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

Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-дагестанская связь

Тардиво Дж.
Падуанский университет, г. Падуя, Итальянская Республика
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X , e-mail: gtardivo@googlemail.com

В соответствии с названием данной статьи, в ней рассматриваются два фактора: фонологическое исследование, которое включает в себя синхронический и диахронический аспекты между до-греческим и нахдагестанским языками. Некоторые слова в данной работе были проанализированы и тщательно изучены в различных аспектах: с точки зрения фонологии и с исторической семантической точки зрения. На протяжении всей статьи также отмечаются другие детали. Тем не менее, главная цель состоит в том, чтобы найти объяснение непонятным греческим словам, что в очередной раз «приводит» на горы Кавказа.

Ключевые слова: фонологическая ретроспектива, фонологический обзор догреческого языка, аферез, исторический аспект, нахско-дагестанские языки, лексические элементы.

People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-Daghestani Connection

Tardivo Giampaolo
Padua State University, Padua, Italy,
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X , e-mail: gtardivo@googlemail.com

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 phonological 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 ἁ ἀ 'barley', Θαργήλια ~ Ταργήλια 'the feast of T. before the harvest', καλλαρίας ~ χελλαρής ~ γελαρίης 'a kind of cod-fish', κάλχη ~ χάλκη ~ 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 1

Lezghian group

Lezg.	Tabasar.	Agul	Rutul	Tsakhur	Budukh	Kryz	Khinal.	Archi	Udi
t', $\widehat{ts}$'	t', $\widehat{ts}$', $\widehat{tʃ}$'	t:, t', $\widehat{ts}$'	t', d	t', Ø	t'	t'	t', s	t'	t:, Ø
k, k'	k'	k'	k', ʔ	k'	k'	k'	k', Ø	k:	k:

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

$k - k^j - k^w;$
$t - t^j - t^w,$
$p - p^j - p^w,$
etc...

In the Eastern Mediterranean area, neither the IE nor the Afro-Asiatic linguistic families display such peculiarity. Conversely, all North Caucasian languages shows this typology: $C - C^j - C^w$.

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, σφοδελός, σποδελός 'asphodel, *Asphodelus ramosa'*, Ακακαλλίς ~ κακαλίς 'narcissus flower' (Brown 1985: ' 26-27, Tardivo-Kitselis 2019: 3).

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

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

Aegean : α-, Ø-.

Daghest.: Ø-, Ø.

For instance, Ἀκακαλλίς ~ κακαλίς 'narcissus flower' shows agreement with *gagali* 'flower' of the Tsezi 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 *ɢʷon* 'рог / horn', but

- Botlikh *ʁʷani*; Godoberi and Tindi *ʕ ʷani*, *'uni*; Chamalal *'um(i)*; *'un(i)*, *'unu*; Bagulal *'un*; Karata (Tokita dialect) *ʕoni* 'голова / head'.

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 Aegean side κ-, Ø-, which is not different from the uvulars (voiced stop and voiced fricative) exposed in *ɢʷ-, ʁʷ- > ʕ ʷ- > '/ ʕ* 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: βο α · γέλη παίδων. Λάκωνες 'a group of ῦ ἀ children' (Laconian), quoted by Hesykhius.

Definition and other details begun with R.S.P. Beekes

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

<u>Variant:</u> Wrong accent according to DELG (Chantraine). βουόα· ἀγέλητις 'a herd' (*Etymologicon Magnum* [208, 6]; perhaps from βουσόα, to σεύειν ? But the original σσ would not have disappeared; Wahramann *Glotta* 17 (1929): 242 supposes an hyper archaism).

According to von Blumenthal 1930: 9, the world is Illyrian for φυή; 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?".[3]

Despite these basic notes, Rémy Viredaz (*Museum Helveticum*, 1992: 49, 4f.) wrote an interesting article on the subject: **Arcadien** βουσος, **Laconien** βουα. Later on, A. A. Déniz endorse Viredaz's explanation in his article: "Linguistic notes on the Spartan ἀγωγή: βούα and βουαγός / βοαγός".

