FILIP DE DECKER
Universiteit Gent
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

ETYMOLOGICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE ‹PG› AND ‹PG?› VOCABULARY IN ROBERT BEEKES'S ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF GREEK: *N*

Abstract

This article presents an etymological case study on Pre-Greek (PG): it analyzes about 20 words starting with the letter *N* that have been catalogued as ‹PG› or ‹PG?› in the new *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (EDG), but for which alternative explanations are equally possible or more likely. The article starts by discussing the Leiden etymological dictionaries series, then discusses the EDG and the concept of PG and then analyzes the individual words. This analysis is performed by giving an overview of the most important earlier suggestions and contrasting it with the arguments used to catalogue the word as PG. In the process, several issues of Indo-European phonology (such as the phoneme inventory and sound laws) will be discussed.

1. General observations on the EGD and the Leiden etymological dictionaries series[1]

The Leiden etymological dictionaries series intends to replace Pokorny (1959), no longer up-to-date in matters of phonology and morphology, by publishing separate etymological dictionaries of every Indo-European language (Beekes 1998). While an update of Pokorny is necessary, some remarks need to be made. First, most etymological

---

[1] For a (scathing) assessment of the Series, see Vine (2012) and Meissner (2014). For a detailed discussion of the EDG, the reader is referred to Meissner (2014).

dictionaries in the series only discuss the inherited lexicon and words that are considered borrowings are left out. As no language has only inherited words, excluding the (allegedly) borrowed words makes the etymological dictionary incomplete. Moreover, what is a borrowing for one scholar, could be inherited according to another. This does not apply to the EDG, as it wants to analyze as many words as possible as foreign (cf. infra). Second, the basis for the reconstruction is the Leiden view of Indo-European, which differs in a number of aspects from other scholars and from the *communis opinio*, the most famous one being the denial of a phoneme **a*. This is not a problem in itself, because the generally accepted opinion is not necessarily correct, but given the fact that these dictionaries are meant to be used by a broad audience, it should be stated clearly that the opinions used are not mainstream. This is not the case, however: the Leiden view is presented as if it were scientific fact. Third, the dictionaries are prepared in a relatively short period of time. The authors are not to be blamed for this, but this inevitably influences the work (see Meissner 2014: 26 and [especially] Vine 2012). A fourth observation involves the EDG itself. A new etymological dictionary of Greek was needed, because Frisk deliberately refused to use laryngeals in his reconstructions and Chantraine focused on the *histoire des mots* and less on the reconstruction (there is a 1999 update of Chantraine and additional etymological observations are being published in the *Cahiers d'étymologie grecque* in the journal *Revue de Philologie*, but they cannot act as a new dictionary) (Frisk 1960: v–vi). Frisk and Chantraine could not yet make use of the Mycenaean evidence to the fullest extent, as the Mycenology was still *in statu nascendi*. It is then all the more surprising and disappointing that Beekes stated that he would not systematically use material from inscriptions and Mycenaean Greek (Meissner 2014: 2–3). As such, the EDG is incomplete in this respect. A fifth and last observation does not only apply to the Leiden Series, but also to works such as the LIV, NIL, older etymological dictionaries and to reconstructions in general: what makes a good Indo-European etymology?[2] How many attestations are needed to guarantee that a word can be reconstructed for PIE? Which languages provide conclusive evidence? In particular, the question is if a word attested in European languages alone or a word only attested in Greek and Indo-Iranian is enough to posit Indo-European heritage.[3] The close relationship between Greek and Indo-Iranian had been noted before (Kern 1858: 272–274, especially 274: „das griechische fast wie ein arischer dialekt"; Grassmann 1863a: 85, 94, 109, 1863b: 119; Sonne 1863: 273; they are also mentioned in Bonfante 1976: 92; Euler 1979, 1980; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995: 794–795), but was (and is) mostly interpreted as being the result of the loss of inherited features in the other languages. One can always argue that all the other languages lost a specific word (and *argumenta e silentio*

---

[2]   Kroonen (2013) is an exception to this, as he distinguished between North-European, European and Indo-European etymologies.

[3]   These questions are not new. Already Fick, writing before the discovery of Hittite and Tocharian, distinguished between European languages and Indo-Iranian (see the subtitles in his two works: Fick 1876, 1890). Meillet (1910: 17–23) introduced the term *le vocabulaire du nordouest*, see Porzig (1950) who distinguished between vocabulary of the East and the West, and Oettinger (1997, 2003) who discussed the *Nordwestindogermanisch*.

remain somewhat problematic), but, following Mallory and Adams (2006: 107–111), we would reconstruct a common PIE word only if there are attestations in an Eastern and a Western language, if not only Greek and Indo-Iranian have the word or if Hittite and another language have the word.

2. The notion "Pre-Greek" and the EDG[4]

The EDG stresses the presence of a large number of words of non-Indo-European origin in the Greek lexicon. This had been noted before (Kretschmer 1896: 401–410; Schwyzer 1939: 58–63). See also Chantraine (1933 *passim*).[5] When the (Proto-)Greeks arrived in Greece, other peoples were already living there, speaking their languages (plural). Given the fact the Greeks arrived in a new region with new fauna and flora and came into contact with cultures that might have been superior to theirs, it is expected that many words of technical and/or fauna and flora were taken over, which explains why so many words with those meanings were not found outside Greek. Later during their history, when the Greeks came into contact with other cultures from the East, they continued to borrow words. In this respect, we agree with Beekes that many words in Greek are not inherited. What is more problematic, however, is his assumption that the vast majority of borrowings came from a single non-Indo-European language which he called "Pre-Greek". We believe that there are some issues to be raised about this.[6] First of all, there is the method. In order to reconstruct this language, Beekes started from the words without Indo-European etymology and tried to account for the phonetic differences found in semantically similar words (or in words he considered to be semantically close). In doing so, he built on Furnée (1972) and assumed that any word that was non inherited was PG unless it could be shown that it had another origin.[7] As Furnée's work was met with skepticism,[8] Beekes tried to rehabilitate the Pre-Greek theory pointing out that the assumptions of this theory were solid (Beekes 2014: 2 "his [i.e. Furnée's, FDD] method, however, was sound"). We believe that this is an *ad obscurum per obscurius*. Beekes started from words without an established etymology (which is sometimes just a matter of personal opinion). He then took words that differed in form and

---

[4]   Beekes expanded this in Beekes (2014), a book dedicated to the PG phonology, morphology and lexicon.

[5]   According to Morpurgo Davies (quoted in Hajnal 2005: 193 and Meissner 2014: 6), only 40% of the Greek vocabulary is inherited.

[6]   In-depth and critical observations on PG can be found in Verhasselt (2009a [in Dutch], 2009b, 2011) and De Decker (2015 = review of Beekes 2014). For a general discussion on the non-Indo-European elements and borrowings in Greek, see Hajnal (2005).

[7]   This is stated explicitly in Beekes (2014: 45): "however, I think that it is <u>methodologically more sound</u> to start from the assumption that non-Greek words are Pre-Greek. <u>Only when there is reason to do so should we assume that they have a different origin</u>" (underlining is ours).

