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Abstract

This article presents an etymological case study on Pre-Greek (PG): it analyzes about 20 words starting with the letter M that have been catalogued as <PG> or <PG?> in the new Etymological dictionary of Greek (EDG), but for which alternative explanations are equally possible or more likely (discussing all instances would be tantamount to rewriting the dictionary). The article briefly discusses the EDG (for an in-depth appraisal the reader is referred to part one of the article) and then analyzes the individual words. This analysis is performed by giving an overview of the most important earlier suggestions and contrasting it with the arguments used to catalogue the word as PG. In the process, several issues of Indo-European phonology (such as the phoneme inventory and sound laws) will be discussed.

1. Observations on the Leiden etymological dictionaries and the EDG.

In part one of this article (in which we discussed the pre-Greek lemmata of the letter N in the EDG), we pointed out that it cannot be denied that Greek borrowed words from many non-Indo-European languages (there is a consensus that more than half of the words in the Greek lexicon are of non-Indo-European origin). It is therefore logic that the EDG often argues for non-IE origin of words, but the problems with the EDG are the following: first, it assumes that Greek borrowed most of its words
from one and the same language, without taking into account the time depth problem (i.e. when was the word attested in, in which author can the word(s) be found) and the unlikeliness of all words coming from one language, given the multitude of languages that were spoken in Antiquity (according to the Ancient sources); second, when a borrowing and an inherited etymology are equally possible, the EDG assumed the word was borrowed without explicitly stating why, but we think that it might be better to prefer an inherited etymology when the evidence allows it; third, it uses the concept “Pre-Greek” to explain away words that have a possible Indo-European etymology that includes elements that are in contradiction with the Leiden school [see Verhasselt (2009a, 2009b, 2011); Meissner (2014); De Decker (2015)].

2. Individual etymologies

1. **mákaːr** ‘happy, blessed’ (Beekes 2010: 893). Older etymological dictionaries linked the word with *makrós* ‘long’ and assumed a semantic evolution from ‘long, great’ into ‘happy’ [Curtius (1879: 161); Prellwitz (1905: 278–279)]. This evolution cannot be ruled out, but is not evident (Boisacq 1938: 601–602), especially since the root *mak* means ‘meagre, long’ and from ‘meagre’ to ‘happy’ is difficult. Brugmann argued that *mákaːr* was an original neuter noun ‘blessedness’, which was then reinterpreted as adjective and received masculine and feminine forms [Brugmann (1905: 434), supported by Benveniste (1935: 18); Boisacq (1938: 601–602); Schwyzer (1939: 519); Chantraine (1968: 659)]. Frisk (1970: 162–163) stated that this explanation was formally sound, but not supported by the texts. Beekes only stated that the texts did not confirm Brugmann’s hypothesis and argued that the isolated formation and the variation between long and short *a* in the second syllable pointed at Pre-Greek origin. This argumentation is not convincing. First, as Frisk stated (and Beekes left out), the distinction between long and short *a* is formally expected: if we start from a stem in a short *a*, the case forms outside the masculine singular have a short vowel *a* whereas the masculine singular has a long *a* because of Szemerényi’s Law: *makars* with a nominative singular ending *s* would regularly become *mákaːr*. The case forms attested in Homer follow this schema. Second, there might be another example of a neuter noun in *ar* that was reinterpreted as an adjective or noun: Pedersen (1893: 244), explained the noun *dámar* ‘wife’ as an original neuter *r/n* noun which was reinterpreted as a feminine, but there are no examples in our texts of a neuter noun *dámar*. If one accepts the analysis for *mártuːs* ‘witness’ (cf. infra), this would be another example of an originally neuter noun that

---

1 We decided to transcribe the Greek. In doing so, we used the accents ´ (acutus), ` (gravis) and ŋ (circumflexus). We use the sign : to indicate vowel length. Vowel length is not indicated when a vowel is written with a ‼, because vowels with a circumflex are always long. A sign H refers to any laryngeal, a C to any consonant, a P to any plosive, an R to any resonant and a V to any vowel.

2 This law states that at word end a sequence VRs (with V being any vowel and R being any resonant) became V:R (see Szemerényi 1996: 116; Weiss 2009: 47; Kümmel forthcoming). This was already noted in the 19th century, as Szemerényi stated himself.
became masculine in Greek. Third, it is true that there are no cognates in the other Indo-European languages, but that does not mean that the word was borrowed from “Pre-Greek”. In any case, there are other neuter nouns ending in ar, such as nêktar ‘drink of the gods’ (although this word was debated as well, cf. part one). Brugmann’s explanation has the advantage that it explains the adjective and its inflection as an inner-Greek development, but the problem is that the original noun is not attested (anymore). This should not be a problem in itself, because the adjective askêthês ‘unharmed’ is derived from a noun *skêthos ‘harm’ which is also unattested (albeit it is attested in other Indo-European languages).

2. makednós ‘tall, slim’ (Beekes 2010: 894); Makedón (nominative), Makedónos (genitive) ‘Macedonian’. As this word means ‘tall’, a connection with makrós seems logical [Prellwitz (1905: 279); Frisk (1970: 163)]. Fick (1901a: 242) interpreted the name as ‘people living on the high planes’. Building on Fick’s explanation, Frisk explained the adjective makednós as having the zero grade dn while the personal name has the full grade don-. Already Krahe (1928: 159) doubted the Greek origin of makédon and Chantraine (1968: 660) and Beekes (2010: 894) followed him in this. Chantraine suspected that Krahe might have been right in doubting the Greek origin of the word Makedón. Beekes admitted that the meaning might point at a link with makrós but argued for PG on two grounds: firstly, because an analysis of make-dn-os would have been impossible for Indo-European and secondly, because there was a variant Makétes ‘Macedonian’. The existence of a form with a d as in Makedón and with a t in Makétes was in Beekes’s opinion indicative for PG origin, as a variation t/d was a feature of PG. The probative value of the form in -étes is in our opinion limited, as we might be dealing with a suffix étes in mak-étes as in oik-étes ‘living in one’s house, house slave’ (this example was even adduced by Beekes himself). We are also unsure why an ablaut pattern don/dn would be impossible. The use of the full grade in the noun declension and the zero grade in the adjectival derivation is paralleled in the word for ‘father’, where we have the nominative patér and the genitive patrós besides patrós ‘fatherly’.

3. malthakós ‘weak, tender, soft, mild’ (Beekes 2010: 897–898).

