

ОБЩЕЕ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЕ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ | GENERAL AND COMPARATIVE  
HISTORICAL LANGUAGE

## Некоторые лексические сравнения языков Древней Анатолии и Левантии

### *Тардиво Дж.*

Падуанский университет, г. Падуя, Итальянская Республика  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X>, e-mail: [gtardivo@googlemail.com](mailto:gtardivo@googlemail.com)

### *Китселис Ф.*

Падуанский университет, г. Падуя, Итальянская Республика  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7376-689X>, e-mail: [bboyflipper@googlemail.com](mailto:bboyflipper@googlemail.com)

Экскурсия по древней Европе с точки зрения исторической лингвистики раскрывает наследие от Эгейского моря и соседней Анатолии до Северного Кавказа. Наша гипотеза связана с культурой раннего земледелия в этом регионе, в период, когда народы, проживающие здесь, говорили на неиндоевропейском языке. Основным источником информации является этимологический словарь греческого языка Бикса. В этом случае внимательно изучается список различных предметов. Открытие бронзы и ее использование имело большое значение, о чем будет рассказано в начале этой статьи. Данная статья впервые приводит интересный факт, очень глубокий по времени, так как предметом научного интереса в ней является слово линейного письма Б, обозначающее «ячмень». От слова «ячмень» анализ переходит к некоторым другим видам пищи, таким как «нут» и «суп»; Таким образом, все три элемента являются частью единой темы: еда. Тем не менее, «еда» - не единственный элемент, который следует принимать во внимание, так как семантика слова «еда» анализируется вместе с инструментами для ее приготовления. По этой причине также включено название «посуда».

**Ключевые слова:** Древняя Анатолия, Левантийская область, лексическое сравнение, линейное письмо Б, этимологический словарь Бикса, синхрония.

**Для цитаты:** Тардиво Дж., Китселис Ф. На пороге новой эры. Лексическое сравнение языков Древней Анатолии и Левантии [Электронный ресурс] // Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 3. С. 4–27. DOI:10.17759/langt.2020070301

## Some lexical Comparison in the Ancient Anatolia and Levantine Area

### ***Tardivo Giampaolo***

Padua State University, Padua, Italy,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X> , e-mail: [gtardivo@gmail.com](mailto:gtardivo@gmail.com)

### ***Kitselis Philippos***

Padua State University, Padua, Italy,

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7376-689X>, e-mail: [bboyflipper@gmail.com](mailto:bboyflipper@gmail.com)

An excursus of ancient Europe from an historical linguistics viewpoint reveals the legacy between Ægean and the nearby Anatolia till Northern Caucasus. This hypothesis is related to the early farming culture, whom people spoken a non-Indo-European language. Main source of information is Beekes Etymological dictionary of Greek. On this occasion, word lists of various items are scrutinized. The discovery of bronze and its use it was of great importance, as it will be illustrated at the beginning of this article. Then, the article contains for the first time, a very interesting fact, very deep in time, as it involves a Linear B word for ‘barley’. From ‘barley’ word, it progresses towards some others kind of foods, such as ‘chick-peas’ and ‘soup’; in this way, all three elements are part of a single theme: food. However, ‘food’ is not the only element taken in consideration, also ‘food’ preparation required tools in order to process it. For this reason, a ‘vessel’ name is also included. Nevertheless, the ‘stone [for special purpose]’ use was never abandoned, conversely, its usage was confined to other purpose..

**Keywords:** Ancient Anatolia, Levantine Area, Lexical Comparison, a Linear B word, Beekes Etymological dictionary, synchronicity.

**For citation:** Tardivo G., Kitselis Ph. On the Edge of a New Era. Lexical Comparison in the Ancient Anatolia and Levantine Area. *Yazyk i tekst = Language and Text*, 2020. Vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 4–27. DOI:10.17759/langt.2020070301 (In Russ.).

### **Forward**

An excursus of ancient Europe from an historical linguistics viewpoint reveals the legacy between Ægean and the nearby Anatolia till Northern Caucasus. This hypothesis is related to the early farming culture, whom people spoken a non-Indo-European language.

Main source of information is Beekes Etymological dictionary of Greek.

On this occasion, a word list of various items are scrutinized. The discovery of bronze and its use it was of great importance, as it will be illustrated at the beginning of this article. Then, the article contains for the first time, a very interesting fact, very deep in time, as it involves a Linear B word for ‘barley’. From ‘barley’ word, it progresses towards some others kind of foods, such as ‘chick-peas’ and ‘soup’; in this way, all three elements are part of a single theme: food. However, ‘food’ is

not the only element taken in consideration, also ‘food’ preparation required tools in order to process it. For this reason, a ‘vessel’ name is also included. Nevertheless, the ‘stone [for special purpose]’ use was never abandoned, conversely, its usage was confined to other purpose.

Throughout the article, there is the intention to forge and to assess the Rules between those words, and how it is possible that Greek substrata words shows common roots with North Caucasian languages.

Furthermore, in the Hesiodic tradition and its links to the Upper Mesopotamian (Hurrian) beliefs, has been discussed a lot in the past; see Güterbock (1948), Versnel (1987) and Campbell (2013), just to quote some of them. The origin of the pre-Olympian gods, the Titans, it draws a lot of attention, as Nilsson (1951) argued that Kronos is an agricultural god, an archaic god of harvest. Other deities, such as the Kabeiroi, have also been brought into context because their Anatolian, pre-IE origin<sup>1</sup>. The list of examples could be extended to others, but it is not the case here.

Recent research in linguistics shows how important human contacts throughout time and place were. The idea of «restriction» or tribal way to live beared from scholars for centuries, after careful consideration, it is constantly surpassed by linguistic perspective. After the discoveries of sites in Eastern Mediterranean area, and related decipherments of Hittite and Mycenaean Greek languages, a new chapter of unsolved questions is still open. Our knowledge of the past is very far from to be complete, and Linguistics can advocate those contacts. The result gained until now by linguistic families, subdivided by groups, it is by no means insignificant or wrongly proved. Actually, it is the most accurate system to classify words, hence, to sieve and purify the lexicon from external sources. The core argument here is – in all respect – to search and reconstruct original lexemes; at the same time, dealing with better understanding how, when and where it happened. Digging in the past, especially when literary sources are very scanty, it is linguistically ground for misinterpret its original meaning. However, oral traditions and comparanda of them, it might be helpful.

### **Weaponry is Metal**

Two metals are used as time denomination: Bronze and Iron. After stone-age, metals appear to mark a boundary between emerging powers and the rest of the world. It is well known that the technology of metal-working was the key factor, or at least, one of the main contributors to permanent settlement of people in certain area. Craftsmen kept their knowledge secret from others; their crafts created a special position within society and a high demand in production of various objects, especially weapons.

At this point, it is possible to redefine this concept. In order to understand how metal-working took part in humankind development, a journey to Anatolia and surrounding area is necessary. Metal products related to Anatolia are recorded from antiquity, actually, recent excavations enlightened and enriched this perspective.

The discovery of Bronze it was a great step, its use ranged from weapons to kitchen tools and beyond that. The first element to take in consideration is a word with specific meaning, ἔναρα ‘the weapons of a fallen opponent’. As Beekes stated, there is no etyma for this word; even previous attempt to related to Sanskrit it failed. However, looking at very rich area of metals production,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Beekes (2004) who compares Καδμῖλος/Κασμῖλος with the Hattian ḫašammil.

such as Майкор and Kura-Araxes, some hypotheses are also possible.

The article of Ruslan Seferbekov “Боги-патроны ремесел у народов Дагестана” deserve a lot of consideration; because it offers the right step for further research; one of them is the Abkhazian theonym Айнар / Ајнар ~ Аінар ‘(божество) кузнецы / smith’s god’, hence Аинаржьи / Ајнарзи ‘мастер золотых дел.; кузнец Нартов / goldsmith, Narts’ blacksmith’<sup>1</sup>.

Assembling these two elements, a West Caucasian theonym, such as Ајнар, and ἔναρα ‘the weapons’, they could be seen as chance similarity; however, the monophthongization of ai / aі > ě is a well-known phonologic Rule.

Even the association of «blacksmith» with «weapon» is quite possible, as “producer → product”. This semantic aspect is a parallel to ἄκακαλλίς, a theonym, originally a phytonym.

### Barley, a Source of Happiness?

In 2017 Rachele Pierini wrote an article about **MA-KA** in Linear B, whose title is “An alphabetic parallel for Mycenaean *ma-ka*” is attractive. Its meaning, due to the position within inscriptions, it appears controversial. The article deserve our attention because it is a good source from attested forms. A general overview and a summary description is exposed as introduction to the theme. Several interpretations are proposed, among them “kneading”, “olives”, “wine”; which, at the end, are discarded.

