

vācāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Studien
zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
Harald Bichlmeier und Velizar Sadovski

Band 17

vácāṃsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai

Proceedings of the international conference
of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII,
Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019,
celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European
comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana

Akten der Arbeitstagung
der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft und des IWoBA XII
vom 4. bis 7. Juni 2019 in Ljubljana
aus Anlass der Hundertjahrfeier der dortigen Indogermanistik

edited by

Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier & Velizar Sadovski

baar

Hamburg 2020

Baar-Verlag

Hamburg

URL: <http://baar-verlag.com>

E-Mail: info@baar-verlag.com

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© The authors, the editors and Baar-Verlag 2020

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Druck und Verarbeitung: SOWA, Piaseczno.

Umschlaggestaltung: Linda Sophie Gableske (5°sued), Dresden.

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed and bound in Poland.

ISBN 978-3-935536-26-4

ISSN 2192-0133

“PRE-GREEK” BETWEEN THEORIES AND LINGUISTIC DATA. EXAMPLES FROM THE ANATOLIAN AREA

Stella Merlin, Verona¹

1 Lexical layers and non-native lexicon

In the last few decades, the existence and the definition of Pre-Greek (henceforth PG) has become a classic problem within scholarly research. Several definitions have been proposed, each based on different theoretical perspectives and terminologies. The discussion around PG is embedded into the wider issue of the organisation of lexicon and the different lexical layers. As observed by Winters (2015: 446):

Genetic inheritance is not the only source of linguistic formation. A second, important aspect is observable through the interactions that languages (or, to be precise, speakers of languages) have with each other. In the lexicon particularly, contact is a powerful force, in great part because it is through contact that languages acquire layers of linguistic units which are not inherited from earlier forms of the language.

In very general terms, suffice it to say that each language has a portion of native vocabulary, which represents the native layer of a given language; then there is non-native vocabulary, which includes borrowings (or loanwords) from different source (or model) languages, but also other surrounding elements, coming from substrate, superstrate, and adstrate languages or varieties. Language change, especially that involving phenomena of language contact and interference, is made possible by historical and cultural conditions, without being strictly deter-

¹ This paper is part of the project PALaC, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (Grant Agreement n° 757299). I wish to thank Federico Giusfredi, PI of the project, for having discussed with me, together with Valerio Pisaniello, all the main points of this paper as well as some minor but essential details. I am also indebted to Paola Cotticelli-Kurras for her expert guidance in the problems relating to language contact, especially when applied to ancient languages, and to Alfredo Rizza, who offered me his deep knowledge in general linguistics and Anatolian languages. Moreover, I thank the participants at the Ljubljana conference for their valuable comments and suggestions and the editors for their careful reading, which helped me to improve the manuscript. All remaining errors and misconceptions are my own.

mined by such conditions. In other terms, the historical and cultural framework or context is a necessary but not sufficient or self-explaining condition for the phenomena of borrowings and language contact.²

The present paper will investigate a small number of lexical items taken from the Ancient Greek (AG) lexicon and, in most cases, considered to belong to the non-native stratum by a variety of etymological dictionaries. The selection of the individual lemmas comprises seven words that the *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (EDG), published by Brill in 2010 and authored by Robert Beekes with the assistance of Lucien van Beek, labels as PG, with or without a question mark. Moreover, along the etymological description some elements referring to the Anatolian world are mentioned.³

As for the existence and the very definition of PG, it is worth remembering that such an issue has been approached through different perspectives, based on different theoretical frameworks and assumptions. To begin with, PG is usually considered as a substrate language or a group of closely related languages widespread within the Mediterranean area. It may belong to the Indo-European (IE) language family (e.g. Georgiev, Heubeck), or not, thus being a non-IE language (this is the perspective of Furnée, Beekes). It would have existed before the arrival of the Greeks, or before Greeks-to-be people became effectively Greek. Moreover, it would have been spoken in the larger Mediterranean area, also including Near East coasts and Anatolian regions.⁴ Concerning this last point, PG could in fact also be qualified as a Pre-Anatolian language.

With regards to the history of research, it is particularly relevant to underline two basic points: first, that PG has been considered alternatively as IE or non-IE and, second, that since it must have been spoken over a larger area before the arrival of the Greek language, the implication is that it was spread in that same area before the arrival of the Anatolian languages as well. Therefore, the relationship between Anatolian and Greek in the same IE language family *vis-à-vis* the substrate, possibly non-IE, is one of the most challenging issues concerning the current study of PG.

² The general framework for the analysis of phenomena of interference and language contact is essentially based on Weinreich (1953), Gusmani (1986) and Bußmann/Cotticelli-Kurras (2007).

³ There already exist several contributions directed to the analysis of individual etymologies within the AG lexicon and their particular interrelations with substrate and Anatolian languages: see in particular Gasbarra/Pozza (2012), Hajnal (2014), De Decker (2016), Simon (2018), Oreshko (2018).

⁴ For a brief state of the art concerning the research on PG and the earliest stages of the Greek language see Silvestri (2014), Filos (2014) and Finkelberg (2014) with further references, all in EAGLL. Cf. also Finkelberg (2005). For a reconsideration of the problem from the point of view of ancient Balkan languages see especially Katičić (1976: 39–97) and Mihaylova (2016).

2 Pre-Greek substrate and loanwords: the EDG hypothesis

As the most recent etymological dictionary of the Greek language, EDG derives much material on word repertory and sources of reference from its predecessors, mostly the *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (GEW) by H. Frisk (1954–1972) and the *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque* (DÉLG) by P. Chantraine (1968–1980, posthumously reedited with a supplement in 1999, to which I will refer in this contribution). The theoretical framework of the EDG is represented by the work of Furnée (1972), who argued for the existence of a single language substrate before Greek (mostly based on non-Greek stop and vowel alternations). EDG provides a very robust definition of PG, which serves as a theoretical guidance to the analysis of Ancient Greek etymologies. It claims very explicitly that PG was an independent substrate language (or a group of very closely related languages) from which Greek was absorbing loanwords during its history.⁵ This position could be referred to as the ‘PG hypothesis’. What is important to highlight is that PG is supposed to be a non-IE language and, according to the authors, this hypothesis is judged to be sounder than others and is constantly applied to the analysis of the individual etymologies. A PG-based etymology essentially depends on an odd phonological feature that reveals the PG source of a given word: for instance, the alternation between /m/ and other labial sounds, or the fact that a plosive could appear as voiced, voiceless, or aspirated. The core notion is that of “variant”: the fact that a word is attested in a different set of forms is self-evident proof that this same word belongs to a substratal non-IE language, i.e. PG. A further element of discussion concerns PG suffixes, which make for a sturdier PG attribution of the words in which they are contained (cf. -αφ, discussed in 3.1 and 3.7 below). It is well-known, however, that in the context of language contact, a given suffix could have expanded its function(s), becoming productive in the entirety of the lexicon in a way that it could secondarily get attached to inherited items as well.⁶

For the purposes of the present contribution, it is worth observing that in EDG the label PG and Anatolian overlap in several cases without any further explanation. It is possible to note a twofold meaning of ‘Anatolian’:⁷ the linguistic/geological one, which stands alongside the geographical designation (also including non-Anatolian and even non-IE factors). So the question is: starting from the linguistic evidence and from the data itself, is it possible to set up a different, perhaps a more adequate and more convincing account of these complexities?

