

- Rüdiger Schmitt: *Grammatik des Klassisch Armenischen*, Innsbruck 1981.  
 Rüdiger Schmitt: *Forschungsbericht: Die Erforschung des Klassisch-Armenischen seit Meillet (1936)*, *Kratylos* 17, 1972 [1974], 1-68.  
 Reinhard Stempel: *Die infiniten Verbalformen des Armenischen*, Frankfurt a. M./Bern/New York 1983.  
 Werner Sundermann: *Westmittelliranische Sprachen, Parthisch, Mittelpersisch*, in: *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, hrsg. von R. Schmitt, Wiesbaden 1989, 106-164.  
 Hans Vogt: *Les formes nominales du verbe arménien*, *NIS* 8, 1937, 5-70.

Lehrstuhl für Indogermanistik  
 der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität  
 Zwätzengasse 12  
 07743 Jena

Susanne Zeilfelder

HS 109/2, '96

## Greek *μῦριος* 'countless', Hittite *mūri-* 'bunch (of fruit)'<sup>\*</sup>

In the long history of Greek etymology no satisfactory explanation has ever been offered for Greek *μῦριος* 'countless,' *μῦριοι* 'ten thousand.'<sup>1)</sup> suggest that *μῦριος* is cognate with Hittite *mūri-* 'a cluster or bunch of grapes or other fruit,' and that both *μῦριος* and *mūri-* are derivatives of a PIE root *\*meuh<sub>1/3</sub>* 'abundant, reproductively powerful,' which also has probable reflexes in Italic and Celtic.<sup>2)</sup>

### *Hittite mūri- and its Anatolian relatives*

The connection between *mūri-* and *μῦριος* may not have previously been made because of some uncertainty about the exact meaning of *mūri-*. There is indeed some disagreement in the literature over whether *mūri-* is properly translated as 'grape' or 'cluster.'<sup>3)</sup> But an examination of the relevant *loci* shows that the primary meaning was clearly 'cluster.' Consider, e.g., *KUB* 43.23, a blessing for Labarna in Old Hittite script:

kēll/a/z ŠA KIRI<sub>6</sub> G[EŠTIN] 1-ašš/a Gišmāhlaš  
 ŠAH-aš iwar mu-u-ri-uš mekkuš [h]ašidd.

Let every single (vine)branch of this vineyard, like the sow, bear many (grape) clusters.<sup>4)</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>) I would like to thank Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Alan Nussbaum for much helpful advice and criticism. Naturally, I alone am responsible for all errors of fact or opinion.

<sup>1)</sup> See Chantraine (1968) 723, and Frisk (1970) 2.271 for the present state of the question. I will return below in note 29 to the possible Old Irish cognate *múr* 'abundance,' suggested by Stokes (1907) 249, still considered possible by Frisk, and firmly rejected by Chantraine.

<sup>2)</sup> On the etymological possibilities thus far suggested for Hittite *mūri-* see Tischler (1977) 233.

<sup>3)</sup> Puhvel (1984) 378, for example, seems to favor a translation 'grape.' The *CHD* (1980) 333 offers both translations.

<sup>4)</sup> This and all other Hittite passages translated by the *CHD*.

The relationship between the *māhlaš* of a vineyard and *mūriuš mekkuš* must be parallel to that between a sow and her offspring. Ehelolf suggests and rejects the translations *Traube* and *Beere* for *māhlaš* and *mūriuš* respectively, since clusters do not produce (*haškiddu*) grapeberries but rather consist of them.<sup>5)</sup> Further, the meaning 'vine-branch' has been determined for *māhlaš* from such unambiguous contexts as *KUB* 29.1, a rite for the foundation of a palace:

GIŠGEŠTIN-wa maḥḥan katta šürkuš šarā/ma/wa GIŠmaḥluš šiyaizzi  
Just as the vine sends down roots and sends up branches ...

If *māhlaš* means 'branch' this leaves only two possible glosses for *mūri-*: 'grape' or 'cluster'.<sup>6)</sup> Against the translation 'grape,' one may argue that *mūri-* only occurs in the meaning 'grape' with further specification. So, in the first passage cited, the text makes it clear that the *mūriuš* are the products of the vineyard. In a Neo-Hittite ritual text for the storm god of Nerik (a Neo-Hittite text) the phrase used is GEŠTIN-aš murieš 'clusters of the vineyard'.<sup>7)</sup> Further, whether or not the noun GIŠēppiya-/ippiya- is correctly interpreted as equivalent to GIŠGEŠTIN, *KBo* 11.32 obv. 21, a ritual(?) OH/NS nevertheless provides another example of the specification of *mūri-* by the name of the plant that produces it:

DUMU É.GAL-kan GIŠtepaza GIŠippiyaš mū-ri-in ŠÀ Ì.DÜG.GA  
šunnizi  
The palace servant throws clusters of the *ippiya*-tree with a ladle (?) into the aromatic oil.

Cf. also *Bo* 884 ii 8, *ēppiyaš mu-u-ri-iš*.<sup>8)</sup>

This pattern indicates that *mūri-* cannot mean specifically 'grape' since the constant specification by GIŠGEŠTIN *vel sim.* would be superfluous. Compare the situation in Latin, where *uva* means specifically 'grape' or 'grape-cluster.' Although *uva* can be used metaphorically of other grape-like clusters, e.g., *amomi uva* (Plin. *H. N.* 12.48), one never finds, to my knowledge, the expression \**uva vitis* in all Latin literature up to Vergil. Additional evidence against the translation 'grape' is provided by *KUB* 39.7 i 11-12:

<sup>5)</sup> Ehelolf (1933) 5.

<sup>6)</sup> As evidence that a vine may be said to produce clusters, cf. *Od.* 5.69: ἡμερὶς ἡβώωσα τεθῆλει δὲ σταφυλῆσι.

<sup>7)</sup> See Haas (1970) 159.

<sup>8)</sup> Puhvel (1984) 378.

namma/an IŠTU. GIŠGEŠTIN GIŠINB[ I] mu-u-ri-ni-it  
šGiyatnaš mu-u-ri-ni-it unuwanzi

They adorn it (a grapevine wrapped in ŠÀ KA.DU cloth) with a cluster of the fruit of the vine and with a cluster of *iyatar*-wool.

'Cluster' or 'bunch' is the obvious translation in this passage.<sup>9)</sup>

Finally, the denominative verb *mūriya*-<sup>10)</sup> makes better sense as a derivative of a word meaning 'cluster' than as a derivative of a word meaning 'grape' (*KBo* 25.72/*KBo* 20.83 i 9-10):

1 LÚḪÚB.BI mu-u-ri-at-ta t/as ḥapšālli k[īša]

One acrobat crouches down (i.e., bunches up) and becomes a stool.