Contextualise the position within tablets, Pierini’s first step was to classify the relevance of **MA- KA** and its use. The author makes it clear what kind of word is, and, frankly, the method is quite orthodox. Pinpointing the relevant part, by number:

1. [First], it is related to the religious sphere, because of the content of the tablets where it appears.
2. [Second] the syntactical analysis has highlighted the following data:
  - a. **MA-KA** is strongly linked to *HORD(EUM)*.
  - b. **MA-KA HORD(EUM)** is the first entry, occasionally preceded by temporal clauses.

**MA-KA** is not a recipient but rather a common Noun, and recipients are listed from line .2 onwards.

- c. allocation after **MA-KA HORD(EUM)** are much larger than those on recipients in following entries.
- d. **MA-KA** is syntactically similar to **KA-PA**.

All those parts will constitute the core of the discourse, especially when it progress in diachronic system.

It is not less relevant the fact that “From a semantic point of view, it had been highlighted that

**MA-KA** refers to a grain, that such a grain was for communal use, and it was possibly processed

in some manner or stored. [...] Given the meaning δεῖπνον of **DE-QO-NO**, such a parallel

---

<sup>1</sup> Касландзия, see Bibliography

between **MA-KA** and **DE-QO-NO** indicates that **MA-KA** belongs to the semantic area of food, and that one can specify this as ritual food because of the religious content of tablets where **MA-KA** appears. Finally, the Linear B spelling points to **MA-KA** being related to a root like *\*mak-* or *\*mag-*.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, Pierini goes ahead with late sources, such as Hesychius of Alexandria; a very useful lexicographer. However, modern Scholars tend to ignored him. From Hesychius (μ 103 L.) we know that:

μακαρία · βρῶμα ἐκ ζωμοῦ καὶ ἀλφίτων, basically ‘a soup (or sauce) with flour’.

Other sources (see Pierini’s article) are not different from Hesykhios description. So, to summarize all three Greek writers, briefly Pierini wrote:

“...that alphabetic Greek μακαρία refers to a ritual food made of cereal flour and distributed to people involved in a ritual.”

At this point, the author sharpening – in order to avoid confusion between – those two words; thus, a morphological analysis and establishing suffixal form with:

“These strong similarities allow for a semantic comparison between ritual food **MA-KA** and μακαρία, making it highly likely to consider μάκαρ as the alphabetic interpretation of **MA-KA** and, in turn, μακαρία as a derivative of it.”

According to *LSJ*, μάκαρ ‘blessed, happy (as epithet of the gods)’; in this way, it looks disconnected from **MA-KA**.

Despite the attempt to make a secure etyma, those words are classified as part of the sub-strata lexicon; simply because within Indo-European languages, there is no data available; once again, an isolated word in the Aegean area. There are two strong factors in favour of sub-strata origin:

1. It is a cereal, where’s Indo-European languages – in some cases – lack of a proper terminology.
2. Its phonological structure.

Further, even μάκαρ is a lexeme alien to Indo-European linguistic family.

Besides Pierini’s explanation, as already stated for Indo-European, the word **MA-KA** has anything to do with Russian (a Slavic language) ‘мука / flour’. Nevertheless, Pierini’s questions lead to С. М. Хайдаков/ S. M. Khaidakov’s<sup>1</sup> article “Полеводческие и животноводческие термины в Дагестанских и Нахских языках, восходящих к эпохе энеолита / Field and livestock terminology in Nakh-Daghestanian languages from Neolithic Era”. Such article shows what kind of words are safely backdating to early historical time; among them: ‘ячмень / barley’, as Khaidakov wrote:

“Название древнейшей сельскохозяйственной культуры ‘ячмень’ бесспорно восходит к общенахско-дагестанскому хронологическому уровню./ The word for «barley» can be safely backdated to the ancient time of the common Nakh-Daghestanian lexicon.”

In his list, Khaidakov includes 13 languages; much more the same number of Johanna Nichols’ list; except for some languages. Both them are below of Nikolaev & Starostin’s list (with 16). There is no general agreement about their relationship; simply because similar words, also in

---

<sup>1</sup> Khaidakov, p. 109.

meaning, appears crosswise in the area. For this reason, Nikolaev & Starostin split up ‘barley’ in two separate roots: *\*mu:qV* ‘barley’ proper, and *\*wVlq’V*: ‘a kind of cereal; flour made of it’. However, there is no general consensus for Proto North-Caucasian reconstruction carried out by Nikolaev & Starostin. In any form, the core is Linear B **MA-KA** et sim., in order to reconstruct a possible common origin, various perspective will be illustrated.

Table 1

**The following scheme is far away from to be assertive; it actually is an attempt to conciliate various forms:**

Akhwakh	<i>muq<sup>h</sup>:á</i>	голозерный ячмень / naked barley
Chechen and Ingush	<i>muq</i>	ячмень / barley
Tindi	<i>múja</i>	
Tsezi and Hinuq	<i>maqʁ χ(a)</i>	
Inkhokvarian	<i>maqɑ</i>	
Khwarshi	<i>maqɑ</i>	
Dargwa (Kubachi)	<i>muq<sup>h</sup>ɑ</i>	
Archi	<i>maχá</i>	
Tabasaran	<i>muh, muhú, muhár</i>	
Agul	<i>muχ</i>	
Budukh	<i>mux</i>	
Lezgian	<i>muχ, məχ</i>	
Kryz	<i>míχ</i>	
Khinalug	<i>maqá</i>	
Bezhta	<i>miq’oʔ</i>	пшеница / wheat
Hunzib	<i>múχe</i>	злак(и). зерно, урожай / cereal, grain

**NOTES:**

- Nakh group: Chechen, Ingush and Akkin also *me:qaf*, Kistian dialect *me:kif*, Cheberloi dialect *maqif*, and Itumen dialect *maqef* ‘ib.’.
- Andi group: For Akhwakh: 3<sup>rd</sup> cl., (Tsegob.) *muʔɑ*, (Ratlub.) *muq<sup>h</sup>:á*. For Tindi 2<sup>nd</sup> cl.
- Tsezic group: Tsezi and Hinuq 3<sup>rd</sup> cl., Hunzib 4<sup>th</sup> cl.
- Lak-Darg. group: Darghin varieties: Akusha, Urakh, Muir, Tsudakhar *muq<sup>h</sup>i*, Kajtagh *miq<sup>h</sup>æ*, Sirhan *miq<sup>wh</sup>i*.
- Lezghian group: Archi translation is partly problematic, as Chumakina et al. translate as рожь / rye; 3<sup>rd</sup> cl.; meanwhile Kibrik&Kodzasov translate as «barley». For Budukh e Khinalug 3<sup>rd</sup> cl.

External to the scheme, the Andi compound form *muq̄:ga* ‘смешанное зерно / mixed grain’. The first things which apparently contradict the intention, is the vowel variation *-a-* (*-e-*) / *-i-* / *-u-*; such feature is pretty common within Nakh-Daghestanian languages, especially between dialects of the same language. Also, the presence of a uvular is unproblematic, as “*The difference between velar and uvular consonants is that with velar consonants the tongue body is raised, whereas with uvular consonants it is not*”<sup>1</sup>. Such picture could be Regular; although it is not the same as Khaidakov’s exposure; which include Hunzib *oh*, Bezhta *og* ‘barley’, Avar *hoq<sup>h</sup>*; *oq<sup>h</sup>*: ‘ib.’, Lak *qa* ‘ib.’, on top of Lezgi (proper), Tabasaran, Agul, Budukh, Archi, Kryz, Dargin and Chechen (as above).

Even more audacious is Nichols’<sup>2</sup> configuration, with a Nakh-Daghestanian protoform in *\*(m)uq-*, *\*(m)aq-* [‘barley’]; and the languages included are: Chechen-Ingush, Avar, Tsez, Khwarshi, Lak, Dargi, Lezgi, Tabasaran, Agul, Kryz, Archi, Khinalug (as above), plus Udi with *mu* ‘barley’; last one deserve a bit of attention, as W. Schulze<sup>3</sup> wrote “Nikolaev & Starostin relate the term to (see *\*wVlq’V*: ‘a kind of cereal; flour made of it’). Rather doubtful. Both stem and oblique inflection.”

