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) $*b^hard^h$-, does not, perhaps, belong to one of these types.

The word is most probably non-IE, as PIE had no $*a$, and as a laryngeal can hardly solve the problem in this case ($*b^hh_2rd^h$- would have given $*burd$- in Germanic; $*b^hh_2erd^h$- is an unusual structure).

When a (possibly) non-IE word is found in more than one IE language, the reaction is usually one of the two following:

1) the agreement is so evident that the etymology is accepted and the word is considered IE in spite of indications to the contrary (thus e. g. *caput*, section 2.); or

2) the agreement is less evident or more difficult, so that the etymology is rejected (thus in the case of ἀγαθός, section 6.).

Both reactions are understandable, and every case must be studied in its own right, but the possibility which mostly is not seriously considered, is:

3) the – more or less evident – agreement is real and points to genetic relationship, but, after 200 years of trying, we have to admit that the difficulties are such that the word cannot be of IE origin.

The situation becomes even more difficult when such a word is found not only in the languages of (western) Europe but also in Greek and Sanskrit. Still, we should not a priori exclude this possibility. If only a handful of such cases are found, one may doubt them (though we have one already in *paraśú-*). But I have collected some 50 good cases where the relevant word is also found in Greek. (I presented a paper on it at a congress of the Societas Linguistica Europaea in Leiden in sept. 1995; I hope to publish an extended version soon.)

Historically it would not be surprising if European loanwords appear in Greek and Sanskrit. Proto-Indo-European was spoken in the Ukraine, that is in Europe, and it bordered, by definition, on non-IE languages in the west. Even at that stage there may, and I would say, must have been loans, especially if we realize that in the west the Indo-Europeans bordered on the Tripolye-Cucuteni culture, which was an advanced, very refined culture. At later stages some (later) languages moved elsewhere (Tocharian, Hittite, Indo-Iranian) but e. g. Greek may have stayed in central eastern Europe for some time. Note that in the list of loanwords with *a* given by Kuryłowicz 1956, 194 f. there are several Greek words. – A possibility that I am considering with regard to Greek is that these words may have been first adopted by the non-IE inhabitants of Greece, from whom the Greeks took them over later. A case in point may be ἐρέβινθος, with its non-Greek suffix.

To make discussion of these matters easier I propose two terms. One is to call "the non-IE substratum language in Greece from which so many loans entered Greek" henceforth 'Helladic'. Perhaps 'Pelasgian' is quite apt (though we are not certain), but the term has been used with a different content and should therefore be avoided. Of course, I have adopted this name from the archaeological term 'Helladic culture', which seems very appropriate, because the language I mean must have been spoken by (large groups of) the Helladic culture. There may have been more than one language, but we cannot yet distinguish them. There will have been a 'Minoan' language on Crete which was different from 'Helladic'. Eteocretan is most probably a continuation of it. Also there may have been a separate 'Cycladic' language, given the separate character of the Cycladic culture at an early stage. (Archeologists are quite certain now about an invasion from Asia Minor into the Cyclades about 2300 BC; cf. Barber 1987, 29 and 137 ff.). A language cognate with Etruscan existed on Lemnos and probably elsewhere in Greece; perhaps this was 'Pelasgian', but this language should at the moment preferably be called simply 'Lemnian'. The problem is that we do not know whether these languages were related to each other or not. – Further, I would not exclude the possibility that one 'European' language was spoken in a part of Greece.

Second, I propose to call the substratum language in Europe simply 'European'. There may have been more languages, and even more language families in Europe, but we don't know. We may be able to distinguish between e.g. East, Central, West and North European later, but at the moment this seems premature. For the language of the river names established by Krahe we have the term Old European, so that no confussion can exist on this point. I assume that Old European was indeed much older that the language(s) that furnished most of the loanwords (cf. Kuiper 1995, 71–76).[1]) Further attention should be paid to the time aspect. As the first Indo-Europeans arrived in the Netherlands before 3000 BC (the Beaker Cultures, esp. the Protruding Foot Beakers), we must reckon with more than 3000 years during which loans could be taken from

---

[1]) On OEur. see now the important studies by Vennemann, 1994 and 1995. There are two reasons to think that the words here studied are not Old European: 1) the OEur. toponymy is not found in Greece, while several of the words studied here also occur in Greek; 2) the reconstructed forms are not of the typical OEur. shape, e.g. stops are much more frequent (cf. Kuiper 1995, 73 for numbers).

European languages: before 3000 BC words may have come into (parts of) Proto- Indo-European, and at the beginning of the Christian era non-IE languages were still spoken at least in north-western Europe.

I define 'European' then as follows: the language that provided many loanwords in the oldest IE languages; this language was characterized by: 1) a frequent vowel *a*; 2) a vowel-system, or an ablaut system different from PIE, resulting in vowel 'variations' unknown to IE; thus vowel length seems to be varying, which may mean that European had no opposition in vowel length; 3) a stop system different from IE, resulting in variation in the stops (which is unknown in IE); 4) one frequent category of stops was perceived as aspirated; 5) further it seems that *b* was not uncommon.

In the following I shall discuss a few words as examples, most of them well known, but rarely discussed as possible loanwords.

2. *Lat. caput etc.*

The cognates of Lat. *caput* are:

OIc. *hǫfuð*, OE *hafud* < *habuda-
OIc. *haufuð*, OE *héafod*, OFr. *hāved*, *hā(u)d*, *hāfd* < *haubuda-
Goth. *haubiþ*, OS *hōbid*, OHG *houbit* < *haubida-

That these words are cognate has never been doubted, but they present several difficulties for an IE reconstruction.

The first is the vocalism *a*. If one does not accept a PIE *a*, one could theoretically assume *kh_2p-. However, such a form is not attractive (e. g. there is no evidence for a full grade *keh_2p-). Also the root form *kaup- would then be *kh_2eup- (which is theoretically possible) or *keh_2up- (which is not an admitted root form in PIE). It seems therefore probable that the root had -a-, which implies that the word is of non-IE origin.