4. málthe: ‘mix of wax and pitch’ (Beekes 2010: 898). Hesychios has a gloss málthe: trupheré: málthe: means ‘delicate’. The adjective malthakós is traditionally linked with the Germanic words for ‘mild’ (mild in English, German and Dutch; mildêis in Gothic and mildr in Old Norse) and with Sanskrit mardhati ‘to neglect’, and can be reconstructed as *meldh [Kluge et al. (1957: 479); Chantraine (1968: 662); Van Veen, Van der Sijs (1997: 563); Zehnder (2001b); DWDS s. u. mild; Mayrhofer (1996: 328–329) was more skeptical]. As malthakós and malakós ‘soft’ show similar suffixes and have the same meaning, it is likely that they influenced each other [Chantraine (1968: 662); Frisk (1970: 167)]. Solmsen (1909: 55–56; quoted in Frisk 1970: 167) and Chantraine (1968: 662) argued that the feminine noun málthe: was in origin a feminine adjective form from *malthós and reconstructed malthakós as *mlthnkos. Beekes argued that malakós ‘soft’ and malthakós...
did not influence one another, but did not state why he thought so. He assumed that \textit{malthakós} was PG, because it could not be derived from a zero grade of \textit{*meld} as this would have given \textit{**blathakós}. In addition, there was no Indo-European suffix \textit{*ŋko} (as suggested by Solmsen), and as Beekes (2010: 898), who discussed the well-known PG suffix \textit{ako} and assumed that most words in \textit{ako} were of substrate origin, and posited that \textit{malthakós} was of PG origin as well. He denied the link between \textit{málthe}: and \textit{malthakós}, but doubted the meaning \textquote{delicate} that was given by Hesychios and considered \textit{málthe}: to be PG, because of its technical meaning. We, on the other hand, see no reason to doubt the link between \textit{málthe}: and \textit{malthakós}. As wax is soft and mild, this poses no serious semantic problems. It is true that the lexicon by Hesychios is not always trustworthy, but in order to decide when it can(not) be trusted, an in-depth analysis is needed and one cannot just doubt words because they do not fit in into a certain theory. One could explain \textit{malthakós} as a derivation from \textit{málthe}: influenced by \textit{malakós}. As the \textit{-akos} in \textit{malakós} was inherited, Greek had words ending in \textit{akos} that were not PG and consequently, not every word with this suffix can be catalogued as PG. As the meanings of both words were very close, mutual influence between them cannot be denied.

5. \textit{mallós} \textquote{flock of wool} (Beekes 2010: 899). Fick and Prellwitz connected this word with Lithuanian \textit{milas} \textquote{coarse homespun wool}, reconstructed \textit{*mal-yos} and linked it with \textit{malakós} [Fick (1872: 176); Prellwitz (1899: 285); Pokorny (1959: 721)]. Semantically, this is not convincing.\footnote{As was already noted by Boisacq (1938: 606), Greppin (1981: 70). Frisk (1970: 168) was less critical, while Chantraine (1968: 663) only stated that the etymology was unknown.} Greppin rejected the link made by Fick, compared the Greek word to Armenian \textit{mal} \textquote{wether, castrated ram} and reconstructed \textit{*malyos} (as Fick had done). He argued that the basic meaning was not \textquote{castrated sheep}, but that it received that meaning through the resemblance with the verb \textit{malem} \textquote{to crush, castrate} (Greppin 1981: 72). Greppin’s explanation was doubted by Hamp (1982) and Clackson (1994: 232) because of the semantics.\footnote{This word was not discussed in Martirosyan (2008).} Clackson explained the Armenian word as a borrowing from Arabic \textit{māl} \textquote{possession} with a semantic evolution from \textquote{possession} into \textquote{sheep} in Armenian. The semantics of Greppin’s explanation are not problematic,\footnote{As Beekes (2010: 899) pointed out as well.} and certainly less problematic than Clackson’s suggestion (also because it offers an etymology that does not involve a borrowing). If the initial meaning was \textquote{sheep}, it is possible that Greek narrowed the meaning into \textquote{wool}. Beekes argued for PG because a reconstruction \textit{*mh,l} would be improbable and because the cluster \textit{ll} could have been a geminate from PG. If Greppin is right in his equation (and we see no reason to doubt it), this would be an Helleno-Armenian isogloss.\footnote{For evidence in favour of a close relationship between Greek and Armenian, see Solta (1960) and evidence against it can be found in Clackson (1994), but we leave out a detailed discussion on the issue of the relationships of Greek and the other Indo-European languages.} As such, a reconstruction (Proto-)Helleno-Armenian \textit{*malyos} would be possible and there is thus no need for a PG etymology. Assuming an Helleno-Armenian etymon would
also solve the a problem, because at that stage the Helleno-Armenian proto-language could have had an a phoneme already (even if one started from the assumption that PIE did not have it).

7. mérimna ‘care, concern’ (Beekes 2010: 932).

Since Fick, mártus has been linked with Sanskrit smára ‘remember’ from the root *smer ‘remember’ (Fick 1890: 338; Boisacq 1938: 612; Hofmann 1950: 191; Frisk 1970: 170). Frisk (1970: 170) suggested the following evolution for mártus: first, the root was put in the zero grade and extended by an abstract suffix tu and would have meant ‘remembrance, testimony’. In a second stage, an adjectival ro was added and in a third stage, martus and márturos became crossed, leading to a new nominative *márturs which became *mártu: and eventually dissimilated into mártus (which explains the apparent exception to Szemerényi’s Law) (Schwyzer 1939: 260, with a list of similar dissimilations; Frisk 1970: 170; a list of dissimilations can be found in Grammont 1948). In this scenario, mártus would originally have meant ‘testimony, remembrance’ and only later ‘he who remembered, witness’. A similar evolution from an abstract noun into a concrete one or adjective can be seen in mákār (cf. supra). Chantraine (1968: 669) rejected this hypothesis, because an action noun martu- remained hypothetical. Beekes assumed a PG origin, because a form *smṛtu in the zero grade⁷ should have given **bratu and because the suffixes tu and r were of non-Indo-European origin. We doubt this, because the evolution form mr into bra is only certain for word initial position, but in *smṛtu the cluster mr stands in word internal position. We also disagree with the assessment that the suffixes tu and r were of non-Indo-European origin. The root *smer can also be seen in mérimna (Chantraine 1968: 687; Mayrhofer 1996: 781). Beekes doubted the Indo-European heritage of this word, because he and Furnée (1972: 246) considered the suffix mna to be PG. We believe that there are neither semantic nor formal reasons excluding an Indo-European etymology for both words.

8. máthuia ‘jaw’.
10. mástaks ‘mouth’ (Beekes 2010: 911).
12. móthos ‘battle din’ (Beekes 2010: 961).

We believe that the first three words are related and that the last three are related as well. We discuss them together, because their etymologies pose the same problems,

---

⁷ Prellwitz (1905: 282–283) mentioned both mar and smer as possible etymologies. Surprisingly enough, Greek mártus was not mentioned in Mayrhofer (1996: 781, contrary to mérimna).
⁸ They did not address the absence of Szemerényi’s Law.
⁹ Beekes did not distinguish between vocalic and consonant resonants. There is a case to make for such an approach, especially since different languages seem to follow different vocalization rules, but after some hesitations, we decided to make the distinction after all.
namely the issue of the aspirates and the treatment of a laryngeal preceded by a conso-

nant and followed by a yod.

The words máthuia, masáomai and mástaks are related to Latin mandere ‘chew’
and can be linked to either Sanskrit MATH ‘rob, take quickly’\textsuperscript{10} or MANTH ‘move
heavily, move quickly’ (Hofmann 1950: 191; Walde, Hofmann 1954: 26; Zehnder
2000d: 442; Meiser 2005).\textsuperscript{11} The former continues PIE *mat\textsuperscript{h}, while the latter continues
*me\textsuperscript{onth}.