Last one is Nikolaev&Starostin edition, freely available on-line (website: starling.rinet.ru). Furthermore, G. A Klimov<sup>4</sup> in his dictionary of Kartvelian linguistic family, he presented a form in *\*maxa* - ‘sort of wheat’: Georgian მახა [maxa] ‘sort of wheat’; Lazi *moxa*.

The agricultural term represented in Georgian dialects (Lečx., Rač’a). There are no traces of it in Megrelian. The Laz correspondence was noted in Marr (1910: 168). A possibility of reconstructing form *\*maqa-* cannot be ruled out, especially if we take into account material parallelism in Nakh-Daghestanian languages (cf. Chechen and Ingush *muq*, Tsezi *maqa*, Darg. *muqa* alongside Archi *maxa*). The word seems to reflect an old cultural property.

At this point, there is a clear-cut about Nakh-Daghestanian languages, their well-preserved lexical item could be strong enough to be compared with **MA-KA**. Second part to taken into consideration is the suffixal form in **-ap**, and in all respect, there are few other words with this ending, such as δάμαρ, εἶθαρ, ἴκταρ, καλαμίνδαρ, νῶκαρ, παλλιχίαρ, σκίναρ, σῦφαρ and ὕφεαρ. Even in this case, Nakh-Daghestanian languages offers a possible solution. In the present paper, a general overview allows to conceptualize a derivative form. As С. М. Темирбулатова / S. M. Temirbulatova<sup>5</sup> wrote for Dargin:

От существительных множественного числа именительного падежа, при помощи суффикса **-ap** образуются конкретные прилагательные. При этом конечный гласный **-и** существительного замещается гласным **-а** суффикса **-ap**:

1. илби – илб-**ap** «глаза – глазастый»
2. цилби – цилб-**ap** «зубы – зубастый»
3. кИпри – кИпр-**ap** «листья – лиственный»
4. кьялуппи – кьялупп-**ap** «ветви – ветвистый»

<sup>1</sup> Odden, p. 143.

<sup>2</sup> Nichols, p. 256-257.

<sup>3</sup> Schulze, p. 300.

<sup>4</sup> Klimov, pp. 117-118.

<sup>5</sup> Темирбулатова, p. 77.

5. унцІби – унцІб-ар «клинья – с клиньями».

[Eng.: The suffix **-ar** is used as plural formative; also, the adjective manner of a Noun. So, the final vowel will be truncated and replaced by **-ar**:

1. *ilbi* ~ *ilb-ar* «eye ~ with big eyes»
2. *Asilbi* ~ *Asilb-ar* «tooth ~ toothy»
3. *k'ipri* ~ *k'ipr-ar* «leaf ~ full of leaves»
4. *q'æluppi* ~ *q'ælupp-ar* «branch ~ branch-like»
5. *untʃ s'bi* ~ *untʃ sb-ar* «wedges ~ in wedges»]

This aspect is not a prerogative of a single language, it actually is quite widespread, including its functionality, like in Tabasaran (Lezg. group), as Сулейманов, Н. Д. / N. D. Sulejmanov<sup>1</sup> wrote:

хураг «кушанье» / *hurag* «dish»,  
хураг-ар «кушанья» / *hurag-ar* «dishes» [PLUR.],  
хураг-ар «кухня» / *hurag-ar* «kitchen»

Within Pre-Greek, the suffix **-ar** waiting for an explanation; and this is an attempt to make akin both parts, Aegean with Greek (actually Pre-Greek) and Daghestani.

After this excursus with Daghestanian language, Linear **MA-KA** *HORDEUM* relationship to μάκαρ will be strengthened by suffixal use of **-ar** / **-ar** [-ar] in diachronic way; as seen in the description, it is multifunctional. One question may arise, why «barley» was so relevant in ancient time? What reason pushed those people specifically to this cereal? Explanation is quite plain, like wheat and rye, barley was one of the most consumed cereal in the Middle East, as “Domesticated barley is abundant at Near Eastern archaeological sites from 9500 C years ago and the crop spread to Europe, Egypt, and south Asia from about 8000 C years ago, with the other Neolithic crops of the Fertile Crescent”<sup>2</sup>. Throughout time, barley crop slowly declined for human consumption; meanwhile it increased as fodder.

To figure out its relevance, another Pre-Greek (or Greek substrata) word might be helpful: οὐλαί. According to Beekes, ‘(underground) barley corns, roasted and sprinkled between the horns of the sacrificial animal’ (Ionic since γ 441); Latin *mola salsa*. Nevertheless, its variation with ὀλαί (Attic), ὀλοαί (Arcadian Π<sup>a</sup>). Cf. ὄλπα · χόνδρου τις ἔψησις. ἔδεμά τι ‘cooking of groats, a dish’. ἡ ὄλβος ‘wealth, blessed state’ (Hesychius).

To go further, for ὄλβος ‘wealth, blessed state, prosperity, happiness’, Beekes’ comment is:

¶ If the gloss is cognate [to ὄλπα], it must be Pre-Greek, which is certainly a good possibility.

Such definition, open a question on Urartian<sup>3</sup> *ma-ku-ri* ‘милостивый, милостиво / gracious(ly)’; which it could be related to μάκαρ, μακαρία. However, based on Urartian inscriptions, there is not enough data to demonstrate a secure connection with Linear B **MA-KA**. Once again, ‘barley’ was at the centre of religious performance, and the description “it is related to the religious sphere” should be taken faithful and correct.

To resume the process as a whole, Pierini’s article opened a new path in historical linguistics, thus, good agreement with Khaidakov’s previous observation of ‘barley’, a very old lexical item in

<sup>1</sup> Сулейманов, Н. Д.; p. 82

<sup>2</sup> Prance&Nesbitt 2005, p. 49

<sup>3</sup> Мещанинов / Meščaninov, pp. 192-193



Nakh-Daghestanian languages; in spite of Kartvelian scanty record.

Furthermore, the suffixal form is diachronically elaborate, and, as result, it reinforces main concept of «barley → religious sphere» granted in οὐλαί. The comparison between two sides of Anatolia (Aegean in the west, and Caucasus in the north-east), starting with ancient inscriptions, it will be an opportunity to safely reconstruct linguistic family-tree.

### Why Chick-Peas Are Salty?

It is well known that plant denominations are quite colourful. It may vary from one place to another, not only between languages, also among dialects of the same language. In many cases, the same name might be referred to different or similar plants. For this reason, in order to avoid confusion between plants varieties, the Swedish botanist Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778) decided to use Latin or a Latinized form for plants (and animals) description and classification.

This is also the case of γάλινθοι ‘chick-peas, *Cicer arietinum*’<sup>1</sup>. Its Latin name is quite clear, *Cicer* as generic phytonym, and *arietinum* < *aries* ‘ram’, simply because they resembling ‘ram’s head’.

However, the Pre-Greek form contain a more specific detail, and it is utterly different from fanciful Latin denomination. The first element to taken into consideration is vegetable characteristics, as Theophrastus (*Historia Plantarum*, VIII, 6, 13) pointed up:

“More abundant rain is beneficial to all crops when they come into leaf and formed the flower; however it is harmful to wheats and barleys and other cereals when they are actually in flower; for it destroys the flower. But to pulses it is harmless, except to chick-peas; for these, if the salt is washed off them, perish from rot or from being eaten by caterpillars. However, the black and the red chick-pea are stronger than the white, and it is beneficial, they say, to sow this crop late in moist soil.”

This peculiar description is observed by Costas A. Thanos in his article (*Aristotle and Theophrastus on plant-animal interactions*; at p. 6.):

“In the case of chick pea, Theophrastus argues that it is a particular saltiness in the seed coat that prevents infestation (*Causis Plantarum* – VI, 10.6)<sup>2</sup>”.

There are no doubts that ‘salt’ play an important role for chick-pea seeds; and the description made by Theophrastus is very helpful. Other element to analyze is its phonological variation: γέλινθοι, γάλιθοι on top of the more standard form in γάλινθοι. At this point, to quote Beekes is the right path:

¶ Pre-Greek (note the suffix -ινθος with a variant without prenasalization, as well the interchange α / ε).

Hence, based on description, a synchronical reconstruction in \*γάλ(i)- / \*γέλ(i)- is more likely. Briefly, three main elements corroborated this view:

1. Latin name is different from Greek name.
2. The ‘saltiness’ is a relevant detail.
3. Phonologic variations within Pre-Greek.

<sup>1</sup> турецкий горох.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle and Theophrastus on plant-animal interactions; p. 6.

The name itself shown a very strong legacy with Nakh-Daghestanian languages, particularly with Lezghian group; as their word for ‘salt’, once compared to Ægean word, it shows a common origin.