Very problematic is the variation *a/au*. I found the following explanations. One is contamination with the root seen in NHG *Haube* (which itself has *au* from *ū*). But it is difficult to see why, in some Germanic languages (in some forms), *habud(a)- was contaminated with a form *haub- which did not mean 'head'. And, as De Vries 1962, 279 remarked, "leider besitzt das germ. hier gerade keine wörter mit *au* als stammvokal." – Another suggestion is that the root had originally *au*, and that in some forms the *u* disappeared through

dissimilation against the *u* in -*ut*-. This would imply that this dissimi-
lation also occured in Latin, which is improbable. If OE *h(e)afola*
'head' contains the same root, this confirms that the root had *a*.
(According to Ernout-Meillet, the Latin compounds of the type *an-
ceps* also have *kap-* without -*ut*-.) – Thirdly, it has been proposed
that in **kap-uet-* the *u* was anticipated, giving **kaup-* (Marstrander;
thus Kluge-Seebold). However, there is no evidence for a suffix form
-*uet-*. As Boutkan 1995, 2 remarks, Germanic has no traces of ablaut
in suffixes ending in a stop (referring to Paul 1879). See also below
on the (impossiblility of the) suffix. – The last attempt I know of is
Nussbaum 1986, 214, who assumes that *au* was introduced after the
words for 'eye' and 'ear'. This is improbable; that 'eye' was influenced
by 'ear' is understandable, because it regarded the initial of the word,
and because the (organs of the) two most important senses are often
considered together, but not with 'head'. Thus there is no acceptable
explanation of the variation *a/au*. – On the other hand, such alterna-
tions are known from non-IE languages. Greek has examples which
are probably 'Helladic': Furnée 1972, 335–339. E. g. ψάκαλον/ψαίκα-
λον, λαφύσσω/λαιφάσσω, λήθαργος/ λαίθαργος, ληκάω/λαικάς. Lat.
caupō 'merchant' is probably connected with κάπηλος. This word
may be of Mediterranean origin, as is Lat. *caepa*, *cēpa* 'onion' beside
κάπια, and Lat. *aesculus*, a kind of oak, beside ἄσκρα· δρῦς ἄκαρπος.
Schrijver (unpublished) points to OE *hrāgra* etc. 'heron' < PGm.
*hraig- beside MWelsh *crehyr*; Dutch *spreeuw* < **spraiw-* beside
Bret. *frao* < **spraw-*. The word for 'boar', OHG *bēr* < PGm. **baiza-*
stands beside Welsh *baedd* < **basyo-* (Schrijver, ibid.). In the next
section I shall discuss a probable instance in a European loanword.

   The suffix -*ut*- itself is a problem. There is no evidence for a PIE
suffix -*ut*-, except that of the perfect participle. (This suffix has in
fact been assumed here, already by Brugmann; it was rejected e. g. by
WH.) (The nouns that had -*ut*- in Celtic, like OIr. *cin*, originated
from -*u*- followed by -*t*-, probably the zero grade of -*et*-; thus in
OCS *nogъtь*, see Vaillant, *Gr. comp.* II, 1 p. 231, and IV p. 699.) This
means that the suffix in all probability is non-IE. (Note that we can-
not therefore assume a PIE ablaut form -*uet*-.)

   Lastly, the Germanic forms with -*it*- provide a problem. We have
just seen that it cannot be derived from -*uet*-, because such a form
probably did not exist. Further, - (*u*)*et*- did not become -(*w*)*it* in
Germanic, as is shown by forms like OE *mæged-*, *hæleþ-* (cf. Boutkan
1995). Now Germanic has many instances of suffixes with the form
-*a/i/uC*-. These may partly have arisen from PIE forms in -*a*, -*i* or

-*u* followed by the zero grade of suffix -*eC/C*-, but the large-scale existence of these alternations will be partly due to the existence of non-IE suffixes with this alternation.

The conclusion is that several aspects point to a non-IE word:

- the (probable) *a*-vocalism;
- the variation *a/au*;
- the suffix -*ut*-;

and, probably, also:

- the suffix -*it*-.

To this we may add:

- initial *k*-, if this was a plain velar and not a palatal.

Though I think that PIE had plain velars (Beekes 1995, 109–113), they were not very frequent, and beside the other non-IE characteristics this *k*- may be a further indication of foreign origin. Most of the words in Pokorny beginning with *ka*- seem to be non-IE (cf. also the list in Kuryłowicz 1956, 194 f.). In the section 4. we shall discuss *kakubh*-.

Given this situation – which has always been clear – it seems certain that the word is a loan. I find it surprising that I nowhere have seen even the suggestion that the word could be non-IE (except in Schrijver 1991, 100 f.).

3. ὀλόπτω/ὀλούφω

Another instance of a variation is *o/ou* in Gr. ὀλόπτω/ὀλούφω. I discussed these words in 1971. Though I am not certain now about all combinations proposed,[2] the essential part seems to be valid. ὀλόπτω is known from Hesychius (glossed λεπίζειν, τίλλειν) but the aorist, ὤλοψα, is found in the texts, since Callimachus. ὀλούφω is known from three glosses (τίλλειν, and διολούφειν· διατίλλειν, both H.), one of which says that it is identical to ὀλόπτειν (Photius).

While ὀλόπτω is connected with λέπω ('to peel, to strip off the rind or husks; to give a hiding, i.e. to thrash; to eat'; for the meaning I

---

[2] I am not sure now e.g. about the words for 'Pfote' (Pok. 679), which I mentioned on p.135.

refer to my article), ὀλούφω is connected with the root Pok. 690
*leup-, leubh-. (I think that the form *leub-, which is found only in
OIc. *laupr* 'Korb, Holzwerk' etc. has a deviant meaning and should
be separated from the other forms. I am also not certain that Goth.
lubja-leis 'knowing of drugs and poisons', OE *lyf* 'Heilkraut', to
which OIr. *luib* may belong, is cognate with the rest.) The form with
-*p*- is found in Lith. *lùpti*,[3]) Russ. *lupit'*, the form with -*bh*- in Lith.
lùbena 'abgeschälte Haut, Schale (verschiedener Früchte)', *lúoba*
'(Baum)rinde, Schale', *laũbti* 'graben, scharren, abschälen, herunter-
streifen', Latv. *luba* 'Linden- oder Tannenrinde', *luôbît* (with meta-
tony in verbs in *-*īti*) 'schälen, klauben, ablösen'; Russ. *lub*, Polish
łub 'Borke, Bast, Baumrinde'; OHG *louft* 'Bast' (though here the
nature of the labial cannot be ascertained), probably Goth. *lauf(s)*,
OHG *loub* 'Laub' etc., and Lat. *liber*. (It is now certain that the
consonant in Balto-Slavic was -*bh*-, as Lith. *lub*- does not show
lengthening according to Winter's law, and as the circumflex of *laũbti*
confirms, as -*b*- would have given an acute according to Kortlandt's
addition to this law.)

The forms *leup*- and *leubh*- are traditionally seen as different
extensions of a root *leu*-, but the variation may be due to the fact
that the root is of non-IE origin. On this variation see e. g. Kuiper
1995, 69 ff.; cf. below on the root *k/guP*-.

