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As the title suggests, on this occasion two factors are considered: A phonological survey, either way, Synchronic and Diachronic between Pre-Greek and Nakh-Daghestani languages. Then, a few words analyzed and scrutinized in various aspects; by phonology and from an historical Semantic perspective. Throughout the article, other details are also observed. Nevertheless, the main goal is to find an explanation for obscure Greek words, once again it leads on the mountain of the Caucasus.
The phonological retrospective

A comparative phonological perspective

New theories are – in general – seen with skepticism, which is perfectly conceivable. In order to demonstrate its validity, the core project must lean on a solid basis. In the Linguistic field, the correct method is known as «regular sound change». Of course, there are many words worldwide that resemble each other, however, the regular sound changes allow us to identify the real relationship between languages; outside of this specific method, it must be seen as Folk-etymologies or chance similarities.

The proposal of an ancient relationship between Greek and the Caucasian languages is not very news. In the past, some attempts to reconnect Georgian and unetymologized Greek words failed (Klimov 1984)\(^1\). The main problem with the North Caucasian languages, is the lack of attested written sources, which is of great concern for scholars; and it is seen as a weak point. Despite the conceivable criticism, the oral form tends not to rapidly change over the time. According to M. G. Bartoli\(^2\), more isolated and environmentally less accessible is the area, more conservative is the language (or are the languages); and the Caucasus mountain offers not only a great variety of languages, but also a unique linguistic richness.

The preservation of the Basque is due to the location in the Pyrenees mountains, the same as it occurs with (e.g.:) the Rumantsch in the Alps. It seems obvious that the environment plays an important role in the continuum of daily language usage. Only external contacts might affect – more or less – people’s way to speak, and in the case of the Northern Caucasus, Islam means partial replacement of the original lexicon – and some morphological feature – with the Perso-Arab-Turkism borrowings/loanwords. Earlier than that, some words were already borrowed from other languages within the area (e.g.: Georgian, Armenian, Ossetian, etc…).

The picture as a whole is not always clear. Therefore, it is not a good reason for avoiding a linguistic investigation.

Among the aspects to take in consideration, the parallel evolution of the sound position. Most languages of the same group tend to develop in the same direction; it depends on the accent/intonation and any other phonological environment.

In the first part of this research paper, there are some phonological parallels between Pre-Greek and some Centro-Oriental Northern Caucasian languages. It is symptomatic that those languages developed in the same phonological manner; their changes are almost the same as the Pre-Greek.

The first part of the article is dedicated to phonological changes spotted by Beekes for the Pre-Greek. It might sound very unlikely that Daghestani languages and dialects also went to a similar event.

A preliminary phonologicial overview of the Pre-Greek

As we know, Beekes (2003, 2007, 2010, 2014) wrote extensively about Greek language and its

---

\(^1\) Klimov, see Bibliography

\(^2\) Bartoli, M., see Bibliography
phonological aspects. There are three main distinctive traits to take in consideration: Greek words of IE origin; borrowings from other languages, and some of unexplained origin. The last one is also split up between words with regular changes and words with random aspects.

Despite the effort to sieve the lexemes, Beekes met fierce criticism by scholars. His rational view of the Greek language is centered on «regular sound change, exceptionless»; for this reason, a second group of words are classified as Pre-Greek, and the last part are «of unknown origin».

In his description of the Pre-Greek lexemes, there are phonological changes very side by side to the North Caucasian languages, especially of the Central-Eastern family.

The first step is to go through his observations about the Pre-Greek phonological character, and from there, to see where it leads to.

Throughout the pages, both aspects are considered: Synchronic and Diachronic.

### 1. The opposition

Within Greek-IE, the opposition *voiced ~ voiceless ~ aspirated* are of primary importance, meanwhile the Pre-Greek set of consonants ignoring such opposition; e.g.: κοστή ~ γοσταί ‘barley’, Θαργήλια ~ Ταργήλια ‘the feast of T. before the harvest’, κάλχη ~ χάλχη ~ χάλχη ‘purple flower’, πέλλα ~ φελλεύς ‘stone’. It is already clear that the variation κ ~ γ ~ χ, τ ~ θ, π ~ φ expressed in this small word list are alien to the IE standard, at the same time, they are found within Daghestani languages; like in the Lezghian group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lezghian group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lezg.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t', ṭ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, k'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the Pre-Greek language shows an alternative characteristic: a phonological frame completely different from the common IE scheme. In this case, the three main vowels (a, i, u) play an important role, as the opposition consists of plain ~ palatalized ~ labialized set of consonants; and the list – according to Beekes – is formed by three stops (p, t, k) and five continuous consonants (s, r, l, m, n); so

\[ k \sim k' \sim k^{"}; \]

\[ t \sim t' \sim t^{"}; \]

\[ p \sim p' \sim p^{"}; \]

etc...

