

JOURNAL of LANGUAGE RELATIONSHIP

No 4
2015



RSUH/RGGU BULLETIN

№ 4 (13)

Academic Journal

Series:

Philology. Journal of Language Relationship

Moscow 2015

ВЕСТНИК РГГУ

№ 4 (13)

Научный журнал

Серия

«Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»

Москва 2015

Редакционный совет серий «Вестника РГГУ»

Е.И. Пивовар, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (председатель)

Н.И. Архипова, д-р экон. н., проф. (РГГУ), А.Б. Безбородов, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), Х. Варгас (Ун-т Кали, Колумбия), А.Д. Воскресенский, д-р полит. н., проф. (МГИМО (У) МИД России), Е. Вятр (Варшавский ун-т, Польша), Дж. Дебарделебен (Карлтонский ун-т, Канада), В.А. Дыбо, акад. РАН, д-р филол. н. (РГГУ), В.И. Заботкина, д-р филол. н., проф. (РГГУ), В.В. Иванов, акад. РАН, д-р филол. н., проф. (РГГУ; Калифорнийский ун-т Лос-Анджелеса, США), Э. Камия (Ун-т Тачибана г. Киото, Япония), Ш. Карнер (Ин-т по изучению последствий войн им. Л. Больцмана, Австрия), С.М. Каштанов, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИВИ РАН), В. Кейдан (Ун-т Карло Бо, Италия), Ш. Кечкемети (Национальная Школа Хартий, Сорбонна, Франция), И. Клюканов (Восточно-Вашингтонский ун-т, США), В.П. Козлов, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ВНИИДАД), М. Коул (Калифорнийский ун-т Сан-Диего, США), Е.Е. Кравцова, д-р психол. н., проф. (РГГУ), М. Крэмер (Гарвардский ун-т, США), А.П. Логунов, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), Д. Ломар (Ун-т Кельна, Германия), Б. Луайер (Ин-т геополитики, Париж-VIII, Франция), С. Масамичи (Ун-т Чуо, Япония), В.И. Молчанов, д-р филос. н., проф. (РГГУ), В.Н. Незамайкин, д-р экон. н., проф. (Финансовый ун-т при Правительстве РФ), П. Новак (Ун-т Белостока, Польша), Ю.С. Пивоваров, акад. РАН, д-р полит. н., проф. (ИНИОН РАН), Е. ван Поведская (Ун-т Сантьяго-де-Компостела, Испания), С. Рапич (Ун-т Вупперталь, Германия), М. Сасаки (Ун-т Чуо, Япония), И.С. Смирнов, канд. филол. н. (РГГУ), В.А. Тишков, акад. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИЭА РАН), Ж.Т. Тощенко, чл.-кор. РАН, д-р филос. н., проф. (РГГУ), Д. Фоглесонг (Ун-т Ратгерс, США), И. Фолтыс (Политехнический ин-т г. Ополе, Польша), Т.И. Хорхордина, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ), А.О. Чубарьян, акад. РАН, д-р ист. н., проф. (ИВИ РАН), Т.А. Шаклеина, д-р полит. н., проф. (МГИМО (У) МИД России), П.П. Шкаренков, д-р ист. н., проф. (РГГУ)

Серия «Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»

Редакционная коллегия серии

В.А. Дыбо, гл. ред., акад. РАН, д-р филол. н. (РГГУ), Г.С. Старостин, зам. гл. ред., канд. филол. н., доц. (РГГУ), Т.А. Михайлова, отв. сек., д-р филол. н., проф. (МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова), К.В. Бабаев, д-р филол. н., доц. (РГГУ, ИВ РАН), А.В. Дыбо, д-р филол. н. (ИЯз РАН), А.С. Касьян, д-р филол. н. (ИЯз РАН), С.В. Куланда, канд. ист. н. (ИВ РАН), М.А. Молина (ИЯз РАН), И.С. Якубович, канд. филол. н. (РГГУ)

Ответственные за выпуск: Г.С. Старостин, А.С. Касьян, М.А. Молина

УДК 800(05)
ББК 80/84я5

Вопросы языкового родства: Международный научный журнал / Рос. гос. гуманитар. ун-т; Рос. акад. наук. Ин-т языкознания; под ред. В. А. Дыбо. — М., 2015. — № 4(13). — x + 106 с. — (Вестник РГГУ. Серия «Филология. Вопросы языкового родства»: Научный журнал).