Gr. λέπω has been connected with Lith. *lèpti*, which is doubtful as
this verb means 'verzärtelt, verwöhnt, verweichlicht'; also with Lith.
lãpas 'Blatt' (thus Fraenkel), Slov. *lépen* 'Blatt', and Russ. *lápot'*
'Bastschuh' (cf. λώπη 'Mantel'; though one might hesitate to connect
the words with meanings in this sphere, like Russ. *lepén'* 'Stückchen,
Fetzen').

The reason why ὀλόπτω was connected with λέπω and separated
from ὀλούφω was, of course, because the rules of Indo-European
make a connection of *o* with *ou* impossible. This is clearly stated by
Chantraine (*Dict.*) s.v. ὀλούφω: "Le rapprochement avec ὀλόπτω ne
mène à rien." If one accepts, however, that most languages have a
large number of loanwords, the conclusion is that the words are cog-
nate but non-IE. That the words are cognate is shown by the fact that

---

[3]) Latv. *lupt* means 'schälen, kahl machen, (scherzhaft) essen'. Therefore I now
prefer to explain the meaning 'to eat', which is also found for λέπτει· κατεσθίει in
Eupolis according to Photius, from 'kahl machen', as 'kahl fressen' (in Dutch
kaalvreten is a well established word), rather than as I did in 1971, 135.

both are glossed with τίλλειν, that Photius identifies the two words, and by the overall resemblance of the forms. (Note that we do not know whether ὀλόπτω had a root in -π or – φ.) If we combine the two words, which seems the obvious thing to do, the conclusion is that the words are loanwords. This agrees with the fact that the variation *leup-/leubh- may also point to a non-IE origin. Perhaps the connection with λέπω must be maintained; for the vocalism cf. ἐρέβινθος/ὄροβος – To reduce the conclusion to its kernel: ὀλόπτω and ὀλούφω are cognate and therefore non-IE, and the latter word has cognates in Balto-Slavic, and probably in Germanic and Latin as well.

4. Skt. kakúbh- etc.

Skt. kakúbh- 'peak, summit; hump' has always been connected with Lat. cacūmen 'top'. For the Sanskrit forms see now EWAia, and Lubotsky 1995, 128. The above form is the oldest, kakúd- is younger and probably due to dissimilation. The old adjective is kakuhá- 'hervorragend', of which the -h- is unexplained. Lubotsky finds no evidence for bh > h in the oldest books of the Rigveda, and assumes a kind of dissimilation again. Perhaps through dh (so that we have well known dh > h). Remarkable is kākúd- 'gullet'.[4])

Lat. cacūmen is assumed to have been influenced by acūmen, which is possible but not certain. It may have been *kakub(h)-men originally (Schrijver 1991, 426).

In this case it is certain that we are dealing with the plain velar, which is rare in IE (section 1.).

This time the a cannot be h_2. h_2e is possible, but *$kh_2e(k)$- is a rare type of root (and we would expect kh- in Sanskrit). If we have an original a, the word was non-IE.

---

[4]) For the meaning 'gullet, (beginning/top of the) throat' see Stephanie Jamison, FS Cowgill 1987, 75 n. 10. Geldner translated it with 'Schlund' (see below). I wonder whether a parallel for this meaning is found in Dutch huig 'uvula'. There are three groups of words. 1) OE ūf from Lat. ūva; 2) OE hūf, MDu. huuf; 3) MLG hūk, Gronings (NE of the Netherlands) hoek (oe = [ū]), Germ. diall. Hauch < *χūk < *kūg-; 4) Du. huig, MDu. huuch, MLG hūch, with probably OE hyge 'Schlund' (with short u), < *χūg- < *kūk-?. Nr. 2. may well be 1. with h- added. So probably the old forms derive from *kuK-. However, I wonder whether this word did not get its meaning from 'ball' rather than through 'palate', cf. Lat. ūva (ūvula is not classical Latin).

The long $\bar{u}$ of Latin can be analogical, but if it is old (see the next section), it shows a non-IE variation $u/\bar{u}$. (Every PIE long $\bar{\imath}$ or $\bar{u}$ derives from i, u + laryngeal.)

The Lat. *m* can be explained as above (assimilation and/or analogy), but I would consider the possibility that it is old and is a 'nasalized' *bh*. (For the phenomenon, in Helladic, see Furnée 1972, 203–227; e.g. κυβερνάω/κυμερῆναι, μύσταξ/βύσταξ, σκόλυμος/σκόλυβος, τέρμινθος/τερέβινθος). We shall see in the next section that prenasalization is frequently found in **k/guP-*, i.e. **k/gumP-*. From this root we have it in κυμίνδαλα· καταστροφή beside κυβάσαι· καταστρέψαι (Furnée 215). As a further instance I suggest Lat. *cumulus* 'heap, pile; surplus; summit, point; tas qui dépasse la mesure'. The analysis **ku-me-lo-* (WH) is no longer possible nowadays. Rather it is **kum-elo-*. It may be cognate with Lith. *kaũpas* 'heap' (see next section). But all this is no more than a suggestion at the moment.

The structure of the word suggests a reduplicated form, containing the root **k/guP-*, which I shall discuss in the next section. If this is correct, the reduplication with *a* cannot be IE. Another analysis is difficult: root *kak-*, suffix *-ubh-*, is most improbable for an IE word.

We find, then:

- a plain velar **k*, which is rare in IE;
- a vowel *a*, which is non-IE;
- a structure, probably reduplication **ka-* from the root **kubh-*, which cannot be IE; with a root **kubh-* which is non-IE (next section);
- perhaps $u/\bar{u}$;
- perhaps *bh/m*.

We must conclude that the word is non-IE. Most words beginning with **ka-* are non-IE in my view; see above on *caput*. Of course it is interesting that the word is also found in Sanskrit; see the end of the next section.