[8]   Furnée's work was not just met with criticism; most reviews pointed out both negative and positive elements. We refer especially to Heubeck (1974: 277), who described the work as follows: "seine Arbeitsleistung – … – ist bewundernswert".

sometimes also in meaning. These words were often found in different writers of different periods. And from the differences in those words, he tried to derive the phonemic system of a language that allegedly provided all these words but that had left no traces whatsoever. Secondly, it is unclear to us why most of these words would have been borrowed from <u>one and the same</u> language.[9] Thirdly, the words are attested in a number of different authors and dialects, and in lexica. This poses a time-depth problem, because in order to "qualify" for PG, they would all have to be borrowed at the earliest stage of Greek (when PG still existed), but this is by no means certain.[10] If a word is only attested in a lexicon of the 3rd century AD or even in the Byzantine period, it is possible that the word was borrowed at that period. In addition, the question of the reliability of the lexica needs to be raised as well (although this is not a remark that applies to the PG question alone). Fourthly, when an IE etymology and a PG origin could both be possible, Beekes preferred a PG origin, but it is unclear why that would be the case. Fifthly, it is not because most of the words referring to technical objects and plant names are of non-Indo-European origin, that they are <u>all</u> of non-IE origin. Sixthly, it is possible that Greeks borrowed words from other Indo-European languages in the area (be this called Pelasgian or not) (Georgiev 1941, 1945; Van Windekens 1960; Sakellariou 1976), but this does not mean that all words are borrowed from that language (as was argued by Georgiev 1941: 162). The seventh observation involves the reconstruction of PG itself. What constitutes a PG word? Beekes (2010: xxiii, 2014: 13) claimed that this could be stated *relatively easy*, namely the absence of an Indo-European etymology and one of the criteria mentioned below. Besides the fact that accepting an IE etymology is sometimes a matter of personal conviction (Meissner 2014: 8), the variations adduced by Beekes raise eyebrows. We list some of the features that are allegedly the result of Pre-Greek sounds:[11]

a) an *m* can be alternate with another labial;
b) a single vowel can appear a diphthong with *w* sound;
c) a word can have a nasal infix or not;
d) a plosive can appear as voiced, voiceless or aspirated;
e) a word initial or intervocalic *s* can appear or not;
f) an *s* can precede a consonant or follow it, examples are *ps* and *sp*, *ks* and *sk*;
g) a dental can alternate with a liquid;
h) a dental at the beginning can appear or not;
i) a velar at the beginning of a word can appear or not.

---

9   This had been noted already by Verhasselt (2011: 279): "the wide geographical distribution of the Aegean substratum, however, makes a linguistically diverse continuum (perhaps even comprising IE elements) more plausible" and by Meissner (2014: 6–7): "Das Schwierigste hierbei ist wohl die Annahme selber: hierbei wird versucht, eine Sprache aufgrund von aus dem idg. Erbe des griechischen nicht verständlichen Teilen des griechischen Wortschatzes zu rekonstruieren, wobei weder klar noch naheliegend ist, daß es sich hier um *eine* Sprache gehandelt haben muß".

10 Hajnal (2005: 194): „bei naher Analyse erweist sich der Fremdeinfluss auf das griechische Lexikon und die Toponymie zwar als quantitativ erheblich, <u>aber eben auch als als geographisch und chronologisch heterogen</u>" (underlining is ours); Verhasselt (2009b).

11 This list is not exhaustive. We refer for a more detailed criticism to De Decker (2015: §3.13).

The author argued that it is not surprising that such variations occurred, since "we cannot predict how a Pre-Greek form will appear in Greek" (Beekes 2010: xvii, 2014: 5). As Pre-Greek was a non-Indo-European language, the Greeks needed to adapt the individual sounds and clusters from that language with a different inventory to their own phonemic system. While it is true that Greek might not have had all features of the Mediterranean languages, Beekes's classification is in our opinion more than problematic: it allows for almost any variation,[12] it excludes falsification and enables to connect words that have no clear link and have them catalogued as Pre-Greek. In addition, Beekes assumed that certain suffixes proved PG origin. Even if PG did provide suffixes that were taken over by the Greek language (which is not certain at all),[13] it is still possible that these suffixes became productive and that they were added to inherited words as well. Beekes also argued that certain endings, such as a feminine nominative singular in short *a* or in *eús*, were indicative of PG, but these endings can be explained otherwise and also appear in words that are clearly inherited.

Beekes is right that one should not be trying to find an Indo-European etymology for each Greek word, but we do not think that finding words that could be of Mediterranean origin should be a goal per se. As was the case with earlier attempts to find large volumes of Semitic or Afro-Asiatic words in Greek, the PG theory seems overzealous to find words that confirm the theory. The objective should be to provide etymologies for each word and in our opinion, a borrowing or non-Indo-European origin should only be considered if all other options are excluded. As a result, not all borrowing suggestions made by Lewy, Bernal, Furnée or Beekes are wrong, but some caution is needed.[14]

3. Our approach

In this article, we have taken about 15 words starting with an *n* that were catalogued as ‹PG› or ‹PG?› in the EDG, but for which an alternative explanation might have been possible. It was not our intention to analyze all of them nor to rewrite the entire dictionary. We gave an overview of previous scholarship, i.e. (the literature quoted in) Frisk, Chantraine and Beekes (when needed, reference was also made to earlier works such as Curtius, Prellwitz, Boisacq and Hofmann), and contrasted this with the PG analysis.

---

[12] Meissner (2014: 9): "es entsteht der Eindruck einer unkontrollierbaren Beliebigkeit".

[13] Hajnal (2005: 209) argued that there were no substrate or adstrate influences on Greek phonology or morphology.

[14] For a more moderate approach to loanwords in Greek, one is referred to Rosół (2012), where all possible Semitic loans in Greek were discussed. Bernal (1987) was criticized for his debatable linguistic reconstructions (see Nussbaum, Jasanoff 1996: (especially) 194). In later writings, he attempted to address the criticisms (unsuccessfully in our opinion).

4. Individual etymologies[15]

1. *naío:* 'live' (Beekes 2010: 994). Brugmann (1900: 84, 1904: 100, 123) linked this word with the root **nes* 'return'. In the name *Nésto:r* and the noun *nostos* 'return', the *e* grade and *o* grade were regularly represented. He interpreted the verb *naío:* as a zero grade formation. While this would regularly have given ***aío:*, an initial *n* was reintroduced under the influence of the forms with *nes* and *nos*. The zero grade **ns* gave *as* in Greek which is still visible in the adjective *ásmenos* 'happy' (Wackernagel 1897: 6). This explanation has been accepted by Hofmann, Pokorny and LIV[2] (Hofmann 1950: 211; Pokorny 1959: 766–767; Zehnder 2001a: 454–455), but was doubted by Frisk because of the difference in meaning,[16] and by Chantraine (1980: 733) because of the phonetics. Beekes suggested that *nas-* could be PG, but starting from a meaning 'heimkehren, ungeschadet davon kommen' (Zehnder 2001a: 454–455), *naío:*, *ásmenos* and *nóstos* can be explained from within Greek.

2. *na:ós* 'temple' (Beekes 2010: 995–996). This word is in all likelihood linked to *naío:* and represents **nas-wos* 'place to live (for the gods)', hence 'sanctuary, temple' (Pokorny 1959: 766–767). Beekes (2010: 996) considered the Indo-European etymology *quite possible*, but mentioned that Furnée (1972: 338) argued for PG origin, because there were variants with *i* as in *neiós* and *naiós*, but since these forms are late, their probative value is limited. We see no reason to doubt the inherited nature of this word.[17]

3. *néktar* 'drink of the gods, nectar" (Beekes 2010: 1004–1005). The meaning and etymology of this word are debated.[18] In the *Iliad*, it means 'drink of the gods' but it also refers to the balsam used to preserve Patroklos's corpse from decaying (*Iliad* 19,38). Indo-European etymologies have been suggested, but the word has been explained as PG and as a borrowing from Semitic. The first etymology was by Güntert, who linked the word with the Hesykhian gloss *ktéres nekroí* "*ktéres* means 'corpses'". He explained *néktar* as *ne-ktar* 'not dead' (Güntert 1919: 161–163). This suggestion is not tenable (Frisk 1970: 300–301), because the negative prefix **ne/n* is not attested in the form *ne* in Greek, but only in the form *a*, *n* or *an*.

---

[15] We decided to transcribe the Greek. In doing so, we used the accents ´ (acutus), ` (gravis) and ˆ (circumflexus). We use the sign : to indicate vowel length. Vowel length is not indicated when a vowel is written with a ˆ, because vowels with a circumflex are always long. In our Indo-European reconstructions, we decided – with some hesitation – to follow the principle used by the Leiden School and the dictionaries not to distinguish between vocalic and consonantic resonants. We admit that this might be confusing, but it is uncertain whether PIE had a phonemic distinction between vocalic and consonantic resonants. In certain forms, different resonants are syllafied in different languages. As such, an *i* can refer to the vowel but also to the glide.
A sign H refers to any laryngeal, a C to any consonant, a P to any plosive, an R to any resonant and a V to any vowel.

[16] Frisk (1970: 286–287) who described the motivation to link these words as: "mit zweifelhaftem Recht".

[17] Chantraine (1980: 734): "il n'y a aucune raison de supposer que le mot ait été emprunté".

[18] Chantraine (1980: 742): "pas d'étymologie établie".

