

Reflections on the Hesychian Lemma βουρικυπάρισσος

Elwira Kaczyńska

University of Lodz, Faculty of Philology, Chair of Classical Philology,
Department of Latin Studies and Linguistics,
171/173, ul. Pomorska, Łódź, 90-236, Poland; elwira.kaczynska@uni.lodz.pl.

For citation: Kaczyńska E. Reflections on the Hesychian lemma βουρικυπάρισσος. *Philologia Classica* 2022, 17 (1), 60–76. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2022.105>

The Greek grammarian and lexicographer, Hesychius of Alexandria (5th–6th c. CE) included a Pamphylian gloss: βουρικυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι in his dictionary of rare and dialectal words. Based on a microphilological and lexical analysis, I suggest that the Greek text should be read as follows: βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι (“*bourí*: cypress or grapevine. Citizens of Perge”). The Pamphylian gloss in question represents two different borrowings of terms originating in the Near East. The first item βουρί· κυπάρισσος (‘cypress’) seems to have been borrowed from Akkadian *burāšu(m)* ‘a kind of conifer tree; juniper or cypress’ with a Lycian intermediary (Akk. *burāšu* → Luw. **burašiš* > Lyc. **burehi* > **burhi* → Pamph. βουρί), whereas the second one βουρί· [...] ἄμπελος (‘grapevine’) reflects a separate loanword from an Anatolian source, cf. Hitt. and Luw. *muriš* c. ‘a grapevine, a vine, a cluster or bunch of grapes or other fruit’. The Pamphylian dialect of Ancient Greek represents an extraordinary idiom, which was used in the neighbourhood of numerous Anatolian languages such as Lycian, Milyan, Sidetic, Pisidian and Cilician. It is therefore not surprising that the Pamphylian Greeks borrowed a number of cultural terms for plants from an Anatolian Indo-European source, as well as from Akkadian or other West Semitic languages via Luwian and Lycian. Additionally, other possible Anatolian borrowings into Ancient Greek (e. g. Gk. dial. βωληνή ‘a type of grapevine’, μῶλαξ ‘id.’ vs. Hittite *maḫlaš* c. ‘grapevine, *Vitis vinifera* L.’) are mentioned and reviewed.

Keywords: Hesychius’ lexicon, Ancient Greek, Pamphylian dialect, Anatolian borrowings, language contacts, Egyptian, Semitic loanwords.

The extensive glossary compiled by Hesychius of Alexandria, an early Byzantine Greek grammarian, is an invaluable source of knowledge for modern linguists researching Ancient Greek dialects. It should be remembered, however, that the material collected by the lexicographer contains, apart from dialectal items, rare or obscure words, as well as a selection of peculiar inflectional forms and phraseological expressions, most often of a proverbial nature.

In this rich collection, which includes approximately 51,000 entries, our attention is drawn to an extremely curious gloss (Hsch. β-963): βουρικυπάρισσος· ἢ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι “*bourikypárisσos* — grapevine. Citizens of Perge”.¹ The gloss with an ethnic qualifier *Pergaioi*, refers to the inhabitants of Perge, a city located in the southern part of the Asia Minor coast, and clearly indicates its Pamphylian origin.

¹ Cunningham 2018, 458. See also Schmidt 1858, 391 (β-969), Latte, 1953, 340 (β-963).

The Pamphylian idiom of Ancient Greek was a particular, idiosyncratic mixture of features characteristic of the dialects of the Arcado-Cypriot (also called Achaean) and (to a lesser extent) Doric and Aeolian groups.² The peculiarities of the dialect in question stem from the fact that the first Greek inhabitants of Pamphylia, a fertile land located between Lycia and Cilicia, were probably the post-Mycenaean Achaeans (2nd half of the 2nd millennium BCE), related to later Arcado-Cypriot Greeks, who in turn were followed by users of Doric (including speakers from Argos, Laconia, and Rhodes) and Aeolian dialects (including speakers from Aeolian Kyme, and Lesbos) that came in two separate waves around the 8th century BCE or a little later.³ A number of phonological, morphological and lexical innovations developed in the Pamphylian dialect through transference from neighbouring adstrate languages. It should not be forgotten that the area in question, before the arrival of the first Greek settlers, was inhabited by the Anatolian people who spoke languages of the Luwian subfamily (Lycian, Milyan, Sidetic, Pisidian, and Cilician).⁴

1. Pamphylian glosses in Hesychius' lexicon

Moritz Wilhelm Constantin Schmidt, the nineteenth-century editor of Hesychius' lexicon, recorded a total of 31 Pamphylian dialect forms.⁵ The Pamphylian origin of the lemmas is indicated by the ethnic name Παμφύλιοι ("Pamphylians") or by a prepositional phrase of the type ὑπὸ Παμφυλίων ("by the Pamphylians"), παρὰ Παμφυλίων ("at the Pamphylians"). It can also be recognized by reference to one of the main cities of "Hellenic" Pamphylia, i. e. Perge, Aspendos and Side: Περγαῖοι ("inhabitants of Perge"), ὑπὸ Περγαίων ("by inhabitants of Perge"), ἐν Πέργῃ ("in Perge"), Ἀσπένδιοι ("Aspendians"), παρὰ Σιδιήταις ("at the Sidetians"). These latter glosses prove the existence within the Pamphylian dialect of several local varieties used in the major centers of Pamphylia.

In the Pamphylian lexical material collected by Hesychius, the most numerous are those termed the Perge glosses. Among the nineteen words attributed to the idiom of the inhabitants of Perge, the lexeme which stands out is βουρικυπάρισσος signifying 'grapevine / ἡ ἄμπελος'.⁶ This dialectal word — at first glance — seems to represent a complex formation, created by combining two words: an unclear βουρι- and the noun known from the Greek language κυπάρισσος (Hom. *Od.* 5.64+), Att. κυπάριττος f 'evergreen cypress,

² Pamphylian-Achaean isoglosses, in addition to Pamphylian-Doric and Pamphylian-Aeolian ones, are mentioned by Brixhe 1976, 145–146; Brixhe 2013, 185–203; Bartoněk 2011, 63–65, 82–84; Filos 2014, 8–11; and Panayotou 2015, 427–432. The genetic diversity of the Pamphylian dialect is indicated by its very name, derived from the choronym Pamphylia (Gr. Παμφυλία) 'the land of all tribes'; cf. Gr. πᾶν n. 'everything, each' and the appellative φυλή f. 'group of people united by common blood ties and origin, tribe' (or φύλον n. 'bloodline, tribe, clan, race').

³ Filos 2014, 8.

⁴ Colvin 2007, 48; Skelton 2017, 104–129. The area of the later Pamphylia from the Bronze Age was dominated by the Luwians; see Popko 1999, 112. The Milyan language is alternatively called Lycian B, though there are numerous systematical differences between Lycian and Milyan; cf. Sevoroshkin 2013, 154–165. Sidetic represents a vernacular language of Side, the city of Pamphylia, situated on a small peninsula; see Kassian 2013, 175–177.

⁵ Schmidt 1864, 153 (s. v. ΑΣΠΕΝΔΙΟΙ), 163 (s. v. ΠΑΜΦΥΛΙΟΙ, ΠΕΡΓΑΙΟΙ), 164 (s. v. ΣΙΔΕΤΑΙ). See also Pisani 1973, 89–90; Brixhe 1976, 141–143. It cannot be ruled out that the Hesychian glossary contains more words of Pamphylian origin, that are not labelled with an ethnic qualifier.

⁶ Liddell and Scott 1996, 326: "βουρικυπάρισσος ἄμπελος (Perge), Hsch."

Cupressus sempervirens L.,⁷ universally agreed to be an early Semitic borrowing; cf. Hebr. *gōḇer* ‘the type of wood used to build Noah’s ark; fir’ (*Gen.* 6.14).⁸

In relation to the Hesychius’ gloss βουρικυπάρισσος· ἡ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι, the question is why the grapevine (*Vitis* L.), which is a deciduous shrub, was defined by a term containing (in the second part of the compound) the name of a coniferous tree, the cypress (*Cupressus* L.). This significant mismatch causes us to question the veracity of the gloss under review. It should be noted that reservations about the lemma βουρικυπάρισσος had already been put forward by Schmidt over a century ago, who (in the critical apparatus) cautiously labelled his proposal for text restitution with a question mark: βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος?⁹ Kurt Latte, a later editor of Hesychius’ lexicon, inserts a comment: “βουρικυπ. ἢ ἀμπ. Schm.”¹⁰ Ian Campbell Cunningham, the editor of the first volume of the revised edition of Kurt Latte, does the same (“βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄ. Schm.”).¹¹ The editors thereby indicate the absurdity of the phytonym juxtaposition κυπάρισσος ‘(evergreen and coniferous) cypress’ with ἄμπελος ‘(deciduous) grapevine’.

In all likelihood the gloss βουρικυπάρισσος· ἡ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι was incorrectly restored and was originally: βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι (‘bouiri — cypress or grapevine. Citizens of Perge). This hypothesis implies that the lexeme βουρί must have been a Pamphylic borrowing from a non-Greek source, probably from two different languages in which it either meant ‘cypress’ (κυπάρισσος), or ‘grapevine’ (ἄμπελος).

