originating from the particle *kem in a context with negation still seems more economical:[158] in a negative context, this particle would have been οὔ κεν and in the zero grade *οὔ kṃ, which lead to οὔ καν, which was then falsely segmented into οὐκ ἄν. Another problem is that Dunkel needed to distinguish between potential and counterfactual, which seems to be contradicted by the evidence of the other Indo-European languages.[159] A third problem is that there are several modal indicatives that can be reconstructed as older optatives, but that there are no optatives in counterfactual/past potential contexts that can be reconstructed as indicatives. This seems to indicate that the optative in this context was older than the indicative. Fourthly, Dunkel's scenario cannot explain how the optative would have intruded into the field of the indicative, if the counterfactual and potential were as sharply distinguished as he argued. At the same time the optative did not replace / "compete with" the indicative in the εἰ μή clauses. If both coexisted and intruded in each other's domain, one would have expected to find examples of that as well. This is an indication that the εἰ μή clauses must have played an important role in the substitution. Fifthly, the reconstruction of Hittite man as ma an is unlikely at best,[160] and seems to be contradicted by the fact that man has a short a.[161] Sixthly, the assumption that there were in origin three different particles with three different meanings, which evolved into three particles used interchangeably, each having only two meanings, is unfalsifiable, because any difference in meaning between these three can be countered by saying that the meanings had merged.

5. The next scenario is that based on suggestions by Gerth, Mutzbauer, Ruijgh and Hettrich. They noticed that there were 69 counterfactual constructions with at least one indicative (either in the protasis or/and in the apodosis) in Homer.[162] Of these 69, 57 constructions had a postposed conditional clause and in

158. Forbes (1958), Palmer (1960: 176-177).

159. Hettrich (1998: 264).

160. Hettrich (1998: 264): "Die vorgeschlagene Segmentierung von man in ma plus an ist bestenfalls eine sehr hypothetische Möglichkeit." (my underlining).

161. Hittite had two different particles, man and mān, only the former being the modal particle under discussion (cf. Kloekhorst [2008: 551-552]).

162. The counterfactual instances are Iliad 2,80-81; 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 3,453; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 5,897-898; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126;

46 instances the postposed conditional clause was introduced by εἰ μή. As such, they considered the εἰ μή to be the starting point for the substitution.[163] Gerth noticed the parallel between a counterfactual sentence followed by another main clause introduced by ἀλλά and a counterfactual sentence followed by a negative conditional introduced by εἰ μή, and suggested that they influenced each other, but did not elaborate any further.[164] Although Mutzbauer did not state that the optative was replaced by the indicative nor that there was a difference between the constructions with the optative and the indicative (in his opinion there was neither a *modus irrealis* nor a specific counterfactual construction, and the counterfactual meaning was only visible from the context), his input was nevertheless important as he explained how the constructions evolved from two coordinated main clauses to a main clause followed by negative conditional clause, then a positive conditional clause and in a final stage the conditional clause could even precede the main clause.[165] Ruijgh started from an original paratactic construction, in which the clauses were separated by ἀλλά and in which the action of one clause was prevented by the action in the second clause,[166] and suggested that the action of the first sentence was expressed in the subjunctive and meant "I expect X to happen / X can happen", and the second meant "but Y had done and prevented it". If this was related by a person who did not witness the actual action, the subjunctive was replaced by an optative and meant "X could have happened, but Y had done and

---

15,459-460; 16,617-618; 16,686-687; 16,698-701; 16,847-848; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,526-527; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,220-222; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 1,237-240; 3,255-256; 4,171-173; 4,292-293; 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 4,732-734; 5,39-40; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 9,497-499; 11,317; 13,137-138; 13,384-385; 14,67; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,21-23; 23,218-220; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530.

The εἰ μή clauses are *Iliad* 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126; 16,698-701; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 13,384-385; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530. See Basset (1989: 16).

163. This suggestion was first made by Gerth (1878) and by Mutzbauer (1902). That it was the basis for the substitution, was noticed by Chantraine (1953: 226-227) and Brunel (1980: 242), but they did not elaborate on it.

164. Gerth (1878).

165. Mutzbauer (1902).

166. Ruijgh (1992), Hettrich (1998). This had been suggested already by Krisch (1986) and Mutzbauer (1902).

prevented it". In a second stage, ἀλλά was replaced by εἰ μή and the indicative appeared thus in a conditional clause. From the negative conditional, the indicative was first expanded to the positive conditional and then to the protasis. The extension to the protasis was triggered by the Greek preference to have the same mood in both the apodosis and the protasis for the different constructions: as potentialis and realis used the same mood in both clauses, the counterfactual would have followed this parallelism as well.[167] Hettrich also observed that most counterfactuals of the past had the apodosis put after the main clause.[168] Agreeing with Ruijgh's chronology, he suggested that the first clause was expressed in the optative as it was only a possibility (past potential),[169] and the second one in the indicative, as that action did occur. Once it had been expanded to the main clause of the counterfactual, it was also expanded to the modal indicatives that were not used in a conditional construction. Four problems remain, however. A first problem for this explanation is that it assumes many intermediary stages, but has one important advantage, namely that it explains why there are no postposed conditional clauses with εἰ μή and the optative. There are examples of the optative in the "unreal" clause, followed by the "unless" clause introduced by εἰ μή, as can be seen in the two examples quoted below:

(EX.04.26) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.27) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν· ὃ δ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

---

167. Ruijgh (1992: 81-82).

168. Hettrich (1998: 267), see also Wakker (1994: 206-214), who stated that in 47 out of 70 instances, the εἰ μή-clause followed the main clause.

169. The interpretation of the optative as past potential in such sentences was already made by Kühner – Gerth (1898: 232), Brugmann (1900: 505) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 328).

The aorist is used here, because single actions are related.

The second objection could be that the initial paratactic scenario with the optative in the main unreal clause, followed by the second clause with the "actual event" introduced by ἀλλά or νῦν δέ is not attested. We have examples of this construction, but in those instances the "unreal" sentence has already the injunctive or indicative. Below I give two examples from our corpus:

(EX.04.28) (22) οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς <u>ὑπέκφυγε</u> κῆρα μέλαιναν
(23) ἀλλ᾽ Ἥφαιστος <u>ἔρυτο</u>, σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας, (*Iliad* 5,22-23).

"He himself then would not have escaped black fate, but Hephaistos protected him/snatched him away and saved him by covering him with the night."

In these verses Homer relates how Dares, a priest of Hephaistos, would have died, if Hephaistos had not intervened. In this instance, the "unless" element is related by another main clause, introduced by ἀλλά. The verb in the "unreal" clause is in the injunctive, ὑπέκφυγε, and the optative cannot be reconstructed here:

(EX.04.29) (15) ἔβλαψάς μ᾽ ἑκάεργε θεῶν ὀλοώτατε πάντων
(16) ἐνθάδε νῦν τρέψας ἀπὸ τείχεος: ἦ κ᾽ ἔτι πολλοὶ
(17) γαῖαν ὀδὰξ <u>εἷλον</u> πρὶν Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι.
(18) νῦν δ᾽ ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κῦδος <u>ἀφείλεο</u>, τοὺς δ' ἐσάωσας
(19) ῥηϊδίως, ἐπεὶ οὔ τι τίσιν γ᾽ ἔδδεισας ὀπίσσω.
(20) ἦ σ᾽ ἂν τισαίμην, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε παρείη. (*Iliad* 22,15-20).

"You have caused me harm, Farshooter, most destructive of all the gods, after driving me now here away from the wall. Certainly, many would have bitten the earth with their teeth before reaching Ilion. Now you have taken away great fame from me and you saved them without problems, since you did not fear punishment afterwards. I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."

In these lines, Akhilleus complains to Apollon that many more Trojans would have died, had he not intervened. The "unless, if … not …" clause is expressed by another main clause, introduced by νῦν δέ and the indicative ἀφείλεο and by ἐσάωσας (but as the augment in this form is metrically insecure, it could also be an injunctive). The verb of the "unreal" clause is in the indicative, εἷλον (one could argue that the optative could be reconstructed, γαῖαν ἔλοιεν ὀδὰξ πρὶν Ἴλιον

εἰσαφικέσθαι, but it has not been transmitted and then ὀδάξ would have to be put after the verb). The use of the aorist forms here (εἷλον, ἀφείλεο, ἐσάωσας) can be explained by the punctual meaning. It be noted that Akhilleus' threat to Apollon is expressed in the optative, τισαίμην and παρείη (the example was discussed above already).

A third problem was raised by Hettrich himself: why would a syntactic change have occurred / started in Homer and expanded into later Greek.[170] Hettrich stated that the influence of Homer could not be overestimated. This is true, as can be seen by his profound influence on prose writers such as Herodotos. In addition, also in later times poetry could influence prose, as can be seen in Attic prose.[171] As possible parallel I could refer to the influence of the Bible translations on the vernaculars: many sayings and syntactic turns that are found in the Bible have made their way into the spoken and written language. I therefore do not think that it is a problem that a syntactic change would have occurred in Homer. Moreover, it is not certain that the evolution *started* in Homer. It might have been ongoing already and Homer's use might have accelerated the process. Fourth, one could ask why a postposed conditional could influence the construction of the main sentence. There are three elements that played a role. First of all, there is the metrical convenience:[172] εἰ μή could be used before a long vowel, a short vowel, a word starting with one consonant or a word starting with more than one consonant (provided that the first syllable of this word was long); ἀλλά could not be used when a word starting with a vowel followed or when it was followed by a word with one consonant and an initial long syllable. A second factor involves the marked position of the conditional clause. As was stated above, 57 of the 69 counterfactual constructions had a postposed conditional. While postposed conditionals are not impossible, they are less common,[173] as even languages that have postposed subordinate clauses prefer to put their conditional clause before the main clause.[174] As such, the Greek conditional schema of the type "p, if not q" with postposed εἰ μή clause was very marked and might have exerted influence on the other constructions. In the *Odyssey* postposed conditionals are much less common,[175] and in Classical Greek, more than 2/3 of the protases precede the apodosis.[176] A third factor is that the substitu-

---

170. Hettrich (1998: 267).
171. The standard work on this issue is Bers (1984).
172. Ruijgh (1992: 81-83).
173. Greenberg (1963: 68), Comrie (1986: 83-84), Hettrich (1998:268).
174. Comrie (1986: 83-84).
175. Lang (1989).
176. Seiler (1997: 309).

tion of the optative by an indicative in the conditional clause created a difference in construction between protasis and apodosis. By extending the mood of the conditional clause to the main clause this disequilibrium was resolved.[177] As such, there seem to be no real objections against the substitution scenario. As was stated above, the transition probably went from optative into the tenses referring to the past (both indicative and injunctive). The only problem is the distinction between injunctive and indicative and a detailed study should analyse when the injunctive and when the indicative was used in the εἰ μή-clauses.

6.   The last explanation is that there was no substitution, but that the constructions with the indicative and optative differed in meaning: Basset (implicitly) and Willmott argued that the modal indicatives distinguished themselves from the optative in that they were in situations that could have occurred, while the optatives could not be used in such contexts.[178] They referred for this to Seiler's analysis of the optative as *dissociative*.[179] Willmott used the following two examples to prove the difference between indicative and optative:[180]

(EX.04.30) (155) ἔνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη
(156) εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,155-156).

"And then there would have been a homecoming against their fate for the Argives, had Here not spoken a word towards Athene."

(EX.04.31) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

The first example described how the Greeks would have returned home before Troy was conquered, if Here had not told Athene to intervene. The second example referred to the salvation of Aineias by Aphrodite during battle. Willmott stated that the indicatives in the first example showed that the return was a genuine possibil-

177. Ruijgh (1992: 83).
178. Basset (1989: 220-230) noticed the differences between the constructions, but did not state that the indicative replaced the optative. Willmott (2007: 48-52); in 2008 she discussed the potential optatives but did not address the issue of the substitution nor the counterfactivity.
179. Seiler (1971, 1993, 1997). See also Basset (1984, 1986).
180. Willmott (2007: 48-52, 120-122).

ity, while the optative was used to indicate that the event of Aineias's death was very unlikely, given his divine lineage.[181]

That both indicative and optative coexisted and were semantically distinct is in my opinion problematic. First, it is indeed true that some examples of the indicative do indeed show a relationship with the real world (see *Iliad* 22,202-203 treated above, but not discussed by Willmott), but some of the optatives did this well. Second, a substantial part of the modal indicatives in conditional constructions occurred in instances that could never have occurred.[182] Thirdly, Willmott's distinction is not correct: it is not true that Aineias could not have died because he was the son of a goddess, since divine descent is by no means a guarantee against death, as is proved by the deaths of Akhilleus and Sarpedon, who were children of a god(dess) and nevertheless both died. In addition, the return of the Greeks cannot have been considered a real possibility, because everybody *knows* that Troy will eventually fall. Polsley, focusing the narrative implication of the use counterfactual constructions, argues that "De Decker 2015 (esp. 21 (sic)-240) challenges Willmott (although, problematically, he does not differentiate between speakers' diegetic levels)",[183] but does not address the issue as to why two equally (im)possible contexts have different modal constructions. In my opinion this can only be explained by the fact that a substitution was ungoing. Fourthly, Seiler attributed the notion of dissociation both to the optative and to the modal indicative, and not to the optative alone. Fifthly, in many cases the indicative in the counterfactual construction is equivalent to an optative form, but reversely the optatives in these constructions are always metrically secure, which seems to point in the direction of a substitution of the optative in favour of the indicative (this metrical fact is in my opinion too often neglected).[184] A sixth and final element arguing in favour of the substitution scenario is that there are no conditional clauses with an MP attested in the indicative, neither in Attic nor in Homer. Conditional clauses with the subjunctive or the optative can have the MP. This is in my opinion an indication that this construction originated in a period where the MP use was already much stricter, and would therefore be another indication that this construction is of a younger date.

In short, I believe that there is no difference in meaning between the indicative and the optative in the sentences with an unreal or remotely possible meaning. The

181. Willmott (2007: 49, 120-122).

182. The instances were analysed in De Jong (1987: 67-81), Lang (1989), Nesselrath (1992: 1-38) and Polsley (2019, discussing the "Aineias-episodes").

183. Polsley (2019: 8).

184. I refer for more details to De Decker (2015: 323-332).

use of (forms that go back to) the optative to express the remotely possible and/or unreal in other Indo-European languages and the fact that some relics of the optatives in these contexts still exist in post-Homeric Greek make it more likely that the optative was the oldest mood for this type of meaning and this makes a substitution scenario the most likely. In the next subchapter I will discuss the instances of *Iliad* 16 in detail and occasionally provide examples from the large corpus.

4.5. *The instances of* Iliad 16

(EX.04.32) (71) ἐγγύθι λαμπομένης τάχα κεν φεύγοντες ἐναύλους
(72) <u>πλήσειαν</u> νεκύων, εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
(73) ἤπια <u>εἰδείη</u>: νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται (*Iliad* 16,71-73).

"… of my (helmet) shining nearby. Soon they would have filled the rivers beds in their flight with their corpses, if (only) rules Agamemnon had known (to act) appropriately towards me, but now, they (sc. the Trojans) are pressing on the (Greek) army."

This is probably one of the most important examples in this discussion, because it illustrates the original use of the optative in counterfactual constructions and also shows that the distinction between the tense forms is aspectual rather than temporal. In these verses, Akhilleus complained here that he was mistreated by Agamemnon; if he had received respect, the Trojans would have been dying in large numbers, but now they are attacking the Greeks and have already surrounded them. We note a very clear difference between the situation that could have been and the one from the reality, introduced by νῦν δέ. The perfect stem is used because the verb "know" in Greek is resultative (i.e. it describes a state, "having seen", hence "know"), and the filling of the river is described in the aorist, because one can only fill a river with his corpse once. This instance is also a good example for Lange's theory that Greek originally did not have subordinate conditional clauses, but that they were independent wish clauses (with varying degrees of fulfilment) that later became subordinate clauses.[185] This instance would then have to be interpreted as "they would have … if only he had known to treat me …". Although adopted by the standard grammars on Homeric Greek,[186] this thesis is not

185. Lange (1872, 1873).
186. Brugmann (1890: 191-192, but cf. infra), Monro (1891: 290-294), Chantraine (1953: 274-276), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 557, 682-684).

universally accepted.[187] It is somehow related to the issue whether or not the oldest Greek (and Indo-European) had subordinate clauses (see the subchapter on the MP). For the discussion on the counterfactuals, this issue is irrelevant, but there are other examples that indicate that Lange's construction might very well have been correct (and it cannot be denied that Homer as a preference for paratactic structures).[188] One of the most striking examples of the optative expressing a wish and a remote possibility within the same passage is:

(EX.04.33) (722) αἴθ᾽ ὅσον ἥσσων εἰμί, τόσον σέο φέρτερος <u>εἴην</u>
(723) τώ κε τάχα στυγερῶς πολέμου <u>ἀπερωήσειας</u>. (*Iliad* 16,722-723).

"Were I so much stronger than you than I am weaker than you, in that case you would quickly and painfully withdraw from battle."

In this instance, Asios (Apollon in disguise) shouts to Hektor that only if he were stronger than Hektor, he (H) would be able to withdraw from battle. The sentences clearly have an unreal meaning. In the first sentence we have a wish (εἴην) and the second one a main clause with an optative (ἀπερωήσειας). Both optatives clearly refer to something that is only remotely possible and actually even contrary to fact. From this type of paratactic constructions the later conditional constructions would have arisen.

Two other examples are:

(EX.04.34) (558) κεῖται ἀνὴρ ὃς πρῶτος ἐσήλατο τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν
(559) Σαρπηδών· ἀλλ᾽ εἴ μιν <u>ἀεικισσαίμεθ</u>᾽ ἑλόντες,
(560) τεύχεά τ᾽ ὤμοιιν <u>ἀφελοίμεθα</u>, καί τιν᾽ ἑταίρων
(561) αὐτοῦ ἀμυνομένων <u>δαμασαίμεθα</u> νηλέϊ χαλκῷ. (*Iliad* 16,558-561).

---

187. This theory was criticised, because it could not explain all instances, see Brugmann (1890: 192 – he accepted the theory, but noted that there were nevertheless cases that could not be analysed as old wishes), Lattmann (1903: 415), Tabachovitz (1951), followed by Hettrich (1992: 265-266). For a critical survey of both theories, see Risch (1953, 1954). It has not been addressed in Willmott (2007) nor in Jacquinod (2017), the most recent treatises on Homeric and Greek syntax.

188. Delbrück (1871: 20-25), see also Monro (1891: 254-255), Notopoulos (1949), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 631-636), Chantraine (1953: 12), and more recently, Bakker (1997: 35-85, 125-155), Wachter (2000: 104), Minchin (2014); surprisingly enough the issue has not been addressed in Willmott (2007).

"There lies the man who first assaulted the wall of the Akhaians, Sarpedon. But if we could take and dishonour him, take his armour from his shoulders (and) maybe we could (also) tame with the pitiless bronze some of his friends who are now defending him."

In this example it seems that there are only verb forms that depend on the εἰ-clause (unless one interprets δαμασαίμεθα as the verb of the main clause, which case we would have to interpret καί as "also" and not as "and"). In this specific instance an interpretation as a remote possibility of contrary-to-fact is not likely, given the fact that Sarpedon has just fallen and that robbing him of his armour is not impossible; on the other hand, since Sarpedon's body is being defended at the time, taking the armour is not seen as realis either. The aorist is used, since the robbing can only be done once.

(EX.04.35) (686) νήπιος: εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο <u>φύλαξεν</u>
(687) ἦ τ᾽ ἂν <u>ὑπέκφυγε</u> κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο. (*Iliad* 16,686-687).

"(…) the fool! If he had heeded the word of Peleus' son, for sure he would have escaped the evil fate of black death."

In this instance Homer laments that Patroklos could have survived if only he had listened to Akhilleus' warnings. The first sentence could very well have been an old wish "if only he had …" and although the indicative φύλαξεν is used (or put better, the injunctive, since the absence of the augment in φύλαξεν is secured by the metre),[189] the form could "hide" an older optative φυλάξαι (as will be argued below, several indicatives contain older optatives, while almost all optatives in these contexts are metrically secure). The main clause has unreal meaning, but the verb ὑπέκφυγε appears in the injunctive and is metrically secure.

There are other examples of older wishes in the large corpus as well:

(EX.04.36) (255) ἦ κεν <u>γηθήσαι</u> Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
(256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν <u>κεχαροίατο</u> θυμῷ
(257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα <u>πυθοίατο</u> μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

---

189. It is guaranteed by Meyer's Third Law, which states that there should not be word end at 3a and 5a in the hexameter. The augmented Πηληϊάδα' ἐφύλαξεν or Πηληϊάδεω ἐφύλαξεν would have word end at 5a and 3a.

"For sure Priam would now feel happiness, and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

In this instance (discussed above already), one could interpret the conditional clause as "Would they find out that … !". This specific case would be an example of a wish that Nestor did not want to be true. Examples such as these were used to state that the theory of an original wish clause was incorrect, because Nestor could never have wished for the Trojans to find out, but this is not really a counterargument, as Nestor could very well have expressed this wish as something that could cause serious harm and could have used it as a negative *exemplum*.

(EX.04.37) ἦ σ᾽ ἂν <u>τισαίμην</u>, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε <u>παρείη</u>. (*Iliad* 22,20).

"I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."

This instance, which has been discussed above, is clearly unreal, as Akhilleus will never have the power to challenge a god, but it can serve as another example for the original wish construction "if only the power were present in me".
Now I discuss two possible wish constructions that refer to the same event:

(EX.04.38) Μηριόνη τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστήν περ ἐόντα
ἔγχος ἐμὸν <u>κατέπαυσε</u> διαμπερές, εἴ σ᾽ <u>ἔβαλόν</u> περ. (*Iliad* 16,617-618).

"Meriones, soon my sword would have stopped you forever, even though you are a dancer, if I had hit you."

This is a counterfactual construction with the indicative in both the main clause and the subordinate conditional clause (as would be the case in Attic Greek). In these verses Aineias complains that he missed Meriones and that he survived the attack. Willmott argued that in this instance the indicative had positive epistemic stance and Aineias genuinely believed that he could have killed Meriones, because otherwise the taunt would not have made sense.[190]

(EX.04.39) (623) εἰ καὶ ἐγώ σε <u>βάλοιμι</u> τυχὼν μέσον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
(624) αἶψά κε καὶ κρατερός περ ἐὼν καὶ χερσὶ πεποιθὼς
(625) εὖχος ἐμοὶ <u>δοίης</u>, ψυχὴν δ᾽ Ἄϊδι κλυτοπώλῳ.' (*Iliad* 16,623-625).

190. Willmott (2007: 49).

"If I had hit you and hit you in the middle with the sharp bronze, soon you would have given me glory and Hades with the famous horses your soul, although you are stronger and trust your hands."

These verses are pronounced by Meriones in response to Aineias' attack quoted above. Here the optative is used. Ascribing negative epistemic stance to these verses means assuming that Meriones considered his own attack to be futile, because he knew that Aineias was stronger, but why would a warrior in a verbal fight concede when he has not even lost yet? I believe that this example shows that the distinction between indicative and optative is invalid. Moreover, the indicative forms can contain an older optative (ἔγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ᾽ ἔβαλόν περ is equivalent to ἔγχος ἐμὸν παύσειε διαμπερές, εἴ σε βάλοιμί περ), but the optative forms are metrically secure. In several instances the indicative forms can "hide" an older optative, but reversely, almost all optatives are metrically secure (reason why they were preserved). Both instances have only aorist forms, because they refer to single and punctual actions, and not because they refer to the present or past.

(EX.04.40) (638) οὐδ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(639) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,638-639).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

In this instance (discussed above as to aspect and meaning) we have a form with potential meaning, which could refer to both present and past. Here the indicative note that ἔγνω is used, but this form is equivalent to the optative γνοίη.

(EX.04.41) (698) ἔνθα κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἕλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
(699) Πατρόκλου ὑπὸ χερσί, περὶ πρὸ γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θῦεν,
(700) εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ἐϋδμήτου ἐπὶ πύργου
(701) ἔστη τῷ ὀλοὰ φρονέων, Τρώεσσι δ᾽ ἀρήγων. (*Iliad* 16,698-701).

"And there the sons of the Akhaians would have taken Troy with the high gates by the hands of Patroklos – since he was raging forward heavily with his sword – if Phoibos Apollon had not put himself before the well-built tower, noticing the danger for it (Troy) and protecting the Trojans."

These verses describe how Patroklos would have led the Greeks to conquer Troy, if Apollon had not intervened. This is one of the instances of the εἰ μή constructions: an action could/would have occurred, if the action in the εἰ μή sentence had not thwarted it. In this specific instance εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων could contain an older paratactic ἀλλ' Ἀπόλλων "but Apollon" (with metrical lengthening of the first syllable of Ἀπόλλων, which is attested elsewhere as well). The original meaning would thus have been "and there the Greeks would have taken … but Apollon stood …". The indicative ἔστη has nothing unreal in it, because it refers to an actual event, namely Apollon's protection. As was noted above, no εἰ μή clause has an optative in it, because none of these sentences refers to an unreal event. The reason why the original optative is replaced by an injunctive ἕλον and not by an augmented indicative cannot be addressed here.

In the larger corpus, there are more examples of this type of postposed εἰ μή-clauses in the larger corpus. There are two examples with the optative, quoted below:

(EX.04.42) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη. (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.43) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέα ἐξήγγειλεν: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα. (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

In most examples, however, the indicative is already used in the main clause:

(EX.04.44) (679) καί νύ κ᾽ ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων <u>κτάνε</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
(680) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ νόησε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ: (*Iliad* 5,679-680).

"And now shining Odysseus would have killed many (more) of the Lykians, if great Hektor with the waving helmet had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.45) (310) ἔνθα κε λοιγὸς <u>ἔην</u> καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα <u>γένοντο</u>
(311) καί νύ κεν ἐν νήεσσι πέσον φεύγοντες Ἀχαιοί,
(312) εἰ μὴ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ κέκλετ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς. (*Iliad* 11,310-312).[191]

"And there there would have been death and unspeakable actions would have occurred, and now the fleeing Akhaians would have fallen in the ships, if Odysseus had not shouted to Diomedes, son of Tydeus."

(EX.04.46) (713) καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
(714) Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
(715) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα. (*Iliad* 24,713-715).

"And now they would have wailed for Hektor, in front of the gates shedding tears the entire day until the setting of the sun, had not the old man addressed the people from his chariot."

The aorist forms refer to single actions (for ἐξήγγειλεν, cf. supra and κέκλετ᾽ is an aorist, because *verba dicendi* are considered to be durative, but *verba clamandi* are not)[192] and the imperfects to more durative actions. In 11,310 the indicative γένοντο could "hide" an older optative γένοιτο (with a single verb for a neutre plural subject).

A last example of a construction with an optative in the conditional clause interpretable as an old wish and a counterfactual optative in the main clause is the following:

(EX.04.47) (746) εἰ δή που καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι <u>γένοιτο</u>,
(747) πολλοὺς ἂν <u>κορέσειεν</u> ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθεα διφῶν
(748) νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος <u>εἴη</u> (*Iliad* 16,746-748).

"If only he were somewhere in the sea rich in fishes, this man would satisfy man of them, looking for oysters, jumping overboard from a ship, even if the sea was stormy."

191. De Decker (2015: 236).
192. For more details see De Decker (2015: 195-211, and specifically 207 for this instance; see also De Decker forthcoming).

In this instance, Patroklos mocks the dying Kebriones and states that if he were a diver in a sea full of fish, he would have given food to many of them. This description is clearly unreal and this is another instance in which the optative refers to something that is only remotely possible (at best) and probably contrary-to-fact. Note that they are metrically secure. The first conditional clause can still be interpreted as an old wish clause "if only he were in the sea …", but for the second such a reconstruction is more difficult. The use of the tenses is aspectual, the aorists refer to the single action of Kebriones' dying moments: he falls of his chariot resembling a diver jumping into the sea. As Kebriones can only die once, the aorist is used. The present refers to the stormy sea into which Kebriones as diver would have jumped. The looking for oysters and the diving into the sea are conceived as durative actions, as one has to dive and look for them intensely before finding them.

The final example from *Iliad* 16 is a special case in which two different constructions are combined, but no optatives are used, only injunctives and indicatives:

(EX.04.48) (847) τοιοῦτοι δ᾽ εἴ πέρ μοι ἐείκοσιν <u>ἀντεβόλησαν</u>,
(848) πάντές κ᾽ αὐτόθ᾽ <u>ὄλοντο</u> ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες,
(849) ἀλλά με μοῖρ᾽ ὀλοὴ καὶ Λητοῦς <u>ἔκτανεν</u> υἱός. (*Iliad* 16,847-849).

"If twenty of such men had approached me, they would all have died there on the spot, tamed by my sword, but destructive Fate and the son of Leto have killed me."

In these verses Patroklos refutes Hektor's claim that he should have listened to Akhilleus' warnings not to assault the city. Patroklos replies that even if twenty Trojans had come towards him, he would all have killed them. There is a highly remarkable hiatus here in the injunctive form ὄλοντο ἐμῷ, which could contain an older optative ὀλοίατ' ἐμῷ, but in that case we would have to accept an elision before the 3b caesura, and while not entirely impossible, this is nevertheless very uncommon. In this construction we have a merger of two different constructions: on the one hand, a preposed subordinate conditional clause (which could be an old wish clause) "if only twenty of them had approached me, they would have died!", but the form ἀντεβόλησαν (which does not have a metrically secure augment, and could therefore be an old injunctive or an indicative) cannot be contain an older optative, and on the other hand, a postposed paratactic "ἀλλά-clause", which describes how the unreal action described in the preceding clauses has been thwarted by an actual event, namely the fatal intervention by Fate and Apollon. In this in-

stance the metrical form preserved the ἀλλά-sentence and prevented a substitution into an εἰ μή-clause. The use of the aorist indicative in ἔκτανεν is easily explained, as the aorist refers to a single action and the indicative to an actual event; the use of the aorist in ἀντεβόλησαν and ὄλοντο is less straightforward, as one could think that Patroklos viewed this as durative, but in all likelihood he saw this as one action, "they would have approached me and would have died".

4.6. *Conclusion*

In this subchapter I analysed the data of epic Greek and by using many examples I showed that in epic Greek it is often difficult to distinguish between possibility, remote possibility and contrafactivity, that there is no difference between present and past reference in potential and counterfactual constructions, but that there are only aspectual differences, and that the optative, and not the indicative, was the oldest mood used in these constructions (this is confirmed by other Indo-European language and even Attic poetry and prose have relics of this older construction). The use of (forms that go back to) the optative to express the remotely possible and/or unreal in other Indo-European languages and the fact that some relics of the optatives in these contexts still exist in post-Homeric Greek make it more likely that the optative was the oldest mood for this type of meaning. The exact details about how and why the indicative eventually replaced the optative might not be entirely clear, but the use of both optative and indicative in epic Greek rules out that the use of the indicative with an MP to mark contrafactivity and the indicative without MP to refer to the realis is an isogloss between Greek and Anatolian.

