Alexander Nikolaev
(Boston University, USA)

ETYMA GRAECA II

This paper proposes new Indo-European etymologies for the following Ancient Greek words: ἄλξη ‘heat’ (**h₂leu_hx-* ‘to burn’, cf. Ved. *rūrā-* ‘hot’, OIr. *loscaid* ‘burns’, etc.); ἀμείνων ‘braver, better’ (**h₂mei-* ‘to be strong’, cf. Toch. B *maiwe* ‘young’, *maiyya* ‘strength’); δυσπήμελος ‘dangerous, turbulent (of sea)’ (**g^{wh}emb^hh₁-* ‘deep’ cf. Ved. *gabhīrā-*, YAv. *jafra-*); ἔθειρα ‘hair’ (< **h₁(e)g^h-u_{er}-ih₂-*, cf. Toch. AB *yok* ‘a single hair’, pl. *yākwa* < **h₁ēg^hu-*); θιβρός ‘biting, stinging’ (< **d^hih₂g^w-ro-*, cf. Lith. *diēgti* / *diēgti* ‘to poke, sting’, Lat. *fīgere* ‘to insert, pierce’, Toch. AB *tsāk^a-* ‘to bite; to pierce’, etc.); ἴλιον ‘female pubis’ (< **h₂ih_{2/3}-*, cf. Pal. *īhha-* ‘flank’, Lat. *īlia* ‘groin’); μάρπτω ‘seize’ (**merk^w-*, cf. Toch. A *mārḱ-* ‘take away’, Lat. *merx* ‘commodity’ < *‘what is taken/bought’); μῖμος ‘mime’ (**meh₂-i-* ‘(to reveal by) making motion by hand’, cf. Lith. *móju* ‘wave hand’, Proto-Slavic **majati* ‘to make signs with a hand’, Yazgulyam *amaw-* ‘to motion with a hand’); ὠτίς ‘bustard’ (< **uōti-* ‘bird-like’, ‘a sort of bird’ ← **uoti-*, cf. Hitt. *wattai-* ‘bird’).

Keywords: etymology, Indo-European reconstruction, Ancient Greek, Anatolian, Tocharian, Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, Latin, Celtic.

А. С. Николаев
(Бостонский университет, США)

Etyma graeca II

В статье предлагается ряд новых этимологий для древнегреческих слов: ἄλξη ‘жара’ (**h₂leu_hx-* ‘гореть’, ср. вед. *rūrā-* ‘горячий, пылающий’, др.-ирл. *loscaid* ‘горит’, и т. д.); ἀμείνων ‘лучше, сильнее’ (**h₂mei-* ‘быть сильным’, ср. тох. В *maiwe* ‘молодой’, *maiyya* ‘сила’); δυσπήμελος ‘опасный, бурный (о море)’ (**g^{wh}emb^hh₁-* ‘глубокий’, ср. вед. *gabhīrā-*, мл.-ав. *jafra-*); ἔθειραι ‘волосы, грива’ (< **h₁(e)g^h-u_{er}-ih₂-*, ср. тох. АВ *yok* ‘волос’, pl. *yākwa* < **h₁ēg^hu-*); θιβρός ‘жгучий, острый’ (< **d^hih₂g^w-ro-*, ср. лит. *diēgti* / *diēgti* ‘колоть, жалить’, лат. *fīgere* ‘протыкать, вставлять’, тох. АВ *tsāk^a-* ‘кусать, протыкать’, и т. д.); ἴλιον ‘женский лобок’ (< **h₂ih_{2/3}-*, ср. пал. *īhha-* ‘пах’, Lat. *īlia* ‘брюшная полость’); μάρπτω ‘хватать’ (**merk^w-*, ср. тох. А *mārḱ-* ‘забирать’, лат. *merx* ‘товар’, т. е. ‘то, что берут’); μῖμος ‘мим’ (**meh₂-i-* ‘показывать руками, жестикулировать’, ср. лит. *móju* ‘машу’, праслав. **majati* ‘махать’, язгулям. *amaw-* ‘делать жест рукой’); ὠτίς ‘дрофа’ (< **uōti-* ← **uoti-*, ср. хетт. *wattai-* ‘птица’).

Ключевые слова: этимология, праиндоевропейская реконструкция, анатолийские, тохарские, индоиранские, балтославянские языки.

9. ἄλέᾱ*

Att. ἄλέᾱ, Ion. ἄλέη ‘heat, warmth’ (Hom. +) is traditionally compared to the root of OE *swelan* ‘to burn slowly’, Lith. *svilti* ‘to smoulder’, Gk. εἶλη ‘the sun’s heat’ (PIE **suelh₁-* ‘sing, burn’)¹, but the complete absence of rough breathing (which would have been expected if the word continued a protoform with initial **su-*) makes this etymology very problematic: for instance, ἄλεαίνουμι and ἐν ἄλέᾳ in Aristophanes (*Ec.* 540–41) are both transmitted with *spiritus lenis* in all of the seven manuscripts and no manuscripts aspirate ἄλεαίνει (Men. fr. 892 K.–A.) either². The proponents of the etymological connection with **suelh₁-* have followed *LfgrE* 1.464 in supposing that psilotic Ionic ἄλέη was adopted as Attic ἄλέᾱ from Ionian medical and scientific writings. However, in Greek literature the word refers to the warmth of the sun or heat in general and does not carry specifically medical connotations: in *Od.* 17.23 the

* For the first instalment see Nikolaev 2014a from which the numeration in the present paper is continued. Greek texts are abbreviated after Liddell–Scott–Jones; Latin texts are abbreviated after Oxford Latin Dictionary. Translation of Homeric passages is by Lattimore, translations of other Greek and Latin texts are from Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise indicated. Gk. = Ancient Greek, Goth. = Gothic, Lat. = Latin, Latv. = Latvian, Lith. = Lithuanian, Luw. = Luwian, Lyc. = Lycian, MCor. = Middle Cornish, OAv. = Older Avestan (Gāthic), OBret. = Old Breton, OE = Old English, OIr. = Old Irish, ON = Old Norse, PIE = Proto-Indo-European, Toch. = Tocharian, Umbr. = Umbrian, Ved. = Vedic Sanskrit, YAv. = Younger Avestan. “>” denotes regular phonological development, “→” denotes morphological derivation.

I would like to thank Hannes Fellner, Jeffrey Henderson, Stefan Höfler, Boris Maslov, Craig Melchert, Sergio Neri, Alan Nussbaum, Martin Peters, Georges Pinault, David Sasseville, and Michael Weiss who kindly answered my questions and provided helpful feedback on individual ideas presented in this paper.

¹ See *GEW* 65–66, *EDG* 62–63, *DELG* 53. This traditional etymology was recently advocated with customary learning and ingenuity by Höfler 2016–2017: 181–184, 190–191 who posited a derivational chain **suelh₁-es-* → **sulh₁-s-ó-* ‘having glowing heat’ → **sulh₁-s-eh₂* ‘glowing heat’.

² 2nd cent. CE grammarian Aelius Dionysius states that ἄλεαίνω was pronounced with a rough breathing (α 81 Erbse: καὶ γὰρ τὸ ‘ἄλεαίνεσθαι’ δασύνουσιν οἱ Ἀττικοί), but this claim does not carry much weight since Aelius could easily have relied on analogy to genuine cases where an Ionic psilotic form stood next to an aspirated form in Attic.

reference is to the heat of the sun later in the day³, while in Arist. *Ec.* 541 ἐν ἀλέᾳ ... καὶ στρώμασιν “in warmth and coverings” is a hendyadis for “in warm coverings”⁴. The word ἀλέη and its derivatives are frequently used in the Hippocratic corpus, but again they never denote fever or bodily heat⁵. Since the word does not have a specifically medical or scientific meaning which could have prompted its adoption into Attic from Ionian prose, the lack of rough breathing in Att. ἀλέᾳ presents an insurmountable obstacle for the derivation of the word from PIE **suelh₁-*.

A search for an alternative etymology is therefore warranted. The lack of contraction in Att. ἀλέᾳ suggests that the hiatus is due to the loss of intervocalic **u*, making the reconstruction of Proto-Gk. **aleu-* plausible: the glosses ἀλεόν· θερμόν ἢ χλιαρόν and ἀλεός· διάπυρος (Hsch. α 2281 and 2282 Cunningham) can be unproblematically taken back to **aleu-ó-*, while a zero-grade root form **alū-* may be continued in ἀλυκρός ‘lukewarm, tepid’⁶ and perhaps in Hsch. α 3296 ἀλύνει· φύει. Another formation made from the same Proto-Gk. root **aleu-* is an *s*-stem **aleu-eh-* reflected in the adj. ἀλεινός ‘warm’ and in the verb ἀλεαίνω ‘to warm up’ formed from **άλε(ε)h-* with hyphaeresis⁷. Direct evidence for this *s*-stem is

³ ἀλλ’ ἔρχεο· ἐμὲ δ’ ἄξει ἀνὴρ ὅδε, τὸν σὺ κελεύεις / αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ κε πυρὸς θερῶ ἀλέῃ τε γένηται “So go. This man whom you ordered will lead me, right after I get warm from the fire and there’s heat”.

⁴ σὲ δ’ ἐν ἀλέᾳ κατακείμενον καὶ στρώμασιν / κατέλιπον, ὧνερ “I left you lying in warm spot, snugly blanketed, husband”.

