(Historical) Linguistics and (Classical) Philology[(*)]

Georgios K. Giannakis
University of Ioannina, Greece

The issue of the relation of historical linguistics and classical philology was raised during the nineteenth century, when, as a result of Sir William Jones' declaration for the resemblance and possible genetic relation between Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, Latin, and other old languages, the new science of historical and comparative linguistics began to take shape. Up until the last quarter of the nineteenth century the two fields were in a sense the two faces of the same coin, but with the Neogrammarian 'turn' linguistics managed to define in a clear way its subject matter, formulate its own distinct method, and evolve into a more or less independent and self-determined scientific field of study. The 'linguistics *cum* philology' approach which is suggested in the study for viewing the relation between historical linguistics and philology, classical philology in particular, is supported by a number of arguments that form the common ground of the two fields, namely etymology, textual criticism, text linguistics, poetics, the study of dialects, the decipherment of unknown scripts, the relation of linguistics and philology with other related fields such as archaeology, myth, and culture.

Introduction

It may sound a bit tautological and/or superfluous to invest time and energy in discussing a topic that may have either been solved long time ago or that may call upon no solution at all. Yet, for reasons to be elaborated below we believe that the issue warrants a fruitful discussion and a new and fresh look. The title of the study suggests alternative readings, with both, none or either one of the determinatives and qualifying adjectives of the correlation. In all cases the kernel of the conjunction, i.e. 'linguistics' and 'philology', remains stable and unchanged, perhaps signalling the basic

---

thesis of the writer that the two poles of the correlation should be seen together, and thus justify the undertaking. We assure the reader that this is no word play, but simply the alternative options in dealing with the topic, seeing it either from the broad perspective of the possible relation between linguistics and philology or from the narrower and more concrete vantage point of relating historical linguistics and classical philology. Furthermore, an issue may be taken with regard to the conjunction 'and', i.e. whether it can be read as additive or complexive. The answer to this question will turn out to be rather difficult, but definitely weighing more towards the latter solution.

For historical reasons, in the following pages we propose to investigate the ways and means by which one can determine both the terms and the conditions under which historical linguistics and classical philology are related and/or differentiated. By the term 'historical reasons' we simply allude to the fact that ever since the issue was raised (in the nineteenth century), the emphasis was alternatingly placed upon the side of language or that of philology, depending on the individual researcher's personal taste, his theoretical or ideological allegiance, or the overall climate of the particular period in question.[1] The turning point is located in the last

---

[1]The history of the relation of linguistics to philology, as an epistemological problem, is of special interest for the evolution of both fields. In short, it could be described as a love-and-hate relation, i.e. as a process from an originally close association to a gradual disengagement, then to near complete divorce of linguistics from philology, and finally a reunion with the formation of new interdisciplinary trends in which linguistic and philological approaches meet each other again. However, the relation of historical linguistics and classical philology has always been a really close one ever since the first suspicion was removed, especially directed from classical philologists towards the newly founded discipline of historical linguistics in the first half of the nineteenth century. Some characteristic items of the literature on this issue are the following (listed in chronological order): Curtius (1845 and 1862/1886), Schleicher (1850), Förster (1851), Bréal (1878), Brugmann (1885), Bolling (1929), Sturtevant and Kent (1929), Debrunner (1930), Vendryes (1951), Robinett et al. (1952-53), White (1953-54), Reid (1956), Arbuckle (1970), Stechow (1970), Beyer and Cherubim (1973), Hofmann (1973), Jankowsky (1973), Latacz (1974), Hildebrandt (1975), Storost (1984), Jäger (1975), and others. For a good summary of the story and the basic bibliography, see Anttila (1975), and Koerner (1989); see also Giannakis (2005: 259-274). For the general possibility for cooperation of the two fields, see the essays in Ahlqvist (1982: 395ff.), Fisiak (1990), Eichner and Rix (1990); see also Ziolkowski (1990).

quarter of the nineteenth century with the Neogrammarians and the primacy of linguistics over philology as far as the theoretical foundations of the proposed correlation are concerned.[2]

Linguistics and/or Philology?

The 'and/or' disjunction reflects the two extreme attitudes and stances taken by scholars in the past or today. Traditionally, philology is identified with the interpretation of texts, particularly the texts of classical antiquity. Following a long tradition of approaching the classical texts, it aspires to imbue them with their original spirit, and reenact, as it were, the historical, social, and cultural milieu within which they were conceived, matured and executed. Their reading and understanding involve the knowledge of social history and the history of ideas in the broad sense of the terms. August Boeckh declared that philology is 'the knowledge of what is known', i.e. philology is a kind of re-cognition (cf. Gk. ἀναγιγνώσκειν), as it leads to familiarization with the accumulated knowledge of the past. Boeckh's definition reflects his concept of philology as an 'encyclopedia', in other words the idea of the unity of knowledge (Einheitstheorie), as a prerequisite for interpreting classical texts. His reference to this idea is quite compelling, as he states: "When the idea of encyclopaedic knowledge is used in connection with philology, however, the knowledge must be organized into a unity, because here the general knowledge common to all the sciences is very prominent. The particular here is bound up in the general. This unification of knowledge becomes the more important, the more the single parts are divided among different brains" (1968: 31). This knowledge is for Boeckh both a theory and an epistemological principle, to the development of which he devoted his entire scholarly life.[3] In

_____

[2]Within this frame, it is interesting to note the shift of the emphasis from philology to linguistics as seen in the two essays by teacher and student, namely Curtius' "Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft" (delivered in 1862, published in 1886) and Brugmann's "Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie" (1885), with the symbolic reversal in the order of the members of the correlation, intending in this way to underline the priority of the position of linguistics over that of philology, and at the same time to signal the passage from linguistics as an accessory of classical philology to linguistics as an autonomous science: the 'Neogrammarian controversy' is well under way!
[3]The original German edition of Boeckh's work was published in 1886, and

this way, philology sees and understands the mind of the past as present and makes the strange familiar (see also Gadamer 2004: 233).

It is true that knowledge has been compartmentalized as a result of the progress of science and of the subsequent overspecialization. Yet, Boeckh's idea of a holistic knowledge is both possible and necessary. Towards this goal one sees the need to 'read the past' by decoding the message of classical texts. This decoding requires the prior reading of the linguistic code in which these texts are written. And by linguistic code we mean the system of the language of the text, which amounts to the analysis of the phonological system, the morphological (= grammatical) structure, the syntactic organization, as well as of the lexicon and the meaning. In plain words, we need to proceed to the interpretation of the texts, and, as is stated by Gadamer (2004: 399), "the interpretation places the object, as it were, on the scales of words." Hermeneutics is the end but also the means for the final understanding of classical texts. However, understanding and interpretation are indissolubly bound together. Classical philology is doing precisely that, and this seems to be its exclusive task. Thus, the analytic and interpretive processes of philology become possible through the previous recognition and reading of the linguistic code of the texts, linguistics' task par excellence. By way of its analytic means, grammatical analysis decomposes the units into their constituent parts, e.g., sounds, morphemes, lexemes and lexical syntagms, and then recomposes them into larger units so that the meaning hidden in them be revealed. This analysis-to-synthesis process of philology is executed with the

---

was the result of his teaching the subject for over fifty years in Heidelberg and Berlin. The English edition omits a few parts that were thought not to be necessary for understanding the technique and method suggested by the author. Boeckh believes that the linguistic analysis is only one out of four fundamental methodological approaches of the text. The others are the historical, the individual, and the generic interpretation.

