



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Review of Bianconi M. (2021) Linguistics and cultural interactions between Greece and Anatolia: in search of the golden fleece

Kloekhorst, A.

Citation

Kloekhorst, A. (2024). Review of Bianconi M. (2021) Linguistics and cultural interactions between Greece and Anatolia: in search of the golden fleece. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 81(1-2), 95-98. doi:10.2143/BIOR.81.1.3293881

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4211965>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

BIANCONI, M. (ed.) — Linguistics and Cultural Interactions between Greece and Anatolia. In *Search of the Golden Fleece*. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East, 122). Brill Academic Publishers, Leiden/Boston, 2021. (24 cm, XII, 259). ISBN 978-90-04-46158-1. ISSN 1566-2055. € 117,-.

As we learn from the book's Introduction *Looking for the Golden Fleece: Where Are We Going*, written by its editor Michele Bianconi, this volume finds its origins in the conference *In Search of the Golden Fleece* held at the University of Oxford in January 2017, and contains a “new and up-to-date selection of case studies of linguistic, cultural, and literary contacts between Greece and ancient Anatolia”, including some papers from said conference. The volume contains ten chapters in total, all written by well-known scholars working on the intersection between Anatolian and Greek studies.

Chapter 1, *‘There and Back Again’: A Hundred Years of Graeco-Anatolian Comparative Studies* by M. Bianconi, offers a rich overview of previous publications regarding contacts between Greece and ancient Anatolia, including an impressive 17-page long bibliography on this subject. Chapter 2, *Homeric Covenantal Terminology and Its Near Eastern Forerunners* by P. Dardano, discusses covenantal formulations in Greece and the ancient Near East. She compares extensive passages from Homer with comparable text fragments from Hittite rituals, and focuses on the use of the phrase ‘to cut a covenant’. Chapter 3, *Anatolian and Greek in Contact: The Infinitive Periphrasis Hom. βῆ δ’ ἔμην, Hitt. dai-/ti- + supine -u-yan, Hluw. ta- + Infinitive* by J.L. García Ramón, argues that the Greek inchoative construction βῆ δ’ ἔμην ‘to start to go’ ← litt. *‘to take a step to do’ is a calque on the Hittite construction *tije/a-* + supine in *-u-yan* ‘to start X-ing’ ← litt. *‘to take a step in order to X’. This suggestion is based on an incorrect analysis of the Hittite material, however. The Hittite supine construction does not regularly use *tije/a-* ‘to step’, but rather *dai-* / *ti-* ‘to put’. This is clear from the fact that in OS and MH/MS texts, all supine constructions use unambiguous forms of the verb *dai-* / *ti-* ‘to put’, never of *tije/a-* ‘to step’.¹⁾ It is true that *dai-/ti-yanzi*-class verbs show through time a mechanical transfer to the *mi*-conjugated *-ie/a-*-class (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 144), which means that in NH texts the supine construction is found with forms of ‘to put’ that show a stem *tije/a-* and that thus are