⁵ Cf. *Vict.* 3.65 περιπάτοισιν [...] βραδέσιν ἐν ἀλέῃ “short walks in the sun”; *Morb. Sacr.* 13 ἢ καὶ ἐκ ψύχους εἰς ἀλέην ἔλθῃ καὶ παρὰ πῦρ πολὺ “if he leaves the cold for warmth and a large fire”; *Vict.* 3.68 φυλασσόμενον τὰς μεταβολὰς τῶν ψυχέων καὶ τῆς ἀλέης ἐσθῆτι παχείῃ “with the use of a thick garment to guard against sudden changes of heat and cold”; *Aēr.* 19 ὁ γὰρ χειμὼν κωλύει καὶ τῆς γῆς ἢ ψιλότης, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλέη οὐδὲ σκέπη “they are stunted owing to the severe climate and the bareness of the land, where there is neither warmth nor shelter”. The denominative verb ἀλεαίνω is used in the meaning ‘apply warmth to, keep warm’ in *Aff.* 26, *Mul.* 1.58, 2.17, *Epid.* 5.57, 7.76a.

⁶ Call. fr. 270 Pfeiffer γέντο δ’ ἀλυκρά “they’ became warm”, Nic. *Al.* 386 ἀλυκρότερον ‘slightly warmed’, Suid. ἀλυκρά· χλιαρά ‘warm’, Hsch. α 3295 Cunningham ἀλυκρόν· εὐδινόν.

⁷ Cf. μενεαίνω ‘to rage, to desire’ derived from the *s*-stem found in μένος ‘rage, strength’, ἀμενής ‘feeble’.

found in the hapax ἐπαλής ‘warm’⁸ (Hes. *Op.* 49) which in my opinion is best explained as an endocentric augmentation of the same type that we find in Homeric εἴκελος ‘similar’ beside ἐπείκελος ‘similar-ish’, ξανθός ‘yellow, brown’ beside ἐπίξανθος ‘brownish’, etc.⁹. The meaning of ἐπαλής is therefore ‘hot-ish, warm’ which suits Hesiod’s description of the smithy after hours quite well¹⁰. The stem *ἐπ-αλεε- can be analyzed as a form of an *s*-stem adjective -αλεεh- which matches the adj. ἀλεεινός < *aleehno-.

Proto-Gk. *aleu- can be compared with the following forms none of which have a satisfactory etymology: (a) Ved. *rūrā-* ‘deliriously hot’, used to denote a kind of *takmán-* ‘fever’¹¹ (< *h₂luh_x-ro-); (b) Proto-Iranian *rau- ‘to burn’ (< *h₂leu_x-)¹²; (c) OIr. *loscaid* ‘burns, consumes by fire’ (< *luskā-, a remodeling of thematic *luske/o- < Insular Celtic *lūske/o- < *h₂luh_xskē/o-)¹³, and

⁸ The *s*-stem may also be attested at S. *Ph.* 859 ἀλεῆς ὕπνος ἐσθλός “sleep in the heat is sound” (trans. Jebb), although most editors (Lloyd-Jones and Wilson, following Radermacher and Kraus) adopt Reiske’s conjecture ἀδεῆς (“good sleep has no fears”).

⁹ See Strömberg 1946: 101–8.

¹⁰ πᾶρ δ’ ἴθι χαλκεῖον θῶκον καὶ ἐπαλέα λέσχην / ὥρῃ χειμερῇ, ὅποτε κρύος ἀνέρας ἔργων / ἰσχάνει· ἐνθά κ’ ἄοκνος ἀνὴρ μέγα οἶκον ὀφέλλοι “pass by the bronze-worker’s bench and his warm lounge in the wintry season, when the cold holds men back from fieldwork, but an unhesitating man could greatly foster his household”.

¹¹ AVŚ 1.25.4+. *EWAla* 2.456 “Nicht klar”.

¹² Chorasmian caus. *pcr*’wy- ‘to heat up’ < *pati-rāuajia-, Ossetic (Iron.) *arawyn* / (Dig.) *arawun* ‘to burn in fire’, see Cheung 2007: 19.

¹³ British Celtic forms (MWelsh *llosci* ‘to be on fire, to burn’, MCorn. *lesky* ‘to burn’, OBret. *lescsit* gl. *extorruit* ‘parched’) cannot be reconciled with the Goidelic form without a host of ancillary assumptions: the only way of aligning the root vowel in Proto-British *loskī- with that in OIr. *loscaid* is to reconstruct Proto-Celtic *loT-ske/o- where an *o*-grade would be extremely peculiar. But rather than following the contrived scenario of Klingenschmitt (1982: 194 n. 40) who reconstructed Proto-Celtic *lo(p)skī-, viz. as a causative made from a secondary root based on a reanalysis of *lh₂p-skē/o- ‘to be light’ (Hitt. *lap-*, Gk. λάμπω), one may simply assume that MWelsh *llosci*, etc. are early Goidelic loanwords: this is a well-known and well-studied phenomenon, cf. MW *byth* ‘always’, MBret. *bez*, Corn. *byth* ‘ever’ which cannot be derived from Proto-Celtic *bitu- (irregular [θ] in Welsh and Cornish, [z] in Breton) and are best explained as LW from OIr. *bith* ‘perpetual’; cf. also MW *kerbyt*, OBret. *cerpit* ‘chariot’ vs. OIr. *carpat* ‘id.’ < Proto-Celtic *karbanto, or MW *llwch* (OW *lichou*) and

perhaps (d) Luw. (:)lūha- ‘warmth?’ < *h₂louh_{2/3}-eh₂ (with loss of initial *h₂ by the Saussure’s effect)¹⁴ and (e) Lat. *lūstrum* ‘purification ceremony’ < *h₂luh_x-s-tro- ‘instrument of burning’ (and hence of purification)¹⁵. Based on these forms, we can reconstruct a new PIE root *h₂leuh_x- ‘to burn; to be hot’¹⁶ and its derivatives, *h₂leuh_x-es- > Gk. *ἄλεεῃ- and *h₂leuh_x-ó- ‘burning, hot’ (cf. ἄλεός) substantivized as *h₂léuh_x-eh₂ > Ion. ἄλέη, Att. ἄλέᾱ.

10. ἁμείνων

ἁμείνων ‘better, braver’ does not have a universally accepted etymology¹⁷: this word (for which an original *ei in the root is made certain by Lesbian and Thessalian personal names in Ἀμειν-) may be compared to Toch. B *maiwe* ‘young’, *maiyyā_u* (adj.) ‘powerful, strong’, *maiyya* ~ *maiyyo* ‘strength, power’ under the assumption that the original meaning of IE *h₂moǵ-uo- was ‘strong’ and it could be used to refer to youthful vigor, hence the meaning of Toch. B *maiwe*¹⁸. Under this analysis, ἁμείνων would have to be analyzed as a *faux* comparative, viz. an adj. *ἄμεινος ‘strong’ (< *h₂meǵ-no-) secondarily pressed into service as a suppletive comparative to

OBret. *loch* ‘lake, pond’ vs. OIr. *loch* (< Proto-Celtic *loku-), see Rhys 1895; Pedersen 1909: 24; Bauer 2019.

¹⁴ It is unclear at present whether the same preform *(h₂)louh_{2/3}-eh₂ > Luwic *lūHa- is the source of Lyc. B 3 pl. ipv. *lugātu* (TL 44d.60; see GLyk 187) and Luw. (FLAMMAE)la_x-há-nú-wa/i-ta_x ‘he burned down’.

¹⁵ If one is willing to believe that the purifying agent in the original version of the *lustrum* was fire which is an assumption that our present knowledge of the ritual does not allow to either confirm or deny. As a parallel, compare *purgō* / *purigō* ‘purify ceremoniously’ < *pūr-agō < *puh₂r-h₂ǵe/o- ‘to lead the fire about’ with the PIE word for ‘fire’ (Umbr. *pir*, Gk. πῦρ) as the first compound member (Thurneysen 1912–1913: 278) or *februa* ‘means of purification’ usually taken from *fexro-, PIE *d^heg^{wh}- ‘to burn’ (Pisani 1979), but recently argued to go back to *fesro- < *d^h(u)h₂es-ro-, PIE *d^hueh₂- ‘to smoke’ (Lat. *suffire*, Gk. θύω) by Vine 2020.

¹⁶ Depending on the assessment of Luw. (:)lūha-, the root-final laryngeal may be specified as *h_{2/3}-.

¹⁷ EDG 91, DELG 71, EDG 86. For an overview of usage and semantics as well as for further bibliography see Dieu 2011: 29–47.

¹⁸ A competing school of thought assumes that the original meaning of the Tocharian words was ‘young’ < ‘small’, and compares ON *mjór* ‘slender, delicate’ < *moǵuo- ‘little’, following Lane 1938: 24, see DoT² 509.

ἀγαθός¹⁹ and remodeled as an $\tilde{o}n$ -stem by analogy to other n -stem comparatives²⁰.

11. δυσπέμφελος

The rare epic word δυσπέμφελος occurs once in the *Iliad* and three times in Hesiod. Its exact meaning is uncertain: in *Il.* 16.748, Hes. *Th.* 440 and *Op.* 618 δυσπέμφελος is applied to turbulent sea or the dangers of seafaring²¹, while in *Op.* 722 it is used of a person, presumably in the sense ‘disturbing’ or ‘troublesome’²². In later Greek δυσπέμφελος occurs in the epigram composed by a certain Herodicus the Babylonian (*FGE* 1) possibly active in the second or first century BCE: there is no consensus about the text and the interpretation, but the meaning ‘stormy, troublesome’ is certain enough²³. Finally, the word undergoes a large-scale revival in Nonnus where it is used as a *recherché* epithet of winds, torrents, and Hesiod’s native town notorious for its miserable weather²⁴.