In the Eastern Mediterranean area, neither the IE nor the Afro-Asiatic linguistic families display such peculiarity. Conversely, all North Caucasian languages show this typology: C – C’ – C”.

### 2. The aphaeresis

The fluctuant presence of an α-, very inconsistent, described by Beekes as “The definition is ‘initial vowel’ that is present or absent in (nearly) identical forms”; for we cannot say whether the vowel disappeared or was added under certain circumstances.”, like ἀσφόδελος ~ σφόδελος, σφοδέλος, σφοδέλος ‘asphodel, Asphodelus ramosa’, Ἀκακάλλις ~ κακάλλις ‘narcissus flower’ (Brown 1985: 26–27, Tardivo-Kitselis 2019: 3).

Such aspect pose a question for the Ægean side, meanwhile, in the Daghestanian side, words are in #C. Such ambiguity is expressed only in the Ægean side; at the end, the result is:
Ægean: α-, Ø-.
Daghest.: Ø-, Ø.

For instance, Ακακαλλίς ~ κακαλίς ‘narcissus flower’ shows agreement with gagali ‘flower’ of the Tsezic language (Tsezic group).

It is quite possible that the α- works as an “article” or the like, in any form, a determinative; and because the morphological aspect is unclear, the debate still is open.

3. K-, T- > Ø-

According to Beekes “There are instances where a velar or a dental may be absent in initial position […] As an explanation one could think here of an uvular, q.”. A good example is καλινδέομαι ~ ἀλίνδω ‘to roll, to wallow’.

The same phonological aspect is also seen within the Andian group, like

- Andi  NSAttributedString “por / horn”, but
- Botlikh NSAttributedString “uni; Chamalal ’um(i); ’un(i), ’unu; Bagulal ’un; Karata (Tokita dialect)  NSAttributedString ”/ ”case.

This phonological development – within the Andian group – could be of the later period, however, it is difficult to ascertain the exact period of time.

So, in the Ægean side κ-, Ø-, which is not different from the uvulars (voiced stop and voiced fricative) exposed in  NSAttributedString “,  NSAttributedString ”>  NSAttributedString “>  NSAttributedString “ case.

Some lexical items

After the possible phonologic parallel, some words are well preserved throughout the time; and the partial «sound change» is not an obstacle for a comparison between the two wings of Anatolia. Their consistency is also helpful, it allow them to determine what kind of contacts existed since then.

The words taken in considerations are:
1. A group of children.
2. The fly [INSECT]
3. The sea urchin.
4. The house.

Despite the lexemes seems very casual, for some reasons, they have an interconnection from a glottochronological point of view, as explained in the discussion at the end.

Herds or people?

As Marielle Tsaroïeva wrote in her book “Racines mésopotamiennes et anatoliennes des Ingouches et des Tchétchènes” (2008) [Mesopotamian and Anatolian roots of the Chechens and Ingush], the title pointed up at the fact that the isolation of the Caucasian people were – throughout the time – not so real; and the language of each village (or aul) reveal some form of contacts with the external world. Like any other mountain place on Earth, the process takes ages to do so, however, it was relentless. This is the reason why a common root between North Caucasian languages and Greek (actually Pre-Greek) is possible.

Let’s take in consideration a very disputed case: AttributeValueNotNull “children” (Laconian), quoted by Hesykhōus.

Definition and other details begun with R.S.P. Beekes
Variant: Wrong accent according to DELG (Chantraine). Βοούας ἀγέλητις ‘a herd’ (Etymologicon Magnum [208, 6]; perhaps from βοῦας, to σεβέν; But the original σσ would not have disappeared; Wahramann Glotta 17 (1929): 242 supposes an hyper archaisms.)

According to von Blumenthal 1930: 9, the world is Illyrian for φυνή; this is semantically improbable. See Bechtel 1921, 2: 368f. and Kretschmer Glotta 17 (1929): 242.