homophonous with *tije/a-* ‘to step’. Yet, there can be no doubt that to the mind of the Hittite speaker the verb used in this construction was ‘to put’. This is detrimental to García Ramón’s proposal that the Hittite construction arose from a periphrasis *‘to make a step into’ → ‘to begin to’. Rather, we have to assume an original construction with ‘to put’.²⁾ Since in OH texts all attested supine constructions use a transitive verb (*huganni-yan* (StBoT 12+ i 43 (OS)) ‘to butcher’; *iššui-yan* (KBo 8.42 rev. 2 (OS)) ‘to do, to make’; *pijanni-yan* (KBo 8.42 rev. 3 (OS)) ‘to give’; *dameške-yan* (KBo 22.1 obv. 3 (OS)) ‘to (op)press’), we may envisage an original construction *‘to put someone/something under the act of X-ing’ → ‘to start X-ing someone/something’, which was then extended to intransitive verbs, ‘to start X-ing’. It therefore seems best to assume that the Greek construction βῆ δ’ ἔμην ‘to start to go’ arose independently, without any Anatolian influence. Chapter 4, *A Possible New Greco-Carian Contact Phenomenon* by H.C. Melchert, treats the possible phonetic values of the Carian letters *y* (n° 5) and *ý* (n° 28) and *u* (n° 19) and *w* (n° 32),³⁾ and to what extent Greek rendering of Carian names with these letters and *vice versa* may elucidate this question. The conclusions of this chapter are somewhat vague, and the author “leave[s] it to readers to draw their own judgments”. Chapter 5, *Language Contact between Lydian and Greek or The Origin of Lydian k*, by N. Oettinger, presents a compelling argument that Greek κάπηλος ‘merchant’ is a borrowing from Lydian, and that the Lyd. stem **kap-* is cognate to Hitt. *happ-* ‘business’ < PIE **h₃ep-*. This identification is used as an argument that in this word PIE **h₃* > Lyd. *k*, which supports the idea that the Lydian name *kuka-* ‘Γύγης’ reflects PIE **h₂eu_h2o-* ‘grandfather’, with PIE **h₂* > Lyd. *k*. A further treatment of Lydian words on the basis of which it has been claimed in the past that PIE **h₂/3* > Lyd. Ø shows that they are either non-probative (*eša-*) or show a conditioned loss of **h₂/3* before a glide (λαίλας, *wešfa-*). This is an important contribution, since it puts Lydian in line with Lycian, Carian and (possibly) Sidetic, where PIE **h₂/3* also yielded a *k* (in specific environments). Chapter 6, *In Search of the Holy Cube Roots: Kubaba—Kubeleya—Κύβεβος—Kufaws and the Problem of Ethnocultural Contact in Early Iron Age Anatolia*, by R. Oreshko, discusses several theonyms starting with **kube-* (or something comparable), attempting to use them for discussing contacts between different regions in Anatolia. The author allows himself a lot of freedom in his analyses, ignoring well established linguistic principles. For instance, he cites a Lydian deity “Qaḷijāns”, whereas this theonym is generally read *Q₂dān-*, in which *d* = [ḏ]. He claims that Lyd. *Lews* can directly reflect PIE **dei_uos*, whereas otherwise PIE **d-* is expected to yield Lyd. *t-* or, when palatalized, *c-*. He claims that Phr. *kubeleya* can be connected to Gr. κεφαλή ‘head, top, extremity’ and that both can reflect **g^heb^h-a-l-* through Grassmann’s Law, although e.g. Phr. *bev₂dos* ‘statue’ < PIE **b^heud^h-os-* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 195-6) clearly shows that Grassmann’s Law did not apply in Phrygian.

¹⁾ In StBoT 12+ i 42 (OS), we find [(*huganni*)]*yan tianzi* ‘they start butchering’ with 3pl.pres.act. *tianzi*. However, in this text, a consistent distinction is made between *tianzi* (3pl.pres.act. of *dai-* / *ti-* ‘to put, to place’) and *tienzi* (3pl.pres.act. of *tije/a-* ‘to step’; e.g. in i 4, 6, 20), so there can be no doubt that this supine construction takes the verb *dai-* / *ti-*.

²⁾ In Spanish, an inchoative construction formed with ‘to put’ exists as well, but here the verb is always used as a reflexive (*ponerse* ‘to put oneself’), which implies a different grammaticalization path (cf. Enghels & Comer 2018) from the one we may envisage for Hittite.

³⁾ Transliterations according to Adiego 2007. It is annoying that Melchert does not give a clear overview in his chapter of which Carian sign is transliterated in what way by whom, making it difficult to follow his arguments.