The bulk of the evidence favors the translation 'cluster.' But even if this were not the case, it would hardly be unreasonable to derive a word meaning 'grape' from a word meaning 'cluster.' For example, French *raisin* derives from Latin *racemus* 'bunch of grapes'; Romanian *strugure* means 'grape' but in Old Romanian simply meant 'cluster' and could be used of other fruits, e.g., *strugur de puama* 'bunch of apples'.<sup>11)</sup>

### The Morphology of *mūri-*

The following forms of *mūri-* are attested in the various stages of Hittite:

	OH	OH/NS	MH/NS	NS
NS				mūriš
AS		murin		
IS			mūrinit	
NP				murieš
AP	mūriuš		mūrianuš	

Old Hittite attests only an *i*-stem, and the contrast of OH *mūriuš* vs. MH/NS *mūrianuš* is revealing. The *n*-stem forms must be secondary, just as they are for another word in the same semantic sphere, i.e. OH *alkišta-* vs. NH *alkišan-* 'branch', *ḫurpašta-* vs. *ḫur-*

<sup>9)</sup> Puhvel (1984) 351 still prefers the translation 'grape' so that *iyatnas mūri-* are false grapes made from wool. It cannot be denied that *iyatar* wool was used to construct other dummy ritual objects like the *laḥanza* birds of *KU/B* 39 ii 10-11.

<sup>10)</sup> In form parallel to *ūrkiya-* 'to trail' from *ūrki-* 'trail'. See Oettinger (1977) 355.

<sup>11)</sup> Buck (1949) 378-9.

*paštan-* 'leaf'.<sup>12)</sup> Fairly consistent plene spelling of *u* and the absence of any evidence for plene spelling of the *i* vowel indicate a barytone accent.<sup>13)</sup>

Since *\*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)r-/\*mu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)r-* is not a possible PIE root shape, *mu-ri-* must be the preferred morphological analysis. But what is the status of this apparent suffix *-ri-* in Hittite and PIE? The answer to this question requires a brief survey of the Hittite and PIE evidence.<sup>14)</sup>

Of the Hittite *i*-stems ending in *-ri-*, many have no good etymology or are loanwords.<sup>15)</sup> Of the words with reasonably secure etymologies, *kari-* 'thanks', *peri-* 'bird', and *warri-* 'helping' are *i*-stems to roots in final *r* or *\*rH*.<sup>16)</sup> On the other hand, there are several words which are properly segmented ROOT + *-ri-*, and it is among these words that *comparanda* for *mūri-* are to be sought. The most plausible cases of this analysis are:

<sup>12)</sup> Oettinger (1980) 53. The priority of the *-i*-stem is also supported by the derivative *mūriyala-* 'grape-shaped bread'. H. Craig Melchert (Comparative Grammar of Anatolian, Fall, 1995, at the University of North Carolina) has suggested that the *-n*-stem extension in this case is to be identified with the PIE individualizing suffix *\*(h<sub>1</sub>)o/en-*.

<sup>13)</sup> Whatever the ultimate origin of the *u* vowel in *mūri-*, whether it derives from a Proto-Anatolian short or long *u* or is the result of a monophthongized *ew* diphthong, the plene spelling must reflect a Hittite long vowel resulting from tonic lengthening in open syllables or a Proto-Anatolian long-vowel preserved in tonic position. See Melchert, (1994) 104, 131.

<sup>14)</sup> The reconstruction of a laryngeal at the end of the root *\*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)-* is, on the evidence of *mūri-* alone, optional. The evidence of cognates to be cited below point conclusively to the existence of a final laryngeal in this root. The Hittite evidence itself excludes the reconstruction of *\*h<sub>2</sub>* which would not be assimilated or lost in this position. Cf. *muḫrai-* 'fibula' (?). For these reasons we have adopted there construction *\*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)-*.

<sup>15)</sup> For example *ahrušhri-* 'incense holder' of Hurrian origin. see Friedrich-Kammenhuber (1975-1984) p. 46.

<sup>16)</sup> *Kari-* occurs only in the phrase *kari tiya-* 'willfahren' and could be the d.l. of an *i*-stem or an *a*-stem. If the former, then it is to be compared directly with Greek χαρίς. If the latter, then it should go with Av. *zara-* 'grace'. In either case, it is a derivative of the root *\*g<sub>h</sub>er-* seen in Greek χαίρω. OLatin *horior*. See Tischler (1977) 503. *Peri-* goes with Vedic *pariá*. See Zucha (1988) 314. *Warri-* 'helping' is an adj. derived from the root or thematic noun seen in *wa-ar-a-aš* g. s. 'help' cited by Watkins (1975) 97. This is cognate with Greek ἤρα as in the Homeric formula ἐνὶ ἤρᾳ φέρεται. The root is *\*werh<sub>1</sub>-* according to Melchert (1994) 78, but the identity of the root final laryngeal is not absolutely certain.

1. *auri-* c. 'lookout'. This has been connected with the verb *au/u-* 'see' since Pedersen.<sup>17)</sup> The *-ri-* suffix appears to make a deverbal abstract which subsequently acquired concrete meaning.<sup>18)</sup>
2. *ēdri-* n. 'food'. This is obviously a derivative of the root *ed-* 'eat'. Again, the *-ri-* suffix originally must have made a deverbal abstract which has been concretized.<sup>19)</sup>
3. *kišri-* c. 'carding'. This is a *-ri-* derivative of the verbal root seen in *kišāi-* 'comb'. Outside of Hittite, an *r* suffix is found to the same root in Old Irish *cír* f. 'comb' < *\*kesreh<sub>2</sub>*.<sup>20)</sup>
4. *\*misri-* 'shining'. This noun can be inferred on the basis of the adjective *mišriwant-* 'shining'. Cf. *šamankurwant-* 'bearded' derived from *zamankur* beard. Neumann connects *\*misri-* with Sanskrit *miṣati* 'opens the eyes'.<sup>21)</sup> A *-ro-* stem adjective *\*misro-* is found in the HLUvian personal name *Mi-za-ra/i-mu-wa/i-* and Lycian *Mizre-tije*.<sup>22)</sup>

<sup>17)</sup> Pedersen (1939) 173.