This description is in full agreement with Chantraine’s words “[...] hypothèse en l’air qui ne va pas pour le sens. Un rapport avec βοῦς est plausible, mais par quelle dérivation?”.

Despite these basic notes, Rémy Viredaz (Museum Helveticum, 1992: 49, 4f.) wrote an interesting article on the subject: Arcadien βουσός, Laconien βουα. Later on, A. A. Déniz endorse Viredaz’s explanation in his article: “Linguistic notes on the Spartan ἁγωγή: βοῦα and βουσαγός / βουαγός”.

The definition of γέλη ‘herd (of horses)’, but in Crete and at Sparta ‘bands in which boys were trained’4. More explanations are found in Déniz’s article: “Young boys enrolled in the Roman and imperial Spartan γογή were given military, sportive, and musical training. Although the question is a matter of dispute, there is evidence that Spartan φηβοι were admitted to the γογή within their Ἐ ἀ οῦν βά (Πιτανάτα, Μεσοσύτα, Λιμναες κζ, Κομο{h}ωρε κζ και Ναπολ ίαι) and divided into five ὀ ἰ ἰ groups according to age [...] This annual appointment was of some importance, for it was held only by boys belonging to the most prominent families and βουσαγός was retained as an honorific title throughout adult life.”.

For this reason, Beekes’s translation of γέλη is ‘herd, troops’. So, the explanation of ἀ βο α γέλη ὅ ἀ παιδον ‘a group of children’ seems very clear.

To summarize Viredaz and Déniz’s articles, their involvement of ancient Greek words for ‘cattle’ et sim. are not sufficient to retain this lexeme within the IndoEuropean linguistic family.

Both Chantraine and Beekes are right to suspect an external source, more likely to be a survival from the very early period (Bronze age), in other words, a substrata element.

As stated on several occasions, the North Caucasian area seems good enough for a serious comparison, a great source of information. Is worth it to quote Marielle Tsaroïeva and her explanation about “troops [et sim.]”:

“Or, le mot β’ατσα signifiait primitivement «chef de cents guerriers» (< b’a ou «cent» < b’u ou «troupe»), comme le capitaine des anciens Sémites”5, more specifically:

w’ou (Ingouche) et b’ou (Tchétchène) «guerre», d’ou les noms des tours de guerre; b’u ou «armée» (v.), puis «attroupement, foule, ramassiss»; w’ow-lo et b’ow-lo ou «garde, gardeïen» b’ow xo ou «guerrier»; w’a-tśa et b’a-tśa ou «commandant, capitaine; chef des cents (b’a étant «cent» < b’u «attroupement»), élus par les guerriers lors des campagnes militaires”.

[Eng.: “The word b’atja originally it means «commander of 100 warriors» (< b’a ou «one hundred» < b’u ou «tropso»), like the captain of the Semites”, more specifically:

w’ou (Ingush) and b’ou (Chechen) «war», hence, words for war; b’u or «army» (v.), further «troops, crowd, bunch»; w’ow-lo and b’ow-lo or «guardian» b’ow xo or «warrior»; w’a-tśa and b’a-tśa or «commander, captain; chef of 100 (b’a means «100» < b’u «tropo»), etc...”].

Such preliminary explanation from the Central area, it goes straight away to the eastern side of the North Caucasian mountains chain, like Avar bo (-jal, -l // -dul, -jul) ‘народ, общество, ополчение, войско, рать / people, society, militia, army’. The oblique form is quite popular,

3 [an hypothesis with no sense. A relationship with βο ζ is plausible, but the derivative form is problematic]
4 LSJ
5 M. Tsaroieva, p. 275 and p. 277; see Bibliography
because it also is the denomination of the language itself “The literary language is based on the Khunzakh dialect which was also the basis of the old “bol mats’ ..” (“army language”), the common Avar lingua franca.”.

This word appear also in the Archi language (Lezghian group) as botɬ ’народ, люди / people, nation’, probably a borrowing from the Avar language.

Based on this database, it seems that only Avar and Chechen-Ingush offers a valid proposal to the Pre-Greek βο α. From a Semantic perspective, both Ægean and Central-Daghestani languages bear o the meaning of ‘troops’, hence, the transposition of «herd → group» will be more doubtful, as Chantraine pointed up in his comment.