The definition of γέλη 'herd (of horses)', but in Crete and at Sparta 'bands in which boys were ἀ trained'[4]. More explanations are found in Déniz's article: "Young boys enrolled in the Roman and imperial Spartan γωγή were given military, sportive, and musical training. Although the question is ἀ a matter of dispute, there is evidence that Spartan φηβοι were admitted to the γωγή within their ἕ ἀ own βά (Πιτανάται, Μεσοάται, Λιμναε ς, Κονο(h)ουρε ς and Νεαπολ ται) and divided into five ὠ ῖ ῖ ῖ 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 βουαγός 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 ῦ ἀ παίδων '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 *b'atša* 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'où les nomes des tours de guerre; *b'u* ou «armée» (v.), puis «attroupement, foule, ramassis»; *w'ow-lo* et *b'ow-lo* ou «garde, gardien» *b'ow-xo* ou «guerrier»; *w'a-tša* et *b'a-tša* 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'atʃa originally it means «commander of 100 warriors» (< *b'a* ou «one hundred» < *b'u* or «troops»), 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-tʃa* and *b'a-tʃa* or «commander, captain; chef of 100 (*b'a* means «100» < *b'u* «troops»), 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* (*-jał, -l // -dul, -jal*) '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 ς is plausible, but the derivative form is problematic]
[4] LSJ
[5] M. Tsaroieva, p. 275 and p. 277; see Bibliography

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

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 bo*tł* '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 Aegean and Central-Daghestani languages bear ῦ 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, μυ α is the common name for 'fly' (the insect), and it is of IE origin; ῖ 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 Aegean side, and a Pre-Latin form in the Italic peninsula.

θ 102

"The Cretan word is to be connected with δάπτης "gnat" (Lykophron, 1403) and Latin <u>tabānus</u> "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: θάπτρα · μν μα. Κρ τες. This would give a purely Greek explanation. ῆ ῆ 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].

λ 409

λάττα · μυῖα. Πολυρρήνιοι [MS].

λάττας · μυῖα. Πολυρρήνιοι [Latte]

"Latte's emandation is on the assumption that λάττας is from an earlier *λάπτ ς, Doric for ᾱ *λάπτης, from the verb λάπτω on the analogy of δάπτης and δάπτω. However, *λάπτης is not attested in Greek and to derive a word for "fly" from λάπτω is not convincing; and, in any case, λάπτω itself has no known etymology.

There is no reason to suppose that λάττα needs emendation. It is indeed for an earlier *λάπτα, showing the regressive assimilation of consonants that is typical of Cretan forms. But Polyrrhenian λάπτα (←* λάπτα) should be compared to θάπτα, which is also found in Crete. The alternation of λ with dental plosive is a feature of certain pre-Greek borrowings. We thus have here a further form of the pre-Greek word for "fly" or "gnat": Polyrrhenian λάττα (← *λάπτα), Cretan θάπτα Greek δάπτης, Latin <u>tabānus</u>"[7].

From a geographical point of view, this word ("fly") go with ράχνη ~ ἀ arāneus 'spider', both are found exclusively in the Greek and Latin languages. In any form, all Daghestani languages (except a few) show a relationship with the Pre-Greek lexeme, and the phonological explanation is expressed in the commentary section below.

Table 2

Daghestani languages show a relationship with the Pre-Greek lexeme

---

[6] Brown, op. cit., p. 57
[7] Brown, op. cit., p. 77

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

Avar	*t'ot'*	3rd class	муха / fly
Andi	*t'ent'a*	3rd class	
Akhwakh	*t'it'i*	3rd class	
Chamalal	*t'unt'*	3rd class	
Tindi	*t'unt'u*	3rd class	
Bezhta (Inkhokvarian), Tsez and Hinuq	*t'ut'*	3rd class	
Bezhta	*t'ot'*	3rd class	
Hunzib	*t'õt'*	3rd class	
Darghin (Chirag)	*t'et'*	3rd class	
Lezghian	*tʷ'at'*	-	
Rutul	*dɨd*	3rd class	
Kryz	*t'it'*	3rd class	
Agul	*t'ut'*	-	
Budukh	*t'ut'*	3rd class	
Udi	*t:at:*	-	
Tsakhur	*t'ot'*	3rd class	пчела / bee
Archi	*t'ant'*	3rd class	
Pre-Greek	θάπτα		
Latin	*tabānus*		