The Greek words could continue a zero grade from the root *me\textsuperscript{onth} or
the full grade from *mat\textsuperscript{h}, but Latin mandere cannot be reconstructed from the zero
grade of a root with *e/o. Mástiks and móthos can be linked to Sanskrit mánthati
‘agitate’, OCS mentetb ‘causes confusion’ and ON mǒndull ‘Drehholz’.\textsuperscript{13} In case of
mástiks, the word is built on the zero-grade (with Greek a being the reflex of a so-
nantic n) and the meaning would be that a whip is a tool to drive and agitate animals.

The word móthos is a bit more problematic: it is either a formation on the zero grade
with Aeolic treatment of the vocalic n (which would then be an Aeolism of the epic
language, móthos first being attested in Homer) (Kuiper 1934: 104), or it is built on
a nasalless form of the root *me\textsuperscript{onth} which is attested in Indic as well.\textsuperscript{14} We believe
that Moûsa can be linked as well, but will discuss the word at the end. Because he
ruled out that PIE *tH became th in Greek and because he did not accept voiceless
aspirates for PIE, Beekes (2010: 909) rejected the connection between the Greek
words and the other cognates, and considered the Greek words to be PG. He assumed
that the suffix ig in mástiks was an additional indication for PG origin. Frisk and
Chantraine also rejected the etymologies, because they thought that the Indo-
European *t\textsuperscript{h} was rendered by t in Greek (Chantraine 1968: 669, 708; Frisk 1970:
248–249; see especially Frisk 1936). We agree with Beekes that laryngeals did not
aspirate in Greek (Beekes 1969: 179–181, 2010: 909; Elbourne 2000),\textsuperscript{15} but – contrary
to Beekes – believe that PIE did in fact have a fourth category of plosives, namely
De Decker 2011, forthcoming a, forthcoming b). Their existence is no longer

\textsuperscript{10} The Indic roots are quoted in capital letters, because that is the way they are printed in Mayr-
hofer’s etymological dictionary.

\textsuperscript{11} For the difference between Sanskrit MATH and MANTH see Narten (1960); Hackstein (1995:
29–30), discussing the Tocharian evidence; Mayrhofer (1996: 311–312) who pointed out
that both roots were confused only in later texts and not in the RigVeda; Zehnder (2000c, 2001d).
Fick (1890: 283) only mentioned the root “quirlen” and not “kauen”.

\textsuperscript{12} We explain later on why we reconstruct the forms with *t\textsuperscript{h} and not *th\textsuperscript{h}.

\textsuperscript{13} For the listing of the cognates, see Fick (1890: 283, ‘without the Greek words’; Prellwitz
mamphur ‘Stück aus einer Drehbank’ (only attested in Paulus ex Festo) and mentula ‘dick,
penis’ have been linked as well, but they pose some problems and we will leave them out of
the discussion.

\textsuperscript{14} According to Whitney (1885: 117), the Atharva Veda has a form máthati ‘he agitates’, but it is
possible that this nasalless form is the result of inner-Indic evolutions (see above).

\textsuperscript{15} We discussed all the examples in De Decker (2011 and forthcoming a), and showed that none
of the examples in favour quoted in Peters (1993a, 1993b); Meiser (2005) and Nikolaev (2010:
66–67) was absolutely convincing. Beekes (2010: 909) also stated that there is not enough
evidence to assume aspiratory force of laryngeals in Greek.
generally accepted, after de Saussure had shown that certain Indic voiceless aspirates could be explained by the combination of a plain plosive and a laryngeal. Nevertheless, for a (relatively small) number of words their presence is needed. We also believe that the Greek evidence excludes a laryngeal. Latin *mandere* and Sanskrit *MATH* could theoretically continue both PIE *math₂* as *matʰ*, while Sanskrit *MANTH*, the Germanic and Slavic cognates could continue both PIE *melonth₂* as *mo/entʰ*, but this is not the case for the Greek words. If we start from the forms with a laryngeal, we can theoretically explain the aspiration in *máthuia* and *móthos*, but we cannot arrive at *mástaks*, *mástiks*, *masáomai* or *Moûsa*. If one starts from *math₂*, the forms *mástaks*, *mástiks* and *masáomai* cannot be explained, because the *transponat* *math₂:taks* would have given Greek **mátaks** and *math₂:tiks* would have yielded **matatiks**. The form *masáomai* is also difficult to explain starting from a root *math₂:* because that would have given *matai-* . The same applies to Moûsa: in laryngealistic terms, this would be *month₂:yt₂*, but that would have given **montaya**. There is a (supposed) sound law that states that a laryngeal disappeared between a consonant and a yod in word internal position (the so-called Lex Pinault or Pinault’s Law). If this rule were correct, *masáomai* and Moûsa would be regular outcomes from *math₂:ye/o* and *month₂:yt₂* respectively, but there are some doubts about the validity of this sound law for Greek (Lindeman 2004: 126—129; Piwowarczyk 2008, forthcoming; Verhasselt forthcoming, §3 treats the Greek material). First of all, there are counterexamples such as *aróo* : ‘I plough’ from *h₂erh₃:ye/o* and *(w)eméo* ‘I vomit’ from *wemh₁:ye/o*, forms which Pinault explained as *thematische*

---

16 In 1892, De Saussure, quoted in Bally, Gautier (1922: 603), argued in a short article in BSL that *certain cas* of the Indic voiceless aspirates went back to a combination of a plain voiceless plosive and what we would now call a laryngeal. In his Mémoire sur le système primitive des voyelles (dating from 1879) he had already suggested that the th in e.g. *grathnati* and *granthi* -tas was possibly the reflex of the i elsewhere in the verbal flection (Bally, Gautier 1922: 228). See Mayrhofer (1981a) for a detailed analysis of de Saussure’s reconstructions. It is important to note that de Saussure never said that all cases of Sanskrit th could be explained this way. The summary in BSL mentions *certains cas*, but since we only have a summary of what he actually said, we will never know how he actually envisaged the Indo-European consonant system. De Saussure’s explanation was expanded by Pedersen (1893: 269–273, 1926: 48, 63–64); Kuryłowicz (1927: 202–204, 1928: 55–56, 1935: 46–52). Cuny (1912) showed that laryngeals could also aspirate voiced plosives in Indo-Iranian. For a detailed treatment of the laryngeal effects in Indo-Iranian, see Mayrhofer (1981b, 2005).


18 For the laryngealistic reconstructions, see Mayrhofer (1996: 298–299, 311–312), Zehnder (2001c, 2001d). The form *math₁* was suggested to include the Greek personal name *Promатheús* but the long a in that name might be a case of secondary ablaut a/ā with the Greek *math* from *manthāno* : ‘I learn’.

19 Pedersen (1926: 52–54) already alluded to the fact that the Greek aspirate might be due to a laryngeal.

20 This had first been noticed by Wackernagel (1896: 81) for Indic. For PIE, see Pinault (1982), Ringe (2006: 15), Byrd (2015: 208–240) (admitting that there are still unexplained counterexamples).
Umbildungen of originally athematic verbs based on the aorist forms érosa ‘I ploughed’ and émesa ‘I vomited’. This would presuppose that all instances were analogically levelled out, which cannot be proved nor disproved. Secondly, while there are several good examples that seem to confirm this sound law for Greek, they can be explained differently (Piwowarczyk forthcoming). The first example is the noun aossetér ‘helper’ from *sm-sokʰ3-y- (literally ‘together-follower’) (Pinault 1982: 271–272). This word is related to Latin socius ‘ally’ and Sanskrit sákhā- and Avestan haxā ‘friend’. The indications for the laryngeal come from Indo-Iranian, namely the aspirate and the absence of Brugmann’s Law.