2. The Near Eastern origin of the gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος

The postulated word βουρί is isolated in Ancient Greek and its foreign origin seems likely. I believe we should focus on two alternatives: Egyptian and Anatolian. To this end, the following sections compare the gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος first with the Egyptian word *brri*, denoting the type of wood, and then with the Hittite appellatives ^{gis}*pura*[- and ^{gis}*puriš* / *purijaš* (i. e., with the Sumerian ideogram GIŠ ‘tree, wood, wooden equipment’).¹²

The word *brri* is attested in Ancient Egyptian with the sense ‘type of wood used to build carts / Art Holz als Material für einen Wagen.’¹³ The English Egyptologist and Orientalist Sir Ernest Alfred Wallis Budge (1857–1934) provisionally reconstructs the word as *bari* and with a clearer meaning ‘cypress wood.’¹⁴ The quality of the root vowel in the Egyptian word remains unknown.¹⁵ Table 1 demonstrates that the Egyptian name *brri*

⁷ Cf. Gr. Myc. *ku-pa-ri-se-ja* adj. n. pl. (PY Sa 488) = *κυπαρίσεια ‘made of cypress’; see Aura Jorro 1985, 403; Kazanskene, Kazanskii 1986, 67. Linear B tablets also testify to the existence of a toponym [*ku-pa-ri-so*] (PY Na 514) (today Kyparissía) and the ethnic name *ku-pa-ri-si-jo* (PY An 657.8).

⁸ Beekes 2010, 803–804; Rosól 2013, 185; Blažek 2014, 99; Beekes 2014, 55.

⁹ Schmidt 1858, 391.

¹⁰ Latte 1953, 340.

¹¹ Cunningham 2018, 458.

¹² Friedrich 1991, 274.

¹³ Erman and Grapow 1971, 466, s.v. *brri*. See also Lesko 1982, 158, s.v. *brri* (“wood”) and s.v. *brri* (“chariot, wagon box, body of chariot”); Hoch 1991, 128–129; 1994, 100–101 (“a type of wood used in chariots; chariot”); Hannig 1997, 256, s.v. *brri*, *bry* c. (“Holz (für Wagen); *Wagenkasten”), *bryt* f. (“Wagenkasten, Wagenkörper”); Hannig 2000, 1482.

¹⁴ Budge 1978, 204.

¹⁵ Hoch 1991, 128 gives the vocalized Egyptian word as **burraya*. One can agree with the researcher on the root vowel -u-. It is worth mentioning here that all the proposed etymologies of the Egyptian word suggest the root vocalism -u-; see Takács 2001, 258–259.

[bVri] overlaps in four important points with the revised lemma βουρί of Hesychius' gloss recorded under the number β-963.

Table 1. Phonetic correspondence between Egyptian and Greek Pamphylian word meaning 'cypress / cypress wood'

Language	Anlaut consonant	Root vowel	Inlaut consonant	Auslaut vowel	Meaning
Greek Pamphylian	β-	-ov- [u]	-ρ-	-ί	'cypress'
Egyptian	b-	unknown	-rr-	-i	'wood used to build carts, presumably 'cypress wood' (?)

The Egyptian word *brrī* signifying 'wood used to build carts', probably 'cypress wood', is often juxtaposed with a phonetically similar Egyptian appellative *brj* 'a kind of stick or cane'.¹⁶ The latter word has exact cognates in Berber languages, e. g. Ghd. *ta-buri-t* f. 'stick, drumstick'; Ahg. *ā-būri* m. 'thick stick (used in some traps)', *tā-būti-t* f. 'stick (of medium thickness)'; Twl. *ā-borāy* 'a stick attached to a trap with a rope to prevent the animal from escaping'; Ghat *ta-buray-t* 'stick, cane; piece of cloth used commercially as a unit of length'.¹⁷ Further equivalents are attested in the Cushitic languages (e. g. Afar *būra* 'dry sticks or twigs for the fire'; Qwd. *bel-ito* 'firestick') and in the Chadic languages (e. g. Dng. *bòrlà* 'spear shaft'; Pero *hwar* 'club').¹⁸ It is therefore highly likely that the original vowel of the Egyptian word *brj* 'a kind of stick or cane' was [u]. If, as we hypothesize, the Egyptian words *brj* and *brrī* are etymologically related, then the word *brrī* 'type of wood' should be vocalized as [buri].¹⁹

James E. Hoch views the Egyptian word *brrī* 'type of wood used in chariots; chariot' as a Semitic borrowing and proposes to compare it with Akk. *murrānu* 'a species of tree', perhaps 'ash-tree' (once recorded as *burrānu*), TAram. *mūrnayān* 'ash trees' and Ar. *myur-rān*- 'beech tree'.²⁰ This etymology is rightly considered as "unconvincing",²¹ because the Semitic items contain different consonants in both anlaut (*m-*) and a final position (*-n-*). The assumed Egyptian-Semitic correspondence would therefore be limited to the geminate *-rr-* and to the general semantics 'a kind of tree / a type of wood'.

A different etymology is adopted by Gábor Takács, who assumes the native origin of the Egyptian word *brrī* and the original meaning 'wooden frame, structure' based on the comparison of Brg. *buburu* 'bedstead', Alg. *buburu* 'id.', and Qwd. *bul-iko* 'id.' (< Rift or South Cushitic **bur-* 'bedstead').²² It seems that these last words can be derived from the

¹⁶ Such a comparison is made by Takács 2001, 258–259. It should be noted, however, that other Egyptologists separate these words from each other, cf. Erman and Grapow 1971, 465, s. v. *brj* ("Art Stöcke") and 466, s. v. *brrī* ("Art Holz als Material für einen Wagen").

¹⁷ Takács 2001, 258–259.

¹⁸ Diakonoff, Belova, Chetverukhin, Militarev, Porkhomovsky and Stolbova 1994, no. 123; Takács 2001, 258–259.

¹⁹ Note that Egyptian writing recorded only the consonantal shape of the language.

²⁰ Hoch 1991, 128–129; 1994, 100–101.

²¹ Takács 2001, 258–259.

²² Takács 2001, 259.

Afro-Asiatic root **bur-* ‘to build’, cf. Hebr. *br’* ‘to create’, Aram. *berā* ‘id.’, Ar. *br’* ‘id.’ (< Sem. **bVra-* ‘to create’); Kirfi *buru* ‘to build’, Galambu *bər-* ‘id.’; Fyer *bur* ‘hut’, Paa *mbura* ‘place’, Siri *bəri* ‘id.’, Buli *ibəri* ‘id.’ (< WCh. **bur-* ‘to build; hut, place’); Mandara *bəre* ‘town’, Mwu-lyen *vura* ‘id.’, Bachama *vura-to* ‘id.’ (< CCh. **bur-* ‘town; fortified place’).²³

All the above-mentioned explanations of the Egyptian word *brrī* assume [u] vocalism in the root syllable and unanimously suggest the reading [buri]. The comparison of Gr. Pamph. βουρί [bu’ri] (‘cypress’) with the Egyptian word *brrī* [buri] (‘type of wood’) reveals that the words correspond phonetically very well. Only the semantics of the Egyptian lexeme *brrī* requires commentary. Although we have no doubts about its general meaning (‘Art Holz als Material für einen Wagen’), the precise definition of the wood material seems debatable. The Egyptologist Budge was of the opinion that the word could refer to the cypress wood. This solution is supported by a Mycenaean Linear B attestation from the 12th century BCE which we will discuss in detail.

On a clay tablet from Pylos (on the Peloponnese), belonging to the Sa series (registering vehicles and weapons), there is a word *ku-pa-ri-se-ja*, accompanied by an ideogram denoting a circle (**243 = ROTA*): (PY Sa 488) *ku-pa-ri-se-ja* ROTA + *TE ZE 1 MO 1*.²⁴ The overwhelming majority of Mycenologists reconstruct the syllabic notation *ku-pa-ri-se-ja* as referring to the wheels of the chariot in the form **κυπαρίσσεια* and interpret it as a neuter plural adjective, formed from a dendronym *κypάρισσος* f. ‘cypress’: Myc. *ku-pa-ri-se-ja* ‘(made) of cypress wood’ (i. e. Myc. *a-mo-ta* n. pl. = Gr. **ἄρμωτα* ‘wheels’).²⁵ The Mycenaean document records three wheels made of cypress wood — strictly speaking, one pair of wheels (*ZE 1*: the acronym of the Greek word ζεύγος n. ‘pair’) and the single wheel (*MO 1*: the acronym of Gr. Myc. **μόνρον* adi. n. ‘single’) — all of which are equipped with four wooden spokes attached to the rim with brackets (*TE*: **τερμυδέντα*).²⁶ From the context in which the word *ku-pa-ri-se-ja* appeared, it is clear that the wheelwrights from Pylos, bearing the Mycenaean name *te-ko-to-ne* (= Gr. τέκτονες ‘craftsmen who work with wooden objects’), made chariot wheels from cypress wood.²⁷ However, on the island of Crete, different types of wood were used to make wheels: willow (with 11 attestations)²⁸ or elm (with 8 attestations)²⁹. It is worth noting here that scribes from Pylos, unlike the Knossian archivists, were not in the habit of specifying the species of wood used for wheels. The only exception in the group of 33 tablets belonging to series Sa is tablet No. 488 (i. e., the one under analysis). This fact is pointed out by Alberto Bernabé, who supposes that the

²³ Orel, Stolbova 1995, 84, s. v. **bura* ‘build’ and 87, s. v. *būr-* ‘fortified place, building’.