¹⁹ Cf. *Il.* 15.641–2 ἀμείνων / παντοίας ἀρετάς, ἡμὲν πόδας ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι “stronger in every faculty, whether running or fighting”.

²⁰ πλέων (n.) : πλέων (m./f.) = ἄμεινον (n.) : x, where x is resolved as ἀμείνων.

²¹ *Il.* 16.746–8: εἰ δὴ που καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι γένοιτο / πολλοὺς ἄν κορέσειεν ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθεα διφῶν / νηὸς ἀποθρώσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἶη “If only he were somewhere on the sea, where the fish swarm, he could fill the hunger of many men, by diving for oysters; he could go overboard from a boat even if [the sea] is *δυσπέμφελος*”; Hes. *Op.* 618 εἰ δέ σε ναυτιλίας δυσπεμφέλου ἥμερος αἰρεῖ “if a desire for *δυσπέμφελος* seafaring grips you”; *Th.* 440 οἱ γλαυκὴν δυσπέμφελον ἐργάζονται “those who work hard on *δυσπέμφελος* sea” (but see Fusillo 1981 who argued that in this verse the kenning for ‘sea’ is τὸ δυσπέμφελον: by using a substantivization with a literal meaning ‘the turbulent one’ to refer to the sea, Hesiod would demonstrate, yet again, his notorious aversion to the marine world).

²² μηδὲ πολυξείνου δαιτὸς δυσπέμφελος εἶναι “and do not be *δυσπέμφελος* in your mood at a dinner with many guests”.

²³ τοῦθ’ ὑμῖν εἶη, δυσπέμφελοι “let these things be yours, you *δυσπέμφελοι* men”. The editors, including Page, print *voc.pl.* assuming that the epithet refers to the rival grammarians of the school of Aristarchus (“you, turbulent people”), but the manuscript tradition of Athenaeus 5.222A, where the epigram is transmitted, has *δυσπέμφελον* which could be construed with preceding τοῦτο (“may this stormy (fate) be yours”). As modern commentators have correctly observed, the epithet resumes the nautical theme of the first verse φεύγετ’, Ἀριστάρχειοι, ἐπ’ εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης / Ἑλλάδα.

²⁴ *Dion.* 2.550 (αὔρη); 13.75 (Ἀσκη); 22.171 (προχέων ποταμὸς *δυσπέμφελον* ἀλκὴν); 24.64 (αὔρη).

There can be little doubt that the original sense of δυσπέμφελος has to be sought in its application to the sea and its dangers²⁵.

The isolated²⁶ Greek word is in my opinion related to Indo-Iranian **gab^hHra-* ‘deep’ > Ved. *gabhīrā-*, YAv. *jafra-*²⁷: as a danger-conveying epithet of the sea, Gk. **dus-k^wemp^helo-* is analyzable as a bahuvrīhi-compound meaning ‘having depth, which is bad’ or possibly ‘having too much depth, which is bad’.²⁸ The initial voiced aspirate in PIE **g^{wh}emb^hH-* would undergo dissimilation in both branches (Grassmann’s Law): **(-)g^{wh}emb^h-* > **(-)k^{wh}emp^h-* > **(-)k^wemp^h-*²⁹ > Gk. *(-)πέμφ-*³⁰, **g^{wh}m^bh-* > Indo-Iranian **gab^h-*³¹.

Since the *-ī-* in Ved. *gabhīrā-* seems to point to a root-final laryngeal, the most economical solution would be to analyze the second member of Proto-Gk. **dus-k^{w(h)}emp^helo-* ‘having depth, which is bad’ as a reflex of an adjective abstract **g^{wh}émb^hh₁-lo^{-m}*

²⁵ It is uncertain how much trust may be placed in Hsch. π 1385 πέμφελα· δύσκολα, τραχέα, βαθέα ‘difficult, rough, deep’: Hansen is justifiably skeptical and suggests in his app. crit. that this is a *glossa decurtata* (viz. <δυσ>πέμφελα).

²⁶ The etymological dictionaries are unanimous in calling δυσπέμφελος an “expressive word without etymology” (*GEW* 426–7; *DELG* 290; *EDG* 361).

²⁷ The initial palatalization in the Avestan form is due to a contamination of full-grade root **jamb^hH-* with zero-grade **gab^hH-*: the initial consonant was leveled out in both branches, as **g-* in Indo-Aryan and as **j* in Iranian (*jafra-* < **jabra-* < **gabra-* x **jamban-*).

²⁸ Not simply ‘having bad depth(s)’; compare δυσηχής ‘bringing woe (ἡγή), which is bad’ (πολέμοιο δυσηχέος 7x *Il.*, not tautological ‘bringing bad woe’) or δυσαής ‘having too much gust, which is bad’ (ἀνέμοιο δυσαέος *Il.* 5.865).

²⁹ I accept the rule according to which intervocalic *ND^h* > *ND* in posttonic syllables on the way to Greek (see Miller 1977: 37; Hajnal 2005: 196–8; Kümmel 2013: 160, 168–70, Miller 2010: 234–7), but even though this rule predicts that **(-)g^{wh}émb^hH(e)lo-* should develop into Gk. †*(-)πέμβελος*, there would be plenty of ways for analogy to eliminate the allomorphy, especially since the derivational basis of **g^{wh}émb^hH(e)lo^{-m}* ‘depth’ would have been an oxytone adjectival stem in **-ló-* which would not be subject to Miller’s rule.

³⁰ The “Aeolic” development of initial **k^w* > *p* before **e* is fully consonantal with the fact that in early Greek literature δυσπέμφελος occurs only in epic and may therefore be at home in epic Aeolic dialect.

³¹ See Mayrhofer 1986: 112–5.

‘depth’ derived from the adjective $*g^{wh}m_b^h h_l-ló-$ ‘deep’³² directly reflected in Ved. *gabhīrā-*, YAv. *jafra-* and, with a different suffix, in Toch. A *kupār* ‘deep, deeply, depth’³³.

It remains to clarify the meaning of the Greek word. The passage from the Iliad cited above (16.748: εἰ δὴ πού καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι γένοιτο [...] εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἴη) is interesting in two ways: its syntactic structure shows that for the poet δυσπέμφελος was not an obsolete epithet fossilized in a formula, while the use of the epithet in the context of oyster farming makes it clear that the poet did not associate δυσπέμφελος with depth, since oysters are harvested in shallow waters³⁴. The most adequate translation would be ‘troublesome, dangerous’ which suits the Hesiodic usage perfectly and presents an unobjectionable semantic development from the original meaning ‘having (too much) depth, which is bad’.

12. ἔθειρα(ι)

In Homeric epics the word ἔθειρα is used twice to refer to the golden mane of horses belonging to Zeus and Poseidon and in another three instances the word is used of the horse hair crest on Achilles’ helmet (including when it was donned by Patroclus)³⁵. In the *Hymn to Apollo* (5.228) ἔθειρα denotes Tithonus’ hair which has just begun turning grey, while the author of the *Hymn to Dionysus* chose to recycle the Homeric verse-end phrase καλαὶ δὲ περισσεῖοντο ἔθειραι ‘the lovely fringes were shaken’ (*scil.* the plume on Achilles’ helmet) to apply it to the god’s locks. The word is only used in the plural in early hexameter poetry where nom.pl. ἔθειραι is

³² For the mechanism of producing adjective abstracts with an accent-shift and a concomitant insertion of a new full-grade in the root see Rau 2007. Compare the following pairs (back-reconstructed for PIE): $*h_x t n ó-$ ‘guilty’ (Ved. *ṛnā-*) → $*h_x é r n o-$ ⁿ ‘guilt’ (YAv. *arəna-* ‘injustice’ attested in *arənat_čāēša-* ‘punishing injustice’) or $*g ê h_l t ó-$ ‘born’ (Ved. *jātā-*) → $*g ê n h_l t o-$ ⁿ ‘the born one, child’ (OHG *kind*).

³³ See Pinault 2019: 499 (*kupār* < $*kwäbāræ$ < CToch. $*kwäm bāræ$ < $*g^w m_b^h H-ró-$). Of course, the Indo-Iranian forms may also go back to $*g^{wh}m_b^h h_l-ró-$ ‘deep’ with the same suffix as in Toch. A *kupār*.

³⁴ Cf. also Hes. *Th.* 440: those who γλαυκὴν δυσπέμφελον ἐργάζονται are fishermen, not sailors, so this poet is not talking about deep sea either. I thank B. Maslov for drawing my attention to this.

³⁵ Cf. also ἔθειράδες (Didymus’ reading for γενειάδες of the paradosis) of Odysseus’ beard at *Od.* 16.176.

consistently verse-final. The word appears to have been exclusively poetic and does not appear in inscriptions until the Imperial times.

There is no satisfactory etymology for ἔθειρα on the books: “nicht sicher erklärt” (*GEW* 446), “uncertain” (*EDG* 376), while *DELG* 300 and *LfgrE* 2.410 endorse Frisk’s earlier comparison with ὠθέω ‘push, thrust’ and with ἔθων paraphrased in the scholia as ‘βλάπτων’³⁶. While in theory hair may be described as ‘that which one can shake back and forth’³⁷, methodologically it appears more prudent to look for potential cognates referring to hair.