5. *Conclusion*

In this long article I addressed one of the alleged morphosyntactic Graeco-Anatolian isoglosses, namely the use of a modal particle (MP) to convey modal meaning to the verb forms and to distinguish between the realis and the counterfactual / irrealis in the indicative. After making some methodological observations on the *comparanda*, I proceeded first to the use of the MP in Homeric Greek, analysing a large corpus of 5267 verses from the *Iliad* and providing a more detailed investigation of *Iliad* 16. My analyses showed that the MP was mostly used in speeches and only rarely in narrative. It is incompatible with the deontic and jussive axis as described in Allan 2013: this is the reason why it is missing in negative purpose/wish clauses, in positive wishes and purpose clauses, in deliberative (indirect) questions and with future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms. It is used

when a specific instance in the near future and close to the speaker and hearer is related (in Basset's words, close to the *actualité du locuteur*). This explains why almost all instances can be found in speeches and not in narrative, and why it is not used in negative contexts, in descriptions of repeated actions (both in the optative and the subjunctive) and in generic and generalising statements (where the poet preferred the so-called *τε-épique*). The only mood where the MP could add modal meaning is the indicative in the so-called past potential and counterfactual constructions and would seem to confirm the isogloss, but upon closer inspection, we note first, that sharply distinguishing between past and present counterfactual and past and present potential is not always possible (and that the aspect rather than the distinction past / present is the factor deciding on the tense usage), second, that Homeric Greek used both the indicative and the optative for these constructions, third, that in many other Indo-European languages the optative or constructions and/or forms that can be reconstructed as an optative are used for these constructions, fourth, that even post-Homeric Greek has remnants of the optative in these type of constructions. All these elements make it more likely that the optative was the original mood for the (different degrees of) potentiality and contrafactivity, and that the indicative intruded on this field and gradually replaced the optative. The reason(s) why and the exact details about how the indicative eventually replaced the optative might not be entirely clear, but it is possible that the need to make a distinction between present and past reference might have played a role. In any case, the use of both optative and indicative in epic Greek for (past) potential and counterfactual constructions, the fact that the indicative is in all likelihood not the original mood, and the fact that the MP conveyed specific emphatic and deictic (and not modal) meaning to the verb form rule out that the use of the MP to grant modal (counterfactual) meaning to the indicative is an isogloss between Greek and Anatolian.

6. *References*

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literatur, University of California, Irvine. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/inst/tsearch.jsp

The Chicago Homer: Ahuvia Kahane – Martin Mueller (eds.) https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html

Perseus Digital Library. Gregory R. Crane (ed.). Tufts University. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection: Greco-Roman

ADRADOS, Francisco R. et al. (eds.) (1986): *Diccionario griego – español. II: Alla-Apokoinonetos*. Madrid.

AHRENS, Rudolph (1852): *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen.

AKEN, Adolf Friedrich (1861): *Die Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus und Modus im Griechischen: historisch und vergleichend aufgestellt*. Rostock.

AKEN, Adolf Friedrich (1865): *Die Hauptdata der griechischen Tempus- und Moduleher, historisch und vergleichend*. Berlin.

ALLAN, Rutger (2013): "Exploring Modality's Semantic Space Grammaticalization, Subjectification and the case of ὀφείλω". *Glotta* 89: 1-46.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich (1868): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Erstes Heft. Gesang I-III*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1881): *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XVI – XVIII*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1884): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-III*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1885): *Homers Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Zweiter Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang XVI - XVIII*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1901): *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIX-XXIV*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – Hentze, Carl (1906): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXII-XXIV*. Leipzig.

AMIGUES, Suzanne (1977): *Les subordonnées finales par ΟΠΩΣ en attique classique*. Paris.

ATHANASIADOU, Angeliki – DIRVEN, René (1997): "Conditionality, hypotheticality, counterfactuality". In: id. (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 61-97.

AVERY, John (1885): "The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11, 326-365.

BAKKER, Egbert (1997): *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca.

BAKKER, Egbert (1999): "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer". In: Kazazis, John – Rengakos, Antonios (eds.): *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart, 50-65.

BAKKER, Egbert (2001): "Similes, Augment and the Language of Immediacy". In: Watson, Jane (ed.): *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden, 1-23.

BARNES, Joshua (1711): *Homeri Ilias and Odyssea. Et in easdem Scholia, sive INTERPRETATIO, Veterum*. Cambridge.

BASSET, Louis (1984): "L'optatif grec et la dissociation énonciative". *LALIES* 4: 53-59.

BASSET, Louis (1986): "La représentation subjective d'un point de vue passée: l'optatif oblique dans les complétives déclaratives chez Thucydide". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 19-40.

BASSET, Louis (1988a): "Valeurs et emplois de la particule dite modale en grec ancien". In: Albert Rijksbaron – Hotze Mulder – Gerry Wakker (eds.): *In the footsteps of Raphael Kühner*. Amsterdam 27-37.

BASSET, Louis (1988b): "Qu'est-ce que l'irréél?". In: N. N. (eds.): *Hediston Logodeipnon. Mélanges de philologie et de linguistique grecques offerts à Jean Taillardat*. Paris, 25-32.

BASSET, Louis (1989): *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire*: *études des modes et des négations dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Lyon.

BASSET, Louis (2000a): "L'opposition aspectuelle présent/aoriste chez Platon: une paire minimale 'peux-tu le dire?'". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 123-134.

BASSET, Louis (2000b): "Le prévisible et l'imprévu : oppositions de l'imparfait et de l'indicatif de l'aoriste dans Thucydide VI". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 135-142.

BASSET, Louis (2004): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora*. Lyon.

BECK, Jana – MALAMUD, Sophia – OSADCHA, Iryna (2012): "A Semantics for the Particle ἄν in and OUTSIDE Conditionals in Classical Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 51-83.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (2010): "Etymological Dictionary of Greek". LIEEDS 10. Leiden – Boston.

BENNETT, Charles (1910): *The Syntax of Early Latin*. Boston.

BENVENISTE, Émile (1951): "Prétérit et optatif en indo-européen". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 47: 11-20.

BERNHARDY, Gottfried (1829): *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Berlin.

BERS, Victor (1984): *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*. New Haven

BIANCONI, Michele (2015): "Contatti greco-anatolici e *Sprachbund* egeo-micrasiatico. Stato della ricerca e nuove prospettive". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 100: 129-178.

BIZOS, Marcel (1961): *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.

BLASS, Friedrich (1889): "Demosthenische Studien III". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 44: 406-430.

BRASWELL, Bruce (1988): *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.

BRÜGGER, Claude (2018): *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XVI*. Berlin.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1880): "Beiträge zur Conjugationslehre". In: id. – Karl Osthoff (eds.): *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 3. Cambridge, 1-91.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1890): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1900): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1904): *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indo-germanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1916): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. II.3*. Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1925): *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen*. Berlin.

BRUGMANN, Karl – Thumb, Albert (1913): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUNEL, Jean (1980): "Les périodes conditionnelles du grec et le problème de l'optatif". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 75, 227-261.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1810[5]): *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1819[5]): *Griechische Schulgrammatik*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1830): *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre. Erster Band*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1854): *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.

BYBEE, Joan – PERKINS, Revere – PAGLIUCA, William (1994): *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago.

CAMERER, Ruth (1968): "Über den emphatischen Grundwert des Partikels ἄν". *Glotta* 46: 106-117.

CAREY, Christopher (2007): *Lysiae Orationes*. Oxford.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1948): *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1953): *Grammaire homérique. II: Syntaxe*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1964[2]): *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1966): "Questions de syntaxe grecque I-II". *Revue de philologie* 40: 37-44.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1968-1980): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.

CLACKSON, James (2007): *Indo-European Linguistics*: *An Introduction*. Cambridge.

COLVIN, Stephen (2012): "The Modal Particle in Greek". *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 62: 65-84.

COMRIE, Bernd (1986): "Conditionals: a typology". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals*. Cambridge, 77-99.

CRESPO, Emilio (1997): "Delbrück y la sintaxis de los modos". In: Emilio Crespo – José Luís García-Ramón (eds.): *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Wiesbaden, 27-62.

CRISTOFARO, Sonia (2012): "Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: Unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis'". *Language Sciences* 34: 131-146.

DAHL, Eystein (2010): *Time, Tense and Aspect in Early Vedic Grammar*. Leiden.

Dahl, Östen (1997): "The relationship between past time reference and COUNTERFACTUALITY: a new look". In: Angeliki Athanasiadou – René Dirven (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 97-113.

DEBRUNNER, Albert (1921): "Das hellenistische Nebensatziterativpräteritum mit ἄν". *Glotta* 11: 1-28.

DE DECKER, Filip (2015): *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*. PhD dissertation. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

DE DECKER, Filip (2016): "A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod". *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 13: 33-128.

DE DECKER, Filip (2018): "The tense usage in the speech conclusions with past reference in Homer". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 46: 109-151.

DE DECKER, Filip (2019): "Studies in Greek epic diction, metre and language: the augment use in The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (HH 5)". *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 16: 1-86.

DE DECKER, Filip (2020): "A semantic-pragmatic analysis of the augment in epic Greek, applied to some longer passages". In: Martti Leiwo – Marja Vierros – Sonja Dahlgren (eds.): *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics. 30 August – 1 September 2018*. Helsinki, 447-477.

DE DECKER, Filip (forthcoming). "The tense usage in the speech introductions with past reference in Homer".

DE HAAN, Ferdinand (2006): "Typological approaches to modality". In: William Frawley (ed.): *The expression of modality*. Berlin, 26-63.

DE JONG, Irene (1987): *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Bristol.

DE JONG, Irene (2012): *Homer. Iliad Book XXII*. Cambridge.

DELAUNOIS, Marcel (1975): "Contributions à l'étude de la notion du "possible du passé" en grec classique". *L'Antiquité Classique* 44: 5-19.

DELAUNOIS, Marcel (1988): *Essai de syntaxe grecque classique*. Leuven.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1871): *Syntaktische Forschungen. I: Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1876): *Syntaktische Forschungen. II: Altindische Tempuslehre*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1879): *Syntaktische Forschungen. IV: Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1888): *Syntaktische Forschungen. V: Altindische Syntax*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1897): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen II*. Leipzig.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1900): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen III*. Leipzig.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1904): "Der germanische optativ in Satzgefügen". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 29: 201-304.

DE MOL, Geert (2015): *Het modale partikel ἄν / κε(ν) / κα. Een bijdrage aan de Griekse Grammatica DyLEGRam*. MA dissertation. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

DEVARIUS, Matthaeus (1587): *De Graecae linguae particulis*. Roma

DEVARIUS, Matthaeus – Klotz, Reinhold (1835): *Matthaei Devari Liber de Graecae linguae particulis. Edidit Reinholdus Klotz*. Leipzig.

DRAEGER, Anton (1874): *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache. Band I.* Leipzig.

DRAEGER, Anton (1878): *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache. Band II.* Leipzig.

DREWITT, John (1912a): "The Augment in Homer". *Classical Quarterly* 6 (1): 44-59.

DREWITT, John (1912b): "The Augment in Homer (continued)". *Classical Quarterly* 6 (2): 104-120.

DREWITT, John (1913): "A Note on the Augment". *Classical Philology* 8 (3): 349-353.

DUBOIS, Laurent (1986): *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien. I: Grammaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

DUNKEL, George (1990): "Jakob Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln *só, *ke, *kem und *an". In: Helmut Rix – Heiner Eichner (eds.): *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden, 110-130.

DUNKEL, George (2014): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, *II*: *Lexikon*. Heidelberg.

EBELING, Heinrich (1885): *Lexicon Homericum*. *I: A-Ξ*. Leipzig.

EULER, Wolfram (1994): "Herkunft und ursprüngliche Funktion des Optativs Präteriti im Germanischen". In: Gertrud Bense (ed.): *Diachronie – Kontinuität – Impulse*. Frankfurt. 25-49.

EULER, Wolfram (1995): "Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen". In: Wojciech Smoczyński (ed.): *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, I*. Cracow. 137-142.

EVANGELISTI, Enzo (1955): *L'imperfetto armeno e l'uso preteritale dell' ottativo indeuropeo*. Arona.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1858a): *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Erster Band*. Berlin.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1858b): *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Zweiter Band.* Berlin.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1860): *Homers Odyssee, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Berlin.

FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO, Manuel (1992): "Books XXI-XXII". In: Joseph Russo – id. – Albert Heubeck (eds.): *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. III*: *Books XVII – XXIV*. Oxford, 131-311.

FICK, August (1883): *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FICK, August (1885): *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FICK, August (1887): *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FORBES, Kathleen (1958): "The Relations of the Particle ἄν with κε(ν), κα, καν". *Glotta* 37: 179-182.

FOURNIER, Henri (1946): "Formules homériques de références avec verbe 'dire'". *Revue de Philologie* 20: 29-68.

FRANKE, August (1861): *Über die Bildung der Futura im Griechischen*. Lingen.

FRAENKEL, Eduard (1950): *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.

FRISK, Hjalmar (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I: A-Ko*. Heidelberg.

FROHBERGER, Hermann (1863): "Ueber die unterordnung mehrerer verba unter *ein ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* stehendes *ἄν*". *Philologus* 19: 599-613.

FYKIAS, Ioannis – KATSIKADELI, Christina (2013): "The rise of 'subordination features' in the history of Greek and their decline". *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3 (1): 28-48.

GARCÍA-RAMÓN, José-Luís (2012): "Aspect and Mood in Indo-European Reconstruction". In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.): *The Indo-European Verb. Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles, 13-15 September 2010.* Bremen, 73-85.

GERÖ, Eva-Carin (2000): "The Usage of ἄν and κε in Ancient Greek: Towards a Unified Description". *Glotta* 76: 176-191.

GERÖ, Eva-Carin (2001): "Irrealis and Past Tense in Ancient Greek". *Glotta* 77: 178-197.

GERTH, Berthold (1878): *Grammatisch-Kritisches zur griechischen Moduslehre*. Dresden.

GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau (1882): "Studies in Pindaric Syntax". *American Journal of Philology* 3: 434-455.

GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau (1900): *Syntax of Classical Greek*. Baltimore.

GIUSFREDI, Federico (in press): "On the Aegean-Anatolian interface in the Final Bronze Age: some historical considerations and their cultural and linguistic implications". Forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference *The Aegean Interface, 19. Grazer Althistorische Advent gespräche, 12-13 December 2019*.

GOLDSTEIN, David (2012): "Iterated Modal Marking and Polarity Focus in Ancient Greek". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110: 1-25.

GONDA, Jan (1956): *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden

GOODWIN, William (1865): *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge.

GREENBERG, Joseph (1963): "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements". In: Joseph Greenberg (ed.): *Universals of Language*. Cambridge, 73-113.

GREENBERG, Joseph (1986): "The realis-irrealis continuum in the Classical Greek conditional". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals*. Cambridge, 247-264.

HAJNAL, Ivo (2014): "Die griechisch-anatolischen Sprachkontakte zur Bronzezeit – Sprachbund oder loser Sprachkontakt?". *Linguarum Varietas* 3: 105-116.

HAJNAL, Ivo (2018): "Graeco-Anatolian Contacts in the Mycenaean Period". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Com-*

parative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, III. Berlin – Boston, 2037-2055.

HARRIS, Martin (1986): "The historical development of SI-clauses in Romance". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals*. Cambridge, 265-284.

HARTUNG, Johann (1832): *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache I*. Erlangen.

HARTUNG, Johann (1833): *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache II*. Erlangen.

HENTZE, Carl (1907): "Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikeln εἰ, εἴ κε und ἤν mit dem Konjunktiv". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 41: 356-378.

HERMANN, Eduard (1895): "Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze?". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 33: 481-534.

HERMANN, Gottfried (1831): *De Particula ἄν libri IV*. Leipzig.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1976): *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots*. Göttingen.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1987): "Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindo-germanischer Sprachen". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 100 (2): 219-237.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1988): *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1992): "Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprach-vergleichender Sicht". In: Oswald Panagl – Thomas Krisch (eds.): *Latein und Indogermanisch*. *Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986*. Innsbruck, 263-284.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1996): "Review of G. Wakker, *Conditions and conditionals. An investigation of Ancient Greek*". *Kratylos* 41: 130-137.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1998): "Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit". In: Jay Jasanoff – H. Craig Melchert – Oliver Lisi (eds.): *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck, 261-270.

HOFFMANN, Karl (1967). *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg.

HOFFNER, Harry A. – MELCHERT, H. Craig (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. LANE 1. Winona Lake.

HOLLENBAUGH, Ian (2018): "Aspects of the Indo-European Aorist and Imperfect. Re-evaluating the evidence of the R̥gveda and Homer and its implications for PIE". *Indo-European Linguistics* 6: 1-68.

HOLLENBAUGH, Ian (2020): "Pragmatics, discourse context, and common ground: Hymn-initial injunctives in the R̥gveda". Presentation and Handout presented at the *230th Meeting of the American Oriental Society*. Boston, March 22, 2020.

HOOGEVEEN, Henricus (1769): *Doctrina particularum linguae Graecae*. Leiden.

HOOGEVEEN, Henricus – SCHÜTZ, Christian (1813): *Henrici Hoogeveen doctrina particularum linguae Graecae in epitomen redegit Christianus Schütz*. Glasgow.

HORROCKS, Geoffrey (1995): "On condition: aspect and modality in the history of Greek". *Cambridge Classical Journal* 41: 153-174.

HOWORTH, R. H. (1955): "The Origin of the Use of ἄν and κεν in Indefinite Clauses". *Classical Quarterly* 5 (2): 72-93.

HUMBERT, Jean (1960): *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.

HUMMEL, Pascal (1993): *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Leuven.

H. M. (1832): "On Certain Constructions of the Subjunctive Mood". *Philological Museum* 1: 96-106.

JACQUINOD, Bernard (2017): "The Syntax of Greek". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I*. Berlin – Boston, 682-695.

JAMISON, Stephanie (2009): "Where have all the optatives gone?". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 27-45.

JANKO, Richard (1992): *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume XIII-XVI*. Cambridge.

JEFFERS, Robert J. – PEPICELLO, William. J. (1979): "The Expression of Purpose in Indo-European". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84: 1-16.

JOLLY, Julius (1871): *Die Moduslehre in den altiranischen Dialekten in ihrer Bedeutung für die Classification des arischen Sprachzweigs*. München.

KELLENS, Jean (1984): *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.

KELLENS, Jean (1985): "Le système modal vieux perse". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45: 105-125.

KEYDANA, Götz (2018): "The Syntax of Proto-Indo-European". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, III*. Berlin – Boston, 2195-2228.

KIECKERS, Ernst (1926): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen IV. Syntax. Zweiter Teil*. Berlin.

KIPARSKY, Paul (1968): "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax". *Foundations of Language* 4 (1): 30-57.

KIPARSKY, Paul (1995): "Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax". In: Adrian Battye – Ian Roberts (eds.): *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford, 140-172.

KIPARSKY, Paul (2005): "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications". In: Rajendra Singh – Tanmoy Bhattacarya (eds.): *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2005*. Berlin – New York, 219-235.

KIRK, Geoffrey (1985): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books I-IV*. Cambridge.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. LIEEDS 5. Leiden – Boston.

KLUGE, Heinrich (1911): *Syntaxis Graecae quaestiones selectae*. Berlin.

KNOBL, Werner (2007): "Mind-reading the Poet: Cases of Intended Metrical Irregularity in Vedic Poetry". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 24: 105-139.

KOCH, Konrad (1868): *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig.

KÖLLIGAN, Daniel (2007): *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen.

KOPPERS, Bertha (1959): *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek and some other Indo-European Languages*. The Hague.

KOPPIN, Karl (1878): "Giebt es in der griechischen Sprache einen modus irrealis? Fortsetzung". *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 32: 97-131.

KRAUSE, Wolfgang – WERNER, Thomas (1960): *Tocharisches Elementar-buch. I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg.

KRISCH, Thomas (1986): *Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen*. Innsbruck.

KRÜGER, Karl Wilhelm (1845): *Griechische Grammatik für Schulen*. Berlin.

KRÜGER, Karl Wilhelm (1859): *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Zweiter Theil: Ueber die Dialekte, vorzugsweise den epischen und ionischen. Zweites Heft: Poetisch-dialektische Syntax*. Berlin.

KÜHNER, Raphael (1870[2]): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil, erste Abtheilung.* Hannover.

KÜHNER, Raphael – GERTH, Berthold (1898): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre. Erster Band.* Hannover.

KÜHNER, Raphael – GERTH, Berthold (1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre.* Zweiter Band. Hannover.

KÜMMEL, Martin (2000): *Das Perfekt im Indo-Iranischen*. Wiesbaden.

KUNAMOTO, Hiroshi (2009): "The Injunctive in Khotanese". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 133-149.

LANG, Mabel (1989): "Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30: 5-26.

LANGE, Ludwig (1872): *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI*. Leipzig.

LANGE, Ludwig (1873): *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI II: EI KEN/ AN mit dem Optativ und EI ohne Verbum Finitum*. Leipzig.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1870): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIII-XVI*. Berlin.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1871): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI-XXIV*. Berlin.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1876): *Homeri Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars posterior*. Leipzig.

LATACZ, Joachim (2000): *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band I.1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung.* München.

LATACZ, Joachim – NÜNLIST, René – STOEVESANDT, Magdalene (2002): *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band I. Erster Gesang. Faszikel 2: Kommentar.* München.

LATTMANN, Hermann (1903): "Die Bedeutung der Modi im Griechischen und Lateinischen". *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Literatur, und für Pädagogik* 6. 410-416.

LAZARD, Gilbert (1975): "La catégorie de l'éventuel". In: Françoise Bader (ed.): *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, 347-358.

LAZARD, Gilbert (1998): "L'expression de l'irréel: essai de typologie". In: Leonid Kulikov – Heinz Vater (eds.): *Typology of Verbal Categories*. Tübingen, 237-247.

Leaf, Walter (1888): *Homer: The Iliad. II. Books XIII-XXIV*. London.

LEAF, Walter (1900):   *Homer*: *The Iliad I. Books I-XII*. London.

LEHMANN, Winfred (1974): *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin.

LEHMANN, Winfred (1980): "The Reconstruction of Non-Simple Sentences in Pro-to-Indo-European". In: Paolo Ramat (ed.): *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam, 113-144.

LEUMANN, Manu (1940): "Zur Vorgeschichte der lateinischen Finalsätze mit *ut*". In: N. N. (ed.): *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout*. Paris, 231-235.

RIX, Helmut (ed.) (2001[2]): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer.* Wiesbaden.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2000): "Der Nebensatz und seine Konkurrenten in der Indogermania: Der altindische Relativsatz". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 113: 71-87.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2008): "Competitive Indo-European Syntax". In: Gisella Ferraresi – Maria Goldbach (eds.): *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Amsterdam, 121-159.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2012): "Komplementsätze im Indoiranischen". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 125: 227-241.

MADVIG, Johan (1847): *Syntax der griechischen Sprache, besonders der attischen Sprachform, für Schulen*. Braunschweig.

MASIUS, Richard (1885): *Über den Gebrauch des Konjunktiv in unabhängigen Sätzen bei Homer*. Glogau.

MATTHIAE, August (1826): *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*. Leipzig

MEIN, Anton (1903): *De optativi obliqui usu Homerico. Pars I. De sententiis obliquis aliunde pendentibus primariis*. Bonn.

MEISER, Gerhard (1993): "Uritalische Modussyntax: zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekts". In: Helmut Rix (ed.): *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden, 167-175.

MEISTERHANS, Konrad (1885): *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. Berlin.

MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, Julián (2018): "The Language of the Dodona Oracular Tablets". In: Georgios Giannakis – Emilio Crespo – Panagiotis Filos (eds.): *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: From Central Greece to the Black Sea*. Berlin, 265-296.

METHNER, Rudolph (1908): *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*, Bromberg.

MINCHIN, Elisabeth (2014): "Poet, Audience, Time, and Text: Reflections on Medium and Mode in Homer and Virgil". In: Ruth Scodel (ed.): *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity*. Leiden, 267-288.

MONRO, David Binning (1891): *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford.

MONTANARI, Franco (2015): *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (1995): "Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv". In: Heinrich Hettrich – Wolfgang Hock (eds.): *Verba et Structurae*. *Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*. Innsbruck, 169-193.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (2004): "Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments". In: Thomas Krisch (ed.): *Analecta homini universali dicata*: *Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik*, *Linguistik*, *Philologie*, *Politik*, *Musik und Dichtung*. *Festschrift für Oswald Panagl*. Stuttgart, 148-158.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (2011): "Optativ und verbale Infinitheit". In: Thomas Krisch – Thomas Lindner (eds.): *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Wiesbaden, 411-420.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1902): "Die Entwicklung des sogenannten Irrealis bei Homer". *Philologus* 61: 481-502.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1903a): "Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen". *Philologus* 62: 388-409.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1903b): "Das Wesen des Optativs". *Philologus* 62: 626-638.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1908): *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig.

NAPOLI, Maria (2006): *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek. A Contrastive Analysis*. Milan.

NEISSER, Walter (1927): "Vedica". *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 5: 281-292.

NESSELRATH, Heinz-Günther (1992): *Ungeschehenes Geschehen.* 'Beinahe-Episoden' *im griechsichen und römischen Epos von Homer bis zur Spätantike*. Stuttgart.

NOTOPOULOS, James (1949): "Parataxis in Homer. A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80: 1-23.

NUTTING, Herbert Chester (1901): "The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus". *The American Journal of Philology* 22: 297-316.

NUYTS, Jan (2006): "Modality: overview and linguistic issues". In: William Frawley (ed.). *The expression of Modality*. Berlin, 1-26.

ORESHKO, Rotislav (2018): "Anatolian linguistic influences in Early Greek (1500–800 BC)? Critical observations against sociolinguistic and areal background". *Journal of Language Relationship* 16: 93-118.

PAGE, Denys Lionel –DENNISTON, John Dewar (1957): *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.

PAGNIELLO, Frederick (2007): "The past-iterative and the augment in Homer". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112: 105-123.

PALMER, Frank (2001²): *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge.

PALMER, Leonard (1960): *The Language of Homer*. In: Alan Wace – Frank Stubbings (eds.): *A Companion to Homer*. London, 75-178.

PINAULT, Georges Jean (1997): "Sur l'assemblage des phrases ('Satzgefüge') en tokharien". In: Emilio Crespo – José Luís García-Ramón (eds.): *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Wiesbaden, 449-500.

PLATT, Arthur (1891): "The Augment in Homer". *American Journal of Philology* 19: 211-237.

POLSLEY, Cynthia Carolyn (2019): *Contrafactual Structures in Ancient Greek Narrative*. PhD dissertation. Yale University.

PROBERT, Philomen (2015): *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford.

RAMAT, Paolo (ed.) (1980): *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam.

REICHELT, Hans (1909): *Altawestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.

RENOU, Louis (1928): "Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda". In: *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, 63-80.

RENOU, Louis (1952): *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris.

RICHARDSON, Nicholas (1993): *The Iliad*: *A Commentary. 6*: *XXII-XXIV*. Cambridge.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2012): *Die Konditionalsätze, Irrelevanzkonditionalia und Konzessivsätze des Altirischen*. Münster.

RIJKSBARON, Albert (2002): *The Syntaxis and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*: *an Introduction*. Amsterdam.

RISCH, Ernst (1953): "Review of D. Tabachovitz, *Homerische εἰ-Sätze. Eine sprachpsychologische Studie*". *Gnomon* 25: 138-140.

RISCH, Ernst (1954): "Review of P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. II: Syntaxe*". *Gnomon* 26: 70-74.

RIX, Helmut (1976): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.

RIX, Helmut (1992²): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.

ROMAGNO, Domenica (2005): *Il perfetto omerico. Diatesi azionalità e ruoli tematici*. Pisa.

ROMAGNO, Domenica (2015): "The Greek-Anatolian area in the 2nd millennium B.C.: between language contact, Indo-European inheritance and typologically natural tendencies". *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 53: 429-446.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1969): "Esquisse d'une nouvelle théorie sur 'TE épique'". *Mnemosyne* 22 (1): 1-69.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1971): *Autour de "τε-épique"*. Amsterdam.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1992): "L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε/ ἄν". In: Françoise Létoublon (ed.): *La langue et les textes en grec ancien*. *Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine*. Amsterdam, 75-84.

SCHWYZER, Eduard (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München.

SCHWYZER, Eduard – DEBRUNNER, Alfred (1950): *Griechische Grammatik. II: Syntax*. München.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1971): "Abstract Structures for Moods in Greek". *Language* 47: 79-89.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1993): "Satzverbindung in Konditionalgefüge (besonders im Altgriechischen)". *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 47: 143-158.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1997): "Conditionals in dimensional perspective". In: Angeliki Athanasiadou – René Dirven (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 307-320.

SIMON, Zsolt (2018): "Anatolian Influences on Greek". In: Łukasz Niesiołowski-Spanò – Marek Węcowski (eds.): *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-Eastern Mediterranean at the Turn of the Bronze Age and in the Early Iron Age*. Wiesbaden, 376-418.

SLOTTY, Julius (1915): *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten. I: Der Hauptsatz*. Göttingen.

SMYTH, Herbert – Messing, Gordon (1956): *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge.

STAHL, Johann Matthias (1907): *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. Heidelberg.

STOLPE, August (1849): *Iterativorum Graecorum vis ac natura ex usu Homeri atque Herodoti demonstrata*. Bratislava.

STRUNK, Klaus (1968): "Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 73: 279 -311.

STRUNK, Klaus (1975): "Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen". *Gymnasium* 82: 225-239.

STRUNK, Klaus (1992): "À propos de quelques catégories marquées et non-marquées dans la grammaire du grec et de l'indo-européen". In: Françoise Létoublon (ed.): *La langue et les textes en grec ancien. Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine*. Amsterdam, 29-42.

STRUNK, Klaus (1997): "Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch". In: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (ed.): *Einleitung in de griechische Philologie*. Leipzig, 135-155.

SVENSSON, Arvid (1930): *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griechischen*. Lund.

TABACHOVITZ, David (1951): *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprach-wissenschaft-liche Untersuchung*. Lund.

TEDESCO, Paul (1923): "*a*-Stämme und *aya*-Stämme im Iranischen". *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 2: 281-315.

THOMAS, Werner (1952): *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf -l. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung*. Berlin.

THOMAS, Werner (1970): "Zu einigen Besonderheiten der tocharischen Syntax". *Orbis* 19: 452-472.

TICHY, Eva (2002): "Zur Funktion und Vorgeschichte der indogermanischen Modi". In: Heinrich Hettrich – Jeong Soo Kim (eds.): *Indogermanische Syntax*: *Fragen und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden, 189-208.

TICHY, Eva (2006): *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien*. Bremen.

TICHY, Eva (2009): *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen.

TICHY, Eva (2010): *Älter als der Hexameter? Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias*. Bremen.

TÝN, Emanuel (1860): "Über den Gebrauch und die Bedeutung der iterativen Imperfecta und Aoriste im Griechischen". *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 10: 677-695.

VALGIGLIO, Ernesto (1955): *Omero. Il IX Libro dell'Iliade*. Rome.

VAN DER AUWERA, Johan – PLUNGIAN, Vladimir (1998): "Modality's semantic map". *Linguistic Tipology* 2: 79-124.

VAN EMDE BOAS, Evert – HUITINK, Luuk (2010): "Syntax". In: Egbert Bakker (ed.): *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, 134-150.

van Emde Boas, Evert et al. (2019): *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.

VAN LEEUWEN, Jan (1885): "Homerica. De particularum κέν et ἄν apud Homerum usu". *Mnemosyne* 15: 75-119.

VAN POTTELBERGH, Rudolph (1939): *Over de Geschiedenis en de Beteekenis van den EI-zin in het Grieksch*. Gent.

VAN THIEL, Helmut (2011²): *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim.

VEITCH, William (1879): *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*. Oxford.

VEKSINA, Marina (2017): "Modalized Future and Scheduled Present in Coan Inscriptions". In: Klaas Bentein – Mark Janse – Jorie Soltić (eds.): *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Leiden, 189-217.