– Also in Chamalal (Gigatl) *t'unt'ú*.
– In some Avar dialects *t'ut'* 'ib.'.
– Within the Darghin area, Akusha, Tsudakhari, Sirhani *t'ent'*, Urakhi *t'ant'*, Muiri *t'int'*, Kajtaghi *t'ut'ar*, Kubachi *t'at'* 'ib.'.
– In Akhwakh a derivative form: *t'it'ik:'o* 'слепень / horse-fly'.
– The word is also used for 'bee'(in Hunzib), and in some languages (Tsez, Bezhta) it is a complementary word for 'bee ← honey + fly', but in Kryz 'bee ← honeycomb + fly'.

<u>Comment.</u>

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: $p^j > b > w (> *m) > n$ 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 μυ α and θάπτα were both in use in the island of Crete. So, all the substrata ῖ 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 ἀράχνη ~ *arāneus* 'spider', καμάν ~ *campus* [8] '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 ἀ 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 ῖ

Variations go directly to μβρυττοι · ε δος χίνων θαλασσίων 'id.', βρύττος (by Aristophanes), ἄ ῖ ἐ βρύσσος (by Aristoteles).

2. βρύσσος [m.] 'a kind of sea urchin'.

Variations include μβρυττοι · ε δος χίνου θαλασσίου, Αριστοτέλης α του ἄ ῖ ἐ ᾿ ὐ ῖ ὐς δεὺ βρύττους καλε 'kind of sea urchin, also called βρύσσος by Aristoteles (Hesykhius) (also μβρυττοι); also βρύττος ἄ · ε δος χίνου πελαγίου, ς φησιν Αριστοτέλης, ο δε ῖ ἐ ὥ ᾿ ἱ ἱ ἱ ἄ ἤ ὐ χθύν, ο δεὺ τρισυλλάβως, μβρυττον, ν, Λάχης ποιε 'some: a fish; others, with three syllable, μβρυττον [?]' (Hesykhius; it cannot be ῖ ἄ concluded that the reading ἄμβρυττοι is false).

The variants, together with the prenasalization, prove that this is a Pre-Greek word.

The first element to be considered, the aphaeresis of α-, as illustrated above and on other occasions (Tardivo-Kitselis 2019:3).

Table 3

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

---

[8] This association is not accepted by Mallory-Adams (p. 384)

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

ἄμβρυττοι	ἄμ-
ἀβρυτοί	ἀ-
βρύττος ~ βρύσσος	#C-

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

The Daghestani counterpart also abide this Rule, it only appears in two languages

Khwarshi (Inkhokvarian)	*boru*	3rd class	колючка (или растения) / thorn, prickle
Lak	*bʲoru-w*	3rd class	татарник / thistle, bur (*Onopordum acanthium*)
Pre-Greek	ἄμβρυττοι, ἀβρυτοί, βρύττος, βρύσσος		
– 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 r ʷɨ* [9], but in Abaza *grʷɨ* 'needle' (as *gʷ- > b, d*).

The aphaeresis 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 Ἀκακαλλίς ~ 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

Synchronic		Daghestanian lang.
ἀ-	Ø-	Ø- (#C-)
Ἀκακαλλίς	κακαλίς	Tsezi: *gagali* 'flower'
ἄμβρυττοι, ἀβρυτοί,	βρύττος, βρύσσος	Lak: *bʲoru* 'thistle, bur (*Onopordum acanthium*)'

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

Stout biennals, 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 əʷər and g rə ʷ 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 ἀ ἄ 'thorn, thistle (*Acanthus*)'; and καλήφη, καλύφη 'stinging nettle, sea anemone'. Both of them ἀ ἀ 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 (*k^h, 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 *$smeug^h$ -, like Greek, but the Germanic words may also go back to *smeuk* and correspond to Old Church Slavonic *smyakati sę* 'to drag on, cooper', Lithuanian *smùkti* '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 νδότατοι και ἱ ἱ ἐ ἀ ἔ ἦ ὐ πόκρυφοι, λιμένες, κοιλότητες. σχατα. καιὺ ταὺ ποιήματα. ταὺ ἐσώτερα μέρη.