²⁴ Ventris and Chadwick 1973, 373; Kazanskene, Kazanskii 1986, 67.

²⁵ Chadwick and Baumbach 1963, 215; Sali-Aksiotti, 1996, 101–104, 212. The term *κypάρισσινος* ‘of cypress wood’, which has been known since the time of Homer (*Od.* 17.340), is the semantic equivalent of the presumed adjective **κypάρισσειος*, attested exclusively in Mycenaean Greek; see Montanari 2018, 1196.

²⁶ John Chadwick emphasizes that “Mycenaean wheels always have four spokes”; see Chadwick 1958, 108. The fresco from Tiryns is the best example of this statement (13th century BCE), depicting two women riding a chariot equipped with four-spoke wheels (National Archaeological Museum, Athens).

²⁷ Light chariots for two people were a very popular means of transport during the Mycenaean period. The iconographic evidence provides many depictions of two-horse chariots, which, according to researchers, the Mycenaean Greeks used in times of both war and peace, see Chadwick 1958, 107; Schofield 2007, 124.

²⁸ Aura Jorro 1985, 244–245, s. v. *e-ri-ka* (= Gr. **ἐλικᾶς* gen. sg.); Kazanskene, Kazanskii 1986, 67, 108; Sali-Aksiotti 1996, 142–143; Aura Jorro, Bernabé, Luján, Piquero, Varias García 2020, 113.

²⁹ Kazanskene, Kazanskii 1986, 67 & 108; Aura Jorro 1993, 165–166, s. v. *pte-re-wa* (= Gr. **πτελέφας* gen. sg.); Sali-Aksiotti 1996, 266; Aura Jorro, Bernabé, Luján, Piquero, Varias García 2020, 285.

scribes from Pylos wanted to emphasize the preciousness of cypress wood.³⁰ It should be added that the wooden wheels were protected against damage by hoops made from bronze (PY Sa 794; KN So 894.2), and even from silver (PY Sa 287).³¹

Tablet PY Sa 488 is thus a confirmation of Budge's conjecture that in antiquity, and certainly in the Mycenaean civilization, cypress wood was used to produce wheels. It cannot be ruled out that the same material was used for other construction elements of the cart, for example axles, body, and box. It is known that cypress wood is extremely hard and durable. The homogeneous structure of this raw material, as well as its resistance to pests and decay, guarantees the durability of items made from it.³² Cypress wood is resistant to deformation and relatively easy to process, so it is not surprising that in ancient times it was used in construction, boat building and furniture making.³³

The evergreen cypress, native to the eastern Mediterranean, is not limited to Greece.³⁴ The tree grows in, among others, northern Egypt, the Near East, as well as in the southern part of Asia Minor (including the area of ancient Pamphylia). In ancient Egypt, structural elements (e. g. monumental doors, and supports), furniture, sculptures, boats and coffins were made of cypress wood.³⁵ It seems likely that the ancient Egyptians, like the Mycenaean Greeks, also used cypress wood to make wheels and other parts of carts or chariots.

In the light of the Mycenaean evidence (cited above) which documents the use of cypress wood in the manufacture of chariots (carts), especially wheels (PY Sa 488), and because of the phonetic closeness of the Egyptian word *brrī* with the Hesychian gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος, Budge's assumption that the lexeme *brrī* meant 'cypress wood' seems quite convincing.

Since the Hesychian gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος fully reflects the consonant notation of the Egyptian word and its supposed meaning and since Greek and Egyptian belong to separate language families (Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic, respectively), the nature of this correspondence should be elucidated. There is no doubt that we are dealing here with a loanword. There are three possible interpretations. Firstly, the Pamphylian word may have been borrowed from the Egyptian language. Secondly, the Egyptians could have borrowed the term from the Pamphylian Greeks. Thirdly, the two words under discussion could have been borrowed from a third Mediterranean language.

If we accept that the Pamphylian gloss documents a borrowing from the Egyptian language, then the question which arises is how did the Egyptian word *brrī* ('cypress wood') find its way into the language of the inhabitants of Perge. It seems that the Egyptian name for cypress wood could have been borrowed either by Pamphylian sailors or boat builders whose services could have been used by Egyptian rulers, or by merchants, or by Pamphylian mercenaries whose presence in Hellenistic Egypt is confirmed by four short

³⁰ Bernabé 2016, 520. Cypress wood, according to the Italian scientist, was very valuable in antiquity, as it is today ("molto pregiato").

³¹ Sali-Aksioti 1996, 101, s.v. ἄρμω.

³² Theophrastus of Eresos, the Greek philosopher and botanist (c. 371–287 BCE), emphasizes (HP 5.4.2) that cypress wood is hard, does not rot, and is excellent for polishing. Cf. also Vittr. 2.9.13.

³³ The ancient Greeks believed that the cypress, like the fir, the pine, the juniper, the oak and the Phoenician juniper, was perfect for building houses (Thphr. HP 5.7.4). Cypress wood was also used for artistic purposes, such as carving statues (Thphr. HP 5.3.7).

³⁴ Segura Munguía and Torres Ripa 2009, 117–119, s.v. *El ciprés*.

³⁵ Gale, Gasson, Hepper and Killen 2000, 350–351, s.v. *Cypress* [*Cupressus sempervirens* L.]; Lucas and Harris 2011, 434, s.v. *Cypress*.

inscriptions written in the Pamphylian dialect. It is believed that the graffiti, carved on the walls of the temple of Pharaoh Seti I in Abydos, popularly known as Memnonion, was the work of Pamphylian soldiers serving in the Egyptian Ptolemaic army.³⁶ On the other hand, the acquisition of the Egyptian word may have occurred in Pamphylia. We know that in 309 BCE the Egyptian fleet, led by Ptolemy I Soter plagued the Pamphylian coast. At that time, the port city of Phaselis (west of Perge) was seized and used as a stationing site for the Egyptian fleet.³⁷

The phonetic correspondence between Eg. *brrī* ('cypress wood') and Gr. Pamph. βουρί· κυπάρισσος ('cypress') can also be explained as a result of the influence of the Pamphylian language on the Egyptian language. Since craftsmanship was highly developed in Egypt, but the country suffered from a lack of forests, large amounts of wood were imported from Nubia, Crete, Cyprus, Lebanon, Syria and probably Asia Minor.³⁸ It is therefore possible that the Egyptian word *brrī* is a borrowing, as some researchers have assumed.³⁹ It should be noted that in the 7th century BCE the inhabitants of the Pamphylian city of Phaselis took an active part in establishing the Greek colony of Naucratis in Lower Egypt.⁴⁰ Perhaps the Pamphylian colonists then passed the term for cypress wood to the Egyptians. Therefore, if we assume that the direction of the borrowing was the opposite and that the Egyptian language was not the source of the borrowing, the problem which still remains is where the inhabitants of Perge got the name of the cypress, unknown to other Greeks.

I believe that in the case of the Pamphylian noun βουρί ('cypress') a borrowing from an Asia Minor source cannot be ruled out and that therefore possible references to dendronyms attested in the ancient Anatolian languages should be discussed. The Hittite texts bring two similar-sounding appellatives which are labelled with an ideogram GIŠ 'tree, wood, wooden object': Hitt. GIŠ^{is}*pura*[- (in cuneiform writing GIŠ^{is}*pu-ra-x*[-]) 'a kind of tree or a wooden object / ein Baum oder hölzener Gegenstand' (*KUB* 54.93 obv. 2)⁴¹ and Hitt. GIŠ^{is}*puriš* (*puriiaš*) c. 'a wooden object, existing in sets, for supporting pitchers, etc.; probably a tray'.⁴² The word-initial *p*- in Hittite can render both the voiceless labial [p], and the voiced [b].⁴³ Unfortunately, we are not able to establish the voicing of the labial consonant on the basis of the Anatolian material. In this regard, the lexical documentation of other ancient languages spoken in the Mediterranean region can prove very helpful.

³⁶ Brixhe 1976, 291-293.

³⁷ Grainger 2009.

³⁸ Wąsowicz 1975, 183; Gale, Gasson, Hepper and Killen 2000, 350-351; Alimpertis 2006, 16.

³⁹ Hoch 1991, 128-129; 1994, 100-101, opts for borrowing from a Semitic source. In turn, the Egyptologist Hannig (1997, 256) recognizes the Egyptian word as a probable borrowing, which he signals with the abbreviation *ext (the symbol [*] means "unsicher", while [ext] represents a "fremdsprachlich" item).

⁴⁰ Grainger 2009, 20.

⁴¹ Güterbock and Hoffner 1997, 382; Tischler 2001, 655.

⁴² Güterbock and Hoffner 1997, 386; Tischler 2001, 659.