The fly

In the Greek language, μο α is the common name for ‘fly’ (the insect), and it is of IE origin; ἴ however, in the Cretan record another word appear: θάπτα, which it is not of IE origin.

The detailed phonological description is well presented by Brown in two distinct paragraphs; as it shows two different forms in the Ægean side, and a Pre-Latin form in the Italic peninsula.

"The Cretan word is to be connected with δάπτης “gnat” (Lykophron, 1403) and Latin tabānus “gadfly”, thus show a pre-Greek and pre-Latin alternation θ ~ δ ~ t. This should also be compared with gloss λ 409, see below.

Latte emends this gloss: θάπτα · Μύι. Κρτες. This would give a purely Greek explanation. ἶ ἶ There is, however, no reason to suspect that the text is corrupt. Furthermore, as it shown above, the Cretan word can be shown to have cognates from the same pre-Greek source."6

Table 2

Daghestani languages show a relationship with the Pre-Greek lexeme

---

6 Brown, op. cit., p. 57
7 Brown, op. cit., p. 77
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avar</td>
<td>t'ot'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>муха / fly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi</td>
<td>t'en't'a</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhwakh</td>
<td>t'it'i</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamalal</td>
<td>t'un't'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindi</td>
<td>t'un't'u</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezhta (Inkhokvarian), Tsez and Hinoq</td>
<td>t'u't'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bezhta</td>
<td>t'ot'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunzib</td>
<td>t'ö't'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darghin (Chirag)</td>
<td>t'et'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lezghian</td>
<td>i'w'at'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutul</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kryz</td>
<td>t'it'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agul</td>
<td>t'u't'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budukh</td>
<td>t'u't'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udi</td>
<td>t'at'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsakhur</td>
<td>t'ot'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>пчела / bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archi</td>
<td>i'ant'</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Greek</td>
<td>θumpa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>labānus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Comment.

The presence of a voiceless nasal in the Daghestani list is not in opposition to the labial sound; as the Lezghian language still is preserved through a labialized consonant (t'ʷ), expressed by other languages with a labial vowel (-o/-u-) (Tardivo 2020/1).

The attested Latin form shows a -b-. From this perspective, a process of labial sounds: p' > b > w (＞ *m) > n is also possible. Furthermore, when the voiceless plosive turned to a nasal, the register tone changed, although the Andi and Tindi forms preserve the final syllable; such tonal development is expressed by the presence of a second voiceless plosive (-t').

Nevertheless, the Rutul form in d-/d- exposed here shows no opposition with the voiceless plosive, as already illustrated in the scheme.
From a socio-glottochronological analysis, it is self-evident that Greeks and Pre-Greeks shared lexical items, as μυα and θάπτα were both in use in the island of Crete. So, all the substrata elements are strong indications of the resilience over the time, and that is due to their ability to dominate Nature with technological advanced tools; that means, the attested form in Latin must be seen as a signal of knowledge that imply communication between areas of the Mediterranean Sea. The so-called Mediterranean substrata words are seen as remnants of unknown people living in the basin; and it is common opinion that different – perhaps unrelated – people used to live in those places, such as Greece, Italy, Anatolia.

There are no evidence of a common origin, but the hypothesis that Pre-Latin and Pre-Greek were connected – in somehow – is very high; like ύράχνη ~ arâneus ‘spider’, καμάν ~ campus8 ‘field’ and some others.

The thorn

Even with a glimpse, the Caucasus is – geographically speaking – a mountain chain between Asia and Europe. Yet, the linguistic richness of the indigenous languages of the area include the word for ‘sea’, and this detail is quite amusing; or more realistically, a very questionable fact.

The maritime side of the Daghestan is represented by the Caspian Sea, which is difficult to reach from the highland settlements.

Conversely, the island of Crete – as such – is part of the Mediterranean Sea. Despite the environmental differences, the linguistic background shows a semantic application of terrestrial items to marine’s life.

This is the case of ‘sea-urchin’, a marine animal – as the name suggests – with thorny ends. There are two interrelated words for them: βρυτοί and βρύσσοσ. As Beekes retrieve from ancient υ sources; in this case, mainly from Aristotle.