<sup>18)</sup> For the preservation of the diphthong before coronal continuants, see Melchert (1994) 148. The suggestion by Tischler (1977) 95. that *auri-* is a secondary *-i*-stem to an old action noun in *-war* has nothing to recommend it. In fact it may probably be excluded, since one would not expect the diphthong *au-* to be preserved before *w*, and *\*au-war* would presumably have given Hittite *\*aumar*. See Melchert (1994) 127, 149.

<sup>19)</sup> See Puhvel (1984) 319. H. Craig Melchert has suggested to me (personal communication) that the neuter gender of *ēdri-* is probably best explained as the result of a grammatical back-formation from a collective plural. Cf. the case of Greek ἄστρον back-formed from ἄστρα, which originally was the collective plural of ἄστρη.

<sup>20)</sup> Thurneysen (1946) 132.

<sup>21)</sup> Neumann (1958) 88.

<sup>22)</sup> The identification of the element *\*misro-* in the HLUvian and Lycian names is due to Carruba (1990) 249-251. The analysis as a *-ro-* stem is given by Melchert (1994) 274. A further member of the family *\*m(e)is-* may be seen in Latin *mīrus* 'amazing'. *Mīrus* may straightforwardly be derived from *\*meisos*, 'shining'. As for the semantics the derivation of *mīrus* from an earlier meaning 'shining' seems unproblematic in the light of Russian *dívny*, 'wonderful' Czech *dívat se* 'look', and the standard comparison with Skt. *smera-* 'smiling' is not semantically without its own problems, since as Nonius says (521.19): *mira et miracula veteres pro monstribus vel horrendis ponebant*.

It is also worth mentioning the possibility that *mīrus* could be from *\*misro-*, and therefore a very close formal match for Proto-Anatolian *\*misro-*. This derivation may seem to fly in the face of an acknowledged sound law: *\*-sr- > -br-*, e.g., *finēbris* < *\*founesris*. But there are at least two apparent exceptions to the *\*-sr- > -br-* rule which other scholars have noted. 1. *vēr* 'spring' < *\*wēsr-*. 2. *hir* 'palm of the hand' > *\*ghēsr-*. Duchesne-Guillemin (1939) 213, has suggested that a sequence *\*-Vsr-* became *-Vr-*, but *crābrō* 'hornet' < *\*krāsrō* is an

5. *lūri-* c./n. 'loss of honor', 'financial loss'. This word is best etymologized as an abstract in *-ri-* to the verbal root \**leu*(*h*<sub>x</sub>)- 'abschneiden' (Pk. 681) seen in Latin *luo*, Greek λύω. For the semantic development, cf. Modern English *loss* < OE *los* n. 'destruction' < PIE \**lúsom* also from the root \**leu*(*h*<sub>x</sub>)-.<sup>23</sup>)
6. <sup>SIG</sup>*antari-* 'a kind of wool'. besides the adjective *antara-* 'blue' < \**mdhro-*. Cf. Czech *modrý*, 'blue', ON *madra* 'galium boreale'.<sup>24</sup>) In all probability, the Germanic and Slavic forms reflect a color adjective built with the suffix *-ro-* to a root \**m*(*o*)*dh-* '(be) blue'. Cf. for the suffix *ruber* < \**h<sub>1</sub>rudh-ro-*.
7. *ēš(ša)ri-* n. 'image, statue'; c. 'fleece'. Certainly a derivative of the root *eš-* < \**h<sub>1</sub>es-* 'be', the original meaning of which must have been 'essence'.<sup>25</sup>)

These examples make it clear that Hittite possessed a small class of, with the exception of SIG *antari-*, deverbals in *-ri-*. All of these nouns except *luri-* and *kišri-* have been concretized. If we look elsewhere for parallel *-ri-* suffix formations, our attention is drawn to a number of apparent *-ri-* derivatives in Sanskrit and Greek. Many of these forms occur beside thematic adjectives in *-ro-*, and it is reasonable to assume that the forms in *-ri-* are, in fact, substantivizations of these adjectives and not directly built to roots. For example, AV *vánkri* f. 'rib' belongs most immediately with *vakrá* 'bent' and is not directly built to the verb *vañc-* 'go crookedly'. In Greek, in addition to the well-known case of ὄκρις vs. ἄκρος we find another apparent deverbals in *-ri-* is (F)ῖρις 'rainbow' derived from the root

obvious counter-example, and it seems impossible to order this rule before the change of \**rH* to *rā*, which is common to Italic and Celtic. In any case, this rule would not help to explain *mirus*, if the connection with Skt. *miśati* is correct. Another possible explanation is to regard *hir* as a borrowing from Grk. χεῖρ or as a creation of the grammarians – the word is, in any case, of very tenuous attestation see Walde-Hoffmann (1938) 649 – and to postulate a dissimilatory reversion of β, the voiced bilabial fricative resulting from *s* in the cluster *-sr-*, to *z* when the preceding syllable began with a labial. This *z* then shared the fate of other *z*'s before resonants and was lost with compensatory lengthening. This could explain *vēr* and *mīrus*.

<sup>23</sup>) Latin *lura os cullei vel etiam utris* (Paul. Fest. p120M) might belong here.

<sup>24</sup>) For the comparison with Czech see Puhvel (1984) 78. For the Germanic forms see Pokorny (1959) 747.

<sup>25</sup>) For the forms see Friedrich-Kammenhuber (1988) 124, 127 and Puhvel (1984) 313–315. For the neuter gender of *ēš(ša)ri-* see above note 19. One more possible example may be found in *puri-* c. 'lip'. According to Neumann, this is a *-ri-* derivative of the PIE root \**pu-* (Pk. 847) 'aufblasen'. Cf. Polish *pysk* 'snout'.