ἔθειρα looks like a substantivized feminine adjective made with the same possessive suffix as πείρα ‘fatty, rich’ (= Ved. *pīvarī* ‘id.’) standing next to masc. πίων ‘fatty’ (= Ved. *pīvan-*) and ultimately derived from **pih_xur_o* (Gk. πῖαρ ‘fat’)³⁸. If we apply this morphological analysis to ἔθειρα, one of the possible ways in which the form can back-reconstructed is **h₁(e)g^huerih₂*³⁹, a derivative of **h₁eg^h-ur_o /-u_{en}-* (cf. **pih_xur_o* → **pih_xuerih₂* > πείρα). The heteroclitic stem **h₁eg^h-ur_o /-u_{en}-* with a complex suffix may have been derived from an *u*-stem, cf. **seh₂ul_o / -u_{en}-* ‘sun’ ← **sēh₂u-* ‘burning’ or **d^hemur_o / -u_{en}-* (Lat. *femur*, *feminis* ‘thigh’) ← **d^h(o)/emu-* (Gk. θαμύς ‘thick’)⁴⁰. Precisely such an *u*-stem is in my opinion directly continued in Toch. AB *yok* ‘a single hair’ < **h₁ēg^hu-*⁴¹. The plural *yākwa* (PK NS 18 A al; M 3b7) with *a*-umlaut

³⁶ See Frisk 1930.

³⁷ As a parallel, Frisk adduced Lat. *crīnis* which he compared to Goth. *afhrisjan* ‘to shake off’; de Vaan calls this analysis “possible, but not very appealing” (*EDLIL* 145).

³⁸ For this well-known derivational mechanism see Nikolaev 2019: 793.

³⁹ For phonological development cf. **g^huēr* (Russ. *zver’*) > θήρ.

⁴⁰ As a parallel for word meaning ‘wide, thick, fat’ giving rise to a word for ‘thigh’ cf. Mod. English *thigh* < Gmc. **peuho-* < PIE **teuk-* (~ **teuh_x-*), Lith. *tūkti* ‘to be(come) fat’. PIE **d^hemu-* may either have been substantivized as ‘the thick one’ or have acquired the meaning ‘thigh’ via the mechanism known as “transferred epithet”, assuming that the word for ‘thick’, ‘thickness’ was used in a fixed expression with a word for ‘leg’ (in Nikolaev 2010: 58–63 I used an *exempli gratia* reconstruction **d^hemu-sreno-* ‘thick upper leg, thickness of the upper leg’; cf. Swed. (dial.) *buslägg* ‘thigh’ lit. ‘swollen leg’ [see Rietz 1862–7: 67] or Wakhi *bajlāng* ‘thigh’ lit. ‘thick leg’, see Steblin-Kamenskij 1999: 92). On the difference between these two mechanisms, namely, ellipsis-based substantivization and direct substantivization, see Höfler 2020.

⁴¹ *DoT*² 550–1 compares *yok* with Arm. *asr* ‘fleece’ and Ved.

confirms the *u*-stem, while sg. *yok* shows *u*-umlaut: *yok* < *'æku < **h₁ēg^hu*- 'hair'. Toch. B *or* : pl. *ārwa* 'wood' (< **doru*-) provides a perfect phonological parallel for both sound changes, as Hilmarsson 1985 already recognized⁴². Further descendants of **h₁ēg^h*- 'hair' are unclear at the moment⁴³.

θιβρός

In Hellenistic poetry we find adj. θιβρός of unknown meaning and etymology⁴⁴. In Nic. *Th.* 35 the word is used of painful condition caused by a snake bite⁴⁵, while in *Al.* 554–6 the word is used to

yāśu- tentatively translated as 'pubic hair', but the latter gloss is entirely conjectural: *yāśu*- 'semen discharge' can be unproblematically analyzed with Karl Hoffmann (*apud* Witzel & Göto 2007: 685) as a derivative of **h₁ieh₁-(k)*- 'to throw, to send forth' (*LIV*² 225), cf. Lat. *ēiaculārī*; as to Arm. *asr*, it has been traditionally and plausibly analyzed as a reflex of **pokū*- (cf. Lat. *pecū*, Ved. *pásu*-, Myc. *po-ku-ta*, etc., see Pinault 2003: 169–173 and Martirosyan 2010: 122–124). Another etymology of Toch. AB *yok*, not registered by the etymological dictionaries, is due to Paul Widmer *apud* Balles 1999: 11 n. 21: Widmer reconstructs an acrostatic *i*-stem **h₁ēg^wi*- from the root **h₁ēg^w*- 'to gleam, to blaze' (**h₁og^w-ni*- 'fire') further identified by Balles in Lat. *sanguis* (< **h₁sh₂n₃-h₁g^w-o/i*- 'hell leuchtend wie Blut') and by Nussbaum *apud* Balles in Gk. ἐρυσίβη and ἀκρῖβής (< *-*h₁g^w*-); the downsides of this analysis of Toch. *yok* are that pl. *yākwa* must be treated as analogical and that the meaning 'color' (< *'gleaming') must be primary and the meaning 'hair' would be secondary, while the reverse ('hair' > '(any) color') is a much better-attested semantic development (see *DoT*² 550).

⁴² See Malzahn 2010: 10–12 for these sound changes.

⁴³ In principle, Hitt. *auwawa(i)*- (c.) 'spider' may be a Luwianism and continue **h₁ēg^h-uo*- 'hairy', hence 'a hairy spider' with a characteristic Luwian loss of a voiced velar and change of Proto-Anat. **e* > *a*, but this etymology is not necessarily compelling from the zoological perspective and the meaning 'spider' is not certain, see Boddy 2021: 337 with references to older literature. Leaving this doubtful connection aside, for Greek and Tocharian one may reconstruct either **g^h* or **g^h* and possibly even **g^{w(h)}*. The similarity with PIE *(*h₁*)*eg^h*- 'out(side)' is potentially intriguing.

⁴⁴ *GEW* 674, *DELG* 420, *EDG* 549. We also have personal names (Θίβρος, Θίβρων, Θίβραχος), see Bechtel 1917: 508. The earliest onomastic attestation is Σέβρον (viz. Θέβρον) Alc. fr. 1.3 PMGF.

⁴⁵ Θιβρήν δ' ἐξελάσεις ὀφίων ἐπιλωβέα κῆρα "you may expel the *θιβρήν* and harmful doom that snakes bring" (ed. Jacques 2002, trans. Gow and Schofield 1953).

describe turtle eggs cooked on the coals⁴⁶. A scholion on Nic. *Ther.* 35a (Crugnola) translates θιβρός as ‘hot’, but there is no reliance on this ancient tradition: the paraphrase ‘hot’ may simply be due to the fact that the word θιβρός bears some similarity both to θερμός and to τέφρᾱ. I propose that the meaning of θιβρός may have been ‘stinging, biting, mordant’ which is an epithet equally well-suited for sharp pain caused by snake’s venom and for slightly sharp, piquant taste of turtle eggs⁴⁷.

If the word θιβρός belonged to the same semantic field as ὀξύς, δριμύς, or πικρός and referred to various unpleasant sensory experiences, the use of the word in two more Hellenistic fragments becomes clear. The same scholion on Nic. *Ther.* 35a cites Call. fr. 654 (Pfeiffer) θιβρῆς Κύπριδος ἀρμονίης (Ἀρμονίης?) and Euphron fr. 115 (Lightfoot) θιβρὴν τε Σεμίραμιν⁴⁸. Arena 1970 aptly compared the Callimachean fragment with Emp. fr. 122.2 DK Ἀρμονίη θεμερῶπις and marshalled other arguments in favor of the view that for Hellenistic poets the word θιβρός was confused with (“contaminato”) and influenced by another rare word θεμερός ‘solemn, august, venerable’. This is in principle possible, but a more economical solution would be to accept that in these two fragments Aphrodite and Semiramis are described as ‘stinging’, ‘biting’, ‘tart’ or ‘bitter’. Both the goddess and the queen are emblematic of Eros⁴⁹, and it requires no detailed substantiation that for Greeks Eros could be stinging or bitter: one only needs to think of Sappho’s Ἔρος ... γλυκύπικρον (fr. 130 Voigt) or Aeschylus’ δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος “heart-stinging flower of love” (*Ag.* 743). It may even be possible to go a bit further and surmise that the word θιβρός carried the specific

⁴⁶ Ναὶ μὴν ῥητίνῃ τε καὶ ἱερὰ ἔργα μελίσσης / ῥίζα τε χαλβανόεσσα καὶ ὤεα θιβρὰ χελύνης / ἀλθαίνει τότε νέρθε πυρὸς ζαφελοῖο κεραίης “again, pine-resin and the sacred produce of the bee and the root of all-heal and the θιβρά eggs of the tortoise are curative when you mix then on a hot fire”.

⁴⁷ An excellent parallel in English, suggested to me by B. Maslov, may be seen in the word *tart* whose meanings, at least through its history, have ranged from ‘sharp, severe, painful’ to ‘sharp to the sense of taste, pungent’ to ‘acrimonious’ (of a person).

⁴⁸ Following the scholia, students of these fragments have translated θιβρή with ‘hot’, ‘burning’, or ‘sultry’, e.g. D’Alessio 1996: 2.761: “della bruciante Cipride”; Lightfoot 2010: 357: “sultry Semiramis”; Acosta-Hughes & Cusset 2012: 170: “l’ardente Sémiramis”.