Table 2

As usual, a scheme is illustrated here:

Tabasaran	<i>q'il</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> class	СОЛЬ / salt
Agul	<i>q'el, q'il</i>	-	
Lezghian	<i>q'el, q'äl</i>	-	
Rutul	<i>q'ely</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	
Tsakhur	<i>q'ew</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	
Kryz	<i>q'ël</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> class	
Budukh	<i>q'el</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	
Khinalug	<i>q'ä</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> class	
Udi [?]	<i>el</i>	-	
Pre-Greek	γάλινθοί, γάλ(ι)-, γέλ(ι)-		

In Rutul **ERG.** *q'il-í-r*, in Kryz **GEN.** *q'il*.  
 In Tabasaran, a derivative form is *q'eldq z:*, *q'ildq z:ú*, *q'ildq z:ár* ‘селитра / saltpeter’.  
 For Udi form, Schulze’s comment: “The underlying Proto-Lezghian form is *\*q<sup>ʕ</sup>el* (or *\*qäl*).  
 Though initial *\*q<sup>ʕ</sup>*- can be dropped in Udi, we cannot exclude the possibility that the Udi term *el*  
 does not stem from Proto-Lezgian, but is a loan from Old Armenian *al* ‘salt’.”<sup>1</sup>.

Regarding some phonological aspects, the comparison shows some minor problems to fix. All Lezghian languages shows a glottalized voiceless Uvular plosive, whilst Pre-Greek has a simple γ- (gamma) [+ voiced + velar + plosive]; which it seems inappropriate for the case. However, all authors whom investigate and describe Pre-Greek lexemes, they came at the same conclusions: poor graphic system [Greek alphabet] for a rich phoneme inventory [Pre-Greek]. From this descriptive analysis, it is remarkable that Lezghian languages are more conservative with *q'*-; thus, a passage in *q' > \*G* is plausible. Based on this reconstructive phonologic attempt, it is possible now to restore Pre-Greek original pronunciation in γάλι- < *\*gál(i)-* < *\*q'ál(i)-*.

The German ethnographer Roderic von Erckert, despite his effort on the subject, in his book about Caucasian languages, the part dealing with lexical record, at n. 291 (Salz / Salt / Sel), it is proven totally wrong, on the following ground: first, the Greek word for ‘salt’ is ἄλς, which is fully Indo-European, and part of word-list with σ- > h- > Ø- Rule. Then, it is impossible to demonstrate a passage *h > q'*. The same aspect is repeated between Khinalug *q'ä* and Armenian ա[al] ‘salt’.

The dissertation on chick-pea unveil its name; and it is supported from Theophrastus’

<sup>1</sup> Schulze, p. 274.

description. The fact that γάλινθοὶ bear its name from ‘salt’, it put together Lezghian original and conservative meaning with Pre-Greek derivative form. Even the phonologic feature is not an obstacle to reconstruction. Furthermore, it corrects the previous assumption made by German ethnographer v. Erckert.

### From Field to Table

To continue on the same field, more words appears to be on both sides of the Anatolian plateau; that’s include special food preparation, such as μυττωτός ‘dish, kind of paste’, whom ingredients are ‘cheese, honey, garlic, etc...’ (Hipponax, Ananius., comedy, Theophrastus). Then, a slight sound variation in -σσ- (Hippocrates, περὶ τόπων τῶν καταάνθρωπον 47), -σ- (Callimachus, *fragmenta* 282). According to Beekes:

For the realia, cf. on μῦμα. A formation in -ωτός, probably denominal (cf. Chantraine 1933; 305f., Schwyzer: 503). In view of the variation -ττ- / -σσ- / -σ-, the word is Pre-Greek.

A very explicative statement come from Ramazanov’s Agul-Russian dictionary, the description of *mut’úla*, *mut’úlaj* ‘растопленный внутренний жир, замерзший налет на жирном мясном супе / melted inner fat, coagulate fat on meat soup’ is self-evident. Besides, the Pre-Greek alternation with -σσ- / -σ-, it leads to another Agul lexeme, as Ramazanov describe: *mus:uaf* ‘(толокняная каша) традиционное горское блюдо на основе жидко сваренной мучной болтушки, далее замешиваемой с толокном, подвояемой, с маслом, урбечем<sup>1</sup> и медом / (porridge) traditional dish of mountaineer, made out of cooked flour mixed with butter, nut-butter and honey’; basically < *mus:ú* (Burshagh), *musú* (Richag, Fitigh), *mus:í* (Burkihan) ‘толокно, у Агулов традиционно мололи толокно из жареного в [хьаре] ячменя / traditional porridge of roasted wheat and barley’, especially in the case of *mus:ú t’ifí* [‘knead the dough’] ‘одно из традиционных блюд горцев Дагестана, ели вместо хлеба / typical food of Daghestanian highlander, ate instead bread’. Yet, it is not completely clear if this is the case of sound variation (-ττ- / -σσ- / -σ-), or two different kinds of food; as the Pre-Greek description is a bit vague. In light of this comparison, the second option is more likely.

### Remnants of an Era

Even when metals begun to be part of civilization progress, stones were in use anyway. The “stone” lexicon was never forgot throughout the time. This is the case of γυλλός [meaning unclear] ‘block of stone’ (Milete VI-V<sup>a</sup>), carried in a procession for Apollo (Nisson, *Greek Religion* 1,189); κύβος, ἢ τετράγωνος λίθος ‘cube or cubic stone (Hesychius); γυλλοί · στολομοί ‘equipment, apparel’ (Hesychius; Latte corrupt). According to Beekes:

¶ No etymology. Lewy KZ 55 (1928): 72f. connects the word with Hebrew *gōlēl* “Rollstein”.

<sup>1</sup> “a thick liquid mass obtained from roasted toasted or simply dried seeds of flax, hemp, sunflower, pumpkin, apricot kernels or nuts. In the traditional cuisine of the peoples of Daghestan, it is used to make a sweet dish of the same name (with honey and butter), as a nutriment for maintaining strength, in the treatment of diseases”.

Such assumption is – obviously – rejected by Beekes, by phonology and semantic grounds.

For the connection between the deity and the ‘stone’, there is a story that “...*Though purified of his guilt, he was haunted by Procris’s ghost and, fearing to bring misfortune on his companions, went one day to Cape Leucas, where he had built a temple to Apollo of the White Rock, and plunged into the sea from the cliff top. As he fell he called aloud on the name of Pterelas; for it was under this name that Procris had been most dear to him.*”<sup>1</sup>.

Table 3

**Then, a comparison with Lezghian group reveal its nature and relationship.**

Lezghian	<i>q<sup>w</sup>’al</i>		обрыв, круча / precipice, steep
Tabasaran	<i>q’al</i>		обрыв, пропасть / cliff, abyss
Rutul	<i>q’ul, q’ala</i>		скала, доска / rock, board
Tsakhur	<i>q<sup>w</sup>’ul<sup>j</sup></i>	4 <sup>th</sup> class	скала, скалистый склон / rock, rocky slope
Budukh	<i>q’ol</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	скала, утес / rock, cliff
Archi	<i>q<sup>w</sup>’il</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> class	выступ на склоне горы / jut (on the hill)
Pre-Greek	γαλλός		
Partly relevant, from Starostin’s edition is: - OBL. base * <i>q<sup>w</sup>’ila-</i> (cf. Lezghian <i>q<sup>w</sup>’ala-</i> , Tabasaran <i>q<sup>w</sup>’áli-</i> , Rutul <i>q’ulá-</i> , Tsakhur <i>q’ule</i> ).			

Two phonologic elements show agreement with other lexemes. The presence of -wV- > Labial vowel(s), as already seen in “Labialization in Aegean and Nakh-Daghestanian languages” (Tardivo, 2020/1); and then, the same phonologic process of γάλινθοι.

Table 4

**In both cases, γ- of Aegean match q- / q’- of Daghestanian languages; as shown here:**

	Tabasaran	Rutul	Tsakhur	Budukh
γάλινθοι, γάλ(ι)-, γέλ(ι)-	<i>q’il</i>	<i>q’ely</i>	<i>q’ew</i>	<i>q’el</i>
γαλλός	<i>q’al</i>	<i>q’ul, q’ala</i>	<i>q<sup>w</sup>’ul<sup>j</sup></i>	<i>q’ol</i>
γ-	<i>q-</i>	<i>q-</i>	<i>q-</i>	<i>q-</i>

The assumption of “...*q’-*; thus, a passage in *q’ > \*G ...*” exposed in this article should be seen as a principle for phonologic Rule, also known as regular sound change. Such feature is not restricted to a single group of languages in comparison to Pre-Greek; it also include others, like

<sup>1</sup> Robert Graves, n 89.