\**weih<sub>x</sub>-* (cf. Latin *viere* 'twist' and Skt. *vyáyati* 'winden').<sup>26</sup>) In Germanic and Celtic, however, there is a thematic adjective \**wi-ro-* or \**weiro-* reflected by OI. *wír* m. 'wire' and OIr. *fiar* 'crooked'. This suggests the following derivational chain for (F)ῖρις: \**weih<sub>x</sub>-* 'bend' → \**wih<sub>x</sub>-ro-* 'bending' → \**wih<sub>x</sub>-ri-* 'bending' substantive → 'rainbow'.<sup>27</sup>)

This comparative evidence suggests a reinterpretation of the Hittite evidence. Above it was mentioned that at least three Hittite *-ri-* nouns occur beside thematic form; *kišri-* vs. OIr. *cír* 'comb' < \**kesre-* *h<sub>2</sub>*, \**misri-* vs. Lyc. and Hluv. *mizre-*, and <sup>SIG</sup>*antari-* vs. the adjective *antara-* < \**mdhro-*. Taking all these facts into consideration, we can now reconstruct the following patterns:

* <i>wenk-</i> 'bend'	* <i>wṇk-ró-</i> 'bending'	* <i>wénk-ri-</i> 'a bending'
* <i>weih<sub>x</sub>-</i> 'twist'	* <i>wih<sub>x</sub>-ro-</i> 'twisting'	* <i>wih<sub>x</sub>-ri-</i> 'a twisting'
* <i>kes-</i> 'comb'	* <i>kes-ro-</i> 'combing'	* <i>kes-ri-</i> 'a combing'
* <i>mis-</i> 'shine'	* <i>mis-ro-</i> 'shining'	* <i>mis-ri-</i> 'a shining'
* <i>modh-</i> '(be) blue'	* <i>mdh-ro-</i> 'blue'	* <i>mdh-ri-</i> 'blue thing'

In other words, the *-ri-* nouns of Hittite are best analysed from the diachronic point of view as *i*-stem nominalizations of adjectives in *-ro-*. This is not to claim that every *-ri-* once had a *-ro-* beside it. Hittite may easily have lost the middle step of the derivational chain. Furthermore, there is no special relationship claimed between *-ri-* nouns and verbal roots, except in so far as the suffix *-ro-* very frequently formed verbal adjectives. In principle, any *-ro-* (or for that matter any *-o-*) whether of Caland, locative or *-r*-stem origin could make an abstract in *-i-*.<sup>28</sup>)

Returning to *mūri-*, we now have evidence that suggests that a putative root \**meu*(*h*<sub>1/3</sub>)- 'be abundant' could have made a derivative in *-ri-*, \*'abundance' > 'bunch' possibly via the intermediate step of

<sup>26</sup>) Another Greek example may be hidden in the pair ἴδρις/ἄδρις. This is traditionally compared with ON *viir* g.s. *-rs* 'wise' to reconstruct a PIE \**wídris*, e.g., by Euler (1979) 137. The Old Norse, however, is ambiguous and could equally well be reconstructed as PGmc. \**witrá-*. From the PIE ancestor of this one could derive a \**wídris* 'knowledge' which could then form a *bahuvrihi* \**ḥwídris* 'without knowledge' > Grk. ἄδρις 'ignorant'. From this Greek could have abstracted a positive adjective ἴδρις 'knowing'. For back-formation from compounds cf. *ops* · *opulentus* (Paul. Fest. p190M), an obvious back formation from *inops*.

<sup>27</sup>) See Bechtel (1914) 181.

<sup>28</sup>) Cf. Hitt. *dalugasti-* = OCS *dlŭgostŭ* 'length' but to *dlŭgostŭ* 'long'. Kronasser (1963) 208. For *-i*-abstracts in general see Schindler (1980) 208. This is not to deny that the *-ri-* suffix seems to have developed something of a predilection for verbal root.

a *-ro-* adjective.<sup>29)</sup> Now as Frisk has pointed out, *-ro-* adjectives frequently pattern with *o*-grade thematic nouns. So, for example, Vedic *mudrá* 'glad' vs. *móda* 'joy'; *vīprá* 'inspired' vs. *vēpa* 'vibrating voice'.<sup>30)</sup> Frisk was concerned with establishing this pattern only for Vedic, but examples like Vedic *krurá* 'bloody' vs. OIr. *cró* 'death' < \*krowh<sub>2</sub>o- show that this is a pattern of Indo-European date.<sup>31)</sup> Therefore from the root \*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)-, besides \*m(e)u(h<sub>1/3</sub>)-ro-, one might expect to find a noun \*mów(h<sub>1/3</sub>)os or \*mow(h<sub>1/3</sub>)eh<sub>2</sub> meaning 'abundance' *vel sim.* Now in Hittite there is a noun *mūwa-* c., attested only in Neo-Hittite, which is glossed as 'an awe-inspiring quality possessed by kings, deities, the lion, countries, and boundaries'.<sup>32)</sup> Its relative antiquity, however, is proved by its occurrence in personal names of the Old and Middle Hittite periods and by its presence in Cuneiform Luvian and Hieroglyphic Luvian. And considerations of phonology show, in fact, that Hittite *mūwa-* is a Luvianism. For as Melchert has demonstrated, a *w* after a *u* would regularly have been dissimilated to *m* in Hittite, e.g., Hittite *dumēni* 'we take' < \*duwēni, but would have remained unchanged in Luvian, e.g., Luvian *aztūwari* 2pl.med. 'you eat' vs. the Hittite 2pl.med. ending *-duma*.<sup>33)</sup> Thus we can reconstruct a Luvian \**mūwa-* which in turn can come from either \*mów(h<sub>1/3</sub>)os or \*mow(h<sub>1/3</sub>)éh<sub>2</sub>.<sup>34)</sup> The semantic gap between 'abundance' and 'awe-inspiring quality' can easily be bridged. Cf. Latin *ops* which means both 'wealth' and 'power', and from the same root \*h<sub>3</sub>ep- ON *ašli-* 'power' vs. Skt. *ápnas* 'property' and Hittite *happinant-* 'wealthy'.

Further Luvian derivatives strengthen the case for the interpretation of *mūwa-* as 'power which results from or consists in abundance,' and may also allow us to give a more specific meaning to the root

<sup>29)</sup> This adjective may be attested in OIr. *múr* 'abundance' (a substantivized adjective?) or in RV *mūrá*, Av. *mūra-* 'silly'. The Old Irish word is, however, considered to be a metaphorical extension of *múr* 'wall' (< Latin *mūrus*) by Vendryes (1960) M-76. The semantic development for the Indo-Iranian word would then be similar to that seen in Modern English *clod* 'a clump of earth' and 'a clumsy, foolish person'. Cf. Swiss German *mugel* 'runder dicker mensch' vs. MHG *mocke* 'klumpen'. Torp (1909) 325.

<sup>30)</sup> Frisk (1966) 238.

<sup>31)</sup> Old Irish *cró* see Joseph (1988) 182.

<sup>32)</sup> CHD (1980) 314-315.

<sup>33)</sup> Melchert (1994) 127-128.

<sup>34)</sup> Melchert (1994) 234. The *plene* spelling of *u*, e.g., *KUB* 16.47.9, is inconclusive for deciding between these two alternative reconstructions, since it could simply be serving to indicate a glide. See Melchert (1994) 27.