Since such idiosyncratic linguistic analyses form a large part of the basis on which Oreshko's overall claims rest, it is difficult to see how trustworthy these are. Chapter 7, *Diplomatic Marriage as an Engine for Religious Change: The Case of Assuwa and Ahhiyawa*, by I. Rutherford, discusses the possibility that the (badly preserved) text AhT 6 mentions a "royal betrothal" between Ahhiyawa (Mycenaean Greece) and the Western Anatolian political Aššūwa, and what influence such royal marriages between different states in general may have on the religious systems of the states involved. Chapter 8, *The Mopsos Names and the Prehistory of the Lydians*, by Z. Simon, argues that Anatolian personal names of the shape *MuksV-* and *MoksV-* cannot be the result of a borrowing of the Greek personal name Μόψος < *Mok^wso* (Mycenaean *mo-qo-so*) into the Anatolian languages, since we would expect the Greek *-k^w-* to have been borrowed as *-k^w-*, not as *-k-*. He therefore concludes that Greek "*Mok^wso*" > *Mopso-* and Anatolian *Moxos* / *Muksos* / *Muksa-* / *Mukšu-* have nothing to do with one another". According to Simon, this also applies to the Luwian name *Muksa-* (spelled *mu-ka-sa-* / *mu-ka-sá-*) that is used in the Hieroglyphic Luwian version of the KARATEPE bilingual to render the name of the ancestor of the ruling dynasty of Hiyawa, who in the Phoenician version of the text is called *MPŠ* (a name that is generally seen as reflecting Gr. Μόψος). Simon thus assumes that "the translator of the Phoenician original created for the dynasty of Mopsos translated /luwianized the name *MPŠ* (Mopsos) with a similar sounding Luwian name, *Muksa-*", and that the combination of Phoen. *MPŠ* and Luw. *Muksa-* is thus "strictly secondary". This seems too far-fetched to me. Proto-Indo-European knew a constraint against the combination **u* + labiovelars,⁴⁾ and there is no reason not to assume that this constraint was inherited by Anatolian. This implies that native Anatolian words could not contain a sequence **/*u*(*ː*)*k^w*/ or **/*o*(*ː*)*k^w*/ (< PIE **-(*e/o*)*uk^w*-), but did know the sequences /*ū*(*ː*)*k*/ and /*ō*(*ː*)*k*/. It thus seems unproblematic to me to assume that the Greek name *Mok^wso-*, since it could not be taken over into the Anatolian languages as **/*mok^wso-*/, was instead rather borrowed in the shape /*mokso-*/. I therefore see no reason to doubt that Luw. *Muksa-* is a spelling for /*moksa-*/, a direct rendering of /*mokso-*/ (with trivial transfer to the *a*-stem inflection) < Greek *Mok^wso-*. The same could then in principle go for the other Anatolian names, as well: *Mukšu-*, the name of a Western Anatolian individual attested in the Hittite Madduqatta Text; and Phr. *Moxos*, the name of a legendary Lydian leader; and Phr. *Muksos*. Pace Simon, we therefore cannot refute on linguistic grounds historical hypotheses that are based on an equation of one or more of these names with the Greek name *Mok^wso-* / Μόψος, and more specifically with the name of the seer Μόψος who according to Greek mythology sailed from Ionia to Cilicia to settle there.⁵⁾ Chapter 9, *Distorted Reflections? Writing in the Late Bronze Aegean in the Mirror of Anatolia*, by W. Waal, compares characteristics of the writing traditions in the Late Bronze Age Aegean (Linear A, Linear B) with that of contemporary Anatolia (Anatolian Hieroglyphs; Cuneiform), focusing on attested text genres and writing materials. She makes a convincing case that, besides on clay tablets, Linear A and B were written on perishable materials as well (primarily palm leaves, but possibly

also wood, bark, leather, parchment), which would explain the absence of non-administrative texts in Linear B, whereas these are abundantly attested in Anatolia. The chapter contains an addendum by M. Dillo, who argues that the wooden diptych found at the Uluburun shipwreck may contain incised signs that represent Mycenaean numerals, and which would thus directly attest the use of Linear B on wood. Chapter 10, *The Anatolian Connections of the Greek God Enyalios*, by I. Yakubovich, argues that the name of the Greek war deity Ἐνυάλιος derives from the Lydian word *ēnwala-*, which is attested once and may denote a "ruler or representative" of a certain group of people. Lyd. *ēnwala-*, in turn, is argued to have been borrowed from a Luwian word **annawal(i)-* that itself is unattested but would also be the source of Hitt. *annaqali-* 'co-ranked, peer, colleague'. Although all these forms are phonetically certainly similar to each other, the semantic part of Yakubovich's argumentation seems rather speculative. We may therefore judge this proposal as a mere possibility at best.

All in all, the ten chapters that make up this volume contain interesting new ideas at the crossover between Ancient Greece and Anatolia and showcase how rewarding it can be to study both regions in tandem. Especially the studies by Oettinger and by Waal offer noticeable progress on important issues. Moreover, the volume is carefully edited and beautifully printed. We may therefore wholeheartedly congratulate the volume's editor for having done a great job.

References

- Adiego, I.-J., 2007, *The Carian Language*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
 Brugmann, K., 1881, Griechische Etymologien, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 25, 298-307.
 Enghels, R. & Comer, M., 2018, Evaluating grammaticalization and constructional accounts: The development of the inchoative construction with *put* verbs in Spanish, *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar* (edd. E. Coussé, P. Andersson, J. Olofsson), Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107-133.
 Kloekhorst, A., 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
 López-Ruiz, C., 2009, Mopsos and cultural exchange between Greeks and locals in Cilicia, *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (edd. Ü. Dill & C. Walde), Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 487-501.
 Obrador-Cursach, B., 2020, *The Phrygian Language*, Leiden – Boston: Brill.
 Saussure, F. de, 1889, Βουκόλος, *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 6, 161-162.

Leiden University,
 January 2024

Alwin KLOEKHORST

⁴⁾ Brugmann 1881: 307¹; De Saussure 1889.

⁵⁾ E.g. López-Ruiz 2009.