VERSTRAETE, Jean-Christophe (2005): "The semantics and pragmatics of composite mood marking: The non-Pama-Nyungan languages of northern Australia". *Linguistic Tipology* 9: 223-268.

VITI, Carlotta (2007): *Strategies of Subordination in Vedic*. Milan.

VITI, Carlotta (2008): "The phylogenesis of hypotaxis in Vedic". *Diachronica* 25: 386-409.

VITI, Carlotta (2013): "Forms and functions of subordination in Indo-European". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 126: 89-117.

VITI, Carlotta (2015): *Variation und Wandel in der Syntax der alten indogermanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen.

VOGRINZ, Gottfried (1889): *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn.

VON BÄUMLEIN, Wilhelm Friedrich (1846): *Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ἄν*. Heilbronn.

VON CHRIST, Wilhelm (1880): "Die Wiederholungen gleicher und ähnlicher Verse in der Ilias". *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissen-schaften. Philosophisch-philologische Klasse* Jahrgang 1880: 221-272.

von Naegelsbach, Carl Friedrich (1834): *Bemerkungen zur Ilias (Buch I; II 1-483), nebst Excursen über Gegenstände der homerischen Grammatik*. Nürnberg.

VON THIERSCH, Friedrich Wilhelm (1818): *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialects*. Leipzig.

VON THIERSCH, Friedrich Wilhelm (1826): *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig.

WACHTER, Rudolph (2000): "Grammatik der homerischen Sprache". In: Joachim Latacz (ed.): *Homer Gesamtkommentar*. Berlin, 61-108.

WACKERNAGEL, Jakob (1916): "Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer". *Glotta* 7: 161-319.

WACKERNAGEL, Jakob (1924): *Vorlesungen über Syntax II*. Basel.

WAKKER, Gerry (1994): *Conditions and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.

WAKKER, Gerry (2006): "'You could have thought': past potentials in Sophocles?". In: Irene De Jong – Albert Rijksbaron (eds.): *Sophocles and the Greek Language*. Leiden, 163-180.

WALTER, Adolf (1923): *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen*. Heidelberg.

WATHELET, Paul (1997): "Les particules κεν et ἄν dans l'épopée grecque". In: Albert Rijksbaron (ed.): *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Amsterdam, 247-268.

WEBER, Philip (1884): *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Würzburg.

WEST, Martin (1989): "An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek". *Glotta* 67: 135-138.

WEST, Martin (2000): *Homerus Ilias. II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*. Berlin.

WILHELMI, Wilhelm (1881): *De modo irreali, qui dicitur*. Marburg.

WILLI, Andreas (2011): "Morphosyntaktische Überlegungen zum Ursprung des griechischen Futurs". In: Thomas Krisch – Thomas Lindner (eds.): *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten Der XIII. Fachtagung Der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. 21.-27. September 2008, Salzburg*. Wiesbaden, 605-615.

WILLI, Andreas (2018): *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge.

WILLMOTT, Jo (2007): *The Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge.

WILLMOTT, Jo (2008): "The 'Potential' Optative in Homeric Greek". *Cambridge Classical Journal* 54: 237-251.

WINDISCH, Ernst (1869): "Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativpronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen". *CS* 2. 201-420.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2010): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language.* Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 2. Leiden – Boston.

YOSHIDA, Kazuhiko (2009): "Minor Moods in Sogdian". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 281-293.

ZERDIN, Jason (2002): "The 'Iterative-Intensives' in -σκ". *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 103-130.

Skandal! Alles nur geklaut?

Andreas Opfermann[1]
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Das neuhochdeutsche Wort *Skandal* (m., früher n.) ‚anstoßerregender Vorgang' wurde wohl Anfang des 18. Jh.s aus frz. *scandale* (m.) derselben Bedeutung ins Deutsche entlehnt.[2] Dasselbe gilt bspw. für engl. *scandal* im 16. Jh. (entlehnt aus afrz. *esc(h)andle*) und mengl. *sclaundre* > nengl. *slander* ‚Verleumdung' bereits im 13. Jh. (entlehnt aus afrz. *escla(u)ndre* etc.).[3] In vielen weiteren nur entfernt oder gar nicht verwandten Sprachen ist dieses Wort vertreten, vgl. bspw. finn. *skandaali*, poln. *skandal*, türk. *skandal*. Letztlich gehen alle modernen Kognaten auf das biblische Wort gr. σκάνδαλον n., lat. *scandalum* n. ‚Versuchung; Falle' zurück.[4] Das gesamte Netzwerk der Entlehnungen in den

---

2. Vgl. Grimm – Grimm (1854) *s. v.* Nach Pfeifer (1993²) *s. v.* (07.11.2020) hat die Entlehnung bereits Ende des 16. Jh.s stattgefunden.

3. Vgl. zu den hier paraphrasierten Etymologien *eOED s. vv.*

4. Bei lat. *scandalum* handelt es sich freilich auch um eine Entlehnung bzw. ein Fremdwort aus dem Griechischen der biblischen Vorlage.

modernen Sprachen aufzudecken, verlangte größtenteils eine Darlegung der Wege der Christianisierung. Dafür ist in diesem Beitrag weder der geeignete Platz noch ist es das Ziel der vorliegenden Untersuchung. Vielmehr soll im Folgenden die Wortfamilie von gr. σκάνδαλον beleuchtet werden (§1). Daraufhin sollen die bisherigen Etymologien geprüft (§2.1) und als neuer Vorschlag eine Verbindung mit dem Verb hluw. /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ ‚verzieren' wahrscheinlich gemacht (§2.2) und schließlich der Versuch unternommen werden, ein weiteres Wort, namentlich lat. *scandula*/*scindula* ‚Schindel' anzuschließen (§3).

1. *Gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle' und (Un-)Verwandtes im Griechischen*

Zur Wortfamilie von gr. σκάνδαλον n. gehören neben den hauptsächlich und in ihren ältesten Belegen ausschließlich biblischen Lexemen (σκάνδαλον [§1.a], σκανδαλίζω [§1.d]) auch Derivate aus profaner Überlieferung (σκανδάλη [§1.b], σκάνδαλος [§1.c], σκανδαλιστής [§1.e], σκανδάληθρον [§1.f]). Im Folgenden soll der (größtenteils vergebliche) Versuch unternommen werden, besonders anhand philologischer und morphologischer Analysen die eigentliche Bedeutung des wohl ursprünglichsten dieser Wörter, nämlich gr. σκάνδαλον herauszufinden.

a) gr. σκάνδαλον (LXX+)

Als Erstbeleg für dieses in der *Septuaginta* (LXX) und dem *Neuen Testament* (*NT*) häufig vorkommende Wort wird regelmäßig ein Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr. angegeben, vgl. bspw. Liddell – Scott (1996[9]: 1604). Bei diesem Papyrus handelt es sich um einen Brief, der wohl von einem landwirtschaftlichen Vorarbeiter Zenons von Kaunos[5] geschrieben wurde. Der relevante Abschnitt des Briefes sind die letzten vier Zeilen:

1) P. Cairo Zen. IV,59608,4-8 (Mitte des 3. Jh.s v. Chr.)[6]
[…] τὸ σήσαμον δ[ὲ ἐπε]|ληλύθαμεν καὶ ἔστιν ἀ[ξι]|όλογον. φρόντιζε οὖν πρὸ πολ|λοῦ <u>περὶ τῶν σκανδάνων</u>. | ἔρρωσο.

„Wir haben das Sesambeet aufgesucht und es ist bemerkenswert. Mache dir also schon lange vorher Gedanken <u>über die σκάνδανα</u>. Mach's gut."

5. Vgl. weiterführend zu Zenon von Kaunos https://www.trismegistos.org/archive/256.
6. Vgl. https://www.trismegistos.org/text/1241 und für eine Abbildung http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/PCZ-colour/300dpi/P.Cair.Zen.IV.59608r.jpg.

Auf dem Papyrus steht zweifelsfrei ⟨σκανδανων⟩[7] und nicht ⟨σκανδαλων⟩ geschrieben, wie leicht durch den Vergleich mit dem Buchstaben ⟨λ⟩ im selben Dokument, also bspw. dem sehr gut lesbaren zweiten Lambda von πολ|λου zu Beginn der Zeile, überprüft werden kann. Unter der Annahme, es sei eigentlich σκανδάλων gemeint, müsste man wohl mit Einfluss der vorangehenden Graphemsequenz ⟨αν⟩ rechnen. Dies ist insofern nicht unplausibel, als das ⟨ν⟩ nur eine Haste mehr aufweist als das ⟨λ⟩, allerdings sind die beiden ersten Schenkel des ⟨ν⟩ im Vergleich zu den Schenkeln des ⟨λ⟩ um ca. 40° gegen den Uhrzeigersinn gedreht. Aus paläographischer Sicht ist eine Emendation also nicht zwingend und auch der Kontext erfordert eine Bedeutung ‚Falle' o. ä. nicht notwendigerweise: Inhaltlich kann an den Empfänger ebensogut die Aufforderung ergehen, sich über die ‚Fallen' Gedanken zu machen wie bspw. über bestimmte Pflanzen.[8] Da sich also weder für die Semantik noch für die Stammgestalt unabhängige und eindeutige Evidenz beibringen lässt, darf dieses Wort nicht als vor- und außerbiblischer Erstbeleg für gr. σκάνδαλον gelten.

In der Bibel selbst finden sich keine guten Hinweise auf die exakte und eigentliche Bedeutung des Wortes. Während viele Belege bereits die übertragene Bedeutung ‚Verführung, Versuchung' zeigen,[9] steht σκάνδαλον häufig neben (und daher in gewisser Abgrenzung zu) anderen Wörtern für ‚Falle' (παγίς, θήρα), vgl.

2) LXX *Josua* 23:13
καὶ ἔσονται ὑμῖν εἰς παγίδας καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα καὶ εἰς ἥλους ἐν ταῖς πτέρναις ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς βολίδας ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν […]

„und sie werden euch zu Fallen (παγίδες) und zu σκάνδαλα und zu Nägeln in euren Fersen und zu Stacheln in euren Augen […]"

3) *NT Römer* 11:9
γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς […]

---

7. Von Danker (2000: 926) wird die mir unverständliche Lesung ⟨σκανδαδον⟩ (Tipp- oder Lesefehler?) angegeben.

8. Eine irgendwie geartete Verbindung mit gr. Σκάνδιξ ‚Venuskamm (eine Salat-/Gemüse-pflanze)' wäre u. U. möglich.

9. Diese Bedeutungskomponente ist gemäß der Wörterbücher auf semitischen Einfluss der Vorlage zu bewerten, vgl. bspw. Frisk (1970: 717).

„Es werde deren Opfertisch ihnen zu einer Falle (παγίς) und zu einer Falle (θήρα) und zu einem σκάνδαλον und zu einer Vergeltung (ἀνταπόδομα) […]"

Aus der Nebeneinanderstellung von σκάνδαλον, παγίς und θήρα können schlechterdings keine sicheren Schlüsse auf das konkrete Wesen eines σκάνδαλον gezogen werden: Bei παγίς handelt es sich um eine unbestimmte Art Falle; das Wort selbst gehört zum Verb gr. πήγνυμι ‚festmachen', beschreibt also lediglich den Zweck, nämlich das Fangen des Opfers. Das Wort gr. θήρα bedeutet in der Regel ‚Jagd; Beute' (Liddell – Scott 1996⁹: 799), nur in der zitierten Passage (*NT Römer* 11:9) ist die Bedeutung ‚Falle' erforderlich. Da sich θήρα prototypisch auf (die Jagd auf) Wild bezieht, dürfte es sich hier um eine ‚Wildfalle' oder ein ‚Fangnetz (für Wild)' handeln. Bemerkenswert ist die Tatsache, dass σκάνδαλον als ‚(Art Falle)' in Septuaginta und Neuem Testament meist mit τίθημι ‚legen' konstruiert wird. Wie Dunbar (1998: 249) jedoch in anderem Zusammenhang anmerkt, ist ἵστημι im Kontext des Fallen- und Netzestellens das übliche Verb. So findet sich bspw. LXX *Psalmen* 140:9 παγίς ‚Falle' als Objekt von (συν-)ἵστημι ‚aufstellen', nicht aber das im selben Vers vorkommende σκάνδαλον, das an dieser Stelle ohne Prädikat steht. Die Bedeutungsbestimmung von gr. σκάνδαλον kann also durch die Analyse von nominalen Kookurrenzen zwar nicht befördert werden, hinsichtlich der verwendeten Verben aber unterscheidet sich σκάνδαλον von üblichen Fallen, die ‚aufgestellt' (ἵστημι) werden und nicht ‚gelegt' (τίθημι).

Es scheint die metaphorische Verwendungsweise als ‚Verführung (zur Sünde), Versuchung' darauf hinzudeuten, dass es sich bei einem σκάνδαλον um eine (wie auch immer geartete) Lockfalle, die mit einem Köder ausgestattet ist, handelt. Dagegen wiederum sprechen die Belege, an denen es ‚Fallstrick' oder ‚Stolperstein' bedeuten dürfte (Danker 2000: 926 *s. v.* σκάνδαλον 1), vgl.

4) LXX *3. Mose* 19:14
…ἀπέναντι τυφλοῦ οὐ προσθήσεις σκάνδαλον…

„…einem Blinden sollst du nicht ein σκάνδαλον in den Weg stellen…"

Da in diesem Beleg als Opfer eines σκάνδαλον ein blinder Mensch genannt wird und dadurch impliziert wird, dass ein Sehender nicht zum Opfer würde, muss es sich hier um etwas anderes als eine Lockfalle handeln.[10] Eine Lockfalle zeichnet

---

10. Vgl. ebenso den Vergleich mit dem sprichwörtlich gewordenen „Stein des Anstoßes" in *NT Römer* 9:33: Ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου „Siehe, ich setze in

sich ja gerade dadurch aus, dass das Lockmittel perzipierbar ist, während die von ihr ausgehende Gefahr auch einem Sehenden verborgen bleibt. Ein Blinder wird also wohl kaum Opfer einer Lockfalle.

Zwei gegenläufige Hinweise ergeben sich also aus der Analyse der Verwendungsweisen von σκάνδαλον, weshalb dessen exaktes und ursprüngliches Wesen nicht bestimmt werden kann. Weil außerdem das Wort in nicht biblisch-christlichen Kontexten nicht belegt ist, drängt sich der Verdacht auf, dass es sich nicht um einen definierten Fachterminus der Jägersprache handelt bzw. dass, wenn σκάνδαλον tatsächlich einst der Jägersprache angehört hat, dann die fach-sprachlichen Inhalte derart verwässert wurden, dass sie heute nicht mehr nachzu-vollziehen sind. Es ist möglich, dass σκάνδαλον nie eine Tierfalle bezeichnete, da auch kein Beleg aus LXX und *NT* in direktem Zusammenhang mit der Tierjagd steht; das Nebeneinander von παγίς ‚(Tier-)Falle' und σκάνδαλον an Belegstellen wie LXX *Josua* 23:13 (s. o. Bsp. 2) leitet dann in die Irre.[11] Eine eigentliche Bedeutung könnte daher ‚Stolperfalle' sein.[12] Hiermit lässt sich die Tatsache, dass ein Blinder offenbar leicht Opfer eines σκάνδαλον wird (s. o. Bsp. 4), verbinden. Bei einer Bedeutung ‚Stolperfalle' schließt sich auch der Beleg in der formelhaften Verbindung λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου (*NT Römer* 9:33, *1. Petrus* 2:8, vgl. Fn. 10) einigermaßen nachvollziehbar, wenngleich nicht reibungslos, an: „einen Stein des Anstoßens und einen Fels des Stolperns [nicht: Stolperfalle!]". Ob aber die metaphorische Verwendung als ‚Verführung' im Sinne einer Beeinflussung der Bewegungsrichtung des Opfers mithilfe eines Lockmittels damit erklärt werden darf, muss zweifelhaft bleiben.[13]

b) Gr. σκανδάλη ‚Auslöser einer Falle' (2. Jh. n. Chr., *Hapax legomenon*)

Das Femininum zu gr. σκάνδαλον ist nur einmal in der griechischen Literatur zu finden,[14] beim attizistischen Sophisten Alkiphron, vgl.

Zion einen Stein des Anstoßes und einen Fels des σκάνδαλον". Auch ohne die Passage ausführlich zu interpretieren, wird klar, dass beide Steine bis zur Schädigung des Opfers unbemerkt bleiben.

11. Vgl. für das *NT* Danker (2000: 926): „1 a device for catching someth[ing] alive, *trap*".

12. Vgl. für die Septuaginta Muraoka (2009: 622): „1. an object deliberately placed to make s[ome]b[o]d[y] trip, ‚stumbling-block'".

13. Es sei an dieser Stelle an die sog. ‚Lappjagd' erinnert, wobei sog. Stoff- oder Feder-‚Lappen', also Stoffstücke oder Federbüschel so im Wald an gespannten Leinen aufgehängt werden, dass das aufgescheuchte Wild in eine bestimmte Richtung getrieben wird. Diese Art des Jagens war zumindest den Römern bekannt, vgl. Orth (1914: 570f).

14. Entgegen Barrett (1964: 378) muss in Babrios' Fabel 130 σκύδαλιν (ms.) nicht zu σκανδάλην konjiziert werden, vgl. Holzberg (2019: 178), wo σκυταλίδα ‚kleiner Stab' steht.

5) Alkiphron 3,22 (= 2,19) (2. Jh. n. Chr.)
Πάγην ἔστησα ἐπὶ τὰς μιαρὰς ἀλώπεκας κρεάδιον τῆς <u>σκανδάλης</u> ἀπαρτήσας. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐπολέμουν τὰς σταφύλας […][15]

„Ich stellte eine Falle (πάγη) für die verruchten Füchse auf, nachdem ich ein Stück Fleisch an der <u>σκανδάλη</u> aufgehängt/befestigt hatte. Weil sie nämlich die Weintrauben raubten […]"

Eine σκανδάλη ist offenbar der Teil einer Falle (hier: Fuchsfalle [unbekannter Art]), an dem der Köder befestigt wird. Da keine weiteren Informationen zur spezifischen Art der Falle gegeben werden, kann auch das konkrete mit σκανδάλη bezeichnete Bauteil nicht genauer beschrieben werden. Deswegen muss die allgemeine Bedeutungsangabe ‚Bauteil einer Falle, an dem der Köder angebracht wird', genügen. Bei primitiven Fallen – Springfalle, Schlagfalle, Kistenfalle – wird der Köder häufig an einem beweglichen Stab befestigt. An der vorliegenden Textstelle dürfte kaum mit einer Lebendfalle (Kistenfalle, Fallgrube) gerechnet werden, da der Fuchs als Schädling sicher getötet werden sollte. Es handelt sich also wahrscheinlich um eine Spring- oder Schlagfalle,[16] weswegen eine vorsichtige Deutung als ‚Auslöser einer Falle (an dem der Köder befestigt ist), Stellung' hier wohl angemessen ist.[17]

c) gr. σκάνδαλος ‚Hindernis' (Hesych)
Das nicht literarisch überlieferte Maskulinum zum Neutrum σκάνδαλον (und dem Femininum σκανδάλη) findet sich zweimal in Hesychs Lexikon:

6) Hesych σ 842 (Latte)
<u>σκάνδαλος</u>· ἐμποδισμός
„<u>σκάνδαλος</u> ‚Hindernis'"

---

15. Frisk (1970: 717) bemerkt, dass die „Lesung nicht unbedingt sicher" sei, obwohl der kritische Apparat in der Teubneriana-Ausgabe (Schepers 1905: 40) lediglich die Handschriften-Lesungen τῆς σκανδάλης *B* und τῆς σκανδάλας cet. angibt.

16. Vgl. Babrios' Fabel 130, wo von einer Schlagfalle (hier: πάγη) die Rede ist: χαλασθείσης | ῥάβδου μέτωπα σύν τε ῥῖνας ἐπλήγη „nachdem der Stab ausgelöst worden war, wurde er (i. e. der Wolf) auf Stirn und Nase getroffen".

17. Dementsprechend kann davon ausgegangen werden, dass σκανδάλη, falls eine Springfalle vorliegt, nicht das biegbare und unter Spannung stehende Holz (sog. ‚Schloss') bezeichnet.

Hier wird nach Hansen (2005: 301) auf *NT Römer* 14:13 Bezug genommen, wo jedoch die Wortform (Akk. Sg. σκάνδαλον) zum einen kein Maskulinum (Nom. Sg. -ος) erzwingt und zum anderen eine übertragene Bedeutung ‚Versuchung' o. ä. vorliegt.[18] Diese Glosse ist also eher ein unabhängiges, aber nicht hilfreiches Zeugnis.

Ein weiteres Mal, nämlich als eine von mehreren Bedeutungsangaben, kann σκάνδαλος ebenfalls in Hesychs Lexikon gefunden werden:

7) Hesych σ 1212 (Latte)
σκῶλος· ῥάβδος. <u>σκάνδαλος</u>. οἱ δὲ σκόλοψ, ἤ ῥάβδος, ἤ ἀπωξυμμένος πάσσαλος, „ὥστε σκῶλος πυρίκαυστος", ἤ ἀκάνθης εἶδος. παρὰ τὸ σκέλλω. ἔστι δὲ καὶ πόλις ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ

„σκῶλος (‚spitzer Pfahl, Stachel') ‚Stab, Rute (ῥάβδος), <u>σκάνδαλος</u>', andere sagen σκόλοψ (‚spitzer Pfahl, Dorn') oder ῥάβδος (‚Stab, Rute') oder ἀπωξυμμένος πάσσαλος (‚angespitzter Stab') – „Wie ein feuergebrannter spitzer Pfahl" (*Ilias* 13,564) – oder ‚eine Art Dorn' (ἀκάνθης εἶδος). Von σκέλλω (‚trocknen'). Es gibt auch eine Stadt in Böotien (vgl. *Ilias* 2,497)."

Während das Lemmawort gr. σκῶλος (auch σκῶλον) außerbiblisch (*Ilias* 13,564, Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 810) unzweifelhaft die konkrete Bedeutung ‚spitzer Pfahl, Stachel' besitzt, kommt das Wort ebenso in der Septuaginta vor und trägt dort u. a. die übertragene Bedeutung ‚Stolperstein, Hindernis' (Muraoka 2009: 628, wo auch σκάνδαλον verglichen wird).[19]

Da an der ersten Belegstelle (6) eine übertragene Bedeutung und an beiden (6, 7) biblisch-christlicher Einfluss nicht ausgeschlossen werden können, lässt sich nicht mit Sicherheit entscheiden, ob σκάνδαλος auch im materialreicheren Lemma σκῶλος (7) übertragen oder eher konkret zu verstehen ist. Ein Hinweis auf die ursprüngliche Semantik kann also nicht gesichert werden.

d) gr. (bibl.) σκανδαλίζω ‚verführen' (LXX+)
Ein morphologisch durchsichtiges, ausschließlich biblisches Verb ist σκανδαλίζω ‚verführen (LXX, *NT*); beleidigen (*NT*)', vgl. Muraoka 2009: 622,

18. Die übertragene Bedeutung wird an dieser Stelle dadurch begründet, dass σκάνδαλος (besser: -ον) mit Hilfe der disjunktiven Konjunktion gr. ἤ ‚oder' mit ebenfalls übertragen gebrauchtem πρόσκομμα ‚Anstoß, (Anlass zum) Ärgernis; Schaden (Hesych π 3825)' verbunden wird. Vgl. zum Nebeneinander dieser beiden Wörter auch Fn. 10 und das Ende von § 1.a.

19. Auch eine der Bedeutungsangaben in Bsp. 7, gr. σκόλοψ, eig. ‚spitzer Pfahl, Dorn', wird in LXX *Hosea* 2:8 als Hindernis gebraucht, um den Weg zu versperren.

Danker (2000: 926). Das Verbalsuffix gr. -ίζω ist sehr produktiv, kann auch an *o*-stämmige Basen treten und weist sehr verschiedene denominale Bedeutungen auf, vgl. Schwyzer 1939: 735f. In unserem Fall muss σκανδαλίζω als ‚ein σκάνδαλον machen' paraphrasiert werden. Da aber σκάνδαλον eine konkrete und eine übertragene Bedeutung – 1.‚Falle' vs. 2.‚Verführung' – aufweist, muss entschieden werden, auf welcher dieser beiden Bedeutungen die Derivation von σκανδαλίζω aufbaut. Die beiden möglichen Ausgangsbedeutungen wären (a) 1.*‚eine Falle stellen' und (b) 2.*‚eine Verführung anstrengen'. Beides kann sich leicht zu ‚(zur Sünde) verführen' weiterentwickeln. Wie sich im Folgenden (*sub* § 1.e) herausstellen wird, ist die ökonomischste Lösung die Variante (a), nämlich die konkrete Lesart. Für die semantische Bestimmung der Derivationsbasis aber taugt das Verb σκανδαλίζω kaum. Die einzige Information, die sich gewinnen lässt, ist diejenige, dass eine σκάνδαλον-Falle eine lockende (> verführende) Komponente enthält.

e) gr. σκανδαλιστής ‚(Art Unterhaltungskünstler)' (2./3. Jh. n. Chr., *Hapax legomenon*)

Auf einer nachchristlichen Inschrift ist gut lesbar das Substantiv σκανδαλιστής belegt:

8) *SIG*³ 847 (Delphi, 2./3. Jh. n. Chr.; Perpillou-Thomas 1995: 228)[20]
[μέγας Π]ύθιος Ἀπόλλων | ... Νόννος ὁ καὶ | [Δη]μήτριος Ἀλεξαν|δρεύς, κοντοπ{αί}κτης | σκανδαλιστής καλο|βάτης ἀρέσας Δελφοῖς | ἐγενόμην βουλευτής | τε καὶ πολείτης | μεγάληι | τύχηι Δελ|φῶν

„Der große pythische Apollon. … Nonnos, alias Demetrios Alexandreus, erfreute als Balanceur, als σκανδαλιστής und als Seiltänzer die Delpher. Er wurde Ratsherr und Bürger in hohem Stand bei den Delphern."

Die Derivationsmorphologie von σκανδαλιστής ist klar: Ursprünglich handelt es sich bei den *Nomina agentis* auf -ιστής um Derivate von Verben auf -ίζω, vgl. π(τ)ολεμίζω ‚kämpfen' (*Ilias*+) → π(τ)ολεμιστής ‚Kämpfer' (*Ilias*+) (Schwyzer 1939: 499f.). Das Verb wiederum kann von verschiedengestaltigen Nomina abgeleitet sein, bspw. von *o*-Stämmen, vgl. π(τ)όλεμος ‚Krieg, Kampf' → π(τ)ολεμίζω ‚kämpfen'. Während also σκανδαλίζω diejenige Tätigkeit ist, die man

20. Vgl. https://epigraphy.packhum.org/text/238837.

mit einem σκάνδαλον macht (vgl. dazu oben § 1.d), ist ein σκανδαλιστής derjenige, der σκανδαλίζω macht.

Anhand der dargestellten dreigliedrigen Derivationskette lassen sich aus der Bedeutung eines der beteiligten Wörter die dadurch implizierten Bedeutungen der jeweils beiden anderen Wörter erschließen. In der relevanten Literatur wurden vier Vorschläge zur Bedeutung von σκανδαλιστής gemacht: (a) ‚Trapezkünstler' (bspw. Liddell – Scott 1996[9]: 1604),[21] (b) ‚Stelzenläufer' (Boccard in Bourguet 1929: 226), (c) ‚Seiltänzer' (Chantraine 1999: 1010) und (d) ‚Zauberkünstler' (Dittenberger in *SIG*[3] 847). Die ersten drei Bedeutungsvorschläge implizieren, dass es neben σκανδαλίζω ‚verführen' ein zweites Verb 2.*σκανδαλίζω (oder med. -ομαι) gegeben haben muss, das eine konkrete, wohl artistische Semantik aufgewiesen haben musste: (a) 2.*σκανδαλίζω/-ομαι ‚mit einem Trapez / einer Trapezstange umgehen', daher 2.*σκάνδαλον ‚Trapezstange',[22] (b) 2.*σκανδαλίζω/-ομαι ‚mit Stelzen umgehen', daher 2.*σκάνδαλον ‚Stelze',[23] (c) 2.*σκανδαλίζω/-ομαι ‚mit einer Balancierstange umgehen', daher 2.*σκάνδαλον ‚Balancierstange'.[24] Vorschlag (c) muss in jedem Fall ausscheiden, da es zum einen nach Blümner (1918: 14) keine antiken Belege für Balancierstangen gibt und mit καλοβάτης bereits der Beruf des Seiltänzers auf der Inschrift genannt ist. Auch die beiden anderen Deutungen sind nur solange erwägenswert, bis eine Möglichkeit gefunden werden kann, ohne die nicht belegten Dopplungen 2.*σκάνδαλον ‚(Art Stange, Stab)' und 2.*σκανδαλίζω ‚mit einer Art Stange, Stab umgehen' auszukommen. Dieser Ausweg liegt uns in Vorschlag (d) ‚Zauberkünstler' vor, wofür folgende Implikationen gelten: (d) σκανδαλιστής ‚Zauberkünstler; Täuscher', also σκανδαλίζω ‚täuschen' < *‚eine Falle stellen', daher σκάνδαλον ‚Falle'. Dass Demetrios Alexandreus' Tätigkeit als Zauberkünstler auf seinem Grabstein Erwähnung findet, mag auf den ersten Blick verwundern, aber, wie Blümner (1918: 19) berichtet, „[o]ft erwähnt werden in der Literatur auch die Taschenspieler oder, wie man sie besser bezeichnet, da die Alten ja keine Taschen an ihren Kleidern hatten, die Zauberkünstler. […] Die Bewohner von Histiaia […] ehrten sogar den Zauberkünstler Theodoros durch eine im Theater aufgestellte Erzstatue".

Wenngleich im Vorangehenden die Bedeutung von σκανδαλιστής näher beleuchtet werden konnte, liefert sie uns zwar einen Hinweis auf die auch profane

---

21. Vgl. noch Frisk (1970: 717), Beekes (2010: 1341), *SEG* 2,328.
22. Zu Trapezkünstlern in der Antike vgl. Blümner (1918: 12).
23. Zu Stelzenläufern in der Antike vgl. Blümner (1918: 16).
24. Zu Seiltänzern in der Antike vgl. Blümner (1918: 14).

Existenz von σκανδαλίζω als ‚eine Falle stellen, täuschen', aber der Natur eines σκάνδαλον sind wir nicht näher gekommen.

f) gr. σκανδάληθρον ‚Köder(?); (Art Falle)(?)' (425 v. Chr., *Hapax legomenon*)

Der früheste Beleg eines Mitgliedes der Wortfamilie von gr. σκάνδαλον findet sich bei Aristophanes:

9) Aristophanes *Acharner* 685-691 (425 v. Chr.; Olson 2002: 35f., 247-250)
ὁ δὲ νεανίας ἐπ' αὐτῷ σπουδάσας ξυνηγορεῖν
εἰς τάχος παίει ξυνάπτων στρογγύλοις τοῖς ῥήμασιν,
κᾆτ' ἀνελκύσας ἐρωτᾷ <u>σκανδάληθρ</u>' ἱστὰς ἐπῶν
ἄνδρα Τιθωνὸν σπαράττων καὶ ταράττων καὶ κυκῶν.
ὁ δ' ὑπὸ γήρως μασταρύζει, κᾆτ' ὀφλὼν ἀπέρχεται·
εἶτα λύζει καὶ δακρύει καὶ λέγει πρὸς τοὺς φίλους   690
„οὗ μ' ἐχρῆν σορὸν πρίασθαι, τοῦτ' ὀφλὼν ἀπέρχομαι."