⁵ See also Beekes (2014), who collects all PG items according to their semantic field (flora, fauna, instruments etc.)

⁶ This is what Gusmani (1986: 137–177) called *induzione di morfemi* ‘morpheme induction’. For similar points of criticism of the theory of EDG see De Decker (2016: 153).

⁷ Cf. Simon 2018: 376.

3 Selection of lemmas

3.1 βάρκαρις

The word βάρκαρις indicates an ‘unguent derived from the homonym plant’. This word is labelled by EDG 194 as <PG? LW Lyd?>, both with question marks, thus suggesting that it could be a loanword, either from the PG substrate (according to the hypothesis presented above) or from the Lydian language. This word is attested several times in different ancient sources, e.g. Aeschylus, Hipponax, scholia. If it is not a loanword in itself, it can be morphologically derived from βάρκαρ (attested only twice, but as βάρκαρ),⁸ which in itself may really be a loanword, one also quoted by Latin authors such as Plinius the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* 21.29), who connects *baccar* with *asarum* (cf. gr. άσαρον).⁹ It is once attested as βακκάριον in Hippocrates: προστίθεσθαι χρῆ πρὸς τὸ ὑγιές ισχίον ἔλαιον Αἰγύπτιον λευκὸν ἢ βακκάριον, ‘it is necessary that white olive oil from Egypt or *bakkarion* be applied on the healthy hips’ (*De natura muliebri*, 25, 2–3).¹⁰ Looking only at the context in which the word appears, it could be an alternative name for a “white olive oil from Egypt” or maybe some different oil or unguent. As for the ancient sources, the testimony of Athenaeus (2nd/3rd CE) provides a useful summary of the mentions of the word βάρκαρις (*Deipnosophistae* 15. 690b–d).¹¹ βάρκαρις is a product coming from Lydia and mentioned in connection with great Lydian personalities such as Croesus, e.g. in Hipponax;¹² moreover, Lydians were famous for their perfumes and their “soft-living”. However, as Athenaeus observed, it is also possible that βάρκαρις was not a perfume, since authors separated it from other substances in the way they referred to it; for example, in a fragment of the now lost *Amygone* by Aeschylus: κάργωγε τὰς σὰς βακκάρεις τε καὶ μύρα ‘I (don’t want) your *baccaris* and your perfumes’.¹³

⁸ According to the TLG the word is attested in two medical texts by Pedanius Dioscorides and Aretaeus, both presumably from around the 1st cent. CE.

⁹ The passage from Plinius the Elder’s *Nat. Hist.* (21, 29) describes the plant called *baccar* in substantial detail: *Baccar quoque radice tantum odoratae est, a quibusdam nardum rusticum appellatum. Unguenta ex ea radice fieri solita apud antiquos Aristophanes, priscae comediae poeta, testis est; unde quidam errore falso barbaricam eam appellabant. Odor est cinnamomo proximus. Gracili solo nec umido provenit.*

¹⁰ A slightly different presentation in the same medical work is the following: καὶ προσθέσθω βάρκαριν ἢ λευκὸν ἔλαιον πρὸς τὸ ὑγιές ισχίον (6, 11–12). See also Littré (1851: 312–430). It is interesting to note that there are possible connections with Egypt, since the word βάρκαρις appears in the same context in which Egypt is mentioned. The context, however, seems to be quite generally referring to “exotic” plants, so that it does not necessarily imply an Egyptian origin of such a substance (here cited as a medical unguent or oil).

¹¹ See Pedley (1972: 43f.) for the text, the translation and a short comment.

¹²]. τὸ πῦρ κατακρύψας / [βάρκαρ,1 δὲ τὰς ῥίνας / [ἡλειφον ἴῆστι δ’ ὁ οἶνπερ Κροῖσος. Hipponax, fr. 104, lines 20–22 (West 1971: 144).

From the point of view of the literary tradition it is interesting to note that ancient sources, from Athenaeus onwards, seem unsure of the word’s origin and even of its nature, that is whether it is a perfume or in fact something else, perhaps an unguent or a type of oil. Latin authors also discuss the problem of reference: is *baccar* the *nardum selvaticum* or is it something else? According to Plinius, it probably refers to some other type of aromatic plant and *baccar* is the Latin name for Greek ἄσαρον.¹⁴

The word βάκκαρις is usually analysed by modern scholars as “Lydian”,¹⁵ in accordance with the ancient opinion, often referring in particular to the evidence of Hipponax, together with a scholion to the *Persians* of Aeschylus¹⁶ and a gloss in Hesychius.¹⁷ In the scholion βάκκαρις is said to be a Lydian unguent and the same notion occurs in Hesychius. The first point to make is that it is the object of reference that is Lydian, not the word itself. A very important question then offers itself: what was Lydian for ancient scholars? Should we simply assume that we are dealing with Lydian (as we understand it today) when Hesychius tells us a particular word is Lydian? The risk is to read an ancient lexicographic work such as the *Glosses* of Hesychius through the filter of the modern knowledge of the genealogical relationships within the Anatolian group of the Indo-European language family. We should, however, keep in mind that in those times Lydian was essentially a geographical term, indicating any inhabitant of the region of Lydia.¹⁸ Of course, historical facts, as well as ancient works of history and geography (such as Herodotus and Strabo) can help us recover the facts on what exactly Lydian could have referred to in ancient perspective. There can be some overlap with the modern notions but, at least methodologically, the two perspectives, ancient and modern, should always be kept separated.

¹³ See also ὃ Ζεῦ πολυτίμηθ’ οἶον <ἐπ>ἐπνευσ’ ὁ μιαρὸς / φάσκαλος εὐθὺς λυόμενός μοι τοῦ μύρου / καὶ βακκάριδος. Aristophanes, Fragment 320 (Edmonds 1957: 662). See also the fragment of *Ion. Trag.* 24: βακκάρης δὲ καὶ μύρα / καὶ Σαρδιανὸν κόσμον εἰδέναι χροὸς ἄμεινον ἢ τὸν Πέλοπος ἐν νήσῳ τρόπον (Snell 1971: 103).

¹⁴ *Nat. Hist.* 21, 30: *eorum quoque error corrigendus est, qui baccar rusticum nardum appellavere. Est enim alia herba sic cognominata, quam Graeci asaron vocant.* However, the Latin word is considered to be a borrowing from Greek.

¹⁵ Among recent contributions see especially Simon (2018: 386) with references, who reports that “βάκκαρις ‘unguent from asarum’ [...] is of Lydian origin according to classical authors, generally followed by the modern ones as well”. See also Oreshko (2018: 113) “[βάκκαρις] is the name of a *specific* product and, as such, is very likely to be borrowed together with the product”.

¹⁶ Fr. 41 *scholia vetera* Dindorf (1851: 3, 70–92). This is the last line of the scholion: καὶ τὴν βάκκαριν δὲ ἔνιοι Λυδῶν μύρον ἔφασαν. Or with Λυδῶν as an adjective agreeing with the noun, without a change in meaning. See Degani (1977) for a discussion of this point, where it is suggested that there is no reason to abandon the idea of the genitive plural in favour of an adjectival interpretation.

¹⁷ (107) βάκκαρις· μύρον ποιὸν ἀπὸ βοτάνης ὁμωνύμως· ἔνιοι δὲ ἀπὸ μυρσίνης· ἄλλοι δὲ μύρον Λυδῶν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ξηρὸν διάπασμα τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ῥίζης (Alpers/Cunningham 2018: 416).