As we see, we enter here into a rather difficult philosophical issue which addresses the question of the nature of history and of historical explanation as a whole. Boeckh's idea is only one out of many equally strong theories for studying the past. From the point of view of historical linguistics, excellent treatments are to be found in Anttila (1989) and Lass (1980 and 1997). From the historian's point of view, the issue has been dealt with, among others, by Collingwood (1946), Gardiner (1961), Carr (1987), and Cannadine (2002).

techniques and mechanisms provided by linguistics. Philology is working with complete wholes (the texts), linguistics puts together the constitutive components into these wholes. In this sense, the cooperation of the two fields seems to be ideal. These are necessary, albeit not sufficient, conditions in order for the text to turn into a relevant subject, or to achieve the link between text and reader, and ultimately to reach its final interpretation.

Calvert Watkins puts the relation between text and reader in the following manner: "It is a commonplace that the historical linguist deals first of all with a text, and his first task is the interpretation of the meaning of that text. Now there is a realm of meaning called 'semantics', and a realm of meaning nowadays called 'pragmatics'. The latter, as Michael Silverstein has succinctly put it in a recent paper, 'is the study of the meaning of the language forms as these depend on the linkage of signs to the context in which they occur (we call this the 'indexical' meaning of signs).' Despite the relative novelty of the term pragmatics [...] the historical linguist has been dealing with this all along; he just calls it philology" (1981: 238-239). Or, to put it in Carroll's way, philology is "the large middle ground between linguistic science and the literary and humanistic studies" (1955: 65).

This is indeed the "middle" approach on the matter. On the other hand, as will be seen later, theoretical linguistics and philology are characterized by a gradual centrifugal tendency, and most linguists today see very little –if any at all– relation between the two fields of study.

As in the past, likewise in the present views on the matter diverge into two main camps. On the one hand there are those who believe that between linguistics and philology there is no relation, since each has its own goals and a different methodology. This is the view of the majority of theoretical linguists, whose main interest focuses on theory and on spoken languages rather than on texts. The second group holds the view that historical linguistics and classical philology cannot be kept apart from each other, but are complementary and interrelated. To this group belong most historical linguists as well as all those who work on the vicinity of linguistic studies in conjunction with contiguous and interdisciplinary fields, such as sociolinguistics, ethnography of speech, anthropological linguistics, text linguistics, etc. These fields of

study regain for linguistics its humanistic character that was endangered under the pressure of extreme formalism and of the mechanistic views of language during the second half of the twentieth century. Anthropological linguistics in particular has many similarities with (traditional) classical philology, as it sets similar priorities and its approach is not confined to linguistic description alone but moves beyond form and investigates the relation of language to human history and civilization.[4]

Despite the differences with regard to method and goals between theoretical linguistics and those of classical philology, the relation of the latter to historical linguistics is still strong. Therefore, our answer to the dilemma posed by the title of this section 'linguistics and/or philology?' is 'linguistics *and* philology', a position to be argued for in the rest of the paper, but with a number of qualifications.

The 'linguistics *cum* philology' approach

The approach suggested here is methodologically a synthesis, or better a fusion, of the techniques of historical linguistics and of classical philology: it is not a matter of simple addition of the linguistic and of the philological methods, but the result of their combination into a new complexive synthesis and into a 'new' method. This method is supported by a series of arguments and/or examples of application, among them the following: the linguistic analysis of texts (the text-linguistic method); the critical edition of texts, the chronology of textual evidence and other similar documents; the placement of the philological documents within the general sociohistorical and cultural era of their genesis; linguistic geography and language variation; the possible relation of a particular philological document with a broader historical and/or comparative framework of genetically related traditions, and its ultimate projection back to a 'proto-philological' tradition; the decipherment of unknown scripts; perhaps, the best case exemplifying this method is etymology, to which a distinct section is devoted in this study.[5]

---

[4]Anttila (1975: 151) comments on this point: "Society needs linguistics and linguistics needs society. Ethnography without linguistics is unspeakable and linguistics without ethnography is mindless, unsociable."

[5]For a discussion of all these, see Giannakis (2005: 259-295), whereas a detailed treatment of the relationship between historical linguistics and

As will become clear in the course of the study, our proposal is not simply an epistemological issue, but is a matter of substance, and addresses a central issue of historical linguistics. There definitely exist discrete borders between historical linguistics and classical philology, but at the same time there is also a broad common ground between the two, such that one is justified in speaking of parallel and complementary courses. This relation is more pronounced in the case of Indo-European linguistics, which was characterized by Debrunner (1930: 21) as the "child of classical philology and general linguistics".

As is the case with pragmatics, philology too studies linguistic signs in context, what is usually termed by semioticians the indexical function of signs. In line with Benveniste's concept of ethnosemantics, Watkins (1989) calls this approach 'new comparative philology', intending to highlight by the term the close link between historical and comparative linguistics with philology, on the analogy of, or, perhaps, in contradistinction to 'comparative philology' which had been used earlier for comparative linguistics. The main feature of this 'new' approach is its strong dependence on philological documents, since these are the sole evidence for linguistic history. In this sense, the historian has no other choice but live with the texts, often attested in an incomplete and fragmentary form, and apply the historical method in evaluating and interpreting them in such a way that they turn into valid and adequate evidence. In this procedure, very often philological analysis is a sort of microscopic examination of particular details of the texts. Linguistics in its turn attempts, by way of a macroscopic approach, to re-compose and re-construct the various sides of the philological analysis and sew them together into larger, more composite, and more coherent wholes that amount to the system of the language. In this way, linguistic investigation goes far beyond the particularities of a single text or of a group of texts, or even of a single language, acquiring thus a universal character.

History and comparison are the two central issues of historical and comparative linguistics; yet they are not immediately obvious to the classical philologist. Next we turn to a brief discussion precisely of this question.

---

classical philology, along with a host of related issues, is to be found in a monograph under preparation.

'Classical philology': what does it really mean?

We referred earlier to the compound determinative adjective 'historical-comparative', which applies to the linguistic aspect of the correlation 'linguistics and philology'. This adjective automatically introduces two important features of our investigation, namely history and comparison. The core question to be addressed here is the following: "What exactly is 'classical philology'?". The search for an answer to this question raises a large number of related questions, all begging an answer. These questions relate to the very nature of classical philology, and are of the type "when?, where?, and how?". In other words, one should rethink the issue of the temporal and/or spatial determinatives of classical philology, i.e. to search for its beginnings, its continuation into and influence upon post-classical traditions, as well as its possible relatives. The first is a historical concern, the second a geographic, and the last a comparative concern. The subquestion "where?" tackles the spatial/geographic determinants of the field of classical philology: is classical philology confined (or should it be confined) to the familiar geographical and cultural territory of classical antiquity, Greece and Rome, or can/should it be opened up to embrace other classical traditions as well, especially traditions of related linguistic (and philological) stocks, e.g. Indo-European? As for the question "how?", one needs to look for the distant beginnings of classical philology and its projection back in time to possible genetic relations and a common proto-philological source. The last issue is, to my mind, of extremely high interest, since it may lead to the discovery of the distant origins and, in the course of time, of unknown relatives of classical philology. Admittedly from this point on we start moving onto the less familiar and more ambiguous sphere of reconstruction of a proto-philological tradition, on the model of the linguistic reconstruction of protolanguages. This procedure, i.e. the breaking of the traditional confines of classical philology –before, after, and laterally– widens the view by means of vertical, horizontal and lateral relations, and prolongs the temporal range by the bilateral projection both into the past and into the future.