\*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)-, viz. 'to be reproductively powerful'. First the HLuvian for 'offspring' is *nimuwiza-* < \*ne-muwi(s)ko-, which can plausibly be explained as 'not having *mūwa-*', i.e., 'lacking reproductive ability' and therefore 'immature'.<sup>35)</sup> But a clearer connection of a derivative of *mūwa-* with the idea of reproduction is in an inscription from Carchemish A 11 c, 4-5:

- (i) wa/i-tu VIR-ti-ia-ti-ia-za-ha „CULTER“ pa+ra/i-tú-ni-tú-u
- (ii) FEMINA-ti-ia-ti-ia-ha-wa/i-tú-u „CULTER“ pa+ra/i-tú-ni-i-tú
- (iii) wa/i-tú- VIR-ti-ia-ti-i-na mu-wa/i-i-ta-na NEG, ta-ti-i
- (iv) FEMINA-ti-ia-ti-pa-wa/i-tú 4-ta ni-i ta-ti-i

After Hawkins:<sup>36)</sup>

(against him may the gods be angry)  
and from him may they sever virility  
and from her may they sever femininity  
, and for him may they not take male potency  
and for her may they not take female fertility

✧ Here *muwita-* is an accusative plural noun of the *-a-* stem declension which quite clearly means specifically 'reproductive power.'

✧ This Luvian form and the precise meaning it helps establish for the root \*meu(h<sub>1/3</sub>)- can, I think, shed some light on the prehistory of Latin *mūtō* 'penis'. We find this word precisely three times in all Latinity besides its attestations as a cognomen of the *Tīti*. First in Lucilius 307 *laeva lacrimas mutoni absterget amica* (sc. *manu*) and then in Horace *Satire* 1.2.68 in a notable personification *huic si mutonis verbis mala tanta videnti diceret haec animus*, and finally in the gloss (Loewe, *Prodr.* 304) *muto: Priapus*. There are also a number of derivatives: *mutonium*, *mutunium mutuniatus*, *mutinium*, *Mutinus*, *Mutunus*.<sup>37)</sup> Although noth-

<sup>35)</sup> On Hieroglyphic Luvian *nimuwiza-*. See CHD s.v. *muwa*, 315.

<sup>36)</sup> Hawkins (1976) 143. 4-ta in line iv is a rebus writing for *muwita* based on the partial phonetic similarity between *muwita* and the HLuvian word for four *mawa-*.

<sup>37)</sup> The set of derivatives and variants presents some interesting phonological and morphological questions. First we find variation between *muto* and *mutto* in the literary attestations. The majority of manuscripts of Horace's *Satires* offer the spelling *mutto* at 1.2.68: ULg corr. R φπPorph. sch. ΓVvc according to Bo (1958) and also L and O according to Villeneuve (1958). On the other hand *muto* is found in MDE<sup>2</sup>AU (Villeneuve (1958)). The Lucilius passage, preserved by the by scholiasts to Horace, seems to have only the form *mutto*. The cognomen *Mutto* also seems to show some variation in the manuscripts: *mutonis* in Festus mss. VXZW and Paulus ms. L, but *muttonis* in Festus ms. L and Paulus ms. P accord-

ing very conclusive can be gleaned from the literary attestations of this word, it seems clear that *mūtō* was the *vox propria* for the penis as reproductive organ. For the Romans home-grown fer-

ing to Lindsay (1913) 492–493. There is no evidence for any thing but *Mutto* in the mss. of Cicero's *Pro Scauro* 23 as far as I can judge from the apparatus of Olechowska (1984). The manuscripts of Priscian 7.58 quoting Cicero's lost *Pro Fundiano* appear to preserve only corrupt readings. On the other hand, the two epigraphical attestations of the cognomen are unanimous in offering *Mutto* (C.I.L. 5.1412, 8473 (both from Aquileia)). This situation is precisely parallel to that of *Iuppiter* vs. *Iupiter*, where the latter more archaic form is only rarely attested, e.g., Varro *L.* 5.62. And, in fact, it is simplest to suppose that *mūtō* vs. *muttō* is just another example of the *Iuppiter* rule whereby the last mora of a long vowel (usually  $\bar{i}$  or  $\bar{u}$ ) is reassigned to the following consonant. A conceivable alternative hypothesis, i.e., that *mutō* is simply a defective and late spelling for *mutto*, is ruled out by the evidence of the form *moetinus* (Lucilius 78) where the spelling *oe* can only be explained as an archaizing allograph for a long  $\bar{u}$ . The only form indisputably derived directly from *mut(t)o* is *mutonium* (Lucilius 965) which is simply a nominalization of a genitival *-iyo*-adjective. Another set of forms cluster around the adjective *mutinus*/*moetinus*, which has also been nominalized as the name of a god *Mutinus* (*Mutunus*) *Titinus*. It is conceivable that this form could also be a derivative of the *n*-stem form with a dissimilatory loss of the first *n*, i.e.,  $*mVt(V)n\text{-}ino\text{-}$ . Cf. Umbrian hapinaf (77 1 a 24) 'agnas' <  $*ag\text{-}n\bar{i}no\text{-}$ . But it seems more likely that *mūtino-* is a parallel derivative from the thematic stem that also underlies *mūtōn-*. If this is the case, then the thematic stem  $*m\bar{u}to\text{-}$  would probably have been a noun since the suffix *-ino-* makes denominal adjectives. It would then follow that the *-n*-stem suffix in *mūtōn-* is the denominal Hoffmann suffix and not the deadjectival individualizing suffix (type *Catō* ← *catus*). The spelling *moetinus* at Lucilius 78 is a simple false archaism for long  $\bar{u}$ . Cf., e.g., Lucilius' spelling *seis* for *sis* at 86. *mutinium* Priap. 72.2 would appear to be a derivative of *Mutinus*, exactly parallel to *mutonium* from *mutō*. The by-form *Mutunus* which occurs in various Christian authors (Tert. *Ad Nat.* 2.11, Apol. 25.3, August. *C.D.* 4.11) is probably best explained as replacing *Mutinus* under the influence of other divine names ending in *-ūnus*, e.g., *Neptunus*, *Portunus*. It is also possible that perseverative assimilation from the *u* of the first syllable may have played a subsidiary role. The form *Mutunus* must, however, be considerably older than its first textual appearance since it clearly served as the basis for the forms *mutunium* (C.I.L. 4.1939, 1946 (Pompeii)) and *mutuniatus* (Priap. 52.10, Mart. 3.73.1, 11.63.2). The quantity of the first *u* in all these forms clustering around  $*m\bar{u}tino\text{-}$  is uncertain except in the case of *mūtiniatus* where the metrical occurrences guarantee a short vowel and in the case of *moetinus*, which, as noted above, must be a false archaism for long  $\bar{u}$ . This short first *u* may also be supposed for *mutunium* and possibly also for *Mutunus*, although this latter form is regularly given a long vowel, e.g., by the Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. The short vowel in *mutuniatus* may be explained via the shortening of double consonants before the accent as for example in *sacellus* ← *saccus*. Thus  $*m\bar{u}t\bar{u}no > *mut\bar{u}no > *m\bar{u}t\bar{u}no \rightarrow m\bar{u}t\bar{u}niatus$ . On the other hand, the long vowel or double consonants could always have been restored analogically from  $*m\bar{u}to$ / $*mutto$  at any time.