The most commonly accepted explanation is that the word is a compound of *nek̂* 'death' and *terh₂* 'beat, overcome', the meaning thus being 'overcoming death, salvaging from death and destruction'.[19] Semantically, this explanation is fine, but there is a formal problem. If one assumes that the reconstruction *nek̂trh₂* is correct for the nominative singular, the Greek *néktar* is not the regular outcome.[20] One would either expect *néktra:* or *néktara* in the nominative, and *néktaros* in the genitive (Beekes 1969: 160–161 with reference to Pisani). Pisani (1953: 121) argued that the stem form was taken over from the genitive singular, but Schmitt (1965: 156–157) objected to this and claimed that the genitive could not have influenced the other cases as the nominative/accusative was much more common than the other cases. He (Schmitt 1965: 156–157) suggested that a final laryngeal could be dropped in sentence sandhi comparable to Kuiper's (1955) analysis of the voca- tives which lost the word final laryngeal *in pausa*. Pisani's explanation is much more likely, however, since such a sandhi drop of a laryngeal would be unparal- leled in Greek. It is more likely that the Greek nominative was replaced by the stem of the oblique cases because it looked too aberrant: a neuter nominative singular *néktra:* besides a genitive *néktaros* would be too atypical and a nomi- native singular *néktara* would have been interpreted as a plural (Beekes 1969: 160–161, agreeing with Pisani). The genitive *néktaros* besides the 'ending' *ar* in other neuter nouns, such as *ónar* 'dream' and *hêpar* 'liver' also contributed to the creation of the nominative *néktar*. This etymology is not generally accepted, however (Frisk 1970: 300–301).[21] Furnée objected to this etymology on the ground that the compounding was "too Indo-Iranian in character" (the quote comes from Beekes 2010: 1005). He pointed out that nectar was also used to preserve Patroklos's corpse and that a meaning 'overcoming death' could therefore not be correct. He referred to the word *nikárion* 'eye-salve' and concluded from that that the word was PG, especially since it ended in *ar* (Furnée 1972: 320, followed by Beekes 2010: 1004–1005). The word was also interpreted as a Semitic loanword. Lewy (1895: 80–81) considered the word as a borrowing from *niqtār* 'mit Ge- würzen versetzter (Wein)'. Levin (1971) noticed that nectar smelled good, and linked it with *muqtór* 'incense'. He saw a connection between *néktar* and *thu:mós* which means 'character, spirit', but also 'smoke', and referred to the Hesykhian gloss *nektárthe: ethu:mó:the:* "*nektárthe:* means 'he started fuming / became angry'".[22] Drew Griffith (1994) linked it with the Egyptian *nṯry* 'divine', *a kenning to denote sodium carbonate*, which was used in mummification. This Egyptian word is also borrowed in Greek *nítron* (Spiegelberg 1907: 130). This makes it less likely that *néktar* was borrowed from that word. If *néktar* were the same as *nṯry*, Greek would have rendered the Egyptian *ṯ* by *kt* but the word is also

---

[19] Prellwitz (1905: 308, who stated that this meaning had been suggested already by Jacob Grimm); Boisacq (1938: 660–661, all without the laryngeal); Schmitt (1961, 1965: 154–157), with reference to Thieme (1952).

[20] Pisani (1953: 121); Schmitt (1965: 155–157), with reference to Thieme (1952); Beekes (1969: 160–161).

[21] Pokorny (1959: 732) and Beekes (1969: 160–161) had already voiced doubts about the etymology.

[22] We tried to render both the notion of 'spirit' as that of 'smoke' in our translation.

borrowed in Hittite and Akkadian without a *k*. As such, the *k* in Greek is un-accounted for (Beekes 2010: 1005). An additional question is why the Greeks would have rendered the word by *néktar* if they could also render it as *nítron* which is much closer to the Egyptian form. Rosół (2010: 196) rejected the Semitic origin of the word, because of the difference in meaning and form between the Semitic words and the Greek. We believe that there is no need to assume either a PG word nor a Semitic loanword. Furnée, Levin and Drew Griffith started from the passage where Patroklos's body was treated with *néktar* and assumed that 'preventing decay' had been the original meaning. This does not have to be an argument against the inherited meaning, however. One can also explain the use of *néktar* in the preservation process starting from the meaning 'overcoming death'. The first meaning was 'overcoming death and destruction coming from death' which means that it would protect Patroklos's body against physical degradation. As to the "too Indo-Iranian" compounding, we believe that this is not a valid argument. As the word belonged to the old poetic lexicon, it is logical that it shares word formation types with words from Indo-Iranian poetry. In short, this word can be explained from an Indo-European perspective and consequently, there is no need to assume a borrowing from Semitic or Pre-Greek.

4. *nêsos* 'island' (Beekes 2010: 1018). The Indo-European word for 'island' cannot be reconstructed and Greek *nêsos* has no cognates in other languages. Earlier, it was linked with the root *snā* 'swim' (*$sneh_2$ in laryngealistic terms). Already Curtius suggested that the word *nêsos* might be linked to *sné:kho:* (in Doric *sna:kho:*, from *$sneh_2$-g^h-o:*) 'I swim' (Curtius 1879: 319; Prellwitz 1905: 314; both without the laryngeal reconstruction). Others argued that the word was non-Greek, because it had no cognates outside Greek. Ernout, Meillet argued that *nêsos* was related to Latin *insula* 'island' and that both words were of Mediterranean origin (Ernout-Meillet 1967: 467, see also Skok 1936). Chantraine (1980: 758), however, dismissed the connection with *insula* and the Mediterranean origin. Frisk (1970: 317 "ägäisches Lehnwort") and Beekes (2010: 1018 "Pre-Greek") assumed that this word was non-Indo-European, because the words for 'island' in other languages were unclear as well. This in itself is no argument, however. It is not because a word denoting X has no etymology in languages A and B, that it is necessarily true for the word denoting X in language C. It is true that there is no reconstructable word for 'island', but in other Indo-European languages such as Germanic, the word is derived from a word for 'water': Dutch *eiland* and English *island* are compounds from the word for 'water' and 'land' (from *h_2e/ok^w- as in Latin *aqua* 'water')[23] and the Dutch suffix *-oog* (which is also derived from the word for water) means 'island' in place names such as *Schiermonniksoog*, while German *Insel* is a borrowing from Latin (Van Veen, Van der Sijs 1997: 251 and 653).[24] As such, a link with water or something similar

---

[23] The Indo-Iranian word *apa-* is derived from *h_2e/op,* which seems a dialectal variation (Mayr-hofer 1992: 81–82, *dubitanter*).

[24] The English writing *island* with *s* can be ascribed to the Middle French *isle* 'island'.

is not a priori excluded, but the link with *$sneh_2$ is not without problems: if the word is a derivation from the root *$sneh_2$ directly, the intervocalic *s* is a problem, because Greek usually does not have a single intervocalic *s*. If it is a derivation from *sna:kho:* the single *s* in Attic is a problem, because it cannot be derived from a cluster with a velar. Meier-Brügger (1993) derived it from *sna:kho:* and started from a form *$na:khyos$ 'the swimming one' which became *nêssos* in Ionic and *nêsos* in Attic.[25] He assumed that the treatment of single *s* was reminiscent of that in *tósos* 'so many as' (from *$tot-ios$) contrary to *mélitta* 'bee' (from *$melit-ia$). There is one problem, however. Both *tósos* and *mélitta* are derived from a stem in a dental. In such cases, a treatment by *tt* or *s* is possible, but there are no examples for an evolution velar plus yod becoming single *s* in Attic.[26] The normal treatment of velar plus yod in Attic Greek is *tt*, as can be seen in the verbs in *tto:* from velar stems or in the comparative *elátto:n* 'fewer' from *$elakhyo:n$ (Kühner-Blass 1890: 103–105, 1892: 151). Although a link between 'swim' and 'island' seems obvious, this etymology is uncertain.[27] Maybe Rix's (1991) solution for the Indo-European and Greek word for 'duck' can solve the problem.[28] In the other Indo-European languages that preserved the inherited word for 'duck', the form seems to be (*transponat*) *h_2neh_2t-. The Greek forms *nâssa* (in Doric) and *nêtta* (in Attic) cannot directly be explained from *$h_2neh_2t-ih_2$ as this would have given **$ána:ssa$. Peters (1980: 26) argued that *h_2nh_2 gave *na:*, but there are no clear examples that could confirm such an evolution.[29] Rix (1991) argued that the original form *$h_2neh_2t-ih_2$ was remodelled after the root *$sneh_2$ 'to swim' and became *$sneh_2t-ih_2$ and became Proto-Greek *$sna:tya$. This form, in turn, was remodelled after the verb *sna:kho:* and became *sna:khya* which became regularly *nêtta* in Attic and *nêssa* in Ionic. Rix added this extra step, because he could not explain the double *tt* in Attic *nêtta*, if it came from *$sne:tya$ (but this step is not strictly necessary in our opinion). If we now apply Rix's analysis for *nêtta* to *nêsos*, we could hypothesize that the word for 'island' was not derived from the verb *sna:kho:* but was a secondary creation on the inner-Greek root *sna:t*. The duck would then have been *$sna:tya$ 'the swimming (bird)' and the island *sna:tyos* 'the swimmer'. The only remaining problem is the different outcome of the cluster *ty*. This can, in our opinion, be explained by the fact that the cluster *tya* gave *tta*/ *ssa* in Greek (*ntya* gave *sa* with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in the feminine adjective form *pâsa* 'entire, all' from