At this point an important issue must be clarified, namely our reference to cognacy. What is meant here is that there

may exist cognate features in different philological traditions, in a way parallel and similar to cognate linguistic traditions. This cognacy may be generic, thematic, ideological, cultural and mythological, or formal and structural, a fact that is determined by applying the comparative method to philological traditions on any or all of the aforementioned aspects.[6] With the proviso that comparison be conducted according to the prescriptions of the comparative method, the common features may be projected back to some common source from which there sprang all or some of the compared traditions, or at least some of their features. The comparison must be confined within cognate linguistic traditions, with an effort to locate those features that may derive from a common proto-philological source. In other words, the effort should be directed to demonstrating which of the observed similarities among the comparanda may be of common ancestry.[7]

As with cognate languages, classical philology must look for its relatives –prehistoric, ancient, and more recent. As was also mentioned earlier, we are talking here of cognate Indo-European traditions. This co-examination can be conducted on different levels and to various extents, by geographical zones, but also on the entirety of the family; by generic type, e.g. epic poetry, sacral/mythological literature, legal texts, etc.; it can also be approached in terms of motif and/or theme, e.g. the theme of killing the serpent as represented in the widely attested motif of the struggle between man and serpent

---

[6]Gasparov (1996), for instance, argues that it is possible to project to a common source in Indo-European several metrical patterns of European poetic traditions, leading to what he calls "a historical poetics of European literature."

[7]As is the case with linguistic relations, on the level of philological relations too certain features may be the result of borrowing and other such influence or of parallel development. Classical philologists do show interest in this type of relation, trying to trace influences from other neighbouring traditions upon certain aspects of classical philology. An example of such an investigation is West (1997), in which the author traces the influence from Mesopotamian, Assyrian, and other Anatolian traditions on archaic Greek poetry. Similar efforts have been made for various aspects of oriental influences on Greek culture by many other scholars, e.g. Cyrus Gordon, Walter Burkert, Saul Levin, Sarah Morris, Bruce Louden and others. Again, the fundamental prerequisite for fair and adequate treatment of such matters is the strict observance of the principles of the comparative method. Although this kind of relation is also of interest for comparativists, it will not be dealt with in this study.

(amply illustrated by Watkins 1995).

A number of justified questions could be raised in this respect, among them the following: What are the gains for classical philology from such a comparison with other alleged cognate traditions? How is this comparison to be carried on on the level of philology? Are the methodological tools used in linguistic comparison compatible and applicable? How far and how wide can the comparison be taken? What are the requirements or the qualifications on the part of the researcher for such a project? Finally, what is the method to be applied here? All these questions amount to the formulation of a theory which will support the practical aspects of the comparison of philological traditions and the recovery (i.e. reconstruction) of features of the philological prototype.[8]

The rest of the study will deal with these questions, revolving around the central axis of the relation between historical linguistics and classical philology. The comparative stance purports to highlight some of the main features of the 'linguistics *cum* philology' method that is developed here.[9]

[8]A more practical problem is to devise criteria according to which all these questions can be treated adequately and effectively in the academic world. The whole issue becomes even more complicated by the very nature of the approach adopted, which is interdisciplinary, a fact that requires some type of coordinated and combined effort not only on the level of research but mainly and foremost on that of teaching. The situation today in the institutions of higher education is telling a different story: the extreme fragmentation and compartmentalization of knowledge, as a result of overspecialization, despite the avowed calls for interdisciplinary collaborations, disfavours such an effort. This 'modern' trend is also reflected in the structure of programs of study and the structure of the old Schools of Humanities, where each individual field of study, irrespective of size, is represented by independent and autonomous departmental arrangements. This tendency has been more pronounced in the 1960's and the subsequent decades, in particular in the United States which tends to set the pace and/or the model of development of the modern University. In Europe, these changes resulted in the collapse of the traditional structure of the Schools of Humanities and their split into separate departments, a fact that led to even greater isolationism. On the other hand, there are signs of reversal of this expansionist-isolationist phase and its development into a more compact and combinatorial (hopefully also interdisciplinary) system, similar but not identical to the older one. All these are evident in the reorganization activity observed during the last few years in academia, perhaps a positive development, but again time will judge whether all this leads to a happy end.

[9]As was alluded to earlier, the range of the possible collaboration of historical linguistics and philology is much wider than the one which is described in the present study. Here we list some more of these areas (for a fuller picture, see

First, we will address the issue of etymology.

Etymology

Etymology is part of lexicology, more specifically of historical lexicology, but has many peculiarities and idiosyncracies of its own that require a special approach on the part of the etymologist. In etymological work the principle that the part is older than the whole seems to have a general application. This means that etymology, as the investigation of words' origins, is an operation of *ana-lysis* and *dis-crimination* of the particular constituents of the word. As such and in an extended sense, etymology is also part of the *critical* study of the texts.[10] On the other hand, the parts (i.e., the morphemes) are functional elements of the whole, and this leads to a sort of a bifid and bidirectional process of analysis-and-synthesis. Etymology is a process that evolves as part of comparative and historical grammar, and is thus based on the notion of the genetic relationship of languages. In this sense, it is both a diachronic and a comparative subdiscipline, and among its basic operations is establishing systematic correspondences on the phonetic and morphological levels, as well as explaining the semantics of the items investigated. The first two are formal components, whereas meaning links etymology to the outside world, and is based on the concept of language as a system of signs that express the world of experience and of the spiritual activity of the linguistic

---

the topics dealt with in Fisiak 1990): textual analysis and reconstruction, text edition, phonetics, metrics, the role of punctuation, the history of writing, the decipherment of unknown scripts, poetics, the study of dialects, translation, language instruction, the relationship of linguistics with other fields of study such as archaeology, myth, and ethnography of speech, and many more (see also the essays in Bartsch and Vennemann 1975).

[10] Cf. the meaning of the Greek verb κρίνω as "choose, pick out; separate; decide", from which the English word *critical* derives. According to the *Grammar* (τέχνη γραμματική) of Dionysius Thrax, etymology (ἐτυμολογία) is one of the six parts of the grammatical study of language, and its critical study (κρίσις ποιημάτων) is characterized as the noblest of all. See Dionysius' definition of grammar as translated by Robins (1979: 31): "Grammar is the practical knowledge of the general usages of poets and prose writers. It has six parts: first, accurate reading (aloud) with due regard to the prosodies; second, explanation of the literary expressions in the works; third, the provision of notes on phraseology and subject matter; fourth, the discovery of etymologies; fifth, the working out of analogical regularities; sixth, the appreciation of literary compositions, which is the noblest part of grammar."

community. Consideration of the socio-historical and cultural context of language use plays a crucial role in the etymological enterprise (see the essays in Maher 1977 and Malkiel 1968). Therefore, etymology is nothing but a disciplined and strictly controlled exercise in historical reconstruction, but is more of an analytic than a synthetic process.

Let us take our first example that illustrates the etymological practice. Here we will briefly analyze a number of items that derive from the Indo-European root *h₂aĝ- "lead".

a. Up until recently the Greek word ἄναξ has been marked as of unknown or obscure etymology.[11] However, a recent suggestion by Hajnal (1998: 60-69) fulfils all the criteria for a plausible etymology of the word, i.e. the phonological and morphological (i.e., internal) criteria as required by the system of the language, the semantic criterion, as well as the external (i.e., comparative) criterion of the word's genetic relations. In addition, an important criterion for any sound etymological and historical explanation, namely the existence of (typologically) parallel cases from the same and/or from cognate languages, is also met, making thus the proposed etymology even stronger.[12]

According to Hajnal, the word ἄναξ (or better *ϝανακτ-ς, with initial digamma ϝ- and a stem in -t- as seen in the inflectional paradigm of the word, e.g. gen. ϝανακτος, etc.), morphologically is of the same type as the word λᾱγέτης, Doric λᾱγέτᾱς "leader of (military) people", which is also attested in the Mycenaean documents (ra-wa-ke-ta = /lāwāgetās/). This word is analyzed as *λαϝο-αγέτης-, i.e. λαϝός "military people", the verbal root ἀγ- (i.e., IE *h₂aĝ- "lead", see verb ἄγω), and the common derivational suffix -(ε)τ-,[13] plus the inflectional suffix -ης/-ας (in Indo-European terms: *lah₂wo-h₂aĝ-t-). Now the word ἄναξ also has Mycenaean attestation (e.g. wa-na-ka = /wanaks/, wa-na-ka-te, etc.)[14], and follows a similar formative

---

[11] See the etymological dictionaries of Ancient Greek by Frisk s.v., and Chantraine s.v.