Nakh group. A good example is γαυλός ‘milk-pail, water-bucket, beehive’ (Odyssey), with different accent γαῦλος. Its etyma is doubtful, with some reference to Semitic languages, as Beekes stated:

A connection with γωλεός and γύαλον and, outside Greek, Old High German *kiol*, Old Norse *kjóll* ‘ship’ has been considered. Alternatively, γαυλός could be borrowed from Semitic, cf. Hebrew *gullā* ‘vase for oil’. Specifically Phoenician origin cannot be proven with the gloss γαυλοί · καὶ ταὶ Φοινικικαὶ πλοῖα γαῦλοὶ καλοῦντοὶ ‘also Phoenician ships are called γαῦλοὶ’ (Hesychius); see E. Masson 1967: 39ff. Latin *gaulus* is borrowed from Greek.

Briefly, neither IndoEuropean nor Semitic are conclusively convincing. The Nakh group offers a more striking solution with Chechen *q’ylg* (Cheberloi *q’olig*, *q’v:lgef*; Itumen *q’vj*), and Ingush *q’ulg* (Kistian *q’vjg*) ‘маслобойка / churn’. Several phonologic elements appears, the persistent relationship between consonants, where Pre-Greek shows γ- directly related to north Caucasian *q- / q’-*; then, the diphthong -αῦ- fits -v:- lengths of the Cheberloi dialect (of the Chechen language). The -g ending appears quite regularly in Nakh words, as Starostin wrote, it is a diminutive. Even from a Semantic perspective, it appears more reliable, as ‘milk-pail → churn’. Once again, the Greek graphic system is close enough to those languages located in the bridge between Asia and Europe.

The forefather of this kind of studies was Paul Kretschmer. His first step was “to sieve” Greek words of IndoEuropean origin from Greek as a whole. Since then, this kind of studies still are quite debated. The key-point is centered in Rule violation, for this reasons, there is strong disagreement between Scholars. The Neo-grammarians motto is based on “Regular sound change, exceptionless”.

Even in this occasion, unetymologized Greek words are potentially related to North Caucasian languages. What it emerge from this research, despite the opposition of sound classification (voiced ~ voiceless ~ aspirated vs. plain ~ palatalized ~ labialized), it is a complying system in accordance to Neo-grammarians method; which is universally accepted. It is possible now to trace it back the phonologic Rule of a voiceless uvular plosive, with further development as voiced uvular plosive (*q / q’ > \*G*).

This Rule will be added to others. Such Rules are fully applicable to ἀγήρατος ‘stone used to polish women’s shoes’ (Galenus), according to Beekes:

A connection with the word for ‘age’ does not seem appropriate. Szemerényi Gnomon 43 (1971): 641-75 proposes ἀγήρατος ‘very lovely’, which is not much better.

Conversely, the Nakh group show good agreement with, starting with Chechen *qε:т, qε:ra* (6th class) ‘камень / stone’, hence, Ingush and Bats with *qera* (6th class) ‘камень для метания / throwing stone’. Analyzing the last word, the process fulfill the Neo-grammarians expectations:

1. The aphaeresis of *â- > Ø-*.
2. The consonant */-γ-/* is linear to other words shown here
3. The middle vowel length is also reflected in Chechen. At this point, a resume of all cases is due:

Table 5

**Analyzing the last word, the process fulfill the Neo-grammarians expectations:**

Pre-Greek	Lezghian	Nakh
γάλινθοὶ, γάλ(ι)-, γέλ(ι)-	<i>q / q’ &gt; *G</i>	
γαλλός	<i>q / q’ &gt; *G</i>	

γαῦλος		$q > *G$
ἀγήρατος		$q > *G$

### One more dish made of cereals: κόλλυβα.

In the rich lexicon of Greek language, an etymologized word appears: κόλλυβα. It is a ceremonial cake that is being eaten in Greece, Romania and others Eastern Orthodox countries, in commemoration of the dead. Its preparation consists of boiled wheat, with pomegranate, coriander, raisins, nuts and icing sugar bounded together. Its origin goes back to the pre-Christian era, and it was called πανσπερμία ‘mixture of all seeds’ in antiquity. On the final day of the Anthesteria, this mixture, was offered to Hermes Chthonios. The rite was said to have been established following the great flood<sup>1</sup>, a story adopted by Turkish folks<sup>2</sup>; when a few survivors gathered together and ate whatever food was available. Theopompos<sup>3</sup> tells us it was intended propitiate Hermes on behalf of the dead. According to Johnston (1999), the idea behind it was to win Hermes favour and thereby guarantee his solicitude for the dead, for whom he acted as a guide back and forth between the worlds of the living and the dead.

Greek etymological dictionaries associate this word to κόλλυβος ‘coin of little value’ or κόλλαβος ‘small wheaten cakes’<sup>4</sup> or ‘desert made of nuts and fruits/seeds’<sup>5</sup>. The etymology appears uncertain, although, there is a proposal to connect to Hebrew *hālṗ* ‘exchange’. Such a proposal has been rejected by Beekes (2010), who classified it as a Pre-Greek lexeme. Based on the fact that κόλλυβα is a wheat, product; its meaning could be:

1. A word for ‘wheat’ or similar cereal, or
2. A root for cereal-based product (such as bread, porridge).

The fact that κόλλυβο means both ‘wheat’ and ‘coin’ may raise some questions. Coinage was first introduced in Lydia the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE. Earlier than that, agricultural societies used barter payments involving cereals and their products, e.g.: beer, which leads to a regular semantic cprocess: cereal → payment → coin

<sup>1</sup> Scholia Aristoph. Acharnians 1076: Χύτροι, έορτη παρ Αθηναίοις γινομένη τῷ Διονύσῳ· ἄγεται δει παραι ταύτην τη ν αιτίαν, ην καιι Θεόπομπος εκτίθεται γράφων οὔτω· «Διασωθέντας οὔν τοις ανθρωπους, η̄περ ε̄θάρρησαν η̄μέρα, τῷ ταύτης ονόματι προσαγορεῡσαι καιι τη ν έορτη ν ἅπασαν· ε̄πειτα θύειν αυτο̄ις ε̄θος ε̄χουσι τῶν μειν Ὀλυμπίων θεῶν οὔδεν̄ι τοι παράπαν, Ἑρμῆ δει Χθονίῳ· καιι τῆς χύτρας, η̄ν ε̄ψουσι πάντες οι καται τη ν πόλιν, οὔδειις γεύεται τῶν ιερέων· τοῦτο δει ποιοῦσι τη η̄μέρα, καιι τοις τότε παραγενομένους υπ̄ειρ τῶν αποθανόντων ιλάσασθαι τοι ν Ἑρμῆν.» Ἦγοντο δει ἄγωνες αὐτόθι οι Χύτρινοι καλούμενοι, καθά φησι Φιλόχορος εν τη εκτη τῶν Ᾱτθιδων.

<sup>2</sup> There’s a Turkish desert called Aşure, known also as Noah’s pudding. The story and the product are the same, but adjusted to the Abrahamic tradition.

<sup>3</sup> Hist. FGrH 115 F 347a, 347b

<sup>4</sup> See the scholia on κόλλαβος in Aristoph. Frogs 507 and Peace 1196

<sup>5</sup> Hesch. <κόλλυβα>· τρωγάλια



Рис. 1. Cuneiform tablet dated around 2350 BCE, stating that adult workers should be paid 30 or 40 pints of barley per month.

In the surrounding area, words with \*κολλ- used for wheat, barley, oats etc, are also manifest in some others languages. The main semantic concept is ‘cereal’. Starting from ‘wheat’, the same word might be in use for some others cereals. The rich varieties of languages in the Caucasus mountains are very useful in the context. The Lezgetic subgroup of languages is part of the North-East Caucasian linguistic family.

Table 6

**The word for ‘wheat’ is listed in the table below.**

Lezghian	<i>qyl</i>	-	пшеница / wheat ( <i>Triticum vulgare</i> )
Rutul	<i>vil</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	
Kryz and Budukh	<i>gul</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> class	
Archi	<i>q<sup>h</sup>oq<sup>h</sup>ól</i>	3 <sup>rd</sup> class	
According to Starostin: “The Archi form is reduplicated.”. In any form, it is doubtful.			