5. The root **k/guP-*

The root **k/guP-*, which indicates various bent forms, shows many forms and a large variety of meanings. The forms can be found Pok. 395 s.v. **guP-* and 588 s.v. **kuP-*. The meanings found may be grouped as follows:

1. Höhle, Grube, schlechtes Haus
2. Schale, Becher, Gefäß; and derived from this:
   2 a. Schiffsrumpf
   2 b. Biegung am Körper
3. Haufen
   3 a. sheaf
   3 b. Hügel, Berg
4. Buckel, gekrümmt
   4 a. Lump
   4 b. knob
   4 c. young animal
   4 d. Gipfel, Kopf
   4 e. Haube, Federbusch

The forms found are the following:

1. Höhle, Grube, schlechtes Haus

gup-:	Gr. γύπη· κοίλωμα γῆς, θαλάμη, γωνία
gup/bh-:	G. *Koben*, OE *cofa* 'simple room'
kub(^{h})-:	W. *gogof* (**upo-kubā*)
kup-:	Skt. *kū́pa-*? 'Grube, Höhle'
	Gr. κύπη· τρώγλη

2. Schale, Becher, Gefäß

gumbh-:	Gm. **kumb-*: OE *cumb*, G. *Kumme, Kumpf* (**kump-*)
kub-:	Gr. κύβος· ... τρύβλιον
kubh-:	Po. *kubek* 'Becher'
kup-:	Gr. κύπελλον
	Lat. *cūpa* 'barrel'
kumb(h)-:	Skt. *kumbhá-*, Av. *xumba-*
	Gr. κύμβη 'Becher'
	G. *Humpen* 'beaker'
	MIr. *comm*, (W. *cwmm* 'valley')

2 a. Schiffsrumpf

kup-:	Gr. κύπαι· εἶδός τι νεώς ...
	OIC *húfr* (with *ū*)

2 b. Biegungen am Körper

kub-:	Gr. κύβος 'Höhlung vor der Hüfte beim Vieh; Würfel(?)' (but see Frisk)
	Lat. *cubitum* 'elbow'
	Goth. *hups* (*i*-stem), OE *hype* 'hip'
kumb-:	OIc. *aptr-huppr*, Norw. diall. *hupp, hump* 'haunch'

3. Haufen

gūp- :	OIc. *kúfr* 'Haufen, (runde Spitze)'
kūb-	OHG *hūfo*, G. *Haufen*; OE *héap* < **koub-*
kup- :	Alb. *kjipi* 'heap'
	Lith. *kaũpas, kùpstas*, OCS *kupъ* 'heap' < **koup-*
	MIr. *cúan* 'troop of dogs' < **k(o)upn-?*

3 a. sheaf

kūp- :	MHG *hūste*, G. *Hauste*

3 b. Hügel, Berg

kup- :	Av. *kaofa-* 'mountain, (hump)'
	OHG *hubil* 'hill'

4. Buckel, gekrümmt

gūb- :	Gm. **kūp-* : recent, diall.
kūbh-	Gr. κυφός 'buckelig'
kup- :	OHG *kovar*, OE *hofer*
	Lith. *kuprà*
kumb- :	E. *hump*

4 a. lump

kumb- :	Norw. *hump?*
	Du. *homp*

4 b. knob

kumb- :	Skt. *kumba-* 'dicke Ende eines Knochens'

4 c. young animal

gu.. :	Gm. **kubb-* : E. *cub*

4 d. Gipfel, Kopf

gu.. :	Gm. **kubb-* : E. *cob* 'clump, head, spider'
kub- :	κύβη = κεφαλή
	G. *Kopf*
kubh- :	Skt. *kakúbh-*
	Gr. κύφερον ἢ κυφήν· κεφαλήν, Κρῆτες H.
kumb- :	Gr. κύμβη = κύβη = κεφαλή[5])

---

[5]) I agree with Kuiper 1956, 214 that ἀνακυμβαλίαζον Ilias 16,379 means 'turned over'. The passage means: the warriors fell from their chariots, because their chariots turned over. This is also the interpretation of the glosses (with one exception). The objection (LfGrE) that one would expect a middle form is not at all decisive. Thus κυβιστάω is active. With a translation like "sie prallten wie κύμβαλα aufeinander" (Frisk) I would expect a passive (it also leaves ἀνα- unexplained). The sound of broken - wooden - cars can hardly be compared with that

4 e. Haube (Federbusch)

gu..:   Gm. **kubb-*: WFlem. *kobbe* 'Federbüschel'

gūp-:   Du. *kuif* 'tuft, forelock'

kūbh-:   OHG *hūba* (G. *Haube*), OE *hūfe*, OIc. *hūfa*

The forms and meanings show so much overlap that it may be assumed that they form one etymon. Forms with **g-* are Germanic, and Gr. γύπη. However, one might consider to add the forms Pok. 450 **gheub(h)-*, which is glossed 'biegen', like the two other roots. Here, as we now know, the Balto-Slavic forms (Lith. *gaũbti*) have *bh-*. The Germanic ones have *g-* < **gh-* (in BSl. we cannot decide between *g-* and *gh-*) and *-p* < **-b* or a geminate (of which the origin is difficult to assess). There is no clear agreement in meaning between these two groups, so perhaps they are not cognate. The BSl. forms may have **gubh-* and may therefore be combined with our two root forms (**k/guP-*). If this is correct there are more forms with **g-*. (They have not been included in the above table.)

As to the labials, all three types are attested. After *m* only *b* is found, except Skt. *kumbhá-*. On possible forms with single *-m-* see above on *cacūmen*, *cumulus* (section 4.).

We find *u/ū*, but other ablaut forms are rare: only the words for 'heap' and Av. (and OP) *kaofa-*.[6] Kuiper (1995, 70–73) thinks that the ablaut is secondary, which seems quite probable.

<hr>

of – metal – cymbals. Further compare ἀνακύπόω (Lyk., Nik.) 'to turn over' (with long *ū* metri causa?). This verb can hardly be derived from κύπτω (see Frisk), as its root is κυφ- and the meaning is different.

   [6] I have considered the possibility that the words for 'heap' are not cognate with the others, because they have 'full grade' and because the meaning is rather different from 'lump, hump' etc.: a heap is something piled up from smaller elements, and the result is not very hump-like. But the difficulties may not be decisive. The root forms **kug-* (Pok. 589) and **gug-* (Pok. 394) also show the meaning 'heap'. – Note that Av. *kaofa-* would be a loanword, when it is cognate with the other words. I wonder whether this is the cause of the fricative. Cf. Av. *xumba-*, also with unexplained fricative (here Sanskrit has *kumbhá-*). There are, however, in Iranian more forms with unexpected *f*. One such form is Skt. *śaphá-*, Av. *safa-* 'hoof'. OE *hōf* etc. have a long vowel. If the word had *a*-vocalism (considered by Pokorny 530), it would be non-IE, but we cannot be sure. (If the word would be cognate with σκάπτω, *a*-vowel would be certain, but this connection is a very complicated matter. Note that OHG *scaban* etc. from **skabh-* is quite probably non-IE; cf. the forms discussed in this article.) It cannot be reconstructed as PIE **kopho-* as in EWAia (because of the *ph*; also Brugmann's law would have operated); possible is **kop-/kōp-*. A suffix *h₂o-* (Burrow 1955, 195 f.; EWAia) is improbable, as it concerns a few words suspect of being loanwords

The forms are found abundantly in Germanic and in Greek, much less so in the other languages.