---

[25] Meier-Brügger (1993), following Rix (1991); Abbenes (1996a), following Rix (1991) but not Meier-Brügger (1993).

[26] See the schema in Wyatt (1968: 9).

[27] Chantraine (1980: 752) described it as: "ni probable ni démontrable".

[28] Rix explained this word, because it was one of the clearer counterexamples to his own sound law (Rix 1970) that stated in a word initial sequence *HR, the laryngeal vocalized and not the resonant. This law was doubted by Lindeman (1990, 1994, 1997: 53–54, 2004, using this example). We have been unable to consult Nikolaev's Russian article from 2005 in which he addressed the "Lex Rix".

[29] In earlier times, Greek *nêtta* was explained as an ablaut type *aNa/Nā* (see, among others, Schwyzer 1939: 361; Kuhn 1954: 146; Frisk 1970: 318), but this is impossible in laryngealistic terms.

pantya), but that the cluster *tyos* yielded *ttos/ssos* as in *bussós* 'depth' from *buthyos*,[30] or *sos* as in *tósos* from *totyos*.[31] This explains the difference between *mésos* 'middle' from *methyos* and *mélitta* from *melitya*. As such, *nêtta* comes from *sna:tya* and *nêsos* from *sna:tyos*. The feminine gender of *nêsos* originated under the influence of its opposite *é:peiros* 'mainland'. The exact details are unclear, but we believe that it is possible to explain *nêsos* as an inner-Greek creation and not as PG.

5. *ní:ke:* 'victory', *ni:káo:* 'I win' (Beekes 2010: 1021–1022). Several attempts at an etymology have been made, but none of them is free of problems. Osthoff and Brugmann linked it to Sanskrit *nīca* 'going downwards' and OCS *nicŭ* 'forward, in the face', and reconstructed *ni-(ə)qo* 'downwards'. *ni:káo:* would then mean 'I put down' and the derived noun 'the act of putting down, victory' (Osthoff 1881: 223–224; Brugmann 1888: 403). There are two problems. First, the preverb *ni* is not attested in Greek. Second, the reconstruction they suggested, would be *nih_3k^wo* in the current terms (Mayrhofer 1996: 60), but then we would expect a labial sound in Greek and not a plain velar (Beekes 2010: 1021). This etymology is therefore uncertain.[32] Schmitt linked *ní:ke:* with Lithuanian *apnìkti* 'to attack' and pointed at Gothic *sigis* 'victory' and Sanskrit *sahas* 'violence, force' to explain the semantic relationship (Schmidt 1889: 395–396, mentioned in Boisacq 1938: 670). Hofmann (1950: 213) and Pokorny (1959: 761) added *neikéo:* 'I attack, I chastise' to these words,[33] but the link is problematic on semantic and phonological grounds: an ablaut schema *ei/ī* is difficult (for the semantic problems, see Chantraine 1980: 755 and Beekes 2010: 1022). This etymology is therefore not certain either (although leaving out *neikéo:* would make the etymology less problematic). More recently, Klingenschmitt (1975: 162) analyzed the word as a compound of a preverb *ni* 'down' and a from *ih_1-k* from the root *$Hieh_1$* 'throw' (as in Greek *hí:e:mi* 'I throw').[34] The word would then mean 'the act of throwing down'. This is possible, but the problem is that the preverb *ni* is not attested in Greek (cf. supra). As such, we agree with Beekes that there is no convincing etymology,[35] but we doubt that this means that word was of PG origin.

6. *nóthos* 'bastard, child born outside a legitimate marriage' (Beekes 2010: 1022–1023).

7. *noûthos* 'dull' (Beekes 2010: 1025).

8. *nuthós* 'numb, dark' (Beekes 2010: 1025).

---

[30] We do not think that this word was borrowed from Egyptian, as assumed by Spiegelberg (1907: 128–129).

[31] For the data, see Kühner-Blass (1890: 104–105) and Rix (1992: 90).

[32] As had already been observed by Boisacq (1938: 670) and Frisk (1970: 320–321). This suggestion was not even discussed by Chantraine (1980: 755). This word is discussed in Trümpy (1950: 191–196), but no etymology is suggested.

[33] The link between *neîkos* and Lithuanian *apnìkti* had already been made by Fick, Bezzenberger (1881: 238). See also Trümpy (1950: 145).

[34] For the reconstruction of the root with initial laryngeal, see Peters (1976, 1980: 107) and Kümmel (2001a).

[35] As was noted by Chantraine (1980: 755 "étymologie inconnue") and Frisk (1970: 321 "eine überzeugende Etymologie fehlt"); Beekes (2010: 1021–1022).

9. *nó:thé:s* 'indolent' (also used for an ass that is unwilling to move); the form
    no:thrós 'slack, indifferent' is more common (Beekes 2010: 1029–1030).

    Beekes listed these four words as ‹PG?›, but only linked the last three. Bez-
    zenberger linked *nóthos* with *nuthós* and *noûthos* suggested to link it with San-
    skrit *andhas* 'blind' (Bezzenberger 1877: 342; Prellwitz 1905: 315). He started
    from the word *nothogénne:tos* 'born as a bastard' and argued that the prefix
    notho- originally meant 'blind, unseen' and was reinterpreted as 'bastard' only
    later. This is problematic, because the word *nóthos* is already attested earlier
    and the compound *nothogénne:tos* is only attested in Hesykhios. Besides the
    semantics, the phonology makes the equation impossible.[36] As such, this word
    has no etymology, in spite of its "Indo-European looking" form: one could,
    for instance, suggest **not^h* or **nod^h* but there are no cognates in the other Indo-
    European languages.

    The words *noûthos* and *nuthós* are not common. The latter is attested in
    a gloss in Hesykhios *nuthón ápho:non, skoteinón* "*nuthón* means 'speechless,
    numb, dark'", while the former only occurs in an Hesiodic fragment: [37]

    > "noûthos dè podôn húpo doûpos oró:rei"
    > "A quiet sound rose up from under their feet" [Hesiod, fragment 118 in Most (2007)].

Noûthos and *nuthós* can be linked with one another, the latter being the zero
grade of the root and the former the *o* grade. Solmsen (1909: 75) linked the Greek
word with Latin *nūbēs*, Avestan *snaoδa* and Cymrian *nudd* (all these words mean
'cloud').[38] These words could be reconstructed from a root **sne/oud^h* and this
connection was accepted by later etymological dictionaries.[39] Furnée (1972: 120),
followed by Beekes, connected *nuthós* and *noûthos* with *no:thé:s* and assumed
a PG origin for all these words, but just like *nuthós* and *noûthos* are inherited
and not PG, *no:thé:s* can also be explained as an inherited or inner-Greek for-
mation. Three suggestions have been made for it (which were all rejected by
Beekes). First, it was explained as a negative compound **n* and *óthomai* 'I care
about'. The word would then mean 'who does not care'.[40] The second suggestion
was a negative compound with *o:théo:* 'I hit, push'. The word would then mean
'who does not let himself be pushed away'.[41] The third suggestion is from Johans-
son (1893), who linked the word with Sanskrit *ādhra-* 'schwach' and *nādhr* 'sich

---

[36] This suggestion is not mentioned in Chantraine (1980: 755) nor in Mayrhofer (1992: 78–79)
and rejected in Boisacq (1938: 671) and Frisk (1970: 322).