The Anatolian languages are divided into two groups: Indo-European and non-Indo-European. Among non-IE there’s Hattic, and then, Hurrian language. None of them have a specific word for

‘wheat’<sup>1</sup>. The most interesting word related to ‘grain’, comes from Lycian language, and it’s *qele*. Hence, *Qele* was also the ‘grain god’ of the Lycians, and it seems to be of pre-IE origin. The Hittite *ḫal-ki-iš* ‘barley, grain’, and the Luwian *ḫu-ul-li-ti-iš* ‘kind of bread’, derive from the Proto-Anatolian *\*Holgg i* ‘barley, grain’, which is a loan from a non-IE language. A Phrygian attested form from inscriptions is *ακκαλος*<sup>2</sup> ‘a kind of bread’. According to Petrantoni (2019), it could be of Semitic origin<sup>3</sup>.

Within Pre-Greek, *κόλλυβα* is not the only word having this root; the list includes *κόλλαβος* ‘a type of cake or roll’, also *κόλλιξ* ‘a roll or loaf of coarse bread’, and *κολλύρα* ‘round bread’. The word *ἄκολος* ‘small bread, morsel’<sup>4</sup> can be added with caution to the list and get paired with Phrygian *ακκαλος/ακαλα*. All these lemmas have been discussed in detail by Tardivo (2020/1).

Table 7

To briefly resume all those parts, a second scheme is shown here:

<b>Lycian</b>	<i>qele</i>	зерно / grain
<b>Luwian</b>	<i>ḫu-ul-li-ti-iš</i>	хлеб / a kind of bread
<b>Hittite</b>	<i>ḫal-ki-iš</i>	barley, grain
<b>Lezghian</b>	<i>qyl</i>	пшеница / wheat ( <i>Triticum vulgare</i> )
<b>Pre-Greek</b>	<i>κόλλυβα</i>	хлеб / a kind of bread or cereal product
	<i>κόλλαβος</i>	
	<i>κόλλιξ / κόλλικας</i>	
	<i>κολλύρα</i> <sup>5</sup>	
	<i>κολλούρας</i>	

The material from each region, it allows the reconstruction of the protoform in *\*k<sup>w</sup>VI-*. As shown in article “Labialization in Aegean and Nakh-Daghestanian languages” (Tardivo 2020/1), the following Rule is observed:

Labialized consonant + vowel > Consonant + labial vowel.

<sup>1</sup> They have other words like grain e.g. *kait, kade*.

<sup>2</sup> MAMA VII: 313, 454, 495

<sup>3</sup> Neo-Assyrian *akalu* ‘bread, food, small measure’, *akālu* ‘to eat’

<sup>4</sup> Eust. p. 1817.46–9 = ii.141.37–42 ἄκολος, μικροὶς ψωμοῖς μηκέτι κολουέσθαι δυνάμενος καὶ εἰς μικρὰ τέμνεσθαι

<sup>5</sup> In modern Greek, *κουλούρι/κουλούρα* can mean except from round/roll bread, anything round, even zero. This is rather a fossilized derivation, since *κολλύρα* et sim are round breads or pastry rolls





Greek κορκότον, already attested in the Scholia of Plutus<sup>1</sup> by Aristophanes. It could be the result of reduplication of *\*k<sup>w</sup>Vr-*. Such word is manifest in Armenian with կորկոտ(korkot) ‘groats of wheat or barley’, and then, in Eastern Georgian კორკოტი(korkoti), which is another name for წყაღი(Tsandili) or კოლი(kolio), the ritual dish prepared to commemorate the deceased<sup>2</sup>.



Рис 2. Geographic distribution of the root *\*k<sup>w</sup>Vr-*

Overall, the final solution for *\*k<sup>w</sup>Vr-* (et sim.) still is problematic. The existence of Iranian words such as Avestan *x<sup>v</sup>arəθa-* ‘food’, Middle Persian *xwar-* ‘to drink, eat, enjoy (food), consume’, Khotanese Śaka *hvar-* ‘to consume’, Middle Sogddian *xwr-* ‘to eat, consume’ < PIIr. *\*huar* ‘to consume, eat’ and even Azeri *xörək* ‘food, dish’, pose a challenge for a safe reconstruction. While the Armenian lexeme cannot be of Iranian origin, everything else is very risky. Despite

*\*huar* lacks of reliable Indo-European cognates, it will be very wise for *\*k<sup>w</sup>Vr-* to search for more supportive evidence; in other words, to leave the door open.

## Conclusions

The article is a further attempt to trace it back Greek words of substrata origin. The search affect different items, mainly Cereals and food in general. The mountains of Caucasus, also known as ‘mountain of tongues’ seems a fertile linguistic ground for comparison. Besides, the relevance goes beyond the chance similarity, as Regular sound change (or Rules) appears to be linear between those languages; and this list could be a trialblaze for further research.

However, some doubts are also expressed; in any form, it does not diminish the linguistic opportunity that two sides of the Anatolian plateau offering in term of comparison. The Anatolian plateau – whatever attested forms are available – also took part to the investigation.

Overall, the perspective is also supported from ancient literary sources, from Hesiod to Theophrastus; which are a relief for search in Linguistics.

Nevertheless, the definition of «Mediterranean languages» after two centuries of endless refrains, it should be abandoned, as language contacts are more likely. Based on the fact that Bronze (later on replaced by Iron) was a key-factor in ancient time, a new Era led human being to reach great

<sup>1</sup> See scholion 673: δει την σεμίδαλιν . . . ἀθάρας : Ἦγουν κουρκούτης . ἀθάρα λέγεται ἡ ἰδιωτικῶς λεγομένη κουρκούτη : ἤγαγε δει αὐτήν

<sup>2</sup> Practically it is the Georgian კოლი, also made with wheat

distances.

This opportunity created more cross-linguistic interactions; far beyond our level of knowledge.

### **Литература**

1. Алироев И.Ю. Сравнительно-сопоставительный словарь отраслевой лексики Чеченского и Ингушского языков и диалектов. 1975. М.: Чечено-ингушское книжное издательство, 386 с.
2. Ганиева Ф.А. Хиналугского-Русский словарь. 2001. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 495 с.
3. Гасанова С.М., Ибрахимов Г.Х., Магомедова П.Т., Мейланова У.А., Талибов Б.Б. Сравнительно историческая лексика Дагестанских языков. 1971. М.: Наука, 293 с.
4. Исаков И.А., Халилов М.Ш. Гинухско-Русский словарь. 2005. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 616 с.
5. Исаков И.А., Халилов М.Ш. Гунзибско-Русский словарь. 2001. М.: Наука, 288 с.
6. Исмаилова Э.И. Русско-Рутульский словарь. 2011. М.: ИЯЛИ ДНЦ РАН, 201 с.
7. Касландзия В.А. Абхазско-Русский словарь. 2005. С.: Олма-пресс, 720 с.
8. Кибрик А.Е., Кодзасов С.В., Оловяникова И.П., Самедов Д.С. Арчинский язык: тексты и словари. 1977. М.: Изд-во Московского университета, 310 с.
9. Кибрик А.Е., Кодзасов С.В. Сопоставительное изучение дагестанских языков: Глагол. 1988. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 228 с.
10. Кибрик А.Е., Кодзасов С.В. Сопоставительное изучение дагестанских языков: Имя. Фонетика. 1990. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 366 с.
11. Магомедова П.Т. Тиндинско-Русский словарь. 2003. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 618 с.
12. Магомедова П.Т. Абдулаева И.А. Ахвахско-Русский словарь. 2007. М.: Изд-во ДНЦ РАН, 727 с.
13. Махмудова С.М. Закон экономии подлежащего в нарративном дискурсе [Электронный ресурс] Вестник Дагестанского государственного университета. Серия 2: Гуманитарные науки. 2012. № 3. С.18-20. URL: <http://www.vestnik.dgu.ru/Stat/18-20.pdf> (дата обращения 02.09.2020).
14. Мейланова У.А. Будухско-Русский словарь. 1984. М.: Наука, 253 с.
15. Мещанинов И.И. Аннотированный словарь Урартского (Биайнского) языка. 1978. Л.: Наука, 388 с.
16. Мусаев С.М. Лексика Даргинского языка (Сравнительно-исторический анализ). 1978. М.: Изд-во ДГУ, 107 с.
17. Рамазанов М.Р. Агульско-Русский словарь. 2010. М.: Лотос, 712 с.
18. Сефербеков Р.И. Боги-патроны ремесел у народов Дагестана [Электронный ресурс] // Вестник Дагестанского государственного университета. 2013. № 4. С. 61-66. URL: <http://vestnik.dgu.ru/Stat/v2013-4-10.pdf> (дата обращения: 18.09.2020).
19. Сулейманов Н.Д. Морфемная структура имен в группе лезгинских языков (вопросы исторической деривации) // Морфемный строй дагестанских языков: сб. статей. / Под ред. З.Г. Абдуллаев. 1988. М.: Дагестанский Филиал АН СССР Ордена Почета Институт Истории, Языка и Литературы им. Г. ЦАДАСЫ, С. 80-87.
20. Талибов Б. Гаджиев М. Лезгинско-Русский словарь. 1966. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 603 с.
21. Тардиво Дж. ЛабIALIZация в эгейских и нахско-дагестанских языках [Электронный ресурс] // Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 1. С. 109–120. DOI:10.17759/langt.2020070111

Тардиво Дж., Китселис Ф.  
На пороге новой эры. Лексическое сравнение языков  
Древней Анатолии и Левантии  
Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 3. С. 4–27.