¹⁸ On Lydia see Högemann/Oettinger 2018.

However, some scholars have tried to find a possible connection with a Lydian word or root. Hawkins (2004: 270f.) suggested relating βάκκαρις to the Lydian verbal root *wc-baqēnt* ‘trample on’, semantically compatible if the cosmetic perfume was in form of a powder, as mentioned in Hesychius.¹⁹ However, the existence of such a Lydian root (attested in the different context of curse formulas) does not necessarily point to a loanword, also considering the fact that /b/ in Lydian could stand for a /p/ or a /b^h/ as well.

To sum up, the origin of the word βάκκαρις is ultimately unknown. It can effectively be a loanword, although the form of the model language is so far unattested or even unknown. It may be Lydian, but until a Lydian text appears containing a similar word, we cannot say anything on its origin as a Lydian borrowing in Greek. If it were a loanword from the PG substrate, this would be based on the morphological element *-ap-*, which, according to the EDG hypothesis, is a specific marker of the PG language. There is another element to this, however, that could perhaps steer the discussion in the right direction. If we look at the formulations contained in the ancient testimonies, we never come across the statement that βάκκαρις is a Lydian *word*. All the ancient sources say is that it is Lydian *product*, which makes a great difference. There can also be a supplementary morpho-syntactic element in support of our hypothesis: in the scholion of Aeschylus it is said that καὶ τὴν βάκκαριν δὲ ἔνιοι Λυδῶν μύρον ἔφασαν ‘some called the *bakkaris* ‘perfume of the Lydians’’. In this sense, the bare noun represents the description, the gloss, which explains a definite name preceded by the definite article. Definite articles open a determiner phrase that contains the property of “given” opposed to “new” from the point of view of information structure. Similarly, there are examples with Carian glosses (see Adiego 2007: 454) in which the Greek word is preceded by the article, and the Carian correspondence has none, so σοῦσαν τὸν τάφον, ‘[by the word] *sousa* [they designate] the tomb’, γέλαν δὲ τὸν βασιλέα ‘the word *gelan* means the king’ etc. In the case we are concerned with, we are not dealing with a bare noun but with a sort of alternative description: the *baccaris* (that everybody knows) is also called ‘perfume of the Lydians’. Pushing the argument further, one could claim that at least for ancient authors, who are actually the main source of the idea that the word is Lydian, βάκκαρις is, on the contrary, very much a Greek word, or at least a word that was perceived by the speakers as native Greek, i.e., reflecting recognizably Greek morphology and one whose meaning (and reference) – relating to the domain of Lydian cosmetics – was generally known. Therefore, if βάκκαρις is really a loanword, it must have surely been one fully integrated into the lexicon as it was not recognized as a foreign element by the target language.

¹⁹ See also Hawkins 2013: 156–157. Cf. Gusmani 1964: 223f.

3.2 γεῖσον

EDG (264) considers the word γεῖσον, which means ‘the projecting part of the roof’, as possibly PG, again with a question mark <PG?>. This word is interesting for our survey since in the description of the lemma it is said that according to Stephan of Byzantium it is Carian. As we can read in Adiego (2007: 454) the gloss tells that the Carian word *gissa* means ‘stone’:²⁰

Μονόγισσα, <πόλις Καρίας> [...] γίσσα γὰρ τῆ Καρῶν φωνῆ λίθος ἐρμηνεύται. καὶ νῦν τοὺς πλακώδεις καὶ μαλακώδεις λίθους γίσσα λέγουσι.
 ‘Monogissa: <city of the Caria> *gissa* in fact in Carian language means ‘stone’. And now the hard stones and soft stones are called *gissa*’.

This seems to fit quite well semantically by straightforward metonymy. In his *Addenda/corrigenda* (GEW III: 60), Frisk refers to θρίγκος ‘topmost course of stones in a wall’ saying that the origin of the architectural vocabulary is unknown. Quite differently, EDG (264) argues that building terms are often loanwords (cf. DÉLG 213: “terme technique de l’architecture dont l’emprunt est probable”). EDG decides on a PG etymology, basing its attribution to the fact that the origin of this word is ultimately unknown. The reference to Carian *gissa* comes from an ancient gloss and is not supported by any direct textual source such as a Carian inscription in which the word would appear. In order to support the hypothesis that Greek γεῖσον is a loanword from Carian *gissa*, then, we can only really turn to the testimony of Stephan of Byzantium.

From the point of view of morphology, the presence of the verb γεισώω ‘provide with a γεῖσον, an edge’ has to be noted, not encountered in LSJ, but mentioned by DÉLG 213 ft. 21, where it is further referred to γεισώμα and γεισώσις, which could potentially be derived from this verb. EDG (264) also quotes the word κίσηρις (also κίσηλις) ‘pumice-stone’, because Furnée (1972: 117) compared it with the Carian word *gissa/γίσσα*. EDG (703) concludes that the word κίσηρις is “without a doubt PG, in view of the variation ρ / λ”. Furnée also quotes Dumézil who compares it with Georg. *kviša* ‘gravel’ and reports a comparison with the Basque form *gisul/khisu*. According to the PG hypothesis as provided by Furnée and followed by EDG these are sufficient clues that speak in favour of such an origin of γεῖσον. If we refrain from *a priori* assumptions, however, it must be said that the linguistic evidence around this word is not actually sufficient for one to propose a PG origin and neither does it point to a possible loanword from Carian.

²⁰ See also Adiego (2007: 7–9) for a comment on indirect sources, in particular glosses and pseudo-glosses.

²¹ From *EM* (*Etymologicum Magnum*), but see also *Antologia Palatina*, as in Rocci 1943: 379. More references in *Th.LG* (vol. 2, 1833: 544f.); see also γεῖσον, γεῖσος, γεισώω, γεισώμα, and γεισώσις in DGE. I am thankful to Paolo Scattolin for these references.

3.3 δάρπη

According to the TLG database, the word δάρπη is a *hapax*, attested once in Hesychius *s.v.* (273) δάρπη · σαργάνη. Κόφινος (Alpers/Cunningham 2018: 544). The gloss contains two synonyms, whose meaning is related to a big basket, possibly made of wicker.²² On the contrary, the word τάρπη with the voiceless dental stop is recorded by the TLG twenty-seven times, occurring in grammatical texts, scholia and lexica. The same form but with a voiceless /t/ is attested in four inscriptions from Attica dating back to the end of the 4th century BCE.