μυχοί 'deep end, harbour, hollow, interior'. In all respects, a synchronic conclusion is a root in *μυχ-.

Even Chantraine explanation is not different from

Pas d'étymologie évidente pour ce terme expressif. Si l'ou pose un nom verbal signiflant 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

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

Tsezi	*muχári*	4th class	камин, дымоход / hearth, chimney
Bezhta	*múk'ol, mók'ol*	3rd class	постель / bed
Akhwakh	*mék'u*	3rd class	угол / corner
Tabasaran	*múq', muqʷár*	2nd class	гнездо / nest
Darghin (Chirag)	*muq'*	3rd class	
Agul	*mug*	-	
Lezghian	*mɨg*	-	
Pre-Greek	μυχός		

– In Tsezi (Mokoki) *buχári* 'ib'.
– Darghin 'гнездо змеи / snake's nest'; also (Akusha) *puɡa*, (Urakhi) *muq'a*, (Kubachi) *muga*, (Kajtag) *meg* 'гнездо / nest'.
– In Tabasaran (Dubek) *múq'u* 'ib.'.
– Lezghian oblique forms: **ERG**. *mɨk:áni*, **PLUR**. *mɨk:ári*.

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 Aegean, 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 *muχári* 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 Aegean 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 *հ այ ր* [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 θάπτα case seem to contraddict 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 ῦ 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 Aegean-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.

Литература

1. *Генко А.* Табасаранско-Русский словарь. 2005. М.: Academia, 320 с.
2. *Гимбатова М.М.* Аварско-Русский словарь. 2006. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 2096 с.
3. *Гудава Т.Е.* Консонантизм Андийских языков. 1964. Т.: Изд-во Акад. наук Груз. ССР, 221 с.
4. *Джампаоло Т., Китселис Ф.* Прометей или Амирани. Обновленное исследование о до-греческом субстрате и его происхождении [Электронный ресурс] // Язык и текст. 2019. Том 6. № 3. С. 56–69. DOI:10.17759/langt.2019060307
5. *Исаков И.А., Халилов М.Ш.* Гинухско-Русский словарь. 2005. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 617 с.
6. *Исаков И.А., Халилов М.Ш.* Гунзибско-Русский словарь. 2001. М.: Наука, 284 с.
7. *Исмаилова Э.И.* Русско-Рутульский словарь. 2011. М.: ИЯЛИ, 342 с.
8. *Кибрик А.Е., Кодзасов С.В.* Сопоставительное изучение Дагестанских языков. Глагол. 1990. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 225 с.
9. *Кибрик А.Е., Кодзасов С.В.* Сопоставительное изучение Дагестанских языков. Имя. Фонетика. 1990. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 366 с.
10. *Климов Г.А., Халилов М.Ш.* Словарь Кавказских языков. Сопоставление основной лексики. 2003. М.: Восточная литература, 510 с.

Тардиво Дж.
Люди, звуки и окружающая среда. Эгейско-
дагестанская связь
Язык и текст. 2021. Том 8. № 2. С. 4–20.

Tardivo G.
People, Sounds and the Environment. The Aegean-
Daghestani Connection.
Language and Text. 2021. Vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 4–20.

11. *Магомедова М.И.* Диалектологический словарь Аварского языка. 2008. М.: Наука, 483 с.

12. *Магомедова П.Т.* Тиндийско-Русский словарь. 2003. М.: ДНЦ РАН, 618 с.

13. *Магомедова П.Т.* Чамалинско-Русский словарь. 1999. М.: Ин-т яз., лит. и искусства им. Г. Цадасы, 436 с.

14. *Магомедова П.Т., Абдулаева И.А.* Ахвахско-Русский словарь. 2007. М.: Изд-во ДНЦ РАН, 727 с.

15. *Мейланова У.А.* Будухско-Русский словарь. 1984. М.: Наука, 251 с.