[37] This is fragment 158 in Merkelbach, West (1967) and 118 in Most (2007). The translation is
taken from Most (2007: 178–179).

[38] The link between the Latin and Celtic cognates had been made already by Thurneysen (1890: 488).

[39] Boisacq (1938: 672), Walde, Hofmann (1954: 183), Pokorny (1959: 978), Frisk (1970: 325), Chan-
traine (1980: 758), but it was not mentioned in Mayrhofer (1992, 1996), and considered unclear
by Abbenes (1996b).

[40] This connection was first made by Doederlein (1850: 154–155), Bechtel (1914: 237).

[41] This connection was first made by Clemm (1870: 325). Frisk (1970: 331) and Chantraine (1980: 761)
also referred to Müller, Graupa (*BPW* 63: 94 *non uidimus*).

in Not befinden'.[42] In laryngealistic terms, the words could be reconstructed as *$n(e)h_3d^hr$-.[43] Phonetically, the first and the third suggestions are possible, but the second is more problematic. If one starts form *h_3d^h- for *óthomai*, the negation would regularly yield *no:thés*; the same applies to *nh_3d^hros, as this would also yield *no:thrós*. The second reconstruction is less likely: as the verb *o:théo* originally started with *w*, one would expect the negation to be *a(w)o:thé:s* and not *no:thé:s*.

   To conclude, we believe that Bezzenberger's (1877) connection between *nóthos*, *noûthos* and *nuthós* is untenable and do not think that *no:thé:s*, *noûthos* and *nuthós* are related and would point at a PG etymon. With the exception of *nóthos*, all words have an Indo-European or inner-Greek etymology: *noûthos* and *nuthós* belong to the root *sne/oud^h and *no:thé:s* is related to either *óthomai* (in which case the word would be an inner-Greek creation) or to *nh_3d^hros, in which case the word would be East-Indo-European as it is attested in Greek and Indo-Iranian. There is no need to assume that all these words are PG.

10. *nótos* 'wind, southwest wind' (Beekes 2010: 1025).[44] This word means 'southwest wind', and this is the wind that usually brings rain. As such, a link with Armenian *nay* 'wet, fluid' cannot be excluded (Scheftelowitz 1905: 46; Prellwitz 1905: 316; Brugmann 1906: 220; Boisacq 1938: 673; Hofmann 1950: 219). Theoretically, one could add Latin *nāre* 'swim' as well, but as Umbrian has **snata** 'washed' with an initial *s*,[45] the word is better linked with *$sneh_2$ 'swim' (Zehnder 2001c; Weiss 2009: 169). The Greek and Armenian forms could be reconciled into *nh_3t which gives *not* in Greek,[46] and *nat* in Proto-Armenian.[47] As such, it is more likely that this word represents an Helleno-Armenian isogloss rather than a word from PG.[48]

---

[42] Johansson (1893: 40–41) and also Brugmann (*Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 1897: 29 *non uidimus;* quoted in Boisacq 1938: 676). It was recently reiterated by Mayrhofer (1992: 165–166, 1996: 34).

[43] The laryngealistic reconstruction was made by Mayrhofer. See also Garnier (2012), with reference to Peters (1999 *non uidimus*).

[44] Beekes (2010: 1025).

[45] When quoting forms from Osca and Umbrian, the bold face is used when the form was written in the local alphabet, which was an adaptation of the Etruscan one (Weiss 2009: 14).

[46] We refer to Beekes (1988) for the treatment of *$\#Rh_{1/2/3}C$ as $\#Re/a/oC$. See also Weiss (2009: 100), who called this "Beekes's Law". Fritz's (1996: 5) criticism that Beekes applied his sound law only to the word for 'nose', is unjustified, because the Latin word *lassus* 'tired' from *lh_2d^htos proves the correctness of the sound law.

[47] We refer to Mondon (2008: 171) for the rule that (in Armenian) "interconsonantal laryngeals were lost when flanked by two non-syllabic sonorant consonants, the second of which was a nasal". In other positions, they were preserved. Exceptions to the preservation could be explained by either the Schmidt-Hackstein rule (this rule stated that a sequence CH.CC was already reduced to CCC in PIE itself; it had been noted for Indo-Iranian by Schmidt (1973) and for PIE by Hackstein (2002) or by the Saussure Effect. In its limited version, this sound law states that in a sequence #HRORC or CORHC the laryngeal was lost. This was first noted by De Saussure in 1905 (quoted in Bally, Gautier 1922: 582), without linking it to laryngeal loss, by Meillet (1908: 68) and by Hirt (1921: 185–186), who linked it with "schwa". See Rasmussen (1989: 175–230), Nussbaum (1997), Weiss (2009: 113) and Yamazaki (2009). For a critical assessment, see Van Beek (2011) and Pronk (2011), cf. infra.

11. *nuktálo:ps* 'seeing in the night, day blind' (Beekes 2010: 1025–1026). Bechtel argued that the original form was *nukt – an – o:ps* and that the meaning was 'who does not see at night' (Bechtel 1913: 229–230, accepted by Prellwitz 1927: 154 and Schwyzer 1939: 259). This form was then dissimilated into *nuktálo:ps*. Formally, there are no real problems with the dissimilation, as they do occur in Greek: *argaléos* from **algaléos* 'painful', *lé:thargos* from **lé:thalgos* 'suffering from forgetting, lethargic'.[49] What speaks against this explanation, is the fact that the word does not mean 'who does not see at night', but 'who <u>only</u> sees at night, day blind'. Chantraine (1980: 758) referred to Greek medical literature and suggested that the original meaning might indeed have been 'who does not see at night' after all (which would agree with the suggested etymology). Beekes rejected the Indo-European origin of the suffix *o:ps* and explained the resemblance to *núks* 'night' as folk etymological and considered the word to be PG. In our opinion, this word is clearly a compound of *núks* 'night' and *o:ps* 'seeing'. Beekes argued that the compounds in *o:ps* were PG, but there is the adjective *múo:ps* in the meaning 'short sighted', which certainly contained the suffix *o:ps* in the meaning 'seeing'.[50] As such, there is nothing that excludes the meaning 'seeing' here either and there is no need to catalogue this word as PG.

12. *númphe:* 'young lady' (Beekes 2010: 1026). There is no agreement on the etymology of this word. Kretschmer (1909) suggested to link the word with Latin *nubere* and Russian *snubiti* 'to couple'.[51] This was accepted by Boisacq (1938: 673–674), Hofmann (1950: 219), Pokorny (1959: 977–978) and LIV² (Kümmel 2001b: 574), but was rejected by others, either because *nubere* was said about the woman and *snubiti* about the man (Wiedemann 1902: 212–213; Ernout, Meillet 1967: 449),[52] and/or because the nasal infix was not sufficiently explained.[53] Beekes pointed at the nasal infix and assumed that this reflected a "pre-nasalized" consonant, which would be characteristic for PG. In addition, the short *a* in the Homeric vocative could have been the original nominative and a nominative in short *a* was also a sign for PG words. None of the arguments is conclusive. The short *a* in the Homeric vocative *númpha* does not have to be a sign of a PG vocalism, but might be an archaism and could be explained by Kuiper's Law of laryngeal loss in pausa (such as in vocatives):[54] a vocative (transponat) **numphaH* would have become *numpha* with short *a* in pausa. The nasal infix is more difficult to explain and

---

48 This word was not discussed in Clackson (1994) nor in Mondon (2008).

49 Bechtel referred to Schulze (1888: 257, 1895: 226) for examples of *n* dissimilation in Greek. One can also refer to Grammont (1948) and Lejeune (1972) for more examples. See already Kühner, Blass (1890: 279).

50 See Schwyzer (1939: 426) on the compounding with forms in *op* -and *o:p*-.

51 Kretschmer (1909: 325–331), referring to a Festschrift in which he first made this suggestion. He pointed out that the connection between *númphe:* and *nubere* had already been made in Antiquity.