The definition and description is quoted here:

1. βρυτοί · χίνων θαλασσίων ε δος [m.] ‘a kind of sea-urchin’. ἀ ἐ ἰ
   Variations go directly to μβρυττοι · ε δος χίνων θαλασσίων ‘id.’, βρύττος (by Aristophanes), ἀ ἰ ε βρύσσος (by Aristoteles).

2. βρύσσος [m.] ‘a kind of sea urchin’.
   Variations include μβρυττοι · ε δος χίνων θαλασσίων, Αριστοτέλης α του ἀ ἰ ε ἐ ἰ ὑ ἰ υς δεν βρύττος καλε η ‘kind of sea urchin, also called βρύσος by Aristoteles (Hesykhius) (also μβρυττοι); also βρύττος ἀ · ε δος χίνου πελαγίου, ze φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης, o δε ἰ ε ὑ ἰ i i a ἦ ὑ χθον, o δεν τρισυλλάβως, μβρυττον, ν. Λάχης ποιε ‘some: a fish; others, with three syllable, μβρυττον [?]’ (Hesykhius; it cannot be ἀμβρυττοι is false).
   The variants, together with the prenasalization, prove that this is a Pre-Greek word.
   The first element to be considered, the apopheresis of α-, as illustrated above and on other occasions (Tardivo-Kitselis 2019:3).

The synchronic aspect of an apopheresis is well manifest in this word

---

8 This association is not accepted by Mallory-Adams (p. 384)
Other aspects to take in consideration, it is the fluctuant presence of the nasal labial sound (-μ-).
The interchange of -ττ- ~ -τ- ~ -σσ- is of secondary importance. To resume the synchronic aspect, the root *βρυττ-/*βρυ- seems plausible.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khwarshi (Inkhokvarian)</th>
<th>børə</th>
<th>3rd class</th>
<th>Колонка (или растения) / thorn, prickle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lak</td>
<td>bórə-w</td>
<td>3rd class</td>
<td>татарник / thistle, bur (Onopordum acanthium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Greek</td>
<td>ámbρυττοι, ámbρυτοι, βρύττος, βρύσσος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

– But (Lak) bulru in Kibrik&Kodzasov textbook.

Comment. The two labial vowels (_o_ _u_) manifest in the Daghestani side are syncopated in the Pre-Greek form (CVCV- > CCV-)

In the Western side of the North Caucasus, a more archaic form appear, more precisely in the Abkhaz language with a-g rʷi 9, but in Abaza grʷi ‘needle’ (as gʷ- > b, d).

The apheresis of the α- seems evident, and the synchronic response is already expressed in the scheme. Even on this occasion, there are some key-points to substantiate the proposal. The ’Ακακαλλίς ~ κακαλίς contra Tsezi gagali ‘flower’ (Tardivo-Kitselis 2019:3) could be seen as an isolated case.

Table 5

Such principle is quite regular, as expressed by the synchronic and diachronic scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synchronic</th>
<th>Daghestanian lang.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α-</td>
<td>Θ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>’Ακακαλλίς</td>
<td>κακαλίς Tsezi: gagali ‘flower’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ámbρυττοι, ámbρυτοι, βρύττος, βρύσσος</td>
<td>Lak: bórə ‘thistle, bur (Onopordum acanthium)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Semantic passage, from «thorny plant» to «sea urchin» is equally unproblematic, as the phytonymic definition of ‘Onopordum’ is

Stout biennials, generally with spiny-winged stems and often covered with cobwebby hairs. Leaves spiny margined. (Wild flowers of the Mediterranean, p. 453)

9 But a-g σʷər and g τəʷ respectively, according to Chirikba
or even better (Wild flower of Crete, p. 248)
Leaves dentate, pinnately-lobed or pinnate, with prickles.
The connection between plants and animals are also attested in κανθίων ‘hedgehog’ < κανθα ἄ ἄ ‘thorn, thistle (Acanthus)’; and καλήφη, καλύφη ‘stinging nettle, sea anemone’. Both of them ἄ ἄ share the common detail of a «thorny» element.
This detail is also an indication of a semantic passage, how a plant name – based on its characteristics – was applied to a sea animal. This kind of application is pretty common in glottochronology.