tility god whose rites so scandalized the early Christians was known as *Mutunus Tutunus* or *Mutinus Tītinus*.<sup>38</sup>) If one wishes to pursue the Luvian analogy as closely as possible, one may suppose that  $*mow(h_{1/3})i\text{-}to\text{-}$  'reproductive power' was inherited into Italic. To this noun a Hoffmann suffix was added to give  $*mowitōn\text{-}$  'having reproductive power' > *mūtōn-*, a very apt name for the member in question.

On the other hand, it is equally possible that Latin inherited a *-to*-verbal adjective to the zero-grade of the root  $*meuh_{1/3}\text{-}$ ,  $muh_{1/3}\text{-}tō\text{-}$ , which was nominalized as  $*m(V)uh_{1/3}\text{-}to\text{-}$  'reproductive power'.<sup>39</sup>) From this, again by the addition of the Hoffmann suffix, *mūtōn-* 'having reproductive power'. If this latter account is true, then *mūtō*'s closest analogue would be, as Strachan noted many years ago, *Mr. moth · ball ferda*. 'male organ'.<sup>40</sup>) The latter must be from  $*muh_{1/3}\text{-}tō\text{-}$  with laryngeal not lengthening the vowel as in OIr. *both* f. 'being' <  $*bhu\text{-}ta < *bhuh_x\text{-}teh_2$ .<sup>41</sup>) The second hypothesis seems preferable to me since close morphological matches between Italic and Celtic are more probable than close morphological matches between Italic and Luvian.

Several supposed derivatives of *mūri-* remain to be discussed.

*Muranza-* which describes a ritual to prevent plague in the army is probably a Luvian word. Laroche has suggested a connection with *mūri-*, presumably because the rite is called for when the army is dying KALAG.GAZa, i.e., 'in great numbers'.<sup>42</sup>) But KALAG.GAZa might equally well be translated 'terribly'.<sup>43</sup>) The connection is hardly compelling.

*Murassiya-*, (Μουρσια in Greek inscriptions) a place-name in Lycania, has been connected with *muri-* by Laroche.<sup>44</sup>) But, since

<sup>38</sup>) On *Mutunus* see most recently Palmer (1974) 187–206.

<sup>39</sup>) This analysis, of course, requires the presence of a final laryngeal in this root. Therefore I will subsequently leave out the parentheses around the laryngeal which I have thus far been using to indicate the indeterminacy of this part of the reconstruction. Further proof of the existence of the final laryngeal in the root  $*meuh_{1/3}\text{-}$  is provided below by the comparison of Greek  $\mu\upsilon\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ .

<sup>40</sup>) See Strachan (1895) 304.

<sup>41</sup>) On this phenomenon see Joseph (1980) 306, 307. Whether the failure of the laryngeal to cause lengthening in these forms is due ultimately to phonological or analogical causes is immaterial for our purposes.

<sup>42</sup>) See Oettinger (1976) 490. Laroche (1959) 72.

<sup>43</sup>) CHD (1986) 332.

<sup>44</sup>) Zgusta (1984) 402.

*mūri-* is a real *-i*-stem and not simply a Luvian *-i*-motion, we would expect the genitival adjective to be *\*muriyassa-*, just as Luv. *hawī-* 'sheep' (cf. Lat. *ovis*) makes *hawiyassa-*. On the other hand *immari-* 'field', which corresponds to Hittite *gimmara-*, makes the genitival adjective *immarassi-*.<sup>45)</sup>

3. *Mūriyala-*, an Old Hittite bread name, has been connected with *mūri-* by Otten and Souček. It is translated by them as 'traubenförmig'.<sup>46)</sup> Its formation is like *auriyala-* 'warder' to *auri-* 'watch-tower'. A priori, it is possible to imagine bread from or with grapes (cf. raisin bread) or made in the shape of a cluster of fruit.<sup>47)</sup> We have demonstrated above, however, that the meaning of *mūri-* was originally 'bunch.' If our conclusions are correct, then the latter translation of *mūriyala-* is to be preferred. Furthermore, the most characteristic use for *mūriyala-* bread is for it to be hung from an animal's horns, for example, *Bo.* 2689. ii. 9-12:

nu mu-ú-ri-ia-lu-uš GUID. Hl. A-an karauni/šmi [katta] ganganzi  
On the horns of the oxen they hang the *muriyala-* bread.

This practice strongly supports the idea that *mūriyala-* bread is bunch-shaped.

The question arises whether Latin *muriola* 'a kind of wine' can be borrowed from Hittite *mūriyala-*. It seems that this cannot be the case. First of all, the word *muriyala-* is attested only in Old and Middle Hittite. Therefore, it is somewhat unlikely that it survived nearly unchanged into the Anatolian languages of the Roman period. Second, as we have suggested above, *mūriyala-* does not mean 'grape-bread,' and although a semantic development from 'grape-matter' to, on the one hand, 'grape-bread' and on the other, 'grape-drink' is conceivable, a development from 'bunched matter' to 'grapedrink' is not. Etruscan could have served as the link between Latin and Hittite, but the word has no earmarks of Etruscan transmission.

It remains therefore to consider whether there might be a genetic relation between *muriyala-* and *muriola*. A Pre-Latin *\*mūri-* 'bunch' could have developed the meaning 'grape.' To this could have been built an adjective *\*mūrio-* 'of grapes' which subsequently could have

<sup>45)</sup> Melchert (1993) 66, 89.

<sup>46)</sup> Otten and Souček (1968) 99. Hoffner (1974) 173.