⁴⁹ For Semiramis’ excessive lust cf. e.g. Diod. Sic. 2.13.4.

connotation of bee sting: for Eros imagined as a honey-bee flitting about the flowers cf. ποτ' εὔρον / ἐν τοῖς ῥόδοις Ἔρωτα (Anac. 6.1–2 West), and a specific association between sting of love and sting of a bee is a common topos in post-Classical Greek poetry.

If θιβρός indeed meant ‘biting, stinging’⁵⁰, the etymology presents itself virtually unbidden: I submit that that the adjective goes back to Proto-Gk. **tʰīg^wro-* (< **dʰih₂g^wro-*) made from the same root as Lith. *diēgti* / *diēgti* ‘to poke, sting, hurt, prick’ (= Latv. *diēgt* ‘to stab’), *įdiēgti* ‘to sting’⁵¹, *dīgūs* ‘prickly’⁵², Latv. *daīga*₂ ‘kind of fly’⁵³, OE *dīc* ‘ditch, pit’ (and perhaps Mod. English *dig*), OHG *dīh* ‘moles, gorges’⁵⁴, Lat. *figere* ‘to insert, fix, pierce’⁵⁵, and Toch. AB *tsāk^a* ‘to bite; to pierce’.⁵⁶

Formally, **dʰih₂g^w-* (< **dʰh₂ig^w-* with a laryngeal metathesis) is best seen as a zero grade of PIE **dʰeh₂ig^w-*⁵⁷ of the same complex

⁵⁰ Hesychius’ lexicon offers a long series of *interpretamenta* for θιβρός, but one of them — specifically, the one that does not seem to come from ancient exegesis on Callimachus, Euphorion, or Nicander, — offers additional support for the hypothesis put forth in this paragraph: θιβρήν· [...] τινὲς δὲ χάλεπὴν (Hsch. θ 579 Cunningham).

⁵¹ The LKŽ illustrates this meaning with a proverb that amusingly leads us back to Greek: *bėk nuo grieko kaip nuo žalčio, nes, jei tu prisiartinsi, įdiegs tave* ‘run away from a Greek as if from a snake: if they get closer, they will sting you.’

⁵² See Smoczyński 2007: 109.

⁵³ See Mühlenbach & Endzelin 1923–1936: 2.430.

⁵⁴ See *EWAh* 2: 630–4.

⁵⁵ The inscriptional form *FIGIER* (inf. pass.) in the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* (186 BCE, *CIL* I² 581.27) indicates that the long *-ī-* in the forms of the Latin verb cannot continue an old diphthong (contrast *EXDEICATIS* in the same inscription, l. 22, from *dīcere* < PIE **deǵk-*), while Old Lat. *fīuere* ‘id.’ (Cat. via Paul. Fest p. 92 M.) and the noun *fībula* ‘pin’ (< **fīuibula* < **fīued^hla*) show that the final consonant of the root goes back to PIE **-g^w-* (word-medial *-g-* in Classical Latin stem *figere* was introduced by analogy to the perfect, see Bock 2008: 239–240; Garnier 2010: 398).

⁵⁶ See Ringe 1988–1990: 71; *DoT*² 800.

⁵⁷ The disyllabic structure of **dʰeh₂ig^w-* suggests a secondary root. Such an extended root would not be unparalleled: cf. Gk. ῥαίβος ‘bent inward’, Goth. *wraiqs* ‘crooked’ (< **ureh₂ig^w-*) or Lat. *saepēs* ‘hedge’ and Gk. αἴψα ‘quickly’ (from ‘closely packed’?) on the basis of which de Vaan (*EDLIL* 533) reconstructed **seh₂ip-* clearly relatable to **seh₂i-* ‘bind’; see also Janda 2001–2002.

structure as e.g. $*g^w eh_2 id-$ > Gk. φαῖδρός ‘bright’, Lith. *gaidrūs* ‘id.’⁵⁸. A reduplicated present stem $*d^h i-d^h eh_2 ig^w-$ ‘to bite’⁵⁹ (> Proto-Gk. $*t^{(h)} it^h aig^w-$ with Grassmann’s Law) made from this root would make a plausible point of origin for a nominal stem $*t^{(h)} it^h aig^w-o-$ ‘act of biting; a bite, a sting’⁶⁰. From this reduplicated noun we can in turn posit a denominative verb $*τιθαιβόω$ ‘to provide with a bite’, hence ‘to sting’ (cf. πύργος ‘turret’ → πυργόω ‘equip with fortifications’)⁶¹ from which first an agent noun $*τιθαιβότης$ ‘stinger’ (cf. ἐδνόω ‘betroth’ → ἐδνωτής ‘matchmaker’) and then a verb in -ώσσω ‘to sting’ was derived by familiar rules of word formation (cf. ἀγρώτης ‘hunter; hunting’ → ἀγρώσσω ‘catch by

⁵⁸ In *LIV*² 142 the root is reconstructed as $*d^h eiHg^w-$ ‘to stick in’, but this phonologically suspect reconstruction is proposed solely on the evidence of Lith. *diegti*, Latv. *diēgt* and other forms in Baltic languages that point to Proto-Baltic $*deig-$ / $*daig-$. As is acknowledged in the first footnote to the *LIV* lemma, the Proto-Baltic full grade $*deig-$ may be secondary and in fact, there are many examples of such secondary full grades in Baltic languages. For instance, Lith. *seĩlas* ‘noose, rope’ (< $*seĩ-$) can only be explained as a derivative of the root $*seh_2 i-$ ‘bind’ discussed above in n. 57 under assumption that a new full grade $*seĩ-$ was created in Proto-Baltic to match $*sĩ-$ < $*sih_2-$ < $*sh_2 i-$ ~ $*seh_2 i-$. Similarly, the only way to align Lith. *rieti* ‘to scold’, Latv. *riēt* ‘to bark’ (< $*rei-$) with Russ. *rajat* ‘to make a noise’ and Latv. *rāt* ‘to rebuke, scold’ (< PIE $*reh_2 i-$) is to posit a secondary full grade $*rei-$. Examples could be multiplied; the point is that Baltic evidence for $*deig-$ (to which one should add some Slavic forms overlooked in etymological dictionaries, namely, Sloven. and Croat. *degāti se* ‘to argue’ < Proto-Slavic $*dĕgati$, see Г. А. Ильинский *apud* Trubachev 1957: 95) is not incompatible with the reconstruction $*d^h eh_2 ig^w-$ marshalled above.

⁵⁹ Remodelled either from athematic $*d^h e-d^h eh_2 ig^w-$ (compare $*d^h e-d^h eh_1-$ >> $*d^h i-d^h eh_1-$ > τίθημι) or from thematic *i*-reduplicated $*d^h i-d^h ih_2 g^w-e/o-$ (compare $*s(t)i-sth_2-e/o-$ >> $*s(t)i-steh_2-$ > ἵστημι).

⁶⁰ Cf. συνεοχμός ‘joining, joint’ (< $*-hehok^h mō-$) from the root of συνέχω (see Solmsen 1901: 256).

⁶¹ As A. J. Nussbaum reminds me, there is more than one way of arriving at $*τιθαιβόω$, and while it is possible that the hypothetical nominal stem $*τιθαιβος$ / $*τιθαίβη$ ‘biting’ was concretized to ‘a bite/sting’ and served as a derivational basis for a factitive verb $*τιθαιβόω$ ‘to make a bite/sting’, a different approach is just as possible: one could posit a nominal stem $*τιθαιβός$ with a passive meaning ‘bitten, stung’ that would make an -όω present stem meaning ‘to render bitten / stung’, hence ‘to bite, to sting’ (compare e.g. θοός ‘sharp, sharpened, whetted’ vs. θοόω ‘to make sharp’ on which see Nikolaev 2018).

hunting’ or ύπνώω ‘sleep’ → *ύπνώτης → ύπνώσσω ‘be sleepy’). At this point our reconstruction forward is no longer an idle string of hypothesis, since the verb τιθαιβώσσω is attested in the *Odyssey* in the description of bees in the cave of the Nymphs:

Od. 13.103–106 (ed. West):

ἀγχόθι δ’ αὐτῆς ἄντρον ἐπήρατον ἡεροειδές,
 ἱρὸν Νυμφάων αἶ νηϊάδες καλέονται.
 ἐν δὲ κρητῆρές τε καὶ ἀμφιφορῆες ἔασιν
 λάϊνοι· ἔνθα δ’ ἔπειτα τιθαιβώσσουσι μέλισσαι.
 And near it a pleasant dusky cave,
 sacred to the nymphs who are called Naiads.
 In it are mixing bowls and amphoras
 of stone, and bees τιθαιβώσσουσι there.

The context gives no clear indication what the precise activity of the bees described by the verb τιθαιβώσσω might have been and modern scholarship has been agnostic about the meaning of the verb⁶². The ancient commentary offers the translation ‘to store up (food / honey)’ (τιθέναι βόσιν), but this is doubtlessly a folk etymology prompted by the similarity of first two syllables of τιθαιβώσσω to the stem of τίθημι⁶³. I propose that the verb here refers to one of the prototypical activity of the bees and should be translated as ‘sting’.

It is entirely plausible to assume that the passage describes bees stinging mortals who dare enter the cave via the way of the gods. But it is also possible that the verse-final phrase τιθαιβώσσουσι μέλισσαι was no longer transparent to the singer, since because the verb had become obsolete: it was extracted from its original context (in which it meant ‘bees sting’) and used in the description of the Cave of the Nymphs simply because the latter featured bees⁶⁴.