„Der junge Mann aber, der eifrig gegen ihn vor Gericht zieht, schlägt schnell zu, indem er mit geschliffenen Worten angreift. Und dann zieht er einen Mann (so alt) wie Tithon heran (i. e. in den Zeugenstand) und befragt ihn, stellt <u>σκανδάληθρ</u>' aus Worten, führt ihn vor, verwirrt ihn und verstört ihn. Der schürzt die Lippen, weil er so alt ist, und wird zu einer Strafe verurteilt; dann schluchzt und weint er und sagt zu seinen Freunden: ‚Ich bin dazu verurteilt, das zu zahlen, wovon ich eigentlich einen Sarg kaufen wollte.'"

An dieser Stelle beklagt der aus alten Männern bestehende Chor, dass ihresgleichen nicht in der Lage wäre, den verbalen Manövern eines jungen Kontrahenten vor Gericht Paroli zu bieten. Der Jüngling bereitet in Vers 686 „mit geschliffenen Worten" (στρογγύλοις τοῖς ῥήμασι) seine überrumpelnde und eloquente Strategie vor, weshalb es sich anbietet, σκανδάληθρα (ἐπῶν) im folgenden Vers als „Wortfallen" zu verstehen, vgl. Olson (2002: 248). Jedoch ist nicht zu klären, ob eine sichtbare Lockfalle (→ bspw. Fangfragen) oder ein verdeckter Fallstrick o. ä. (→ bspw. Suggestivfragen) der metaphorischen Übertragung zugrunde liegt. Es ist aber bemerkenswert, dass σκανδάληθρον als Prädikat ἵστημι ‚aufstellen' aufweist, was für σκάνδαλον nicht belegt ist. Es passt also σκανδάληθρον hinsichtlich der verbalen Kookurrenz eher dazu, was wir über Fallen und Fangnetze wissen, die ja i. d. R. ebenfalls mit ἵστημι ‚stellen' konstruiert werden (vgl. § 1.a).

Derivationsmorphologisch ist σκανδάληθρον auffällig widerspenstig. Zwar ist das Suffix -θρον allbekannt und bereits für die Grundsprache als Teil eines Suffix-komplexes *-d^hro-, *-tro-, *-d^hlo-, *-tlo- zur Bildung von *Nomina instrumenti* und *Nomina loci* zu rekonstruieren. Es diente ursprünglich zur deradikalen bzw. deverbalen Derivation (vgl. uridg. *$h_2$érh$_3$-tro- ,Pflug' zu *$h_2$erh$_3$- ,aufbrechen, pflügen', Wodtko – Irslinger – Schneider 2008: 323), konnte aber im Griechischen auch an unterschiedliche Nominalstämme antreten, vgl. hom. πτόλις ,Stadt' → πτολιέθρον ,id.', dann aber meist ohne offensichtlichen Bedeutungsunterschied. Falls σκανδάληθρον derivationsmorphologisch damit vergleichbar wäre, würde es ebenso wie σκάνδαλον eine ,Falle' bezeichnen. Nicht hilfreich hingegen sind Bildungen wie ἕλκηθρον ,Pflugschar', da sie deverbal sind (← ἕλκω ,ziehen'). Möglicherweise ist aber das Trislegomenon δακτυλήθρα (f.) ,Fingerwärmer (Xenophon); Daumenschraube (LXX)' (← δάκτυλος ,Finger') formal heran-zuziehen,[25] allerdings lässt sich aus der exozentrischen(!) Derivatsparaphrase ,Instrument mit Bezug zu den Fingern'(?)[26] nur Unsicheres für die Analyse von σκανδάληθρον gewinnen. Wenn σκανδάληθρον auf die gleiche Weise wie δακτυλήθρα paraphrasiert werden darf, handelt es sich um ein ,Instrument mit Bezug zur Falle (σκάνδαλον)'. Da Fingerwärmer und Daumenschraube exozentrische Derivate sind, sollte dies für σκανδάληθρον dann auch gelten.[27] Ein über die eigentliche Falle hinausgehende, fakultative Komponente könnte bspw. ein Lockmittel, also ein Köder sein, der das Opfer zur und in die Falle leitet.[28]

---

25. Vielleicht handelt es sich beim eingeschobenen -η- um eine Strategie zur Vermeidung eines nicht lizensierten Konsonantenclusters *-λθρ- (keine Ergebnisse bei *PuPL*-Abfrage nach „*λθρ*"), vgl. auch o. g. ἕλκηθρον statt *ἕλκθρον. Chantraine (1933: 374) gibt keine weiteren Hinweise zu Suffix oder Bindevokal -η- (in denominalen Bildungen).

26. Vgl. aber auch die Etymologie in Gemoll (2002: 182): „aus δακτυλο-λήθρα, λανθάνω [,verbergen']", allerdings ohne die (Beachtung der) Bedeutungsangabe ,Daumenschraube' (LXX *4. Makkabäer* 8:13).

27. Dementsprechend könnte σκανδάληθρον also nicht als ,Instrument mit σκάνδαλον/ σκανδάλη/σκάνδαλος' paraphrasiert werden.

28. Im Scholion zur Stelle finden wir als Periphrase „das gebogene Holz in den Fallen" (τὸ ἐν ταῖς παγίσι ἐπικαμπὲς ξύλον). Damit ist wohl der Köderträger wenngleich in einer Springfalle gemeint, vgl. σκανδάλη (§ 1.b). Inwiefern das Scholion und auch Pollux, der in 7,114f. und 10,155f. das σκανδάληθρον als Auslösehölzchen in Mausefallen erklärt, verlässliche Kenntnis über dieses *Hapax legomenon* haben, darf in Frage gestellt werden. Es ist nämlich so, dass der Stab, der gebogen wird, Spannung hält und nach dem Auslösen die Falle schließt, (Scholion) das Schloss ist, und der Stab, der die Falle auslöst, der also vom Beutetier berührt wird, (Pollux) die Stellung ist. Es handelt sich also um die zwei essenziellen, aber voneinander streng verschiedenen Bestandteile einer primitiven Springfalle.

Diese Bedeutung ‚Lockmittel, Köder' passt insofern ausgezeichnet auf die obige Passage, als der Jüngling bei der Befragung „Köder aus Worten" (σκανδάληθρ᾽ […] ἐπῶν, V. 687) auslegen kann, um den Greis zu fangen. Darunter lassen sich problemlos Fangfragen verstehen, die den Befragten zu einer verfänglichen Antwort verleiten und ihn in Widersprüche verstricken, so dass er den Prozess verliert (ὀφλὼν ἀπέρχεται, V. 689).

g) gr. σκανδαλ(λ)άριος ‚Dachdecker(?); Fallenbauer(?)' (3., 6. Jh. n. Chr.)
Das Wort σκανδαλάριος ist insgesamt wohl zweimal nachzuweisen:

19) *TAM* V.3 1852 (3. Jh. n. Chr., Philadelphia [Lydia])
Ὑποσόριον | Ἀρτεμιδώρου β᾽ | σκανδαλαρίου
„‚Hyposorion' des σκανδαλάριος Artemidorus II."

20) Rhetorius in *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum* 8(4), p. 215 (6. Jh. n. Chr.)
Περὶ οἰκοδόμων ἢ κεραμέων | Κρόνος […] σκανδαλλαρίους (cod., σκανδουλαρίους Delcourt) ποιεῖ ἢ τοιχοβάτας ἢ οἰκοδόμους ἢ κεραμεῖς ἢ λυχνοποιούς. εἰ δὲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη ἐπιθεωρήσῃ, νευροβάτας ποιεῖ.

„Über Architekten und Töpfer | Saturn […] macht σκανδαλλαρίους oder Mauerläufer[29] oder Architekten oder Töpfer oder Lampenmacher. Wenn aber die Venus im Aspekt von rechts steht, macht er Seiltänzer."

Die Grabinschrift (19) liefert keine unabhängige Evidenz für die Bedeutung von σκανδαλάριος. Dass es sich um die Bezeichnung des Berufes handeln dürfte, den Artemidorus II. zu Lebzeiten ausgeübt hat, hilft kaum weiter. Petzls Übersetzung als ‚Schindeldecker' (in *TAM* V.3) basiert lediglich auf der Gleichsetzung mit der Berufsbezeichnung lat. *scandularius* ‚Dachdecker(?)', die aber zuerst bei Justinian (6. Jh. n. Chr.!) belegt ist (s. u. Fn. 59). An der zweiten Belegstelle (20) werden Handwerker aufgezählt, die mit dem Hausbau (‚Mauerläufer'[?], Hausbauer) oder der Herstellung von Keramik (Töpfer, Lampenmacher) zu tun haben, wie es die Überschrift des Kapitels („Über Architekten und Töpfer") auch ankündigt. Da sich das Wort σκανδαλλαρίους am Beginn der

---

29. Eigentlich ist τοιχοβάτης ein architektonischer Terminus, der das Mauerfundament bezeichnet, vgl. Ginouvès (1992: 16f.). Hier muss es sich aber um eine Berufsbezeichnung o. ä. handeln, vgl. so auch die Übersetzung von Holden (2009: 142): „those who walk on walls". Ob dieser etwas mit dem Mauerfundament zu tun hat (‚Fundamentleger'[?]), muss dahingestellt bleiben.

Aufzählung befindet, dürfte es sich dabei auch um einen Beruf im Bereich des Hausbaus handeln; ‚Dachdecker' wird wohl eine angemessene Bedeutungsangabe sein, vgl. so auch Holden (2009: 142: „roofer").

Bemerkenswert an beiden Stellen ist das zweite -α-, falls es sich tatsächlich um eine Entlehnung aus lat. *scandularius* ‚Dachdecker(?)' (s. u. Fn. 59) handeln sollte. Die einzige Erklärung in diesem Fall wäre eine Kontamination mit dem Wort σκάνδαλον.[30] Dies ist wohl an der Rhetoriusstelle (20) der Fall, da die wohl falsche Doppelschreibung des ⟨λ⟩ vermuten lässt, dass auch im Vokalismus ein Fehler vorliegt. Für den inschriftlichen Beleg (19) lässt sich zur Rettung des Schreibers vermuten, dass hier eine andere Berufsbezeichnung gemeint ist, nämlich die eines ‚Fallenbauers', wenn als Derivationsbasis σκάνδαλον ‚Falle' angenommen wird.[31] Klarheit lässt sich nicht finden, einen Beitrag zur Erhellung des Wesens eines σκάνδαλον liefert keine der beiden Belegstellen.

Im vorangegangen Abschnitt dieses Beitrags wurden gr. σκάνδαλον und Verwandtes so genau als möglich beleuchtet. Folgende Resultate wurden gewonnen:

a) σκάνδαλον (n.) ‚Falle; Verführung' (LXX+)
b) σκανδάλη (f.) ‚Auslöser einer Falle' (2. Jh. n. Chr.)
c) σκάνδαλος (m.) ‚Hindernis' (lexikogr., 5./6. Jh. n. Chr.)
d) σκανδαλίζω ‚verführen' (LXX+)
e) σκανδαλιστής (m.) ‚Zauberkünstler(?)' (2./3. Jh. n. Chr.)
f) σκανδάληθρον (n.) ‚Köder(?); (Art Falle)(?)' (425 v. Chr.)
g) σκανδαλάριος (m.) ‚Fallenbauer(?); Dachdecker(?)' (3., 6. Jh. n. Chr.)

2. *Die Etymologie von gr. σκάνδαλον ‚±Falle' inkl. eines neuen Vorschlags*

In den folgenden beiden Abschnitten sollen zum einen (§ 2.1) die Äußerungen der einschlägigen etymologischen Wörterbücher zum Griechischen bewertet und zum anderen (§ 2.2) ein neuer Vorschlag zur Herkunft von gr. σκάνδαλον unterbreitet werden.

---

30. Dass das lydische Philadelphia in der Bibel als hartnäckig während der Christenverfolgung beschrieben wird (*Offenbarung* 3:7-13), also offenbar als besonders christlich gelten kann und daher mit dem biblisch-christlichen Begriff σκάνδαλον in hohem Maße vertraut war, dürfte wohl kaum als Argument für die Annahme einer solchen Kontamination gelten.

31. Das Suffix gr. -αριος diente zur Bildung von *Nomina agentis*, dann besonders auch von Berufsbezeichnungen und ist freilich aus lat. *-ārius* entlehnt, vgl. Cameron (1931: 234) und ebenso ahd. *-ǻri* (Lloyd – Springer 1988: 326-329).

2.1 *Bisherige Vorschläge*

In Frisks Etymologicum zum Griechischen wird σκάνδαλον anhand der (vermeintlichen) Evidenz von σκανδαλιστής ‚Trapezkünstler' und der Tatsache, dass es sich um eine Falle oder einen Teil davon handelt, als „aufgehängtes od[er] frei herabhängendes Holz" (Frisk 1970: 717) interpretiert.[32] Dass diese Hypothese schwer zu halten ist, wird durch die mangelhafte Beweiskraft von σκανδαλιστής wahrscheinlich gemacht. Zum einen ist σκανδαλιστής erst im 2./3. Jh. n. Chr. belegt und zum anderen bezeichnet das Wort nach dem oben (*sub* § 1.e) Gesagten eher den ‚Zauberkünstler', jedenfalls mangelt es an unabhängiger Evidenz für die Bedeutung ‚Trapezkünstler'.[33] Neben σκάνδαλον als Teil der Falle (‚Stellholz') sieht Frisk (1970: 717) σκανδάληθρον als die Falle als Ganzes, also als (denominales!) *Nomen instrumenti* ‚Stellholzgerät' (vgl. zur Derivation aber oben § 1.f). Beide Begriffe seien dann auch für das jeweils andere verwendet.[34] Auch der vertretene Wurzelanschluss – letztlich uridg. 1.**skend-* ‚(los-)springen, davon-springen' (Rix 2001²: 554) – spricht eher gegen das Primat des ‚hängenden Holzes', da in diesem Fall eher mit einem ‚springenden Holz' gerechnet werden sollte. Wohl als erster hat August Friedrich Pott (1833: 249) gr. σκανδάληθρον „aufspringendes Stellholz" mit lat. *scandere* ‚steigen' verbunden, die Derivation mit nhd. *Sprenkel* ‚Vogelstrick (Art Vogelfalle)' (: *springen*) verglichen und unter der Wurzel **skand-* ‚*subsilire* (losspringen), *scandere* (steigen)' subsummiert; ihm folgen letztlich Frisk (1970: 717) und Chantraine (1999: 1010). Die Wurzel wird heute als uridg. 1.**skend-* ‚(los-)springen, davonspringen' (Rix 2001²: 554) rekonstruiert und die lateinische Bedeutung ‚steigen' als sekundär verstanden.[35] Zugehörig sind neben lat. *scandere* ‚steigen' auch lat. *scālae* ‚Treppe', ved. *skándati* ‚springt,

---

32. Ebenso Beekes: „construction with a piece of wood hanging on ropes" (Beekes [2010: 1341]), Chantraine rekonstruiert keine Seile: „une barre de bois plus ou moins longue" (Chantraine 1999: 1010).

33. Bemerkenswert ist, dass Beekes (2010: 1341) schreibt, dass „σκανδαλ-ίζω ‚to tempt, be offensive, annoy', -ίζομαι ‚to be tempted to sin, to be offended' […]" die Derivationsbasis („whence") von σκανδαλιστής „an acrobat, e.g. ‚trapeze artist'" sei, ohne auf die offensichtliche semantische Divergenz einzugehen.

34. Als Vergleichspunkt wird schwed. *giller* ‚Stellholz, Falle' angeführt, was aber so nicht bestätigt werden kann, vgl. Freese (1842: 150): „ein Sprenkel zum Vogelfang, eine Schlinge, Falle für wilde Thiere".

35. Vgl. ebenso Fn. 43. Noch weiter fortentwickelt wäre eine Bedeutung ‚treten', wie sie der Vergleich mit ae. *treppe* ‚Falle' neben ae. *treppan* ‚voranschreiten, traben' (Hinweis von Sergio Neri, per E-Mail vom 28.06.2020) implizierte, die wohl auf eine Ursprungssemantik ‚treten' (oder gar ‚to trample', vgl. Kroonen 2013: 520f.) zurückgehen.

hüpft'[36] und air. *sceinnid* ‚springt'. Sollte gr. σκάνδαλον diese Wurzel fortsetzen, müsste, wenngleich dieser Typ nicht sehr häufig ist, von einem *Nomen agentis* des Typs διδάσκαλος (‚Lehrer' : διδάσκω ‚lehren') ausgegangen werden:[37] gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Stellholz' < *‚Lossprinngendes', vgl. bspw. Walde – Pokorny (1927: 540). Während diese Etymologie semantisch nicht unattraktiv ist,[38] wird ihre Plausibilität deswegen reduziert, weil im Griechischen jede Spur eines Verbs gr. *σκάνδω ‚springen' o. ä. fehlt. Darüberhinaus ist, wie Beekes (2010: 1341) richtig bemerkt, das wurzelhafte -α- (besonders vor -νC-) im Griechischen problematisch.[39] Chantraine bezeichnet σκάνδαλον (*ad hoc*?) als „terme technique à vocalisme *a*" (Chantraine 1999: 1010). Als einzige Möglichkeit, das -α- regelhaft zu erklären, erscheint die Annahme einer ursprünglich schwundstufigen Bildung mit der Wurzelform *skn̥d- > gr. *σκαδ- und sekundäre Einführung des Nasals → σκανδ-.[40] In diesem Szenario müsste man erklären können, woher der Nasal kommen kann, aber da keine Bildungen mit der Wurzelform *σκενδ- oder *σκονδ-, die also den Nasal enthalten hätten, im Griechischen belegt sind, kommt man über Spekulationen nicht hinaus. Im Falle eines σκάνδαλον (bzw. *σκάδαλον), das nach

---

36. Bemerkenswert ist, dass nach Mayrhofer „viell[eicht] auch gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle'" (1976: 506) hierzugehört, einige Jahre später aber in Mayrhofer (1996: 749) das griechische Wort nicht mehr erwähnt wird.

37. Vgl. auch gr. πάσσαλος ‚Nagel' < *‚befestigendes Utensil' (: πήγνυμι ‚befestigen'). Die weiteren Beispiele in Chantraine (1933: 245) scheinen durchweg *Nomina rei actae* zu sein, vgl. πτύαλον ‚Spucke' (: πτύω ‚ausspucken').

38. Vgl. den o. g. *Sprenkel* ‚Vogelstrick'. Anders Beekes (2010: 1341), der die „semantic arbitrariness" bemängelt.

39. Das vermeintliche Komparandum gr. κάνδαρος ‚(gr.) ἄνθραξ, Kohle' (Hesych κ 642 Latte) wird zwar gelegentlich mit uridg. 2.*(s)kend- ‚ergläanzen' (Rix 2001²: 554) zusammengebracht (vgl. bspw. Frisk 1960: 776), jedoch besitzt eine einzelne Hesychglosse ohne jede Zusatzinformation nicht ausreichend Beweiskraft für ein Lautgesetz dieser Art, vgl. auch Bichlmeier (2018: 100 Fn. 6). Dasselbe gilt für gr. Akk. Pl. κανθύλας ‚(gr.) τὰς ἀνοιδήσεις, Geschwülste' (Hesych κ 664 Latte) neben Nom. Pl. κονθηλαί ‚(gr.) αἱ ἀνοιδήσεις, Geschwülste' (Hesych κ 3508 Latte), vgl. Frisk (1960: 778f.).

40. Auf diese Möglichkeit macht mich freundlicherweise Sergio Neri (per E-Mail am 28.06.2020) aufmerksam. Aus lautlicher Sicht käme auch der Ansatz eines Nasalpräsens uridg. *skn̥-né-d-/*skn̥-n-d-´ in Frage, wie es Schumacher (2004: 574f.) für air. *sceinnid* ‚springt' für möglich hält. In diesem Fall könnte ved. *ská-n-d-ati* ‚springt' ebenso auf ein Nasalpräsens zurückgehen, die griechische Entsprechung wäre etwa *σκά-ν-δ-ω bzw. *σκα-ν-δ-άνω (vgl. zum Typ πυ-ν-θ-άνο-μαι Rix 1992: 211). Weil doch die αλο-Agentiva vom Verbalstamm und nicht von der Wurzel abgeleitet werden, müsste man dann nicht *σκανδάναλον erwarten? Gegen ein grundsprachliches (und dementsprechend griechisches) Nasalpräsens spricht jedoch, dass bei intransitiven Grundverben wie ‚springen' ein kausatives Nasalpräsens ‚springen lassen' zu erwarten ist.

dem Muster διδάσκαλος : [δι-δά-σκ]-ω von einem Verbalstamm abgeleitet ist, wäre eine schwundstufige Verbalbildung *$skn̥d$- (mit sekundärem Nasal) anzunehmen; das für die Grundsprache nach Rix (2001[2]: 554) zu rekonstruierende Präsens ist aber mit *$skénd$-e/o- e-vollstufig. Beekes' Schlussfolgerung in dieser innergriechisch kaum aufzulösenden Situation ist die Annahme fremder Herkunft, entweder aus dem von ihm angenommenen und elaborierten vorgriechischen Substrat „Pre-Greek"[41] oder aus einer nicht griechischen indogermanischen Sprache. Eine Entlehnung sei insofern plausibel, als es sich bei σκάνδαλον (und σκανδάληθρον) um Fachvokabular handele. In der Liste der Suffixe, die auf Herkunft aus dem „Pre-Greek" hindeuten, findet sich auch -αλ(λ)-ο- (Beekes – Norbruis 2014: 31). Ganz gleich, wie man die Beekes'sche Pre-Greek-Hypothese beurteilt, ist die Erwähnung unseres Suffixes in diesem Kontext indikativ für eine problematische Position innerhalb des Griechischen. So bemerkt auch schon Chantraine in seiner *formation des noms en grec ancien* abschließend zum Suffix -αλο-: „Les noms en -αλο- étant souvent obscurs, il ne faut pas oublier qu'ils peuvent parfois avoir été empruntés au vocabulaire méditerranéen" (Chantraine 1933: 247 Anm. II). Wie es nun der Zufall will, finden sich tatsächlich in einer dem Griechischen geographisch nahen Sprachgruppe teils produktive Suffixe, die gr. -αλο- lautlich durchaus ähnlich sind: luw. /-alla/i-/, /-al(i)-/ und /-al-/.[42]

2.2 *Ein neuer Vorschlag: Entlehnung aus dem Luwischen*

Zuerst von Rieken (2010: 657) wurde das hieroglyphen-luwische Verb /skandal(l)issa-(i)/ als ‚Applikationen anbringen an, leuchten lassen' (besser: ‚verzieren, schmücken', vgl. § 2.2.1) interpretiert und mit der Wurzel uridg. 2.*(s)kend- ‚(er-)glänzen' (Rix 2001[2]: 554) verbunden, vgl. Opfermann – Sasseville (2017a), Sasseville (2021: 500f.).[43] Nach Sasseville ist als Derivations-

---

41. Vgl. Beekes (2010: xiii-xlii) und Beekes – Norbruis (2014), wozu in jedem Fall die Rezensionen bspw. von Thorsten Meissner (2013) und Rüdiger Schmitt (2015) zu vergleichen sind.

42. Da sie letztlich keine Rolle für den hier vorgebrachten Vorschlag spielt, bleibe die Frage nach direktem griechisch-luwischen Kontakt bzw. nach der Existenz einer luw(o)iden Sprache in Westanatolien, wie und wo sie Simon (2017b) annimmt, an dieser Stelle unbeantwortet. Der Autor dieser Zeilen sieht sich fachlich außer Stande, eine gelehrte Entscheidung zu treffen. Kontakt zwischen dem Griechischen und einer oder mehreren anatolischen Sprachen ist in jedem Fall anzunehmen.

43. Es mag eingewendet werden, dass das Verb an der Belegstelle ANCOZ 5, §§ 3f. (bzw. ANCOZ 8 + ANCOZ 5, §§ 7f., vgl. Hawkins 2019) kaum jene von Rieken vorgeschlagene Bedeutung haben könne, da in § 3 (bzw. § 7) als Akkusativobjekt (MONS)*wa/i-ti-na* der Bedeutung ‚Berg (Hurtula?)' zu

basis des zugrundeliegenden Verbs */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ am ehesten ein Adjektiv luw. */skandal(l)a/i-/ ‚glänzend, hell, verziert‘, vielleicht auch ein Substantiv */skandal-/ zu rekonstruieren. Dessen Derivationsbasis luw. */skanda-/ ‚Glänzendes, Schmuck, Zierat‘ sei wiederum in luw. *šakantama/i-* ‚verziert(?)‘ (Simon [2017a]) und *šak(k)antat(t)ar* ‚Verzierung(?)‘ (Busse – Simon 2017) fortgesetzt, vgl. Opfermann – Sasseville (2017b). Luw. */skanda-/ ‚Glänzendes, Schmuck, Zierat‘ selbst kann mit urkelt. *kando-* ‚hell‘ (vgl. kymr. *cann* ‚weiß, hell‘, mbret. *cann* ‚Vollmond‘ etc.) auf ein urindogermanisches *Nomen agentis *(s)kn̥d-ó-* ‚glänzend, leuchtend‘ zurückgeführt werden. Die zugrundeliegende Wurzel ist uridg. *(s)kend-* ‚(er)glänzen‘ (Rix 2001[2]: 554). Da vorgeschlagen werden soll, dass gr. σκάνδαλον (etc.) aus der Derivationsbasis des Verbs luw. */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ entlehnt wurde, muss die inner-luwische Derivationsgeschichte möglichst genau beleuchtet werden. Dadurch werden sich Konkretisierungen und Korrekturen des eben paraphrasierten Szenarios ergeben.

2.2.1 *Die formale Seite der Entlehnung*

Aufgrund der Form des Verbs hluw. /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ muss gefolgert werden, dass es mithilfe des deverbalen Suffixes luw. /-ssa-[(i)]/ von einem Verb */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ abgeleitet wurde. Wie Sasseville (2021: 509) zusammenfasst, deckt das luw(o)ide Suffix *-ssV-[(i)] (> luw. /-ssa-[(i)]/, lyd. *-ši-*), mit dem wir es hier zu tun haben, verschiedene Funktionen ab: distributiv (luw.), inchoativ (luw.), iterativ (lyd.), wobei auch unklare Fälle wie luw. /hwihwiyassa-[(i)]/ ‚laufen‘ ← /hwiya-[(i)]/ ‚id.‘ möglicherweise ohne semantische Differenz auftreten, vgl. Sasseville (2021: 492f.). Da weiteres Vergleichsmaterial fehlt, kann eine sichere Aussage über die Funktion des Suffixes /-ssa-[(i)]/ in hluw. /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ nicht getroffen werden; die Annahme von Synonymie ist am wenigsten verfänglich.

---

lesen ist, vgl. Poetto (2010: 132), Hawkins (2019). Federico Giusfredi (per E-Mail vom 09.12.2020) stellt die Vermutung in den Raum, ob nicht statt der Wurzel 2.*(s)kend-* ‚(er)glänzen‘ die Wurzel 1.*skend-*, die in lat. *scandere* ‚steigen‘ fortgesetzt ist, vorliege, was in Bezug auf einen Berg besser passe und letztlich in der Tat sehr gut als Basis einer Bezeichnung für ‚Fall(grub)e‘ (vgl. engl. *trap* oben in Fn. 35) dienen kann. Gegen diesen Vorschlag ist jedoch einzuwenden, dass die Wurzel in Rix (2001[2]: 554) mit der Bedeutung ‚(los)springen, davonspringen‘ angesetzt wird und ‚steigen‘ als sekundär zu betrachten ist, wie schon in anderem Zusammenhang in § 2.1 angemerkt wurde. Zudem sind mit der konkretisierten Bedeutung ‚verzieren, schmücken‘ durchaus beide Belegstellen (ANCOZ 8+5, BOYBEYPINARI 2) befriedigend zu übersetzen, vgl. § 2.2.1. Ein anderer, aber m. E. überflüssiger Ausweg könnte die Annahme eines Bedeutungswandels ‚glänzend machen‘ > ‚berühmt machen‘ (vgl. lat. *clarus* ‚hell; berühmt‘, *illustris* ‚id.‘ etc.) sein, was an allen Belegstellen auch passen könnte.

Das zu rekonstruierende Verb luw. */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ enthält das Suffix /-i-[(ti)]/. Als Ableitungsbasen solcher Verben sind nach Sasseville (2021: 131-153) diverse Kategorien belegt, in unserem Fall kommen aber lediglich zwei in Frage: ein denominaler Adjektivstamm */skandal(l)a/i-/ (< *-é-lo-, *-ó-lo-) oder ein deverbales *Nomen instrumenti* */skandal-/ (nt.) (< *-ó-lo-), vgl. so auch Sasseville (2021: 501).[44]

Da *Nomina instrumenti* deverbal sind, müsste als Derivationsbasis von luw. */skandal-/ ein Verb, bspw. das Faktitivum */skanda-[(ti)]/ ‚glänzend machen, verzieren', rekonstruiert werden. Die (inner-luwische) Ableitungsgrundlage für ein Faktitivum */skanda-[(ti)]/ ‚verzieren' kann das Substantiv */skanda-/ (< *-eh₂-) oder das Adjektiv */skanda/i-/ (< *-o-) sein, wobei Letzteres als uridg. *(s)kn̥dó- ‚glänzend' rekonstruierbar und auch im Keltischen fortgesetzt ist, vgl. Opfermann – Sasseville (2017b). Die Bedeutung von luw. */skanda-/ kann also als ‚etwas, womit man verziert (*/skanda-[(ti)]/)' *vel sim.* (> ‚Verzierung') rekonstruiert, also die Semantik des abgeleiteten Verbs */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ als ‚ein */skandal-/ verwenden' periphrasiert werden. In ANCOZ 5 §3 (bzw. §7, vgl. Hawkins 2019) ist hluw. /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ ein transitives Verb mit dem direkten Objekt (MONS)*wa/i-ti-na* ‚Berg',[45] was die Annahme zulässt, dass die Funktion des Suffixes /-issa-[(i)]/ in diesem Fall (mindestens) Transitivisierung gewesen sein müsste: */skandal(l)i-[(ti)]/ (intr.) ‚ein */skandal-/ verwenden' → /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ (tr.) ‚etw. durch die Verwendung eines */skandal-/ affizieren' > ‚verzieren, markieren'.[46] Für diese Funktion findet sich im Luwischen zwar kein Beispiel (Sasseville 2021: 489-504), vgl. aber lyd. *caši-* (tr.) ‚weihen(?)' ← *ca-[(t)]* (intr.) ‚einen Anteil geben' (Sasseville 2021: 506). Wenn es sich bei */skandal-/ also um ein *Nomen instrumenti* handelt, das zur Verzierung geeignet ist, könnte eine Erklärung für die Verwendung des Instrumentals /hubidattadadi/ in BOYBEYPINARI 2 §4 gefunden sein. Bei diesem Wort handelt es sich um ein Derivat von */hubid-/ ‚(eine Art Kopfbedeckung?)', vgl. Cammarosano (2018: 244f.) mit Lit. Dem Verb /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ ist gemäß

---

44. Rein theoretisch könnte auch ein *a*-stämmiges *Nomen agentis* (c.) */skanda(l)la-/ (< *-V-leh₂-) zugrunde liegen (vgl. zu diesen Sasseville 2014-2015), was aber insofern problematisch ist, als nur ein einziges spätes Beispiel (kluw. /hattari-[(ti)]/ ‚hacken' ← /hattara-/ ‚Pickel, Spitzhacke') belegt ist und von *a*-Stämmen in der Regel luw. /-a-[(ti)]/- oder /-a(i)-[(ti)]/-Verben abgeleitet werden, vgl. Sasseville (2021: 148).