Inside the house
Another word with ambiguous characteristics, where the original lexeme slightly changed due to climate reasons: μυχός ‘the innermost place, interior, corner, hiding-place, storage room’ (Iliad).
Furthermore, as Beekes stated “for the meaning in Homer see JHS 71 (1951): 203ff.”.
For some reasons (listed below), the IE explanation is rejected by Beekes.
As a fourth series of stops (*kʰ, etc.) is not assumed anymore, the genetic connection with Armenian mxem ‘to immerse’ (Frisk) is obsolete, but it was semantically doubtful anyway. The Germanic group of Old Norse smjúga ‘to slip in’, Middle High German smiegen ‘to nestle’ may theoretically derive from IE *smeugʰ-, like Greek, but the Germanic words may also go back to *smeuk and correspond to Old Church Slavonic smyakati se ‘to drag on, cooper’, Lithuanian smūkti ‘to glide (away)’, etc. Furnée 364 thinks that is Pre-Greek but without further arguments (see βυθός and Furnée 254). One argument could be the gloss βύσσαλοι, if it really belongs here, another, the gloss μοχοῖ ἐντός with a vocalic interchange.
To take in consideration μυχοί and its definition
μυχοί · α καταδύσεις, ο νυότατοι και ι ἵ ἐ ἕ ἦ υ πόκρυφοι, λιμένες, κοιλότητες, σχάτα. καὶ ταῖ ποῆματα. τα ἐσώτερα μέρη.
μυχοί ‘deep end, harbour, hollow, interior’. In all respects, a synchronic conclusion is a root in *μυχʰ-.
Even Chantraine explanation is not different from
Pas d’étymologie évidente pour ce terme expressif. Si l’ou pose un nom verbal signifiant quelque chose comme le fait de «se cacher» ou peut penser à mettre le radical *meuqʰ- / *muqʰ- en rapport avec l’Arménienne mxem «enfoncer, plonger dans», etc., ou aussi avec un groupe de mots germaniques […].
[No etyma for this expressive word. Perhaps a verbal root with the meaning of «to hide, to conceal» or a root in *meuqʰ- / *muqʰ- related to the Armenian mxem «to sink» or some Germanic words…]
The Daghestani languages offer a reliable wordlist related to.

Table 6

The Semantic explanation in the comment section
Comment.

According to Soysal, the Hattic word *muḫa* (*muḫ ?*) or *muḫal* ‘hearth [?]’. It might be included in the list; however, the doubtful translation is an obstacle to the connection.

The first step to consider is the ‘hearth’ in a very hot climate place. It will be a suicidal idea to have a fireplace inside the house, especially in the summertime. However, as Willets wrote “A house in the Middle Neolithic level 3 at Knossos had a room about 5m square, a door in one corner and a low platform in the corner furthest from the door, similar to the low sleeping platforms occasionally found in the Bronze Age palaces and houses. The walls seem to have been covered with clay plaster. The floor of beaten earth had a hearth sunk in the middle” 10.

The description of ‘a hearth sunk in the middle’ is spotted also in the Anatolian area, as illustrated by Sagona & Zimansky with “After the first collapse of the wall residents built a circular freestanding house that was constructed entirely of mud bricks. An almost complete refit of an obsidian pebble reconstituted from the flakes collected on the floor demonstrates that stone working activities were clearly carried out in the house. In the centre of the house and built into the floor was a circular hearth that would have caught the eye as one entered the doorway on the western side” 11; a building technique already in use in the ancient Caucasus, as the excavations reveal that “The central wooden post was a common feature already in the early trans-Caucasian 1 period, and is well exemplified at Kvatskhelebi, where there was also a hearth beside the post. The need for the central post largely depends on the diameter of the houses, those at Shengavit, not all of this first period, being of six to eight meters. At Kültepe II there was a wide divergence, from little more than a hut (3.50 m.) to as much as 13 m. in diameter: here too were the central post, hearths and ovens […].

The importance of the hearth has been much emphasized, especially at Kvatskhelebi, where, it has been suggested, the fire razed the village to the ground probably happened at the time when the inhabitants were enacting an important ritual centred round each family hearth.

10 Willets, pp. 44–45; see Bibliography
11 Sagona & Zimansky, p. 164; see Bibliography
A factor supporting this suggestion is the decoration lavished on the portable hearths and stands which are so distinctive a feature of the whole Early Trans-Caucasian tradition. An altogether wider question is whether these portable hearths can in any way be compared with the ‘horns of consacration’ of Minoan Crete and their counterparts in the shrines excavated in the Early Bronze II levels (XVI–XIV) at Beycesultan, in south-western Anatolia”12.