[12] On the requirement of parallels in etymological work, see Anttila (2000 and 2002).

[13] For the prehistory of this suffix, see Leukart (1994: 262ff.).

[14] According to the Linear B script convention, word-final consonant clusters are simplified by the omission of all but a single consonant. In our case, wa-na-

path, and we have a proto-form *wṇ-h₂aĝ-t-s*, in other words: the zero-grade *wṇ-* of the root *wen-* "profit", the verbal root *h₂aĝ-* (as before), followed by the same derivational (*-t-*) and inflectional (*-s*) suffixes.[15]

The parallel morphophonological pattern is also supported by the fact that the two words constitute significant items of the sociocultural, military, and political structure of the Mycenaean social system: both items refer to important institutions and belong to the same semantic field, that of 'power and government'.

The external and comparative evidence to support this connection comes from Sanskrit, and more specifically from the word *vaṇíj-* "merchant". The Sanskrit word is etymologized as deriving from a proto-type *wen-h₂ĝ-*, literally "leader/provider of gain/profit", while it is also used with reference to the god Indra in the meaning "leader or protector god of goods" (e.g., AV 3.15.1, and elsewhere; cf. Hajnal 1998: 68).[16]

It seems that this analysis of Greek ἄναξ satisfies all the criteria set earlier so as to be a plausible and acceptable etymology. This is a small, albeit characteristic, example of how historical and comparative linguistics can illumine a problem that is also a concern of classical philology. The systematic and refining comparative work of the linguist coupled with the philological documentation results into a plausible solution to a very difficult and thorny problem. And since philology

---

ka represents original *wanakts* where the last two consonants have been omitted in the writing convention; compare also o-nu-ka or o-nu (ὄνυξ), to-ra-ka or to-ru (θώραξ), a₃-ti-jo-qo (Aἰθίοψ), etc. See Bartoněk (2003: 111).

[15] To be sure, several scholars have suggested a similar etymology, but deriving the first part of the word from the root *wen-* "tribe, kin", and thus *wen-h₂ag-t-* meaning "leader of the tribe, kin". See among them Szemerényi (1979: 217). For an overview of the etymological issue, see Papanastasiou (2001: 280ff.). For a general discussion but not of the etymology, see Benveniste (1969 II: 23ff.).

[16] Hajnal (1998: 65) also discusses an interesting collocation of two terms in a Phrygian inscription from the grave of king Midas. The text runs as follows (the two words in case are underlined): *ates : arkiaevais : akenanogavos : midai : lavagtaei : vanaktaei : edaes* "Ates built <the grave> of Midas, the lawagetas and wanaks" (M-01a). Hajnal argues against a Greek loan here, giving further evidence of this formation in Phrygian proper names like Ουαναξος, Ουαναξων or Ουαναξιων, etc., all based on a noun *vanak(t)s*, an interesting Greco-Phrygian isogloss (?). However, the possibility of Greek loans in these instances is to my mind quite strong.

concerns itself with the study of culture through texts, thanks to comparative linguistics an important cultural item of Ancient Greek philology finds its natural place within the cognate Indo-European languages. Thus, if interpretation is the final aim of philology, etymology has much to contribute to this end.

b. In an exemplary study, with rich documentation from Indo-European but also with parallels from other, non-Indo-European languages, Anttila (2000) applies a method similar to our 'linguistics *cum* philology' approach in his analysis of a large body of terms deriving from the Indo-European root *$*h_2a\hat{g}$-*. Anttila sees etymology as an exercise on sociocultural and linguistic reconstruction. This approach follows the spirit of the philological tradition, as a background and framework, and is supported by the analytic tools of the linguistic method; it is what we would term 'socio-linguistic etymological paleontology' or what Diebold (1987: 52) calls 'interpretive etymology'.[17] According to this approach, the researcher is not content in simply drawing etymological correspondences but goes beyond form and aims at establishing language's connections to the general sociocultural and historical context, making inferences about the social prehistory of the linguistic community. In his research Anttila takes an interdisciplinary stance, opting for a holistic approach and utilizing the methodological procedures of contiguous fields, such as history, philology, linguistics, semiology and hermeneutics. The final purpose of this procedure is what Anttila calls 'hermeneutic empathy', i.e. the effort "[...] to show that as contemporary interpreters we actually extend the speech communities of the past to us, we become fellow members [...]" (2000: 9). In this way, it is possible for modern reader to become both interpreter and sharer of the past, and this is, at least in theory, the task of

---

[17]Diebold (1987: 52) gives the following description of this procedure: "Basically the procedure examines a set of established cognates taken from the lexica of genetically related languages in order to ascertain if their shared prehistoric etymon has a reconstructible meaning from which it is possible to deduce or to infer anything revealing about the physical and sociocultural environments of the prehistoric speech communities of the protolanguage." We would add that this procedure also has similarities with other procedures that have been applied in the past with success and profit, such as *Wörter und Sachen*, the technique of *semantic fields*, and that of *linguistic paleontology*.

philology.[18]

Anttila's study deals with a large number of derivatives from the Indo-European root *$h_2a\hat{g}$-*. In the following brief discussion we will concentrate on a couple of these lexical items as a way of illustration of the merits of the collaborative procedure of historical linguistics, classical philology and social history.

The first of these words is Greek ἀγών "athletic competition". According to Anttila, this word is originally a plural of an unattested neuter noun *αγα (from *$h_2a\hat{g}$-n̥-). The singular is seen in the adverb ἀγα- "very, highly", e.g. ἀγακλυτός "very famous, of high renown", and many other similar formations. The formative model seems to be an analogical pattern of the type χειμών : χεῖμα = ἀγών : *αγα. It is not unlikely that prehellenic *αγα may have had the meanings "leading" and "military unit", the head of which is the ἀγός. As is known, of course, of the same etymon is also the verb ἄγω "lead", as well as a long list of cognates both from Greek and from other Indo-European languages. We have to say that the above etymology is ingenious, albeit difficult, but Anttila makes a very good case for it.

The second word to be examined is Greek ἀγαθός, which reflects IE *$h_2a\hat{g}$-n̥-dh_1-o-s*, in other words, the noun *αγα and the zero grade of the root *$dheh_1$- "put, place; make". Therefore, the meaning of ἀγαθός is "the leader or the upholder of the *αγα", a meaning that is supported by the word's usage in Homeric poetry, where the ἀγαθοί form a distinct class of social and military leaders of the *αγα and are protectors of heroic values.[19] In a heroic society like Indo-European and Homeric society, one of the prime concerns for the leader was to ensure the means of survival and wellbeing

---

[18] This approach reminds us of Boeckh's idea of philology as 'the knowledge of what is known', or Collingwood's 're-enactment of the past' way of approaching historical knowledge. Gadamer's definition of philology as the art of understanding with the help of the context (for instance, see 2004: 182 and *passim*) is also in line with these approaches but viewing the text from the viewpoint of the hermeneutic circle.