45. Dieses Objekt ist nach David Sasseville (E-Mail vom 06.01.2021) wohl auch für den folgenden Paragraphen 4 (bzw. 8) impliziert.

46. Es ist durchaus möglich (so auch David Sasseville per E-Mail vom 06.01.2021), dass ein Berg bzw. dessen Spitze aus (quasi-)religiösen Gründen verziert, geschmückt, letztlich markiert wird, vgl. bspw. (christliche) Gipfelkreuze oder (tibetisch-buddhistische) Gebetsfahnen.

der eben vorgeschlagenen Derivationskette nämlich ein Instrument (*/skandal-/) inhärent, das leicht durch etwas konkret Benanntes im Kasus Instrumental ersetzt werden kann. BOYBEYPINARI 2 §4 kann dann folgendermaßen übersetzt werden: „du siehst (LITUUS+*na-ti-sa*), mit welchem (*kwa/i-a-ti*) hubidad(i)- (*hu-pi-tà-ta-tà-ti-wa/i*) ich (etwas/jemanden) verziere (*sà-ka-tá-li-sà-wa/i*)". Das Derivat /hubidadana-/, das in BOYBEYPINARI 2 §7 im Akkusativ steht und daher direktes Objekt zu /skandal(l)issa-(i)/ sein dürfte, könnte sich dann auf den/die/das in §4 ‚Geschmückte/-n‘ beziehen. Das rekonstruierte *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ ‚etwas, womit man verziert, Verzierung‘ fügt sich also in die Beleg-situation und in die Derivationskette semantisch und morphologisch passend ein:

uridg. **(s)knd-ó-* > luw. */skanda/i-/ ‚glänzend‘
    → Faktitivum */skanda-(ti)/ ‚glänzend machen, verzieren‘[47]
    → *Nomen instrumenti* */skandal-/ ‚etwas, womit man verziert, Verzierung‘
    → denominales Verb */skandal(l)i-(ti)/ (intr.) ‚eine Verzierung anbringen‘
    → deverbales Verb /skandal(l)issa-(i)/ (tr.) ‚verzieren (± Instr.)‘

Alternativ wurden oben als außerdem mögliche Derivationsbasen die Adjektive (a) */skand-alla/i-/ < (*-*é-lo-*) und (b) */skand-al(i)-/ (< *-*ó-lo-*) genannt, wofür als Ableitungsgrundlage ein Substantiv */skanda-/ ‚der/die/das Glänzende‘ in Frage kommt. Dieses dürfte am ehesten eine Substantivierung eines Adjektivs */skanda/i-/ sein, das in der Form uridg. **(s)knd-ó-* ‚glänzend‘ bereits für die Grundsprache rekonstruiert werden kann (vgl. Opfermann – Sasseville 2017b). Unklar bleibt hierbei jedoch die Bedeutung des Verbs */skandal(l)i-(ti)/. Am besten würde sich ein Faktitivum ‚verziert machen‘ einfügen, das aber mit dem Suffix /-a-(ti)/ abgeleitet sein müsste (†/skandala-(ti)/), was wiederum nicht als Derivationsbasis für /skandali-ssa-(i)/ taugt.

Folgende Derivationskette müsste also angenommen werden:

uridg. **(s)knd-ó-* > luw. */skanda/i-/ ‚glänzend‘
    → Substantivierung */skanda-/ ‚das Glänzende, Schmuck, Zierat‘
    → Possessivadjektiv */skandal(l)a/i-/ ‚Verzierung habend, verziert‘
    → denominales Verb */skandal(l)i-(ti)/ ‚verziert machen(??)‘
    → deverbales Verb /skandal(l)issa-(i)/ (tr.) ‚verzieren (± Instr.)‘

47. Hieran ließen sich das mögliche Partizip luw. /skand-ama/i-/ ‚verziert(?)‘ (Simon 2017a) und das Verbalabstraktum luw. /skand-attar/n-/ ‚Verzierung(?)‘ (Busse – Simon 2017) anschließen.

Eine Entlehnung des Adjektivs */skandalla/i-/ (*-*é-lo-*) als gr. σκάνδαλον (etc.) muss aus lautlicher Sicht als problematisch eingeordnet werden. Das geminierte /l/ besaß im Griechischen nämlich Phonemcharakter und wäre daher wahrscheinlich erhalten (nicht †σκάνδαλλον), vgl. gr. βάλλω /balːɔː/ ‚werfe‘ vs. βαλῶ /balɔː/ ‚werde werfen‘.[48] Die Alternative, nämlich die Entlehnung eines Adjektivs */skandal(i)-/ (< *-*ó-lo-*), birgt lautlich keine Probleme. Die neutralen Formen entsprechen denjenigen, die auch für das *Nomen instrumenti* auf /-al-/ belegt sind: Nom./Akk. Sg. nt. */skandal/, Nom./Akk. Pl. nt. */skandala/. Da Nominalstämme auf -λ (oder gar -λι) im Griechischen eigentlich nicht existieren, ist es nur folgerichtig anzunehmen, dass das Adjektiv luw. */skandal(i)-/ einerseits und das *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ andererseits in die produktivste Nominalkategorie, namentlich in die thematischen Stämme übernommen würden. Das Adjektiv luw. */skandal(i)-/ erschiene dann als gr. σκάνδαλος, σκανδάλη, σκάνδαλον.[49] Das neutrische *Nomen instrumenti* wäre freilich primär als Neutrum gr. σκάνδαλον zu erwarten, wozu erst sekundär Maskulinum und Femininum gebildet würden.

Aus formaler Sicht bieten sich also das Adjektiv luw. */skandal(i)-/ und das *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ als Entlehnungsgrundlagen an. Inner-luwische philologische Gründe (s. o.) lassen die Rekonstruktion des *Nomen instrumenti* attraktiver erscheinen, aber die Tatsache, dass im Griechischen drei Genera des angenommenen Lehnwortes belegt sind (vgl. oben § 1.a-c), spricht eher für die Entlehnung eines (*qua definitionem* genusindifferenten) Adjektivs.

---

48. Es mag die Frage gestellt werden, ob die Entlehnungsgrundlage auch dem Lykischen (Suffix lyk. A /-ala-/) entstammen könne, was aus phonologischer Sicht durchaus bejaht werden kann; das Suffix lyk. A /-ala-/ bildet allerdings *Nomina agentis* und entspräche luw. /-alla/- (< *-*é-leh₂-*), was in Fn. 44 aber als Zwischenstufe abgelehnt wurde, und nicht /-alla/i-/ (< *-*é-lo-*), was wiederum lyk. /-ele/i-/ (mit Nom./Akk. Pl. nt. /-ala-/) entspricht. Gegen den Ansatz eines lykischen *Nomen agentis* */skandala-/ ist einzuwenden, dass die Existenz eines solchen Stammes im Lykischen A nur hypothetisch möglich ist, im Luwischen dagegen ist ein entsprechender Stamm wegen hluw. /skandal(l)issa-[(i)]/ zwingend zu rekonstruieren. Ockhams Rasiermesser rät also von dieser Möglichkeit ab.

49. Überdies lauten die (neutrischen) Pluralformen in beiden Sprachen gleich, nämlich /skandala/, vgl. gr. σκάνδαλα in Bsp. 2) oben. — Die hier angenommene Lokalisierung der Entlehnung im Westen Kleinasiens, also im ostäolischen, ostionischen oder kleinasiatisch-inseldorischen Sprachgebiet des 1. Jt.s v. Chr. könnte als Anlass genommen werden, zu erwägen, ob der Beleg bei Alkiphron (Bsp. 5) gemäß der Mehrheit der Handschriften als σκανδάλᾱς (statt σκανδάλης) wiederzugeben ist. Bekanntlich bleibt in den nicht ionisch-attischen Dialekten langes ā stets erhalten, σκανδάλᾱ wäre dann von Alkiphron als äolischer (oder dorischer) Fachterminus verwendet. Da Alkiphron aber ein Attizist aus dem 2. Jh. n. Chr. gewesen ist, dürfte es sich hierbei um nichts mehr als ein Gedankenspiel handeln.

Als essenzieller Bestandteil der Entlehnungshypothese muss schließlich die Semantik beurteilt werden, die möglicherweise helfen kann, die eben dargestellte Aporie hinsichtlich des luwischen Rekonstrukts aufzulösen.

2.2.2 *Die semantische Seite der Entlehnung*

Wenn das entlehnte Wort in der Nehmersprache (gr. σκάνδαλον) ein technisches Gerät bezeichnet, gibt es zwei Möglichkeiten, was damit zum Entlehnungszeitpunkt benannt wurde: entweder das technische Gerät an sich oder ein Bestandteil bzw. Charakteristikum dieses Geräts. Im Falle von gr. σκάνδαλον wird diese Zuordnung dadurch erschwert, dass dessen Wesen nicht zweifelsfrei bestimmt werden kann (vgl. oben § 1.a).

Aus rein formalen Gründen kommen zwei verschiedene Bedeutungen als Entlehnungsquelle in Frage: ‚glänzend‘ (Adj. */skandal(i)-/) oder ‚Verzierung‘ (Subst. */skandal-/).

a) ‚glänzend, hell, verziert‘ → ‚Falle‘?

Die semantische Verknüpfung von */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend, hell, verziert‘ und dem griechischen Material erscheint auf den ersten Blick nur schwer möglich. Da eine Falle meist eine Konstruktion aus mehreren Bauteilen ist, wäre es kaum zu erwarten, wenn sie als Ganze schlicht als ‚Glänzendes, Helles‘ bezeichnet würde. In zwei semantischen Feldern aber ist das Attribut ‚glänzend, hell‘ durchaus als Benennungsmotiv belegt und beide können in Bezug auf Fallen vorkommen: die Werkstoffe Metall und Holz.

Die *Vox classica* eines ‚glänzenden‘ Metalls ist uridg. **h₂(e)rĝn̥tó-* ‚Silber‘ (: **h₂erĝ-* ‚weiß, hellglänzend‘, Wodtko – Irslinger – Schneider 2008: 317-322), vgl. bspw. auch ahd. *bleh* ‚Blech, Goldblech, Amulett‘ (: uridg. **bʰleig-* ‚glänzen‘, Rix 2001²: 89, Lloyd – Lühr – Springer 1998: 174f.) Bemerkenswert ist die Information in der *Ilias*, dass Alybe, eine wohl nordostanatolische Stadt,[50] „der Geburtsort des Silbers ist" (ἀργύρου ἐστὶ γενέθλη, *Ilias* 2,857). Ein weiteres Metall, dessen östliche Herkunft möglicherweise durch seinen Namen indiziert wird, ist Oreichalkos. Hierbei handelt es sich um eine (teils zufällig entstandene) Kupferlegierung, deren exakte Natur schlechterdings nicht feststellbar ist (vgl. Muhly 1993: 120f.). Der Name *Oreichalkos*, gr. ὀρείχαλκος (*hom. Hymnus* 6,9, Ps.- Hesiod+) weist als Kompositionshinterglied unzweideutig den Metallnamen χαλκός ‚Kupfer‘ auf. Das Vorderglied ὀρει- ist entweder der Dativ/Lokativ des

---

50. Vgl. https://pleiades.stoa.org/places/554184.

Wortes für ‚Berg‘, gr. ὄρος (nt.), oder ein semitisches Lehnwort, das akkad. *erû*, *werûm* ‚Kupfer‘ (Black et al. 2000²: 438) entspricht.[51] Das Kompositum ὀρεί-χαλκος bedeutet also entweder ‚Berg-Kupfer‘ (bspw. Frisk 1970: 426, Rosół 2013: 198) oder tautologisch ‚Kupfer-Kupfer‘ (Szemerényi 1974: 151f., Muhly 1993: 120).[52] Die innergriechische Etymologie ist nach Szemerényi (*ibid.*) deswegen schwerlich zu halten, weil i. d. R. die Komposita mit Vorderglied Dat./Lok. Sg. ὀρει° oder Dat./Lok. Pl. ὀρεσ(σ)ι° verbale Rektionskomposita oder adjektivische Possessivkomposita sind, bei denen auch die lokativische Semantik erkennbar ist, vgl. ὀρεί-κτιτος ‚auf dem Berg lebend‘ (Pindar) zu κτίζω ‚siedeln‘ und die weiteren Lemmata in Liddell – Scott (1996⁹: 1247f.). Auch das griechische Wort für ‚Gold‘, χρυσός (myk.+) wurde bekanntlich aus einer semitischen Sprache entlehnt, vgl. Frisk (1970: 1122f.), Rosół (2013: 109-111). Es müsste nun angenommen werden, dass ein Adjektiv der Bedeutung ‚(silbrig) glänzend‘ aus dem Osten entlehnt wurde. Dieses wäre als Attribut eines Metalls, das beim Bau einer bestimmten Falle (Stolperfalle?) geeignet(er) war (als andere), letztlich metonymisch für die gesamte Konstruktion (‚Stolperdraht‘ → ‚Stolperfalle‘) in die griechische Sprache eingegangen.[53] Wohlgemerkt sagt der etymologische ‚Glanz‘ eines Materials letztlich nichts über die Sichtbarkeit des fertigen Produkts aus – ein Schutz*blech* am Fahrrad glänzt nicht notwendigerweise –, weswegen dieser semantische

51. Die Entlehnungshypothese hat zuerst Szemerényi (1974: 151f.) formuliert. Dabei müsste man wohl eine (volksetymologisch motivierte?) Metathese der Vokale mit anschließender Angleichung an das bekannte, semantisch freilich nicht abwegige Kompositionsvorderglied gr. ὀρε(h)ι-/ὠρε(h)ι- ‚Berg-‘ annehmen: akkad. (*w*)*erû* → gr. **erŏ̆(n)°* → **ŏ̆re°* → ὀρει°/ὠρει°. Zur Entsprechung von akkad. *û* als gr. ω(ν)° vgl. gr. χιτών ‚Gewand‘ ~ akkad. *kitû* ‚Flachs, Leinen‘ (Rosół [2013: 105-107]) oder gr. λιβανωτός ‚Weihrauch‘ ~ akkad. *lubbunû* ‚Weihrauch‘ (Rosół 2013: 65f.), zu akkad. *û* ~ gr. o(ς) vgl. gr. λίβανος ‚Weihrauch(baum)‘ ~ akkad. *lubbunû* ‚Weihrauch‘ (Rosół 2013: 63-65). Das weniger häufige langvokalische Kompositionsvorderglied gr. ὠρει° ist bspw. vom Namen Ὠρεί-θυια (*Il.*18,48+) her bekannt, weswegen die Verbindung mit der Semantik ‚Berg-‘ leicht möglich ist. Ins Lateinische wurde gr. ὀρείχαλκος schließlich ebenfalls mit volks-etymologischer Umgestaltung des Vordergliedes (nach lat. *aurum* ‚Gold‘) als *aurichalcum* entlehnt.

52. Vgl. zum Typ nhd. *klammheimlich* ← lat. *clam* ‚heimlich‘ + nhd. *heimlich*.

53. Wenn ital. *scandaglio* ‚Senkblei‘ etc. mit Meyer-Lübke (1911: 576, Nr. 7651.1) auf lat. **scandalium* ‚Senkblei‘ zurückzuführen ist, könnte dies wiederum aus gr. **σκανδάλιον* entlehnt sein. Letzteres kann plausibel als Deminutiv ‚kleines Bleistück, Bleiklümpchen‘ o. ä. interpretiert werden, vgl. χαλκίον ‚Kupfergeld‘ < **‚kleines Kupferstück‘, χρυσίον ‚Goldschmuckstück, Goldmünze‘ < **‚kleines Goldstück‘. Es ist m. E. deutlich weniger plausibel, ital. *scandaglio* mit Meyer-Lübke (1935: 633f., Nr. 7649a) als Lehnwort aus aokz. *escandal(h)* ‚(Art Raummaß)‘ (*eDOM s. v.*), das auf lat. **scandaculum* ‚Leiter; Senkblei; Sonde‘ zurückgehen soll, zu interpretieren. Letzteres sei nach Meyer-Lübke (1935: 634) mit lat. „SCANDERE ‚skandieren‘“ (‚metrisch vortragen‘?), also letztlich lat. *scandere* ‚steigen‘ zu verbinden.

Vorschlag durchaus plausibel erscheinen mag. Es sind allerdings m. E. hierbei zu viele unbelegte Zwischenschritte und Zusatzannahmen zu machen, die zudem arbiträr erscheinen:

luw. */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend, hell'
→ elliptisch ‚glänzendes Metall' > ‚(Art Metall)'
→ metonymisch ‚Metallbauteil (Draht?) einer Falle'
→ *pars pro toto* gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle (, in der das Metallbauteil verwendet ist)'.

Eine zweite Kategorie Werkstoffe, die mit einem Attribut ‚glänzend, hell' in Zusammenhang stehen kann, ist Holz. Auch Baumarten können nämlich nach der hellen Farbe ihrer Rinde oder Blätter benannt werden, vgl. uridg. *$b^h\underset{r}{}H\hat{g}o$-* ‚Birke' (helle Rinde) zu uridg. *$b^hreh_1\hat{g}$-* ‚erstrahlen, erglänzen' (Rix 2001[2]: 92, Mallory – Adams 2006: 159), nhd. *Silber-Pappel* (helle Rinde) und *Weiß-Eiche*,[54] *Silber-Weide* (helle Blätter). Es ist gut vorstellbar, dass ein Zweig der Silber-Weide sehr gut geeignet ist, als sog. Stellholz die Spannung, die für das Auslösen der Falle benötigt wird, zu halten. Andererseits eignet sich Weidengeflecht zum Bedecken einer Fallgrube. Wenngleich auch bei diesem Vorschlag gegen die einzelnen Schritte nicht viel einzuwenden ist, erscheint auch hier das Gesamtbild zu künstlich. Unbelegte Zwischenschritte und Zusatzannahmen verringern die Plausibilität des Vorschlags:

luw. */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend, hell'
→ elliptisch ‚helle(s) Laub/Rinde' → *pars pro toto* ‚Baum mit hellem/r Laub/Rinde'
synekdotisch ‚Holz/Zweig eines Baumes'
→ metonymisch ‚Holzbauteil (Stellholz? Grubenabdeckung?) einer Falle'
→ *pars pro toto* gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle (in der das Holzbauteil verwendet ist)'.

Es hat sich gezeigt, dass die Verbindung von ‚glänzend' und gr. σκάνδαλον zwar im Einzelnen möglich, aber auf den zweiten Blick m. E. zu weit hergeholt ist. Die Alternative, namentlich das *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung' als Entlehnungsgrundlage zu wählen, scheint erfolgversprechender zu sein.

---

54. In der modernen Taxonomie werden nicht nur die (nordamerikanischen) Arten *Quercus alba* und *aliena* als *Weiß-Eichen* bezeichnet, sondern sogar die gesamte Sektion *Quercus*. Die zugehörigen Arten haben i. d. R. gräulich behaarte Blattunterseiten.

b) ‚Verzierung‘ → ‚Falle‘?

Ausgehend von einer ursprünglichen Bedeutung ‚Verzierung‘ wäre das Benennungsmotiv entweder die ‚Abdeckung‘, also Tarnung der Konstruktion oder das ‚angebrachte‘ Lockmittel. Ersteres kann sowohl allgemein verstanden werden als auch konkret die Abdeckung einer Fallgrube bezeichnen. Eine solche Abdeckung besteht aus Zweigen oder dünnen Brettern, damit das Opfer bei Betreten der Konstruktion einbricht und in der Grube gefangen ist. Dabei kann das von hluw. /skandal(l)issa-(i)/ abhängige Instrument in BOYBEYPINARI 2 §4 in Erinnerung gerufen werden: hluw. /hubidad(i)-/, das nicht von */hubid-/ ‚(eine Art Kopfbedeckung?)‘ getrennt werden kann. Ebenso könnte die ‚Verzierung‘ des Berges bzw. Berggipfels in ANCOZ 8+5 eine ‚Bedeckung‘ (Decke?) sein und luw. /skandattar/n-/ eine flächige Dekoration, die auf Stoff angebracht wird (Simon in Busse – Simon 2017). Als dritte Möglichkeit kommt in Betracht, dass es sich bei der ‚Verzierung‘ um die optionale Verkleidung der Seitenwände von Fallgruben mit Holz oder Mauerwerk handelte, die geeignet ist, das Opfer daran zu hindern, wieder emporzuklettern und zu entkommen. Die anzusetzenden Zwischenschritte beschränken sich auf eine leichte Bedeutungsverschiebung und die Verwendung eines Teils für das Ganze:

luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung‘
    → ‚Camouflage (einer Fallenkonstruktion); Abdeckung (einer Fallgrube); Verkleidung (der Seitenwände einer Fallgrube)‘
    → *pars pro toto* gr. σκάνδαλον ‚(getarnte) Falle; (abgedeckte/verkleidete) Fallgrube‘.

Als letzter Vorschlag zur Entlehnungssemantik von gr. σκάνδαλον soll der Köder als ‚angebrachtes‘ Lockmittel angeführt werden. Fallen funktionieren freilich am besten bzw. manche nur dann, wenn das Opfer durch einen Köder an eine bestimmte Stelle gelockt bzw. zu einer bestimmten Handlung (Entnahme des Köders etc.) verleitet wird. Ein Köder ist also ein essenzieller Bestandteil der meisten Fallen und häufig auch opferspezifisch und unabhängig von der Art der Falle: „Mit Speck fängt man Mäuse“.[55] Folgende Entwicklung wäre anzunehmen:

---

55. Da es sich bei gr. σκάνδαλον definitiv nicht um ein Fischfanggerät handelt, sei der reflektierende (also glänzende!) Angelköder *Blinker* ohne weiteren Kommentar nur am Rande erwähnt.

luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung‘
> → ‚attraktive Anfügung (an eine Falle), Lockmittel‘
>> *pars pro toto* gr. σκάνδαλον ‚(mit einem Köder versehene) Falle‘.

In Anbetracht fehlender Evidenz kann natürlich keine sichere Entscheidung getroffen werden, welcher der angeführten Wege das Richtige trifft. Es zeigt sich aber angesichts der weniger arbiträren Annahmen zur semantischen Entwicklung, dass der Ansatz des *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung‘ deutlich attraktiver ist als der eines Adjektivs luw. */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend‘. Es sei aber explizit darauf hingewiesen, dass das nur gilt, wenn gr. σκάνδαλον tatsächlich aus dem Luwischen entlehnt ist. Wenn dies nicht der Fall sein sollte, kommt zusätzlich wieder das Adjektiv luw. */skandalla/i-/ ins Spiel, das aber nach dem oben über das Adjektiv */skandal(i)-/ Gesagte dem *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ als Glied der Derivationskette nachsteht.

3. *Anmerkungen zu lat. scandula ‚Schindel‘ und Verwandtem*

Wie gr. σκάνδαλον, lat. *scandalum* ‚Versuchung, Anstoß erregender Vorgang‘ ist auch lat. *scandula, scindula* ‚Schindel‘ ein Wanderwort, das heute noch als rum. *scîndură* ‚Brett‘, frz. *écente* (= *essente*, vgl. *CNRTL s. v.*) ‚Schindel‘ etc. (Meyer-Lübke 1935: 634 Nr. 7652) und nhd. *Schindel*, engl. *shingle* etc. fortlebt. Im antiken Latein selbst finden sich nur acht Belege für lat. *scandula* ‚Schindel‘: In einer undatierten Inschrift aus Lyon (*CIL* XIII,1730) wird berichtet, dass ein gewisser Gaius Nonius Eposius das beschriftete Heiligtum „mit einer Mauer und einer *scandula* umgibt“ (MVRO ET SCANDVLA CINXIT). Bemerkenswert ist, dass *scandula* im Singular steht, also kollektiv das ‚Geschindel, Schindeldach‘ bezeichnet,[56] vgl. ähnlich auch Pl. *tēgulae* ‚Ziegel; Ziegeldach‘. Plinius (1. Jh. n. Chr.) berichtet in seiner *Naturgeschichte* (16,15) davon, dass Schindeln aus Eichenholz die besten und von denen aus harzführenden Hölzern die Fichtenschindeln am längsten haltbar seien usw. In dieser Passage wird *scandula* ebenfalls im Singular verwendet, was bei dieser fachlichen Darlegung jedoch nicht ungewöhnlich ist. Auffälliger wiederum ist der Singular im darauffolgenden Satz, in

---

56. Auch auf der anderen Inschrift, auf der das Wort belegt ist (*CIL* III,14360,20, 1.-3. Jh. n. Chr., Szombathely [HU]), ist eine solche Bedeutung zu vermuten. Dort steht: … SCANDVLAM ET TEGERVNT NAVAL[E „…*scandula* (Akk. Sg.) und deckten die Werft(?)…“. Das Vorkommen des Verbs *tegere* ‚decken‘ deutet darauf hin, dass es um das Decken von Dächern geht, und macht wahrscheinlich, dass *scandula* hier auch ‚Schindel(dach)‘ bedeutet.

dem Plinius notiert, dass Rom gemäß Cornelius Nepos bis zum Pyrrhischen Krieg (280-275 v. Chr.) mit Schindeln (Abl. Sg. *scandula*) gedeckt war. Hier ist also weniger von einer ‚Schindel‘ (Sg.) oder einem ‚Schindeldach‘ (s. o.), sondern eher von einem Kollektivum ‚Geschindel‘ die Rede – in der deutschen Übersetzung sollte einfach der Plural ‚Schindeln‘ verwendet werden. Drei Kapitel später (16,18) steht in dem Bericht, dass üblicherweise Kiefernholz zur Herstellung von Schindeln (und Fässern etc.) verwendet wird, der Plural (Akk. Pl. *scandulas*). Vitruv (2,1,4; 1. Jh. v. Chr.) teilt mit, dass eichene Schindeln (Pl.) in den Provinzen Gallia, Hispania, Lusitania und Aquitania, also mehr oder minder im festland-europäischen Westen des Römischen Reiches zum Dachdecken verwendet werden.[57] Neben diesen Belegstellen sind in den Zettelkästen des *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* noch zwei weitere Stellen angeführt, an denen die Bedeutung ‚Schindel‘ aber eher unpassend ist: Bei Columella (8,3,6; 1. Jh. n. Chr.) werden wahrscheinlich ‚Bretter‘ oder ‚Sprossen‘ mit *scandulae* bezeichnet, die „von außen an den Fensterchen (des Schlafhäuschens im Hühnergehege) angebracht werden, durch die die Vögel zur Nachtruhe hineinkriechen können“ (… *forinsecus* […] *fenestellis scandulae similiter iniungantur, quibus inrepant aves ad requiem nocturnam*). Wenn es sich bei dieser architektonischen Konstruktion um eine Hühnerleiter handelt, besteht die Möglichkeit, dieses Wort von *scandula* ‚Schindel‘ zu trennen und in der Bedeutung ‚Stiege‘ zu lat. *scandere* ‚steigen‘ zu stellen. Andererseits könnte auch ein oder mehrere ‚schindelartige Brettchen‘, jedenfalls ‚gespaltene Brettchen, Holzscheite‘ als Landefläche oder Treppe verwendet werden. Der zweite semantisch unklare Beleg findet sich im letzten Buch des *Gallischen Krieges* (Hirtius *Bellum Gallicum* 8,42,1; 1. Jh. v. Chr.). Hier wird beschrieben, dass die Bewohner der von den Römern belagerten Stadt Uxellodunum (heute: Puy d'Issolud [FR]) „Fässer mit Talg, Pech und *scandulae* füllten und brennend auf die Belagerungsmaschinen rollen ließen“ (… *cupas sebo, pice, scandulis complent; eas ardentes in opera provolvunt*). Es ist gut möglich, dass in die Fässer tatsächlich Schindeln gegeben wurden, aber doch wahr-scheinlicher, dass es sich dabei um kleineres ‚Kienholz‘ oder ‚Spanholz‘ handelt. Da Kien- und Spanholz ebenso wie Schindeln durch Spalten hergestellt wird, kann hier von einer sekundären Bedeutungsübertragung ausgegangen werden.[58]

---

57. Bemerkenswert aber wohl ohne Bedeutung ist die *varia lectio* scandalis *HS* (neben scandulis *G*), vgl. den kritischen Apparat von Krohn (1912: 30).

58. Freilich liegt es auch im Bereich des Möglichen, dass ursprünglich *scindula* im Text stand, das nach lat. *scindere* ‚zerteilen, spalten‘ gebildet sein kann und ‚Spalt-holz‘ bezeichnete. Vgl. zur Wortform *scindula* das Folgende.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich über lat. *scandula* sagen, dass das Wort zwar einigermaßen selten belegt ist,[59] die Bedeutung, auch anhand der romanischen und fremden Fortsetzer, aber sicher als ‚Schindel' festzustellen ist.

Das Primat der *a*-haltigen Form *scandula* gegenüber der *i*-haltigen erweist sich nicht nur anhand der Beleglage – der erste verbürgte Beleg für *scindula* stammt von Isidor von Sevilla:

21) Isidor *Origines* 19,19,7 (6./7. Jh. n. Chr.)
Scindulae, eo quod scindantur*, id est, dividantur*
„*Scindulae*, weil sie *gespalten werden* (*scindi*), das heißt, geteilt werden".

Außerdem ist *scandula* gegenüber *scindula* die *Lectio difficilior*. Die Variante *scandula* kann nämlich leicht, wie es Isidor zeigt, volksetymologisch mit lat. *scindere* ‚spalten' verbunden und danach in seiner Lautform angepasst sein; der umgekehrte Weg (*scindula → scandula*) lässt sich hingegen kaum motivieren.[60]

Die etymologischen Vorschläge zu lat. *scandula* (bzw. *scindula*) ‚Schindel' sind bisher nicht zufriedenstellend: Die in de Vaan (2008: 544) und vorsichtig von Ernout – Meillet (1967: 599) vertretene Ableitung von der Wurzel *$sk^hei̯d$-‚spalten' (Rix 2001[2]: 547f.), die bspw. in lat. *scindere* ‚spalten' und gr. σχίδαξ (m.) ‚Holzscheit' fortgesetzt ist, ist zwar semantisch attraktiv, aber insofern problematisch, als die Variante *scindula* nicht die primäre Form ist. Andererseits wird von Walde – Hofmann (1954[3]: 488f.) und Pokorny (1959: 918f.) eine Verbindung zu gr. σκεδάννυμι, σκίδνημι ‚zerstreuen', jaw. 3. Pl. *scan̩daiieiṇti* ‚zerbrechen' usw. hergestellt, woraus sich die heute als uridg. *$(s)kedh_2$-‚zersplittern, zerstreuen' (Rix 2001[2]: 550f.) rekonstruierbare Wurzel extrahieren lässt. Es ist lautlich und morphologisch unmöglich, aus dieser Wurzel eine Form

---

59. Neben dem Simplex finden sich noch das Adjektiv *scandularis* ‚mit Schindeln bedeckt' (*Hapax legomenon*, Apuleius *Metamorphosen* 3,17; 2. Jh. n. Chr.) sowie die Berufsbezeichnung *scandularius* ‚Schindler, Dachdecker' (*Hapax legomenon*, *Digesta Iustinianis* 50,6,7(6); 6. Jh. n. Chr.!). Die Bedeutungen beider Wörter sind rein etymologisch festgestellt, kontextuell nicht erzwungen, aber passend. Zu gr. σκανδαλ(λ)άριος o. ä. vgl. oben § 1.g.