Tardivo G., Kitselis Ph.  
On the Edge of a New Era. Lexical Comparison in the  
Ancient Anatolia and Levantine Area  
Language and Text. 2020. Vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 4–27.

22. Темирбулатова С.М. Иманная морфемика Хайдаского диалекта Даргинского языка // Морфемный строй дагестанских языков: сб. статей. / Под ред. З.Г. Абдуллаев. 1988. М.: Дагестанский Филиал АН СССР Ордена Почета Институт Истории, Языка и Литературы им. Г. ЦАДАСЫ, С. 73-79.
23. Хайдаков С.М. Полеводческие и животноводческие термины в дагестанских и нахских языках, восходящие к эпохе энеолита // Материалы первой сессии по сравнительно-историческому изучению иберийско-кавказских языков. 1969. М., С. 27-33.
24. Халилов М.Ш. Цезско-Русский словарь. 1999. М.: Академия, 454 с.
25. Ханмагомедов Г.К., Шалбузов К.Т. Табасаранско-Русский словарь. 2001. М.: Наука, 477 с.
26. Чумакина М.Э. Corbett G.G., Brown D., Kuilliam H. Словарь Арчинского языка. 2007. М.: ИЯЛИ ДНЦ РАН, 211 с.
27. Beekes R.S.P. Etymological Dictionary of Greek, Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series: in 10 vol. Vol.1. 2010. L.-B.: BRILL, 1808 p.
28. Beekes R.S.P. The origin of the Kabeiroi [Elektronnyi resurs] // Mnemosyne. 2004. Vol. 57. Issue 4. P. 465-477. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525042226101>
29. Cheung J. Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb. 2007. L. and B.: Brill, 600 p.
30. Camagni F. The Greeks Had a Word for It. An Outline of the Attestation, Distribution and Variability of Non-Indo-European Vocabulary in Ancient Greek, from Homer to Byzantium. 2018. U.K.: The University of Manchester, 354 p.
31. Campbell D.R. On the Theogonies of Hesiod and the Hurrians: An Exploration of the Dual Natures of Teššub and Kumarbi in: R. Creation and Chaos: A reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaos Kampf Hypothesis. 2013. I.: Winona Lake, P. 26-43.
32. Graves R. The Greek myths. 1955. E.: Penguin Books, 410 p.
33. Güterbock H.G. The Hittite version of the Hurrian Kumarbi myths: oriental forerunners of Hesiod [Elektronnyi resurs] // American Journal of Archaeology. 1948. Vol. 52. No. 1. P. 123-134. DOI: 10.2307/500560
34. Jahukyan G. Hayoc 'lezvi patmutyun: naxagcayin žamanakašrjan [History of the Armenian language: the preliterate period]. 1987. Y.: Academy press. P. 311-321
35. Johnston S.I. Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece. 1999. O.: University of California Press, 352 p
36. Klimov G.A. Etymological dictionary of the Kartvelian languages. 1998. B.-N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 504 p.
37. Martirosyan H. Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon. 2009. L. and B.: Brill, 988 p.
38. Nichols J. The Nakh-Daghestanian consonants correspondences // Current trends in Caucasian, East European and Inner Asian linguistics. 2003. A.-Ph.: John Benjamins Publishing Company. P. 207-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.246.14nic>
39. Nikolayev S.L., Starostin S.A. A North Caucasian etymological dictionary. 1994. M.: Asterisk, 1406 p.
40. Nilsson M.P. The Sickles of Kronos [Elektronnyi resurs] // Annual of the British School at Athens. 1951. № 46. P. 122 - 124. URL: [https://archive.org/stream/in.gov.ignca.3835/3835\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/in.gov.ignca.3835/3835_djvu.txt)
41. Odden D. Introducing phonology. 2005. C.: Cambridge University Press, 348 p.
42. Petrantoni G. On the Semitic origin of Greek ἄκολος // Semitica et Classica. 2019. Vol. 12.

Тардиво Дж., Китселис Ф.  
На пороге новой эры. Лексическое сравнение языков  
Древней Анатолии и Левантии  
Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 3. С. 4–27.

Tardivo G., Kitselis Ph.  
On the Edge of a New Era. Lexical Comparison in the  
Ancient Anatolia and Levantine Area  
Language and Text. 2020. Vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 4–27.

P. 227 - 228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.SEC.5.119660>

43. Pierini R. An alphabetic parallel for Mycenaean ma-ka // *Kadmos*. 2017. Vol. 56. P. 89-106. DOI: 10.1515/kadmos-2017-0004
44. Prance G., Nesbitt M. The cultural history of plants. 2005. N.Y.: Routledge, 460 p.
45. Schulze W. The Udi Gospels: Languages of the world. 2001. M.: University of Munich, 350 p.
46. Thanos C.A. Aristotle and Theophrastus on plant-animal interactions // *Plant-animal interactions in Mediterranean-type ecosystems*. 1994. Vol 31. P. 3-11. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0908-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0908-6_1)
47. Hort A. Theophrastus: Enquiry into Plants. 1916. L. and N.Y.: William Heinemann and G.P. Putnam's Sons, 475 p.
48. Einarson B. Theophrastus. *De Causis Plantarum*, 1976. C., MA: Harvard University Press, 361 p.
49. Van Dongen E.W.M. Studying external stimuli to the development of the ancient Aegean The 'Kingship in Heaven'. Theme from Kumarbi to Kronos via Anatolia. Dr. Sci. diss. London, 2010. 326 p.
50. Versnel H.S. Greek Myth and Ritual: the case of Kronos // *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. 1987. N.Y.: Routledge, P. 121-152.

### References

1. Aliroev I.Yu. Sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nyi slovar' otraslevoi leksiki Chechenskogo i Ingushskogo yazykov i dialektov. 1975. Makhachkala: Checheno-ingushskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 386 p. (In Russ.).
2. Ganieva F.A. Khinalugskogo-Russkii slovar'. 2001. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 495 p. (In Russ.).
3. Gasanova S.M, Ibrakhimov G.Kh., Magomedova P.T., Meilanova U.A., Talibov B.B. Sravnitel'no istoricheskaya leksika Dagestanskikh yazykov. 1971. Moscow: Nauka, 293 p. (In Russ.).
4. Isakov I.A., Khalilov M.Sh. Ginukhsko-Russkii slovar'. 2005. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 616 p. (In Russ.).
5. Isakov I.A., Khalilov M.Sh. Gunzibsko-Russkii slovar'. 2001. Moscow: Nauka, 288 p. (In Russ.).
6. Ismailova E.I. Russko-Rutul'skii slovar'. 2011. Makhachkala: IYaLI DNTs RAN, 201 p. (In Russ.).
7. Kaslandziya V.A. Abkhazsko-Russkii slovar'. 2005. Sukhum: Olma-press, 720 p. (In Russ.).
8. Kibrik A.E., Kodzasov C.B, Olovyannikova I.P., Samedov D.S. Archinskii yazyk: teksty i slovari. 1977. Moscow: Publ. Moskvskogo universiteta, 310 p. (In Russ.).
9. Kibrik A.E., Kodzasov C.B. Sopostavitel'noe izuchenie dagestanskikh yazykov: Glagol. 1988. Moscow: Publ. MGU, 228 p. (In Russ.).
10. Kibrik A.E., Kodzasov C.B. Sopostavitel'noe izuchenie dagestanskikh yazykov: Imya. Fonetika. 1990. Moscow: Publ. MGU, 366 p. (In Russ.).
11. Magomedova P.T. Tindinsko-Russkii slovar'. 2003. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 618 p. (In Russ.).
12. Magomedova P.T. Abdulaeva I.A. Akhvakhsko-Russkii slovar'. 2007. Makhachkala: Publ. DNTs RAN, 727 p. (In Russ.).