[19] For the diachronic development of the meaning of the word ἀγαθός in Ancient Greece, along with many other related terms, see Adkins (1960 and 1972).

of his social unit, primarily through the success in war raids, and especially the acquisition and protection of bovines.[20]

Within this sociocultural framework it is also easy to understand the metaphorical semantic shift of the cognate Greek word ἀγέλη from meaning "lord of cows" to that of "unit of youngsters" (Sparta, Crete). The etymological meaning of the word must be "the leading of the *αγα", its formation being from *αγα + ἐλάω or ἐλαύνω "lead" (said of animals or of military units, e.g. ships, chariots, etc.).[21]

An interesting feature of the derivatives of the root *$h_2a\hat{g}$- is that they all belong to the semantic fields of herding, of social and military organization, and of religious terminology. Among the long list of these words are the following: ἄγω, ἀγαθός, ἀγών, ἀγός, ἀγήνωρ, -αγρος (e.g. the proper name Μελέαγρος and the verb ἀγρέω "hunt"), ἄγαν, ἀγα-, ἄγμα, ἀγή, ἀγέλη, ἀγρός, ἀγέρωχος, ἀγανός, ἄνωγα, ἄγε (particle), ἀγάπη[22], ἀγαπάζω, ἄγος, ἄγνος, ἄγαμαι, ἄγη, ἀγαυός, ἀγάλλω, ἀγανακτέω, and many others. Since the investigation is etymological, the comparative evidence is very rich, as is also the evidence of typological parallels from both Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages.

---

[20] The significance of bovine and other large domesticated animals for the wellbeing and the prosperity of Indo-European society is an established fact. This is also reflected in the semantic development of vocabulary from original meaning "bovine" to the derived meaning "wealth" and the like, e.g. from IE *peḱu- "domestic animal, (large) mamal, cow", as in Lat. *pecu, pecus*, to the semantic development of *pecūnia* "money, wealth", or *pecūlium* "property", OHG *fihu*, ON *fē*, OE *feoh* (> Mod. Eng. *fee*), Go. *faihu*, in all languages "bovine; movable property, money". A similar semantic shift is also seen with Gk. πρόβατον which is related to πρόβασις (Hom.+), with the meaning "movable wealth, property" and "sheep", in contradistinction to the unmovable wealth (cf. κειμήλια, κτήματα, etc.). For all this see Benveniste (1969 I: 37-61) and Mallory and Adams (1997: 23).

[21] However, the direction of the development could have been the opposite as well, i.e. from the reference to the unit of young people, especially of young soldiers, to that of cow-herd.

[22] According to Anttila (2000: 82-94), the word reflects IE *$h_2a\hat{g}\mathring{n}$-ph_2-ā*, where *-ph_2-* is the zero grade of the root *pā(s)-/*pā(y)-/*pī-* "guard, watch, protect", and refers to the task of the sole son towards his family and his community. Being the only heir, he also has the assignment to represent worthily his contingent (family or the extended community under his jurisdiction: *αγα) in its associations with other groups, to advocate their interests, and to demonstrate effective leadership (being both ἀγαθός and ἀγαπητός).

c. The first step of the comparative method is phonetic and semantic similarity, which with strict and clear criteria will turn surface similarities into a regular correspondence. This process requires a justification of every single step taken, and an explanation not so much of the similarities but primarily of the deviations and the exceptions.[23] The concept of 'correspondence' is the paramount and most central principle for any comparison of worth; external similarities may be our first guide but are potentially risky and misleading. Regular correspondences are the necessary prerequisite for plausible explanations in etymological work. Antoine Meillet describes this procedure in a clear and pithy way, saying: "Whatever language is concerned, an etymology can be considered as proved only if a set of precise agreements establishes that the similarities of the words compared cannot be due to chance" (1967: 54). The next example is a good illustration of this point.

Starting with the phonetic and the semantic similarity the etymological association of Gk. $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}s$ and Lat. *deus* should at first look to be an easy task. However, the ease is restricted only to this first impression. For, as soon as a closer and more systematic examination of the two words begins, the first doubts start to appear. The basic difficulty lies in explaining the initial consonant of the words. The historical grammar of the two languages teaches that the initial *d-* of the Latin word goes back to IE **d*, and the initial θ- of the Greek word to IE **dh*, a fact established by many similar cases from the two languages. IE **dh-* would develop in this position into Latin *f-*, cf. *facio* that corresponds to Gk. $\theta\eta$- as in the verb $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\eta\mu\iota$ (both from IE **dheh₁-*). IE **d*, on the other hand, would be reflected in Latin *d-* and in Greek δ- (/d/), but not in θ- (/tʰ/). These are the lessons of historical and comparative grammar for the development of the Indo-European consonants in the two languages, a fact that is beyond doubt, since they form regular correspondences. Therefore, our initial 'conviction' turns into a strong doubt, if not complete change of mind. The etymon

---

[23] As a rule, in historical and comparative linguistics reconstruction is based on exceptions rather than on similarities. This is because exceptions usually point to archaisms, that is they preserve features that are closer to the protolanguage. On this point, see also Meillet (1967: 41).

of the Latin word is IE *$*di̯eu̯$-*, also reflected in Gk. Ζεύς, Διϝός (gen.), Skt. *dyáus*,[24] *divás* (gen.), etc., whereas that of Gk. θεός may be *$*dheh_1-s-os$* (i.e. the IE root *$*dheh_1$-* "put, place; make").[25]

What on the surface looks a perfect etymological match turns out to be a trap: surface similarities do not always constitute etymological cognates; these similarities may be the result of phonetic changes that mask the underlying difference, or, on the other hand, unlike forms may ultimately turn out to be related etymologically (as in the next example). Only the systematic comparison by means of well established principles is the indispensable tool for sound etymological work.

d. The preceding example is a good illustration of how slippery the way to etymology is: what one sees is not always true, or, conversely, dissimilarity on the surface may hide an underlying common base. The next example is a case in point.

Antoine Meillet (1967: 49-50) discusses the etymology of the Armenian numeral *erku* "two". We will add to the etymological game the Greek equivalent δύο, in order to make the point clearer.[26] The two words demonstrate no phonetic similarity, but ultimately they have the same etymon. The original phonetic similarity has been effaced as a result of a long centrifugal development in the two languages which each took its own way and by its own terms and rules of development through time. However, the close and systematic comparison of the two languages reveals a regular correspondence on the phonological level, and this is illustrated by the comparative procedure. Both words go back to IE *$*du̯u̯o-/*du̯o$*, the etymon of similar derivatives in many Indo-European languages, such as Lat. *duo*, Skt. *dvā́(u)*, Pers. *do*, OCS *dŭva*, Russ. *dva*, Lith. *dù*, Alb. *dy*, Goth. *twai*, OIrish *da*, OE *twa*, Toch. A *wu*, etc.[27] Our knowledge of the history of

---

[24] The vowel length in the Sanskrit word is secondary and due to analogy from the acc. sg. form *dyā́m* (from *$**dieum$*); see Sihler (1995: 337).

[25] Other cognates include Gk. θεσμός, θέμις, Skt. *dhā́man* "established order", etc. See Burkert (1985: 271-272), and Giannakis (1997: 105-106).

[26] In fact, Meillet compares the Armenian word with Russian *dva* "two".

[27] Due to their high degree of retention, numerals are among the best evidence for comparative purposes, a well known fact among historical linguists.

the two (and of the rest of the) languages tells us that the development of IE *d(u)u̯-* is δυ- for Greek and *erk-* for Armenian, a regular correspondence established by many other relevant examples, e.g. Gk. δηρός/δᾱρός, Arm. *erkar* "long", from IE *duāro-*; Gk. δείδω, Arm. *erknčim* "be afraid", from IE *du̯ei̯-*, and many other examples. Therefore, the establishment of the phonetic correspondence between Greek and Armenian here is proven and is beyond doubt, as is also the etymological connection of the two words in question.