60. Man sollte sich wundern, wenn eine synchron nachvollziehbare etymologische Beziehung, wie sie für *scindula* ‚Schindel' < *‚gespaltener (Holzscheit)' neben *scindere* ‚spalten' anzunehmen wäre, durch eine semantisch schwierigere (*scandula* ‚Schindel' neben *scandere* ‚steigen', vgl. dazu das Folgende) ersetzt würde. Es sei außerdem darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass das Suffix lat. *-ula*-keine *Nomina rei actae*, sondern *Nomina agentis* bildet (Leumann – Hofmann – Szantyr 1977: 311), d. h., dass eine regelmäßige Ableitung von *scindere* ‚spalten' nicht die Bedeutung ‚gespalten', sondern ‚spaltend', ‚Spalter' hätte. Dies ist ein derivationsmorphologischer Hinweis auf den sekundären Charakter der Variante *scindula*.

lat. *scandula* oder *scindula* zu bilden, da nicht zuletzt der Nasal kaum zu erklären ist.[61] Wenngleich im Iranischen eine Wurzelform **sčand-* bzw. **skand-* ‚brechen‘ rekonstruiert werden muss, scheint es sich hierbei am ehesten um eine Kontamination der beiden eben genannten Wurzeln **sḱʰei̯d-* ‚spalten‘ und **(s)kedh₂-* ‚zersplittern, zerstreuen‘ zu handeln, vgl. Cheung (2007: 342f). Einen solchen Wurzelsynkretismus auch für das Lateinische nur wegen eines einzigen Wortes anzunehmen, wäre methodisch sehr fragwürdig. Diese beiden Vorschläge aus der einschlägigen Literatur scheitern also schon an formalen Hindernissen. Valpy (1828: 420) schlägt dagegen vor, *scandula* von lat. *scandere* ‚steigen‘ abzuleiten, weil Schindeln übereinander befestigt werden. Die formale Seite ist einigermaßen problemlos: Das inlautende -*a*- findet sich nicht nur im Verb *scandere* ‚steigen‘, sondern bspw. auch im nominalen Derivat *scalae* ‚Treppe‘, der Nasal ist bereits wurzelhaft und das Primat der Form *scandula* gegenüber *scindula* kann aufrechterhalten werden. Allerdings bereitet die Semantik Sorgen. Eine ursprüngliche Bedeutung ‚steigend‘ müsste angenommen werden, was aus derivationsmorphologischer Sicht durchaus möglich ist, vgl. *tēgula* ‚Ziegel‘ < *‚Deckende‘ (mit sekundärem -*ē*-) ← *tegere* ‚decken‘. Allerdings scheint mir die Art und Weise der Montage kein geeignetes Benennungsmotiv zu sein, besonders weil es kein distinguierendes Merkmal einer Schindel ist: Auch Ziegel und bspw. Reet werden freilich ‚steigend‘ angebracht, um einen günstigen Regenwasserabfluss zu gewährleisten.

Da auch für lat. *scandula* ‚Schindel‘ keine befriedigende einzelsprachliche Etymologie vorliegt, soll ebenfalls eine Entlehnung vorgeschlagen werden.

Lautlich kann lat. *scandula* problemlos auf *skandala zurückgeführt werden,[62] da im Lateinischen bis zum Ende des 3. Jh.s v. Chr. i. d. R. jeder unbetonte Kurzvokal vor *l pinguis* [ɫ] geschwächt und schließlich zu -*u*- wurde, vgl. gr. κραιπάλη ‚Rausch; Kater → Lehnwort frlat. *krápalā[63] > lat. *crāpula* ‚(Wein-)Rausch; Kater‘, frlat. **én-sa̧lsos* > *insu̧lsus* ‚geschmacklos‘ (Meiser 1998: 68f., Weiss

---

61. Ein regelmäßiges Nasalpräsens, wie es tatsächlich zu rekonstruieren ist, vgl. gr. σκίδνημι ‚spalten‘, zeigt den Nasal *nach* dem dentalen Verschlusslaut, **skid-né-h₂-/*skid-ņ-h₂-′*, vgl. Rix (2001²: 550).

62. Wie auch schon für das Griechische festgehalten (s. § 2.2.1) ist für das Lateinische eine Vorlage *skandalla mit langem /l:/ nach regulärer Phonologie nicht aufrechtzuerhalten.

63. Im Lateinischen wäre mit Erhalt des Diphthongs zu rechnen (†*craepula*), weswegen mit einer anderssprachigen Zwischenstufe oder einem analogischen Ersatz des Diphthongs -*ai̯*- durch -*ā*- (nach lat. *crāter* ‚[Wein-]Mischkrug‘?) zu rechnen wäre.

2020²: 127).[64] Das feminine Genus kann, wenn es nicht original ist, problemlos nach der anklingenden Bezeichnung einer anderen Dachbedeckung, lat. *tēgula* (f.) ‚Ziegel' eingeführt sein.

Es ist nicht davon auszugehen, dass die Römer das Wort direkt aus dem Luwischen entlehnt haben, da Kontakte zu den entsprechenden Ethnien Kleinasiens in ausreichend früher Zeit nicht nachzuweisen sind und wahrscheinlich gar nicht existent waren. Als Zwischenstufe bietet sich jedoch die griechische Sprache an, für die erörtert wurde (s. § 2.2.2), dass gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle' am ehesten ein Lehnwort aus dem *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung' ist: → ‚Bedeckung, Abdeckung, Camouflage' → ‚(bedeckte, versteckte, getarnte) Falle'. Wenn gr. σκάνδαλον also tatsächlich einst eine ‚Abdeckung', womöglich sogar eine ‚aus dünnen Brettern bestehende Abdeckung' bezeichnet haben sollte, drängt es sich als Entlehnungsgrundlage für frlat. **skandala* ‚Schindel' geradezu auf. Mit dieser Entsprechung könnte auch erklärt werden, warum an vier der sechs klassisch-lateinischen Belege für *scandula* das Wort im Singular steht, aber an zwei (oder drei) dieser Stellen sich nicht eine einzelne Schindel, sondern mehrere Schindeln, ein ‚Geschindel' bezeichnete. Es kann vermutet werden, dass aus dem Griechischen lediglich die (neutrische) Pluralform σκάνδαλα *‚(hölzerne) Abdeckungen' als frlat. **skandala* ‚dünne Holzbretter' > ‚Geschindel, Schindeldach' entlehnt wurde und dies dann nicht mit dem neutrischen Singular lat. †*scandulum*, -*ī* ‚Schindel', sondern mit dem an *tēgula* ‚Ziegel' angeglichenen Genus femininum als lat. *scandula*, -*ae* f. ‚Schindel' lexikalisiert wurde.[65]

---

64. Alessio (1969: 23-27) vermutet, dass auch lat. *scandala* ‚Dinkel' aus dem Griechischen entlehnt ist, da das -*a*- in der Binnensilbe für fremde Herkunft und Latinisierung erst nach Wirken der Vokalschwächung spricht. Alessio (1969: 25) geht von gr. σκανδάλη „bastone" […], probabilmente appunto" aus und kann dies also mit dem Dinkel verbinden, der „una spiga più appuntita' di quella del grano comune" besitzt. Nach der hier (§ 2.2) als weniger wahrscheinlich vorgestellten Entlehnungsgrundlage (luw. */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend, verziert') wäre lat. *scandala* ‚Dinkel' jedoch das ‚helle (Getreide)'. Dies passt insofern, als *scandala* ein sehr helles Korn hat (vgl. Plinius 18,62: *scandalam, nitidissimi grani* „Dinkel, hellsten Korns") und dieses Benennungsmotiv auch für das germanische *Weizen*-Wort belegt ist (Kroonen 2013: 261).

65. Es sei der Vollständigkeit halber noch knapp ausgeführt, dass auch die Bedeutung des Adjektivs luw. */skandal(i)-/ ‚glänzend, hell, verziert' als Grundlage für ‚Schindel' möglich wäre: Zum einen wurden Schindeln aus durchaus hellem Holz gefertigt (vgl. die oben erwähnten Holzarten), zum anderen aber färben sich Schindeln (unterschiedlichen Holzes) durch die Bewitterung allmählich grau, was im Kontrast zu meist rötlichen Ziegeldächern ein plausibles Benennungsmotiv darstellt. Außerdem kann ein Schindeldach im Gegensatz zum Ziegeldach in der Sonne glänzen. Auch eine Bedeutung ‚verziert' wäre möglich, wobei man von einem Diathesenwechsel ausgehen müsste: (pass.) ‚verziert' → (akt.) ‚verzierend, bedeckend' > ‚der/die/das

4. *Fazit*

Es muss den abschließenden Bemerkungen vorangestellt werden, dass alle Ergebnisse als spekulativ betrachtet werden müssen, weil die vorgeschlagene Entlehnungsquelle luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung' lediglich rekonstruiert ist und das primäre Lehnwort gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle' semantisch nicht endgültig klar ist. Die Probleme bei der sprachinternen Etymologie des griechischen und lateinischen Materials sowie die frappierende lautliche Übereinstimmung der drei Lexeme aber verlangten eine genauere Betrachtung möglicher Beziehungen untereinander.

Es sei also die folgende Hypothese zur Herkunft von gr. σκάνδαλον ‚Falle' einerseits und lat. *scandula* ‚Schindel' andererseits gestattet: Ausgehend von einem Verb hluw. /skandal(l)issa-/ ‚verzieren (± Instr.)' kann als Entlehnungsgrundlage am ehesten ein *Nomen instrumenti* luw. */skandal-/ ‚Verzierung' rekonstruiert werden. Dieses wurde im Kontaktbereich zwischen Griechen und einer luwischen (bzw. luw[o]iden, vgl. Fn. 42). Sprechergemeinschaft als Bezeichnung für die ‚tarnende Bedeckung einer Falle' *vel sim.* verwendet, von den Sprechern des Griechischen übernommen und *pars pro toto* als gr. σκάνδαλον in der Bedeutung ‚Fall(grub)e' lexikalisiert (§ 1.a). Im Rahmen innergriechischer Prozesse oder als spontane Bildungen sind ein Femininum (§ 1.b) und ein Maskulinum (§ 1.c) entstanden. Vor der lateinischen Vokalschwächung, also noch vor Ende des 3. Jh.s v. Chr. wurde möglicherweise die Pluralform des Neutrums, gr. σκάνδαλα noch in der Bedeutung ‚Bretter zur Abdeckung' ins Lateinische entlehnt und dort als Wort für das damals übliche Material zum Dachdecken, also die ‚Schindel' eingeführt.[66] Im Zuge der lateinischen Sprachgeschichte erlangte das frühlateinische Wort *skandala* seine belegte Form *scandula* ‚Schindel' und wurde in der Spätantike durch die volksetymologische Eindeutung von lat. *scindere* ‚spalten' zu *scindula* ‚Schindel' umgebildet.[67]

Bedeckende, Schindel'. Mit der ursprünglichen Bedeutung ‚(mit Schindeln) verziert, bedeckt' ließen sich auch die Belege von *scandula* im Singular, wo eigentlich Plural erwartet wäre, erklären.

66. Bemerkenswert ist der Hinweis Blümners: „In Griechenland hingegen scheint man allgemein nur Ziegeldächer gehabt zu haben" (Blümner 1879: 315 Fn. 1). Die Römer dürften also wohl kaum die Schindel als Bauteil einschließlich der entsprechenden Bezeichnung von den Griechen entlehnt haben.

67. Es sei abschließend noch einmal darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass lat. *scandala* ‚Dinkel' (Fn. 64) und ital. *scandaglio* ‚Senkblei' (Fn. 53) sehr elegant auf ein adjektivisches Lehnwort lat./gr. */skandalo-/ ‚glänzend, hell' zurückgeführt werden könnten, wenn es denn existiert hätte, was aber wohl nicht der Fall war, vgl. § 2.2.

Falls die vorgeschlagenen Entlehnungsprozesse das Richtige treffen, gehören nhd. *Skandal* und *Schindel* zu den am weitesten verbreiteten Reflexen eines luwischen Lexems.

5. *Literatur*

CNRTL = Centre National de Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales. http://www.cnrtl.fr (zuletzt aufgerufen: 04.01.2021).

eDiAna = Olav Hackstein – Jared L. Miller – Elisabeth Rieken (eds.): *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München – Marburg. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de

eDOM = DOM en ligne. Dictionnaire de l'Occitan Médiéval. http://www.dom-en-ligne.de (zuletzt aufgerufen: 04.01.2021).

eOED = Oxford English Dictionary (online). http://www.oed.com (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

PuPL = Perseus under PhiloLogic. http://perseus.uchicago.edu (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

SEG 2 = Hondius, Jacob E. (1924): *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Band 2*. Leiden

SIG[3] = Dittenberger, Wilhelm (1915): *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Leipzig

TAM V.3 = Petzl, Georg (2007): *Tituli Asiae Minoris, V. Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti. III: nos. 1415-1953*. Wien

ALESSIO, Giovanni (1969): "Etimologie Latine". In: o. N. (Hrsg.): *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani, I*. Brescia, 19-45.

BARRETT, William S. (1964): *Euripides. Hippolytos. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (2010): *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. LIEEDS 10. Leiden – Boston.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. – Norbruis, Stefan (2014): *Pre-Greek: phonology, morphology, lexicon*. Brill introductions to Indo-European languages 2. Leiden – Boston.

BICHLMEIER, Harald (2018): "Zur lautlichen Gestalt der Hydro- und Toponyme *Kander(n)*, *Laaber*, *Kondrau* und zur Frage keltischer Sprossvokale in süddeutschen Orts- und Gewässernamen". *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 53 (1): 97-110.

BLACK, Jeremy A. – GEORGE, Andrew – POSTGATE, Nicholas (Hrsgg.) (2000²): *A concise dictionary of Akkadian*. SANTAG 5. Wiesbaden.

BLÜMNER, Hugo (1879): *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern, II*. Leipzig.

BLÜMNER, Hugo (1918): *Fahrendes Volk im Altertum*. Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse Jahrgang 1918, 6. Abhandlung. München.

BOURGUET, Émile (ed.) (1929): *Fouilles de Delphes, III: Épigraphie. Fasc. 1, Inscriptions de l'entrée du sanctuaire au trésor des Athéniens*. Paris.

BUSSE, Anja – SIMON, Zsolt (2017): "CLuw. *šak(k)antat(t)ar*- ‚appliqué'". In: *eDiAna*. https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=284 (zu-letzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

CAMERON, Alan (1931): "Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor". *The American Journal of Philology* 52: 232-262.

CAMMAROSANO, Michele (2018): *Hittite Local Cults*. SBL-WAW 40. Atlanta.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1933): *La formation des noms en grec ancient*. Collection linguistique 38. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1999): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris.

CHEUNG, Johnny (2007): *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. LIEEDS 2. Leiden – Boston.

DANKER, Frederick W. (ed.) (2000³): *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*. Chicago.

DE VAAN, Michiel A. C. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. LIEEDS 7. Leiden – Boston.

DUNBAR, Nan (1995): *Aristophanes. Birds. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.

ERNOUT, Alfred – MEILLET, Antoine (1967): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.

FREESE, Albert G. F. (1842): *Schwedisch-deutsches Wörterbuch mit Benutzung der Arbeiten mehrerer älteren und neueren Lexicographen und der jetzigen Orthographie gemäß, mit beständiger Rücksicht auf nordische Geschichte, Alterthumskunde und Mythologie, so wie auf Bergbau, Seefahrtskunde und Naturgeschichte*. Stralsund.

FRISK, Hjalmar (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, *I: A-Ko*. Indogermanische Bibliothek Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

FRISK, Hjalmar (1970): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, *II: Kρ-Ω*. Indogermanische Bibliothek Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

GEMOLL, Wilhelm (2002[9]): *Griechisch-deutsches Schul- und Handwörter-buch*. München.

GINOUVÈS, René (1992): *Dictionnaire méthodique de l'architecture grecque et romaine. II. Eléments constructifs: supports, couvertures, aménagements intérieurs. Préface de Roland Martin.* Publications de l'École française de Rome 84. Rome.

GRIMM, Jacob – GRIMM, Wilhelm (1854): *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig http://woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

HANSEN, Peter Allan (2005): *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, III: pi-sigma*. Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 11. Berlin – New York.

HAWKINS, John David (2019): "Two ANCOZ Texts Combined?". In: Natalia Bolatti Guzzo – Piotr Taracha (Hrsgg.): "*And I Knew Twelve Languages*". *A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Warsaw, 233-238.

HOLDEN, James H. (2009[4]): *Rhetorius the Egyptian. Astrological compen-dium: containing his explanation and narration of the whole art of astrology*. Tempe.

HOLZBERG, Niklas (2019): *Babrios. Fabeln. Griechisch-Deutsch.* Sammlung Tusculum. Boston.

KROHN, Fritz (1912): *Vitruvii de architectura libri decem*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig.

KROONEN, Guus (2013): *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic.* LIEEDS 11. Leiden – Boston.

LEUMANN, Manu – HOFMANN, Johann Baptist – SZANTYR, Anton (1977[5]): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre. Band 1, Abteilung 2, Teil 2.* München.

LIDDELL, Henry G. – SCOTT, Robert (1996[9]): *A Greek-English lexicon. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. With a revised supplement*. Oxford.

LLOYD, Albert L. – SPRINGER, Otto (1988): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen. I: -a-bezzisto*. Göttingen.

LLOYD, Albert L. – LÜHR, Rosemarie – SPRINGER, Otto (†) (1998): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen. Unter Mitwirkung von Karen K. Purdy. II: bî-ezzo*. Göttingen.

MALLORY, James P. – ADAMS, Douglas Q. (2006): *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. New York.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1976): *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, *III: Y-H*. Nachträge und Berichtigungen. Indogermanische Bibliothek Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred (1996): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, *II: N-H*. Indogermanische Bibliothek Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

MELCHERT, H. Craig. (2003): "Language". In: id. (Hrsg.): *The Luwians*. HdO I/68. Leiden – Boston, 170-210.

MEISER, Gerhard (1998): *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.

MEISSNER, Torsten (2013): "Forschungsbericht. Griechische Etymologie. Anläßlich von Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*". *Kratylos* 58: 1-32.

MEYER-LÜBKE, Wilhelm (1911): *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher. III. Reihe: Wörterbücher 3. Heidelberg.

MEYER-LÜBKE, Wilhelm (1935[3]): *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Sammlung romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher. III. Reihe: Wörterbücher 3. Heidelberg.

MUHLY, James D. (1993): "Metalle. B. Archäologisch". In: Erich Ebeling – Ernst F. Weidner – Michael P. Streck (Hrsgg.): *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie, VIII: Meek-Mythologie*. Berlin – New York, 119-136.

MURAOKA, Takamitsu (2009): *A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised edition.* Louvain – Walpole.

OLSON, S. Douglas (2002): *Aristophanes. Acharnians. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford – New York.

OPFERMANN, Andreas – SASSEVILLE, David (2017a): "HLuw. /*skandal(l)issa*/ 'to furnish with applications, make gleam'". In: *eDiAna.* https://www.ediana.gwi. uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=279 (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

OPFERMANN, Andreas – SASSEVILLE, David (2017b): "PLuw. **skanda-* '(gleaming, bright) decoration'". In: *eDiAna.* https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=284 (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

ORTH, Ferdinand (1914): Jagd. In: August Pauly – Georg Wissowa – Wilhelm Kroll (Hrsgg.): *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft I.9,1. Neue Bearbeitung:* Hyaia *bis* Imperator. Stuttgart, 558-604.

PERPILLOU-THOMAS, Françoise (1995): "Artistes et athlètes dans les papyrus grecs d'Égypte". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 108: 225-251.

PFEIFER, Wolgang (1993[2]): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen. Digitalisierte und von Wolfgang Pfeifer überarbeitete Version im Digitalen Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* Berlin. https://www.dwds.de/d/wb-etymwb (zuletzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

POETTO, Massimo. 2010: "L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica ANCOZ 5 (A) rivista e completata". In: René Lebrun – Julien De Vos (Hrsgg.): *Hethitica XVI. Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu dicata* BCILL 126. Louvain-la-Neuve, 131-138.

POKORNY, Julius (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Bern – München.

POTT, August F. (1833): *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen mit besonderem Bezug auf die Lautumwandlung im Sanskrit, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Littauischen und Gothischen.* Lemgo.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2010): "Das Zeichen ⟨sà⟩ im Hieroglyphen-Luwischen". In: Yayına Hazırlayan – Aygül Süel (Hrsgg.): *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri. Çorum 25-31 Ağustos 2008. Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology. Çorum, August 25-31, 2008.* Ankara, 651-660.

RIX, Helmut (1992[2]): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- u. Formenlehre.* Darmstadt.

RIX, Helmut (Hrsg.) (2001[2]): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer.* Wiesbaden.

ROSÓŁ, Rafał (2013): *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen.* Frankfurt am Main.

SASSEVILLE, David (2014–2015): "Luwian and Lycian Agent Nouns in *-é-leh₂*". *Die Sprache* 51: 105-124.

SASSEVILLE, David (2021): *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian.* Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 21. Leiden – Boston.

SCHEPERS, Menno Antonius (1905): *Alciphronis rhetoris epistvlarvm libri IV.* Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecorvm et romanorvm Tevbneriana. Stuttgart.

SCHMITT, Rüdiger (2015): "Rezension zu: R. Beekes, *Pre-Greek. Phonology, Morphology, Lexicon. Edited by Stefan Norbruis*". *Kratylos* 60: 131-134.

SCHUMACHER, Stefan (2004): *Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon.* IBS 110. Innsbruck.

SCHWYZER, Eduard (1939): *Griechische Grammatik: auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2,1,1. München.

SIMON, Zsolt (2017a): "CLuw. *šakantama/i-* 'decorated with appliqué'". In: *eDiAna*. https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=283 (zu-letzt aufgerufen: 20.11.2020).

SIMON, Zsolt (2017b): "δέπας und die anderen: Spuren eines verschollenen luw(o)iden Dialekts?" *Wékʷos. Revue d'études indoeuropéennes* 3: 245-259.

SZEMERÉNYI, Oswald (1974): "The Origins of the Greek Lexicon: *Ex Oriente Lux*". *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 94: 144-157.

VALPY, Francis E. J. (1828): *An Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language*. London.

WALDE, Alois – POKORNY, Julius (1927): *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin – Leipzig.

WALDE, Alois – HOFMANN, Johann Baptist (1954[3]): *Lateinisches etymo-logisches Wörterbuch. II: P-S*. Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Abteilung, Lehr- und Handbücher. Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

WEISS, Michael (2020[2]): *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.

WODTKO, Dagmar S. – IRSLINGER, Britta S. – SCHNEIDER, Carolin (2008): *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Indogermanische Bibliothek Reihe 2, Wörterbücher. Heidelberg.

The alleged Anatolian loanwords in Etruscan: A reconsideration

Zsolt Simon[*]
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

1. *Introduction: the state of the art*

Nowadays it is generally accepted that Etruscan, together with its two known relatives, Lemnian and Raetian, constitute the Tyrrhenian language family, further relatives of which are still unknown,[1] and the evergreen theories of Etruscan as a member of the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European languages or, as an Indo-European language in general, are false.[2]

Nevertheless, the problem, which goes back to the beginning of the research more than a century ago, that some Etruscan words are similar to their Anatolian

1. For the demonstration of kinship with Lemnian, see already Brandenstein (1948: cols. 1925-1929), Rix (1968); with Raetian see Schumacher (1998), (2004: 294-316); Rix (1998a); in general see Steinbauer (1999a: 363-366); Wallace (2008: 215-225).

2. For attempts after Rix (1984a), the first modern grammar, see e.g. Adrados (1989, 1994, 2005); Woudhuizen (1992), (2008), (2019); Steinbauer (2011); for their refutations Neu (1991); de Simone (1997b), (2011); Lebrun (2009); Oettinger (2010: 241-243) (cf. also Beekes 1993: 52). See Facchetti (2005) for a general discussion of pseudo-scholarly suggestions on the relatives of Etruscan.

equivalents remained unsolved. Although this problem is widely neglected in contemporary Etruscology,[3] including the standard Etruscan grammar (Wallace 2008: 127-129), there is in fact a widespread view among Indo-Europeanists that these Etruscan words are loanwords from the Anatolian languages,[4] and this view has been codified in one of the standard introductions to Indo-European linguistics (Fortson 2010: 275). A celebrated American Indo-European linguist went even as far as to claim that Etruscan "*may be a heavily 'Anatolianized' non-Indo-European Asiatic language*" (Watkins 2001: 51).[5]

Surprisingly enough, this claim, which was presented in detail by Steinbauer (1999a: 367-386), has never been critically investigated in its entirety. Next to Oettinger (2010: 241-243), who discussed approximately half of the proposals, only very few and selected cases have been scrutinized. Oettinger frequently agreed with the positive judgements of Steinbauer, and concluded that the "relativ sichere" loanwords are *aril*, *Culśu*, *Mean*, and *Tarχna*, and "relativ wahrscheinliche" cases are *halχ*, *Pesna*, and *spanti* (Oettinger 2010: 242, see below s.vv. for a detailed discussion of these cases). Oettinger classified the remaining words as "*ganz unsichere Anklangsetymologie*". However, the reasons behind his classification are not clear: Why is the connection of *halχ* 'a type of vessel' with Hitt. *ḫalwani-* 'a type of drinking vessel' not an *Anklangsetymologie* and, on the contrary, why is the connection of *heva-* 'all, every' with *ḫūmant-* 'dto' <*ḫŭ̄w-ant-* an *Anklangsetymologie*? Oettinger's approach was also criticized by de Simone, who considered his examples as "molto fragili" (2013: 18 n. 42) and claimed that they remained questionable, at the least (2012: 373, citing him as "Öttinger"), although

---

3. See after the publication of Steinbauer (1999a) (the most detailed treatment of these words) e.g. Prayon (2001: 30-34); Marchesini (2009: 104-108); Bagnasco Gianni (2012, esp. 65-68); Briquel (2012, esp. 14-20); Turfa (2013), (2018, esp. 638-640); Camporeale (2015: 87-96, 230-234); Bell – Carpino (2016) (in this volume esp. Wallace 2016); Smith (2016: 15-22); Bellelli (2017); Naso (2017) (in this volume esp. Ulf 2017); Belfiore (2020); only some vague references can be found in a single chapter (de Simone 2012) of Bellelli (2012). It is unclear what Bellelli – Benelli (2018: 19) meant by the Etruscan-Hittite "parallelismi" that turned out to be without foundation. It is similarly unclear to me if Benelli's general claim about the lack of "qualunque tipo di rapporto" between Etruscan and the languages of Asia Minor (2020: 10) includes these alleged loanwords.

4. Steinbauer (1999a: 366-389) (who has, however, later 2011 argued for genetic relationship); Beekes (2002: cols. 221-226) (followed by Kloekhorst 2012: 50); Oettinger (2010: 241-242); Schrijver (2019: 321) (referring to Steinbauer's collection); cf. already Carruba (1977) and Pallottino (1988: 476-477).

5. Note that the theory of Bachvarova (2007) of Tyrrhenian areal influence on Kizzuwatna Luwian (repeated in Bachvarova 2012: 150, 2016: 361-362) has no linguistic basis, see the criticism in Simon (2016: 330-332).

he only formulated counter-arguments in two cases (cf. below Nos. 10 and 36). Beyond these, one can mention only a paper by Duhoux (2007: 72-78 on *śuθi*, see No. 34 below) and my nine entries in the *eDiAna* (s.vv. *cel*, *maru*, *matu*, *śuθi*, *tamera*, *tmia*, *tupi*, *=(u)m*, Simon 2017a-d, 2019b-c, 2020a-b, 2021).

In other words, a critical investigation of these alleged loanwords or a loanword layer of Etruscan is still missing. This paper is devoted to examining this problem. Note that these alleged loanwords are not merely of linguistic interest but also play an important role in theories about the origins of the Etruscans. The loanwords indicate a problem to be explained by the autochthonous hypothesis,[6] and appear as evidence supporting the hypothesis of immigration from Anatolia (cf. Beekes 2003: 29-36). Accordingly, the question of whether these loan contacts existed is not without historical interest.

In the following, after the methodological preliminaries (§2), the proposed borrowings will be discussed in detail in Latin alphabetical order (§3), and followed by a tabular overview organised according to the probability of the proposals (§4). The paper closes with an analysis of the possible scenarios regarding the formally and semantically possible loanword proposals (§5).

2. *Methodological considerations and scope*

By far most detailed overview of these loanwords can be found in Steinbauer (1999a: 367-386). It serves as the current starting point for any discussion, and has been complemented here by additional material presented in later publications.[7] I

---

6. According to Oettinger (2010: 242), these loanwords were transmitted to the Etruscans by the Lemnians. The Lemnian – Etruscan contacts must have been broken down, however, quite early, since their alphabets are not identical, but originate in two different sources (Malzahn 1999 [*contra* de Simone (2004)]). This radically reduces the length of the period for the transmission (c. 1150 - 800 BCE). Furthermore, this hypothesis assumes active Lemnian – Etruscan contacts, but they are not really attested: Oettinger (2010: 239) could quote only the female praenomen *Lemni* (Ta 1.66) as evidence.

7. Watkins (2001), Lebrun (2006) (who overlooked Steinbauer 1999a), Duhoux (2008), Schrijver (2019), add also Eichner (1985) ignored in Steinbauer (1999a). Although Steinbauer's references to earlier literature are not complete, that literature will only rarely be taken into account here, since the goal of this paper is not the history of the research, but a critical investigation of the evidence for the current widespread view.

have pursued completeness in collecting the material, but some cases may have been unintentionally omitted.[8]

The following categories of the proposed material must be left out of consideration, since for methodological reasons they have no argumentative value (with the examples of Steinbauer):

1) nursery words (*apa* 'father', *ati* 'mother');

2) onomatopoetic words (*hiul* 'owl' [see already Fiesel in Lehmann-Hartleben – Fiesel (1935: 80-81) ("vermutlich")],[9] *tupi* '(unknown, punishment[?], suffering[?])' [on this word see the critical discussion in Simon (2017d)]);

3) personal names, as they do not necessarily imply real or immediate linguistic borrowings, and their etymology cannot be independently ascertained if it is not immediately transparent, as, for instance, an early Indo-European compound personal name can be. Providing Anatolian etymologies for Etruscan names is a *petitio principii* until any Anatolian connection of Etruscan is independently proved.[10] Note that we have the same problem

8. Some of these words were used in the discussions on the alleged Indo-European or Anatolian parentage of Etruscan. However, these discussions have been left out of consideration here, since they are outdated.

9. According to Steinbauer (1999a: 374-375) the earlier form of the Etruscan word was **hiwVl-* <**huwVl-* with dissimilation next to labials, thus "*die Übereinstimmungen zwischen* hiul (…) *und* huwala- [the assumed Hittite word for 'owl' – Zs. S.] *sind zu spezifisch, um ausschließlich auf lautsymbolischer Polygenese zu beruhen*". Oettinger (2010: 242) called this "*sehr fraglich*", without arguments. The dissimilation is *petitio principii* and thus, no earlier form **huwVl-* can be reconstructed (which would anyway make the onomatopoetic analysis even more probable). Note, furthermore, that Eichner (2013: 33 n. 46) questioned the meaning 'owl' on morphological grounds (*hiuls* Vc 7.1 would be ablative) and explained the word as deriving from *hi-χva-la-s 'omnibus'.