52 De Vaan (2008: 416) stated that the link had to be dismissed, but did not say why.

53 Chantraine (1980: 759), Frisk (1970: 326), Beck (1996a) stated that the etymology was unclear.

54 Kuiper (1947: 210, 1955); see also Weiss (2009: 26) and Byrd (2015: 26).

has been explained as "expressive" (Chantraine 1980: 758) or as a relic from an old nasal present (Kümmel 2001b: 574), for which there is no evidence in any of the languages that have the word. Van Windekens (1982) explained the word as a compound of *en* 'in' and **uemb^h* 'womb' in the zero grade (this is the root of English *womb*). He explained the word as 'in the womb', hence 'pregnant woman'. There are two observation to be made: first, it is unlikely that the preposition *en* would give *n* in the zero grade (assuming that it did not start with a laryngeal, because then the form *n* would be impossible). Second, Hesykhios glossed this word as *hè: neo:stì game:theîsa* 'a woman who has been married recently', which means that the word did not mean 'pregnant woman', but 'woman ready to be married'. This gloss is in our opinion an additional argument to link the word with *nubere*. The semantic objections to the link between Latin, Greek and Slavic are not convincing, but the nasal is more problematic. As the word is only attested in European languages, it is not certain that it can be reconstructed for PIE, because it could belong to the European vocabulary. PG seems excluded as it is attested in Latin and Slavic as well.

13. *nússo:* 'I thrust, sting' (Beekes 2010: 1028).
14. *nússa* 'turning point in a race' (Beekes 2010: 1028).

The word *nússa* does not have an etymology that is generally accepted. There are two etymological explanations and three borrowing explanations. Curtius (1879: 546) linked *nússa* with the verb *nússo:*. Schulze (1888: 262–263) pointed out that the word *nússa* was scanned in Homer as if it started with two consonants (*Iliad* 23,758). He assumed that it initially started with *sn* and linked it with Sanskrit *sānu* 'back'. Bloomfield (1891: 13) repeated this equation and reconstructed *snukya*. Others have argued that the word was borrowed from a Semitic word for 'flagpole',[55] from an Aegean non-Indo-European language,[56] or from Pelasgian.[57] Boisacq (1938) doubted the link with *nússo:* and rejected the link with *sānu*.[58] Curtius's suggestion was accepted by Prellwitz (1905: 316), Frisk (1970: 328–329) and Chantraine (1980: 760) and was not ruled out by Beekes. As we argued above, an inherited etymology is to be preferred over assuming a borrowing. As such, we believe that *nússa* is not Semitic, Pelasgian nor PG. The connection with Sanskrit *sānu* is impossible and thus only the link to *nússo:* remains. We therefore have to determine what the etymology of that verb is. Brugmann connected *nússo:* to MLG *nucken* 'to move the head in a menacing manner' and OCS *njukati* 'encourage' (Brugmann 1902: 154; Walde, Hofmann 1954: 189; Pokorny 1959: 767; Frisk 1970: 329 *dubitanter*), and also linked the verb with Latin *nuō* 'I nod' and Greek *neúo:* 'I nod', assuming a velar extension (Brugmann 1902: 153–155; Boisacq 1938: 675). The link between *neúo:* and *nússo:*

---

[55] Lewy (1927: 28–29), but he was unsure whether the language was Hebrew, Aramaic or Assyrian

[56] This suggestion was made by Huber (quoted in Lewy 1927: 29), by Juthner (1939: 251, quoted in Frisk 1970: 329 and Beekes 2010: 1028) and by Hofmann (1950: 220).

[57] Carnoy (1955: 20) assumed that *nússa* and *nússo:* were Pelasgian borrowings.

[58] Boisacq (1938: 675) described the link with *nússo:* as "??" and the suggestion by Bloomfield (1891: 13) and Schulze (1888: 262) as *autres avis, non plausibles*.

is not evident, because it would mean that the basic meaning of the root *neu
was 'to thrust' (Frisk 1970: 329; also Mader 1996a, 1996b; Beekes 2010: 1028).
Chantraine (1980: 760) accepted the connection of njukati and nucken to neúo:
but rejected the link with nússo: because of the different meanings.[59] As the velar
extension is only attested in European languages, it might be a later innovation
referring to a more intense 'nodding'. As such, the basic meaning of the root
*neu might have been 'nod', and that of *neuK (with K referring to any velar)
might have been 'nod strongly, thrust'.

To conclude, we believe that the meaning 'thrust' for the verb nússo: allows
a link with the word nússa as a turning point in the race might very well have
been marked by an object thrusted in the ground. As such, nússa is an inner-
Greek creation and not a borrowing. As to the verb nússo:, the velar extension
to the root *neu is only attested in European languages and might thus be of
later date.

15. nôkar 'lethargy' (Beekes 2010: 1030). This word is generally linked with nekrós
and néku:s 'corpse' (Fick 1890: 262; Prellwitz 1905: 317; Boisacq 1938: 676; Hof-
mann 1950: 220; Pokorny 1959: 762; Frisk 1970: 321). Chantraine (1980: 741) agreed
that the word had to be linked with nekrós but suggested that the o: was due to
the influence of kôma 'lethargy' and the ar was taken from ónar 'dream, sleep'.
That nôkar took the ending ar from ónar cannot be ruled out, but the long vowel
is in all likelihood not taken from kôma. Schindler (1975: 8) asked if the o: could
be the result of an existing ablaut type, as a type o/ō was without parallels. Beekes
denied the link with nekrós because of the long vowel, rejected the translation
Todesschlaf used by the German dictionaries, because it was based on a false
etymology and suggested that the word was PG (Beekes 2010: 1030, referring
to Furnée 1972: 133). He referred to Furnée, who linked the word with no:khelé:s
'slow, dull, sluggish'.[60] This is unnecessary. As the word is only attested in later
writers, it is possible that this word is just a poetic creation on nekrós, maybe
influenced by the existence of series such as némo: 'I divide', nómos 'law' and
no:máo: 'I distribute'.

16. Nôrops (Beekes 2010: 1031). The meaning of this word is unclear (Prellwitz 1905: 317;
Boisacq 1938: 676; Leumann 1950: 214; Frisk 1970: 331; Chantraine 1980: 762; Beck
1996b), but there is a gloss in Hesykhios nôrops lamprós, oksúpho:nos, éne:khos
"nôrops means 'shining, sharp-sounding, resounding'". Chantraine (1980: 762)
argued that the meaning was unclear in Antiquity and that the glosses are there-
fore untrustworthy. It is used in Homer in the verse final formula nó:ropa khalkón
in the accusative or nó:ropi khalkôi in the dative:[61]

"hò:s ár' éphan Aía:s dè korússeto nó:ropi khalkôi"
"So they spoke, but Aias armed himself with his gleaming bronze" (Iliad 7,206).

---

59 This connection was not mentioned in Zehnder (2001b).
60 This equation goes actually back to at least Clemm (1870: 325).
61 The instances of the accusative are Iliad 2,578; 11,16; 14,383 and Odyssey 24,467; 24,500 and
    those of the dative are Iliad 7,206; 13,406 and 16,130.