Journal of Language Relationship: International Scientific Periodical / Russian State University for the Humanities; Russian Academy of Sciences. Institute of Linguistics; Ed. by V. A. Dybo. — Moscow, 2015. — No. 4(13). — x + 106 p. — (RSUH/RGGU Bulletin. Series: Philology. Journal of Language Relationship: Academic Journal).

ISSN 2073-6320

<http://www.jolr.ru/>
journal@jolr.ru

Дополнительные знаки: С. Г. Болотов
Add-on symbols by S. G. Bolotov

Электронная версия данного издания является собственностью издательства,
и ее распространение без согласия издательства запрещается.

Подписано в печать 15.12.2015. Формат 60×90/8.
Бум. офсетная.
Печать офсетная. Тираж 1050 экз.
Заказ №

Отпечатано в полном соответствии с качеством
предоставленного оригинал-макета
в «Наша Полиграфия», г. Калуга, ул. Грабцевское шоссе, 126
Лиц. ПЛД № 42-29 от 23.12.99

Table of Contents / Содержание

Table of Contents / Содержание	vii
Contributors / Сведения об авторах	viii
Note for Contributors / Будущим авторам	ix

Articles / Статьи

<i>Sergei L. Nikolaev. Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan.</i> Part 2: Algonquian-Wakashan sound correspondences	289
[С. Л. Николаев. К реконструкции алгонкино-вакашского праязыка. Ч. 2: Алгонкино-вакашские звуковые соответствия]	
<i>Miguel Valério. Linear A <i>du-pu₂-re</i>, Hittite <i>tabarna</i> and their alleged relatives revisited</i>	329
[Мигель Валерио. Линейное A <i>du-pu₂-re</i> , хеттское <i>tabarna</i> и их гипотетические когнаты]	
<i>А. И. Коган. Дардские языки и пятидесятисловная лексикостатистика</i>	355
[Anton Kogan. Dardic languages and lexicostatistics (the 50-item wordlist approach)]	
<i>М. Н. Саенко. История далматинского и балкано-романских языков с точки зрения лексикостатистики</i>	371
[Mikhail Saenko. History of the Dalmatian and Balkan Romance languages from the lexicostatistical point of view]	

Book Reviews / Рецензии

William H. BAXTER, Laurent SAGART. Old Chinese. A New Reconstruction, 2014 (George Starostin / Г. С. Старостин)	383
Ranko MATASOVIĆ. Slavic Nominal Word-Formation. Proto-Indo-European Origins and Historical Development, 2014 (Ж. Ж. Варбот / Zh. Zh. Varbot)	390

Toward the reconstruction of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan. Part 2: Algonquian-Wakashan sound correspondences

The second part of the present study, continuing an earlier publication by the author in a previous number of JLR, includes: an inventory of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes with a list of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes with references to Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan roots (§2); a comparative Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan dictionary that includes more than 400 root reconstructions, with relevant examples from Proto-Wakashan, Proto-Nivkh and Proto-Algic data, also including Proto-Nivkh-Algic roots (§3); an index of lexical meanings for the Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan and Proto-Nivkh-Algic roots (§4). The main innovative aspect of the present article is the formal demonstration of genetic relationship between Nivkh, Algic, and Wakashan languages, conducted by means of the standard comparative method, i. e. establishing a system of regular sound correspondences between the vocabularies of the compared languages.

Keywords: Algonquian-Wakashan languages, Nivkh-Algonquian languages, Algic languages, Wakashan languages, Chimakuan-Wakashan languages, Nivkh language, historical phonology, comparative dictionary.

1. Introduction

In the first part of the present paper (Nikolaev 2015) it was stated that a genetic relationship between Proto-Wakashan, Proto-Nivkh, and Proto-Algic may be demonstrated by means of the standard comparative method, i. e. the establishment of a system of regular sound correspondences between the compared vocabularies. Table 4 in Nikolaev 2015: 30 displays the reconstructed system of Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonemes and their reflexes in separate families (PW, PN_i, PAlg), but lexical illustration of regular sound correspondences has been limited in that part, for volume reasons, to specific subsets of the “basic” and “cultural” lexicons. Conversely, the second part of the paper will be dedicated to presenting the bulk of the evidence in the form of a comprehensive Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan comparative vocabulary (§3).

2. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonological inventory

The Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan phonological inventory is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Definite reconstructions that contain specific PAW phonemes and ambiguous reconstructions where one of 2 alternate protophonemes may have been present (optional variants are divided with the tilde sign) are listed after the Tables 1 & 2. Numbers refer to the Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan vocabulary (§3). Plain and glottalized sonorants m/m', n/n', r/r', etc. (that differ only in PW and perhaps in PChi) and short/long variants of vowels are given jointly.

3. Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan lexicon

Phonetically, the Proto-Nivkh-Algic (PNA) reconstructions would not differ from the hypothetical Proto-Algonquian-Wakashan (PAW) forms that chronologically precede them; therefore, PNA forms in the list below are interspersed with PAW ones. PNA forms that have their Proto-Salishan counterparts may be considered as PAW forms that were lost in Proto-Wakashan.

The Chimakuan languages (Quileute and the scarcely documented Chemakum) belong to the same phylum as Wakashan. However, the Quileute material still requires further processing in its historical aspect; therefore, only the most important Quileute and Chemakum data are given in the present paper.

There are numerous lexical similarities between Proto-Salishan and PAW, including those within the “basic lexicon” (Nikolaev 2015, §4). However, data for establishing regular sound correspondences between PAW and PS remain scarce, and so the Salish-Algonquian-Wakashan relationship stays in the realm of speculation. In the list below I quote Salishan forms as external comparative data.

Whereas modern forms of the Wakashan and Nivkh languages differ insignificantly from the PW and PN_i forms, sound changes in the Algic family have been so substantial that cognates are frequently unrecognizable to “the naked eye”. For this reason the Proto-Algic and Proto-Algonquian reconstructions are provided below with examples of their reflexes in certain attested languages.

In protoforms the tilde symbol (~) denotes alternative variants of reconstruction, rather than actual variance in the proto-language. If reconstruction of two (rarely three) proto-phonemes in the same position is possible, the alternative variants are given in parentheses. For example, PAW **gilV* (~ *ä*, *l*) ‘three’: Quil. *q̣ẉ:ʔl*, PN_i **ce-*, PAlg **ni-khl-* means that attested reflexes permit us to reconstruct either PAW **i* or **ä*, either **l* or **l’*.

Reconstruction of PAW glottal features of stops/affricates (voiceless / voiced / glottalized) in roots containing two stops or affricates is somewhat difficult, due to assimilation/dissimilation of glottal features in the history of many of the concerned languages; therefore, several roots have optional protoforms. This also applies to labialization of velars and uvulars. In such cases alternate protoforms are divided with the tilde symbol. Thus, cf. PAW **k’i:wɨV* ~ **gi:wɨV* ‘to freeze, cold’: here PW **k’in-* ‘to feel cold’ reflects PAW **k’-*, PN_i **kɨɨ-* ‘to freeze, cool down’ reflects PAW **g-* and PA **ko:n-* ‘snow’ may reflect either of the two proto-phonemes; or PAW **bu:* ~ **pu:* ‘to go out, leave’, where PW **bu:-* ‘to leave, flee, abandon’ reflects PAW **b-*, but PN_i **phu-* ‘to go out/away’ reflects PAW **p-* and PA **papa:-m-* ‘to go about, pass by’ [reduplication] may reflect PAW **p-*, **b-*, **p’-*.

Potential metatheses are represented in the same way; thus, PAW **hoʔVq’A* ~ **hoq’VʔA* ‘hole’ > PWS **ʔaq’iʔ*, **q’aq’iʔ* ‘cave’ vs. PN_i **holq-e-* ‘deepening, hole’, PA **-a:ʔak-* ‘hole’.

Reflexes of the clusters “sonorant + obstruent” (**nC*, **lC*, **rC*, etc.) are rather unstable, and sometimes I reconstruct them on the basis of their presence in just one of the families.

Within the reconstructed forms, capital letters should be decoded as follows: *A* = indefinite mid/back vowel, *C* = any sibilant (alveolar) or hushing (palato-alveolar) affricate, *E* = indefinite front vowel, *K* = any velar stop, *L* = any lateral, *N* = **n* ~ **n̥* ~ **ŋ*, *O* = **u* ~ **o* (~ **i*), *P* = any labial stop, *Q* = any uvular stop, *S* = **s* ~ **š*, *V* = any vowel, *X* = any velar or uvular fricative. This notation is used when sound correspondences are generally regular, but available comparative material is insufficient to definitively choose one particular PAW phoneme over another. Example:

**n’OLK^(w)V* (~ *n̥*) ‘hand, arm’ • PW **-n’uk^w* (suff.) ‘in hand’ • PA **-neʔk-* ‘hand, arm’

Here either *n'* or *n'* can be reconstructed (since the Nivkh data are absent); the symbol *O* denotes a choice between **i* and **u*; the symbol **L* denotes the possibility of reconstructing either **λ*, **λ'*, **λ'*, or **l*; the symbol **K^(w)* denotes a choice between **k^(w)*, **g^(w)*, and **k'^(w)*.