16. *Мусаев С.М.* Лексика Даргинского языка (Сравнительно-исторический анализ). 1978. М.: Изд-во Дагестанского университета, 129 с.

17. *Рамазанов М.Р.* Агульско-Русский словарь. 2010. М.: Лотос, 710 с.

18. *Салимов Х.С.* Гагатлинский говор Андийского языка. 2010. М.: ИЯЛИ, 420 с.

19. *Талибов Б.* Сравнительная фонетика лезгинских языков. 1980. М.: Наука, 350 с.

20. *Талибов Б., Гаджиев М.* Лезгинско- Русский словарь. 1966. М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 603 с.

21. *Тардиво Дж.* Лабиализация в эгейских и нахско-дагестанских языках [Электронный ресурс] // Язык и текст. 2020. Том 7. № 1. С. 109–120. doi:10.17759/langt.2020070111

22. *Хайдаков С.М.* Лакско-Русский словарь. 1962. М.: ГИС, 422 с.

23. *Хайдаков С.М.* Сравнительно-сопоставительный словарь Дагестанских языков. 1973. М.: Наука, 179 с.

24. *Халилов М.Ш.* Бежтинско-Русский словарь. 1985. М.: Ин-т яз., лит. и искусства им. Г. Цадасы, 418 с.

25. *Халилов М.Ш.* Цезско-Русский словарь. 1999. М.: Academia, 454 с.

26. *Ханмагомедов Б.Г-К., Шалбузов К.Т.* Табасаранско-Русский словарь. 2001. М.: Наука, 475 с.

27. *Чумакина М.Э., Corbett G.G., Brown D., Kuilliam, H.* Словарь Арчинского языка. 2007. М.: Серии б/и ЛАТИНИЦА, буква S, 410 с.

28. *Bartoli M.* Saggi di linguistica spaziale. 1945. T.: Vincenzo Bosa, 338 p.

29. *Beekes R.S.P.* Etymological dictionary of Greek. 2010. L.-B.: Brill, 930 p.

30. *Beekes R.S.P.* Pre-Greek. The Pre-Greek loans in Greek. 2017. L.-B.: Brill, 193 p

31. *Beekes R.S.P.* Pre-Greek: Phonology, morphology, lexicon. 2014. L.-B.: Brill, 181 p.

32. *Blamey M., Grey-Wilson C.* Wild flowers of the Mediterranean. A complete guide to the islands and the coastal regions. 2004. L.: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 560 p.

33. *Brown R.A.* Evidence for Pre-Greek speech on Crete from Greek alphabetic sources. 1985. A.: A.M. Hakkert, 408 p

34. *Burney C., Lang D.M.* The peoples of the hills. Ancient Ararat and Caucasus. 1971. L.: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 336 p.

35. *Chantraine P.* Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque. Histoire des mots. 1968. P.: Klincksieck, 364 p.

36. *Chirikba V.A.* A dictionary of common Abkhaz. 1996. L.-B.: Brill, 142 p.

37. *Déniz A.A.* Linguistic notes on the Spartan γωγή· βούα and βουαγός/ βοαγός // Glotta; Zeitschrift Für Griechische Und Lateinische Sprache. 2012. Vol. 88. P. 9-30. DOI:10.2307/41756393

38. *Geiger B., Kuipers A.H.* Peoples and languages of the Caucasus. A synopsis. Aja's Gravenhage 1959. The H.: 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co, 79 p.

39. *Klimov A.* Lexikalische Zeugnisse ältester indoeuropäisch-kartwelischer Kontakte // Sprachen Kaukasiens. 1984. J.: Friedrich-Schiller, 120 p.