The last two examples that we discussed demonstrate the illusory character of surface similarities or dissimilarities as far as genetic relations are concerned. The comparisons are valid only to the degree that they follow strict rules and well founded principles: the less strict the rules the larger the chances to make irrelevant comparisons and draw arbitrary and unsupported conclusions.

e. An important criterion that often constitutes the key to the solution of an etymological problem is structural, i.e. it concerns structural details of the items in question. Such is the case of the aorist of the Greek verb εἶπον "said". Based on inner-Greek formative rules it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to explain the form. Analogical formation to some known model would also be difficult, e.g. to that of the aorist εἶδον "saw", or some other form.[28] Therefore, a solution must be sought elsewhere. The verb is based on the IE root *wek^w-/*wok^w-*, seen for instance in the noun (ϝ)έπος "speech; word", Lat. *voc-is* (gen. of *vox* "voice"), and Skt. *vácas* "voice, speech", among others. Another fact is that this aorist is of the reduplicative type, a type which is characterized by specific formative details, such as the zero-grade root. These two formative features are crucial for explaining the Greek form,[29]

---

[28] The difficulty in this analogy lies in the presence of the initial εἰ- of εἶπον also in non indicative forms of the verb, e.g. impv. εἰπέ, ptcpl. εἰπών, infinitive εἰπεῖν, etc., whereas with the verb εἶδον the initial εἰ- of the indicative is reduced to ἰ- in these forms, e.g. impv. ἰδέ, ptcpl. ἰδών, infinitive ἰδεῖν, etc. This fact is a first indication for the difference in the formative pattern of the two forms.

[29] This type of aorist is also seen with other verbs, e.g. ἤγαγον from pres. ἄγω "lead" (IE *h₂ag̑-), πέφνε from root φεν- "kill" (IE *g^{w}hen-), πεπιθεῖν (infinitive) from pres. πείθω "persuade" (IE *bhei̯dh-), etc. The overall

so that we can trace a process like the following: **(e)-we-wkʷ-o-m*, where *-wkʷ-* represents the zero grade of the root **wekʷ-*, *we-* is the reduplicative syllable, *-o-* is the thematic vowel, and *-m* the first singular secondary ending, and *(e)-* the augment which is optional. All these amount to a process in Greek of the type **ϝε-ϝπ-ον > ϝε-ιπ-ον >* (by dissimilation of the second digamma [labial]) *> εἶπον* (loss of the first digamma).[30] Even if one adds the augment ἐ-, the resultant form would still be the same.

Exactly the same formative details are seen in the similar aorist form of the Sanskrit verb *(a)vocam* "said" (from **(e)-we-wkʷ-o-m*), and this provides the comparative testimony that proves the etymology.[31]

Etymology is said to deal with the true origin of words. If science aims at discovering truth, then etymology cannot but be a scientific field. In this respect, etymology is for both historical linguistics and philology one of their basic assignments, especially seen from the vantage point of history. We have to agree with Friedrich Schlegel's pithy dictum that "der Zweck der Philologie ist die Historie", and history is also the vehicle through which explanation, i.e. hermeneutics, passes. As change is the essence of historical development, so is also the essence of language and its study.

The syntagmatic level

The proposed method of study for a historical and comparative Indo-European philology goes beyond the reconstruction of simple lexical items and enters the area of reconstruction of larger units, e.g. lexical syntagms, and it even attempts textual reconstruction.[32] Till now the best

---

(comparative) evidence points to Indo-European provenience for this type of aorist form (see also Szemerényi 1996: 281).

[30] See also Sihler (1995: 56 and 561-562).

[31] That the Sanskrit form has *voc-* and Greek εἰπ- concerns the phonological history of each language. In the Sanskrit word the *-o-* is the result of the combination of IE *-e-* and *-w-* (= *u*). The main point is that the formative processes are in both languages the same, and this alone is sufficient evidence to clinch the cognacy of the forms in question.

[32] This is the most difficult and the most speculative part of all types of reconstructive work, at least for Indo-European. The first such effort was made in 1868 by Schleicher, who composed the short tale titled *"avis akvasas ka"* ("the sheep and the horses") which, despite the negative reaction it caused, also triggered the interest of comparatists, as we can judge from the

studied lexical combinations are the formulae, that is to say fragments of text that demonstrate special formal, semantic and/or functional features, such that guaranteed their survival in the languages of the historical period. These lexical units form part of the traditional poetic language (Dichtersprache), an area of study that reveals important linguistic and cultural aspects of the societies concerned.[33]

The oldest poetic compositions of Indo-European are the product of mainly anonymous (at times also eponymous) oral composers. The oral character of these works follows certain rules and mnemonic devices prescribed by the technique of oral tradition that aim at facilitating the memorization and reproduction of long texts. Among these devices are the formulae, the typical scenes, the traditional epithets, the meter, and others. Of particular interest are the formulae since, beside their function as mnemonic devices, they also testify to the ideological, social and cultural beliefs and values of their prehistoric users. By studying these formulaic expressions one gets, by means of reconstruction, a glimpse to the way of the mind of the speakers and their overall *Weltanschauung* for a time much prior to the linguistic testimonies themselves. Watkins (1995: 17) characterizes the formula as the surface structure and expression of thematics, i.e., of the conceptual, the notional, and the semantic themes and motifs of the poetic language. Formulae are archaic relics, both in form and content, of language structure of an older time, and in this respect they constitute important evidence for the study of the prehistory of language. They also

---

reeditions of Schleicher's text by Hirt in 1939, Lehmann and Zgusta in 1979, and Peters in 1985. The repeated editions by various scholars also reflect the progress that our knowledge has made for the reconstruction of the Indo-European protolanguage. A more recent attempt was made by a number of scholars for the composition of a short story with the title *"rēks deiwos-kʷe"* ("the king and the god"), which was published in 1994 in the *Journal of Indo-European Studies* under the editorial care of Subhadra Kumar Sen. However, the first real effort to establish criteria and formulate a theory of textual reconstruction of Indo-European is Matasović (1996).

[33] The first comparison of such traditional syntagmatic combinations was Gk. κλέος ἄφθιτον and Skt. *śrávas ákṣitam*, in both languages "unquenched fame", made by Adalbert Kuhn in 1853. Since then the collection of such lexical syntagms has been enriched, and the poetic language has proved an extremely productive field of study. The culmination of this effort is Schmitt (1967) and Watkins (1995). For a recent, partly annotated, bibliography, see Costa (1998).

constitute capsules of textual structures, providing an important help in the reconstructive effort as a whole.

When we speak of poetic language we refer to marked types of speech: the language and its use are characterized by such means and/or mechanisms that can express marked linguistic facts, as well as highlight and underline the message. Roman Jakobson says that the linguistic means are produced "on the base of equivalence, similarity and dissimilarity, synonymity and antonymity, while the combination, the build up of the sequence, is based on contiguity" (1960: 358). His definition of the poetic function of language is that "the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination" (358). Equivalence is a key term in the Jakobsonian theory of poetic language, and this principle is described by him in the following way: "Equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence. In poetry one syllable is equalized with any other syllable of the same sequence; word stress is assumed to equal word stress, as unstress equals unstress; prosodic long is matched with long, and short with short; word boundary equals word boundary, no boundary equals no boundary; syntactic pause equals syntactic pause, no pause equals no pause. Syllables are converted into units of measure, and so are morae and stresses" (358).