Many PAW roots seem to have “inversed” allomorphs **CVCV* and **?VCCV* (rarely **hVCCV*). The latter structures may represent “incorporated” root forms that were originally used as suffixal variants. Reflexes of the *?VCCV*-type allomorphs prevail in PNA. The reconstructed allomorphs of both types are divided with the double tilde (*≈*): **č'Ak^wV ≈ *?Ač'k^wV* ‘earth, dirt’, **č'ak'E ≈ *?ač'k'E* ‘tail (of fish)’, etc.

Another type of alternation, namely **CVCV- ~ *CCV-*, is not infrequent in Nivkh (e. g., PNi **choŋq-ř*, **chqin-ř* ‘polecat, weasel’ < PNA **čo:nVKA*; PNi **ciŋ-r*, **cxə-r* ‘tree’ < PAW **zik'^wE*, etc.); most probably, this is just an internal Nivkh phenomenon, not projectible onto deeper historical levels.

The voiced lateral stop is provisionally denoted here as *λ*, as against Nikolaev 2015, where it was marked as *L*. This replacement has been made in order to avoid graphical confusion of *λ* (“voiced lateral stop”) and *L* (“any lateral”).

Many of the items below are provided with short comments, although this does not extend to the examples that have already been commented upon in Nikolaev 2015. Some of the PAW and PNA protoforms have been improved upon during the preparation of this part of the article, and are slightly different from those quoted in Nikolaev 2015.

1. PNA **?aLVmV* (~ *ä*, *m'*) ‘dog’ • PNi **ajm* ‘dog (taboo)’ [instead of regular ***(a)lam*; irregularity of the PNi form may be explained by a “tabooistic” mutation of the original phonetics]; NiY **laamə* *O* ‘dog’ • PA **aŋem-w-*, *-(a)?ŋem-w-* ‘dog’ [Cree *atim*, Men. *anɛ:m*, Ab. *alem-ós* ‘dog’; Cree *wa:p-astim* ‘white dog’, etc.] || Nikolaev 2015: 47.
2. PAW **?arV* (~ *ä*) ‘blood’ • PWN **?al-k^w-* ‘blood’; **?al-x^w-* ‘to bleed’ • Quil. *ti-č-* ‘blood’, *ti:-* ‘to bleed’ • PNi **ŋ-ar* ‘blood’ ◇ Cf. PSI **m-il'-k* ‘blood’, PS **m-il* ‘to bleed’ [see PNA **ŋV* #268] || Nikolaev 2015: 36.
3. PAW **?AŋV* ‘eye’ • PW **G-aŋ-* ‘eye’ [with prefix of inalienable possession]; PWS (suff.) **(k)s-uŋ-*, *-(k)s-iŋ-* ‘eye’ • PAlg **-ŋeŋ* in **čep-ŋeŋ-*, **-čp-ŋeŋ-* ‘eyelash’ ◇ Cf. PS **-ŋ* in **cap-ŋ* ‘eyebrow, eyelash’ || Nikolaev 2015: 38, 48.
4. PAW **?A:sV* ‘face’ • PW **G-as-* ‘eye’ [with prefix of inalienable possession]; **-as*, **-ŋaw-as* (suff.) ‘cheek’ • PAlg **-a:s-*, **-e-eŋ-s-* (suff.) ‘head’ [PA **-i:ŋ-eŋ-* ‘head hair’, Wi. *-as ~ -iš ~ -uš* (suff.) ‘head’] ◇ Cf. PS **m-ŋus* ‘face’, suff. **-us* ‘face, eye’.
5. PAW **?A:wVN^wE* ‘duck’ • PWN **?anq-* ‘duck (generic)’ • Quil. *díq'diq* ‘duck, mallard’ • PNi **awŋk* (~ *ə*) ‘duck sp.’ ◇ Cf. PSC **muŋq^w* ‘duck (generic)’ || Nikolaev 2015: 53.
7. PAW **?a:gV ~ *ya:gV* (~ *a:*) ‘all’ • PWN **?a:g-* ‘all, in full, every, any, each’ • PA **wi:-yak-* ‘some sort, all sorts’ [Men. *we:yak*, Oj. *wi:yak*, etc.] ◇ Cf. PIS **yax* ‘many, all’.
8. PNA **?a:ndVXKE* (~ *ä:*, *t'*) ‘raven, crow’ • PNi **atk*, **atk-ak* ‘raven, crow’ • PA **a:nte:hkw-* ‘crow’ [Oj. *a:nte:kkw*, Shawnee *a:te:kw-a*, etc.].
9. PNA **?a:XpV* (~ *ä:*) ‘mouth (of animal)’ • PNi **av-ŋ* ‘mouth (of animal), palate’ • P **-a:hp-itk-an-* ‘jaw, chin’ [Cree *-a:p-isk-an*, Men. *-a:hp-ehk-an*, Ab. *od-špp-ihk-án*, etc.].
10. PAW **?änV* ‘year, season’ • PW **-ŋin-χ* (suff.) ‘year, season’; PWN **hi:-ŋan-χ* ‘summer’ • PNi **aŋ* ‘year’; **h-on-f* ‘spring (season)’ • PAlg **-en-* ‘season’ in PA **ni:p-en-* ‘summer’, Yu. *kiš-en-* ‘be summer; summer’ [lit. ‘warm season’] ◇ Cf. PS **-án-ax^w* (suff.) ‘season, year’ || Nikolaev 2015: 46, 54.
11. PAW **?ä:IVw'adVχE* ‘cloud’ • PWS **ti:w'aχ-* ‘get cloudy’ • PNi **lax* ‘cloud’ • PAlg **?a:lwadek-w-*, **?a:lewdek-w-* (~ *kh*) ‘cloud’ [PA **aletkw-* and **watkw-* ‘cloud’, Yu. *lewkw-*, *rewkw-* ‘cloudy, misty’; Wi. *ʔalúk-š* ‘shadow’] || Nikolaev 2015: 37.

