

Sonderdruck aus

Languages in Prehistoric Europe

Edited by

ALFRED BAMMESBERGER

THEO VENNEMANN

in Collaboration with

MARKUS BIESWANGER

JOACHIM GRZEGA

Universitätsverlag

WINTER

Heidelberg

2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHORS' ADDRESSES	8
PREFACE	9
MICHAEL MEIER-BRÜGGER Kurze Anmerkungen zum Tagungsthema	11
COLIN RENFREW Convergence Theory, and Innovation in Proto-Indo-European: 'Old Europe' as a PIE Linguistic Area	17
ALEXANDER HÄUSLER Urkultur der Indogermanen und Bestattungsriten	49
KLAUS STRUNK Vorgriechisch/'Pelasgisch': Neue Erwägungen zu einer älteren Substrathypothese	85
OSWALD PANAGL Paralipomena zur vorgriechischen Substratforschung	99
THOMAS LINDNER Das Problem der 'vorgriechischen' Toponymie	105
ROBERT S. P. BEEKES Indo-European or substrate? φάτινῃ and κῆρυξ	109

IVO HAJNAL Methodische Vorbemerkungen zu einer Palaeolinguistik des Balkanraums	117
HELMUT RIX Ausgliederung und Aufgliederung der italischen Sprachen	147
JÜRGEN UNTERMANN Zur Vorgeschichte der Sprachen des alten Hispanien	173
NORBERT OETTINGER Neuerungen in Lexikon und Wortbildung des Nordwest-Indogermanischen	183
PETER SCHRIJVER Early Developments of the Vowel Systems of North-West Germanic and Saami	195
PETRI KALLIO Languages in the Prehistoric Baltic Sea Region	227
DIRK BOUTKAN Lithuanian <i>šlākas</i> , Old Norse <i>slag</i> Some features of North European substrate words exemplified by an alleged Indo-European etymon	245
FREDERIK KORTLANDT An Indo-European substratum in Slavic?	253
WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG An isogloss uniting Baltic, Slavic, Germanic	261

JORMA KOIVULEHTO

Frühe Kontakte zwischen Uralisch und Indogermanisch im
nordwestindogermanischen Raum

279

THEO VENNEMANN

Languages in prehistoric Europe north of the Alps

319

THEO VENNEMANN

Syntax und Sprachkontakt: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung
der indogermanischen Sprachen des Nordwestens

333

INDO-EUROPEAN OR SUBSTRATE?

φάτνη and κήρυξ

If it is known that a language, like Greek, contains a great number of substrate words, it must be considered every time whether a given word belongs to one category or the other. In the present situation this means that we often have to reconsider our Indo-European etymologies. I give two examples.

1. φάτνη

1.1 The word φάτνη ‘manger’ has a variant πάθνη.¹ Chantraine (*Dict.*) says that the change φ/θ makes it probable that the word had **b^h-d^h*. In the next line, however, he explains that the φ- originates from a secondary (Greek) metathesis. In that case the φ- cannot be used as evidence for an old situation.

It is assumed since Lidén in 1896 that πάθνη is the oldest form, and that the word is derived from **b^hend^h-* ‘to bind’. For the meaning he compared Germ. *Krippe* beside MHG *krepe* ‘Korb’, from a meaning ‘twist, twine’ seen in Gaul.-Lat. *benna* ‘chariot’ and OE *binn* ‘manger, crib’. However, this is rather doubtful since πάθνη is very recent, dating only from the 1st century B.C., while φάτνη occurs already several times in the Iliad. For the change παθ- > φατ- one refers to Schwyzer 269. However, in this same section Schwyzer gives examples of the metathesis of aspiration from the beginning of the word to a following consonant (probably beginning the, or a, following syllable). E.g. κύθρα, and καυχός from χαλκός.² Another example is probably

¹ One mouth of the Nile is called Φατνιτικόν, also Παθμ- (RE s.v. *Phatnitikon*). But it is stated that origin and meaning of the word are uncertain.