If the reconstruction as *sokʰ3-i- is correct, this would be an important example for the Law. Piwowarczyk, referring to Harðarsson, explained this as a secondary thematicization or a backformation on the aorist (Piwowarczyk forthcoming, referring to Harðarsson 1998: 328). In addition, it is possible that the laryngeal suffix *h2-o was only added in Indo-Iranian. In Latin and Greek, sequence *(sm)sock*-y- without laryngeal would have given áoss- and socius as well and if aossetér is related to Greek hépomai ‘I follow’ (from *sekʰ-o-mai), the question remains why hépomai has no laryngeal while would have had a laryngeal. The form aossetér can be explained as a thematicization of *sokʰ-y as is the case for Latin socius. A second example is the comparative meídzo:n ‘bigger’ from mégas (*meģʰ₂s). The expected comparative form would be *meģʰ₂-yos- and this would normally have given **mégaión. The loss of laryngeal is not necessarily a result of the rule. As the positive was mégas and the superlative mégistos ‘biggest’, it is possible that the stem meg was reintroduced to have a comparative and superlative *megyo:n – mégistos besides *kretyo:n – krátistos ‘better, best’ and *elakh-yo:n -elákhistos ‘fewer, fewest’. A third example is the verb teíroː ‘I annoy’ (Pinault 1982: 270). This is generally reconstructed as *terh₁-yoh₂ and would confirm the rule, but Greek térmōn ‘thorn’ shows that the root also existed without a laryngeal and the connection with English thorn indicates that the laryngealless form might have already existed in PIE. A fourth example is the verb éiroː ‘I speak, declare’ from *werh₁-ielo (Pinault 1982: 270). This present is rare and might well be a later creation based on the future erá: ‘I will say’ (Chantraine 1948: 267, 1968: 325–326; Frisk 1960: 470; Kümmel 2001: 689–690; Piwowarczyk forthcoming). As such, we believe

---

21 This was already noted by Peters (1980: 80–81).
22 As we stated above, an Indo-Iranian voiceless aspirate can – in most cases – be explained as the result of a plain plosive and a laryngeal.
23 This law states that an Indo-European *o becomes ā in Indo-Iranian in an open syllable. That this lengthening did not happen in this word, means that the verb did not end in *kʷ followed by a vowel but in *kʰ and a laryngeal (as the laryngeal counts as a consonant). There are nevertheless several examples to this sound law and there are several publications on the problem, but we cannot address the issue here. It was first stated in Brugmann (1876: 380, note 9). The most in-depth analysis is Volkart (1994) (but the literature on the topic is enormous and the issue cannot be addressed here).
24 As is argued by Verhasselt (forthcoming, example 32 in his article).
25 Piwowarczyk (forthcoming) also assumed that the stem meg was used to form the comparative and superlative.
26 See Verhasselt (forthcoming) under his example 30.
that Pinault’s Law is not an Indo-European sound law, and consequently, a reconstruction with a laryngeal cannot account for Greek forms *masiōmai (and Ἐνοίκσα). As the forms cannot be reconstructed with a laryngeal, the Greek aspirates need to be accounted for in a different way. We believe that a reconstruction *meioth and melontʰ (with an Indo-European voiceless aspirate) can solve the problem. If we accept that laryngeals had aspiratory force in Indo-Iranian but not in Greek, and that Greek and Indo-Iranian also preserved the inherited voiceless aspirates, the difference in consonantism between Greek *platús ‘flat’ and Indic *prthus ‘flat’ from *plth₂us is explained, as is the difference in consonantism between Greek *máthuia and *plätús. If one accepts the aspiratory force of laryngeals in Greek, *plätús is a difficult counterexample. If one does not accept aspiratory force and denies the existence of voiceless aspirates, the forms *mōthos and *máthuia are not easily explained. The form oístha ‘you know’ seems to be a strong example for aspiratory force of laryngeals in Greek, if one accepts the reconstruction *th₂e for the 2nd person singular ending (but there is nothing that argues against an ending *tʰa). It is possible, however, that the imperative *ísthi ‘know’ spread its aspiration to oístha (Frisk 1936: 41–43; Ruijgh 1978: 302). A similar example for such an ‘aspiration extension’ can be found in the 3rd person singular imperative *anókhivo: ‘let him order’ and the 2nd plural *ánokkhthe ‘you (pl.) order!’ which have their cluster kth from the 2nd singular imperative *ánokkhthi ‘order!’ from the verb *ánogha ‘I order’.

The last form that needs to be explained is Ἐνοίκσα. Several suggestions have been made for this word. Brugmann interpreted the word as a compound of a root *men ‘think’ and a suffix *tya: the Muse would then be ‘the thinking one, the inspiring one’ (Brugmann 1894: 253–256, building on a suggestion by Theodor Benfey). Wackernagel (1895) argued that the suffix *tya was not attested and suggested to link the word *moûsa with Latin *mons ‘mountain’, namely *mont-ya: the Muse would then be ‘goddess of the mountains’. The last suggestion was that by Ehrlich (1907), who argued that the Muse was the goddess that agitated and inspired knowledge and reconstructed *montʰya. Wackernagel’s ingenious suggestion has the problem that the root *mont is not attested in Greek (Chantraine 1968: 716). We therefore prefer to link *moûsa to *month rather than to *mont. *Moûsa would then be another word linked to the root *melontʰ (a laryngealistic reconstruction *month₂yj, for *Moûsa is problematic, because Pinault’s Rule did not apply in Greek). Beekes (2010: 972–973) argued that the word could be reconstructed as *month⁴ya and be linked with mantháno: ‘I learn’ or was PG because it did not have to be of Indo-European origin. We believe that there is no need to doubt the inherited nature of *Moûsa.

---

27 Lindeman (2004: 126–129) and Piwowarczyk (2008: 37, forthcoming) pointed out that the rule only applied in younger languages and in Indo-Iranian, a language where the anaptyctic vowel between laryngeal and consonant was an i. They wondered if this could not have triggered the deletion. See most recently Verhasselt (forthcoming).

28 Zubaty (1892) and Elbourne (2012) argued that PIE *²tʰ lost its aspiration when it was preceded by a resonant or s. Paul Elbourne (2012) informed us that he therefore denied the link between *mōthos and *māntʰati but this is not necessary. If there was already a nasalless form in PIE, *mōthos might have come from that form. This would not contradict his sound law (but we think that the examples of this sound law can be explained differently).
(or any of the other words) and accepting voiceless aspirates allows us to link these words with other Indo-European cognates and there is no need to assume that the Greek words were PG.

14. mágeiros ‘cook’.
15. mákhaira ‘large knife’, later also ‘dagger’ (Beekes 2010: 915).
16. mákhomai ‘I fight’ (Beekes 2010: 916).

It is not certain whether these three words are related, but we discuss them together as some dictionaries have linked them.