It is accepted that these words are loanwords (for the Greek words this is mostly assumed). See e.g. Cardona 1968. However, words of this type are also found in Semitic and several other languages (Basque, Caucasian, Mongolian). Thus it is a typical *Wanderwort*. (I have the impression that it is a more or less 'sound symbolic' form, meaning convex objects and shapes, occurring in many languages. See on such words Abaev 1979 s.v. *tymbyl.* I don't think that this detracts from its value, as the word behaves in the way typical for 'European' words. Note that it is very firmly embedded in Germanic. (It is remarkable that many items in Pokorny show a plethora of Germanic forms. Perhaps this is just because Germanic has been better studied than other languages or simply more fully presented by Pokorny.)

Note that *kubh-* has a structure which is not allowed in PIE: voiceless stop + aspirated stop do not occur. (This specific form is not very strongly represented: 4. κῦφός, 4c. κυφερόν, 4d *Haube.*) Note that Skt. *kakúbh-* would have this form.

6. Gr. ἀγαθός – Goth. gods

6.1. Gr. ἀγαθός has not yet been satisfactorily explained. A recent short survey gives Panagl 1995. He himself derives it, with others, from the root for 'great', and in particular from *$\acute{m}\acute{g}h_2\text{-}d^hh_1\text{-}os$ 'made

---

(further *śaṅkhá-*, on which see Furnée 278; of course, *rathá-* is another matter: *$Hrot\text{-}h_2\text{-}o\text{-}$). I think that the Indo-Europeans used the word for 'nail' to indicate a hoof, cf. Lat. *ungula* and the old Greek formula μώνυχες ἵπποι (which must have been created when the laryngeals still existed, *$sm\text{-}h_3nog^h\text{-}$). Russ. *kopýto* 'hoof' must be cognate: an independent creation resulting in an almost identical form is too much of a coincidence. That a velar in a loanword becomes a palatal in Indo-Iranian is found more often: *paraśú-*, *śaṇá-* (κάνναβις), *śaṅkha-* (just mentioned; κόγχος, κόχλος); thus Furnée 278 n.41. Slavic may have a plain velar in such cases, cf. Russ. *konopljá* (a loan from Vulgar Latin, where a form with *p* is unknown, seems improbable). Thus I suggest Eur. *kap-/kāp-* 'hoof'. – Another word with aspiration in Sanskrit is *śaphara-*, which has been thought to be cognate with Lith. *śāpalas,* both a fish of the Cyprinus species. But the Sanskrit word is late (which is not a decisive objection against a European loanword). Note that here Baltic (and Slavic, if Russ. *sapa* is cognate) has the reflex of a palatal. As it concerns loanwords, such rules will not be strict; they are rather tendencies.

great', but this is semantically not convincing (the rendering 'hoch-gestellt' is tendentious); the meaning 'noble', from which Panagl starts, is better derived from 'good'; cf. e. g. East Nordic *goþer* 'gut, wertvoll, angesehen' (Heidermanns 1993, 250 ff.); cf. below. – Add.

There is a gloss ἀκαθόν· χρηστόν. (Note that Chantraine remarks that ἀγαθός "s'est trouvé en concurrence avec ... χρηστός 'utile' et καλός.") If we take this form seriously, it might point to non-IE origin of the word. This is confirmed by the other gloss, χάσιος· ἀγαθός, χρηστός. We know the Doric form χάϊος (ᾱ) 'von guter Herkunft, edel, gut' (with Laconian loss of -s-). This form points to *χᾱτος (or early *χᾱθος?). If this is cognate, the word cannot be IE.

Of old the word has been compared with Goth. *gods* etc. Kluge-Seebold s. v. *gut* finds this the best possibility.

6.2. Pokorny 423 posits a root *g^hed^h-* 'to fit' for these Germanic word and their relatives. Of the words mentioned there Skt. *gadh-* means 'ergreifen, an sich reißen, erbeuten'; cf. *gádhyā* 'Beute'. So there is no good reason to connect it with words for 'to fit' (thus e. g. EWAia).

Of the remaining words (except *gods* etc.) Germanic has words with *gad-* 'to fit, unite, gather' etc. Not clear to me are the Balto-Slavic forms. From Baltic is cited Lith. *guõdas* 'Ehre'. However, the words connected with this word show quite different meanings, so that one might hesitate to connect them with a root 'to fit'. The accentuation is not clear either. There is *guõdžioti* but also *gúosti, pagúoda*; the acute forms might point to a root in *-d* (not *-d^h*). Baltic forms with *gad-* have been supposed to be Slavic loans. In Slavic we have Russ. *gódnyj* 'tauglich', OCS *godъnъ* 'gefällig', SCr. *gòdan* 'fitting, (G.) passend', which agree well with the Germanic words. (Note that the short vowel confirms original *d^h*.) Other forms, like Russ. *gadat'* 'wahrsagen, raten', may have a different origin.

It is disputed whether this root was *g^hed^h-* or *g^had^h-*. Original *a*-vocalism may have been assumed because of Skt. *gadh-*, but this argument now disappears. It is true that there is no evidence in any of these forms for *e*-vocalism. If the root had *-a-* it was non-IE.

Note that Neumann 1995, following Carnoy, derives κόσμος from this root (assuming *g^hed^h-*).

6.3. As to Goth. *gods* etc., its vowel may represent eh_2 (oH), $\bar{o}$, or $\bar{a}$. In the first case, Greek *-a-* (in ἀγαθός) could be single h_2, which might also account for the Germanic forms with *gad-*. (But see below on the (im)possibility of ablaut.) If we connect Russ. *gódnyj* etc., a laryngeal is excluded (as it was never vocalized in Balto-Slavic).

If the vowel was $\bar{o}$ (and the word was IE), there are morphological difficulties. An o-stem cannot have had a lengthened grade. One might consider the possibility that the o-stem was secondary, but I know of no root noun (i.e. non-derived) adjectives.[7]) In general, there is no adjective at all that has lengthened grade, so that this possibility disappears.

If, finally, the vowel was $\bar{a}$ (not eh_2), the word was non-IE.

Note further Crimean Gothic *gadeltha* 'pulchrum' (from **gad-ila-*, ntr. *-ata*, see Lehmann s.v.) The meaning 'beautiful' will derive from 'good, fine'. The form has short *a*, so that Germanic too may have had *a* beside $\bar{a}$. Also it confirms the connection with the root Gm. *gad-*.