Thus, poetic language exhibits such formal and technical features that one is justified to speak of *poetic grammar* as a distinct level of linguistic description. Jakobson refers to poetics as that branch of linguistic inquiry that deals with the question "what makes a verbal message a work of art?" (1960: 350).[34]

---

[34]Jakobson developed his thesis on various occasions, but primarily in his pioneering sudies "The poetry of grammar and the grammar of poetry", and "Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics", both published in 1960. See further Watkins (1995: 28-49).

The choice of the poetic devices is such that special phonaesthetic effects are most of the time embedded in poetic function. Paul Valéry defined the poetic work as an ambivalence between sound and sense, meaning with this cryptic phrase that in a poetic work the phonetic means are always bound up with the meaning conveyed by the lexical means, an idea also echoed in Alexander Pope's dictum that in poetry sound must be like an echo of meaning. Wellek and Warren (1956: 241) put the whole matter in the following manner: "Instead of dichotomizing 'form-content', we should think of matter and then of 'form', that which aesthetically organizes its 'matter'. In a successful work of art, the materials are completely assimilated into the

The reconstruction of cultural and mythological features of Indo-European society is a purely semantic procedure which can be independent of lexical reconstruction. Yet, as a rule, these cultural features are traditionally reconstructed by means of etymologically related lexical items or lexical combinations as are attested in older texts.[35] The cognacy of the linguistic means also testifies to the common origin of their semantic content, i.e. their Indo-European provenience.

Next we will briefly study such a traditional fixed phrase which was used in name giving contexts, perhaps also reflecting a common institution of the Indo-Europeans.

In many Indo-European languages there is evidence for an institution of Indo-European antiquity. The lexical syntagm of Greek ὄνομα τίθεσθαι finds etymological and semantic correspondences in many other languages. In some of them there is a partial lexical replacement of the verb expressing the idea of making/placing a name. Thus we have Skt. *nāma dhā-* "put/place a name", the compound nouns *nāmadheya-* and *nāmakaraṇa-* "name-putting/making", as well as the syntagm *nāma dā-* where the verb *dā-* "give" is used instead; Hitt. *laman*

---

form: what was 'world' has become 'language'. The 'materials' of a literary work of art are, on one level, words, on another level, human behaviour experience, and on another, human ideas and attitudes. All of these, including language, exist outside the work of art, in other modes; but in a successful poem or novel they are pulled into polyphonic relations by the dynamics of aesthetic purpose." Such a common phonaesthetic device in Indo-European poetic language are the anagrams. An anagram is the arrangement of the sounds of a word or a phrase in such a way as to allude to messages hidden in them, and is meant to be decoded only by the expert eye. See, among others, Starobinski (1971) and Bader (1993).

[35]An interesting source for such cultural reconstruction is provided by compound nouns and proper names, especially anthroponyms, since they often map cultural beliefs and values of the speakers of ancient (and modern) societies. As a rule, personal names are disyllabic and of the type head + determinative, and are highly symbolic of the heroic character of social values. Such lexemes are like the following (illustrative examples here come from Greek, but similar things happen throughout Indo-European): -κλεϝος "fame, renown", -μενος "mind, spirit", -λαϝος "military people", -ανηρ "man, military person", -αγω/-ος "lead(er)", -αρχος "leader", -ιππος "horse", -λυκος "wolf", -διος "godly, godlike", cf. names like Ἀγαμέμνων, Ἀχιλλεύς, Ἀλέξανδρος, Ἀρχέλαος, Ἡρακλῆς, Λυκοῦργος, Φίλιππος; Germ. *Beowulf* (cf. also *Wolf, Wulf* etc.), *Wolfgang*; Irish *Cú Chulainn*; Slavic *Jaroslav*, Sanskrit *Suśrávas*, etc. The classic work on Indo-European onomastics is still Solmsen (1922); see also Pulgram (1947, 1960), Schramm (1957), and Kazansky (1995).

dai-, Lat. *nomen facio* and *nomen in-do*, Welsh *dodi enw*, although the verb *dodi* may reflect either IE **dheh₁-* "put, place" or IE **doh₃-* "give"; in Welsh we also find the combination of the noun *enw* with the verb *rodi*, in Cornish with the verb *ry*, both from IE **doh₃-*. Likewise in Germanic we have the replacement of the verb with some other verb meaning "make, set, place", e.g. Go. *satjan*, OE *settan* and *scyppan* (cf. Mod. English *shape*). However, this fact points to the conclusion that in the effort to reconstruct an institution exact etymological correspondences are welcome but not always possible, making thus necessary to use also semantically contiguous lexical combinations that express identical concepts. Form is the least resistant to change, but institutions can survive vested in a new formal outfit. This point is an important methodological detail that needs to be considered seriously by the comparatist.[36]

Now based on the above evidence,[37] it is easy to reconstruct an Indo-European protoform for the traditional formula **h₃nomn̥ dheh₁-*, and this must be part of the traditional poetic language of Indo-European. This formulaic syntagm also reflects an old institution with Indo-European roots, an institution that consists in special formal (linguistic) elements, a high symbolism of the ritual acts involved in its execution, and significant allusions to the traditional heroic-code values.

In archaic societies the name was considered an essential part of the person carrying it and in a way was identical with it (see also Gonda 1970: 7ff.). Giving a name to a child was and still is an act of creation. In many cultures one is not considered a 'full person' until acquiring a name identifying oneself. There is also a widely held belief that the nameless child is exposed to many threats and dangers, against which a strong antidote is a fitting name.[38] For Indo-European society

---

[36] For a similar thesis, see Campanile (1993) and Watkins (1995: 15). To be sure, there are also other ways and expressions for naming or calling someone by a name, especially the use of verbs of naming, calling, and the like. See, for instance, Gk. ὀνομάζω, ὀνομαίνω, καλέω, Lat. *nomino, voco*, Hitt. *halzai, lamaniya*, etc. The significance of the lexical combinations of the former type lies in their formulaic, therefore old, status, a fact that points to their traditional character.

[37] See also Hahn (1969), Ivanov (1981), and Pinault (1982). For full textual documentation, see Giannakis (1993 and 1997: 105-116).

[38] For instance, in Ancient India this belief is expressed explicitly in ritual literature, e.g. ŚB 6.1.3.9 (after Gonda 1970: 35) where we read: "One should

we have strong evidence that similar ideas about personal and family name were held in high esteem. Of revealing importance are the well-known expressions of the type of Gk. ὀνομακλυτός, Skt. *nāmaśruta-*, or Old Irish *animgnaid*, all meaning "of famous name, renowned"; cf. also the Tocharian A compound *ñom-klyu-* "famous (lit. name-fame)". Furthermore, traditional expressions like 'imperishable fame' as in Gk. κλέος ἄφθιτον and Skt. *śrávas ákṣitam,* and others like these are indicators of the significance of values like fame, reputation, good name, family tradition and the like for the Indo-Europeans. It is easy to understand why the formula discussed earlier survived in so many Indo-European languages: it carries such an important semantic load that its extinction would amount to abandonment by the Indo-Europeans of an extremely significant part of the traditional heroic-code values. Therefore, one keeps the *signifié* along with the *signifiant,* both meaning and form. In the case considered here this idea is encapsulated in the (mytho)poetic formula **h₃nomn̥ dheh₁-* and its various reflections throughout Indo-European.