EDG (1453) classifies τάρπη ‘big basket’ as <PG> (i.e. as an indubitably PG word), mentioning the variant ταρπός, though no mention is made of δάρπη. In the etymological section GEW is referred to for the comparison with the verb ταργάναι ‘to go sour’, cf. τάργανον ‘sour wine’. Moreover, the word σάρπους (sg. σάρπος) is reported by a single gloss in Hesychius, viz. σάρπους · κιβωτούς. Βιθυνοὶ δὲ ξυλίνους οἰκίας (lemma 231, see Alpers/Erbse/Kleinlogel 2005: 269), where it is reported that the Bythinians call wooden houses σάρπους. Thus, the reference to Anatolia, particularly to the region of Bythynia, remains limited to an indirect source since once again there are no literary texts or inscriptions containing this word. Furnée (1972: 261)²³ suggests a PG root *ταρ/*δαρ, which he links to the root *σαρ/*ζαρ, the alternation being due to the process of assibilation (*Assibilierung*). As for EDG, the PG origin of τάρπη seems to be as good as proven by the morphological variants (mostly based on Furnée’s authority), even though the etymology is still considered unclear. Frisk’s dictionary, also quoted by Furnée (1972: 183), provides a couple of explanations for the presence of the voiced /d/ instead of the voiceless /t/ in the anlaut. The first hypothesis suggests a blending with a non-attested *δαρφη, based on the comparison with Vedic *darbhá-* ‘grass-bundle’.²⁴ Another suggestion is traced to Bechtel (1921), who proposed sociolinguistic variation that would produce an alternative form preserved nowhere but in the lexicographic tradition collected by Hesychius.²⁵ This same proposal is also mentioned in DÉLG 1095. As another similar case Bechtel reports βατάνια, which is based on another Hesychian gloss that claims that the word is the Siciliot variant of πατάνη ‘vessel’,²⁶ showing up with a

²² τάρπη · συρακούσιοι ἑσύνος†. τινὲς σορόν (197). ‘Τάρπη is the name that Syracusans give to the σύννος (?). Some others <call that> the cinerary urn’ (Alpers/Cunningham 2009: 13).

²³ See also Furnée (1972: 183) for references.

²⁴ This hypothesis was laid out by Güntert, see the reference in GEW 350.

²⁵ Bechtel (1921, II: 289): “τάρπα ‘Korb’: τάρπη · Συρακουσίοι σύννος · τινὲς σορόν (Hes.). Statt σύννος vermutet Kaibel (S. 202 Gl. 40) κόφινος, indem er an die Glossen δάρπη · σαργάνη · κόφινος τάρπη · κόφινος μέγας, οἱ δὲ νεκροφορικὸν ἀγγεῖον erinnert. Das Wort τάρπα gehört zu ταρπός, neben dem es Poll. VII 174 erwähnt wird. Den Anlaut von δάρπη kann man mit dem von βάτανια vergleichen, also der vulgären Sprechweise zur Last legen.”

²⁶ See Furnée (1972: 149 s.). Cf. EDG 205, where βατάνη is referred to πατάνη for the etymology.

voiced labial stop instead of a *p*. It is interesting to note the use of the adjective “Siciliot”, which points to a variant first of all along the geographical axis.

In my view, an alternation between a voiced and a voiceless stop does not explain the PG origin *per se*, but can point to dialectal differentiation both in geographical and in sociolinguistic terms. Such an alternation could of course also point to borrowing, by signalling an adaptation of a loanword. In similar vein one should effectively ask what the exact relationship between δάρπη (or τάρπη) and σάρπος, if we trust Hesychius and his reference to “Bythinians”, might be. Similarly as in the case of the purported Lydian origin of βάκκαρις, one should first aim to understand what Hesychius’ use of the term Bythinians implies. It should be clarified whether he was referring to the Roman province or to the ancient inhabitants of the same region, maybe Thracian or Phrygian people (according to the ancient sources). Further research on this point would certainly be needed, mostly based on noncontingent (as often happens with lexicographic works) indirect sources that would possibly reflect different lexical layers in properly diachronic terms.

3.4 θύσθλα

The word θύσθλα is classified as <PG> and said to mean ‘sacred implement for Bacchic sacrifice’ (EDG 567). According to the TLG, the word is generally attested in the nominative-accusative plural (35 out of a total of 44 occurrences), only in 3 cases does it appear in the nominative singular (θύσθλον), namely in Plutarch, Herodian and EM. The description of the lexical entry is modelled on the one given by Frisk (see GEW I: 697; cf. also GEW III: 108f.); it also reports the etymology as *θύρσ-θλα as provided by DÉLG (448) and indebted to Benveniste. According to this etymological explanation, θύρσος ‘wand wreathed in ivy and vine-leaves with a pine-cone at the top, carried by the devotees of Dionysus’ (LSJ 812) should also be taken into account.²⁷ However, according to GEW I: 697, the two words are not related, in the sense that θύσθλα is analysed not as a derivative from θύρσος but said to rather stem from the verb θύω ‘to rush with fury’.²⁸ Differently DÉLG, which prefers to relate the latter to the homophonous verb θύω ‘to make a sacrifice’.

EDG initially classifies this word as definitely “PG”, whereas towards the end it is concluded that the word is a loan, either from Anatolian or from PG. The rejection of the previous hypothesis is supported by the following statement: “This derivation does not seem adequate: it presupposes a much more general

²⁷ See Oreshko (2018: 110f.) with references, for an updated discussion.

²⁸ In the third volume, Frisk adds to the picture other words such as θυσιάζεις ‘ritual vestments’, Θυστήριος ‘sacrifice’, θυσιάς ‘possessed woman’.

meaning than the very specific one of the present entry.” In other words, since the meaning of *θύσθλα* is specifically related to the Bacchic sacrifice, it is not probable that the term is derived from the general meaning ‘make a sacrifice’. In order to evaluate this assumption we can turn to the Homeric text (*Il.* 6. 132–135):

ὄς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας
σεῦδε κατ’ ἠγάθειον Νυσηΐων· αἶ δ’ ἅμα πᾶσαι
θύσθλα χαμαὶ κατέχευαν ὕπ’ ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου
θεινόμεναι βουπληγί· [...]

‘He it was that drove the nursing women who were in charge of frenzied Bacchus through the land of Nysa, and they flung their thyrsi on the ground as murderous Lycurgus beat them with his oxgoad’.²⁹

The word *θύσθλα* is rendered by *thyrsi*, in accordance with the etymology presented above. Moreover, it is worth noting that *θύσθλα* might not specifically refer to the sacred implements used in Bacchic sacrifice but might rather be a general term for ritual implements that appears in the linguistic context referring really to the *τιθήναι* ‘the nurses’ (note in this relation the anaphoric *αἶ*, which functions as the subject of the verbal phrase *θύσθλα χαμαὶ κατέχευαν* ‘threw down the sacred implements’). Therefore, if the main reference is this precise passage of the *Iliad*, the comment on the general vs. specific meaning provided by the EDG is not appropriate. Concerning the use of the term ‘Anatolian’ in this respect, it seems to be very general and it is unclear whether it refers to a geographical or a linguistic entity. In any case, no source language or any foreign word is explicitly mentioned.³⁰ However, looking at Greek word formation, it is rather apparent that *θύσθλα* must be a derivative formation containing the suffix that typically derives *nomina instrumenti*.³¹ EDG judges such an explanation to be inadequate, particularly with respect to the alleged unclear semantic change. Still, similarly to what seems to have happened in the case of *γεῖσον* (see 3.2), a metonymy could easily explain such a transition.

θύσθλα, then, seems to be a native Greek word, according both to its morphology and the meaning, so that it is not really necessary to look for a foreign origin in this case either. EDG assumes that the word is PG, or even Anatolian, but both hypotheses are rather aprioristic and not further explored and adequately explained.

²⁹ Translation by Butler 1898: 93. See also the translation by A.T. Murray (1946: 271, 273): “he that on a time drove down over the sacred mount of Nysa the nursing mothers of mad Dionysus; and they all let fall to the ground their wands, smitten with an ox-goad by man-slaying Lycurgus”. Instead of ‘thyrsi’, the more generic ‘wands’ is chosen in the rendering of *θύσθλα*.