6.4. The conclusion seems clear. Both ἀγαθός (with its variants) and *gods* etc. seem non-IE. And if we compare the two adjectives themselves, not only the stops cannot be explained from IE, but the ablaut cannot be explained either, as we saw above.[8])

On the other hand the words seem to be cognate. Now if they are non-IE, the objections to the connection, which are all based on the assumption that the words were IE, disappear.

The words for 'to fit' may well be cognate. An original meaning 'fitting, (G.) passend' is quite comprehensible. (Heidermanns 1993, 251 starts from 'verbunden', but from there to 'good' seems impossible to me.) If these words indeed had *a*- vocalism, this too provides evidence that they are non-IE. This leads us to a root *$g^h ad^h$- 'to fit'. This is a root of the shape that Kuiper (1995, 65 ff.) considers as typical for a group of substratum words. Variation in the stops (as shown in Greek) is found often in these cases (sections 3 and 5). The change $a/\bar{a}$ would not seem to be a problem (though we do not know how to explain it, as this substratum language is almost completely unknown to us); cf. 7. below.

---

[7]) In 1995, 196 I suggested that there might have been such adjectives, but there is no evidence. My analysis of 'naked' is too uncertain.

[8]) Hammerich 1969, 209 assumed **Hgad^h*-, with the laryngeal causing aspiration (*or* a 'prothetic vowel'!). This idea can no longer be maintained. Pârvulescu 1993, 63, following Kiparsky, assumes a Grassman effect in PIE, giving *$g^h ad^h$- – **gad^h*-. But apart from the idea itself, it is arbitrary to assume that it worked in Greek (but not in all forms, while it does not explain the form with χ- either!) but not in Germanic. Also improbable is the idea that *ἀκαθος was changed after ἀγα- (which means 'great'; in this way the form with χ- cannot be explained either).

That the Greek *a-* in ἀγαθός is a 'prothesis' is already shown by Gr. χάσιος;[9]) at present we have to accept that this variation (at least in the loanwords, perhaps not in the donor language itself) existed. 'European' may, of course, have had laryngeals; now we have finally accepted them for PIE, we should not be jealous and deny them other reconstructed languages. It would be remarkable if evidence for such 'prothetic vowels' would only come from Greek. Note that 'Helladic' too had such vowels; Furnée 368–378. For Europe, Schrijver draws my attention to Lat. *merula*, Welsh *mwyalch* < *mesal-kā* beside OHG *amsla* (G. *Amsel*).

It may finally be noted that the result is simple, i.e. an adjective Eur. *(a)g^{h}ad^h- /(a)g^{h}ād^h- 'good' (with the note that the aspirates were something different from the PIE aspirates, which is why they were rendered in different ways).

A fine parallel is provided by the root *d^{h}ab^h- 'to fit' (OE *gedafen* 'fitting', *gedæfte* 'fitting, friendly'; OCS *po-dobati* 'be fitting'). From this root we have Goth. *ga-daban* 'πρέπειν, be suitable', adj. *gadob ist* (from *ga-dofs*) 'πρέπει, it is suitable', MDu. *on-ghe-doef* 'wild', (cf. OE *ge-dáfe* < *ga-dōb-ja-* 'apt'), OCS *dobrъ* 'ἀγαθός, καλός', *dob(l)jъ* 'ἄριστος, δόκιμος', Du. *deftig* 'noble'. This root, with exactly the same structure as *g^{h}ad^h-, is probably also non-IE. Ernout-Meillet doubt whether *faber* belongs to this root because the Germanic and Balto-Slavic forms never show such a meaning; accepted by Schrijver 1991, 102. This does not affect the validity of the comparison of the Gmc. and BSl. forms. However, the certain evidence for *a* now disappears. It could be *o* (a laryngeal is not possible for Balto-Slavic), but there is no evidence for *e*, which one would expect, expecially in the verb, so that *a* is more probable. Note that the adjective, again, has a long vowel (*ā*). (I wonder whether the vocalism could in this case derive from the perfect, *gadob*.) Note further that, if *faber* is cognate, and with it very probably Arm. *darbin* < *d^{h}ab^{h}r-ino-* 'smith', this 'European' root is also found in Armenian; but these two words may not be cognate with the words discussed here.

---

⁹) Therefore the explanations based on *sm̥- or *n̥- ('together with', Pârvulescu) cannot be correct; the existence of the latter 'prefix' is also very doubtful. Most improbable is Harari's suggestion (1979) of a compound with ἀγα-, i.e. *ἀγα-καθ-ος.

7. 'Evening' in Germanic

The variation long/short vowel (discussed in 6.) brings me to a discussion of the Germanic word for 'evening'. The essential forms are OHG *āband*, OE *ǣfen*, *ǣften*, OIc. *aptann*. A good survey of the problem is given in Lloyd-Springer 9 ff. No convincing solution has been found. One problem is the presence vs. absence of the -*t*-, another that of the final -*t* vs. its absence. These problems might be solved by assuming dissimilation or influence of other forms. A problem that is not mentioned is the suffix -*ont*, which is mostly assumed. This suffix did not occur in PIE. One speaks all too easily of ablaut, but -*ont* is unknown beside -*ent*. See e.g. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* 1, 526 (-*ont* probably in loanwords). For Germanic see Meid 1967, 170 ("Derartige Bildungen sind im Germ. selten"), who does not give an example with *-*ont*. This may point to a loanword.

The main problem is that of the initial vocalism, which is PGm. *$\ǣ$/a*, which seems to reflect (PIE) *ē/ə*. Now this ablaut does not exist any longer since the laryngeals. An ablaut *eh_1/h_1* does not work, as an initial laryngeal before consonant did not become a vowel in Germanic. I can think of two possibilities: *h_2ē/h_2e*, which gives *ē/a* if we accept Eichner's rule (on which see, however, Schrijver 1991, 132 ff. on Lat. *ācer*). Such an ablaut, however, is improbable when there is a suffix. Second possibility: *h_1eh_1/h_1h_1*, if the latter group would give *a-*; cf. Schrijver 1991, 77. I know of no instance of this development in Germanic. The long vowel has further been ascribed to a vrddhi-derivation. This leaves the short vowel unexplained.