⁴³ Melchert 1994, 92-93. Note that the initial sign PU in the Hittite cuneiform script may stand for phonetic [bu] or [pu]. Compare e. g. two Akkadian borrowings in Hittite quoted in 2.1 and 2.2, as well as Hitt. *puriš* (c.) 'lip', Luw. *puriš* (c.) 'id.' < PIE. **b^hurh₂s*, cf. Lith. *burnà* (acc. sg. *būrna*) f. 'mouth, oral cavity; face, mug, muzzle', Bulg. *бърна* f. 'lip', Arm. *beran* 'mouth'. Moreover, the Anatolian languages seem to have generalized voiced stops at the expense of voiceless stops in word-initial position, cf. Melchert 1994, 18-19. It is possible to assume that IE. **b^h* became voiceless initially, but preserved the voiced value in the medial position, like in Latin *faba* f. 'bean' (< IE. **b^hab^hā*).

The partially preserved form ^{GIŠ}*pu-ra-x[-* appears in some ritual context. It is impossible to concretize the original form and semantics of the word above on the basis of the Hittite text. It is not known whether it is a tree species, a type of wood, or an object made of wood. However, it seems that the written form may reflect the Sumerian-Akkadian ideogram ^{GIŠ}BURĀŠU (alternatively written as ^{GIŠ}LI, ^{ŠIM}LI) ‘juniper / Wacholder’, attested in the Hittite texts,⁴⁴ cf. Oakk. *burāšum* (*bu-ra-šu-um*) ‘pine’,⁴⁵ As. *burāšu* (*bu-ra-šú*) ‘juniper tree’⁴⁶, Aram. *b^erāt* ‘cypress’,⁴⁷ Hebr. *b^erōš* ‘conifer; cypress’ (< Sem. **b-r-t* ‘conifer; cypress’). The Akkadian word could refer to a variety of coniferous trees of the cypress family, as the authors of the Assyrian dictionary emphasize:

“The designation *burāšu* for the conifers used in Urartu for roof beams may represent a transfer from the real juniper whose wood is not usable for such purposes. Since the juniper is ubiquitous in the hills to [the] west and north of Mesopotamia, the frequent references “mountain of *burāšu*-trees” could indicate that several conifers were designated by this term.”⁴⁸

The proposal of this paper is that the Assyrian term *burāšu* ‘juniper’ was borrowed into the ancient Anatolian languages and then, through their intermediation, found its way into the Pamphylian dialect of Ancient Greek as βουρί with a meaning changed to ‘cypress’. It can be assumed that the Lycian language, which significantly influenced the phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary of the Pamphylian dialect, played the role of intermediary in the borrowing process.⁴⁹ It is known that the regular transformation of the Anatolian spirant *š into the phoneme [h] took place exclusively in the Lycian language, e. g. Lyc. *kbihu*, Mil. *tbišu* ‘twice’ (< PIE. **duisu*); Lyc. *ehbi* ‘one’s own’ < **ebhi* < **ebhi* < Luw. *apaši* ‘belonging to one; one’s own’.⁵⁰

A further argument in favour of the Semitic-Anatolian genesis of Gr. Pamph. βουρί ‘cypress’ comes from the fact that the same Semitic root **b-r-t* ‘conifer; juniper’ has been borrowed independently (and repeatedly) into Ancient Greek in the form βόρατον n. ‘the stinking juniper, *Juniperus foetidissima* Willd.’ (D. S. 2.49) or βράθν n. ‘the savin juniper, *Juniperus sabina* L.’ (Dsc. 1.76).⁵¹ The Semitic word also found its way into Latin in the form *boratos* f. ‘a kind of juniper’ (Ps.-Apul. 86.13), *bratea* f. / *brathy* n. ‘the savin juniper’ (Scr. Larg. 154; Plin., *NH* 24.102; Ps.-Apul. 86.14; Val. 1.38) and *bratu* n. ‘a species of Asia Minor cypress’ (Plin. *NH* 12.78).⁵²

Although the Hittite word ^{GIŠ}*puriš* (*purijaš*) bears a clear phonetic resemblance to the Pamphylian appellative βουρί ‘cypress’, the former cannot be considered a source of

⁴⁴ Hoffner 1967, 91, s. v. TREES; Friedrich 1991, 306; Tischler 2001, 275, s. v. ^{GIŠ}*burāšu* ‘(phönikischer) Wacholder’ (= Phoenician juniper, *Juniperus phoenica* L., a species of tree or shrub belonging to the conifer family *Cupressaceae*). It should be emphasized that Beekes (2010, 235) translates the Assyrian word as ‘cypress’.

⁴⁵ Gelb 1957, 101.

⁴⁶ Gelb, Landsberger, Oppenheim and Reiner 1965, 326–328.

⁴⁷ Lewy 1895, 34.

⁴⁸ Gelb, Landsberger, Oppenheim and Reiner 1965, 328.

⁴⁹ Skelton 2017, 111–117. The Lycian language is epigraphically attested in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE (about 500–330 BCE). It is believed to have fallen into disuse in the first century BCE.

⁵⁰ Neumann 1969, 379; Danka 1986, 337–338; Melchert 1994, 288; 2008, 49.

⁵¹ Lewy 1895, 34; Schrader and Nehring 1917–1923, 671; Carnoy 1959, 52, s. v. *boraton* and 53, s. v. *brathy*; Beekes 2010, 234–235.

⁵² Schrader and Nehring 1917–1923, 671; André 1985, 37, s. v. *boratos*, 38, s. v. *brathy* and *bratus*; Beekes 2010, 234–235.

borrowing. There was also a similar word in the Hittite language: ^{GI}*puriš*, with a separate ideogram GI ‘reed, arrow, object made of reeds.’⁵³ The authors of the Hittite dictionaries discuss both of these terms under one entry ^{GIŠ(GI)}*puriš* (*puriiaš*).⁵⁴ On this basis, it is assumed that the word referred to some utilitarian object that could be made from wood (GIŠ), or from reeds (GI), or even from metal (AN.BAR ‘iron’ on the inscription *KUB* 42.11 v. 8). However, we should clearly distinguish the object called ^{GI}*puriš*, which probably meant ‘reed mat’ from the quasi-homonymous word ^{GIŠ}*puriš* / *puriiaš*, denoting some wooden object, probably a ‘(pub) counter’ or ‘tray’. For both Hittite forms, we can easily indicate separate Akkadian equivalents, differing in terms of onset and semantics, cf.

2.1. Hitt. ^{GI}*puriš* c. ‘reed mat’ ← As. *burú* ‘(reed) mat’, Bab. *būru* ~ *burru* ‘id.’ < Oakk. *burā²um* ‘reed mat’.⁵⁵

2.2. Hitt. ^{GIŠ}*puriš* (*puriiaš*) c. ‘(wooden) shallow bowl, tray, platter, counter’ ← As. *pūru* (*purru*) ‘a shallow bowl or platter’, Akk. *pūru*, *purru* ‘bowl’.⁵⁶

The two Akkadian words listed above were independently adopted into the Hittite language and adapted as nouns of the personal-animate gender (*genus commune*), as an *i*-stem (or *-iō*-stem)⁵⁷. It can be assumed that in the case of the discussed pair of words, the Hittite language retained the word-initial opposition between the voiced and voiceless labial consonant ([b] vs. [p]), although cuneiform writing obscured this distinction.

For semantic reasons, the Pamphylian name βουρί ‘cypress’ cannot be identified either with Hitt. ^{GI}*puriš* c. ‘reed mat’, or with Hitt. ^{GIŠ}*puriš* (*puriiaš*) c. ‘(wooden) shallow bowl, tray, platter, counter’. The Hittite-Luwian word **burašiš* c. ‘a kind of conifer tree; juniper or cypress’ should be considered a likely donor (possibly attested in a partially preserved record ^{GIŠ}*pu-ra-x[-]*; *KUB* 54.93 obv. 2), which represents the typically Anatolian adaptation of the Akkadian word *burāšu(m)* ‘id.’. It is worth emphasizing that Akkadian words ending in *-u(m)* become accommodated as *-i*-stems in Hittite, e. g. Hitt. *ḫalziš* c. ‘fortress’ ← Akk. *ḫalšu* ‘id.’; Hitt. *kirinniš* c. ‘a precious stone’ ← Akk. *girinnu* ‘id.’ (← Sum. *girin*); Hitt. *laḫanniš* c. ‘bottle’ ← Akk. *laḫannu(m)* ‘drinking vessel’; Hitt. *tuppi* n. ‘clay tablet’ ← Akk. *tuppu(m)* ‘tablet, document, letter’ (← Sum. *dub*); Hitt. *zuppari* n. ‘torch’ ← Akk. *ṭiparu* ‘id.’⁵⁸

There is no doubt that numerous Semitisms in Anatolian languages emerged through the mediation of the Akkadian language, and from there, reached the Greek dialects widespread in Asia Minor. Therefore, I assume the following path of borrowing of the *Wanderwort* at issue:

2.3. Sem. **b-r-t* ‘a kind of conifer tree; juniper or cypress’ > Oakk. *burāšum* ‘pine’ > As. *burāšu* ‘juniper’ → Hittite-Luwian **burašiš* c. ‘a kind of conifer tree’ > Lyc. **burehi*, synco-pated into **burhi* ‘id.’ → Gr. Pamph. βουρί· κypάριςσος ‘cypress’ → Eg. *brri* [buri] ‘cypress wood’.