³⁰ Cf. Simon (2018: 391): “Beekes (2010: 567) suggests an Anatolian or Pre-Greek origin, but no similar Anatolian word is attested so far to corroborate this proposal.”

³¹ As for the instrumental suffix, see also Olsen 1988: 35. Cf. Van Windekens (1986: 101), who does not believe in the presence of the suffix *-θλο-*, but thinks rather of an original formation **θυσ-εσθλοσ* ‘what is good for the cult (of Dionysius)’, which would then be simplified via haplology.

3.5 ἴξαλος

The word is classified by EDG (593) as “<PG(V)>”, i.e. as a PG word because of its variants, and the meaning is said to be ‘(castrated) he-goat’. The same meaning is present in GEW I: 728 that translates it as ‘(verschnittener) Bock’. Taking this as our starting point, it is worth noting that such a meaning is far from securely established given that because in Homer (*Il.* 4. 104–108) it appears as an adjective of αἴξ, effectively ‘goat’ and thus probably means (at least for part of the scholia) ‘bounding, springing’ and not a ‘he-goat’:

[...] τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονοι πείθεν:
 αὐτίκ' ἐσύλα τόξον ἐβῆσον ἰξάλου αἰγός
 ἀγρίου, ὃν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τυχήσας
 πέτρης ἐκβαίνοντα δεδεγμένους ἐν προδοκῆσι
 βεβλήκει πρὸς στήθος: [...]

‘His fool’s heart was persuaded, and he took his bow from its case. This bow was made from the horns of a wild ibex which he had killed as it was bounding from a rock; he had stalked it, and it had fallen as the arrow struck it to the heart’.³²

The misreading³³ may find an easy explanation in the process of metonymy: the adjective ἴξαλος, ‘agile, quick’ (?) got referred to the αἴξ ‘goat’.

According to LSJ (831), the meaning ‘castrated’ (τομίας) is supposed to stem from the commentaries, but the same seems to hold true of the meaning ‘bounding, springing’ recovered from the testimonies of scholia and Hesychius.³⁴ In fact and as also observed by the DÉLG (465), different etymologies for the word ἴξαλος have been formulated since ancient times, because the exact meaning was unknown.³⁵

All the dictionaries also mention the derived feminine ἰξάλῃ ‘goatskin’, for which some orthographical variants are attested, viz. ἰσαλῃ, ἰσέλα, ἰτέλη, ἰθέλα, etc.³⁶ The variation in the first consonant(s) has been considered by modern scholars as a decisive element speaking in favour of the Asia Minor as the place

³² Translation by Butler 1898: 54.

³³ See also 3.4 for a similar case of misreading of the Homeric text.

³⁴ Here the lemma in LSJ: »ἴξαλος, ον, epith. of the Ibex, = τέλειος according to Ar. Byz. ap. Eust. 1625.33, or A. bounding, springing (as Sch.II., Hsch., etc.), or = τομίας (as Porph. ap. Sch.II.), “ἰξάλου αἰγός ἀγρίου” *Il.* 4.105, cf. AP6.32 (Agath.), 113 (Simm.), 9.99 (Leon.). (Perh. borrowed fr. Asia Minor).« A possible Near-Eastern origin is finally mentioned but without any further suggestions.

³⁵ As Chantraine observes: “Les scholies ignorent le sens du mots et imaginent des équivalents divers: τέλειος ou ἐκτομίας ‘châtré’ (absurde, s’il s’agit d’une bête sauvage tuée par un chasseur [...]) ou πηδηδικός ‘bondissant’.” It is particularly relevant to notice (and agree with) the fact that the meaning ‘castrated’ hardly matches with the referent, which is a wild beast killed during a hunting trip. However, since the root that lies behind that is that of τέμνω ‘cut’, it may be possible to understand the participle ἐκτομίας as ‘whose horns have been cut (to do the bow)’. The passage also shows a stylistic effect of alliteration of the sound /ks/, which then continues in v. 114.

³⁶ For the references to the attestations see DÉLG 465.

of the word's origin.³⁷ Quite differently, not only on the descriptive level but also in relation to the content of the classification itself, EDG (593) pronounces ἴζαλος to be PG, in particular "PG(V)", according to the framework in which variants within PG are assumed. One possible hypothesis would be that there is an etymological link between ἴζαλος and αἶξ. The latter can be compared with Armenian *ayc* 'goat'. There are also many derivatives and compounds such as αἰγίς, -ίδος 'aegis, goatskin shield' or αἰπόλος 'goatherd'.³⁸ DÉLG (37) suggests a possible connection with Avestan *izaēna* 'of skin', originally 'of goatskin', which would then be based on the zero-grade of the root involved in all of these apparent cognates. There is also the Greek verb αἶσσω 'to move with a quick shooting motion, to shoot, dart, glance', based on the verbal root αἶγ-, cf. the middle aorist αἶξασθαι (see LSJ: 42–43). According to some scholars, the verb αἶσσω is related to the adjective αἰόλος 'nimble, quick', as in *Il.* 19.404.³⁹

As for Anatolian correspondences, there are some Hittite words that could be added to the lot: *iškallāri* 'slashes'⁴⁰ and *iškāri*, *iškaranzi* 'to cut', possibly related to the Gr. σκάλλω 'to stir up'; cf. also Latin *scalpo* 'to cut, carve, scrape', going back to PIE **sekh₂-/*sokh₂-/*skh₂-*.⁴¹ Focusing on the meaning 'to spring, jump' attributed to the Homeric passage quoted above, other possibly related PIE roots such as **skək-* 'moving fast, jumping' (LIV² 551) or **skend-* 'jump, jump off' (LIV² 552) may also be worth mentioning.⁴²

To sum up, we are faced with a very ancient and challenging item, for which many explanations are in fact possible. It can be a PIE word related to one (or even more) PIE roots and accompanying diachronic changes. If we follow the opinion expressed in EDG 593, it could be a PG word, especially due to the variants. As a third possibility (also suggested by GEW I: 728 and DÉLG 465) ἴζαλος could be the result of language contact. In particular, we could consider it to be an adapted loanword or, to be more precise, a contact-induced derivative from the Hittite root *ikšar-/iškāl-*, showing both metathesis⁴³ and /l/ ~ /r/ alternation. As for its meaning, it can in the end indeed refer to something cut, more specifically to the goat whose horns have been cut.

³⁷ The standard dictionaries quote the positions of Solmsen, Bechtel, Schwyzer and Heubeck. For the relevant references see GEW I: 728, GEW III: 112 and DÉLG 465.

³⁸ See DÉLG 36f. for a list of forms and references.

³⁹ The Homeric text says: "προσέφη πόδας αἰόλος ἴππος". Such an etymological link is proposed by GI 98. See DÉLG 39 for further references.

⁴⁰ See LIV² 553 (s.v. **skelH-* 'aufschlitzen, spalten').

⁴¹ For the analysis of this PIE root and its possible evolutions see Santamaria (this volume).

⁴² Cf. **keh₂k-* 'springen' (LIV² 319), **sker-* 'springen, sich schwingen' (LIV² 556).

⁴³ For the metathesis, but within the PG hypothesis, see Furnée 1972: 392f.