Three suggestions have been made for mákhaira. The first stated that it was a derivation from mákhomai ‘fight’, the second considered it a borrowing from Semitic and the third linked it with mágeiros (Chantraine 1968: 673; Frisk 1970: 187, without further observations; Beekes 2010: 915). Beekes accepted the connection between mágeiros and mákhaira, and interpreted mákhaira as PG, because it had a voiceless aspirate and mágeiros a voiced stop. In addition, the suffix eiros in mágeiros pointed at PG as well. Mákhaira has been interpreted as a Semitic loanword from m’kērā ‘sword’,

29 but against a Semitic borrowing speaks the fact that the word that would have been the basis for the borrowing was uncommon in Hebrew and Phoenician (Lewy 1895: 177–178). This makes it more likely that the word was borrowed from Greek into Semitic.

30 An additional problem is the meaning of the Semitic word: this means ‘sword’, but mákhaira is attested in Homer with the meaning ‘knife, dagger used in a sacrifice’ but is not used to refer to a sword (Seiler, Capelle 1889: 371; O’Sullivan 1993a). This brings us to the third suggestion, namely the link between mákhaira and mákhomai. At first, the link between mákhaira and mákhomai seems self-evident, as mákhaira means ‘knife, dagger’ and mákhomai ‘fight’. In that case, the former would be a derivation with suffix ya on an r extension of mákhomai (i.e. *makh – r – ya) (Boisacq 1938: 616; Frisk 1970: 188; Peters 1980: 181). Some have doubted this derivation, because mákhaira is not used to refer to a sword in Homer (cf. supra) (Seiler, Capelle 1889: 371; O’Sullivan 1993a, cf. supra). Prellwitz (1905: 284) and Boisacq (1938: 616) referred to the labour-class kheiromákhai in Miletos who represented the ‘hand-labourers’ and had nothing to do with fighting. In addition, they pointed out that the Greek medic in the Iliad was called Makhaon. This proved in their opinion that mákhomai did not only mean ‘fight’ but also ‘handle, treat with one’s hands’ and they therefore concluded that the link between mákhomai and mákhaira posed no problems. This analysis

---

29 Lewy (1895: 177–178), with doubts because the suspected source was rare in Phoenician and Hebrew. The borrowing hypothesis was reiterated by Stella (1967: 121–122).
30 See note 29.
31 Sayce (1928: 162) noted that the words were identical, but did not say which language borrowed from which. Frisk (1970: 187) stated that Gordon had argued for a borrowing by Semitic coming from Greek. Rosół (2012: 192–193) rejected the borrowing by Greek because the meanings did not match.
32 Lewy himself had already noted this.
33 Schwyzer (1939: 475) only discussed the suffixation, but not the etymology.
is not convincing, however. First, mákhomai means ‘fight’ in Homer and never ‘make’ or ‘treat with hands’ or something similar (Ebeling 1885: 1023–1025; Seiler, Capelle 1889: 372; O’Sullivan 1993b). Second, Makhaon might be a medic but he was also a soldier and came to Troy with a contingent of soldiers (Seiler, Capelle 1889: 371, referred to Iliad 2,729–733). Third, kheiromákhai are attested much later. There is, however, a reason why mákhaira might have been derived from mákhomai and not from mágeiros. As a sacrificial knife is used to kill animals, it is more likely that such a word is derived from a verb from fighting, whereas a word for ‘cook’ is more likely to be formed from a verb that means ‘prepare, handle (food)’. This brings us to the word mákhomai, which has no certain etymology either, cf. O’Sullivan (1993b: 45).34 Five suggestions have been made. Fick (1901b: 320) linked mákhaira, mákhomai, Makháoːn with mekhané: ‘means, trick’ (Doric makháná). Wiedemann (1904: 62–63) followed this suggestion, added Germanic *mag ‘be able’ to the equation and reconstructed *māgh. Wiedemann’s suggestion was expanded by Trümpy (for Greek) and adopted by Hofmann and LIV2 (with a short vowel) (Hofmann 1950: 201; Trümpy 1950: 126–128; Zehnder 2001a: 422, with reference to Trümpy). The second suggestion was to link it with an alleged personal name Amadzóːn which would be the Aeolic adaptation of an Iranian name hamazan ‘warrior’ (Hofmann 1950: 192–193; Pokorny 1959: 697). This suggestion is very unlikely (Frisk 1970: 188, ebenso geistreich wie unsicher). A third suggestion is to connect it with Vedic makha- ‘fighter’ and to reconstruct the Greek and Vedic words as *makḥ.35 Grassmann (1873: 971) started from an original meaning ‘hit with a (sacrificial) knife, slaughter, fight’ and linked Greek mákhomai, Vedic makhá and Latin mactāre ‘to slaughter’.36 He argued that the other meanings of the word, ‘hero’ and ‘enemy’ could both be derived from ‘fight’, but Macdonell (1893: 272) and Monier Williams (1899: 772) translated the word as ‘joyful, vigorously’.37 After careful consideration, Renou (1966: 141) argued that the original meaning was ‘fight’ after all.38 The fourth suggestion is that by Malzahn, Peters (2008: 266–267, without mentioning the Dutch word), who link it with Tocharian mäke ‘run’ and reconstructed *megʰH with a metathesis in Greek. They linked mákhlos ‘lascivious’ as well (cf. infra) and started from the meaning ‘run’: mákhomai originally meant ‘run’ and evolved via ‘run aggressively’ into ‘fight’, while mákhlos originally meant ‘running’ and this evolved into ‘lascivious’ (for this evolution there would be a parallel in German läufig ‘sexually in heat [of females]’ and Dutch loops ‘sexually heated [usually of female animals]’).

---


35 This had been suggested by Kuhn (1855: 19–21); Grassmann (1873: 971); Curtius (1879: 327); Renou (1966: 141); Dunkel (1979: 259); Mayrhofer (1996: 288, with doubts). *makʰ is our suggestion and not that by Mayrhofer.

36 The link with the Latin word was preserved in Wiedemann (1904: 62) and Lewis, Short s. u. but the other etymological dictionaries denied the link (Walde, Hofmann (1954: 5) and Hofmann (1935: 8) linked with Greek mássos: ‘I knead’ while Ernout, Meillet (1967: 376) and De Vaan (2008: 357) denied it had any cognates at all).

37 This meaning is also mentioned in Mayrhofer (1996: 288).

38 Chantraine (1968: 673–674) stated that the meaning was uncertain, but referred to Renou (1966: 141) who suggested that the original meaning was ‘fighter’.
In that case, the link with Sanskrit has to be given up. What argues against this equation, is that Greek would have preserved two derivations from the root but that none of them maintained the original meaning. The fifth suggestion is that by Beekes (2010: 916) who called the word “probably PG”, because it was isolated and because in the field of fighting inherited terms were unlikely. The last suggestion is *non liquet*, which is in our opinion only the last resort when there are really no other options. If the meaning of Sanskrit *makhá* was indeed ‘fight’, there is in our opinion nothing that argues against a link between the Greek and Sanskrit word, as they correspond perfectly in form and it would be a violation of Ockham’s Razor to state that the Sanskrit word was borrowed from a Dravidian language, and that the Greek word was borrowed from another non-Indo-European language.