² Here arises the problem of the regularity of sound laws. Metathesis is sometimes assumed to be an exception (e.g. Hock, 35; 110f), but I am not sure that this is correct. In any case many distinctions must be made, such as between adjacent (*tk > kt*): non-adjacent, replacement of one phoneme (*cabr > crab*) or two phonemes (*peligro*), or a single feature (like aspiration here), vowel + *r* > *r* + vowel, the sounds *r*, *l* as against others. Some categories are regular (e.g. Hock 115f). A factor may be that some rules would be so specific that they are regular, but cover just one case. E.g. if ἄρτο-ποκ-ος > -κοπ- is defined as ‘metathesis of *p* and *k* flanking -ο-’, then this example is the only instance. In our case one could assume that there were differences in time and dialect, but it may also be that the phenomena are characteristic of the Hellenistic era. There are

χιτών as against κιθών. The situation here is complicated by the fact that it is a loan (for κιτ- see Furnée 136 n. 83), but the distribution agrees well with φάτνη. Yet another example is probably φιδάκνη beside πιθάκνη. Here it is argued that it is a diminutive from πίθος, so that the π- must be old. However, that must be a later consideration. According to Moeris (p. 392 P.) φιδάκνη is Attic, πιθάκνη Hellenistic (just as in the case of φάτνη/πάθνη). The scholiast on Ar. Eq. 792 says: οἱ δε παλαιοὶ φιδάκνην λέγουσιν (though such statements *may* be wrong). Perhaps the following is an argument. If θ was original, one would have expected it to become τ as always happens. But if φιδάκνη projected its aspiration, there is no problem, as there is only one aspirated dental, so it had to become θ. In general – and this would be a decisive point – I have not seen any evidence that Attic has forms where aspiration was moved.³

Thus there is no reason to assume that φάτνη was not the oldest form of the word. Cf. also Lejeune 1972, 59 (without comment), and Bailly 1950 s.v. This means that the current etymology must be abandoned, as φατ- cannot be derived from *b^hend^h-.⁴

1.2. There are also difficulties with the meaning. In 1909 Solmsen (219 n. 3) objected that φάτνη was not a basket of wickerwork because ‘to twine’ [‘flechten’] is rather ‘knüpfen’ than ‘to bind’. I don’t think that this is correct. It is true that Greek does not have the meaning ‘to twine’ from this verb (we only find πείσμα and πενθερός). He further points to Iliad Ω 280 where φάτνη is called ἐυξέστη, which points to a solid wooden construction. This is serious, as is also his objection that horses were bound to the crib (K 567f, cf. Z 506 = O 263), which must therefore be quite strong. I think, however, given the parallel of Lidén, that the manger may in older times have been of wicker-work. Solmsen’s own proposal is not convincing: given K 567f, φάτνη would be originally “die Stelle, der Gegenstand, an dem das Tier im Stalle angebunden wurde.” This is not convincing: the *place* where a horse was bound was or became the stable and not the manger, nor is it conceivable that a construction to which a horse was bound would become its manger.

not, I think, enough instances to solve the question. [Note that beside Φύτιος we also find Πύτιος, Furnée 193. Here again we may have variants due to the word being a loanword.]

³ There is a form φενακνίς (with *d* assimilated to the following *n*) which has an *e* as seen in the Mycenaean variant of πίθος, *qeto*. This might confirm that the form with φ- is old.

⁴ It may be observed that in πείσμα, where the second aspirate lost its aspiration, the φ- was analogically replaced by the unaspirated form (as often). So we would expect a form with π- anyhow.

That, the other way around, a horse was tied to a crib is quite normal, is shown by a Dutch dictionary (Van Dale), where s.v. *krib* the first example of its use is: *het paard aan de krib binden* ('tie the horse to the crib').

Chantraine himself suggests that it is a "synecdoque *pars pro toto*", the name of the 'rope' (cf. *πείσμα*) with which the horse is bound to the crib being used for the crib itself. He points to 'la filière sémantique inverse' in *φορβειά* 'halter' which is derived from *φορβή* 'fodder'. Now whereas this last development is not difficult ('fodder-thing' > the bandage necessary for...'), the first ('rope' becoming 'manger') seems most improbable to me.

These explanations are of course only conceived to save the etymology. Even Chantraine, who accepts the etymology, concludes that the connection with 'to bind' "reste discuté". As we have seen, the etymology is impossible because of the form.