The word ἴξαλος offers a very complex picture in which different morphological outputs cross at different chronological stages. For ancient scholars its exact meaning and internal connections were also unclear. The possibility of an Anatolian loanword is open, especially in light of the context preserved by Homeric poetry. Further research is definitely needed, though “PG(V)” seems to be not at all satisfactory.

3.6 κάλανδρος

The word κάλανδρος, indicating ‘a bird, a king of lark’, belongs to the semantic field of fauna and, according to EDG (622), which classifies it as <PG>, to the substrate layer of the lexicon. The entry is very short:

κάλανδρος [m.] ‘kind of lark’ (Dionys. *Av.* 3, 15). <PG> ETYM Ending like τάρανδ(ρ)ος, Μαΐανδρος; origin unknown. Thence Ital. *calandro* ‘lark’ (Meyer-Lübke 1911–20: No 1486). See also WH s.v. *caliandrum*. No doubt either Pre-Greek, or a loan from Anatolia.

The etymology is mostly based on what is supposed to be the suffixal part, drawing a parallel with words like Μαΐανδρος (a Carian river, nowadays Büyük Menderes in Turkey, flowing near the ancient Greek city Miletus) and τάρανδρος ~ τάρανδος, attested with the meaning ‘reindeer, elk’ or, more generally, referring to a big wild animal, but the word also occurs as a toponym indicating a Phrygian region. GEW (761) argues that the origin of κάλανδρος is unknown, whereas DÉLG (484) proposes that we are certainly dealing with a *pre-hellenique* word, which matches EDG’s “PG word”. The word leaves on in the Romance languages, e.g. It. *calandro*, also *calandra* from a non-attested Lat. **calandra*,⁴⁴ a borrowing from the Gr. κάλανδρος (possibly via Provençal, see Treccani, s.v.). The word seems to appear only once in Greek⁴⁵ and is similar in this respect to the already discussed case of δάρπη (see 3.3), though with κάλανδρος there are no variants to rely on, which complicates the picture. Both words (labelled as certainly “PG” by the EDG), then, go back to solitary attestations of the written tradition and this status hardly allows us to decide anything definitive about their etymological ties.

The form of the lexical entry in the EDG should be commented on from a meta-linguistic point of view, though. Three etymological explanations are provided for the same lemma: a) PG in the main classification, b) origin unknown, and c) “No doubt either Pre-Greek, or a loan from Anatolia”. The impression one gets from that is that previous opinions derived from older dictionaries have somehow converged here, while a number of inconsistencies and discrepancies re-

⁴⁴ Cf. the modern scientific Latin term *Melanocorypha calandra*.

⁴⁵ As also mentioned by EDG 622, the reference is a work on birds (*Ornithiaká* or *De avibus*), attributed to an author called Dionysius (see Lehrs 1862: 123).

main. Concerning the last hypothesis that mentions the possibility of an Anatolian source, what we are missing is the concrete proposal as to what the relevant source-word might have been.⁴⁶

3.7 κέρασος

This word, meaning ‘bird cherry’ and probably referring to the *Prunus avium*, is classified as PG with a question mark in EDG (677). According to the TLG, the word shows an alternation in the stress pattern: the barytone form κέρασος is attested three times more than its oxytone variant κερασός. Ancient authors such as Joannes Philoponus and Tomas Magister provided an explanation of the difference, claiming that κερασός is the tree (as in the case of Hesychius) and κέρασος the fruit.⁴⁷

In the description of the lemma it is said that “[g]iven its intervocalic σ, the form must be Anatolian or Pre-Greek”. The main reason why EDG classifies it as a PG(?) word is the presence of the intervocalic sigma. This same feature could allegedly also point to Anatolia, so that again the two labels occur side by side without any further comment or explanation. In terms of word formation (even though not so explicitly laid out for this lemma), the presence of a particular -(σ)σος is then additionally assumed to point to a foreign origin. The same suffix is also found in words such as νάρκισσος ‘narcissus’ and κυπάρισσος ‘cypress’, both rooted in the domain of flora.⁴⁸

As for the possible Anatolian origin EDG states that “[a]s the improved cherry came from the Pontos area (cf. Κερασοῦς “rich in cherries”, town on the Pontos),⁴⁹ the name is probably Anatolian as well”.⁵⁰ However, as already observed in the case of βάκκαρις (see 3.1) the product itself is one thing, while the name for that product is a different matter altogether. In order to be sure that *the noun* κέρασος (and not only the *referent*, so the tree or the fruit) stems from an Anatolian language we need a relevant Anatolian candidate, but no such item has so far been identified. With respect to other possible connections EDG mentions that comparison has been made with Assyrian *karsu*. However, as Blažek (2014)

⁴⁶ See also Simon (2018: 393), who claims that “there is no evidence for a similar Anatolian word yet”.

⁴⁷ The same distinction is also found in Herodian (the grammarian), quoted by DÉLG 518 and EDG 677.

⁴⁸ As the author says (EDG 677): “[f]or the suffix, cf. θίασος, κάρπασος, which too are of foreign origin”, adding the reference to these two words. On this suffix, together with others like *-nth-*, the research on Pre-Greek or Aegean substrate has been ongoing since Kretschmer (1896) and managed to trace a few correspondences with Greek and the languages of Asia Minor, which at the time were much lesser known and not even considered to be Indo-European.

⁴⁹ Cf. also Κέρασσαι in Lydia (GI 1074).

⁵⁰ For the same assumption see DÉLG 518: “Le cerisier passe pour être originaire de la région du Pont (cf. le nom de ville Κερασοῦς), sa dénomination peut donc venir de l’Asie Mineure.”

observed, we are actually dealing with a ghost-word, given that *karsu* means ‘belly, stomach’ rather than not ‘cherry’.⁵¹

DÉLG (518) is more informative, adding for instance the Mycenaean feminine proper name *Ke-ra-so*, which at least proves that the word was already around in the Late Bronze Age. As DÉLG rightly observes, if κέρασος is really a loanword, it would be a very ancient one.

Finally, as reported in EDG (677), the Greek word was borrowed into many languages, both in the East and in the West:

Gr. κέρασος, -ία, κεράσιον were borrowed into many languages: Asiatic names of the cherry-tree and the cherry, like Arm. *keras*, Kurd. *ghilas*, and in the West, Lat. *cerasus*, -ium, VLat. **cerasia*, **ceresia*, -ea; from Latin came the Romance and Germanic forms like MoFr. *cerise*, OHG *chirsa* > *Kirsche*. [...]

Looking at the word from another perspective, it is relevant to consider that for this lemma Van Windekens (1986: 118) argues in favour of a properly Greek etymology and against the substratum hypothesis or, for that matter, borrowing from some unidentified Anatolian source. Starting from the verb κεράννυμι < PIE **kerh₂-* ‘mix’, he suggests that a metonymic process has taken place from the name of the drink to the name of the plant which provides fruits used in the preparation of the drink. This assumption is not improbable, given that it convincingly traces the origin back to a securely attested PIE verbal root and can plausibly explain the word’s semantic specialization.