Linking the Latin word is more problematic: phonologically, a form *makʰ* could account for the Latin *mac-tāre* (as a Latin sequence *mac* can only come from a root with an *a* in it), but semantically, it is more problematic, because one would then have to start from a meaning ‘hit with a (sacrificial) sword’, which would have been preserved in Greek *mákhaira* and Latin *mactāre* and would have evolved into ‘fight’ in *mákhomai* and *makhá*. This cannot be ruled out, but it seems more cautious to link the Greek and the Sanskrit word; to posit a Graeco-Aryan isogloss *makʰ* ‘fight’ (rather than to link *mákhomai* with the Germanic root *mag*⁴¹) and to assume that *mákhaira* was a secondary derivation from *mákhomai*.

17. *mákhlos* ‘lascivious (of a woman), horny’ (Beekes 2010: 915–916). Prellwitz (1905: 284, with doubts) linked this word to Sanskrit *makha*, but this is semantically unlikely (Chantraine 1968: 673; Frisk 1970: 187; Beekes 2010: 916). Furnée (1972: 209, 211) compared the word with the god Bakkhos and Beekes therefore suggested this word was PG because of the variation *m*/*b*. As we argued elsewhere, allowing such widespread variations is problematic, because it is not falsifiable and enables one to link almost any set of words (De Decker 2015). Malzahn, Peters (2008: 267) argued that the word was related with Tocharian *mäke* ‘run’ and compared German *läufig* (‘sexually) in heat (of females)’, but as we argued above, the problem is that the alleged root *megʰ* ‘run’ would then only have survived in Greek in two words with changed meanings and with metathesis. As the word is attested in Armenian *mahaz* ‘lascivious’ (as noted by Beekes himself) and is close in meaning to the Greek word, it could very well present another Helleno-Armenian isogloss. If the words were independently borrowed from the same language, it would mean that the PG

---

³⁹ This was suggested in Mayrhofer (1996: 288).

⁴⁰ We refer to Dunkel (1979: 259): “no convincing argument has ever been made against the connection of *makhá* and *mákhe*, only alternative suggestions”.

⁴¹ Neither Kluge et. al. (1957: 484) nor the online German lexicon DWDS included the verb *mákhomai* among the cognates of the German *mögen* ‘be allowed, be able’.

⁴² The link was recently reiterated by Malzahn, Peters (2008: 267, without mentioning Prellwitz).

⁴³ Similar arguments were made in Verhasselt (2009a, 2009b, 2011), and in Meissner (2014).

⁴⁴ It was not addressed in Clackson (1994) nor in Martirosyan (2008) and the Armenian word was not mentioned in Prellwitz (1905: 284) nor in Frisk (1970: 187).
language was spoken in an area vast enough to have influenced both Greek and Armenian (either when they were still together or individually). The question is if assuming an Helleno-Armenian isogloss would not be the more economic option.

18. meķhanē: ‘tool, ruse’.

The question is if both Greek words can be considered related to Gothic, German and Dutch mag ‘he is able’, OCS mogo ‘be able’ and possibly also Vedic maghā ‘gift’, in which case they would go back to the root *magʰ ‘powerful’ (Von Miklosich 1886: 199; Osthoff 1891: 216–217; Chantraine 1968: 700; Frisk 1970: 235). Beckes rejected the connection with the Germanic and Slavic forms because of the non-existence of PIE *a and pointed to a suggestion by Van Beek, who compared this word with māṅanon ‘ruse’ (Van Beek apud Beekes 2010: 949–950). As māṅanon had a voiced stop and “pre-nasalization” and meķhanē had a voiceless stop, this word was considered to be PG. Neither argument is convincing. First, there are words that prove the existence of a phoneme *a for PIE. An important example is in our opinion the word for ‘blind’, which is caecus in Latin and is related to Sanskrit kekaras ‘squinting’. The Sanskrit word rules out reconstructions *kh₂eik or *keh₂ik as the former would have given **khekaras and the latter **kaikaras. Second, the consonant variation ng/kh can be explained as the result of an internal Greek sound law. If we start from a stage of Proto-Greek with the voiced aspirates still present, we could assume that from the form magʰ-, a derivation with a nasal infix n and suffix an (a similar derivation occurred in tūmpanon ‘kettledrum’ derived from túpto: ‘I beat’) was made, namely *māṅghanon. In that form, the voiced aspirate was preceded by a nasal and also preceded by the accented syllable. Under these conditions, Greek rendered the voiced aspirate by a voiced stop. This is known as Miller’s Law (Miller 1977a: 151, 1977b: 37–38). As such, māṅanon is an expected outcome and is not an indication of Pre-Greekness. The long vowel in meķhanē needs an explanation as well. Frisk, following Schwyzer, suggested that besides the s stem mēkhos ‘means, remedy’ with lengthened grade, there was also an s noun *mākhar, *mākhanos from which a feminine and oxytone noun meķhanē: was derived with the lengthened grade (although the lengthened grade from mēkhos could have contributed as well) (Schwyzer 1939: 459; Chantraine 1968: 700; Frisk 1970: 235). The Greek forms could also be explained from the root *māgh with a long vowel. In that case, the short vowel of māṅanon could be explained by Osthoff’s Law. As the variations between the Greek words can be explained by internal Greek sound laws and there are cognates in other Indo-European languages, we believe that there is no need to catalogue this word as PG.

45 Frisk noted that Bopp and Pott had already made this equation. The connection with Greek goes back to Fick (1901b: 320) and Wiedemann (1904: 62–63), and was adopted in Pokorny (1959: 659), Mayrhofer (1996: 289) and Zehnder (2001a).

46 This sound law, which is not of Indo-European date as it does not operate in Indo-Iranian and Tocharian, states that a long vowel is shortened in Latin and Greek when it is followed by a resonant and a consonant.
20. *molobrós* (uncertain meaning) (Beekes 2010: 963). This word is used as epithet for Odysseus when he was still disguised as a beggar and therefore must have had a negative or derogatory meaning. Earlier attempts to explain this word are phonologically impossible. One example is that by Fick (1904: 97), who linked it with *blābe*: ‘damage’ from a root *mleb* which would have had *molob* in the full grade. This is impossible (Frisk 1970: 250–251). This word is not only attested in Homer but also appears in Mycenaean as *mo ro go ro* and therefore the word must have had a labio-velar. Chantraine considered this word a compound of *molo* and *gʷro* and translated it as ‘animal qui dévore les jeunes pousses’ (Chantraine 1968: 709, 1972: 203–205). The first part of the Greek word is not attested in the meaning ‘flea’, however, but has an equivalent in Indic *mala* ‘dirt, shit’ and the second is a form of the root *gʷerh₃* ‘devour’ in the zero grade (Normier 1980: 276; Neumann 1992: 75–80; De Leeuw 1993). As this is a compound, the form was subject to the so-called neognós rule, which states that in compounds or reduplicated forms, a laryngeal is lost when it is preceded by a sonorant and followed by a vowel: ⁴⁷ thus *molo-gʷerh₃-os* became *mologʷros*, leading to the attested Greek form. Beekes considered this word PG, because he did not accept the loss of laryngeals in compounds (Beekes 2010: 963 *I do not accept the loss of laryngeals in compounds*). This is strange, because elsewhere in his dictionary and his publications he mentioned the neognós rule. As this word can be explained from an Indo-European perspective and has a meaning that makes perfect sense in the context (‘Dreckfresser’), ⁴⁸ we see no need to assume PG origin.