⁵³ Sturtevant 1936, 77; Friedrich 1991, 273.

⁵⁴ Güterbock and Hoffner 1997, 386; Tischler 2001, 659; Puhvel 2013, 129–133.

⁵⁵ Gelb, Landsberger, Oppenheim and Reiner 1965, 339 (‘reed mat’); von Soden 1965: 141; Black, George and Postgate 2010, 49, s. v. *burú(m)* (‘(reed)mat’).

⁵⁶ Roth 2005, 526–528 (‘a shallow bowl or platter’); Black, George and Postgate 2010, 279, s. v. *pūru*, *purru* (with the suggested meaning ‘(stone) bowl’).

⁵⁷ I cannot accept Puhvel’s explanation of both Hittite words (denoting ‘reed mat’ and ‘(wooden) shallow bowl, tray, platter, counter’, respectively) as native (with reference to Hitt. *puri-* ‘lip, rim, edge, border’), cf. Puhvel 2013, 231–233. The Akkadian origin of these two cultural borrowings is evident.

⁵⁸ Gusmani 1968, 30. One of two anonymous reviewers suggests that Hittite *i*-stem borrowings of Akkadian origin “could be due to Luwian intermediacy”.

The form of the Egyptian word *brri* [buri] convincingly indicates that the Semitic borrowing did not find its way into the Egyptian language directly from the Semitic languages, but through the Lycian language or the Pamphylian dialect of Ancient Greek. The correspondence of the Hesychian gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος (‘cypress’) with the Egyptian word *brri* ‘cypress wood’ is so striking that it allows us to confirm the validity of Schmidt’s decision to recreate the handwritten lemma βουρικυπάρισσος in the form of βουρί· κυπάρισσος.

3. The Hittite origin of the Pamphylian name for the grapevine

The second part of the gloss βουρί· [...] ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι (“*burí* — [...] grapevine. Citizens of Perge”) most certainly refers to the inhabitants of the polis city of Perge, the main settlement center of the Pamphylian area. The Greek settlement in Pamphylia absorbed the population of Anatolian origin, so it is reasonable to consider the local vocabulary pertaining to the cultivation of the vine. We have the Hittite word *muriš* c. meaning ‘a grape bunch, a bunch of grapes’, attested in the second millennium BCE registered in cuneiform writing as nom. sg. *mu-ú-ri-iš* (*KUB* LVII 110 II 8), *mu-ri-eš* (*KUB* XXXVI 89 rev. 58), acc. sg. *mu-ur-in* (*KBo* XI 32 obv. 21), nom.pl. *mu-u-ri-e[-eš]* (*KUB* XXXIX 7 I 17), acc. pl. *mu-u-ri-uš* (*KUB* XLIII 23 rev. 21). There is also an alternative form *muriian-* c. probably meaning ‘a bunch of grapes’ (instr. sg. *mu-u-ri-ni-it*; *KUB* XXX 19 I 6; *KUB* XXXIX 7 I 11; acc. pl. *mu-u-ri-ia-nu-uš*; *KUB* XXX 19 I 17), which seems to represent a collective name derived from the Hittite word *muriš* by a collective suffix **-an-* (< PIE. **-ón-*)⁵⁹, a suffix that was productive in Greek as well.⁶⁰ Lexical material relating to the vine can be found in numerous studies of the Hittite vocabulary.⁶¹

An identical noun *muriš* c. appears in Luwian (in the record, *mu-ri-i[š]*; *KBo* XXIX 34 I 5), although the unclear context in which this word appears does not allow us to concretize the meaning.⁶² Nevertheless, the genealogical closeness of the Hittite and Luwian languages suggests semantic compatibility of both appellatives.⁶³ In one of the Luwian texts (*KBo* VII 54 I 4) we also meet the form *mu-u-ra-an-za*, preceded by a Sumerian ideogram SISKUR.SISKUR (‘sacrifice, ritual gifts’) and interpreted by Hittitologists as nom.-acc. sg. neut. *muran*,⁶⁴ combined with the postpositional demonstrative pronoun *zaš* ‘this’ (the element *-za* also represents nom.-acc. sg. n. ‘that’).⁶⁵ It can therefore be assumed that

⁵⁹ See Puhvel 2004, 128: “*muri(yan)-* is a collective of grapes rather than a single grape”.

⁶⁰ Cf. Gr. Att. ἀμπελών m., Dor., Ion. ἀμπελεών m. ‘vineyard’ (← ἀμπελος f. ‘vine’), Gr. δαφνών m. ‘laurel grove’ (← δάφνη f. ‘laurel’), ἐλαιών m. ‘olive garden; the area covered with olive trees’ (← ἐλαία f. ‘olive tree’), κυπαρισσών m. ‘cypress grove’ (← κυπάρισσος f. ‘cypress’), συκών m. ‘a place planted with fig trees, an orchard, a fig grove’ (← συκία f. ‘fig tree’); cf. Schwyzler 1939, 488.

⁶¹ Sturtevant 1936, 165, s. v. **mūris* ‘cluster of grapes’; Friedrich 1991, 145, s. v. *muri-* (*muriian-*, *muriin-*) ‘Traube’; Güterbock and Hoffner 1989, 333, s. v. *muri-*, *murin-*, *muriyan-* ‘cluster of grapes or other fruit’; Tischler 1990, 233–234, s. v. *mūri(yan)-* ‘Traube’; Puhvel 2004, 192–194, s. v. *muri(yan)-* ‘grape(s)’. It is worth emphasizing that Michael Weiss connects the Hittite noun *muriš* denoting ‘a cluster or bunch of grapes or other fruit’ with Gk. μῦριος adj. ‘countless, innumerable, numerous’; μύριοι pl. ‘ten thousand’; cf. Weiss 1996, 199–214.

⁶² Melchert 1993, 150. See also Laroche 1959, 72, s. v. *mura/i-*.

⁶³ Laroche already suggested such an interpretation in 1959, 72. Cf. also Puhvel 2004, 193.

⁶⁴ Melchert 1993, 150; Puhvel 2004, 193. It should be noted that Laroche 1959, 72, presumed the form of the accusative plural.

⁶⁵ Laroche 1959, 112; Melchert 1993, 274. A different interpretation of the form *mūranza* (an adjective qualifying a ritual) is given by Bawanyeck 2005, 133 (with references).

Luw. *mu-u-ra-an-za* meant literally ‘this grapevine’. Since we are dealing with cult gifts, Luwian neuter lexeme doubtless referred to the fruit of the vine. The main difference between the Hittite-Luwian name *muriš* c. and Luwian *muran* n. consists in a disparity of the gender representing an essential semantic difference. In Anatolian languages there is a personal-animate gender (*genus commune*), specifying the plant itself (or its part), while the Luwian language additionally exhibits an inanimate form (*genus neutrum*) signifying ‘the fruit of the vine’. Plant names (especially of trees) in Indo-European languages are usually feminine, whereas fruit names are neuter, cf. Lat. *mālus* f. ‘apple tree’ vs. *mālum* n. ‘apple’, Gr. μηλέα f. ‘apple tree’ vs. μήλον n. ‘apple’, Pol. *jabłoń* f. ‘apple tree’ vs. *jabłko* n. ‘apple’. Anatolian languages present a similar alternation, with the Hittite word *maḫlaš* c. which means grapevine, *Vitis vinifera* Lat.’ and probably represented an inherited cognate related to Lat. *mālus* f. ‘apple tree’.⁶⁶

The Pamphylian name for the vine βουρί shows great semantic and phonological similarity to Hittite *muriš* c. ‘id.’ and Luwian *muriš* c. ‘id.’ (see Table 2). Two differences that will be explained below concern the anlaut and auslaut.

Table 2. Phonetic correspondence between the Pamphylian, Hittite and Luwian names of the grapevine

Language	Anlaut consonant	Root [vowel]	Inlaut consonant	Stem vowel	Auslaut consonant	Meaning
Pamphylian Greek	β-	-ou- [u]	-ρ-	-ι		‘grapevine’
Hittite	m-	-u-	-r-	-i-	-š	‘grapevine, a vine, a bunch of grapes’
Luwian	m-	-u-	-r-	-i-	-š	‘grapevine’ ?

The variation β~μ occurs very often in Greek loanwords taken from neighboring adstrate languages. It can be found both word-initially and word-internally, e. g.

3.1. Gr. Att. βόλυβδος, Delph. & Epid. βόλιμος, Rhod. βόλιβος m. ‘lead, *plumbum*’ vs. Myc. *mo-ri-wo-do* [moliwdos], Hom. μόλιβος, Ion. μόλυβδος, dial. μόλιβδος, μόλυβος m. ‘id.’;⁶⁷

3.2. Gr. Att. βύσταξ vs. Dor. μύσταξ m. ‘upper lip; moustache’;⁶⁸

3.3. Gr. dial. βύττος vs. μυττός m. ‘female sexual organ’;⁶⁹

3.4. Gr. Att.-Ion. ἀρβύλη f. ‘shoe, boot’ vs. Cypr. ἄρμυλα n. pl. ‘id.’;⁷⁰

3.5. Gr. Att.-Ion. βάρβιτος vs. Aeol. βάρμιτος, Aeol. & Del. βάρμιος m./f. ‘a multi-stringed musical instrument, a kind of lyre’;⁷¹

3.6. Gr. κύβινδις m. ‘bird species’ (whence Lat. *cybindis*; Plin. *NH* 10.24) vs. Hom. κύμινδις m. ‘a species of bird of prey, possibly a sparrowhawk’;⁷²

⁶⁶ Danka 1978, 38; Danka 1983, 165.