4 Discussion

It is evident from the discussion of the selected items that behind the (possible) PG classification provided by the EDG several different circumstances are hiding. Some words are late hapaxes or accidental attestations (such as δάρπη and κάλανδρος). Others are probably Greek, as is perhaps the case with θύσθλα and κέρασος. Certain items are most likely loanwords, although the relevant word in the presumed source language is usually not attested so far (such is the case of γεῖσον). Some words indicate a cultural product coming from a region in Anatolia, as is the story behind βάκκαρις, which stems from Lydia but lacks an identifiable connection to an actual Lydian word. Some words could reflect a chronological stage of a PIE root that has not survived into the Greek language, or could be, indeed for this same reason, a borrowing from a more ancient IE language: this is the case of ἴζαλος, which offers a very complex picture. If a local substrate ever existed, some words could of course come from that source.

⁵¹ See Blažek (2014: 44) with references: “A foreign origin is generally accepted. Rosól (2013: 179) correctly rejects the repeatedly cribbing comparison with the Akkadian ghost-word +*karšu* “Süßkirsche” (for the last time Beekes 2010!). A hypothetical donor-language might be a mediator between Greek κερᾶσός and Akkadian *kami/eaššaru(m)* “pear-tree” (AHw. 432; CAD 8, 122).”

In what follows, I will focus on some essential methodological points in order to provide a few directions for the analysis of the lexicon of an ancient language that is at the same time a *corpus* language.

First, it is crucial to distinguish between the geographical and the genealogical concept of “Anatolian”. It is also important to separate linguistic from metalinguistic explanations, both with regard to ancient and modern perspectives: for instance, if an ancient author claims that a given word is Lydian or Carian, this must fit with (a) the occurrence of the item as a loanword in a Greek text, and (b) the phonological and morphological shape of an identified Lydian or Carian word; the genealogical relationship must of course be excluded (c).

This last point is extremely complex and really the most challenging part of the whole issue, since a probable PIE etymology does not necessarily remove the possibility of language contact. Modern languages often provide cases of borrowing between the members of the same linguistic family or group, consider French loanwords in Italian or English loanwords in Spanish. Only the analysis of the phonological and morphological shape of the word in question can clarify this point and enable more appropriate understanding of the linguistic output. In addition to that, it is also important to exploit the tools of dialectology and language variation in describing variation among the different Greek dialects, e.g., the alternation between simple and geminate consonants could be explained in terms of variation rather than point as a definite clue to a PG origin.

Finally, the distinction should always be taken into account, at least methodologically, between the linguistic and the cultural level: in fact, they go hand in hand but they are hardly the same thing. Looking at a concrete example, how can we claim that βάρκαρις is a Lydian word? Is it sufficient to know that this word refers to a Lydian product? Most definitely not. This is a methodological issue pertaining to the processes involved in borrowing, in particular those situations in which the interpretation of a loanword must proceed without an identifiable source. In other words, every language has at its disposal both linguistic material and the strategies to indicate the particular objects: if one culture borrows an object from another culture, it does not as a rule take over the name as well. Of course this can happen, but it does not have to happen.⁵² The cultural contact is necessary but not a sufficient condition for language contact to occur. Moreover, cultural contact can be of different entities and degrees, determined

⁵² To resort to the examples from modern languages, one can recall the case of the potato: when *Solanum tuberosum* (= the potato) was introduced to Europe, two Romance languages used different strategies to name it: It. *patata*, a borrowing from Spanish *patata*, itself from Quechua *papa*, possibly blended with *batata*, which indicates a similar tuber (see Treccani, s.v.); Fr. *pomme de terre*, literally ‘soil apple’. In an opposite manner developed the terms designating the tomato: cf. It. *pomodoro* (formerly *pomo d’oro* ‘a golden apple’) vs. Fr. *tomate* from Nahuatl *tomatl* via Spanish *tomate*.

by historical and social factors.⁵³ Language data should be evaluated in such a manner that what is inherited is separated from contact features, and also in a way that enables a rethinking of the metalanguage of etymological description on the basis of the current knowledge of historical linguistics, Anatolian linguistics, and the phenomena of language contact in ancient contexts.

5 Final remarks

Etymological dictionaries, having to deal with hundreds of words, cannot be as precise as separate etymological studies. This is why all-inclusive theories, as the PG hypothesis pertained to by the EDG, can be a convenient tool. However, it seems that the continuous advancement of knowledge can lead to a greater understanding of the Greek lexicon, starting from the deep analysis of individual entries, which can potentially lead to an overall picture that is decisively different. Let us return to the question set out at the beginning of this contribution: if PG is not a unique non-IE language (as postulated by the EDG), what then is the real nature of the Pre-Greek substrate? Unfortunately, we do not have many elements at our disposal to define it properly. It can be said that PG consists of a number of unknown languages spoken before the 2nd millennium BCE in the area that would eventually become the Greek-speaking area. So far unattested, such languages could be non-IE (as EDG argues) or IE, in that case an earlier stage of Greek or likely belonging to another branch of the IE family. Methodologically it seems preferable to start from these types of open assumptions, based on the linguistic data and the analysis of evidence. Lejeune’s concluding remarks on the analysis of Georgiev’s hypothesis of *Vorgriechisch* (formerly also *Illyrisch* and *Pelasgisch*) are worth quoting here verbatim:

Je ne prétends point que l’hypothèse soit absurde. Je n’affirme point qu’elle soit fausse. Elle m’apparaît, si elle juste, indémontrable. Les faits linguistiques n’ont point la rigueur de la mécanique céleste. Si Neptune, dans sa révolution, pouvait perturber de façons variées et arbitraires l’orbite d’Uranus, et si cette orbite comportait elle-même des perturbations de sources inconnues dont Neptune ne fût pas la cause, jamais les calculs de Leverrier n’eussent pu démontrer l’existence et situer la position d’une planète nouvelle. Nous en sommes là, présentement. Ce n’est que du déchiffrement des textes égéens que peut venir la lumière. Ne nions point l’existence de Neptune; mais attendons de l’avoir dans le champ du télescope. (Lejeune 1947: 35)

Here he very adequately compares the linguistic discussion on the earlier stages of the Greek language to the astronomic discovery of the planet Neptune, implicitly stressing the core similarity between the two scientific disciplines and procedures. Pre-Greek is like Neptune for Leverrier: a non-evident reality that can “perturb the orbits” of other languages. However, the very difference is that

⁵³ A very insightful discussion on cultural vs. linguistic interferences is provided by Nencioni (1950).

for Neptune there were no other elements of interference, so Leverrier could demonstrate the existence of the new planet before having actually seen it, solely on the basis of mathematical calculations. In the case of languages, the scenario is decidedly different: languages are historical products related to people and people's movement. Interference is the norm, more than an exception. In Lejeune's perspective, our knowledge was insufficient (and still is) to understand the possible directions and crossings of such "perturbations". Many decades have passed since this statement was made but very little has changed. The hope is to find our Neptune, namely that some ancient, possibly PG textual documents would surface somewhere.