Linear A *du-pu₂-re*, Hittite *tabarna* and their alleged relatives revisited *

This article intends to be a comprehensive reassessment of a previous hypothesis connecting the Linear A sequence *du-pu₂-re* and the Hittite royal title *t/labarna-*, as well as a series of Anatolian words, toponyms and personal names allegedly related to the latter and belonging to the semantic sphere of power. In the course of this survey, several Anatolian onomastic elements, mostly dated to the 1st millennium BCE, are disconnected from the Minoan sequence and the Hittite title, and receive new explanations (with various levels of security) in the framework of the Luwic (IE) languages. Likewise, I separate *Labranios* (a Cypriot epithet of Zeus) from Hittite *labarna-* and argue instead for the old theory that it is an adaptation of the Phoenician name of Mount Lebanon. The conclusion of this reassessment is that, while there may have been a Luwian noun **tapara-* ‘rule’, there are no independent grounds for linking any Anatolian material to Minoan *du-pu₂-re* and no basis for assuming the latter meant ‘master’ (or similar).

Keywords: Linear A, Tabarna, Labarna, Luwic languages, Anatolian onomastics, Cilician names.

1. Introduction

Although the language of Linear A (LA), the logo-syllabic script of Minoan Crete, still eludes interpretation, the writing system itself cannot be considered wholly undeciphered. Decades of scholarship have shown that a significant number of syllabograms have phonetic values analogous to their Linear B (LB) counterparts. Particularly, through a set of independent contextual tests Duhoux (1989) has proved this to be the case with at least 30 syllabograms.¹ Inevitably, since LB is the product of an adaptation of LA to another language (Mycenaean Greek), which surely possessed a different phonemic inventory, we can hardly expect all phonetic values to be exact matches. They can, nevertheless, act as guiding phonetic approximations.

In a previous work (Valério 2007), I have dealt with a LA sequence which in this way reads *du-pu₂-re*. It is found self-standing once (KO Za 1) and elsewhere in compounds, namely *(j)a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu₂-re* (PK Za 8 and 15) and *pa-ta-da-du-pu₂-re* (HT Zb 160) (ibid.: 8–9, citing

* The content of this article derives mainly from a presentation made at the 1st session of the workshop ‘Luwic’ *Dialects: Inheritance and Diffusion* (University of Barcelona, October 23, 2013). The final text benefits from various comments, references and suggestions by I.-X. Adiego (U. Barcelona), A. Kassian (Russian Academy of Sciences), C. Melchert (UCLA), I. Yakubovich (U. Marburg) and J. G. Younger (U. Kansas). Thanks are also owed to R. Oreshko (U. Hamburg) for sending me a copy of his recent work. As usual, the responsibility for the views here contained, as well as any mistakes and shortcomings, is mine alone.

¹ These included a survey of the positional frequency of the suspected vowel (V) syllabograms, and listing sign alternations in LA-B pairs of sequences and within LA itself. Duhoux was cautious about the results: he considered different levels of security for each of the phonetic values depending on how many contextual tests confirmed them.