⁶² Skoda 1982: 214 (“obscur”); Hoekstra 1989: 171 (“exact sense and etym. unknown”); Rengakos 1994: 120 (“das immer noch unerklärte Hapax”); *EDG* 1482 (“origin?”); Bowie 2013: 116: “a very rare word, of unknown meaning and etymology”.

⁶³ This folk etymology is responsible for the usage of the verb in later poetry: Antim. fr. 108 (Matthews) ‘put away’, [Lyc.] 622 (‘irrigate’), Nic. *Th.* 199 (‘nourish’). The famous image of a bee depositing honeycombs into Pindar’s mouth in his metrical *vita* (μέλισσά τις ὡς ἐπὶ σίμβλῳ / χεῖλεσι νηπιάχοισι τιθαιβώσσουσα ποτᾶτο, ed. Drachmann) is certainly due to a conscious allusion to the *Odyssey* passage.

⁶⁴ For other similar cases see Leumann 1950: 208–235.

ἴλιον

Hsch. ι 563 ἴλιον· τὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐφήβαιον δηλοῖ. καὶ κόσμον γυναικεῖον παρὰ Κόριος (Cunningham) seems to contain two different words: the Coan word for a woman's ornament (κόσμον γυναικεῖον) is in all probability a derivative of εἰλέω 'to turn, to wind'⁶⁵, while the word for female pubis (ἐφήβαιον)⁶⁶ looks very similar to Lat. (neut. pl.) *ilia* 'loin, groin, flank' to which it has been compared since Stokes 1894: 46⁶⁷. The length of the first vowel in ἴλιον cannot be ascertained, but the length of the initial [i] in *ilia* is metrically assured (e.g. Verg. *G.* 3.507). If the Greek word is cognate with the Latin one⁶⁸, we must reconstruct either **h_xeiliō-* (assuming itacism in Gk. ἴλιον) or **h_xih_xliō-*⁶⁹. That the latter option should be preferred is shown by Proto-Gmc. **ilip-* > ON *il* 'foot sole' which is best derived from **h_xih_x-l-et-* ← **h_xih_x-ló-* with pretonic "Dybo-shortening"⁷⁰. Under this analysis, the consonant **l* is suffixal and not a part of the root.

A new comparandum may be available in Palaic where we find a mysterious word *īhha-* referring to a body part manipulated during the dissection of a sacrificial animal: the sacrificer is instructed to cut off the leg of the animal and hold the *īhha* in their hand⁷¹. The meaning 'flank' suits the context admirably; if it is correct, Palaic *īhha-* may go back to **h₁ih_{2/3}-ó-* 'flank' which may in turn be easily aligned with **h₁ih_{2/3}-ló-* / **h₁ih_{2/3}-liō-* posited above as the hypothetical source of Latin, Greek, and Germanic forms. Further

⁶⁵ See *GEW* 722, *DELG* 445, *EDG* 588.

⁶⁶ The etymological dictionaries usually add Hsch. ι 549 ἴλια· δῶρα γυναικεῖα with Meineke's change of the *interpretamentum* into μόρια which is not obvious.

⁶⁷ Comparison with Gaulish PNs *Iliatus*, *Ilio-uico*, *Illio*, etc. proposed *ibid.* is justifiably deemed implausible by Delamarre 2003: 189.

⁶⁸ It is possible that ἴλιον 'pubis' is a loanword from Lat. *(*)ilium* 'loin' (*DELG* 445), although the meanings are not identical.

⁶⁹ The word is usually cited in works of reference with gen. *-ium* which, however, is not attested before Cassius Felix (5th cent. CE). Cat. 63.5 has gen. sg. *īlī* (if B. Schmidt's conjecture is accepted), while dat.-loc. pl. *īlibus* is first attested in Celsus (2.7.1.1), who also has *īliis*, and Juvenal (5.136). There is thus no certainty that *ilia* is an *i*-stem rather than an *io*-stem.

⁷⁰ Next to **h_xih₂-liō-* > Gmc. **iliā-* > Far. *ill* 'id.'. See Mágusson 1989: 418; Kroonen 2013: 269.

⁷¹ See *eDiAna* s.v. The text (CTH 753.1.A) is currently prepared for publication by S. Görke and D. Sasseville.

evidence for PIE **h₁ieh_{2/3}-* / **h₁eih_{2/3}-* in designations of body parts remains to be discovered.

μάρπτω

Gk. μάρπτω ‘seize, take hold of, overtake, strike’⁷² is a well-attested verb⁷³ which has no etymology⁷⁴. The root μάρπ- can be straightforwardly back-reconstructed as either **merk^w-* or **merp^w-*⁷⁵. Since the root is not attested in Mycenaean⁷⁶, the choice between root-final **k^w* and **p* cannot be made on Greek-internal grounds, but the former option allows discovering plausible *comparanda* for Proto-Gk. **merk^w-* / **mrk^w-* in Tocharian and in Latin.

Toch. A *märk-* means ‘to take away’⁷⁷, cf. the privative compound *sne-märklune* which translates Sanskrit *ahāryo* ‘not to be taken away’ (A 359.15). This meaning squares nicely with that of the Greek verb, e.g. *Od.* 10.116 αὐτίχ’ ἕνα μάρψας ἐτάρων ὀπλίσσατο δεῖπνον ‘at once he [*scil.* giant Antiphates] seized one of my comrades and prepared him for dinner’ or *Sapph.* 58.11–12 ἀλλ’

⁷² Ruijgh (1957: 166) assigned this poetic word to the “Achaean” lexical stock based on the γλῶσσαι κατὰ πόλεις that attribute μάρπτω to the Cypriot dialect (Κυπρίων. ἔμαρπεν· ἔλαβεν), see Bowra 1970 [1934]: 43. Egetmeyer (2010: 488) very plausibly hypothesized that the verb λαμβάνω is not attested in Cypriot inscriptions precisely because it was replaced by μάρπτω in everyday use as the default verb ‘to take’.

⁷³ The nominal derivatives include μάρπτις ‘kidnapper’ (Aesch. *Suppl.* 826), Μάρφοος, a speaking name of a Centaur on a Chalcidian vase (CHA 23 in Wachter 2001: 188), and κάμμαρπις· μέτρον σιτικόν, τὸ ἡμιμέδιμνον. Αἰολεῖς (Hsch. κ 596 Cunningham).

⁷⁴ *GEW* 2.178: “ohne aussergriechische Entsprechung” (= *EDG* 907–8: “system without outer-Greek cognates”); *DELG* 643 is similarly agnostic. The comparison with μάρναμαι (PIE **merh₂-* ~ **merp-/k^w-*?) hesitantly proposed by Egetmeyer (2010: 488) is a counsel of despair.

⁷⁵ Original **r₆* in the root is evinced by the variant βραπ- showing a different vocalization of **r₆*: Hsch. β 1083 βράψαι· συλλαβεῖν, ἀναλῶσαι, κρύψαι, θηρεῦσαι; β 1049 βράπτειν· ἐσθίειν, κρύπτειν, ἀφανίζειν; ε 94 ἔβραπτεν· ἔκρυπτεν. ἐλάφυξεν; ε 97 ἔβραρπεν· ἔκρυρπεν. ἔπιεν. κατέφαγεν (Cunningham).

⁷⁶ The much-discussed theonym *ma-qe* (dat. sg.) attested in KN F 51 v. 2 in the context of grain offerings is unlikely to be related to the root of μάρπτω (the Mycenaean form may have to be read as *ma-ka*, given the possibility of confusion between signs *77 and *78).

⁷⁷ A homophonous root *märk-* ‘to besmirch, to smudge’ in Tocharian B is probably unrelated, see Malzahn 2010: 755–6; *DoT*² 487.

αὐτον ὕμῳς ἔμαρψε / χρόνῳι πόλιν γῆρας ‘yet still grey old age in time did seize him [*scil.* Tithonus]’,⁷⁸. Phonologically, there is no problem with the proposed equation either⁷⁹: PIE **merk^w-* would give Proto-Tocharian **märkw-* > A *märk-* with elimination of labial coarticulation before another consonant: 3 sg. aor. **mērk^w-s(t)* > Toch. A pret. III *markäs*, cf. **h₃ók^w-s* ‘eye’ > Common Tocharian **æk* > Toch. A *ak*, B *ek*⁸⁰.

A *tertium comparationis* for PIE **merk^w-* ‘to seize, to take away’ may be found in Lat. *merx -cis* (f.) ‘commodity, merchandise’ and its derivatives⁸¹. This etymological comparison requires the following ancillary hypothesis: on the way to Italic, the root **merk^w-* developed the meaning ‘to buy’. There are ample parallels for a semantic development from ‘take’ to ‘buy’: for instance, one might compare Lat. *emō* ‘take’ > ‘buy’ or **ad-captō* ‘take’ (*REW* 63) > Italian *accattare*, French *acheter* ‘to buy’. *Nomen actionis* **merk^w-s* ‘buying, commerce’ would regularly give Proto-Italic nom. sg. **merks* with a concretized meaning ‘commodity being bought (and sold)’⁸².

μῖμος

Gk. μῖμος denotes both an actor (‘mime’) and a kind of scenic sketch, founded by the Syracusan Sophron (‘mimus’). This word

⁷⁸ The text is by West 2005: 5.