References

- Adiego, Ignacio J. 2007: *The Carian Language*. (Handbuch der Orientalistik. 1. Abt., Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 86). Leiden – Boston.
- Alpers, Klaus / Cunningham, Ian C. 2009: *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. Vol. IV, T–Ω. Editionem post Kurt Latte continuantes recensuerunt et emendaverunt Peter Allan Hansen, Ian C. Cunningham*. Berlin – New York.
- Alpers, Klaus / Cunningham, Ian C. 2018: *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. Vol. I, A–Δ. Recensuit et emendavit Kurt Latte. Editionem alteram curavit Ian C. Cunningham*. Berlin – Boston.
- Alpers, Klaus / Erbse, Hartmut / Kleinlogel, Alexander. 2005: *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. Vol. III, Π–Σ. Editionem post Kurt Latte continuans recensuit et emendavit Peter Allan Hansen*. Berlin – New York.
- Bechtel, Friedrich. 1921: *Die griechischen Dialekte*. Bd. I–III. Berlin.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 2014: *Pre-Greek. Phonology, morphology, lexicon*. (Brill Introductions to Indo-European Languages 2). Leiden – Boston.
- Blažek, Václav. 2014: Etymologizing 'unetymologizable' Greek dendronyms. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 19(1): 41–50.
- Bußmann, Hadumod / Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola. 2007: *Lessico di Linguistica. Fondato da Hadumod Bußmann. Traduzione italiana, adattamento e revisione sulla base della 3. edizione originale, rivista ed ampliata da Paola Cotticelli-Kurras*. Alessandria.
- Butler, Samuel. 1898: *The Iliad of Homer. Rendered into English prose for the use of those who cannot read the original*. London – New York – Bombay.
- De Decker, Filip. 2016: Etymological and methodological observations on the <PG> and <PG?> vocabulary in Robert Beekes's Etymological Dictionary of Greek. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 133(3): 133–149.
- Degani, Enzo. 1977: Hesychiana. *Museum Criticum*. Pisa: 273–274.
- Dindorf, Wilhelm. 1851: *Aeschyli tragoediae superstites et deperditarum fragmenta*. Vol. 3, Oxford. (Repr. Hildesheim 1962).
- DÉLG = Chantraine, Pierre. 1968–1980: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*. Paris. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots / par Pierre Chantraine; achevé par Jean Taillardat, Olivier Masson et Jean-Louis Perpillou. Avec un Supplément publié par Alain Blanc, Charles de Lamberterie et Jean-Louis Perpillou*. Nouvelle édition. Paris.
- DGE = *Diccionario Griego-Español*. Directed by Francisco R. Adrados (1980–). <http://dge.cchs.csic.es/xdge/> (last access: June 20, 2020).
- EAGLL = Giannakis, Georgios K. (ed.). 2014: *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden – Boston.

- EDG = Beekes, Robert S. P. 2009: *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. (Leiden Indo-European Dictionaries Series 10). Leiden – Boston.
- Edmonds, John M. 1957: *The fragments of Attic comedy*, vol. 1. Leiden.
- Filos, Panagiotis. 2014: Proto-Greek and Common Greek. In: EAGLL 3: 175–189.
- Finkelberg, Margalit. 2005: *Greeks and Pre-Greeks. Aegean Prehistory and Greek Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, Margalit. 2014: Pre-Greek Languages. In: EAGLL 3: 133–136.
- Furnée, Edzard J. 1972: *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen: mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus*. (Janua Linguarum, Series practica 150). The Hague.
- Gasbarra, Valentina / Pozza, Marianna. 2012: Fenomeni di interferenza greco-anatolica nel II millennio a.C.: l'ittico come mediatore tra mondo indoeuropeo e mondo non indoeuropeo. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* (N.S.) 1: 165–214.
- GEW = Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960–72: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Abteilung 1: Sammlungen indogermanischer Lehr- und Handbücher, Reihe 2: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- GI = Montanari, Franco. 2013 [1995¹]: *Dizionario Greco-Italiano*. Torino.
- Gusmani, Roberto. 1964: *Lydisches Wörterbuch: Mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. 2. Reihe: Wörterbücher). Heidelberg.
- Gusmani, Roberto. 1986: *Saggi sull'interferenza linguistica*. Seconda edizione accresciuta. (Le Lettere Università). Firenze.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2014: Die griechisch-anatolischen Sprachkontakte zur Bronzezeit. Sprachbund oder loser Sprachkontakt? *Linguarum varietas* 3: 105–116.
- Hawkins, Shane H. 2004: *Studies in the language of Hipponax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Chapel Hill.
- Hawkins, Shane H. 2013: *Studies in the language of Hipponax*. Bremen.
- Högemann, Peter / Oettinger, Norbert. 2018: *Lydien. Ein altanatolischer Staat zwischen Griechenland und dem Vorderen Orient*. Berlin – Boston.
- Katičić, Radoslav. 1976: *Ancient languages of the Balkans*. The Hague – Paris.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1896: *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
- Lehrs, Franz S. (ed.). 1862: *Poetae bucolici et didactici*. Paris.
- Lejeune, Michel. 1947: Linguistique préhellénique. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 49(1–2): 25–37.
- Litré, Émile. 1851: *Œuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*. Vol. 7. Paris. (Repr. Amsterdam: Hakker, 1962).
- LSJ = Liddell, Henry G. / Scott, Robert / Jones, Henry S. et al. 1968: *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.
- Mihaylova, Biliana. 2016: The Pre-Greek Substratum Revisited. In: Hansen, Bjarne Simmelkjær Sandgaard / Nielsen Whitehead, Benedicte / Olsen, Birgit Anette (eds.): *Etymology and the European Lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermansichen Geselleschaft, 17–22 September 2012, Copenhagen*. Wiesbaden: 307–317.
- Murray, Augustus T. 1946: *Homer. The Iliad with an English Translation by A.T. Murray. Vol. 1*. (Loeb classical library). London – Cambridge (MA).
- Nencioni, Giovanni. 1950: *Ipponatte nell'ambiente culturale e linguistico dell'Anatolia occidentale*. Parte 1. (Mousikai dialektoi 5,2,1). Bari.
- Pedley, John G. 1972: *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis*. (Archaeological Exploration of Sardis – Monographs 2). Harvard.
- Olsen, Birgit. 1988: *The Proto-Indo-European Instrument Noun Suffix *-tlom and its variants*. (Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 55). Copenhagen.
- Oreshko, Rostislav. 2018: Anatolian linguistic influences in Early Greek (1500–800 BC)? Critical observations against sociolinguistic and areal background. *Journal of Language Relationship* 16(2): 93–118.
- Rocci, Lorenzo. 1943 [1939¹]: *Vocabolario Greco-Italiano*. Roma.
- Silvestri, Domenico. 2014: Pre-Greek Substrate. In: EAGLL 3: 136–143.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2018: Anatolian influences on Greek. In: Niesiołowski-Spanò, Łukasz / Węcowski, Marek (eds.): *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-Eastern Mediterranean at the turn of*

- the Bronze Age and in the early Iron Age*. (Philippika: Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen 118). Wiesbaden: 376–418.
- Snell, Bruno. 1971: *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Göttingen.
- Th.LG* = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae ab Henrico Stephano constructus*. Reedited by Charles B. Hase, Wilhelm Dindorf and Ludwig A. Dindorf. 1831–1865. Paris.
- TLG* = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu> (last access: May 12, 2020).
- Treccani = Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana fondata da Giovanni Treccani, *Vocabolario della Lingua Italiana*. <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/> (last access: May 12, 2020).
- Van Windekens, Albert J. 1986: *Dictionnaire étymologique complémentaire de la langue grecque: nouvelles contributions à l'interprétation historique et comparée du vocabulaire*. Leuven.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953: *Languages in contact. Findings and problems*. The Hague.
- West, Martin L. 1971: *Iambi et elegi Graeci*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
- Winters, Margaret E. 2015: Lexical Layers. In: Taylor, John R. (ed.): *The Oxford Handbook of the Word*. Oxford: 445–461.