10. This is exactly what Steinbauer (1999a: 382-383, 453) did when he assumed that Etr. *Pesna* (a masculine praenomen) is connected to Hitt. "*pešna-*" 'man', cf. also the Hittite personal name *Piš(e)ni-* (followed by Oettinger 2010: 241, 242 ["relativ wahrscheinlich"], but rejected by de Simone 2013: 18 n. 42, without arguments; note that the attested form of the Hittite word is *pešn-/pišen-* [Kloekhorst (2008: 670)] and the nom. sg. is hidden behind the spelling LÚ-*aš*, which may refer to */pesas/, as Kloekhorst proposed on the analogy of *ḫāraš, ḫāran-* 'eagle', but also to */pesnas/). But such etymologies can be easily created: It can be quickly "demonstrated" that Uni, an important Etruscan goddess whose name is the Etruscan adaptation of Iuno, actually carries a Luwian name, from the Luwian word *wana/i-* 'woman', with the regular Luwian sound change *wa > u* and with the semantic change 'woman' > 'goddess' (as an analogy, see, e.g. Eng. *queen* from the same Indo-European word). This is exactly the same type of speculation used to explain Etr. *Pesna* from Hitt. "*pešna-*" 'man'.

Similarly, Beekes (2003: 19-20, 47) with ref. saw a borrowing from Lydian in the name of Sergestus, a fellow of Aeneas in the Aeneid (cf. Lyd. *Srkastu-*, Phryg. *Surkastos*) that would have survived in Etr. *Sekst-alu*. According to Beekes, it is impossible that Vergilius obtained a name from

      with the divine names, too, but since they play a crucial role in the loan-word theories, they will be included and discussed.

4)   toponyms (*Curtun*, *Arno*, Lebrun 2006: 371), as their Anatolian etymologization faces the same problems as that of the personal names.

    As for the evaluation criteria, it must be underlined that, as basic logic implies and investigations of contemporary languages demonstrate, borrowings do not happen in a phonologically arbitrary way, but according to the phonology of the borrowing language. In other words, they follow rules. There *are* isolated, irregular cases due to several factors, but one can confidently exclude the possibility that as many cases (c. forty) as noted here are all irregular and do not follow any rule. Besides, only regular loanwords are falsifiable assumptions; irregular loanwords are a matter of belief. These considerations are especially important in the current case, when the very assumption of the Etruscan – Anatolian loan contacts is still in need of proving. Accordingly, one has to show first proven, regular loanwords, before proposing irregular ones.

    A more problematic issue is the semantic differences in the alleged borrowings. Since there are no generally accepted criteria, different meanings will be discussed in every case, whether the differences can be explained by cross-linguistically supported semantic changes or there is no evidence for the assumed semantic change.

3. *The proposed loanwords*

    3.1. =(*i*)*a* 'and, but' ~ Hitt. =*a* 'and' (Steinbauer (1999a: 367) and Oettinger (2010: 242 n. 25), Oettinger's scepticism was unfounded as it relied upon the etymology of the word, which has no role in case of the borrowing). Steinbauer (1999a: 146-148) argued for the existence of such an Etruscan particle; if this is correct, then a theoretically possible case may be made.

Anatolia, in other words, he must have taken it from a source following Etruscan traditions. But of course it cannot be excluded that Vergilius looked for a typical Anatolian name for a fellow of Aeneas. However it may have happened, neither Sergestus nor his name were Etruscan. The connection with *Sekstalu* is phonologically *ad hoc* and *Sekstalu* represents an internal derivation from the praenomen **Sekste* (de Simone 2011: 187, 2012: 366). The same applies to *Corythus* (*contra* Beekes 2003: 55). Finally, the name of the mythical leader, *Nanos*, was classified as "Lallname" by Beekes (2003: 3) himself.

3.2. *an* 'relative pronoun [+anim]' ~ Hitt. *anna/i-* 'a demonstrative pronoun' (Steinbauer 1999a: 368). While the equation is semantically not impossible (note that the existence of the Hittite pronoun [probably a loan from Luwian, Melchert (online) on §17.7] is now firmly established, contrary to earlier doubts [Melchert (2009: 151-152); Goedegebuure (2014: 211-217)]), there is the formal problem of the unexplained disappearance of the vowel of the second syllable (it disappears in Etruscan only in closed syllables, but in that case, the word-final consonant is retained).

3.3. *ar-* 'hochheben, halten, (Kinder) aufziehen' ~ Luw. *ari(ya)-* 'raise; check, restrain' as well as its derivative *aril* 'Atlas' <*ari(j)allu* 'Träger, Halter' ~ Luw. **ariyalla/i-* (Steinbauer 1999a: 369 [on the meaning cf. (1998: 272)]) and Oettinger (2010: 241 ["vielleicht"], 242 ["relativ sicher"]); cf. Duhoux 2007: 78). Although both proposals could be possible, formally speaking, there are semantic and formal problems on the Etruscan side. First, the verb *ar-* 'to make, to do *vel sim.*' is generally regarded as belonging to the semantic sphere of making, building, working and constructing (e.g. Wallace 2008: 52 and Belfiore 2014: 32-33), which does not really fit the meaning of the Luwian verb. However, Steinbauer (1999a: 252-253) made a strong case for the meanings he provided. Second, and more importantly, the suffix *-il* does not lead to agent nouns, but to action nouns, and not necessarily from a verbal stem (see e.g. *acil* 'work', *avil* 'year'). Accordingly, Wallace (2008: 52) interpreted the inscription *aril* next to a giant on the bronze mirror from Vulci (Vc S.2) approximately as 'labour' instead of 'Atlas'. Similarly, also Facchetti (2002: 102) identified *aril* as an action noun, but proposed a meaning 'support' (Hadas-Lebel 2020: 204 n. 16 finds both Steinbauer's and Facchetti's solution possible; for a history of the research see Martino 1987: 13-18). Whatever the precise meaning is, this is clearly an internal derivative, and thus only the parallelism of the verbal stems may present a theoretically possible case (the loss of the stem final *-i-* requires an explanation, but it may be attributed to the Etruscan syncope). In other words, this etymology cannot be entirely excluded.

3.4. *ara* 'Hof, Gut, Besitz' ~ Lyd. *aara-* 'estate' (Steinbauer 1999a: 369-370). See below No. 30 *pera*.

3.5. *atr-* 'selbst' ~ Lyc. A *atla-/atra-* 'person, self' (Steinbauer 1999a: 370). Already Steinbauer admitted that his argument for this meaning is morphologically dubious and the meaning of the Etruscan word "nicht hunderprozentig zu erbringen

ist", more precisely, it is normally booked as *atrš* 'funerary chamber' (e.g. Belfiore 2016: 160-161). Thus, this connection cannot be maintained.

3.6. *avil* 'year' ~ Luw. *awī-* 'to come' (Steinbauer 1999a: 370-371). It is formally possible (as an *-il* action noun derivative from the verb, cf. No. 3), and although the semantic connection is not immediately obvious, it cannot be excluded.

3.7. =*c* 'and' ~ Lyd. =*k* 'dto' or Luw. =*ḫa* 'dto' (Steinbauer 1999a: 371 n. 10 and Lebrun 2006: 372). A borrowing from the Lydian form (but not from the Luwian form, as the disappearance of the final vowel cannot be explained) is theoretically possible.

3.8. *cel* 'earth' ~ Lyd. *kλida-* 'dto' (Steinbauer 1999a: 371-372: "nicht zuverlässig"; labelled by Oettinger (2010: 242) as "sehr fraglich" without arguments). The proposal is phonologically and probably also morphologically false, see the detailed discussion in Simon (2020a) with refs.

3.9. *ci* 'deictic particle in place adverbs' (cf. *cipen* > *cepen*, *pen* 'unten, unter-', *cehen*, *hen* 'außen, äußer-') ~ Hitt. *kinun* 'now' (Steinbauer 1999a: 372). Although the meanings are partly different (*cepen* can be a quantifier, but – contrary to the widespread view – definitely not 'priest' [Adiego (2006: 204-214)] and *cehen* means 'this'), *ce-* of *cehen* may serve as a starting point (Wallace 2008: 65). Nevertheless, this is purely speculative. *kinun* is a Hittite lexical innovation (cf. Cuneiform Luwian *nānun* 'now') and might possibly include the enclitic form *ki-* of the demonstrative pronoun of the first-person deixis (Kloekhorst 2008: 478-479). Thus, the parallelism cannot be fully excluded, but Steinbauer's claim ("[d]ie exakte lautliche und semantische Gleichung zwischen heth. ki- und etr. ci- kann schwerlich durch Entlehnung oder Zufall zustande gekommen sein") is methodologically unfounded, as will be discussed in the final section (§5).

3.10. *Culśu* 'Fate Goddess' ~ Hitt. *Gulša-* 'Fate Goddesses', both <*kuls-*, cf. also *Culśanś* 'double-headed fate god' (Steinbauer 1999a: 372-373 ["*eine semantisch und lautlich befriedigende Übereinstimmung*, *die kaum zufällig sein wird*"], Lebrun 2006: 371, and Oettinger 2010: 241 ["*wahrscheinlich*"], 242 ["*relativ sicher*"]). Philological problems pervade all possible aspects of this idea on both sides. The Etruscan divinities are not fate gods: Culśu is a female demon, a guardian of the gate to the Underworld, and Culśanś is the god of the gates (E. Simon 2006: 58 with refs.). Thus, there is no semantic connection with the Hittite

divinities and this etymology was accordingly excluded by de Simone (1997a: 41), (2012: 365), (2013: 18 n. 42) (cf. already Rix 1986: 20 n. 9, their name might be based on the word for 'gate, door', but see Steinbauer 1996). Moreover, after a heavy debate, the newly published text KpT 1.72 confirmed W. Waal's hypothesis that *Gulša-* is in fact to be read as GUL-*ša-* and the underlying divinities are called *Kuwanšeš* (Waal 2019 with refs.[11]). In other words, nothing remains to be compared.

3.11. *cver*(*a*) 'votive offering$^{?}$' ~ Hitt. *kuera-* 'field parcel, territory, area' ← Hitt. *kuer-* 'to cut' (Steinbauer 1999a: 373-374). Steinbauer himself admitted that this connection is valid only if the semantic change 'schneiden' > 'Standbild' > 'Weihgabe' can be reconstructed for *cver*(*a*) (on the meaning of the Etruscan word(s) see most recently Maras 2009: 84-85). Although this is not unparalleld, there is no independent evidence for that in this case. Thus, the suggestion cannot be proved.

3.12. *halχ* 'a type of vessel' <*halv* ~ Hitt. *ḫalwani-* 'a type of drinking vessel' (Steinbauer 1999a: 374 with n. 2 and Oettinger 2010: 242 ["vielleicht", "relativ wahrscheinlich"]). Setting aside the question of the earlier form of the Etruscan word, it remains unexplained why and how the syllables °*ani-* disappeared. Steinbauer analyses the Hittite word as *ḫalwa-ni-* '*Höhlung' from *ḫallūwa-* 'hollow, deep', but there is no such derivational suffix in Hittite. Moreover, the Hittite word has a by-form, *ḫaliwani-*, which excludes this derivation (HW² Ḫ: 89-90).

It must be noted that also the earlier form of the Etruscan word, as reconstructed by Steinbauer, is problematic. Due to the cognacy of Etr. *maχ* 'five', Lemn. *mav* 'dto', and Etr. *muvalχ* 'fifty' as well as to the Etruscan χv ~ χ-variations it is clear that one can count with a different earlier phoneme in the final position,[12] but Rix (1984a: 210), (1987-1988: 184-187) (ignored by Steinbauer 1999b: 203, who assumed a *v > χ change) already proposed a phonetically more plausible solution: Etr. final -χ goes back to Proto-Tyrrhenian *χ^{w}, which, in Etruscan, became -χ in final position; in Lemnian, however, it became -*v* in final position. This would mean Pre-Etruscan *halχ^{w}. In this case, an Anatolian connection would only be possible if *ḫalwani-* is a Luwian loanword in Hittite, because then one can as-

11. Only for the sake of completeness shall be mentioned that Yakubovich (2020: 281 n. 6) maintains the outdated reading without refuting the clear textual evidence provided in Waal (2019).

12. Most recently Eichner (2012: 25-26) challenged the existence of Lemn. *mav* with good arguments. However, the remaining cases also call for a sound law.

sume the rare but attested Luwian laryngeal loss in this consonant cluster (Melchert 1994: 258) and trace the word back to Luwian *ḫalḫʷani-.[13] However, this still does not explain the loss of °ani-, and cannot be assumed due to the above-quoted variation (ḫalwani- and ḫaliwani-) in the Hittite word. In other words, this connection is to be rejected.

3.13. *heva* 'all, every' <*$h_2ēwo$- ~ Hitt. *ḫūmant*- 'every, all; whole' <*$hŭ̄want$- <*$h_2a/ow(e/o)$- (Steinbauer 1999a: 374). The etymology of the Hittite word is actually unknown (Kloekhorst 2008: 362), and thus, its earlier form is not assured. But even this *$h_2a/ow(e/o)$- does not lead to *heva*, and Steinbauer was therefore required to assume a lengthened grade (*$h_2ēwo$-), which is a *petitio principii*. Therefore, this etymology is to be rejected.[14]

3.14. *hupni* 'sterbliche Reste, Leichnam, Asche' <*$hup(a)$- ~ Lyc. A *χupa-* 'grave' (Steinbauer 1999a: 375-376). Since the meaning of *hupni* is rather 'tomb *vel sim.*' (Belfiore 2016: 147-159), only the morphology requires explanation, which is, however, problematic, admitted by Steinbauer, too. He reconstructed *$hup(a)$-ni($V^?$)- 'dem Grab zugehörig', admitting that the existence of an appurtenance suffix -ni- is not without problems. Therefore, he assumed that the derivation could have been different. This means, however, that the connection cannot be proved on morphological grounds.

3.15. *huśur* 'children' ~ Hitt. *ḫāšša-* 'descendant' (Steinbauer 1999a: 376). According to Steinbauer, the Etruscan word goes back to *$huns°$, either from *hns- or from *$hans°$ (in which also the Hittite word would originate). He explained the different stem class with the analogical case of *Culśu-* ~ *Gulša-*, but we saw that this case does not exist. All of the sound changes assumed for Etruscan by Steinbauer are *ad hoc*. Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

---

13. As for the phonetic details, the different reflexes of the Luwian laryngeals in the Etruscan word could be explained by the two types of Luwian laryngeals or by the complementary distribution of h and χ (the first one only in initial position, the other one in all other positions, Rix 2000: 145). Setting aside the much-debated issue of the phonetics of the Luwian laryngeals, Etruscan h, χ, and c/k/q could obviously be reconciled with any of them.

14. *Heva* could regularly continue Old Etruscan *$hiva$ (Wallace 2008: 34), and considering Steinbauer's view that *hiul* goes back to *$huwVl$- (if it is to be identified with Hitt. *ḫuwala-*, see n. 9), one could regularly reconstruct *$hiva$ <*$huwa$ and thus an identification with the Hittite word. However, as we could see above, the identification *hiul* ~ *ḫuwala-* is probably false.

3.16. *ika* 'this' ← **ka-* ~ Hitt. *ka-* 'dto' (Steinbauer 1999a: 376-377 [with a secondary unetymological prothetic vowel in Etruscan] and Lebrun 2006: 372). The assumption of a secondary unetymological prothetic vowel is *ad hoc*, and thus, this proposal is to be excluded.

3.17. *ita* 'this' ← **ta-* ~ Proto-Anat. *ta-*, cf. Hitt. *ta-* "'da, dann' < 'hier'" (Steinbauer 1999a: 377 [with a secondary unetymological prothetic vowel in Etruscan]). Setting aside the fact that the Hittite word is a clause conjunctive particle (Weitenberg 1992; Rieken 1999) probably originating from a demonstrative pronoun (Kloekhorst 2008: 801), and thus only its precursor could be compared, the assumption of a secondary unetymological prothetic vowel is *ad hoc*. As a result, the proposal is to be rejected.[15]

3.18. *iθal* 'bad' ~ Hitt. *idālu-* / *idālau̯-* 'bad, evil' (Lebrun 2006: 372). This comparison cannot be upheld either formally (the apocope is not explained) or semantically since the meaning of *iθal* is simply unknown.

3.19. *-l* 'intensifying element in demonstrative pronouns' ~ Hitt. *-il(a)* 'intensifying particle in personal pronouns' (Steinbauer 1999a: 377). If Steinbauer's analysis is correct (but he himself claims that the meaning of the particle cannot be defined, Steinbauer 1999a: 93), it is a theoretically possible etymology.

3.20. *maχ* 'vier' <*mav (cf. Lemnian *mav* 'dto') ~ CLuw. *māwa-* 'four' (Steinbauer 1999a: 378). As pointed out in Simon (2021), this classic assumption (since Hamp 1958) is neither phonologically nor semantically possible: the Etruscan numeral means 'five' (cf. already Rix 1969: 848 and de Simone 2011: 175-176, on the Lemnian word see also above) and Etr. final -χ goes back either to *χ^w or *χ (as per above s.v. *halχ*), and *māwa-* probably never had such (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 571-572).[16]

3.21. *man* 'monument' <'*Sichtbares o.ä.' (cf. *mal(e)na* 'mirror' <**manV-na-* 'als zum Sehen/Betrachten geeignet') ~ Luw. *manā-* 'look at, see; experience'

---

15. I admit that I do not understand Steinbauer's claim "[d]*aß in diesem Fall das Etruskische ein Erbstück besser bewahrt hat, kann nicht als Argument gewertet werden. Es liegt vielmehr ein bedeutender Beweis vor*!".

16. The loss of this case implies that the assumption of Beekes (2001: 360) and Oettinger (2010: 243 n. 26) that the preservation of final /v/ in Lemnian refutes the theory of de Simone (1996) (the Lemnians would be Etruscans who emigrated c. 700) is false.

(Steinbauer 1999a: 378-379). The assumed semantic changes are *petitio principii*, just like the dissimilation in *malena*.[17] In addition, both the derivation and the form of *man* remain unexplained, since the Luwian word was phonetically probably /mnā-/ (Melchert 1994: 236-237). Accordingly, this proposal is to be rejected.

3.22. *maru* 'a type of official' ← **mar-* 'to order, command' ~ Lyc. A *mara-* 'law' ← *mar-* 'to order' (Steinbauer 1999a: 379 and Lebrun 2006: 372; but Oettinger 2010: 242: "sehr fraglich"). The borrowing of the verbal stem (the derivatives of which are also attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian) is theoretically possible, but Simon (2019b) has argued that it is cross-linguistically easy to match CVC-roots among non-related languages, and has thus rejected it (on this problem see §5).

3.23. *matu* 'wine' ~ CLuw. *maddu-* 'wine; wine vinegar?', HLuw. *matu-* 'wine' (Watkins 2001: 51). As discussed in Simon (2017a), although the meaning of *matu* is unknown, it cannot mean 'wine' on contextual grounds. Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

3.24. *Mean* 'Hebe, (reife) Jugend, Jugendkraft' <**mi-* + *-an-* 'abstract suffix' ~ Hitt. *mai-*/*mi-* 'to grow (up)' or <**mian* ~ Hitt. *mayant-* 'young, adult man', *miyātar* 'growth, abundance' (Steinbauer 1999a: 379). *Mean* can obviously not be derived from *miyātar* and *mayant-*; the assumption of the abstract suffix cannot be excluded (cf. Steinbauer 1999a: 111), but it is not generally accepted. Oettinger (2010: 241) ("vielleicht", "relativ sicher") explained it from the *genii* of thriving, *Miyatan-zipa* or *Miyanna-*. The former obviously does not fit formally; the latter almost does, except for the problem of the irregular loss of the stem vowel (cf. above No. 2). The real problem is the identification of Mean (see the discussion in Steinbauer (1998: 269-270), who argues for Hebe), who is generally supposed to be identical to Victoria / Nike (e.g. Lambrechts 1992 and E. Simon 2006: 59). Her name could thus also mean 'victory', which would exclude the proposal. Either way, the meaning of her name is simply unknown and thus, every connection remains speculative.

3.25. *meχ* 'Herrin' ~ Hitt. *mekk-* > *mekki-*/*mekkai-* 'much, many' (Steinbauer 1999a: 379-380, on the meaning cf. 1998: 279-280). Since the Hittite word etymo-

---

17. His proposed alternative of occasional *l*/*n*-variation, based on the alleged pair of *hilar* 'limite astratto / soglia / urna?' and *hinθ-* 'finire, delimitare?' (on the meanings see the refs. in Belfiore (2020: 221) with refs.), is *ad hoc*.

logically means 'big', Steinbauer entertained the semantic change '(die) Große' > 'Herrin'. However, he considered it to be unassured, just like the change k > χ, which led him to classify the entire etymology as possible only. Although arguments could be quoted both for the semantic and for the phonological change, the basic problem is the meaning of the Etruscan word, which, based on the title *zilaθ meχl raσnal* 'zilaθ of the public *m*.' (e.g. Tabula Cortonensis l. 24), means something in common possession or has something to do with the community, such as 'territory' (Wallace 2008: 209) or 'res' (i.e., '*z*. rei publicae', Rix 1984b). 'Herrin' obviously does not fit (*contra* Eichner 2011: 82-83 with n. 38: 'Pontifex Dominae publicae [!] / Etruscae') and thus, the etymology has no basis.

3.26. *mi* 'I' ~ HLuw. *ámu*, Lyd. *amu* (Steinbauer 1999a: 380 [the reconstructed accent on the final syllable of the Anatolian forms leads to the loss of the initial vowel and the *i*-vocalism can be explained from the enclitic form *-mi* or with dissimilation]). The assumptions of aphaeresis and the vocalism are problematic, since there are no enclitic forms in Etruscan to trigger such a change and the dissimilation is *petitio principii*. Although the missing initial vowel could be explained by the simplification of the Proto-Anatolian and Hieroglyphic Luwian initial consonant cluster /ʔm/ (as reconstructed in Simon 2012, cf. now Melchert 2019a: 267), the difference of the vocalism remains unexplained. Moreover, first singular personal pronouns with /m/ are cross-linguistically widespread (cf. e.g. Georgian *me* 'ich'), and thus not even a full agreement would prove the loan contact (cf. Oettinger 2010: 242).

3.27. *mul(u)vanice* 'donated' ~ HLuw. *mal(u)wa-* 'ritual offering *vel sim*.', Sidet. *malwa-* '"Denkmal"' (Eichner 1985, for further possible Anatolian connections see Melchert 2004: 40). The stem of the Etruscan verb is in fact *mul-*, and *mul(u)vanice* presents an internal derivation with a secondary verbal stem *mulu(v)anV-* (Willi 2011: 367-369, 382). The origin of the Anatolian words is unclear, except that the Sidetic word is read today as *malja*, without any agreement regarding its meaning (see the overview of Rizza 2019: 543-544 with refs.). Not even the assumption of a suffix *-wa-* in the Hieroglyphic Luwian word helps, since the vocalism of the stem **mal-* remains different. This disjunction cannot be solved without *ad hoc* assumptions (the connection was criticized by de Simone (1997a: 41), (2011: 174 n. 20), (2012: 364) on semantic grounds). Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

3.28. *nac* 'als, weil' ~ Lyd. *nak* 'als, weil', Lyc. *ñke* 'nachdem, weil' <*naká/é* (Steinbauer 1999a: 380-381 ["*einwandfrei*"]). Setting aside the fact that the meaning of *nac* is actually not known, since it is attested in sentences the meaning of which is equally unknown (Wallace 2008: 117-118, but cf. Belfiore 2020: 217 ['quando/così']), and that the Lycian word represents a variant of *ẽke* 'when' (cf. e.g. Melchert 2004: 20), the biggest problem appears on the Anatolian side. The Lydian word is traditionally translated as 'too' quoted by Steinbauer himself and 'so' perhaps only in one case, which was translated by Steinbauer with 'als, weil'. In fact, on Lydian side, setting aside the numerous obscure cases, we are dealing with at least a clause-initial connector *nak* and a different particle meaning 'either/or' or 'both/and', see Yakubovich (forthcoming) with refs. This etymology is thus not acceptable, see the same way Oettinger (2010: 242 n. 24).

3.29. *nacn*(*u*)*va* 'alt, groß, ehrwürdig' <*"nakin-()wa", *"naχan-()wa"* ~ Hitt. *nakkī-* 'important, valuable; difficult, inaccesible; powerful' or *naḫḫān* 'fear, respect' (Steinbauer 1999a: 381 ["mit Bedenken"]). However, setting aside the problematic semantics, the part °*nva* / °*va* remains unexplained in both cases. As V. Belfiore reminded me, *nacn*(*u*)*va* seems to be an internal derivative of *nacna* of the same meaning: the formal differences between *nacna* and the putative Hittite cognates remain, however, unexplained also in this case. Therefore, this etymology should be excluded.

3.30. *pera* 'house?' ~ Lyd. *pira-* 'house' (Steinbauer 1999a: 382). The Etruscan word is attested in the Cippus Perusinus in the phrase *araś peraś*(*c*), which is almost identical to the Lydian phrase *aaras pira-*(=*k*) 'yard and house'. As Steinbauer admitted, the assignment of the meaning of the Etruscan words relies exclusively upon this formal parallelism; thus, it cannot be used as evidence (Oettinger (2010: 243) counts two possibilities: either coincidence or the borrowing of the Lydian formula). As rightly pointed out by Belfiore (2014: 33), *araś* might be a derivative of the verb *ar-* 'to do, to make' (see above No. 3). Moreover, Maggiani (2000: 103-104), (2002: 67-68) argued on contextual grounds that the Etruscan word for 'house' is *θuχ* (which has generally been accepted[18]). Accordingly, these are false etymologies.

3.31. *sa* 'same' <*san* ~ Hitt. *šani-* 'dto' (Steinbauer 1999a: 381 [with secondary *i*-stem in Hittite and with the regular loss of the final nasal in Etruscan, cf.

---

18. See e.g. Rix (2002: 79), Adiego (2005: 11-12), Wallace (2008) *passim*, and Belfiore (2020: 222).

(1999a: 61)]). The meaning of the Etruscan word is not fully assured; it can be a demonstrative or a 3rd person pronoun, too (see the refs. in Belfiore (2020: 213) with refs. and Steinbauer 1999a: 95). Since the historical morphology of the Hittite word is not clear (Kloekhorst 2008: 722-723 with refs.), the assumptions of the secondary *i*-stem and that of the final nasal cannot be proved. These problems are, however, actually irrelevant, since the Carian demonstrative pronoun *sa*- provides a perfect parallel (Duhoux 2007: 78) and thus, a theoretically possible source.

3.32. *spanti* 'plate' ~ Hitt. *išpantuzzi*- 'libation-vessel, libation, libate', both < *spandutí- (Steinbauer 1999a: 383 [with the loss of the unaccented /u/ in Etruscan: the preserved /i/ in Etruscan shows the place of the accent], Lebrun 2006: 372, and Oettinger 2010: 241 ["vielleicht"], 242 ["relativ wahrscheinlich"]). Setting aside the fact that the place of the accent cannot be precisely determined and is ultimately irrelevant, there is a serious semantic difference: Hitt. *išpantuzzi*- refers to a vessel (perhaps to the so-called *Schnabelkanne*, Müller-Karpe 2002: 257) and not to a plate, and while the objects behind cognate vessel names are frequently different, a plate is irreconcilable with libation. Moreover, *spanti* is an internal derivation from *span* 'plain, flatland' (Bellelli – Benelli 2009: 142 with refs. and Wallace 2016: 219). Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

3.33. *sra/enc/χ* 'oben, ober-' ~ Hitt. *šarā* 'up(wards); on top of' <*srá (Steinbauer 1999a: 383). As admitted by Steinbauer himself, the segment °*nc/χ* remains unclear. His proposal (*sran*- <*sramn- ~ Hitt. *šarāmn- 'on top/above') leaves the last consonant unexplained and assumes an *ad hoc* sound change **mn > n* (he attributes the *e*-vocalism to another form [*sre*- <*sri- ~ CLuw. *šarri*, Lyc. *hri*] without explaining the way of influence). The main problem is, however, that the meaning given by Steinbauer cannot be supported: the form in Liber Linteus (II.10) shows neither an adverb nor an adjective, but a noun in loc. pl. (*σrenχve*). The meaning of the noun is unknown, but it denotes something with which someone can anoint *vel sim.* (Wallace 2008: 76).

3.34. *śuθi* 'tomb' ~ Car. *sδi(a)* 'grave?' (Duhoux 2007: 53-78, on the precise form of the Carian word see Simon 2019c with refs.). Duhoux exhaustively investigated this parallelism from a philological point of view and excluded it on phonological grounds (Duhoux 2007: 72-78). Note that the Etruscan word may be an internal derivation from *śuθ* (cf. Simon 2019c with refs.).

3.35. *tamera* 'tomb chamber' ~ "Anatolian" *tam-* 'to build' (Steinbauer 1999a: 384, Lebrun 2006: 372, and Oettinger 2010: 241 ["vielleicht", "äußerst unsicher"]). Steinbauer himself admitted that there is no evidence for a suffix *-era-* and thus this proposal is to be rejected (cf. already Simon 2017b).

3.36. *Tarχna* 'a personal name', *Tarchon* 'a founding hero' ~ *Tarḫun*(*na*)-, *Tarḫunt-*, *Tarḫunza-* 'Storm-god in Anatolia' (Steinbauer 1999a: 474, Lebrun 2006: 371, 374 ["[l]e maillon le plus solide par rapport au monde anatolien"], and Oettinger 2010: 241, 242 ["relativ sicher"]). This is one of the oldest connections proposed between Etruscan and the Anatolian languages, and it has been frequently commented upon, usually positively.[19] Critical comments have been rare (e.g., Cristofani 1985: 285), and there has only been a single linguistic investigation, that by de Simone (1982) (cf. also now 1997a: 41, 2011: 183 n. 98, 2012: 373, 381 n. 149, 2013: 18 Anm. 42), which was ignored by all later scholars except Lebrun (2006: 371 n. 9) (and even in his study it only appears as a bibliographic filling material).

De Simone demonstrated that all Etruscan forms go back to **Tarχu* and **Tarχe*, a personal name (on the forms see also de Simone 2005: 227-230).[20] He argued that since the Anatolian forms are not personal names and formally incompatible with Etruscan names, this comparison should be rejected. In fact, the Anatolian divine name was widely used as a part of personal names, and it is also attested in itself as a personal name (Dinçol – Dinçol 2008: 23, No. 29). However, de Simone was completely right in pointing out that the attested forms of the Anatolian name (reflecting *Tarḫwant-*/*Tarḫunt-*, Kloekhorst 2006: 98) are formally not compatible with the Etruscan forms, and thus, this etymology should be abandoned. Although Steinbauer (1999a: 474) and Oettinger (2010: 241) reconstructed **Tarχvena-* for *Tarχna* (derived by Oettinger from the epichoric form *Targyenos* <*Tarhuwan*(*na*)- attested in Lydia, cf. Högemann – Oettinger 2008: 20 with ref.), it was pointed out already by de Simone that this form does not lead to the attested *Tarχna*, only to **Tarχuna* / **Tarχena*. These are, however, regular internal derivatives from **Tarχu* and **Tarχe*, which are also attested in other derivatives.[21]

19. More recently see e.g. Palmucci (2001); Aigner-Foresti (2002b) (but cf. Aigner-Foresti 2002b); Beekes (2003: 30-31); Bachvarova (2012: 150), (2016: 362); cf. also Pallottino (1988: 473) and Briquel (1994: 329).

20. According to Oettinger (2010: 241), the Etruscan word is a divine name, too, but this is a misunderstanding of the abbreviation "GN" (not *Göttername* but *Gentilname*).