40. *Liddell S.J.* A Greek-English lexicon. 1996. O.: Clarendon Press, 2011 p.
41. *Mallory J.P., Adams D.Q.* The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto- Indo-European world. 2006. O.: Oxford University Press, 731 p.
42. *Sagona A., Zimansky P.* Ancient Turkey. 2009. L.-N.Y.: Routledge, 420 p.
43. *Sfikas G.* Wild flowers of Crete. 2005. A.: Gardners Books, 310 p.
44. *Soysal O.* Hattischer Wortschatz in heithitischer Textüberlieferung. 2004. L.-B.: Brill, 1029 p.
45. Tsaroïeva M. Racines mésopotamiennes et anatoliennes des Ingouches et des Tchétchènes. 2008. P.: Riveneue editors, 329 p.
46. *Viredaz R.* Arcadien βουσος, laconien βουα // Museum Helveticum. 1992. Vol. 49. № 4. P. 217-222. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24817901 (дата обращения: 08.04.2021).
47. *Willets R.* The civilization of ancient Crete. 1976. N.Y.: University of California Press, 299 p.

References
1. Genko A. Tabasaransko-Russkii slovar'. 2005. Moscow: Academia, 320 p. (In Russ.).
2. Gimbatova M.M. Avarsko-Russkii slovar'. 2006. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 2096 p. (In Russ.).
3. Gudava T.E. Konsonantizm Andiiskikh yazykov. 1964. Tbilisi: Publ. Akad. nauk Gruz. SSR, 221 p. (In Russ.).
4. Dzhampaolo T., Kitselis F. Prometei ili Amirani. Obnovlennoe issledovanie o do-grecheskom substrate i ego proiskhozhdenii. *Yazyk i tekst=Language and Text*, 2019. Vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 56–69. DOI:10.17759/langt.2019060307 (In Russ.).
5. Isakov I.A., Khalilov M.Sh. Ginukhsko-Russkii slovar'. 2005. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 617 p. (In Russ.).
6. Isakov I.A., Khalilov M.Sh. Gunzibsko-Russkii slovar'. 2001. Moscow: Nauka, 284 p. (In Russ.).
7. Ismailova E.I. Russko-Rutul'skii slovar'. 2011. Makhachkala: IYaLI, 342 p. (In Russ.).
8. Kibrik A.E., Kodzasov S.V. Sopostavitel'noe izuchenie Dagestanskikh yazykov. Glagol. 1990. Moscow: Publ. MGU, 225 p. (In Russ.).
9. Kibrik A.E., Kodzasov S.V. Sopostavitel'noe izuchenie Dagestanskikh yazykov. Imya. Fonetika. 1990. Moscow: Publ. MGU, 366 p. (In Russ.).
10. Klimov G.A., Khalilov M.Sh. Slovar' Kavkazskikh yazykov. Sopostavlenie osnovnoi leksiki. 2003. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 510 p. (In Russ.).
11. Magomedova M.I. Dialektologicheskii slovar' Avarskogo yazyka. 2008. Moscow: Nauka, 483 p. (In Russ.).
12. Magomedova P.T. Tindiisko-Russkii slovar'. 2003. Makhachkala: DNTs RAN, 618 p. (In Russ.).
13. Magomedova P.T. Chamalinsko-Russkii slovar'. 1999. Makhachkala: In-t yaz., lit. i iskusstva im. G. Tsadasy, 436 p. (In Russ.).
14. Magomedova P.T., Abdulaeva I.A. Akhvakhsko-Russkii slovar'. 2007. Makhachkala: Publ. DNTs RAN, 727 p. (In Russ.).
15. Meilanova U.A. Budukhsko-Russkii slovar'. 1984. Moscow: Nauka, 251 p. (In Russ.).
16. Musaev S.M. Leksika Darginskogo yazyka (Sravnitel'no-istoricheskii analiz). 1978. Makhachkala: Publ. Dagestanskogo universiteta, 129 p. (In Russ.).
17. Ramazanov M.R. Agul'sko-Russkii slovar'. 2010. Makhachkala: Lotos, 710 p. (In Russ.).
18. Salimov Kh.S. Gagatlinskii govor Andiiskogo yazyka. 2010. Makhachkala: IYaLI, 420 p. (In Russ.).
19. Talibov B. Sravnitel'naya fonetika lezginskikh yazykov. 1980. Moscow: Nauka, 350 p. (In

Russ.).