Bechtel linked the word with the verbal form *no:reî* which is attested in the Hesykhian gloss *no:reî energeî* "*noreî* means 'he is powerful, he is very active'" and argued that the adjective originally described a warrior's characteristic, but that this was transferred to the weapon used by the warrior (Bechtel 1914: 238). The verb *no:reî* is often linked to Greek *ané:r* 'man' and to Lithuanian *nóras* 'desire'.[62] This was expanded by Kuiper (1961: 226–227) who argued that the original form was **nôros* but that this was remodelled after *aítho:ps* 'gleaming, fearly looking' to avoid a spondaic fifth foot. He (Kuiper 1961: 224–227) also linked the word with *ané:r* 'man' and argued that the original form was **h₂nōros* which could have lost its laryngeal because of the *o* in the following syllable (although he stated that the exact vocalizations were unclear). The original meaning would therefore have been 'manly looking, brave'. Beekes (2010: 1030–1031) argued that the acute accent in *nòras* ruled out a laryngeal and that the suffix *op-* could point at PG origin.[63] An alternative explanation is that of Kretschmer's (1950), who referred to the grammarians Epaphroditos from Khaironeia (1st c. AD), who was quoted in Stephanos from Byzantion (a Byzantine lexicographer and grammarian from the 6th c. AD) as saying that the word *nôrops* referred to cupper of the town Norikos, and to Clemens from Alexandria (1st–2nd c. AD) who stated that *nôrops* denoted an inhabitant of Norikos, a town where metallurgy was an important occupation. Kretschmer (1950: 3–4) interpreted the Homeric formula as "bronze from Norikos". This is possible, but we believe that the explanation as "manly steel" is better. There are no formal problems with this analysis, if one assumes that the so-called Saussure Effect applied to a sequence **HRo and *oRH as well.[64] Most scholars assume that a laryngeal was lost in a word-initial sequence **HRoRK or word internal *KORHK (cf. supra). The best example for the broader formulation of the rule are the name *He:síodos* and the Hesykhian gloss *godân klaíein* "*godân* means 'to weep'", if both forms are the o grade of the root **h₂ued* 'sing, make noise'. The apparent counterexamples *agé:no:r* 'leading men' and *ané:no:r* 'unmanly, cowardly' are inner Greek creations based on the nominative *ané:r*. The forms *amoibé* 'exchange' comes from **h₂moigʷ-* but the laryngeal was restored after the verb *ameíbo:* 'exchange' (Viechnicki 1994); the same applies to *agorá* 'marketplace' coming from **h₂gor-* which should have lost the laryngeal but had it restored under the influence of the verb *ageíro:* 'I gather'. As such, the words *nôrops* and *no:reî* can be explained as an inner-Greek creation and there is no need to explain it as PG.

---

[62] This equation goes back to Fick (1890: 502–503). See also Bechtel (1914: 238), Hofmann (1950: 220), Walde, Hofmann (1954: 165 with doubts), Pokorny (1959: 765).

[63] Kuiper (1961: 225) admitted that this suffix could be used in PG words as well.

[64] As was assumed by Peters (1980: 14).

5. Conclusion

While it was not our goal to rewrite the dictionary, we hope to have shown that many of the words catalogued as ‹PG› or ‹PG?› allowed for other explanations as well. In order to do so, we often had to analyze many different opinions. We found that in several instances, there was no agreement on an etymology or there was no established etymology altogether, but that in other instances, an Indo-European etymology was available. We never argued (nor will we ever argue) that each and every word in Greek has to have an Indo-European etymology nor that there were no borrowings, but b-finding borrowings should not be the primary goal of an etymological dictionary: when establishing etymologies, one should look at the evidence and not be searching for borrowings when they are not there, and use strict and falsifiable rules.

References

Abbenes J. 1996a. *Nêsos*. – *LfgrE* 16: 378–380.

Abbenes J. 1996b. *noûthos*. – *LfgrE* 16: 438.

Bally C., Gautier L. 1922. *Recueil des publications scientifiques de Ferdinand De Saussure*. Genève.

Bechtel F. 1913. Parerga. – *KZ* 45: 225–230.

Bechtel F. 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer*. Halle.

Beck W. 1996a. *Númphe:*. – *LfgrE* 16: 440–443.

Beck W. 1996b. *Nôrops*. – *LfgrE* 16: 452–453.

Beekes R. 1969. *The development of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.

Beekes R. 1988. RHC in Greek and other Indo-European languages. – *IF* 93: 22–45.

Beekes R. 1998. Een nieuw Indo-Europees etymologisch woordenboek. – *MKNAW* 61: 9.

Beekes R. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden.

Beekes R. 2014. *Pre-Greek. Phonology, morphology, lexicon*. [edited by S. Norbruis]. Leiden.

Bernal M. 1987. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization*. London.

Bezzenberger A. 1877. Etymologien: Gr. *nóthos, núthos*, skt. *Andhá*. – *BB* 1: 342.

Bloomfield M. 1891. On adaptation of suffixes in congeneric classes of substantives. – *AJP* 12: 1–29.

Boisacq E. 1938. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg.

Bonfante G. 1976. *I dialetti indoeuropei*. Brescia.

Brugmann K. 1888. Lateinische Etymologien. – *RhM* 43: 399–403.

Brugmann K. 1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

Brugmann K. 1902. Wortgeschichtliche Miszellen. – *IF* 13: 144–163.

Brugmann K. 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.

Brugmann K. 1906. Die *phôkai népodes* der Odyssee. – *IF* 20: 218–225.

Byrd A. 2015. *The Indo-European syllable*. Leiden.

Carnoy A. 1955. Etyma Pelasgica. – *AC* 24: 5–28.

Chantraine P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec*. Paris.

Chantraine P. 1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. [vol. 2: Λ–Ω]. Paris.

Clackson J. 1994. *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford.

Clemm A. 1870. Beiträge zur griechischen und lateinischen Etymologie. – *CS* 3: 281–348.

Curtius G. 1879. *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*. Leipzig.

De Decker F. (rev.). 2015. A new book on Pre-Greek. – *IJDL* 12: 1–23.

De Vaan M. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden.

Doederlein L. 1850. *Homerisches Glossarium*. Erlangen.

Drew Griffith R. 1994. Nektar and Nitron. – *Glotta* 72: 20–23.

Ernout A., Meillet A. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.

Euler W. 1979. *Indoiranisch-Griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren Indogermanische Grundlagen*. Innsbruck.

Euler W. 1980. Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen. – Mayrhofer M., Peters M. (eds.). *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*. Wiesbaden: 173–179.

Fick A. 1876. *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 2; 3rd edition]. Göttingen.

Fick A. 1890. *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 1; 4th edition]. Göttingen.

Fick A., Bezzenberger A. 1881. Nachträge zum indogermanischen Wörterbuch. – *BB* 6: 235–240.

Frisk H. 1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 1: A-Ko]. Heidelberg.

Frisk H. 1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 2: Kr-O]. Heidelberg.

Fritz M. 1996. Das urindogermanische Wort für ‚Nase‘ und das grundsprachliche Lautgesetz *R̥HV > RV. – *KZ* 109: 1–20.

Furnée E. 1972. *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. Amsterdam.

Gamkrelidze I., Ivanov V. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. [translated from the Russian original by J. Nichols]. Berlin.

Garnier R. 2012. *No:thé:s*. – *CEG* 12: 314.

Georgiev V. 1941. *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*. [part 1]. Sofia.

Georgiev V. 1945. *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*. [part 2]. Sofia.

Grammont M. 1948. *Phonétique du grec ancien*. Paris.

Grassmann H. 1863a. Über die aspiraten und ihr gleichzeitiges vorhandensein im an- und auslaute der wurzeln. – *KZ* 12: 81–110.

Grassmann H. 1863b. Über das ursprüngliche vorhandensein vom wurzeln, deren anlaut und auslaut ein aspirate enthielt. – *KZ* 12: 110–138.

Güntert H. 1919. *Kalypso. Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiet der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Halle.

Hackstein O. 2002. Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. – *KZ* 115: 1–22.

Hajnal I. 2005. Das frühgriechische zwischen Balkan und Ägäis? Einheit oder Vielfalt? – Meiser G., Hackstein O. (eds.). *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: 185–214.

Heubeck A. (rev.). 1974. Furnée 1972. – *IF* 79: 272–277.

Hirt H. 1921. *Indogermanische Grammatik. II. Der indogermanische Vokalismus*. Heidelberg.

Hofmann J. 1950. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen*. München.

Johansson K. 1893. Sanskritische Etymologien. – *IF* 2: 1–63.

Juthner J. 1939. Herkunft und natürliche Grundlagen der griechischen Nationalspiele. – *Die Antike* 15: 231–261. [*non uidimus*].

Kern H. 1858. Ueber die Italer. – *KZ* 5: 272–275.

Klingenschmitt G. 1975. Tocharisch und Indogermanisch. – Rix H. (ed.). *Flexion und Wortbildung*. Wiesbaden: 148–163.

Kretschmer P. 1896. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.

Kretschmer P. 1909. Zur griechischen und lateinischen Wortforschung. – *Glotta* 1: 323–333.

Kretschmer P. 1950. Zu den ältesten Metallnamen. – *Glotta* 32: 1–16.

Kroonen G. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden.

Kuhn H. 1954. Ablaut, a und Altertumskunde. – *KZ* 71: 129–161.

Kühner R., Blass F. 1890. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre.* [vol. 1]. Hannover.

Kühner R., Blass F. 1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre.* [vol. 2]. Hannover.