⁷⁹ Comparisons with Tocharian always have a degree of uncertainty, since PIE voiced, voiced aspirated and voiceless stops have nearly all fell together in Tocharian. While there is no alternative etymology for Toch. A *märk-* on the books, M. Weiss points out to me that the underlying PIE root could in theory also be **merǵ-* ‘divide’ reflected in Hittite *mārḱ-^{ahhi}* ‘I divide, I cut up’, as well as in the noun for ‘border’: YAv. *marāza-* ‘border, district’, Lat. *margō* ‘border’, OIr. *mruig* ‘territory’ (< **mroǵi-*) and Proto-Gmc. **markō-* ‘boundary, region’ (Goth. *marka*, etc.).

⁸⁰ See Pinault 2008: 456–7.

⁸¹ No Indo-European etymology is registered for *merx* in *EDLIL* 376. The god’s name *Mercurius* may or may not be a loanword from Etruscan: in the former case, it would have nothing to do with *merx* (for which, on the contrary, there are no specific indications of Etruscan origin, see Breyer 1993: 92–3 n. 313).

⁸² From nom.sg. the allomorph *merk-* was generalized throughout the paradigm (at the expense of **merqu-*), just as the stem *voc-* was generalized from nom.sg. *vox* < **uok^w-s*. After nom. **merks* had become *mers* (Plaut.), the velar stop was reintroduced into nom. sg. (so Leumann 1977: 221).

(for which the dictionaries offer no etymology⁸³) and its derivative $\mu\tilde{\iota}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘imitate’ may be connected with the PIE root $*meh_2-i-$ for which a rather specific meaning ‘(to reveal by) making motion by hand, to indicate (by gesture)’ can be reconstructed on the basis of the following cognates: Lith. *móju* ‘wave hand’, Proto-Slav. $*majati$ ‘to make signs with a hand’, Yazgulyam *amaw-* ‘to beckon, motion with a hand’ and other Mod. Iranian reflexes of $*fra-majia-$ (*ESIYa* 5.331)⁸⁴. Formally and semantically, Gk. $\mu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ can be unproblematically aligned with this root: zero grade $*mh_2i-$ > $*mih_2-$ (laryngeal metathesis before consonant), $*mih_2-mó-$ ‘making signs by hands’⁸⁵ → $*mih_2-mo-$ ‘a person who makes signs by hands’ > $\mu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$.

ὠτίς

Gk. ὠτίς ‘bustard, *Otis tarda*, дрофа’ is usually explained as a derivative from οὖς ‘ear’⁸⁶, but there is not much about bustard’s appearance that would suggest naming it an “owner of conspicuous ears”: while bustards have ear tufts, these are not nearly as large as those of most owls whose name in Greek (ὠτος) reflects this physical feature⁸⁷. Instead, I would like to suggest a direct comparison between ὠτίς and Hitt. *wattai-* ‘bird’ (KBo 4.2 ii 32⁸⁸) < $*uot-oj-$ ← $*uot-i-$ ‘one that moves / flies’⁸⁹ made from PIE $*u_{et}-$

⁸³ *GEW* 241, *DELG* 677, *EDG* 955.

⁸⁴ $*meh_2-i-$ is an extended form of the root $*meh_2-$ continued e.g. in Gk. $\mu\eta\nu\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ ‘show, reveal’ (*LIV*² 425). Ved. *māyā-* ‘magical power’ (often mentioned in connection with $\mu\tilde{\iota}\mu\omicron\varsigma$) may or may not be related to the latter root.

⁸⁵ Type ὄχμος ‘fortress’ (‘holding’), παρμός ‘sneezing’, σκυλμός ‘rending’, etc., see Chantraine 1933: 132, 151; Probert 2006: 238–257.

⁸⁶ See e.g. Robert 1911: 103, *GEW* 1153, *DELG* 1259.

⁸⁷ This skepticism is shared by specialists in Greek ornithology: according to Thompson 1895: 200 “the etymology (*scil.* from οὖς — A. N.) is doubtful”; Arnott 2007: 240 mentions “bristles across the ears of breeding males which *probably* (emphasis mine — A. N.) accounted for the bird’s name”.

⁸⁸ For the passage see Bawanypeck 2005: 22, 30.

⁸⁹ Parallels for words for birds derived from motion verbs may be found in Mlr. *ethait* ‘bird, fowl’ (< $*peth_2ontih_2$) from the root $*peth_2-$ ‘to fly’ (*LIV*² 479) or the words for ‘eagle’ (Hitt. *hāraš*, Lith. *erēlis*, Goth. *ara*, Gk. ὄρνις, ὄρνειν ‘bird’) derived from the root $*h_3er-$ ‘to set (oneself) in motion’ (*LIV*² 299).

(cf. Mlr. *fethid*₂ ‘makes one’s way’, Gmc. **uēþ-* / **uap-* ‘to go around’)⁹⁰.

Under this hypothesis, Gk. **ὠτι-* (later remade as *ὠτίδ-*)⁹¹ goes back to **uōti-*, a genitival *vrddhi* derivative made from the acrostatic stem **uot-i-* that underlies the Hittite word for ‘bird’⁹². For genitival (= *Zugehörigkeits-*) derivatives of this type one may compare Av. *ahura-* ‘lord’ → *āhūiri-* ‘divine’, Lat. *sacro-* ‘sacred’, *sacra* ‘rites’ → *sācri-* ‘of the rites, for sacrificing’, or Gmc. **dala-* ‘valley’ → **dōli-* ‘of the valley, valley dweller’ (> OIcel. *dæll*)⁹³. As A. J. Nussbaum has shown, across Indo-European languages, genitival derivatives with various formants routinely have the meaning ‘X-like’ vis-à-vis their base noun with the meaning ‘X’: Ved. *vr̥ṣan-* ‘bull’ : *vr̥ṣnya-* ‘bull-like, mighty’, Gk. *θεός* ‘god’ : *θεῖος* ‘god-like’, Lat. *deus* ‘god’ : *dīvīnus* ‘god-like’. These genitival formations are also frequently substantivized in the meaning ‘a kind of X’: Hitt. *pittula-* ‘loop, noose’ : *pittuliya-* ‘a noose of sorts’ > ‘constraint, anxiety’; **h₂ur̥gi-* ‘a turning’ (> Hitt. *hurki-* ‘wheel’) : **h₂ur̥gi-lo-* ‘a turn of sorts’ > ‘deviation’ (> Hitt. *hurkīl* ‘perversion’); Gk. *τείχος* ‘(city) wall’ : *τείχιον* ‘wall (of a building)’⁹⁴.

The meaning of the genitival *vrddhi* derivative **uōti-* would then be ‘bird-like’, ‘a sort of bird’, ‘quasi-bird’, which would not be an inappropriate way of referring to bustards, large birds who make their nests on the ground and prefer to run over flying.

References and abbreviations

- Acosta-Hughes B. and Cusset, C. 2012: *Euphorion. Oeuvre poétique et autres fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
 Arena, R. 1970: Considerationi intorno agli aggettivi *θιβρός* e *θεμερός*. *RIL* 104, 307–314.

⁹⁰ See Schaffner 2004 and for the Hittite word Nikolaev 2014b.

⁹¹ The folk-etymological connection with *οὔς* may have been responsible for the supposed remodelling of obl. **ὠτί-* as *ὠτίδ-* (Xen. An. 1.5.2+).

⁹² An alternative derivational basis is an agent noun **uotó-* ‘moving/flying (around)’.

⁹³ See Darms 1978: 208.

⁹⁴ See Nussbaum 2009. According to Nussbaum, a genitival *vrddhi* derivative made from the athematic word for ‘snake’ provides an explanation for the ever-problematic Armenian cognate: **h₁ó/ég^{wh}i-* ‘snake’ (> Gk. *ὄφις*) → genitival **h₁ég^{wh}i-* ‘a sort of snake, herpetoid’ (> Arm. *iž* ‘viper’).

- Arnott, W. G. 2007: *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London / New York: Routledge.
- Balles, I. 1999: Lateinisch *sanguis* “Blut”. *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. by H. Eichner, H.-Chr. Luschützky und V. Sadovski, 3–18. Praha: enigma corporation.
- Bauer, B. 2019: Irish Loanwords in the Southwest British Celtic Languages. *Eastern European Perspectives on Celtic Studies*, ed. by M. Hornsby and K. Rosiak, 23–33. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Bawanypeck, D. 2005: *Die Rituale der Auguren*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Bechtel, F. 1917: *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Bock, B. 2008: *Die einfach thematischen Präsentien in der dritten Konjugation des Lateinischen*. Graz: Leykam.
- Boddy, K. 2021: *The Composition and Tradition of Erimhuš*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Bowie, A. M. 2013: *Homer, Odyssey, Books XIII and XIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Breyer, G. 1993: *Etruskisches Sprachgut im Lateinischen unter Ausschluss des spezifisch onomastischen Bereiches*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Chantraine, P. 1933: *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Cheung, J. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden: Brill.
- D'Alessio, G. 1996: *Callimaco*. 2 vols. Milan: Biblioteca universale Rizzoli.
- Darms, G. 1978: *Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn: die Vrddhi-Ableitung im Germanischen*. München: Kitzinger.
- Delamarre, X. 2003: *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise: une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. 2nd ed. Paris: Errance.
- DELG = P. Chantraine. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grec. Histoire des mots*, achevé par J. Taillardat, O. Masson et J.-L. Perpillou, avec en supplément, les Chroniques d'étymologie grecque (1–10) rassemblées par A. Blanc, Ch. de Lamberterie et J.-L. Perpillou. Paris: Klincksieck, 2009.
- Dieu, É. 2011: *Le supplétisme dans les formes de gradation en grec ancien et dans les langues indo-européennes*. Genève: Droz, 2011.
- DoT² = Adams, D. Q. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B: Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 2013.
- EDG = R. S. P. Beekes. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- eDiAna = *Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages* (<https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/>)
- EDLIL = M. de Vaan. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and other Italic Languages*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.