⁶⁷ Danka 1978, 38; Danka 1983, 165; Beekes 1999, 7–14. Craig Melchert suggests that the Greek term for ‘lead’ derives from Lyd. *marivda* adj. ‘dark’, cf. Melchert 2008 [bis], 153–157; Beekes 2010, 964–965.

⁶⁸ Furnée 1972, 218.

⁶⁹ Furnée 1972, 218.

⁷⁰ Furnée 1972, 211. Note that Günther Neumann argues an Anatolian origin of the Greek term, cf. Neuman 1971, 482–485; Neumann 1994, 609–612.

⁷¹ Furnée 1972, 212.

⁷² Furnée 1972, 203–237; Beekes 2014, 15.

The change $b < m$ appears incidentally in some Anatolian languages spoken in the first millennium BCE, e. g. Lycian; cf. the Lycian personal name *Ipre-ziti* (= Luw. *Immara-zitiš*); Lyc. *χahba* ‘grandson’ vs. Luw. *hamšaš* c. ‘id.’ (see 4.16). It cannot therefore be ruled out that such a change also took place in other words. The variation $m \sim b$ might well have occurred in the Anatolian languages of the post-Luwian era. Günter Neumann points out the interchangeability of the phonemes /m/ and /b/ in the Greek adaptation of Lycian proper names, e. g. Lyc. *purihime[te]* vs. Gr. Πυριματις / Πυριβατης; Lyc. *Telebehi* vs. Gr. Τελημισός.⁷³

It is worth noting that the instantiation of Anatolian **m*- as Greek β- occurs in another Greek viticultural noun of Anatolian origin:

3.7. The Greek (Ionic) appellative βωληνή f. ‘a type of grapevine growing in Bithynia’ was compared by Edzard J. Furnée and Robert S. P. Beekes with a Lydian name μῶλαξ ‘vine’.⁷⁴ The Lydian name is attested in the lexicon of Hesychius of Alexandria (Hsch. μ-2030): μῶλαξ· εἶδος οἴνου· οἱ δὲ τὸ ἐν τοῖς ὀρκίοις σπενδόμενον, ἀπὸ τοῦ Τμώλου· ὡς τινες Λυδοὶ τὸν οἶνον⁷⁵ (“*mōlaks* — a type of wine, allegedly poured out on the sacrificial victim during the oath ceremony, [named so] after [the city of] Tmolos. In this way some Lydians [call] wine”). There is no doubt that both the Bithynian grapevine (βωληνή) and the Lydian name for the wine (μῶλαξ) ultimately are descended from the Hittite term *mahlaš* c. ‘grapevine, *Vitis vinifera* L.’⁷⁶

The above example confirms that it was possible for word-initial Anatolian *m*- to be borrowed as Greek β, which was pronounced as [b] in the archaic era, and later as [v]. The variation between Ion. βωληνή ‘a species of grapevine’ and Lyd. μῶλαξ ‘wine’, Hitt. *mahlaš* c. ‘grapevine’ is analogous to the pair: Pamph. βουρί ‘grapevine’ vs. Hitt. (and Luw.) *muriš* c. ‘a grapevine, a vine, a bunch of grapevines’.

It is noteworthy that the alternation of β ~ μ appears in two other Greek terms which refer to viticulture and represent borrowings from some foreign source:

3.8. Gr. dial. ἀβίλλιον·οἶνον [acc. sg.] (“*abillion* — wine”) vs. Boeot. ἀμίλλακαν·οἶνον·Θηβαῖοι [acc. sg.] (“*amillakan* — wine. Thebans”).⁷⁷

3.9. Gr. dial. ἀγερακάβος·σταφυλή (‘cluster of grapes; wild grapevine’), ἀγράκαβος·σταφυλή (‘id.’) vs. ἀγγεράκομον·σταφυλή (‘id.’).⁷⁸

The auslaut of the postulated lemma βουρί should also be explicated. It can be easily explained based via Anatolian languages used around Pamphylia in the ancient era, such as Lycian, Sidetic and Pisidian. The Hittite-Luwian ending of the nominative **-š*. disap-

⁷³ Neumann 1969, 377. It is worth adding that Onofrio Carruba associates the Lycian local name *Telebehi* with the town *Kuualapaššiš* (*KUB XXXII* 83 1), located in Pisidia; cf. Carruba 1997, 107.

⁷⁴ Furnée 1972, 219; Beekes 2010, 250, s. v. βωληνή and 991, s. v. μῶλαξ; Beekes 2014, 93.

⁷⁵ Latte 1966, 691; Gusmani 1964, 276.

⁷⁶ Tischler 1990, 89.

⁷⁷ Tischler 1990, 89. Both glosses were recorded in the lexicon of Hesychius of Alexandria; see Latte 1953, 7 (Hsch. α-122) and 128 (Hsch. α-3667); Cunningham 2018, 8 (Hsch. α-122) and 171 (Hsch. α-3667). Both editors spell the lemma of the first gloss with a capital letter Ἀβίλλιον·οἶνον (Hsch. α-122), juxtaposing it in a critical apparatus with another Hesychian gloss (Hsch. α-3675): Ἀμιναιον·δι’ ἐνὸς ᾧ τὸν οἶνον λέγει· ἡ γὰρ Πευκετία Ἀμιναια λέγεται. The editors assume an identical variation β ~ μ, based, however, on a different pair of equivalents. See also Furnée 1972, 221.

⁷⁸ Furnée 1972, 221; Beekes 2010, 10–11, s. v. ἀγερακάβος; Beekes 2014, 92. These three glosses are recorded by Hesychius of Alexandria; see Latte 1953, 18 (Hsch. α-458), 29 (Hsch. α-748) and 16 (Hsch. α-394); Cunningham 2018, 23 (Hsch. α-458), 36 (Hsch. α-748) and 20 (Hsch. α-394).

peared in all these languages. For comparison, let us quote the most obvious examples of this phenomenon:

3.10. Lyc. *ēni* ‘mother’ < Luw. *anniš* c. ‘id.’ vs. Lyd. *ēnaš* c. ‘mother’, Hitt. *annaš* c. ‘id.’⁷⁹

3.11. Lyc. *χ̄ñna* ‘grandmother’ < Luw. **hannaš* c. ‘id.’, cf. Hitt. *hannaš* c. ‘id.’;⁸⁰

3.12. Lyc. *nēni* ‘brother’ < Luw. *naniš* c. ‘id.’;⁸¹

3.13. Lyc. *neri* ‘sister’ < Luw. *nanašriš* c. ‘id.’;⁸²

3.14. Lyc. *tedi* ‘father’ < Luw. *tatiš* c., HLuw. *tati-* ‘id.’, cf. different kinship terms attested in the Hitt. language *attaš* c. ‘father’ and Pal. *papaš* ‘id.’;⁸³

3.15. Lyc. *χ̄uga* ‘grandfather’ < Luw. *huḫaš* c. ‘id.’, HLuw. *huha-* (= AVUS-*ha-*) ‘id.’, Hitt. *huḫḫaš* c. ‘grandfather’ (< PIE. **h₂euḫ₃ós* m. ‘grandfather’);⁸⁴

3.16. Lyc. *χ̄ahba* ‘grandson’ < Luw. *ḫamšaš* c. ‘id.’; cf. HLuw. *hamasi-* ‘id.’, Hitt. *ḫaššaš* c. ‘id.’;⁸⁵

3.17. Lyc. *kbatra* ‘daughter’ < HLuw. *tuwatarāš* ‘id.’ (< PIE. **d^huǵh₂ter-s* f. ‘daughter’);⁸⁶

3.18. Lyc. *tideimi* ‘child, son’ < Luw. **titaimiš* c. ‘infant’; cf. Luw. *titai-* ‘to suck’;⁸⁷

3.19. Lyc. *mahāi* ‘god’ < Luw. *maššaniš* ‘id.’; cf. Sid. *mašara* dat. pl. ‘for gods’;

3.20. Lyc. *izri* ‘hand’ < Luw. *iššari* ‘id.’ vs. Hitt. *keššar* n. ‘hand’ (< PIE. **ǵ^hesr̥*).⁸⁸

The disappearance of the ending **-š* [s] in the nominative singular in the position after the stem vowel also occurred in the Sidetic language, used in Pamphylia, especially in the city of Side.⁸⁹ The same process is documented by tombstone inscriptions from Pisidia. As Maciej Popko emphasizes, “in the nominative [Pisidian] names end in a vowel or *-r*, which means that the old ending *-s* of the nominative was lost”⁹⁰

Since the auslaut consonant **-š* disappeared in the neighboring Anatolian languages used in the first millennium BCE (i. e. in Lycian, Sidetic and Pisidian), there is no doubt that the Greek colonists in Pamphylia must have come across the Hittite-Luwian noun *mu-riš* c. (‘a grapevine, a vine, a bunch of grapes’) with already simplified pronunciation, i. e. without a word-final spirant. No wonder then that Pamphylian speakers borrowed this lexical item in the form which ended in the vowel *-i*, i. e. βουρί ‘grapevine’.