GORILA). I hypothesized that the compound $(j)a-di-ki-te-te-du-pu_2-re$ was to be segmented $(j)a=di-ki-te-te=du-pu_2-re$ and signified a periphrastic divine name: ‘(to?) the Diktaian Master’, or similar. Thus, $du-pu_2-re$ would be the Minoan word for ‘master, lord’. The basis for this interpretation included three morphophonological and contextual facts: (1) the existence of a Minoan stem $du-pu_2-r-$ ($> da-pu_2-r-$), which I linked with LB $da-pu_2(2)-ri-to-$ = alphabetical $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ (with a well-known non-Greek suffix $-v\theta\omicron\varsigma$), i.e. ‘labyrinth’;² the similarity between $(j)a=di-ki-te-te=$ and the name of Mount Dikte, aided by the fact the compounds with this string are limited to stone libation tables found at or near the Minoan peak sanctuary of Petsofas (near Palaikastro, East Crete), which later in the Archaic period was devoted precisely to Diktaian Zeus (i.e. Zeus born on Mount Dikte); beyond phonetic resemblance, this supported the interpretation of $(j)a=di-ki-te-te^o$ as ‘Diktaian’; (3) the attestation of LB $di-ka-ta-jo\ di-we$ ‘Diktaian Zeus’ at Knossos, showing a Late Bronze Age Cretan background for this deity. However, on the side of semantics, the grounds to propose ‘master’ as the meaning of $du-pu_2-re$ were admittedly more fragile. I drew upon Evans’ old idea that $\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\nu\theta\omicron\varsigma$ was the ‘royal palace’ of Knossos (see §2) and the presumable similarity of $da-pu_2(2)-r/\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\upsilon}\rho-$ to one of the titles of the Hittite kings, $tabarna-/labarna-$, as well as a series of words and onomastic elements from Anatolia and Cyprus presumably related to the latter and belonging to the sphere of (human and divine) power.

In this I followed mainly the work of Yakubovich (2002) on Hitt. $t/labarna-$ and its connections. The title has been among the most hotly debated items of the Hittite vocabulary, with contending interpretations of its etymology, Indo-European (IE) and non-IE, including proposals of a traveling contact word (*Wanderwort*) (see §10). Although at present the author thinks it is impossible to quantify the plausibility of the competing IE and non-IE hypotheses (pers. comm.), Yakubovich (2002) contains the most extensive argument favorable to the migrating word hypothesis, which provided the basis for the interpretation in Valério (2007). Starting with the Luwo-Hittite form $(:)tapar-$ ‘to rule’, long thought to be related to Hitt. $t/labarna-$, Yakubovich compiled a dossier of possible regional connections:

- 1.1) Luwo-Hitt. $tapar(r)iya-$ ‘to rule’ and derivatives;
- 1.2) Hieroglyphic Luwian LEPUS+ $ra/i-i(a)-$ ‘authority’ and derivatives;
- 1.3) The Hellenistic Cilician personal names $\tau\beta\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma$ and $\tau\beta\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\omega\varsigma$ (presumably reflecting $*Tapara-zitali$ and $*Tapara-muwa+zi$, respectively)
- 1.4) The Lycian personal name $Dapara-$ = $\Lambda\Lambda\text{Π}\text{Α}\text{Ρ}\text{Α}\Sigma$;
- 1.5) *Labranios* ($\Lambda\text{AB}\text{PAN}\text{IO}\Sigma$), an epithet of Zeus in Cyprus;

² An identical suggestion (unknown to me until very recently) was made by Billigmeier (1989), but unfortunately it was limited to an abstract, with no follow-up paper ever being published (thanks are owed to B. Davis and J. Younger for helping me locate this reference). My own argument (Valério 2007: 7–8) was based on the following: LA $du-pu_2-re$ is reminiscent of LB $du-pu_2-ra-zo$ (KN V[3] 419.1) and $da-pu_2-ra-zo$ (EL 1 1.2), two non-Greek personal names or, rather, two variants of the same name. The Cu-CV-/Ca-CV- alternation is seen in two well-known LA-B pairs: LA $ku-pa_3-nu$ (HT 1, 3, 42, 49, 88, 117, 122) / $ku-pa_3-na-tu$ (HT 119.3), attested in likely Minoan lists of persons, and the non-Greek personal names $ka-pa_3-no$ (KN As[2] 1516.16) / $ka-pa_3-na-to$ (KN Df 1219) in LB tablets from Knossos. Since $-zo$ is a common ending of non-Greek names in the LB records from Knossos, it seems that the names above and LB $da-pu_2(2)-ri-to-$ contain a Minoan element $du-pu_2-r^o$. The most plausible explanation for the vocalism is that of Davis (2014: 242–243): $du-pu_2-r-$ reflects Min. /DūPūr-/ with an unaccented short /u/ that tended to be centralized to a schwa, whence /DəPūr-/ , transcribed in LB as $da-pu_2-r-$, with a (I use “D” and “P” to represent what in my opinion are undetermined dental and labial obstruents). The LA texts are cited according to GORILA and those of LB follow *DocMyc*².