<sup>47)</sup> For breads named after their shapes cf. Hittite *purpura-* 'a ball' ~ NINDA *purpura-* 'ball bread' and NINDA *niniyami-* a Luvian passive participle to *nāi-* 'lead'?

been substantivized as *\*mūria* 'grape'. A diminutive to this, *\*mūrielo-* 'grapish', itself in turn substantivized as *\*mūriela* 'grapish drink', could have given Lat. *muriola*. The proposed derivation is too complicated to be convincing. Furthermore, *muriola* could easily be derived from *muria* 'brine' since Cato *De Agri Cultura* 105 testifies to the use of brine in making wine. The similarity of *mūriyala-* and *muriola* is, therefore, merely coincidental.

### Greek *μυρίος*

Greek *μυρίος* is attested since Homer in the meaning 'countless.' The meaning 'ten thousand' first occurs at Hes. *Op.* 252.<sup>48)</sup> All the etymologies previously suggested are in one way or another lacking.<sup>49)</sup> The first fact we may note about this word is its peculiar accent. Most adjectives in *-ιος* have recessive accent, e.g. *ἅγιος* 'holy', *ἄγριος* 'wild', etc. There are, however, some other adjectives in *-ιος* with oxytone accent, e.g. *βαλιός* 'spotted', *δεξιός* 'on the right', *λαλιός* 'talkative', *μονιός* 'solitary', *πελιός* 'livid', *πολιός* 'grey', *φαλιός* 'with a white spot', *σκολιός* 'bent'.<sup>50)</sup> A probable sub-class of these are the dactylic words with paroxytone accent, such as *ἀντίος* 'set against' and *πλησίος* 'near'.<sup>51)</sup> These are obvious cases of Wheeler's Law and it is to that class that *μυρίος* belongs. We can then posit a pre-form *\*mūriós*.

<sup>48)</sup> The accent of *μύριοι* in the sense 'ten-thousand' is clearly secondary and contrastive in origin.

<sup>49)</sup> For example, Ebeling (1885) 1126, lists the following impossible cognates: 1. Skt. *bhūri-* 'many', but *bh* cannot correspond to Grk *μ*. 2. Grk. *μύριος* 'ant'. 3. Lat. *mille* but *ī* cannot correspond to Grk. *υ*. Thinkable is Schwyzer's connection with *ἄλιμυρής* 'flowing to the sea', and *πλημυρίς* 'flood-tide'. Schwyzer (1939) 593. But *πλημυρίς* has a short /u/ in Homer, e.g., *Od.* 9. 486 *πλημυρίς ἐκ πόντου*. Cf. Schulze (1892) 9 and Bechtel (1914) 278-279. *ἄλιμυρής* is built directly to *ῥομαι* 'flow' esp. of tears. Cf. Risch (1974) 154. Therefore, the basic meaning of the root *μυρ-* (or *μύρ-* if from *\*mūr + ye-*) must be 'flow', and although the derivation of the name of a high number from the name of the sea is paralleled (cf. Skt. *śamudrá-* 'ocean' and '100,000,000,000,000'), the derivation of such a word from a verb meaning 'flow' or even from a noun 'river' is not. For Old Irish *maí* 'abundance' see note 29 above.

<sup>50)</sup> For these see Chandler (1881) 116.

<sup>51)</sup> *δεξιός* does not undergo Wheeler's Law due to the analogy of its antonyms *ἀριός* and *σκαίος*.

Now it is an interesting fact that oxytone adjectives in -ίος (or the Wheeler's law variants -ιος which have good etymologies invariably have a morpheme boundary between the ι and the ο. For example, δεξιός is from \*deksiwós as is proved by the Pamphylian personal name Δεξιφύς (= Mycenaean *de-ki-si-wo*) and by Gaulish *Dexiva*. πολίος is from \*poliwós as Mycenaean *po-ri-wa* shows. αντίος is clearly from \*anti-ós and πλησίος < \*plēti-ós.<sup>52</sup>) These complex suffixes \*-iwó- and -iό- may legitimately be further analyzed as \*-i-wó- and \*-i-ó- respectively. This is clear from the co-occurrence of other extensions of -i- beside forms in \*-iwó- or \*-i-o-. For example, from the -i-extended form of the root \*pel- 'grey' are built in addition to πελιός and πολίος, Vedic *palitá-* 'gray' < \*peli-tó-, Greek πελι-τνός 'livid' and Armenian *alík* 'gray beard' < \*pli-o-; from the extended root \*deksi- are built Vedic *dakṣi-ná-* 'south' and Greek δεξι-τερός 'right hand of two'.

This segmentation makes possible the comparison of these -wó- and -ó- suffixes with the possessive suffixes \*-wó- (Vedic -vá-, e.g., *anjivá-* 'salved' from *anjí* 'salve';<sup>53</sup>) Old Church Slavonic -vŭ-, e.g., *milostivŭ* 'mild' from *milostĭ* 'mildness'<sup>54</sup>) and \*-ó- (-a- in *vatsá-* 'calf' < \*wets-ó- 'having a year'.) Now it is not unlikely that the -i-extended forms seen before the suffix \*-(w)ó- are in origin -i-stem nouns. This is suggested by the evidence of acrostatic ablaut (πολιός vs. πελιός) and by the actual existence in some cases of an -i-stem noun from which a -(w)ó- stem possessive adjective has been made, e.g., φάλις 'hemp' (< \*whiteness) beside φαλιός 'white'.<sup>55</sup>)

The PIE root \*meuh<sub>1/3</sub>- seen in Hittite *mūri-* and Luv. *mūwa-*, and Latin *mūtō* must have meant something like 'abundant/reproductively powerful,' and we have sketched out above how *mūri-* can be derived via a well-established derivational process (\*meuh<sub>1/3</sub>- > \*muh<sub>1/3</sub>-ro- > \*muh<sub>1/3</sub>-ri-). If a PIE \*muh<sub>1/3</sub>-ri- survived into Pre-Greek, either in abstract or concrete meaning, a possessive adjective \*muh<sub>1/3</sub>-ri-(w)ó- 'having abundance' or 'having bunches' could have been built to it, and this by regular sound change would yield Greek μυρίος. The semantic development from 'having bunches' to 'countless' is easily

<sup>52</sup>) Chantraine (1968) 264, 925-926. For the Mycenaean and Pamphylian forms see Aura Jorro (1985) 1.164 and (1993) 2.144.

<sup>53</sup>) Wackernagel-Debrunner (1954) 869.

<sup>54</sup>) Meillet (1961) 368.

<sup>55</sup>) Crepajac (1967) 183.

paralleled, e.g., by the lyrics of a popular American blues tune of the 1930s:

blues for breakfast/blues for lunch/  
blues by the dozen/blues by the bunch/  
(= Homer's μυρί' ἄλγεα (II. 1.2)  
I've got too many blues ...