4. The issue of accentuation of the lemma

Finally, it is worth returning to the analyzed gloss βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος. Περγαῖοι, in order to assess the correctness of the oxytone (βουρί) which was postulated by Schmidt. In my opinion, the reason for the merger of the original lemma βουρί with

⁷⁹ Gusmani 1964, 106; Danka 1983, 175; Weeks 1985, 26; Oshiro 1990, 90.

⁸⁰ Danka 1978, 28 and 32; Weeks 1985, 29; Neumann 2007, 125.

⁸¹ Weeks 1985, 28; Popko 1999, 128.

⁸² Carruba 1969, 271; Carruba 1997, 301; Weeks 1985, 28.

⁸³ Weeks 1985, 26; Oshiro 1990, 88.

⁸⁴ Danka 1978, 28, 30 and 32; Weeks 1985, 28; Oshiro 1990, 88.

⁸⁵ Oshiro 1990, 87.

⁸⁶ Weeks 1985, 27; Oshiro 1988, 50; Kimball 1994, 80.

⁸⁷ Weeks 1985, 27; Oshiro 1988, 49.

⁸⁸ Kimball 1994, 77.

⁸⁹ Popko 1999, 114. In the argument, the author cites two examples borrowed from Greek: Sid. *Por-dor* < Gr. personal name Απολλόδωρος (in a Greek-Sidetic bilingual inscription), Sid. *istratag* ‘chief’ < Gr. στρατηγός. The Sidetic language demonstrates — as one of two reviewers correctly admits — both the disappearance of the final consonant and the apocope of the stem vowel.

⁹⁰ Popko 1999, 115.

the beginning of the gloss κυπάρισσος, which is attested in the only surviving codex containing the Hesychian lexicon (βουρί· κυπάρισσος → βουρικυπάρισσος cod. Marc.), was the scribe's overlooking the accent mark. From a palaeographic point of view, failure to spot a circumflex (~) over the letter upsilon in the initial syllable (βοῦ) is much less likely than missing a relatively small acute sign (´) in the final syllable (ρι). It is thus to assume the postulated lemma βουρί than its alternative in the form of **βούρι.

An oxytone accent seems highly probable for the alleged Egyptian source (if Pamph. βουρί 'cypress' ← Eg. *brri* 'cypress wood'), as well as the Anatolian borrowing (Pamph. βουρί 'grapevine' ← Hitt.-Luw. *muriš* c. 'a grapevine, a vine, a bunch of grapes'). In the Egyptian language, the word stress most often fell on the final syllable. This is evidenced by the Egyptian names of plants written in the work of Pseudo-Dioscurides, e. g. ναρί 'Florentine iris, *Iris florentina* L.' (Ps.-Dsc. 1.1), λιβιούμ 'juniper, *Juniperus* L.' (1.75), βρεχού 'lupine, *Lupinus* L.' (2.109), σοβέρ 'turpentine pistachio, *Pistacia palaestina* Boiss.' (4.49), σχινφί 'oleander, *Nerium oleander* L.' (4.81).⁹¹ Moreover, the Anatolian borrowing in Pamphylian documents the oxytone accent. It is worth recalling that in Lycian the stem vowel is clearly preserved, and examples of apocope are rare and late ("sind selten und spät").⁹² On the other hand, the Lycian texts contain very numerous and early examples of vowel syncope in initial syllables, e. g. Lyc. *qla* c. 'fenced area; sanctuary' < Luw. **hīlaš* (cf. Hitt. *hīlaš* c. 'farm, fence, cowshed'); Lyc. *hri* 'above' < Luw. *šarri* 'id.'; Lyc. *hrzzi* 'higher' < Luw. **šarazzi* (cf. Hitt. *šarazzi* 'id.');

Lyc. *pddē* 'place' < HLuw. **peta-* [=LOCUS-*ta-*] (cf. Hitt. *pedan* n. 'place', Ved. *padám* n. 'id.' < PIE. **pedóm*).⁹³ The observed inclination towards syncope in the second or third syllable from the end, with the simultaneous lack of apocope of the final syllable, seems to document unambiguously that in Lycian the stress could have stabilized on the final syllable. In the current state of research, it is impossible to rule out an alternative solution that the Lycian accent remained free, but the numerous examples of syncope, as well as the occasionally observed phenomenon of aphaeresis, suggest stabilization of the stress in the oxytone position. It seems certain, at least, that stress in many Lycian words must have fallen on the last syllable. In other words, the available Lycian (as well as the Egyptian) material points to the oxytone accentuation of the restored lemma, that is, the form βουρί. We cannot, however, be completely certain from which Anatolian source the inhabitants of Pamphylian Perge borrowed the name of the vine, but the nearby non-Greek languages (e. g. Milyan, Sidetic or Pisidian) are closely related to the language of the Lycians and show similar or the same features as the ones known from numerous epigraphic documents of Lycian.

5. Summary

The above reflections on one of the Pamphylian glosses recorded by Hesychius of Alexandria lead to the following conclusions:

5.1. The Pamphylian gloss βουρικυπάρισσος·ή ἄμπελος, Περγαῖοι was incorrectly printed by the editors of Hesychius of Alexandria's *Lexicon*. The analysed gloss can be reproduced in the following form: βουρί· κυπάρισσος ἢ ἄμπελος, Περγαῖοι ("bouri: cypress or grapevine. Citizens of Perge").

⁹¹ Wellmann 1958, I 6, 74, 95 and 184, II 206 and 243.

⁹² Neumann 1969, 376.

⁹³ Melchert 1994, 219.

5.2. The Pamphylian term βουρί in the sense of ‘cypress’ (Gr. κυπάρισσος) is a Wanderwort of Semitic origin, which was borrowed via a Lycian intermediary. The available lexical data permit reconstructing the following sequence of events: Semitic **b-r-t* ‘a kind of conifer tree; juniper or cypress’ > Oakk. *burāšum* ‘pine’ > As. *burāšu* ‘juniper’ → Hittite-Luwian **burašiš* c. ‘a kind of conifer tree’ > Lyc. **burehi*, syncopated into **burhi* ‘id.’ → Gr. Pamph. βουρί ‘cypress’. It cannot be excluded that Eg. *brri* [buri] ‘a kind of wood used in chariots’, presumably ‘cypress wood’, represents a Pamphylian Greek or Lycian borrowing.

5.3. The Pamphylian word βουρί in an alternative sense ‘grapevine’ undoubtedly represents an Anatolian loan (cf. Hitt., Luw. *muriš* c. ‘grapevine, bunch of grapes’), which was probably taken over via a Lycian intermediary.

Abbreviations

Aeol. — Aeolic; Ahg. — Ahaggar; Akk. — Akkadian; Alg. — Alagwa; Ar. — Arabic; Aram. — Aramaic; As. — Assyrian; Att. — Attic; Bab. — Babylonian; Boeot. — Boeotian; Brg. — Burunge; CCh. — Central Chadic; Cypr. — Cypriot; Del. — Delian; Delph. — Delphic; Dng. — Dangla; Dor. — Doric; Eg. — Egyptian; Epid. — Epidaurian; Ghd. — Ghadames; Gr. — Greek; Hebr. — Hebrew; Hitt. — Hittite; HLUw. — Hieroglyphic Luwian; Hom. — Homeric; Ion. — Ionic; Lat. — Latin; Luw. — Luwian; Lyc. — Lycian; Lyd. — Lydian; Mil. — Milyan (or Lycian B); Myc. — Mycenaean; Oakk. — Old Akkadian; Pal. — Palaic; Pamph. — Pamphylian; PIE. — Proto-Indo-European; Pol. — Polish; Qwd. — Qwadza; Rhod. — Rhodian; Sem. — Semitic; Sid. — Sidetic; Sum. — Sumerian; TArAm. — Talmudic Aramaic; Twl. — Tawllemet; Ved. — Vedic; WCh. — West Chadic.