- 1.6) The epithet of Zeus Labraundos (Λάβραυνδος), at the city of Labraunda, in Caria (with several variant spellings: ΛΑΒΡΑΥΥΝΔΟΣ ΛΑΒΡΑΙΥΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΑΥΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΙΝΔΟΣ; ΛΑΒΡΑΕΝΔΟΣ; Λάβραυνδος; ΛΑΒΡΕΝΔΟΣ; and later Λαβρα[ν]δέυς)
- 1.7) LB *da-pu/pu₂-ri-to-* = alphabetical Greek λαβύρινθος

At the time, the author suggested that these forms were all derivatives of migrating South Anatolian */*daBar-*/ ‘to rule’ and */*daBarā-*/ ‘power?’, /*ð*/ presumably corresponding to a voiced coronal fricative /*ð*/. Thus, Lyc. *Dapara* would be a direct product of */*daBarā-*/, while the Luwian forms would have undergone the development */*daBar-*/ > */*taBar-*/. The lambdacist transcription of *Dapara* as Grk. Λαπαρας would reflect this alien /*ð*/, as would the *d* ~ *λ* alternation in *da-pu(2)-ri-to-/λαβύρινθος* and the varying *t/labarna-*.

In Valério (2007), I proposed this virtual */*daBar-*/ to be related also to LA *du-pu₂-re*, but to help explaining its vocalism, I augmented the dossier of *possible* Anatolian relatives to include:

- 1.8) A set of Carian personal names with the alleged element -*DUbr-* (where D apparently corresponded to either Car. *ð* or *t* → Grk. *ð*, and U seemed to match Car. *w*, now transliterated *y* = Grk. *υ*), including the alleged equivalences of the names *ksatýbr* → Ξανδυβερις and *smdýbrs* → Ζερμεδυβερις.
- 1.9) The Lycian place name *Tuburehi* = Grk. Τυβερισσος and the personal name *Tebursseli*.

A reassessment of my interpretation is now necessary, partly because of intrinsic problems (it admittedly depends on a number of undemonstrated connections) and partly because of its ramifications for the study of the language of LA. Given their phonological shape, the Carian names were one of the cornerstones of the hypothesis, but at the time I put it on paper, I had not yet had the opportunity to study comprehensively the entire dossier (which is gathered and discussed in Adiego 2007). In the meantime, the interpretation of LA *du-pu₂-re* in Valério (2007) has gained some acceptance,³ and its alleged ties to Hitt. *t/labarna-* and Lyc. *dapara/Λαπαρας* are now part of an argument by Davis (2014: 193–215) that the LA *d* series transcribed a “phoneme /*θ*/ that was realized in Minoan speech as allophones [*ð*] and [*θ*]”. In what follows, I will revisit the whole dossier.

2. (Non-)Greek λαβύρινθος and Carian Λαβράυνδα

The theories connecting λαβύρινθος and the Carian city Labraunda (Λαβράυνδα) can be traced back to Plutarch’s (*Greek Questions* 45, 2.302a) explanation of the local epithet of Zeus, Labrandeus (sic), as a derivative of λάβρος, an alleged Lydian word for ‘axe’. The Lydian word may have existed, but there is a chance the account of the ancient author owes to a folk etymology formulated at the end of the 1st millennium BCE, since Zeus Labraundos was characteristically depicted holding a double-axe in Achaemenid coins from Caria (Yakubovich 2002: 106–107, fn. 36.). At the end of the 19th century, Mayer and Kretschmer (apud Kretschmer 1896: 404) came up with the idea that Labraundos corresponded to “Cretan” λαβύρινθος. This notion emerged in connection with another theory by Kretschmer, namely that the toponymic suffixes -*νθος* (Aegean) and -*νδα* (Anatolia) are cognate and ensue from a Pre-Greek “substrate” language spoken on both sides of the Aegean Sea in prehistoric times. This idea is far

³ See Younger (2011: 170, fn. 66) and Davis (2013: 42, 44; 2014).

from demonstrated,⁴ but the crucial issue is not even the suffix, but the base morphemes, which require us to equate λαβύρ(ι)- and Λάβρα(ν)- (with all its variants; see §1). Already Kretschmer (1896: 404) had to do great phonological gymnastics and conjecture for both place-names a common preform *Λαβραυνθος.