13. Makhmudova S.M. Zakon ekonomii podlezhashchego v narrativnom diskurse [The law of economy of the subject in narrative discourse]. *Vestnik Dagestanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2: Gumanitarnye nauki = Bulletin of the Dagestan State University. Series 2: Humanities*, 2012, no. 3, pp. 18-20. Available at: <http://www.vestnik.dgu.ru/Stat/18-20.pdf> (Accessed 02.09.2020). (In Russ.).
14. Meilanova U.A. *Budukhsko-Russkii slovar'*. 1984. Moscow: Nauka, 253 p. (In Russ.).
15. Meshchaninov I.I. *Annotirovannyi slovar' Urart'skogo (Biainskogo) yazyka*. 1978. Leningrad: Nauka, 388 p. (In Russ.).
16. Musaev S.M. *Leksika Darginskogo yazyka (Srvnitel'no-istoricheskii analiz)*. 1978. Makhachkala: Publ. DGU, 107 p. (In Russ.).
17. Ramazanov M.R. *Agul'sko-Russkii slovar'*. 2010. Makhachkala: Lotos, 712 p. (In Russ.).
18. Seferbekov R.I. Bogi-patrony remesel u narodov Dagestana. *Vestnik Dagestanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2013, no. 4, pp. 61-66. Available at: <http://vestnik.dgu.ru/Stat/v2013-4-10.pdf> (Accessed: 18.09.2020). (In Russ.).
19. Suleimanov N.D. Morfemnaya struktura imen v gruppe lezginskikh yazykov (voprosy istoricheskoi derivatsii). Morfemnyi stroi dagestanskikh yazykov. Z.G. Abdullaev (eds.). 1988. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii Filial AN SSSR Ordena Pocheta Institut Istorii, Yazyka i Literatury im. G. TsADASY, pp. 80-87. (In Russ.).
20. Talibov B. Gadzhiev M. *Lezginsko-Russkii slovar'*. 1966. Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 603 p. (In Russ.).
21. Tardivo Dzh. Labializatsiya v egeiskikh i nakhsko-dagestanskikh yazykakh [Labialization in Aegean and Nakh-Daghestanian Languages]. *Yazyk i tekst. = Language and Text*, 2020. Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 109–120. DOI:10.17759/langt.2020070111
22. Temirbulatova S.M. Imannaya morfemika Khaidaskogo dialekta Darginskogo yazyka. *Morfemnyi stroi dagestanskikh yazykov*. Z.G. Abdullaev (eds.). 1988. Makhachkala: Dagestanskii Filial AN SSSR Ordena Pocheta Institut Istorii, Yazyka i Literatury im. G. TsADASY, pp. 73-79.
23. Khaidakov S.M. Polevodcheskie i zhitovnovodcheskie terminy v dagestanskikh i nakhskikh yazykakh, voskhodyashchie k epokhe eneolita. *Materialy pervoi sessii po sravnitel'no-istoricheskomu izucheniyu iberiisko-kavkazskikh yazykov*. 1969. Makhachkala, pp. 27-33.
24. Khalilov M.Sh. *Tsezsko-Russkii slovar'*. 1999. Moscow: Akademiya, 454 p.
25. Khanmagomedov G.K., Shalbusov K.T. *Tabasaransko-Russkii slovar'*. 2001. Moscow: Nauka, 477 p.
26. Chumakina M.E. Corbett G.G., Brown D., Kuilliam H. *Slovar' Archinskogo yazyka*. 2007. Makhachkala: IYaLI DNTs RAN, 211 p.
27. Beekes R.S.P. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series: in 10 vol. Vol.1. 2010. Leiden-Boston: BRILL, 1808 p.
28. Beekes R.S.P. The origin of the Kabeiroi. *Mnemosyne*, 2004. Vol. 57. Issue 4. pp. 465-477. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568525042226101>
29. Cheung J. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. 2007. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 600 p.
30. Camagni F. *The Greeks Had a Word for It. An Outline of the Attestation, Distribution and Variability of Non-Indo-European Vocabulary in Ancient Greek, from Homer to Byzantium*. 2018. United Kingdom: The University of Manchester, 354 p.

31. Campbell D.R. On the Theogonies of Hesiod and the Hurrians: An Exploration of the Dual Natures of Teššub and Kumarbi in: R. Creation and Chaos: A reconsideration of Hermann Gunkel's Chaos Kampf Hypothesis. 2013. Indiana: Winona Lake, pp. 26-43.
32. Graves R. The Greek myths. 1955. Edinburgh: Penguin Books, 410 p.
33. Güterbock H.G. The Hittite version of the Hurrian Kumarbi myths: oriental forerunners of Hesiod. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1948. Vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 123-134. DOI: 10.2307/500560
34. Jahukyan G. Hayoc 'lezvi patmutyun: naxagcayin žamanakaštjan [History of the Armenian language: the preliterate period]. 1987. Yerevan: Academy press. pp. 311-321
35. Johnston S.I. Restless Dead: Encounters Between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece. 1999. Ohio: University of California Press, 352 p.
36. Klimov G.A. Etymological dictionary of the Kartvelian languages. 1998. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 504 p.
37. Martirosyan H. Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon. 2009. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 988 p.
38. Nichols J. The Nakh-Daghestanian consonants correspondences. *Current trends in Caucasian, East European and Inner Asian linguistics*, 2003. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 207-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.246.14nic>
39. Nikolayev S.L., Starostin S.A. A North Caucasian etymological dictionary. 1994. Moscow: Asterisk, 1406 p.
40. Nilsson M.P. The Sickie of Kronos. *Annual of the British School at Athens*, 1951. No. 46, pp. 122 - 124. Available at: [https://archive.org/stream/in.gov.ignca.3835/3835\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/in.gov.ignca.3835/3835_djvu.txt) (Accessed: 18.09.2020).
41. Odden D. Introducing phonology. 2005. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 348 p.
42. Petrantoni G. On the Semitic origin of Greek ἄκολος. *Semitica et Classica*, 2019. Vol. 12, pp. 227 - 228. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.SEC.5.119660>
43. Pierini R. An alphabetic parallel for Mycenaean ma-ka. *Kadmos*, 2017. Vol. 56, pp. 89-106. DOI: 10.1515/kadmos-2017-0004
44. Prance G., Nesbitt M. The cultural history of plants. 2005. New York: Routledge, 460 p.
45. Schulze W. The Udi Gospels: Languages of the world. 2001. München: University of Munich, 350 p.
46. Thanos C.A. Aristotle and Theophrastus on plant-animal interactions. *Plant-animal interactions in Mediterranean-type ecosystems*, 1994. Vol. 31, pp. 3-11. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0908-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-0908-6_1)
47. Hort A. Theophrastus: Enquiry into Plants. 1916. London and New York: William Heinemann and G.P. Putnam's Sons, 475 p.
48. Einarson B. Theophrastus. De Causis Plantarum, 1976. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 361 p.
49. Van Dongen E.W.M. Studying external stimuli to the development of the ancient Aegean The 'Kingship in Heaven'. Theme from Kumarbi to Kronos via Anatolia. Dr. Sci. diss. London, 2010. 326 p.
50. Versnel H.S. Greek Myth and Ritual: the case of Kronos. *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, 1987. New York: Routledge, pp. 121-152.

*Тардиво Дж., Китселис Ф.*  
На пороге новой эры. Лексическое сравнение языков  
Древней Анатолии и Левантии  
Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 3. С. 4–27.

*Tardivo G., Kitselis Ph.*  
On the Edge of a New Era. Lexical Comparison in the  
Ancient Anatolia and Levantine Area  
Language and Text. 2020. Vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 4–27.

***Информация об авторах***

*Джампаоло Тардиво*, Преподаватель лингвистики, Падуанский университет, Италия, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X>, e-mail: [gtardivo@gmail.com](mailto:gtardivo@gmail.com)

*Филиппос Китселис*, Преподаватель лингвистики, Падуанский университет, Италия, ORCID: [ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7376-689X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7376-689X), e-mail: [bboyflipper@gmail.com](mailto:bboyflipper@gmail.com)

***Information about the authors***

*Tardivo Giampaolo*, Professor of linguistics, Padua State University, Italy, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X>, e-mail: [gtardivo@gmail.com](mailto:gtardivo@gmail.com);

*Philippos Kitselis*, Professor of Linguistics, Padua State University, Italy, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7376-689X>, e-mail: [bboyflipper@gmail.com](mailto:bboyflipper@gmail.com)

Получена 01.09.2020

Принята в печать 15.09.2020

Received 01.09.2020

Accepted 01.09.2020