The difficulties suggest that the word is a loanword, also because it is limited to Germanic. But there is something else that strongly points in this direction. It seems not to have been observed that the short vowel occurs before *-*pt*-, the long one before single *-*p*-. This distribution is seen clearly in the examples which Kuiper 1995, 70 f. gives of a group of loanwords which he considers as typical of Germanic (Kuiper himself did not comment upon it). Other examples were found by Caroline Linschoten in an (unpublished) paper she wrote in Leiden. She looked for ancient loanwords in Germanic on the basis of Kluge-Seebold, letters A, B and M. She found the same distribution (p. 93) in forms cited sub *Auerhahn*, *Beutel*, *Bruch*[3], *But*, *Butzen*. Of course this distribution (lengthening in open syllable) is well known from later Germanic languages. Thus we can now prove that this distribution originated in a substratum, and became (much later) a rule in the language.

As to the difference *ē* vs. *a* I think that it must be understood as indicated by Kluge-Seebold s.v. *Mohn*: "der dem Germanischen fremde Laut *ā* könnte teilweise nach wg. [Westgerm.] *ā* aus *ǣ*, teilweise zu kurzem *a* ausgewichen sein." (We only need the first part here.) Thus I reconstruct Eur. **apt-an(t)-*, **āp-an(t)-* 'evening'.[10]

---

[10]) I wonder whether the word for 'evening', Lat. *vesper* etc., is a loanword. The point, of course, is that it has proved impossible to connect the two forms **wesperos* and **wekeros*. (I take W. *ucher* as containing *-sp-*, which is the simplest assumption; see now Schrijver 1995, 159.) There are two main lines of explanation. One is that the words contain the word Skt. *kṣap-* . But we have not succeeded in explaining **we-*. It cannot be connected with 'away' etc., as Lat. *au* e.g. requires initial h_2, which would have given ἀ(ϝ)ε- in Greek (cf. ἄεθλον). Still, a meaning 'pre-night' (cf. Goth. *anda-nahti*) is attractive. Lubotsky points out to me that **ue-* could be compared with **me-* in Lat. *medius* etc. Hamp 1966 suggested **weik/g-* 'Wechsel, unit of time', but neither the form (*-e-*, not *-(e)i-*) nor the meaning can be explained in this way. The other way is to assume a cluster *-ksp-*. Whereas *ksp > sp* is imaginable, it is not easy to explain the *-k-*. Also I think that PIE had no difficulty with such clusters, cf. Lat. *extrā*. But there is also the point that, as far as I know, such difficult clusters are not known to occur at the end of a root (or a stem) in IE, while we do have e.g. **pkt-en-*. (One might think of **septm.*) I could only think of a root **weks-* followed by a suffix beginning with *p*, but such suffixes are unknown.

Therefore one might consider the possibility that the word is a loan. The fact that all forms have exactly the same formation (**uesp/ker-*) also raises doubts: old inherited words mostly show different ablaut forms or derivations. If Arm. *gišer* requires **uei-* we would have the variation *e/ei* seen in sections 2 and 3. (But one might think of *ē*.)

Then we have a variation labial/velar. Now in Germanic there are many instances of such a variation, e.g. Kluge 1913, 74 f. Kuiper 1995, 81–84 called attention to this phenomenon ("whose importance does not seem to have been fully recognized so far"). He observed that by far most of these cases have a preceding *u* or *w*, and therefore assumes that it is a dissimilation (*uP/uK, uCP/uCK, w – b/g, w – p/k, wu/gu, uw/ug*). Kuiper thinks that many of these dissimilations are late. However, his own – new – example, **babmaz > Goth. bagms*, must in any case date from before our Gothic text. I would think that the phenomenon was typical of the substratum language, i.e. European, and that instances may be found which are much older. Thus I think of a dissimilation: *we(s)per > we(s)ker*. For another possible instance see section 8.

There is some evidence for loanwords with and without an *-s-*: e.g. βάσκευται/φάκελος, ὄδερος/ὑστ(ε)ϱο-, both of which have cognates in other languages (but must be loanwords); OE *næsc* 'deerskin', νάκος 'skin of deer'. In Helladic the phenomenon is also known; Furnée 294 ff.: μύκης/μύσκλοι, μύκλος/μύσκλοι, ὑριχός/ὑρίσκος, δικεῖν/δίσκος etc.

If Slavic had a plain velar, though it could be IE, it makes one think of non-IE origin; but it could have been a labio-velar. – If Lith. *ū̃kas* 'Nebel, Bewölkung, Dunst' is cognate, the long *ū* might confirm a loanword (an IE **wek-* could only

8. σιγή, σιωπή

These two words have been connected with OHG *swīgēn* etc., Pok 1952. (I think that the forms mentioned here, OIc. *svía* etc. and the forms under **swīp-*, all meaning 'nachlassen' etc., should rather be joined with the forms under **swei-* on p. 1041 – where Gr. σῑμός and σιρός should be removed, just like the forms under **sweik-*, which mean 'biegen', a meaning not found in the other forms. I shall not try to disentangle these forms; perhaps there was contamination with an IE root.)

The Greek forms have been considered as onomatopoeic. This possibility is hard to deny; Dutch *zwijgen* in any case shows a regular phonetic development. For Greek the gloss ῥίγα· σιώπα, i.e. **Ϝιγα*, points to **swi-*, which make onomatopoeia improbable (as does **Ϝιγ* itself). The variation σ-/Ϝ- cannot be explained according to the normal rules, so they suggest a loanword.

σιωπή cannot be separated from σῑγή (Frisk). An IE interpretation of the -ω- is impossible (Frisk). Chantraine considers it secondary compared to σιγή, but I see no reason for this assumption. Chantraine suggests that it is an expressive variation, which is possible but no more than a guess. The idea that it is due to a contamination is also a possibility, but Chantraine is correct in rejecting the comparison with (Latin!) *sōpīre*. That the *p* is old is perhaps shown by the gloss σίπτα· σιώπα. Μεσσάπιοι H. – I regard the forms with σωπ- as secondary (allegro forms).

If we accept the comparison of the two forms, and forget the -ω- for a moment, we arrive at **swīg-/swīp-*, which must be a loanword in Greek. In note 10 we have seen that the variation labial/velar has parallels in loanwords, notably in Germanic, where we find a clear comparison in the words OHG *swīgēn* etc.

Whereas the long *ī* of Germanic (beside short *i* in OE *swigian*) could reflect *ei*, the Greek forms make this impossible and require *ī*. The ablaut *ī/i* cannot be IE, which also points to a loanword. The

---

give a short vowel). It cannot be *uH* because of its circumflex (*úkana(s)* have metatony). The long *ū* cannot be compared with *údras* (Fraenkel) as here Winter's law operated. However, the etymology is not clear, I think, because the meaning always refers to clouds. – One might expect that the loan-vowels interpreted as long vowel *ā ī ū* got circumflex intonation in Balto-Slavic, whereas PIE *eH, iH, uH* were acute.