23. *mókhthos* ‘difficulty, distress’ (Beekes 2010: 973).
24. *mókhlos* ‘handle, long or strong rod’ (Beekes 2010: 973).

The first three words are clearly linked and the basic word is *mögéo*: (Chantraine 1968: 707–708). Attempts have been made to find an Indo-European etymology. Schulze

---

⁴⁷ The Greek word neognós ‘newly born’ is a compound *neo-ǵnh₁-*os of néos ‘new’ and ġnh₁ ‘originate’. In that compound, the laryngeal is lost. Beekes is considered the inventor of that rule, see Beekes (1969: 241–245, pointing out that Hirt might be the first one to state that laryngeal loss in compounds could occur; 1982: 114; 1988: 60–61, pointing out that there were only a few examples). In Beekes (2010: 1079) he mentioned the rule. Mayrhofer (1986: 129) assumed that the rule applied to *ʰi* alone, but this example proves that all laryngeals were subject to this rule. Weiss (2009: 113) stated that the rule operated in “long” words such as reduplications and compounds. See also Byrd (2015: 26).

⁴⁸ This is the translation suggested by Neumann and De Leeuw.
(1887: 270) tried to connect these words with Latin mōles ‘burden, heavy weight to carry’. Solmsen (1888: 85–86) suggested to link mōgos with Lithuanian smagūs ‘heavy to carry, heavy to drag’ and Latvian smags ‘heavy’. Meier-Brügger (1993) suggested that the Greek words contained the o grade of the adjective mégas ‘big’ and compared mēlas ‘black’ and mólos ‘dirt’. The suggested cognates are not certain: the link with Latin mōles has been doubted by Walde, Hofmann (1954: 102), and neither Ernout, Meillet (1967: 410) nor De Vaan (2008: 386) even mentioned the link, and according to Fraenkel the Baltic words should be linked to Lithuanian smagiū ‘hit, throw something heavy’ (quoted in Frisk 1970: 262). The connection between mōkhlos and Latin mōles can, however, not be excluded a priori, if one reconstructs mogslo- with the suffix slo that is attested elsewhere in Latin as well (as can be seen inpālus ‘pale, stake’ from *pagslo-) (Schulze 1887: 270; Walde, Hofmann 1954: 243; Ernout, Meillet 1967: 478; Frisk 1970: 262). The Greek form mōkhlos ‘handle’ could be included assuming that a handle is a tool to perform (heavy) labour: it could be an original mogslo- with a suffix slo. The form would then have lost the interconsonantic sigma and have aspirated the other consonants, which occurred in ėrkhomai ‘I go’ from Proto-Greek *erskomai. This is better than Chantraine’s (1933: 240) explanation that the suffix was lo and that the aspiration was expressive. The main problem with Schulze’s equation is the difference in declension type in Greek and Latin. Solmsen’s (1888) explanation assumes a link between ‘heavy’ and ‘difficult’ which is acceptable, but Meier-Brügger’s (1993) suggestion is more problematic. He assumed an evolution from ‘big’ into ‘heavy’ into ‘difficult’ and explained the verb’s original meaning as ‘groß machen’ which became then ‘unter großer Anstrengung tun’. A last remark involves the form. If *meoloğh, were the basis, would one not have expected Greek *mogáo? If the Baltic cognates are not related, the word has no etymology (but even with Latin and Baltic cognates, a PIE origin would not have been entirely certain). Beekes argued that the links of mogéov with other Indo-European languages were hardly credible. He also argued that the form mōklos (attested in Anakreon, living in Asia Minor in the 6th century BC) with a plain voiceless plosive instead of an aspirated one in mōkhlos and the variation khth in mōkhθos and g in mogéov: proved that all the words were PG. We do not believe that the derived words are evidence for PG origin. The variation between mōklos and mōkhlos can be explained by an influence of Anakreon’s dialect as well. As he lived in Asia Minor and wrote in Ionic (which was a psilotic dialect), the form without an aspirate could reflect his everyday speech. The aspirate in mōkhlos has been explained above. For mōkhθos, one can assume that the suffix -thos was added to the stem mog. This suffix can be used in words referring to difficult situations or negative feelings such as ākhθos ‘burden, burden of pain’ besides ākhos ‘pain’. Chantraine (1933: 366–367) considered this to be an inherited expressive suffix, visible in Sanskrit tha. Another explanation is

49 De Vaan stated that mōles did not have a good etymology.
50 Rather than a suffix sdho (Schulze 1887: 270) or stho (Prellwitz 1905: 301).
51 Frisk (1970: 261–262) agreed with the Greek expressive suffix but did not mention the Sanskrit suffix.
a link with *d^e\textit{eh} ‘put’ and then the suffix \textit{thos} would be an original *d^h\textit{hos} meaning ‘bringing, carrying X’. It is therefore not correct to use the variation g/k\textit{h\textit{th}} as proof for Pre-Greekness. Even if \textit{mog\textit{eo}} were of non IE origin, the noun \textit{m\textit{ok\textit{h\textit{thos}}} could represent a regular Greek compound.

25. \textit{mud\textit{\textit{ao}}} ‘to be humid’ (Beekes 2010: 974).
26. \textit{m\textit{ud\textit{ros}}} ‘metal roasted in fire, glowing stones’ (Beekes 2010: 975).

As \textit{m\textit{ud\textit{ros}}} represents the molten iron, a link with the verb \textit{mud\textit{\textit{ao}}} is very likely (Debrunner 1908: 5, 9). Beekes considered the noun to be PG because of the anlaut \textit{sm} which is also attested and because of the technical meaning. We believe that this is not necessary. Many words of technical meaning are of non-IE origin, but that does not mean that they are all of such origin; second, the anlaut \textit{sm} could be onomato-
poeic or could have been influenced by other words with an anlaut \textit{C/sC}. The verb is also attested with a long \textit{u}, which is explained as metrical lengthening (Curtius 1873: 336; Frisk 1970: 263; Beekes 2010: 974). Beekes argued that the verb was PG as well because of the link with the adjective \textit{m\textit{us\textit{os}}} (variation \textit{d/s} in one word would point to PG) and because the verb was attested with a long and short vowel. We believe that the arguments are not convincing. First, the distinction in vowel length might be ascribed to metrical lengthening (as Beekes admitted himself) and as such, it has no probative value. Second, there is the connection with the Dutch word \textit{mot\textit{(regen)}} ‘light rain’ and the Sanskrit word \textit{mud\textit{ir\textit{a}}} ‘cloud’ (but this is attested only in the Classical Sanskrit period). As the Indic word also means ‘lover’ according to the lexica, it is often linked to the noun \textit{mud- ‘joy’} (Curtius 1873: 336; Frisk 1970: 263), but this connection is rather doubtful and maybe there was an Indic root \textit{MOD ‘wet’} besides \textit{MOD ‘rejoice’} (Mayrhofer 1996: 383). As such, we believe that the word is of Indo-European origin (as Germanic, Greek and Indic did not have shared innovations).