Kuiper F. 1947. Traces of laryngeals in Vedic Sanskrit. – (n. ed.). *India Antiqua*: 198–212.

Kuiper F. 1955. Shortening of final vowels in the Rig Veda. – *MKNAW* 18: 253–290.

Kuiper F. 1961. Zur kompositionellen Kürzung im Sanskrit. – *Die Sprache* 7: 14–31.

Kümmel M. 2001a. *Hieh₁. – *LIV ²*: 225.

Kümmel M. 2001b. *Sneubʰ. – *LIV²*: 574.

Lejeune M. 1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.

Leumann M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Zürich.

Levin S. 1971. The etymology of *néktar*: Exotic scents in Early Greece. – *SMEA* 13: 31–50.

Lewy H. 1895. *Die semitischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Berlin.

Lewy H. 1927. Etymologien. – *KZ* 55: 24–32.

LfgrE 16 = Meier-Brügger M., Beck W. (eds.). 1996. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos.* [*nee:níe:s – hodós*]. Göttingen.

Lindeman F. 1990. Indo-European laryngeals and fallacious reasoning. – *KZ* 103: 17–19.

Lindeman F. 1994. Phonology and laryngeals. Some critical observations on the "Lex Rix". – *IF* 99: 42–49.

Lindeman F. 1997. *Introduction to the laryngeal theory.* Innsbruck.

Lindeman F. 2004. On the vocalization of 'laryngeals' in Indo-European. – *KZ* 117: 118–133.

LIV² = Rix H. et al. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.

Mader B. 1996a. *Nússa*. – *LfgrE* 16: 448–449.

Mader B. 1996b. *Nússo:*. – *LfgrE* 16: 449–450.

Mallory J., Adams D. 2006. *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. Oxford.

Mayrhofer M. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [vol. 1]. Heidelberg.

Mayrhofer M. 1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. [vol. 2]. Heidelberg.

Meier-Brügger M. 1993. Zu griechisch *nêsos*. – *KZ* 106: 302.

Meillet A. 1908. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris.

Meillet A. 1910. *Les dialectes indo-européens*. Paris.

Meissner T. (rev.). 2014. Beekes 2010. – *Kratylos* 58: 1–31.

Merkelbach R., West M. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford.

Mondon J. 2008. The development of interconsonantal laryngeals in Classical Armenian. – *KZ* 121: 162–180.

Most G. 2007. *Hesiod. The Shield; Catalogue of women; Other Fragments*. Cambridge (MA).

NIL = Irslinger B., Schneider C., Wodtko D. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.

Nussbaum A. 1997. The Saussure Effect in Latin and Italic. – Lubotsky A. (ed.). *Sound law and analogy*. Amsterdam: 181–203.

Nussbaum A., Jasanoff J. 1996. Word games. – Lefkowitz M., MacLean-Rogers G. (eds.). *Black AthenarRevisited*. Chapel Hill: 177–205.

Oettinger N. 1997. Grundsätzliche Überlegungen zum Nordwest-Indogermanischen. – *IL* 20: 93–111.

Oettinger N. 2003. Neuerung in Lexikon und Wortbildung des Nordwest-Indogermanischen. – Bammesberger A., Vennemann T. (eds.). *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: 183–193.

Osthoff H. 1881. Die tiefstufe im indogermanischen vocalismus. – Brugmann K., Osthoff H. (eds.). *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Hildesheim: 1–407.

Peters M. 1976. Attisch *hí:e:mi*. – *Die Sprache* 22: 157–161.

Peters M. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien.

Peters M. 1999. Ein tiefes Problem. – Eicher H., Luschützky H., Sadovski V. (eds.). *Compositiones indogermanicae: In memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: 447–456. [*non uidimus*].

Pisani V. (rev.). 1953. Thieme P. 1952. – *OLZ* 48: 120–121.

Pokorny J. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.

Porzig W. 1950. *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Heidelberg.

Prellwitz W. 1905. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.

Prellwitz W. 1927. Noch einmal *ánthro:pos* und die griechischen Wörter auf *o:ps*. – *Glotta* 16: 151–154.

Pronk T. 2011. The Saussure effect in Indo-European languages other than Greek. – *JIES* 39: 177–193.

Rasmussen J. 1989. *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.

Rix H. 1970. Anlautender Laryngal vor Liquida oder Nasalis sonans im Griechischen. – *MSS* 27: 79–110

Rix H. 1991. Nochmals Griechisch *nêtta nêssa nâssa*. – *KZ* 103: 186–198.

Rix H. 1992. *Historische Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. [2. verbesserte Auflage]. Darmstadt.

Rosół R. 2010. The etymology of Greek *súbakkhos*. – *Mnemosyne* 63: 445–449.

Rosół R. 2012. *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Frankfurt.

Sakellariou M. 1976. *Peuples préhelléniques d'origine indo-européenne*. Athens.

Scheftelowitz J. 1905. Zur armenischen lautgeschichte. – *BB* 29: 13–70.

Schindler J. 1975. L'apophonie des thèmes indo-européens en r/n. – *BSL* 70: 1–10.

Schmidt G. 1973. Die iranischen Wörter für „Vater" und „Tochter" und die Reflexe des interkonsonantischen H (ə) in den indogermanischen Sprachen. – *KZ* 87: 36–83.

Schmidt J. 1889. *Die pluralbildungen der indogermanischen neutra*. Weimar.

Schmitt R. 1961. *Nektar*. – *KZ* 77: 88.

Schmitt R. 1965. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. [PhD thesis]. Saarbrücken.

Schulze W. 1887. Das lateinische v perfectum. – *KZ* 28: 299–274.

Schulze W. 1888. Miscellen. – *KZ* 29: 255–271.

Schulze W. 1895. Alt- und Neugriechisches. – *KZ* 33: 224–233.

Schwyzer E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

Skok P. 1936. Zum insula Problem. – *Glotta* 25: 17–222.

Solmsen F. 1909. Zu lat. *Nūbō*. – *Glotta* 2: 75–81.

Sonne W. 1863. Sprachliche und mythologische untersuchungen angeknüpft an RigVeda I.50. – *KZ* 12: 267–298.

Spiegelberg W. 1907. Ägyptische Lehnwörter in der älteren griechischen Sprache. – *KZ* 41: 127–132.

Thieme P. 1952. *Studien zur indogermanischen Wortkunde und Religionsgeschichte*. Berlin.

Thurneysen R. 1890. Lateinisches. – *KZ* 30: 485–503.

Trümpy H. 1950. *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos*. Basel.

Van Beek L. 2011. The Saussure effect in Greek: A reinterpretation of the evidence. – *JIES* 39: 129–175.

Van Veen P., Van der Sijs N. 1997. *Groot etymologisch woordenboek*. Utrecht, Antwerpen.

Van Windekens A. 1960. *Études pélasgiques*. Louvain.

Van Windekens A. 1982. Gr. *númphe:* "femme enceinte". – *KZ* 96: 93–94.

Veitch W. 1879. *Greek verbs, defective and irregular*. Oxford.

Verhasselt G. 2009a. *Het Pre-Griekse substraat. Recente tendenzen binnen het taalkundig onderzoek*. [MA thesis]. Leuven.

Verhasselt G. 2009b. The Pre-Greek linguistic substratum. An overview. – *LEC* 77: 211–239.

Verhasselt G. 2011. The Pre-Greek linguistic substratum. A critical assessment. – *LEC* 79: 257–283.

Viechnicki P. 1994. *ameibo*: An interdisciplinary approach. – *JIES* 22: 113–132.

Vine B. (rev.). 2012. De Vaan 2008. – *Kratylos* 57: 1–40.

Wackernagel J. 1897. *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. Basel.

Walde A., Hofmann J. 1954. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [vol. 2: M-Z]. Heidelberg.

Weiss M. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.

Wiedemann O. 1902. Etymologien. – *BB* 27: 193–261.

Wyatt W. 1968. Greek Names in *ssos/ttos*. – *Glotta* 46: 6–14.

Yamazaki Y. 2009. The Saussure effect in Lithuanian. – *JIES* 37: 430–461.

Zehnde T. 2001a. **nes*. – LIV^2: 454–455.

Zehnder T. 2001b. **neu̯*. – LIV^2 : 455–456.

Zehnder T. 2001c. **sneh$_2$*. – LIV^2: 572–573.