Of course, this is all very tentative.)

Germanic ablaut could be secondary, but the long $\bar{\imath}$ itself can hardly be IE: it would require a root *sweiHg- etc. (ending in three consonants). The Greek σ- too cannot be the regular development of PIE *sw-, but points to a loanword, cf. σομφός (and ψάμαθος/ἄμαθος beside σῑγή/*Ϝιγα).

Perhaps the possibility cannot be excluded that the Greek words are loanwords from a lost IE language, but the variation labial/velar rather points to a non-IE loanword. The other way round, the Greek forms would confirm that this variation is of pre-IE, 'European' origin.

The last point is the form with -ω-. It seems probable, then, that σιωπ- derives from *swīp-. Therefore I suggest, with much hesitation, that the *w* was moved to the position before the *p*, i.e. would have been metathesized. This might have given something like: *swīp- > *sīwp-/sīup. > *sīop- (Greek has no diphthong *iu*) > *siōp- (the long ō also under influence of the words in -ωπ-, through folk etymology?). (One might consider this development as an alternative to the dissimilation which caused unrounding of the labial resulting in the velar of σιγ-.) This is, of course, an unconventional development, but σιωπ- is a strange form.

9. Conclusion

I have discussed a few words of which I think that they are loanwords from 'European', one or more substratum languages in Europe. The essential point is that words occurring in several IE languages are nevertheless loanwords. I hope to have shown that the difficulties following from the assumption that the words are IE disappear in this way. Of course, we are much more free to speculate about these substratum languages of which we know next to nothing. On the other hand, we see structures and tendencies recurring, so that our reconstructions seem to strengthen each other. We are clearly dealing with specific phenomena typical of some lost languages. Also, it seems reassuring that connections that have long since been assumed but which were inexplicable as IE heritage, can now be aknowledged. – Of course, there will be very many loanwords which were completely adapted to IE structures and which are therefore unrecognizable. In-between there is a large number of items where one might hesitate; every instance must then be considered separately. A considerable number of words may be concerned; I recently worked through

Pokorny and noted some 280 roots which I suspect to be of non-IE origin.

The astonishing thing is that up to now most of the words discussed have not been studied as possible loanwords. The same problem occurs in Indian linguistics. It brought Kuiper (1991), at the age of 84, to stress the non-Indo-European elements in Rigvedic Sanskrit. Indo-European linguists have failed to recognize the importance of the non-Indo-European element in the lexicon of the Indo-European languages, and thus neglected a task and missed opportunities.

Add. to 6. Ruijgh, FS Bartoněk, 1991, 131–148, also starts from $*m\acute{g}h_2\text{-}d^hh_1\text{-}os$, with the second element as a nomen actionis, 'dont les actes sont grands' (146). Semantically not convincing.

University of Leiden   R o b e r t   B e e k e s

Bibliography

Etymological dictionaries are cited with the name of the author only, except KEWA and EWAia; note WH = Walde-Hoffmann, WP = Walde-Pokorny.

Abaev, V. I. (1979): *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, III. Leningrad.

Barber, R. L. N. (1987): *The Cyclades in the Bronze Age*. London (Duckworth).

Beekes, R. S. P. (1971): A European substratum word. *Orbis* 20, 132–137.

Beekes, R. S. P. (1995): *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam (Benjamins).

Boutkan, D. (1995): Altgermanisch 'Held'und die Entwicklung von unbetontem *$*e$* im altnord- und westgermanischen. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 41, 1–7.

Burrow, T. (1955): *The Sanskrit Language*. London.

Cardona, G. R. (1968): Gr. κύμβαχος, itt. *kupahhi-*, ebr. *kôßa/qôba*. *AION-L* 8, 5–16.

Furnée, E. J. (1972): *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. The Hague/Paris.

Hammerich, L. L. (1969): Review of *Evidence for Laryngeals* ed. W. Winter. *Lingua* 22, 203.

Hamp, E. (1966): Three Armenian etymologies. *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 3, 11–15.

Harari, M. (1979): Nuova proposta di etimologia per ἀγαθός. Athenaeum (Pavia) 57, 150–153.

Heidermanns, F. (1993): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektiva*. Berlin/New York (De Gruyter).

Kluge, F. (1913): *Urgermanisch*. Strassburg.

Kuiper, F. B. J. (1956): The etymology of ἄνθρωπος. In: MNHMHΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ, Gedenkschrift P. Kretschmer. Heidelberg, 212–226.

Kuiper, F. B. J. (1991): *Aryans in the Rigveda.* Amsterdam (Rodopi, Leiden Studies in Indo-European 1).

Kuiper, F. B. J. (1995): Gothic *bagms* and Old Icelandic *ylgr. North-Western European Language Evolution* 25, 63–88.

Kuryłowicz, J. (1956): *L'apophonie en indo-européen.* Wrocław.

Lubotsky, A. (1995): Sanskrit *h < dh, bh.* In: *Sthāpakaśrāddham,* FS G. A. Zograph, ed. N. V. Gurov - Ya. V. Vasil'kov. St. Petersburg, 124–144.

Meid, W. (1967): *Wortbildungslehre,* in H. Krahe, *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft* III. Berlin.

Neumann, G. (1995): Altgriechisch κόσμος und seine Sippe. In: *Verba et structurae,* FS K- Strunk. Innsbruck (IBS), 203–210.

Nussbaum, A. J. (1986): *Head and Horn in Indo-European.* Berlin/New York.

Panagl, O. (1995): Griechisch ἀγαθός – ein etymologischer Versuch. In: *Verba et structurae,* FS K. Strunk. Innsbruck (IBS), 229–235.

Pârvulescu, A. (1993): IE *dhughǝtēr* 'daughter' and Grassmann's law. *Indogerm. Forschungen* 98, 50–91.

Paul, H. (1879): Zur Geschichte des germanischen Vokalismus. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 6, 1–256.

Schrijver, P. (1991): *The Reflexes of the PIE Laryngeals in Latin.* Amsterdam (Rodopi; Leiden Studies in Indo-European 2).

Schrijver, P. (1995): *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology.* Amsterdam (Rodopi; Leiden Studies in Indo-European 5).

Vennemann, Th. (1994): Linguistic reconstruction in the context of European prehistory. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92, 215–284.

Vennemann, Th. (1995): Etymologische Beziehungen im Alten Europa. *Der Ginkgo Baum* 13, 39–115.