1.3. A few words on the meaning of *φάτνη*. LSJ give 1 'manger, crib'; 2. 'coffered work of a ceiling'; 3. 'socket of tooth'; 4. 'projecting platform' (Moschio). As to the last meaning, it must rather be 'embrasure d'un vaisseau par où on lançait des projectiles' (Bailly s.v.), as this fits the general meaning better. As to 2., Pape says: 'wegen der Ähnlichkeit (:) die Fächer und Vertiefungen einer getäfelten Decke'. The question arises to what kind of manger this points. (It probably became a general word for ceiling, (Fr.) *lambris*, as appears from glosses like Hes. *φατνώματα* *σανιδώματα*.) Nr. 3. has a good parallel in Latin *alveolus* beside *alveus* 'trough'. *Manger* can mean three things: a) trough (G. *Trogge*, Fr. *auge*), b) crib (G. *Krippe*, Fr. *crèche*), c) rack (G. *Raufe*, Fr. *râtelier*). Again, *crib* may be two things: b1) a 'trough' on a support (trestle) or b2) a manger/crib fastened to the wall.⁵ It is clear that a) and b1) are impossible, as you cannot bind a horse to it. It is generally assumed to be b2). The only exception I saw was Cootjans-Gourevitch 1983, 192, where it is said that the use for 'alvéole' comes from the meaning 'rack'. This seems less probable to me given the Latin parallel. The conclusion for us is that *φάτνη* was a solid piece of wood fastened to the wall with holes (Vertiefungen) for fodder. Thus there is nothing that points to a wicker-work basket, though it cannot be ruled out that this was the older meaning.⁶

1.4. The conclusion must be that the semantics do not confirm the etymology (though it is perhaps not impossible that the manger was at an early time made of wicker-work), and that the form makes the etymology

⁵ But *crib* may perhaps also be used for 'rack', cf. older Dutch *bovenkribbe* and *roosterkribbe* = *Rost-Krippe*.

⁶ The meaning 'star-cluster, the Manger' does not help me to identify the structure.

impossible. We can now go one step further: the sequence b^h-t is not allowed in Indo-European, so the word is probably non-Indo-European. That the word is a substratum word is understandable: it is an agrarian 'instrument'. Also, it is improbable that a word of this meaning was a loanword from an adjacent language (outside Greek territory).

2. κῆρυξ

2.1 The connection of κῆρυξ with Skt. *kārú-* presents many difficulties. κῆρυξ, -ῡκος 'herald' is already found in Mycenaean, *karuke*.⁷ Note the long *u*, which is still seen in Lat. *cādūceus*.⁸

The suffix -υκ- fits well into the system of Pre-Greek suffixes:

-ακ-	-ικ-	-υκ-
------	------	------

all with long or short vowel. To this system also belong:

-αγ-	-ιγ-	-υγ-
-αχ-	-ιχ-	-υχ-
-αγγ-	-ιγγ-	-υγγ-

These series may be compared with

-ανθ-	-ινθ-	-υνθ-
-------	-------	-------

(which have variants without nasal). Note that forms with the typically Indo-European vowels -*e*-, -*o*- do not, or rarely, occur.⁹ See on our forms Chantraine, 376ff, Schwyzler (Gr. Gr.) 496ff. All forms seem non-Indo-European, with one or two exceptions. The comparison of μείραξ with Skt. *marya-ká-* is invalid (Frisk); ἀστακός 'lobster' does not have *nk*.¹⁰ Only for

⁷ I don't know what to do with the gloss κορύγης κῆρυξ. Δωριεῖς H. If the *o* stands for *α* (either as an error in the tradition, or as an instance of interchange in the substratum language; see e.g. Furnée 341ff), then it could be a variant of κῆρυξ (the *α* could be long). But we cannot be sure.

⁸ The accentuation κῆρυξ, given by Herodianus and often found in the manuscripts (see the Thesaurus s.v.), poses a problem. See e.g. Bally §35 and 223. (The suprising accentuation of κῆρυξ ἐστὶ (instead of *κῆρύξ ἐστι) could be explained by original *κῆρύξ ἐστι > *κῆρυξ ἐστὶ, but the problem is general, cf. κλῖμαξ ἐστὶ. (I also considered that here may be found the origin of the accentuation: *κῆρύξ ἐστι may have been changed into *κῆρύξ ἐστι, the stress of the main word being pushed back, giving a circumflex; this would be preferable to moving the stress to the enclitic. But it is not probable that the accentuation before an enclitic was generalised.)