21. Both scholars refer to the Gentilname *Tarquinii* as evidence, which is based on the name *Tarquinius*. Tarquinius must be, however, either a Latin derivation from **Tarχu* or at best a

3.37. *tle-* 'bezahlen' ~ Lyc. A *tll(e)i-* 'to pay' (Steinbauer 1999a: 384). The assignment of the meaning of the Etruscan hapax is based exclusively on this alleged etymology, and despite Steinbauer's claim it does not lead to a better understanding of the inscription (Ta 1.107, l. 4., the deeds of the deceased: *tleχe hanipaluscle* 'he has …ed in/for the (army) of Hannibal', cf. Wallace 2008: 145). Accordingly, this is a false etymology.

3.38. *tmia* 'temple' <*tami* ~ "Anatolian" *tam-* 'to build' (Steinbauer 1999a: 384 and Oettinger 2010: 241 ["vielleicht", "äußerst unsicher"]). The loss of the vowel in the first syllable is *petitio principii*, and thus, it is a false etymology (cf. already Simon 2017c).

3.39. *Turan* 'goddess of love' ~ Greek *tyrannos* from Luw. *tarwani-* 'a title' (Lebrun 2006: 371). Lebrun left unclear which one is the exact source, but the phonetic differences between the Luwian and Etruscan words are not explained and we do now know that the Luwian word is not a title but an adjective meaning 'just (one), righteous' and might read as *tarrawann(i)-* (Melchert 2019b). Note also the semantic gap, which was "solved" earlier only by the *ad hoc* assumption that *Turan* was called 'mistress'. Thus, this connection has already rightly been rejected by Van Windekens (1956: 123) and de Simone (1997a: 40) (both with refs., add also Pallottino 1988: 473). Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

3.40. *twatwawar* 'paralysis; plant causing paralysis' → Lat. *twatwawar* > *papāver* ~ Hitt. *tuttuwani-* 'opium poppy' <*tutwar/n-* 'paralysis' (Schrijver 2019: 320-321). The derivation of *papāver* from *twatwawar* (which is unattested in Etruscan and was reconstructed only for the sake of this etymology) assumes a problematic but possible sound change (*tw-* > *p-*, cf. e.g. Weiss 2020: 174) and two irregular changes (-*tw-* > -*p-* instead of -*tu-* [cf. e.g. Weiss (2020: 174)] and -*aw-* > -*āw-* instead of e.g. -*u-* [cf. Schrijver (2019: 321) himself]). In addition, there is no explanation of the *i*-stem of the Hittite plant name (it could be the oblique form suffxed with the -*iya-* appurtenance suffix). Note too, that *twatwawar* contains an additional syllable -*wa-* that cannot be explained from the Hittite forms. Due to these problems this etymology cannot be accepted.

Latinisation of *Tarχvena* (cf. *Tarχvete* / Tarquitus), since there is no other regular way to derive it from *Tarχu*.

3.41. *θevru* 'bull' from an unattested Anatolian word (Steinbauer 1999a: 385). He argued that the similarity with the Indo-European *taurus*-words could only be explained by the assumption that this word was preserved only in Etruscan among the Anatolian languages, which is obviously not the case, since the Etruscan word as a typical *Wanderwort* could have been borrowed from many other Indo-European and Semitic languages, too (for a critical overview of the possibilities see already Glück 1970: 50-54, esp. 54). Considering the well-known trade connections of the Etruscans with Central Europe (see e.g. Baitinger 2017) and the existence of Proto-Germanic **þeura-* 'bull' (Kroonen 2013: 540), one may even entertain the possibility of a Proto-Germanic loanword in Etruscan (due to the stem final vowel the Etruscan word would reflect a Pre-Proto-Germanic **þeuro-*, which would chronologically be even more fitting).

3.42. *=(u)m* 'and, but' ~ Hitt. *=(m)a* 'dto', Lyd. *=m* (Steinbauer 1999a: 377-378). De Simone (2012: 374) asked what sense it made to compare these forms, without giving any details. Simon (2020b) rejected this comparison since it is cross-linguistically easy to find similar sound short particles (on this problem see §5), and thus, it has no relevance until Anatolian loanwords in Etruscan are not demonstrated independently.

3.43. *vac(i)l* 'then, after (temporal conjunction)' ~ Lyd. *fak* 'clause initial particle' (Steinbauer 1999a: 385). Steinbauer suggested that the Etruscan word perhaps carries the suffix *-l*.[22] However, this does not explain the °i° and whatever the precise meaning of the Lydian particle is (see most recently Sadykova – Yakubovich 2018), there is no reason to assume any sound substitution for the initial consonant. Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

3.44. *zal* 'two' <*za* (cf. *zaθrum* 'twenty', *zavena* 'vessel with two handles' [more precisely, 'kantharos and any drinking vessel with vertical handles', Bellelli – Benelli (2009: 144) with ref.]) ~ Proto-Anat. **dwă-* (Steinbauer 1999a: 386). Despite the logical pre-Etruscan form there is no evidence for the assumed sound change d > <z>/_w, admitted by Steinbauer, too. Accordingly, it is a false etymology.

---

22. Steinbauer quoted the parallelism of *nac* ~ *nak* as a supporting argument, as it would imply Etruscan **vak*, although this is not a necessary implication and the parallelism, as we saw above, is not valid. His counter-argument, the Lyd. variant *fa-*, was also invalid, since this is a preverb (Sadykova – Yakubovich 2018 with ref.).

4. *Interim results*

The critical overview of the proposed loanwords can be summarised as follows:
1) The proposal of a borrowing from an Anatolian language is philologically and/or phonologically and/or morphologically and/or semantically mistaken:

an; ara; aril; atr; cel; Culśu / Culśanś; cver(a); halχ; heva; hupni; huśur; ika; ita; iθal; maχ; man; matu; Mean; meχ; mi; mul-; nac; nacn(u)va; pera; spanti; sra/enc/χ; śuθi; tamera; Tarχna; tle-; tmia; Turan; *twatwawar; θevru; vac(i)l; zal.
2) Theoretically possible loans:
=(i)a$^?$; ar-$^?$; *av-$^?$; =c; *ce-$^?$; -l$^?$; *maru$^?$; =(u)m; sa.

5. *Explanatory possibilities and consequences*

One can conclude that the number of possible loans is extremely low: three verbal stems (but all with problematic semantics), four particles (two with problematic semantics), and two demonstrative pronouns or similar (but one is problematic), which also means that there are altogether only three impeccable parallels (and thus, Etruscan is hardly "*a heavily 'Anatolianized'*" language, *pace* Watkins). The question is if they really represent borrowings, or more precisely, if we are forced to assume that they are borrowings. For that to be the case we have to exclude the possibility of coincidence. However, we are mostly dealing with particles and pronouns here and although the remaining items are verbal stems, they are all problematic. This leads to two problems. First, as F. Giusfredi reminded me: borrowing of grammatical elements such as particles and pronouns presupposes intensive and long language contacts (or pidgin languages), in this case between Etruscan and any Anatolian language, for which there is currently absolutely no evidence (cf. also above, n. 5). Second, particles and demonstrative pronouns are not especially conducive to identifying loan contacts, as they consist of one-two phonemes. Moreover, in such cases and especially in cases of words with CVC structure the chances of coincidence are quite high, as is well known (Ringe 1992, 1999). The same applies to the verbal stems. It suffices to refer to such examples as Hungarian -*be* 'in (directive ending)', *be* '(directive preverb / adverb)' ~ Modern Persian *be*- 'in(to)' in the first case and English *bad* ~ Modern Persian *bad* 'dto' in the second (see Hock 1991: 557-558 on this problem generally). The creative lists of "cognates" intended to illustrate that superficial formal similarities do not prove anything provide many coincidences between languages that were never in contact: their number is in fact richer than the alleged Etruscan – Anatolian loan contacts

(more than one dozen Hausa – German [Parsons *apud* Tucker (1957: 550)] and more than five dozen Sumerian – German [Sommerfeld (2006: 33-39)] "correspondences").

In other words, the alleged evidence for loan contacts between Etruscan and the Anatolian languages consists of cases in which we cannot exclude the possibility that their similarity is mere coincidence. Accordingly, one has to conclude that Anatolian loanwords can currently not be demonstrated in Etruscan.

Finally, this claim has serious historical consequences, since the theory of the Anatolian origin of the Etruscan language has lost the only compelling argument in its favour,[23] thus solving the only serious problem of the autochthony theory.

6. *References*

eDiAna = Olav Hackstein – Jared L. Miller – Elisabeth Rieken (eds.): *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages*. München – Marburg. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de
HW² = Johannes Friedrich et al. (eds.): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1975-.

ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (2005): "The Etruscan *Tabula Cortonensis*: a tale of two tablets?". *Die Sprache* 45: 3-25.
ADIEGO, Ignasi-Xavier (2006): "Etrusco *marunuχva cepen*". *Studi Etruschi* 72: 199-214.
ADRADOS, Francisco R. (1989): "Etruscan as an IE Anatolian (but not Hittite) Language". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 17: 363-383.
ADRADOS, Francisco R. (1994): "More on Etruscan as an IE-Anatolian Language". *Historische Sprachforschung* 107: 54-76.
ADRADOS, Francisco R. (2005): "El etrusco como indoeuropeo anatolio: viejos y nuevos argumentos". *Emerita* 73: 45-56.
AIGNER-FORESTI, Luciana (2002a): "Tarchetos". *Der Neue Pauly* 12/1: Sp. 24.
AIGNER-FORESTI, Luciana (2002b): "Tarchon". *Der Neue Pauly* 12/1: Sp. 24-25.

23. Beekes (2003: 29-36) provided an exhaustive list of the arguments of the Asia Minor origin. For its detailed criticism see Simon (2015: 4 n. 15). The central argument of Beekes (1993: 48) against the hypothesis of Lemnian immigration was that "[i]t is hardly imaginable that people coming from the fertile and prosperous land of Etruria would have settled in a barren [*sic*], out-of-the-way [*sic*] corner like Lemnos". This approach to human migration is, of course, highly naïve.

BACHVAROVA, Mary R. (2007): "Suffixaufnahme and Genitival Adjectives as an Anatolian Areal Feature in Hurrian, Tyrrhenian, and Anatolian Languages". In: Karlene Jones-Bley et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of the 18th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, *Los Angeles*, *November 3-4*, *2006* (*selected papers*). JIES Monograph Series 53. Washington, 169-189.

BACHVAROVA, Mary R. (2012): "The Transmission of Liver Divination from East to West". *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 54: 143-164.

BACHVAROVA, Mary R. (2016): *From Hittite to Homer. The Anatolian Background of Ancient Greek Epic*. Cambridge.

BAGNASCO GIANNI, Giovanna (2012): "Origine degli Etruschi". In: Gilda Bartoloni (ed.): *Introduzione all'Etruscologia*. Milano, 47-81.

BAITINGER, Holger (2017): "Transalpine Regions". In: Alessandro Naso (ed.): *Etruscology*. Boston – Berlin, 1607-1638.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (1993): "The Position of Etruscan". In: Gerhard Meiser (ed.): *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck, 45-60.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (2001): "Review of C. de Simone, *I Tirreni a Lemnos*". *Mnemosyne* 54: 359-364.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (2002): "The Prehistory of the Lydians, the Origin of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas". *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 59: cols. 205-242 = *The Origin of the Etruscans*. Amsterdam, 2003.

BELFIORE, Valentina (2014): "Il *fare* etrusco: discussione sulle radici con senso generico di "fare" e conseguenze per i loro derivati". In: Enrico Benelli (ed.): *Per Maristella Pandolfini* cên zic ziχuχe. Pisa – Roma, 29-41.

BELFIORE, Valentina (2016): "Definizioni locali di spazi tombali". In: Marie-Laurence Haack (ed.): *L'écriture et l'espace de la mort. Épigraphie et nécropoles à l'époque préromaine*. Rome, 141-163.

BELFIORE, Valentina (2020): "Etrusco". *Palaeohispanica* 20: 199-262.

Bellelli, Vincenzo (ed.) (2012): *Le origini degli etruschi. Storia archeologia ANTROPOLOGIA*. Roma.

BELLELLI, Vincenzo (2017): "Woher kommen die Etrusker? Ein seit der Antike ungelöstes Problem". In: Claus Hattler (ed.): *Die Etrusker. Weltkultur im antiken Italien*. Karlsruhe – Darmstadt, 33-39.

BELLELLI, Vincenzo – BENELLI, Enrico (2009): "Un settore "specializzato" del lessico etrusco: una messa a punto sui nomi di vasi". *Mediterranea* 6: 139-152.

BELLELLI, Vincenzo – BENELLI, Enrico (2018): *Gli Etruschi. La scrittura*, *la lingua*, *la società*. Roma.

BENELLI, Enrico (2020): *Etrusco. Lingua. Scrittura. Epigrafia*. Zaragoza.

BRANDENSTEIN, Wilhelm (1948): "Tyrrhener". *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 2.7: cols. 1909-1938.

BRIQUEL, Dominique (1994): "Étrusque et indo-européen". In: Françoise Bader (ed.): *Langues indo-européennes*. Paris, 319-330.

BRIQUEL, Dominique (2012²): *Les Étrusques*. Paris.

CAMPOREALE, Giovannangelo (2015⁴): *Gli Etruschi. Storia e civiltà*. Milano.

CARRUBA, Onofrio (1977): "L'origine degli Etruschi: il problema della origine". In: N. N. (ed.): *Paleontologia linguistica. Atti del VI Convegno internazionale di linguisti tenuto a Milano nei giorni 2-6 Settembre 1974*. Brescia, 137-150.

CORNIL, Pierre (1995): "Un étymologie étrusco-hittite". In: Onofrio Carruba – Mauro Giorgieri – Clelia Mora (eds.): *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di hittitologia*. Studia Mediterranea 9. Pavia, 81-85.

CRISTOFANI, Mauro (1985): *Dizionario illustrato della civiltà etrusca*. Firenze.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (1982): "Hethitisch *Tarḫu* – Etruskisch *Tarχu*". In: Johann Tischler (ed.): *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*. IBS 40. Innsbruck, 401-406.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (1996): *I Tirreni a Lemnos*: *evidenza linguistica e tradizioni storiche*. Firenze.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (1997a): "I Tirreni a Lemnos. Paralipomena metodologici (nonché teorici)". *Ostraka* 6: 35-50.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (1997b): "Review of F. C. Woudhuizen, *Linguistica Tyrrhenica*". *Kratylos* 42: 212-213.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (2004): "Problemi di alfabetizzazione nel Mediterraneo antico. Rappresenta l'alfabeto pelasgo-tirreno di Lemnos una creazione autonoma?". *Mediterraneo antico*. *Economie*, *società*, *culture* 7: 197-246.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (2005): "Sull'origine e funzione della voce etrusca *Tarcianêsi* della Tabula Cortonensis: i nomi etruschi in *Tarc-*". *Mediterranea* 2: 219-242.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (2011): "'L'origine degli Etruschi' ancora: recenti teorie". *Studi etruschi* 74: 169-196.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (2012): "L'origine lidia del popolo etrusco: questioni di principio". In: Vincenzo Bellelli (ed.): *Le origini degli etruschi. Storia archeologia antropologia*. Roma, 359-381.

DE SIMONE, Carlo (2013): "Heiner Eichner: etimologie "etrusco-tirseniche" (et alia)". *Oebalus* 8: 7-51.

DINÇOL, Ali – DINÇOL, Belkıs (2008): *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel aus der Oberstadt von Boğazköy – Hattuša vom 16. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende der Grossreichszeit*. BoHa XXII. Mainz am Rhein.

DUHOUX, Yves (2008): "Le vocabulaire carien de la "tombe". À propos d'une possible isoglosse étrusco-carienne (*suθi/śuθi* "tombeau" ~ carien *sδi/siδi* "tombe")". *Kadmos* 47: 53-107.

EICHNER, Heiner (1985): "*Malwa*, eine hieroglyphenluvisch-sidetische Wortgleichung". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45: 5-21.

EICHNER, Heiner (2011): "Anmerkungen zum Etruskischen *in memoriam* Helmut Rix". *Alessandria* 5: 67-92.

EICHNER, Heiner (2012): "Neues zur Sprache der Stele von Lemnos (Erster Teil)". *Journal of Language Relationship* 7: 9-32.

EICHNER, Heiner (2013): "Neues zur Sprache der Stele von Lemnos (Zweiter Teil)". *Journal of Language Relationship* 10: 1-42.

FACCHETTI, Giulio M. (2002): *Appunti di morfologia etrusca*. Firenze.

FACCHETTI, Giulio M. (2005): "The Interpretation of Etruscan Texts and its Limits". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 33: 359-388.

FORTSON, Benjamin W. (2010[2]): *Indo-European Language and Culture. An Introduction*. Oxford.

GLÜCK, Manfred (1970): "Etruskisch θevru mines. Eine neue Lehn-übersetzung aus dem Griechischen". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 27: 45-78.

GOEDEGEBUURE, Petra (2014): *The Hittite Demonstratives. Studies in Deixis*, *Topic*[*s*] *and Focus*. StBoT 55. Wiesbaden.

HADAS-LEBEL, Jean (2020): "Une origine étrusque pour lat. *corōna*?" In: Romain Garnier (ed.): *Loanwords and Substrata in Indo-European Languages. Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Limoges (5th – 7th June, 2018)*. IBS 164. Innsbruck, 201-213.

HAMP, Eric P. (1958): "Etruscan maχ '4'?". *Glotta* 37: 311-312.

HEUBECK, Alfred (1961): *Praegraeca. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechisch-indogermanischen Substrat*. Erlanger Forschungen A. Geisteswissenschaften 12. Erlangen.

HOCK, Hans Heinrich (1991[2]): *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam.

HÖGEMANN, Peter – OETTINGER, Norbert (2008): "Die Seuche im Heerlager der Achäer vor Troia. Orakel und magische Rituale im hethiterzeitlichen Kleinasien und im archaischen Griechenland". *Klio* 90: 7-26.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. LIEEDS 5. Leiden – Boston.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2012): "The language of Troy". In: Jorrit Kelder – Günay Uslu – Ömer Faruk Şerifoğlu (eds.): *Troy. City*, *Homer*, *Turkey*. Amsterdam, 46-50.

KROONEN, Guus (2013): *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. LIEEDS 11. Leiden – Boston.

LAMBRECHTS, Roger (1992): "Mean". In: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae VI/1*. München, 383-385.

LEBRUN, René (2006): "La langue étrusque: connexions anatoliennes?". *Res Antiquae* 3: 369-374.

LEBRUN, René (2009): Review of F. C. Woudhuizen, *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language*. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 66: cols. 637-641.

LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN, Karl – FIESEL, Eva (1935): "Eine Eulenvase". *Studi Etruschi* 9: 75-81.

MAGGIANI, Adriano (2000): "Dagli archivi dei Cusu. Considerazioni sulla tavola bronze di Cortona". *Rivista di archeologia* 24: 94-114.

MAGGIANI, Adriano (2002): "Riflessioni sulla Tavola di Cortona". In: Maristella Pandolfini – id. (eds.): *La Tabula Cortonensis e il suo contesto storico-archeologico. Atti dell'Incontro di studio*, *22 giugno 2001*. Quaderni di archeologia etrusco-italica 28. Roma, 65-75.

MALZAHN, Melanie (1999): "Das lemnische Alphabet: Eine eigenständige Entwicklung". *Studi Etruschi* 63: 259-279.

MARAS, Daniele F. (2009): *Il dono votivo. Gli dei e il sacro nelle iscrizioni etrusche di culto*. Pisa – Roma.

MARCHESINI, Simona (2009): *Le lingue frammentarie dell'Italia antica. Manuale per lo studio delle lingue preromane*. Milano.

MARTINO, Paolo (1987): *Il nome etrusco di Atlante*. Roma.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (1994): *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. LSIE 3. Amsterdam – Atlanta.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2004): *A Dictionary of the Lycian Language*. Ann Arbor – New York.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2009): "Deictic Pronouns in Anatolian". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 151-161.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2019a): "Hittite Historical Phonology after 100 Years (and after 20 Years)". In: Ronald I. Kim – Jana Mynářová – Peter Pavúk (eds.): *Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years. Proceedings of the International Conference Held at Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*. CHANE 107. Leiden – Boston, 258-276.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2019b): "Iron Age Luvian *tarrawan*(*i*)-". In: Pavel S. Avetisyan – Roberto Dan – Yervand H. Grekyan (eds.): *Over the Mountains*

and Far Away. Studies in Near Eastern history and archaeology presented to Mirjo Salvini on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Oxford, 337-345.

MELCHERT, H. Craig (2020): "Addenda et Corrigenda to Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *Grammar of the Hittite Language* (*GrHL*)". *Reference Grammar*. https://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/Addenda&Corrigenda GrHL.pdf

MÜLLER-KARPE, Andreas (2002): "Die Keramik des Mittleren und Jüngeren hethitischen Reiches. Die Entwicklung der anatolischen Keramik – ihre Formen und Funktionen". In: N. N.: *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*. *Das Volk der 1000 Götter*. Bonn – Stuttgart, 256-263.

NASO, Alessandro (ed.) (2017): *Etruscology*. Boston – Berlin.

NEU, Erich (1991): "Etruskisch – eine indogermanische Sprache Alt-anatoliens?". *Historische Sprachforschung* 104: 9-28.

OETTINGER, Norbert (2010): "Seevölker und Etrusker". In: Yoram Cohen – Amir Gilan – Jared L. Miller (eds.): *Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their neighbours in honour of Itamar Singer*. StBoT 51. Wiesbaden, 233-246.

PALLOTTINO, Massimo (1988 = 1985[7]): *Etruskologie. Geschichte und Kultur der Etrusker*. Basel.

PALMUCCI, Alberto (2001): "Tarconte, un ponte mitostorico fra Tarquinia e Troia". In: Onofrio Carruba – Wolfgang Meid (eds.): *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch*. *Anatolico e Indoeuropeo*. *Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. *Pavia*, *22.-25. September 1998*. IBS 100. Innsbruck, 341-354.

PRAYON, Friedhelm (2001[2]): *Die Etrusker. Geschichte*, *Religion*, *Kunst*. München.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (1999): "Zur Verwendung der Konjunktion *ta* in den hethitischen Texten". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 59: 63-88.

RINGE, Donald A. (1992): "On Calculating the Factor of Chance in Language Comparison". *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 82: 1-110.

RINGE, Donald A. (1999): "How hard is it to match CVC-roots?". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 97: 213-244.

RIX, Helmut (1968): "Eine morphosyntaktische Übereinstimmung zwischen Etruskisch und Lemnisch: die Datierungsformel". In: Manfred Mayrhofer (ed.): *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde. Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein (1898-1967)*. Innsbruck, 213-222.

RIX, Helmut (1969): "Buchstabe, Zahlwort und Ziffern im alten Mittelitalien". In: N. N. (ed.): *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani II*. Brescia, 845-856.

RIX, Helmut (1984a): "La scrittura e la lingua". In: Mauro Cristofani (ed.): *Etruschi. Una nuova immagine*. Firenze, 199-227.

RIX, Helmut (1984b): "Etr. *meχ rasnal* = lat. *rēs pūblica*". In: N. N. (ed.): *Studi di antichità in onore di Guglielmo Maetzke II*. Roma, 455-468.

RIX, Helmut (1986): "Etruskisch culs* "Tor" und der Abschnitt VIII 1-2 des Zagreber Liber Linteus". *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 19: 17-40.

RIX, Helmut (1987-1988): "Zur Morphostruktur des etruskischen *s*-Genetivs". *Studi Etruschi* 55: 169-193.

RIX, Helmut (1998a): *Rätisch und Etruskisch*. Innsbruck.

RIX, Helmut (1998b): "Teonimi etruschi e teonimi italici". *Annali della fondazione per il Museo Claudio Faina* 5: 207-229.

RIX, Helmut (2002): "La seconda metà del nuovo testo di Cortona". In: Maristella Pandolfini – Adriano Maggiani (eds.): *La Tabula Cortonensis e il suo contesto storico-archeologico. Atti dell'Incontro di studio*, *22 giugno 2001*. Quaderni di archeologia etrusco-italica 28. Roma, 77-86.

RIZZA, Alfredo (2019): "About the Greek-Sidetic 'Artemon-inscription' (S.I.1.1)". In: Natalia Bolatti Guzzo – Piotr Taracha (eds.): "*And I Knew Twelve Languages*". *A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Warsaw, 536-551.

SADYKOVA, Anna – YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2018): "The Lydian particle *fak* in Curse Formulae and Elsewhere". Paper presented at *Beyond All Boundaries*: *Anatolia in the 1st Millennium B.C.* Ascona, June 2018.

SCHRIJVER, Peter (2019): "Hittite Plant Names in KBo XIII 248". In: Uwe Bläsing – Jasmine Dum-Tragut – Theo Marten van Lint (eds.): *Armenian*, *Hittite*, *and Indo-European Studies. A Commemoration Volume for Jos J.S. Weitenberg*. Hebrew University Armenian Studies 15. Leuven – Paris – Bristol, 315-321.

SCHUMACHER, Stefan (1998): "Sprachliche Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen Rätisch und Etruskisch". *Der Schlern* 72: 90-114.

SCHUMACHER, Stefan (2004[2]): *Die rätischen Inschriften. Geschichte und heutiger Stand der Forschung*. Budapest.

SIMON, Erika (2006): "Gods in Harmony. The Etruscan Pantheon". In: Nancy Thomson de Grummond – id. (eds.): *The Religion of the Etruscans*. Austin, 45-65.

SIMON, Zsolt (2012): "PIE 'me' and a new Lydian sound law". In: Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead et al. (eds.): *The Sound of Indo-European. Phonetics*, *Phonemics*, *and Morphophonemics.* Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 4. Copenhagen, 485-499.

SIMON, Zsolt (2015): "Zur vorgriechischen Geschichte von Imbros aus philologischer Sicht". *Ancient West & East* 14: 1-21.

SIMON, Zsolt (2016): "Ist die Possessivkonstruktion im Kizzuwatna-Luwischen kontaktbedingt zustande gekommen?". *Aula Orientalis* 34: 325-333.

SIMON, Zsolt (2017a): "Armenian *matʿowz*, Etruscan *matu*". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=223

SIMON, Zsolt (2017b): "Etruscan *tamera* 'tomb chamber'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=360

SIMON, Zsolt (2017c): "Etruscan *tmia* 'temple'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=361

SIMON, Zsolt (2017d): "Etruscan *tupi*, Armenian *topʿem*, Phrygian *tubeti*". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=289

SIMON, Zsolt (2019a): "Carian *sδi(a)* 'grave (?)'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=454

SIMON, Zsolt (2019b): "Etruscan *maru* '(a type of official)'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=359

SIMON, Zsolt (2019c): "Etruscan *śuθi* 'tomb'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=456

SIMON, Zsolt (2020a): "Etruscan *cel* 'earth'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1017

SIMON, Zsolt (2020b): "Etruscan *=u(m)* 'and, but'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1004

SIMON, Zsolt (2021): "Etruscan *maχ* 'five'". In: *eDiAna*. http://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary.php?lemma=1471

SMITH, Christopher (2016): *Die Etrusker*. Stuttgart.

SOMMERFELD, Walter (2006): "Die ältesten semitischen Sprachzeugnisse – eine historische Bestandsaufnahme". In: Guy Deutscher – N. J. C. Kouwenberg (eds.): *The Akkadian Language in its Semitic Context. Studies in the Akkadian of the Third and Second Millennium BC*. PIHANS 106. Istanbul, 30-75.

STEINBAUER, Dieter H. (1996): "Culsans und Culsu". In: Hubert Cancik – Hermann Lichtenberger – Peter Schäfer (eds.): *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag II. Griechische und römische Religion*. Tübingen, 74-76.

STEINBAUER, Dieter H. (1998): "Zur Grabinschrift der Larthi Cilnei aus Aritim/Arretium/Arezzo". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 121: 263-281.

STEINBAUER, Dieter H. (1999a): *Neues Handbuch des Etruskischen*. St. Katharinen.

STEINBAUER, Dieter H. (1999b): "Review of C. de Simone, *I Tirreni a Lemnos*". *Kratylos* 44: 201-203.

STEINBAUER, Dieter H. (2011): "Etruskisch (historisch-)genealogisch und (areal-)typologisch". In: Thomas Krisch – Thomas Lindner (eds.): *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*. Wiesbaden, 548-555.

TUCKER, Archibald Norman (1957): "Philology in Africa". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20: 541-554.

TURFA, Jean MacIntosh (ed.) (2013): *The Etruscan world*. London – New York.

TURFA, Jean MacIntosh (2018): "The Etruscans". In: Gary D. Farney – Guy Bradley (eds.): *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*. Boston – Berlin, 637-671.

ULF, Christoph (2017): "An ancient question: the origin of the Etruscans". In: Alessandro Naso (ed.): *Etruscology*. Boston – Berlin, 11-34.

VAN WINDEKENS, Albert J. (1956): "Zum pelasgischen Ursprung von gr. τύραννος". *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforchung* 74: 123-126.

WAAL, Willemijn (2019): "Fate strikes back: new evidence for the identification of the Hittite fate deities and its implications for hieroglyphic writing in Anatolia". *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71: 121-132.

WALLACE, Rex E. (2008): *Zikh Rasnal. A Manual of the Etruscan Language and Inscriptions*. Ann Arbor – New York.

WALLACE, Rex E. (2016): "Language, Alphabet, and Linguistic Affiliation". In: Sinclair Bell – Alexandra A. Carpino (eds.): *A Companion to the Etruscans*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden – Oxford – Chichester, 203-223.

WATKINS, Calvert (2001): "An Indo-European Linguistic Area and Its Characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal Diffusion as a Challenge to Comparative Method?". In: Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald – Richard M. W. Dixon (eds.): *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance*: *Problems in Comparative Linguistics*. Oxford, 44-63.

WEISS, Michael (2020²): *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor – New York.

WEITENBERG, J. J. S. (1992): "The Uses of Asyndesis and Particles in Old Hittite Simple Sentences". In: Onofrio Carruba (ed.): *Per una grammatica ittita. Towards a Hittite Grammar*. StMed 7. Pavia, 305-353.

WILLI, Andreas (2011): "Revisiting the Etruscan verb". *Alessandria* 5: 365-384.

WOUDHUIZEN, Fred C. (1992): *Linguistica Tyrrhenica. A Compendium of Recent Results in Etruscan Linguistics*. Amsterdam.

WOUDHUIZEN, Fred C. (2008): *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language. Linguistica Tyrrhenica III*. IBK Sonderheft 128. Innsbruck.

WOUDHUIZEN, Fred C. (2019): *Etruscan as a Colonial Luwian Language. The Comprehensive Version*. Amsterdam.

WYLIN, Koen (2005): "Un terzo pronome / aggettivo dimostrativo: Etrusco *sa*". *Studi Etruschi* 70: 213-225.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2020): "Review of A. Kloekhorst, *Kanišite Hittite*". *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 110: 278-288.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (forthcoming): "Lydian *nak*. Lydian *n=ak*". In: *eDiAna*.

This volume focuses on contacts between Anatolian languages within and outside Anatolia. The selected essays, written by members of ongoing research projects on Anatolian languages, present case studies from both the first and second millennia. These include etymological and morphophonological investigations within the framework of Graeco-Anatolian contacts, as well as a critical essay on the possible Anatolian-Etruscan contacts.

Alongside strictly linguistic analysis, the essays cover different aspects of cultural contacts (the origin of the word for 'salt' in Luwian), toponyms (in Lycia), and religion (the god called King of Kaunos), and are introduced with a detailed overview of the origins of the Anatolian linguistic landscape.