Department of Classics  
CB #3145, 212 Murphey Hall  
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599-3145/USA

Michael Weiss

### Bibliography

- Aura Jorro, F.: *Diccionario micénico* (Madrid 1985, 21993).  
Bechtel, F.: *Lexilogus zu Homer* (Halle 1914).  
Bo, D.Q.: *Horati Flacci Opera* Vol. 2 (Turin 1958).  
Bohdingk, O. and Roth, R.: *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg 1875).  
Brugmann, K.: *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Strassburg 1906).  
Buck, C.: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago 1949).  
Carruba, O.: „The Name of the Scribe,” *JCS* 42/2 (1990) 243-252.  
Chandler, H.: *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation* (Oxford 1881).  
Chantraine, P.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968).  
Crepajac, L.: „Die idg. Wortsippe \*gh/ghel- 'hell, glänzend' im Griechischen und Slavischen,” *ZvS* 81 (1967) 181-196.  
Duchesne-Guillemin, J.: „Hittite *keššar* 'main' indo-iranien \*žhasta- et leur correspondants,” *BSL* 39/2 (1938) 211-221.  
Ebeling, H.: *Lexicon Homericum* (Leipzig 1885).  
Ehelolf, W.: „Heth. milit = 'Honig',” *Orientalistische Literatur Zeitung*, 36/1 (1933) 1-7.  
Euler, W.: *Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen* (Innsbruck 1979).  
Frisk, H.: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1970).  
Haas, V.: *Der Kult von Nerik* (Rome 1970).  
Hawkins, J.D.: „The Negatives in Hieroglyphic Luvian,” *AnS* 25 (1975) 119-156.  
Hoffner, H.: *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven 1974).  
Hoffner, H.: *The Hittite Dictionary = CHD* (Chicago 1980-).  
Joseph, L.: *Problems in the Development of the Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*, Harvard diss. (1980).  
Joseph, L.: „The Inflection of OIr. *crú*,” *Eriu* 39 (1988) 169-182.  
Kammenhuber, A. and Friedrich, J.: *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg 1975-1984, 21988).

- Kronasser, H.: *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache*, lief. 2 (Wiesbaden 1963).  
 Laroche, E.: *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite* (Paris 1959).  
 Lindsay, W.M.: *Sexti Pompei Festi de Verborum Significatu quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome* (Leipzig 1913).  
 Meillet, A.: *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1961).  
 Melchert, H.C.: *Studies in Historical Hittite Phonology* (Göttingen 1984).  
 Melchert, H.C.: *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (Chapel Hill 1993).  
 Melchert, H.C.: *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam 1994).  
 Neumann, G.: „Hethitische Etymologien I,“ *ZvS* 75 (1957) 87–90.  
 Nussbaum, A.: *Caland's Law and the Caland System*, Harvard diss. (1976).  
 Oettinger, N.: *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nürnberg 1977).  
 Oettinger, N.: „Die n-Stämme des Hethitischen und ihr indogermanischer Ausgangspunkt,“ *ZvS* 94 (1980) 44–63.  
 Olechowska, E.: *M. Tullius Cicero Pro M. Scauro Oratio* (Leipzig 1984).  
 Otten, H. and Soucek, V.: *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar* (Wiesbaden 1969).  
*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. Glare (Oxford 1968).  
 Palmer, R.E.A.: *Roman Religion and Empire* (Philadelphia 1974).  
 Pedersen, H.: *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäische Sprachen* (Copenhagen 1936).  
 Pokorny, J.: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Munich 1959).  
 Puhvel, J.: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (Berlin 1984–).  
 Risch, E.: *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1974).  
 Schindler, J.: „Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildung“ in *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*. (Wiesbaden 1980) 386–393.  
 Schulze, W.: *Quaestiones Epicae* (Gütersloh 1892).  
 Schwyzler, E.: *Griechische Grammatik* (Munich 1939).  
 Stokes, W.: „Irish Etyma,“ *ZvS* 40 (1907) 243–250.  
 Strachan, J.: „Etymologien,“ *ZvS* 33 (1895) 304–307.  
 Thurneysen, R.: *Grammar of Old Irish* (Dublin 1946).  
 Tischler, J.: *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck 1977–).  
 Torp, A.: *Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit* (Göttingen 1909).  
 Vendryes, J.: *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien* (Paris 1960–).  
 Vendryes, J.: *Traité d'accentuation grecque* (Paris 1938).  
 Villeneuve, F.: *Horace Satires* (Paris 1958).  
 Wackernagel, J. and Debrunner, A.: *Altindische Grammatik*, 212 (Göttingen 1954).  
 Zgusta, L.: *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen* (Heidelberg 1984).  
 Zucha, I.: *The Nominal Stem Types of Hittite*, D. Phil. diss. (Oxford 1988).

## Ancient European Loanwords

### 1. Introduction

Loanwords are only reluctantly accepted in Indo-European linguistics. Of course, evident cases, like Gr. *κυπάρισσος*, are recognized, but on the whole scholars are slow in accepting the possibility of loanwords, or substratum words. Methodically this is understandable. One might argue that the starting point must be that a word in an Indo-European language must be IE, unless this proves not to be the case. And heuristically this is the best way we can work. However, as loanwords are a very frequent phenomenon, one might also argue that a word in an IE language is inherited or a loanword, both possibilities being equally well possible. Loanwords should not be considered nasty, almost as a curse, or at least as elements that spoil the game. On the contrary, it is of great importance for Indo-European studies to sort out the loanwords, so as to get a better view of the IE heritage. Further, the loanwords often give us, of course, a unique insight into earlier history, history of the language and history of the culture. In the case of Old Europe, for example, we have no testimony of the original languages, except Basque (Etruscan being an Asiatic intruder).

The situation is even more difficult when a (possibly) non-IE word is found in more than one ancient IE language. In that case it is a priori more likely that the word is of IE origin. However, there are cases where we nevertheless have to conclude that the word is of non-IE origin. A few cases have been recognized for a long time. An example is Skt. *paraśú-*, Gr. *πέλεκυς*, where the loan must be quite old, as the Sanskrit word joined the hysterodynamic inflexion which has almost disappeared in our texts in the case of *u*-stems. Still, this word might be acceptable as a name coming with a technical product. *Wanderwörter*, whatever their exact definition, are another category that is recognized. However, the word for 'beard', occurring in Germanic, Balto-Slavic and Latin, which must be reconstructed as (something like) *\*b<sup>h</sup>ard<sup>h</sup>-*, does not, perhaps, belong to one of these types.