⁹ With -εκ- there is only ἀλώπεκ-, with nominative -ηξ, a unique system in Greek, but cf. ἄργς, -έτ-. In -οκ- there are a few words, several of them glosses: ?ᾶζ-, βέβρ-, βίρρ-, κέλ-, ῥομ-, στρύμ-. There is nothing with -ωκ-. From those in -ηξ it is difficult to establish whether they have *ē* or *ā* (a list of forms with old *e* in Schwyzler 497).

¹⁰ ἀστακός/όστακός is generally considered as a derivate from the word for 'bone', ending in -*n-ko-*. I agree with Furnée that this is 'wenig wahrscheinlich'. This was already the

véāξ might one consider *-eh₂-k-*, cf. *veā-níāς*, CS *novakъ*.

2.2 The word κήρυξ would have a single ‘erweiterndes’ *-k-*. However, there is hardly any evidence for such a *-k-* in Greek. Schwyzer’s examples (496) are the following. ἄλώπη-κ-, which is an incorrect analysis. So is γυναι-κ-. Uncertain is μαλακός; see Beekes 1995, 198. The following are alternatives to other forms: Dor. κέληκ- for κέλητ- elsewhere. But this word has -ητ/κ-, not -τ/κ-. The form occurs once in an inscription and hardly proves an Indo-European process. κλαικ- beside κλαιδ- (from the velar forms of κλαίζω?), σταλιδ/κ-. These forms are dialectal (analogical?) Greek reshufflings, hardly apt to prove an Indo-European suffixation. φώκη ‘seal’ is without etymology. If the root was φωκ-, it would have a root structure which is forbidden in Indo-European. It is no doubt a loanword. θήκη is unclear (Chantraine 1933, 384). θρήνυ-κ-, in Korinna, is clearly the ‘familiar’ suffix -υξ introduced for -υς (see 2.3). Chantraine 376f has nothing more. I conclude that an Indo-European suffix *-k-* is extremely rare or non-existent in Greek. The possibility that we have one in κήρυξ- is therefore almost nil. Decisive is, of course, that it cannot explain the long *-ū-*.

2.3 One might take into account the possibility that *-us* of the Indo-European word was replaced by -υξ in Greek. There is one instance of this, θρήνυξ. As stated above this form is clearly an instance of the normal value of -υκ-: Schwyzer (496) ‘ausgeprägt umgangssprachlich’, Chantraine (383) ‘mots familiers’. This is quite inapt for κήρυξ. I further found ὄρτυξ ‘quail’, where the suffix is probably added to an Indo-European word. These suffixes are frequent in animal names. And finally there is κόρυξ, glossed νεανίσκος by Hesychius. It contains the root of κορέννυμι, κούρος, and enters the group of familiar words. Besides it would not explain the long *-ū-*.¹¹

opinion of Hübschmann, 114: the value of the Greek word as evidence for a stem in *-n* “fällt nicht schwer in die Wage”. – J. Schmidt 390 argues that the original form had *o-* because of ὀστέον etc. (the *ā-* being due to assimilation). This is circular: you start from what you want to prove. In fact the situation seems the reverse: the *ā-* forms are more frequent; the other form occurs only once. Also, assimilation to *a* is not very probable: we have πλόκαμος, πόταμος, ὄρχαμος, etc. The *o-* can be due to secondary association with ὀστέον, or it may be an instance of the interchange *α/ο* in substratum words (Furnée 339ff). If *ō-* was original, one would expect that the association with ‘bone’ would have prevented assimilation. A stem in *-n* of the ‘bone’ word is not known further in Greek nor anywhere else outside Indo-Iranian except Celtic. (Cf. already Hübschmann; and since then the Hittite evidence confirmed this.) One often invokes Skt. *an-āstha-ka-*, but this form is based on an *o-* stem (AiGr. II 1, 102; would be Gr. *ὀστο-κο-). Greek has animal names in ἐρίθακος, ψιττακός, and many in -αξ. So in all probability the word is a substratum word with *ā-* and *-ακ-*.

¹¹ I found two more cases with -υξ beside -υς. They are βλέτνες (pl.) beside βλίτυξ; and perhaps μώδυξ (and μώλυξ) beside μώλυς.

One might of course assume that *-us* was replaced by *-ūk-*. This is also highly improbable, as there are only a very few words with this suffix, and their meanings are far removed from ‘herald’. I found: βόμβυξ ‘silk-worm’, δοῖδυξ ‘pestle’ and σκάνδυξ ‘wild chervil’ (v.l. for *-ιξ*).¹² It would be strange, then, if exactly this suffix was adopted for the Indo-European word for ‘herald’.