References

- Alimpertis A. *Θεραπευτικά, αρωματικά και εδάσματα φυτά της Κρήτης*. Heraklion, Mystis, 2006.
- André J. *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique*. Paris, Société d’Édition “Les Belles Lettres”, 1985.
- Aura Jorro F. *Diccionario Micénico*. Vol. I–II. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985–1993.
- Aura Jorro F., Bernabé A., Luján E. R., Piquero J., Varias García C. *Suplemento al Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2020.
- Bartoněk A. *Chrétomatie starořeckých nářečních nápisů*. Brno, Masarykova univerzita, 2011.
- Bawanypeck D. *Die Rituale der Auguren*. Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag Winter, 2005.
- Beekes R. S. P. The Greek Word for “Lead”. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 1999, 59, 7–14.
- Beekes R. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2010.
- Beekes R. S. P. *Pre-Greek: Phonology, Morphology, Lexicon*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2014.
- Bernabé A. *Testi relativi a carri e ruote*, in: M. de Freo, M. Perna (eds) *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio di testi in lineare B*. Vol. II. Padova, Libreria Universitaria, 2016, 511–550.
- Black J., George A., Postgate N. *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010.
- Blažek V. *Phytonyms (Names of Trees)*, in: G. K. Giannakis (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Vol. III. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2014, 97–100.
- Brixhe C. *Le dialecte grec de Pamphylie. Documents et grammaire*. Paris, Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1976.
- Brixhe C. La Pamphylie. Peuplement et dialecte: 40 ans de recherché. *Kadmos* 2013, 52.1, 169–205.
- Budge E. A. W. *An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary*. Vol. I. New York, Dover Publications, 1978.
- Carnoy A. *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms grecs de plantes*. Louvain, Publications Universitaires. Institut Orientaliste, 1959.
- Carruba O. Su alcuni nomi di parentela in licio en in nesito. *La Parola del Passato* 1969, 24 (127), 269–278.
- Carruba O. *Analecta linguistica Anatolica*. Pavia, Gianni Iuculano Editore, 1997.
- Chadwick J. *The Decipherment of Linear B*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- Chadwick J., Baumbach L. The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary. *Glotta* 1963, 41, 157–271.
- Colvin S. *A Historical Greek Reader. Mycenaean to the Koiné*. Oxford — New York, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Cunningham I. C. 2018. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I. Berlin — Boston, de Gruyter, 2018.

- Danka I.R. Anatolijskie kontynuanty praindoeuropejskich spółgłosek laryngalnych. *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN* 1978, 24, 25–38.
- Danka, I. R. *Stanowisko języków anatolijskich w rodzinie indoeuropejskiej i ich wzajemne związki*. Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 1983.
- Danka I. R. Języki anatolijskie, in: Bednarczuk, L. (ed.) *Języki indoeuropejskie*. Vol. I. Warszawa, PWN, 1986, 275–339.
- Diakonoff I., Belova A., Chetverukhin A., Militarev A., Porkhomovsky V., Stolbova O. Historical Comparative Vocabulary of Afrasian. *Sankt-Peterburgskii zhurnal afrikaniskikh issledovanii* 1994, 3, 5–26.
- Erman A., Grapow H. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*. Vol. I. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1971.
- Filos P. *Pamphylian*, in: G. K. Giannakis (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Vol. III. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2014, 8–11.
- Friedrich J. *Kurzgefaßtes hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefaßte kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1991.
- Frisk H. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. II. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1962.
- Furnée E. J. *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen mit einem Appendix über den Vokalismus*. The Hague, Mouton, 1972.
- Gale R., Gasson P., Hepper N., Killen G. *Wood*, in: P. T. Nicholson, I. Shaw (eds) *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Technology*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, 334–371.
- Gelb I. J. *Glossary of Old Akkadian*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Gelb I. J., Landsberger B., Oppenheim A. L., Reiner E. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. II. Chicago, The Oriental Institute, 1965.
- Grainger J. D. *The Cities of Pamphylia*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2009.
- Gusmani R. *Lydisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1964.
- Gusmani R. *Il lessico ittito*. Napoli, Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1968.
- Güterbock H. G., Hoffner H. A. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. M. Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1989.
- Güterbock H. G., Hoffner H. A. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. P. The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1997.
- Hannig R. *Großes Handwörterbuch Ägyptisch-Deutsch: Die Sprache der Pharaonen (2800–950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz, Verlag Phillip von Zabern, 1997.
- Hannig R. *Großes Handwörterbuch Deutsch-Ägyptisch: Die Sprache der Pharaonen (2800–950 v. Chr.)*. Mainz, Verlag Phillip von Zabern, 2000.
- Hansen P. A. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. III. Berlin — New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Hoch J. E. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Dr. Sci. Thesis. Toronto, University of Toronto, 1991.
- Hoch J. E. *Semitic Words in Egyptian Texts of the New Kingdom and Third Intermediate Period*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Hoffner H. A., Jr. An English-Hittite Glossary. *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 1967, 25, 7–99.
- Kassian A. S. *The Sidetic Language*, in: Yu. B. Koriakov, A. A. Kibrik (eds) *Ilazyki mira. Reliktovye indoevropeiskie iazyki Perednei i Tsentral'noi Azii*. Moskva, Academia Publ., 2013, 175–177.
- Kazanskene V. P., Kazanskii N. N. *Subject-Conceptual Dictionary of the Greek Language. The Creto-Mycenaean Period*. Leningrad, Nauka Publ. 1986. (In Russian)
- Kimball S. E. Loss and Retention of Voiced Velars in Luvian: Another Look. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1994, 99, 75–85.
- Laroche E. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*, Paris, Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1959.
- Latte K. (ed.) *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I–II. Hauniae, Ejnar Munksgaard, 1953–1966.
- Lesko L. H. *A Dictionary of Late Egyptian*. Vol. I. Berkeley, B. C. Scribe Publications, 1982.
- Lewy H. *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, Berlin, R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1895.
- Liddell H. G., Scott R. (eds) *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lucas A., Harris J. R. *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. Mineola [NY], Kessinger Publishing, 2011.
- McGready A. G. Egyptian Words in the Greek Vocabulary. *Glotta* 1968, 46, 247–254.
- Melchert H. C. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill [NC], by the author, 1993.
- Melchert H. C. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam-Atlanta, Rodopi, 1994.
- Melchert H. C. *Lycian*, in: R. D. Woodard (ed.) *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 46–55.

- Melchert H. C. *Greek μόλυβδος as a Loanword from Lydian*, in: B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, I. C. Rutherford (eds) *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbours*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2008, 153–157. [bis]
- Montanari F. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2018.
- Neumann G. *Lykisch*, in: B. Spuler (ed.), *Altkeinasische Sprachen*. Leiden — Köln, E. J. Brill, 1969, 358–396.
- Neumann G. *Griechisch ἀρβύλη*. *Orbis* 1971, 20, 482–485.
- Neumann G. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1994.
- Neumann G. *Glossar des Lykischen*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2007.
- Orel V., Stolbova O. V. *Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden — New York — Köln, E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Oshiro T. Some Luwian Words of Indo-European Origin. *Orient* 1988, 25, 47–54.
- Oshiro T. On Kinship Terms in Hieroglyphic Luwian. *Orient* 1990, 26, 85–93.
- Panayotou A. *Pamphylia*, in: A.-F. Christidis (ed.) *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Vol. I. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015, 427–432.
- Pisani V. *Manuale storico della lingua greca*. Brescia, Paideia, 1973.
- Popko M. *Ludy i języki starożytniej Anatolii*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie Dialog, 1999.
- Puhvel J. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. VI. Berlin-New York, Mouton Publishers, 2004.
- Puhvel J. Bunch of Grapes, Swarm of Locusts. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2004, 56, 127–128.
- Puhvel J. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. IX. Berlin — New York, Mouton Publishers, 2013.
- Rosół R. *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2013.
- Roth M. T. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Vol. XII. Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2005.
- Sali-Aksioti T. *Λεξικό μυκηναϊκών τεχνικών όρων*. Athens, Papadima, 1996.
- Schmidt M. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I. Ienae, Sumptibus Frederici Maukii, 1858.
- Schmidt M. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. IV.2. Ienae, Sumptibus Frederici Maukii, 1864.
- Schofield L. *The Mycenaean*. London, The British Museum Press, 2007.
- Schrader O., Nehring A. *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*. Vol. I. Berlin — Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter, 1917–1923.
- Schwyzler E. *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. I. München, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939.
- Segura Munguía S., Torres Ripa J. *Historia de las plantas en el mundo antiguo*. Bilbao-Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2009.
- Sevoroshkin V. V. *Miliiskii iazyk*, in: Y. B. Koriakov, A. A. Kibrik (eds) *Iazyki mira. Reliktovye indoevropskie iazyki Perednej i Tsentral'noi Azii*. Moskva: Academia 2013, 154–165. [Sevoroshkin V. V. *The Milyan Language*, in: Y. B. Koriakov, A. A. Kibrik (eds) *Languages of the World. Relict Indo-European Languages of Near and Central Asia*. Moscow: Academia, 2013, 154–165]. (In Russian)
- Skelton Ch. Greek-Anatolian Language Contact and the Settlement of Pamphylia, *Classical Antiquity* 2017, 36 (1), 104–129.
- Soden W. von. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Vol. I. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1965.
- Sturtevant E. A. *Hittite Glossary*. Philadelphia, Linguistic Society of America, 1936.
- Takács G. *Etymological Dictionary of Egyptian*. Vol. II. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2001.
- Tischler J. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20). Part II. 5–6: L.: M. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1990.
- Tischler J. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 20). Part II. 11–12: P. Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 2001.
- Ventris M., Chadwick J. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Wąsowicz A. *Obróbka drewna*, in: K. Majewski (ed.) *Kultura materialna starożytnej Grecji*. Vol. I. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich — Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1975, 273–333.
- Weeks D. M. *Hittite Vocabulary: An Anatolian Appendix to Buck's Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Los Angeles, University of California, 1985.
- Weiss M. Greek μυρίος 'countless', Hittite *mūri-* 'bunch (of fruit)'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 1996, 109.2, 199–214.
- Wellmann M. *Pedani Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*. Vol. I–III. Berolini, Weidmann, 1958.

Received: 05.06.2021

Accepted: 20.08.2021