We know now that this is far from the reality: the Late Bronze Age form of λαβύρινθος was *da-pu*(₂)-*ri-to*-, reflecting most likely /dap^húrint^hos/.⁵ In fact, it is often neglected that the pair is *not synchronic*: λαβύρινθος is first attested in Herodotus (2.148), so more than seven centuries separate it from its Mycenaean predecessor. In LB itself there are no examples whatsoever of words interchanging LB *d* = /d/ and *r* = /l/, which means there is no support for assuming Myc. */dap^húrint^hos/ ~ */lap^húrint^hos/ and, more significantly, no basis for Lejeune's old idea that the *d* ~ *λ* spellings reflect Greek attempts to render a foreign sound. More likely, /dap^húrint^hos/ is the original form and λαβύρινθος owes to later, if only obscure, phenomena.⁶

Finally, in his renowned work on the Knossos palace, Evans (1921: 6) picked up on the (unprovable) suggestions of Mayer and Kretschmer and further claimed the double axe of Bronze Age Crete was identical with the Lydo-Carian λάβρους. For him, this equation was the “key” to understand both Labraundos and the “Labyrinth”, which to his mind were to be “identified with the palace sanctuary of Knossos”. Such etymological speculations constitute the historiographical roots of the interpretation of Grk. λαβύρινθος as ‘royal palace’ (see §1). The fact remains that in its first attestation λαβύρινθος was used by Herodotus (2.148) to refer to a vast, partially-underground Egyptian mortuary complex, so not only we have no basis to infer ‘palace’ was its original sense, but it is actually the case that other meanings, such as ‘hypogeum’, would explain better the earliest uses of the word (see Sarullo 2008).

3. Cypriot Greek ΛΑΒΠΑΝΙΟΣ

In Cyprus, a cult to Zeus *Labranios* (ΛΑΒΠΑΝΙΟΣ) is known through a dozen of ex-votos from the Roman period (late 2nd–4th century), found at Fasoúla, 10 km to the north of Amathus, and at Chandría, to the north of Fasoúla in the Troodos Mountains (Mitford 1961: 111, nos. 12–13).

Yakubovich (2002: 104–105; see also 2009a: 268) advanced tentatively a connection with *labarna*-. In a way, this echoed a theory first expounded by Hall (1885 [1883]: clxviii–clxix), who compared Zeus *Labranios* to Zeus Labraundos (see §2). According to Hall, the cult of Zeus

⁴ For recent discussions see de Hoz (2004) and Yakubovich (2009b: 9–11).

⁵ Chadwick has pointed out that “*pu* = *bu* is ... remarkable” (Ventriss and Chadwick 1973: 538), and indeed the pronunciation of the interchanging *pu* = /pu, p^hu/ and *pu*₂ /p^hu/ ought to be /p^hu/. Although descriptions of the phonological system of Myc. Greek routinely include a phoneme /b/, they overlook the fact that there are no uncontroversial examples of /b/ in native Mycenaean words; the phoneme was absent or near absent from the language, a situation which was inherited from PIE (see Thompson 2005).

⁶ LB *d* > alphabetical *λ* shift(?) is reminiscent of two Pamphylian glosses in Hesychius, who notes that standard Grk. δίσκος ‘discus, quoit’ and δάφνη ‘sweet bay’ were pronounced respectively as λίσκος and λάφνη at the city of Perge. As we will see in §8 and §10, 1st millennium Anatolian languages like Lydian and Lycian lacked initial /d-/, which was replaced with /l-/ in loanwords (at least in Lydian). This suggests that Pergaeian λίσκος and λάφνη may have been the pronunciations of local Anatolians who spoke Greek as a second language. Since λαβύρινθος first appears in the work of Herodotus, a native of Halicarnassus (Caria), perhaps its *lambdacism* owes to similar reasons. As regards LB *p*(₂) = /p^h/ vs. alph. β (see fn. 5), it is tempting to speculate that /dap^húrint^hos/ co-existed with */dawúrint^hos/ owing to different Greek strategies to render a foreign voiceless labial fricative (cf. Mongolian, which adapts Russian [f] as [p^h], [p^h] or [w] in loanwords; Svantesson 2005: 31). For LB *w* > alph. β, cf. the case of LB *mo-ri-wo-do* /mólivdos/(?) vs. μόλυβδος/μόλιβος ‘lead’, certainly a borrowing in Greek.