27. \textit{m\textit{ud\textit{os}}} ‘voiceless, numb’ (according to Hesychios) (Beekes 2010: 975).
28. \textit{muk\textit{\textit{o}}\textit{s}}} ‘speechless’.

These two words have been explained by Hesychios as \textit{\textit{aphon\textit{os}}} ‘speechless’. As \textit{m\textit{ud\textit{os}}} is also attested as \textit{m\textit{und\textit{os}}} , Beekes argued that the words were PG because of the so-called “pre-nasalization”. This is not certain, however. There is the word \textit{m\textit{unj}} in Armenian, which could continue *\textit{mund-yo-}. If this were the case, it could be an Helleno-Armenian isogloss and consequently, PG would be excluded. Clackson (1994)

\textsuperscript{52} Boisacq (1938: 648, without mentioning the Dutch word), Hofmann (1950: 206), Chantraine (1968: 718). Frisk (1970: 263) mentioned the connection, but was doubtful about an etymological link.

\textsuperscript{53} He mentioned the Greek words but not the Dutch one.

\textsuperscript{54} The recent Dutch etymological dictionary by Van Veen, Van der Sijs (1997: 569, 579) linked the Dutch word with Dutch \textit{modder ‘mud’}, English \textit{mud} (this connection had already been made by Prellwitz 1905: 301), Greek \textit{mud\textit{ros}} and Avestan \textit{muthra ‘faeces’} and Indic \textit{mutra ‘urine’}, but this is unlikely as an Indo-Iranian \textit{t}, a Greek \textit{d} and a Germanic \textit{d} cannot be linked with each other.
considered the reconstruction *mundy or *mūndy for the Armenian form somewhat dubious, but he did not discuss the Greek word. Personally, we do not see why a link between the Greek and Armenian word would be excluded. It also seems that the word mukós cannot be separated either. In other languages, there are words with an initial mu/mū that refer to the absence of speaking such as Latin mūtus ‘dumb’ and Sanskrit mūka ‘dumb’ with different extensions (Ernout, Meillet 1967: 427; Chantraine 1968: 720; De Vaan 2008: 398). A connection with sound imitating mū is possible (Frisk 1970: 268), but then the connection with mūthos (cf. infra) is difficult, because that word means ‘word’ and not ‘dumb, deaf, soundless’. One single etymology that connects all different words is not available, but it seems that all words are derivations with different suffixes from the onomatopoeic root mu/ū. As such, there is no need to posit a PG origin for these words.

29. mūthos ‘word’ (Beekes 2010: 976). This word is in formation very similar to the words mentioned above and can -at least formally- be explained by the root *mū and the suffix *thos (be it from *tʰo- or *dʰh₁o-). There are two problems with this explanation: first, there is no indication in the texts that mūthos was ever an onomatopoeic word (Chantraine 1968: 719: “mais le sens du mot, dès les plus anciens textes, n’est pas en faveur de cette hypothèse”) and second, the other words derived from this root mean ‘dumb, not speaking’, which is exactly the opposite. The second observation is maybe less problematic, if one assumes an initial meaning ‘producing the mū sound’ which would have evolved into ‘producing a sound’ and eventually into ‘what is produced by the mouth, (namely) word’. Beekes suggested that the word was PG because there were no comparanda, but not every Greek word without an Indo-European etymology is of substrate origin.

30. mukhós ‘hiding place, innermost place, storage room’ (Beekes 2010: 987). According to Wace (1951: 209–210), the word was also used to refer to the private rooms of the master of the house. Fick (1909: 149) linked múskhon ‘female and male genitalia’ with mukhós as well and suggested an etymology *mukh-skō, in which the first velar was lost but the aspiration was transferred to the last velar. Semantically, there is no problem with this explanation, as the genitalia are those parts that remain hidden. Cognates of this word in other Indo-European languages are OCS smykati se ‘crawl’, Lithuanian smūkti ‘glide’, ON smjúga ‘to slip in’ (Frisk 1970: 279; Beekes 2010: 987), with the first two forms derived from *smuk and the last one from *smugh. Frisk connected mokhós with the Armenian verb mxem ‘immerse’, assumed a basis meaning ‘stuff away, hide’ from which the Greek word received its meaning ‘hiding place’ and reconstructed *mukʰ. Clackson (1994: 182) considered the etymology doubtful and Beekes (2010: 987) rejected this reconstruction because

55 Clackson (1994: 45), talking about the origin of the Armenian u (which is often written ow as well). Similar doubts were already voiced by Frisk (1970: 269).

56 As was already done by Curtius (1873: 336, without discussing the suffix). See also Frisk (1970: 264–265).

voiceless aspirates were no longer accepted. As we stated above, voiceless aspirates are indeed much rarer that the other plosives, but there are a few words where another explanation is not possible (the same applies to PIE *b and *a) and “rare” does not mean “non-existent”. As the root *mukʰ with its voiceless aspirate is only attested in Greek and Armenian, it is not certain that it can be reconstructed for PIE. Other Indo-European languages display roots of a similar form but with different velars (*muk and *mugʰ). Chantraine (1968: 728) explained this by the expressive nature of the word, and Frisk (1970) suggested that the different roots could be unified into one root with several allophonic variants due to assimilation with contiguous consonants. Maybe the Hellenic-Armenian innovation was that from a root *mukʰ and *mugʰ a root *mukʰ was extracted? Beekes mentioned that Furnée considered this word PG, but that the arguments were lacking (Beekes 2010: 987–988, referring to Furnée 1972: 364). Given the fact that this word is attested in several languages, PG origin is in our opinion excluded.

31. múoːps ‘gadfly, goad, spur’ (Beekes 2010: 989). Prellwitz (1905: 192) started from the assumption that cattle feared this animal and that it recognized the insect by its tone. He therefore suggested a compound of the mu ‘mumming sound’ and oːps. Boisacq (1938: 65) explained this word as a compound of múa ‘fly’ and oːps ‘seeing’. The meaning would then be ‘what looks like a fly’. This etymology was accepted by Hofmann (1950: 209) and Frisk (1970: 281), but rejected by Chantraine (1968: 729). Beekes considered it unlikely and rather suggested PG origin because of the suffix oːps that could be found in other insect names such as kóːnoːps ‘gnat’. As there is a word múoːps ‘short sighted’ which is a compound from múo: ‘I close’ and oːps ‘seeing’ and which literally means ‘with closed vision, (hence) ‘short-sighted’,58 there is nothing that rules out that and in this case we would have another oːps compound ‘with fly-looks’.

3. Conclusion

While it was not our goal to rewrite the dictionary, we hope to have shown that many of the words catalogued as <PG> or <PG?> allowed for other explanations as well (this is the reason why we often decided to discuss earlier etymologies as well). In several instances, there was no agreement on an etymology or there was no established etymology altogether, but in many instances, an Indo-European etymology was available. We never argued (nor will we ever argue) that each and every word in Greek has to have an Indo-European etymology nor that there are no borrowings in the Greek lexicon. The main intention of this article was to show that in establishing etymologies one should look at the evidence and not be searching for borrowings when they are not there, and that strict and falsifiable rules should be used.

58 This analysis was accepted by Beekes (2010: 989) as well.
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