2.4 The reconstruction of an Indo-European protoform for the Greek and Sanskrit words is not without difficulties. Mayrhofer EWAia derives the Sanskrit word from the root *KAR*¹ ‘rühmen, preisen’, but expresses doubt by adding “Nicht besser zu *KAR*...” He then comes to a reconstruction **kārHu-*, with *a* and lengthened grade. Schmitt 301f posits **keh₂ru-*. This was accepted by e.g. Lubotsky 35. It implies a root **keh₂r-*, with metathesis in the zero grade, leading to **kerh₂-*. Roots of this shape are rare, but they seem to occur. However, nothing else in the Sanskrit root points to the assumed older shape.

2.5 The meaning of the Sanskrit word is ‘Lobsänger, singender Priester, Verkündiger, Dichter’. It has been proposed that the semantic differences can be bridged. Thieme 1938, 75 pointed out that the ‘bard’ was wandering. Indra says to him: “Wandere singend umher.” Of course, a κῆρυξ is not a singer and does not wander. The Greek official is a ‘Gefolgsmann eines Fürsten’ (Kl. Pauly s.v.), “mit einer Reihe von Aufgaben in unterschiedlichen Bereichen” (LfgrE s.v.). It is not certain that he had a religious function in Mycenaean times (Aura Jorro s.v.). If he had, it would not be very surprising: in ancient times religion was so dominant that it could hardly be expected not to be the case. In the LfgrE an explicit attempt is made to show a possible development of the functions. No matter how they may be, the functions are not (near) identical, and we cannot know whether they had been so.

2.6. In conclusion we can say the following. The Greek form cannot be explained on the basis of Indo-European. The proposed Indo-European protoform can be doubted. And the meanings too cannot be shown to have been identical. On the other hand, the form fits perfectly in what we know of the Greek substratum language. We also know that several terms for leading functions in society, like βασιλεύς, were taken over from there. And I think that the picture of the Homeric ‘herald’ fits very well into the Minoan palatial society. The function may have been something like this: “As head of the constabulary it was his duty to maintain justice, arrest evildoers, issue ordinances to the city, and when the ruler sat in judgment, to set up his throne and hand him the symbol of authority, the sceptre. ...(he) is also in charge of

¹² It should be noted, however, that in many cases the length of the *u* is unknown; they are then mostly given as short for convenience’s sake. Thus, if the accent of μῆρυξ is correct, it should have long *ū* (etym. dict. s.v. μηρυκάζομαι).

policing the courtyard...where the audience seekers throng and of assigning to each their place in line.” (The description is taken from the court of a Sumerian god; Jacobsen 82.) – A ‘herald’ may have different origins. The English word comes from Frankish **hari-waldi* ‘commander of an army’ (‘army’ + ‘rule, wield’).

The conclusion is that the etymology with Skt. *kāru-* must be given up. Gr. *kāruk-* is a word from the Greek substratum language.

Bibliography

- Aura Jorro, F. 1985-1993: *Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid.
- Bailly, A. 1950: *Dictionnaire grec français*. Paris.
- Bally, Ch. 1945: *Manuel d’accentuation grecque*. Berne.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1995: *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam.
- Chantraine, P. 1933: *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Cootjans, G. – Gourevitch, Danielle 1983: Les noms des dents en grec et en latin. *Revue de littérature et d’histoire anciennes* 57, 189-201.
- Dale, van 1970: *Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal*. Den Haag.
- Furnée, E. 1972: Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen. The Hague/Paris.
- Jacobsen, Th. 1977: *The Treasures of Darkness. A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven/London.
- Hock, H.H. 1986: *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam.
- Hübschmann, H. 1894: Arisches und Armenisches. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 4, 112-120.
- Kleine Pauly, Der 1964-1975: Stuttgart.
- Lejeune, M. 1972: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- LfgRE 1955- : *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen.
- W. Pape’s *Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch*. 1914³: Göttingen.
- Schmidt, J. 1893: Assimilationen benachbarter einander nicht berührender vocale. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 32, 321 - 393.
- Solmsen, F. 1909: Odysseus und Penelope. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 42, 207-232.
- Thieme, P. 1938: *Der Fremdling im Rigveda*. Leipzig.
- Vaan, M. de forthc.: The Indo-Iranian animal suffix **-ācū-*. *Indo-Iranian Journal*.