From the archaeological descriptions of a wider area, such as Ægean, Anatolian and Caucasian regions, the building technique shows the same configuration, a hearth situated in the middle, just behind the main post. Although, the main question waiting for a suitable response, and it is more likely that the «hearth» original denomination becoming a symbol of the centre, the “core” of the house in the Pre-Greek version; hence the Tsezi mužâri preserve the original meaning, whilst in the Pre-Greek lost its main function, albeit it was in use as designation of the «innermost place, interior, corner». This semantic shift is pretty common among languages.

Needless to add that in antiquity, the house had a more simple and compact internal structure, so the inclusion of «bed» is easily explained by the custom of having a rough place to sleep close to the heath; also described as a «nest».

Furthermore, one part of the house was reserved for cultual reasons, and the “fire” always played an important role; especially for “spirit of the house (домовой)”, as it was common beliefs that he lives in the hidden part of the building.

**Resume**

The article is basically divided in two parts, the beginning is dedicated to a theoretical framework solely based on some phonological parallels between Ægean and Daghestani languages.

It might be seen as a casual aspect that the same pattern is manifest on both sides; a pure coincidence and no more than that. Actually, the tendency to follow the same development is typical of languages sprouting from a common source. Let see within IE family, two geographically distant groups are showing the same pattern: Gaelic (Celtic group) and Armenian (Armenian group); both them p- > Ø- , like in athair and hwy p [hayr] ‘father’.

The different phonological grid was already a signal of a non-IE language; and the parallel sample exposed here, far from being complete, is an attempt to start with. The tendency is a good signal of common roots, in spite of all the manifest problems, such as unwritten records by Caucasian languages; and whether it is possible to have one, like Greek alphabet for Pre-Greek words, the arbitrary use of the letters in order to render the correct sound is not so precise. This aspect of sound variations is not due to misspelling (except in a few cases), the case has more to do with the random transcription of unfamiliar sounds produced by the speakers; such as co-articulated sounds. The key factor is the preceding vowel, a very hard task to assess with an unknown phonological set. A good example is the Persian language written in Arabic alphabet.

As mentioned at the begin, the selected words have common traits. Their linearity is expressed by phonological analysis and historical semantic development. All the words listed here are phonologically reliable.

β-, as Chechen, Avar, Khwarshi and Bezhta b-
θ ~ τ in all Daghestani languages are t’/-t’.
χ has a counterpart with χ / q’ / k’.

In all respects, the phonological analysis – of the opposition – at the beginning is manifested in the sample. However, the θαπτα case seem to contradict the assumption of a linearity of sounds

---

12 The peoples of the hills, p. 56; see Bibliography
correspondences; at the same time, it is not ignored the fact that a voiceless dentalveolar plosive affect the preceding bilabial sound (-π-), and obviously, the nasal sound in the Daghestani languages is harmonized to the dentalveolar consonant. Furthermore, the labialized environment is not abandoned in full, as the Lezghian in primis (t’ʷ-), and most of the other languages have a labial vowel (-o/-u-).

The historical aspect

The second aspect to consider is Semantic development. The cases of βο α and  θάπτα, their ο meaning are unaffected by the geochronological factor. Meanwhile, βρύσσος and μυχός shows an adaptation to the environment, from a phytonym to a marine animal with the same characteristics (βρύσσος); then, the «hearth» (μυχός) placed at centre of the house used in topological sense only.

Even in ancient times, despite the harsh environment and their level of technical knowledge, the communication between areas was not impossible. The sample listed here is a pale signal of how people moved from one place to another and – at the same time – their lexicon did not change it, actually, it went to an adaptation in the colonized place.

The archaeological description and the literary sources are also supportive of the Ægean-Caucasian common origin. Since the beginning of the language classifications, it was not always possible to rely on a simple linguistic database, the lack of evidence or a contradiction between word applications were unveiled by the support of other disciplines.

Conclusions

The synchronic and diachronic perspective are less controversial that it might seem, they both abide to the same regular sound change); and some evidence is seen in the sample of a few words illustrated throughout the article.

The proposal is another Byzantine piece of the mosaic in the linguistic field. The consideration of several factors, such as archaeology, botanics, literary sources are supportive and explicative of the language dynamics, where the original words were adapted to the new environment.
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