20. Talibov B., Gadzhiev M. Lezginsko- Russkii slovar'. 1966. Moscow: Sov. Entsiklopediya, 603 p. (In Russ.).

21. Tardivo Dzh. Labializatsiya v egeiskikh i nakhsko-dagestanskikh yazykakh. *Yazyk i tekst=Language and Text*, 2020. Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 109–120. DOI:10.17759/langt.2020070111

22. Khaidakov S.M. Laksko-Russkii slovar'. 1962. Moscow: GIS, 422 p. (In Russ.).

23. Khaidakov S.M. Sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nyi slovar' Dagestanskikh yazykov. 1973. Moscow: Nauka, 179 p. (In Russ.).

24. Khalilov M.Sh. Bezhtinsko-Russkii slovar'. 1985. Makhachkala: In-t yaz., lit. i iskusstva im. G. Tsadasy, 418 p. (In Russ.).

25. Khalilov M.Sh. Tsezsko-Russkii slovar'. 1999. Moscow: Academia, 454 p. (In Russ.).

26. Khanmagomedov B.G-K., Shalbuzov K.T. Tabasaransko-Russkii slovar'. 2001. Moscow: Nauka, 475 p. (In Russ.).

27. Chumakina M.E., Corbett G.G., Brown D., Kuilliam, H. Slovar' Archinskogo yazyka. 2007. Makhachkala: Serii b/i LATINITsA, bukva S, 410 p. (In Russ.).

28. Bartoli M. Saggi di linguistica spaziale. 1945. Torino: Vincenzo Bosa, 338 p.

29. Beekes R.S.P. Etymological dictionary of Greek. 2010. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 930 p.

30. Beekes R.S.P. Pre-Greek. The Pre-Greek loans in Greek. 2017. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 193 p

31. Beekes R.S.P. Pre-Greek: Phonology, morphology, lexicon. 2014. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 181 p.

32. Blamey M., Grey-Wilson C. Wild flowers of the Mediterranean. A complete guide to the islands and the coastal regions. 2004. London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 560 p.

33. Brown R.A. Evidence for Pre-Greek speech on Crete from Greek alphabetic sources. 1985. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 408 p

34. Burney C., Lang D.M. The peoples of the hills. Ancient Ararat and Caucasus. 1971. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 336 p.

35. Chantraine P. Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque. Histoire des mots. 1968. Paris: Klincksieck, 364 p.

36. Chirikba V.A. A dictionary of common Abkhaz. 1996. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 142 p.

37. Déniz A.A. Linguistic notes on the Spartan γωγή· βούα and βουαγός/ βοαγός. *Glotta; Zeitschrift Für Griechische Und Lateinische Sprache*. 2012. Vol. 88, pp. 9-30. DOI:10.2307/41756393

38. Geiger B., Kuipers A.H. Peoples and languages of the Caucasus. A synopsis. Aja's Gravenhage 1959. The Hague: 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & Co, 79 p.

39. Klimov A. Lexikalische Zeugnisse ältester indoeuropäisch-kartwelischer Kontakte. *Sprachen Kaukasiens*, 1984. Jena: Friedrich-Schiller, 120 p.

40. Liddell S.J. A Greek-English lexicon. 1996. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011 p.

41. Mallory J.P., Adams D.Q. The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto- Indo-European world. 2006. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 731 p.

42. Sagona A., Zimansky P. Ancient Turkey. 2009. London-New York: Routledge, 420 p.

43. Sfikas G. Wild flowers of Crete. 2005. Athens: Gardners Books, 310 p.

44. Soysal O. Hattischer Wortschatz in heithitischer Textüberlieferung. 2004. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 1029 p.

45. Tsaroïeva M. Racines mésopotamiennes et anatoliennes des Ingouches et des Tchétchènes. 2008. Paris: Riveneue editors, 329 p.

46. Viredaz R. Arcadien βουσος, laconien βουα. *Museum Helveticum*, 1992. Vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 217-222. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24817901 (Accessed 08.04.2021).

47. Willets R. The civilization of ancient Crete. 1976. New York: University of California Press, 299 p.

Информация об авторах

Джампаоло Тардиво, Преподаватель лингвистики, Падуанский университет, Италия, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9398-762X , e-mail: gtardivo@googlemail.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@googlemail.com