- Egetmeyer, M. 2010: *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre*. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter.
- ESIYa = V. S. Rastorgueva, D. I. Édelman. [*Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages*]. Moscow: Vostočnaja literatura, 2000–.
В. С. Расторгуева, Д. И. Эдельман. *Этимологический словарь иранских языков*. М.: Восточная литература, 2000–.
- EWAhD = A. L. Lloyd, O. Springer, and R. Lühr. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988–.
- EWaia = M. Mayrhofer. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter, 1986–2001.
- Frisk, H. 1930: Griechisch ἔθαιρα, ὄθη. *Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift* 36(3), 1–5 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur Indogermanistik und griechischen Wortkunde*, 281–286. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri, 1966).
- Fusillo, M. 1981: Γλαυκη δυσπέμφελος. Una designazione del mare in Esiodo Th. 440. *Studi di letteratura greca* (= *Ricerche di filologia classica* I), 9–23. Pisa: Giardini.
- Garnier, R. 2010: *Sur le vocalisme du verbe latin: étude synchronique et diachronique*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- GEW = H. Frisk. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960–1972.
- GLyk = G. Neumann. *Glossar des Lykischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- Gow A. S. F., Schofield, A. F. 1953: *Nicander*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hajnal, I. 2005: Das Frühgriechische zwischen Balkan und Ägäis – Einheit oder Vielfalt? *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. by G. Meiser and O. Hackstein, 185–214. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Hilmarsson, J. 1985: The Vocalism of Tocharian AB yok ‘hair; colour’. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 90, 83–87.
- Hoekstra, A. 1989: *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Höfler, S. 2016/2017[2019]: “La belle Hélène”, a Generic Brothel, and the Development of *CRHC Sequences in Ancient Greek. *Die Sprache* 52, 177–201.
- Höfler, S. 2020: Substantivization of Adjectives. *Indo-European Linguistics* 8, 181–204.
- Jacques, J.-M. 2002 : *Nicandre: Œuvres. T. 2: Les Thériaques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Janda, M. 2001–2002: Etymologie von altgriechisch αἶψς. *Sborník Prací Filozofické Fakulty Brněnské Univerzity* (= *Studia minora Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Brunensis*). Rada klasická:

- Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 6–7 (= *Festschrift Antonín Bartoněk*, ed. by I. Radová and K. Václavková-Petrovicová), 123–134.
- Klingenschmitt, G. 1982: *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kroonen, G. 2013: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Kümmel, M. J. 2013: The Distribution of Roots Ending in IE *ND. *The Sound of Indo-European* 2, ed. by R. Sukač and O. Šefčík, 159–176. Munich: Lincom.
- Lane, G. S. 1938: Problems of Tocharian Phonology. *Language* 14, 20–38.
- Leumann, M. 1950: *Homerische Wörter*. Basel: F. Reinhardt.
- Leumann, M. 1977: *Lateinische Grammatik*. Vol. 1: *Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: Beck.
- LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, ed. by J. Balčikonis, J. Kruopas et al. 20 vols. Vilnius: Valstybinė enciklopedijų žodynų ir mokslo literatūros leidykla, 1941–2002 (online version: <http://www.lkz.lt/>).
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2010: *Hellenistic Collection*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- LIV² = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*, ed. by H. Rix, M. Kümmel, et al. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Mágnusson, Á. B. 1989: *Íslensk orðsifjabók*. [Reykjavík]: Orðabók Háskólans.
- Malzahn, M. 2010: *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Martirosyan, H. K. 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1986: *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. I/2: *Lautlehre: segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Miller, D. G. 1977: Some Theoretical and Typological Implications of an IE Root Structure constraint. *JIES* 5, 31–40.
- Miller, D. G. 2010: *Language Change and Linguistic Theory*, 2 vols. Oxford University Press.
- Mühlenbach, K., Endzelin J. 1923–1936: *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. 6 vols. Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium.
- Mülenbach, K., Endzelīns, J. 1923–1936: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*. Rīgā: Izdevusi izglītības ministrija.
- Nikolaev, A. 2010: *Issledovanija po praindoevropejskoj imennoj morfologii*. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- Николаев А. С. 2010: *Исследования по праиндоевропейской именной морфологии*. СПб.: Наука.
- Nikolaev, A. 2014a: An Etymological Miscellany. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* 18, 708–717.
- Nikolaev, A. 2014b: Hittite *wattaēš* ‘birds’. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 69, 257–267.

- Nikolaev, A. 2018: Greek *θοός* ‘sharp’, Hittite *tuḫš-* ‘to cut’. *Vina Diem Celebrent: Studies in Linguistics and Philology in Honor of Brent Vine*, ed. by D. Gunkel et al., 267–275. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Nikolaev, A. 2019: *Δάειρα*, the Lady of the Waters. *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* 23, 790–795.
- Nussbaum, A. J. 2009: So How’s the Little Woman?: Genitivals, Diminutivity, and PIE **g^wen-h₂*, etc.. Talk given at the GSAS Workshop for Indo-European Linguistics, Harvard University (April 3, 2009).
- Pedersen, H. 1909: *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pinault, G.-J. 2003: Sur les thèmes indo-européens en **-u-*: dérivation et étymologie. *Indogermanisches Nomen: Derivation, Flexion, Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Freiburg, 19.–22. September 2001)*, ed. by E. Tichy, D. Wodtko, B. Irslinger, 153–188. Bremen: Ute Hempen.
- Pinault, G.-J. 2008: *Chrestomathie tokharienne: textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Pinault, G.-J. 2019: Hittito-Tocharica: Tracking the Bear Once More. “*And I Knew Twelve Languages*”: *A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. by N. Bolatti Guzzo and P. Taracha, 496–509. Warsaw: Agade Bis; University of Warsaw, Faculty of Oriental Studies.
- Pisani, V. 1979: *feber, februm, februārius* e le continuazioni latini di *sr*. *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 64, 102–106.
- Probert, P. 2006: *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and Prehistory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rengakos, A. 1994: Lykophron als Homererklärer. *ZPE* 102, 111–130.
- REW* = W. Meyer-Lübke. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3rd ed. Heidelberg: Winter, 1935.
- Rhys, J. 1895: Goidelic Words in Brythonic. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 12, 264–302.
- Rietz, J. E. 1862–1867: *Svenskt dialektlexikon: Ordbok öfver svenska allmogespråket*. Malmö: Cronholm.
- Ringe, D. 1988–1990: Evidence for the position of Tocharian in the Indo-European family? *Die Sprache* 34, 59–123.
- Robert, F. 1911: *Les noms des oiseaux en grec ancien: Étude sémantique*. Neuchâtel: Attinger frères.
- Ruijgh, C. J. 1957: *L’élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Schaffner, S. 2004: Mittelirisch *fethid* “geht, macht seinen Weg”, althochdeutsch *wadalōn*, *wallōn* “umhergehen, wandern; umherwogen”, altenglisch *waðuma* “Woge, Welle”, *waðol* “Vollmond” und Verwandtes. *Die Indogermanistik und ihre Anrainer: Dritte Tagung der Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaftler der Neuen Länder*, ed.

- by Th. Poschenrieder, 277–314. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Skoda, F. 1982: *Le redoublement expressif: un universal linguistique*. Paris: SELAF.
- Smoczyński, W. 2007: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Uniwersytet Wileński.
- Solmsen, F. 1901: *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Steblin-Kamenskij, I. M. 1999: *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' vahanskogo jazyka*. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University.
- Stokes, W. 1894: *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*. Übersetzt, überarbeitet und herausgegeben von Adalbert Bezzenberger. (= *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, ed. by August Fick, 4th ed., part 2). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Strömberg, R. 1946: *Greek Prefix Studies on the Use of Adjective Particles*. (Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift 52:3). Göteborg: Elanders boktryckeri.
- Thompson, D'A. W. 1895: *A Glossary of Greek Birds*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Thurneysen, R. 1912–1913: Zur Wortschöpfung im Lateinischen. I. *purgare*. II *lēuigare* – *lēuigare*. *IF* 31, 276–281.
- Trubachev, O. N. 1957: [G. A. Il'inskij's Etymological Dictionary]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1957/6, 91–96.
- Трубачев, О. Н. 1957: Этимологический словарь Г. А. Ильинского. *Вопросы языкознания* 1957/6, 91–96
- Vine, B. 2020: Latin *febru(u)m* and the Root Vocalism of Indo-European *s*-Stems. Talk given at the 39th East Coast Indo-European Conference, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (12 June 2020).
- Wachter, R. 2001: *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions*. Oxford University Press.
- West, M. L. 2005: The New Sappho. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 151, 1–9.
- Witzel, M., Göto, T. 2007: *Rigveda: Das heilige Wissen. Erster und zweiter Liederkreis*, unter Mitarbeit von E. Dōyama und M. Ježić. Frankfurt a.M.: Verlag der Weltreligionen.