What we did here is to take the comparison one step further and seek the wider perspective of language use in real societal and cultural contexts. The result is breaking the often hard shell of form and look into the social aspect of language use. This procedure is impossible without the assistance of philology. Philology provides the frame and the canvas, linguistics adds the individual brush strokes, and the picture becomes complete. This kind of linguistics coincides with Watkins' definition of philology as "the art of reading slowly", i.e. the close and careful reading of the text in such a way that its soul is opened up in front of us revealing what is hidden underneath form.[39]

---

give a name to the boy who is born, for thereby one frees him from evil [...]"; also 6.1.3.20 : "To Agni (the great place for the ritual fire) when built up one gives a name; thereby one keeps away evil from him (it)."

[39] This concept has a long tradition, as also noted by Watkins (1990: 25): "What, then, is philology? Let me conclude with the definition of philology that my teacher Roman Jakobson gave (who got it from his teacher, who got it from his): 'Philology is the art of reading slowly'."

On the other hand, Hjelmslev (1961: 127) puts the same thing in the following emphatic manner: "Linguistic theory is led by an inner necessity to recognize not merely the linguistic system, in its schema and in its usage, in its totality and in its individuality, but also man and human society behind language, and all man's sphere of knowledge through language. At that point

The concept of interdisciplinarity

The comparison of prehistoric languages leads to the comparison of prehistoric social conventions. Through the reconstruction of the semantic and conceptual lexicon of the protolanguage we create a general picture of the historical presence and the civilization of the speakers of the language in place and time. The technique of 'linguistic paleontology' was developed during the second half of the nineteenth century, and is a way of looking into prehistoric social and cultural conventions by means of analyzing and comparing the lexicon of related languages. This technique, which was introduced by Pictet (1859-63), and later on was further refined by Hehn (1870), Schrader (1906-7 and 1917-29), and others, has produced some of the best and most enduring works in Indo-European studies.[40] Linguistic paleontology is an interdisciplinary approach that utilizes data and information from many related fields, and enables us to form a picture with the main features of the Indo-European society. These features are described by Gimbutas (1974: 293) as follows:

> 'Kurgan' is a name for a tradition and like many other names does not refer to one feature but to the sum of elements. Among these: a patriarchal society, a class system, the existence of small tribal units ruled by powerful chieftains, a predominantly pastoral economy including horse breeding and plant cultivation, architectural features such as small subterranean or above-ground rectangular huts of timber uprights, small villages and massive hillforts, crude unpainted pottery decorated with impressions or stabbing, religious elements indicating a Sky/Sun god and Thunder god, horse sacrifices and fire cults.[41]

---

linguistic theory has reached its prescribed goal: *humanitas et universitas*." The last three words of the quotation encapsulate the essence of the dialog between linguistics and philology.

[40] In a similar vein moves the series *Wörter und Sachen*, initiated by Meringer in 1909, in which were published vols. 1-18 (1909-28), and in the New Series vols. 1-5 (1937-43).

[41] The term 'kurgan' is a Russian word that refers to the characteristic tumuli which are associated with early Indo-European burial practices, and was used by Gimbutas as a cover term for early Indo-European culture.

   These are only some, perhaps the main cultural features of the Indo-European community that characterize more or less all Indo-European

As is also noted by Watkins (1992: 319), this description of Indo-European culture is matched in every detail by a securely reconstructible common Indo-European lexical item. The linguistic data lead to the inference that the Indo-European society must have had, to a greater or lesser extent, all these features. This inference has been made possible by the application of the comparative method, in collaboration with related disciplines such as linguistics, archaeology, philology, ethnology, mythology, etc.

Despite its limitations, the technique of linguistic paleontology can still be used effectively in interdisciplinary approaches to the linguistic and cultural study of prehistoric societies. In a sense, this technique is part of our 'linguistics *cum* philology' method put forth in this study.

Along with history, archaeology has been the closest ally of classical philology and historical linguistics (and in general of Indo-European philology). Archaeology provides the material evidence that comes to supplement and/or verify the philological and linguistic evidence. Perhaps the best area where archaeology has shown its potentials in this respect is the issue of the Proto-Indo-European homeland: this issue is not only a linguistic problem, nor is it a philological problem alone; it is mainly and foremost an inderdisciplinary problem where archaeology plays the primary role.[42]

In humanistic sciences there is a close interrelationship

---

subgroups. Elaboration on these general points over the last two centuries by a host of scholars gives a relatively accurate picture for a number of details with regard to the cultural and institutional life of the Indo-Europeans. Among others, see Schrader (1906-7 and 1917-29), Benveniste (1969), Sergent (1995), and Mallory and Adams (1997 and 2006).

[42] This issue has a long history in Indo-European studies. For a brief overview of earlier efforts, see Thieme (1953) and the essays in Scherer (1968); for the best synthesis see Mallory (1989), and for the most recent of these approaches see Anthony (2007). A good treatise on the matter from the linguistic point of view is Meid (1989), where both benefits and limitations of the combined linguistic and archaeological approach are discussed. Another such problem is the question of Troy and the Trojan War: the details of this problem, i.e. date, protagonists, etc., have been a source of controversy that still triggers heated debates. On the basis of recent discoveries by the German archaeologist Manfred Korfmann, see the discussions by Latacz (2004) from the side of classical philology, and Hajnal (2003) from the linguistic point of view. In a forthcoming monograph a detailed discussion is given of all these and many other issues that concern the relation between historical linguistics and classical philology.

among the various fields of study, and each subfield stands in an associative and complementary relation to the rest. This means that advances in one subfield automatically have repercussions on all the others. The specialist then cannot ignore or bypass what is happening in related fields. Although a return to the universal man of the Renaissance is neither possible nor desired, his charm is still a thing to wonder and admire. However, this does not cancel the idea of the *hypallelia* (Gk. ὑπαλληλία) of the sciences propounded by the scholastic philosophers of the Middle Ages, i.e. of the interconnection and interdependence among all human sciences. The basic principle of hypallelia of the sciences holds that it is impossible for one science to reach a full state of evolution without the prior full evolution of all the others that are its prerequisites. Although this principle, at least in its original form, may not have a universal application, yet it serves to underline the necessity for collaboration of the different fields of study. Despite the more or less well defined territory of each science, there still is certain fluidity amongst their boundaries, and this is the common ground we must recognize and exploit to the benefit of all related fields. This common ground creates the space of what is commonly understood as interdisciplinarity. If we agree that history is the most complex and composite of all humanistic sciences, it is easy to discern the fundamental role of all the others in the historical method, i.e. of philology, linguistics, archaeology, ethnology, law, sociology, political science, economics, etc. Perhaps, today the courses run criss-crosswise and not as a concatenation and a strict hierarchy of the sciences. This arrangement respects the autonomy of each scientific field but does not exclude interinfluences among them. And, I believe, this is the essence of interdisciplinarity (cf. also Boeckh's encyclopedia/Einheitstheorie mentioned earlier).

As we have already stated, philology is an interdisciplinary field where language, archaeological finds, ethnological material, cultural and other similar data form a rich and colourful mosaic and lead to the best possible interpretation. The concept of interdisciplinarity is a dynamic concept and expresses an open, multilateral, and multilevel coarticulation of language and its surrounding world, be it historical, social or cultural. Furthermore, interdisciplinarity is the common ground where all the above meet, coalesce, and generate; it is

also the process of interdependence, of mutual transfusion and exchange of ideas, methods, and techniques that the human spirit has thus far achieved. This meeting place is represented in the best possible way by philology, especially so when crosscut by historical and comparative linguistics.

The field of historical linguistics has produced some of the best interdisciplinary works, and continues to produce still more. From the point of view of the Indo-European philological tradition and by way of illustration the following works are mentioned:

a. The inspired if to some extent provocative work by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans* (1995, first published in Russian in 1984), a work that combines the theoretical advances of modern linguistic theory with the traditional historical/comparative linguistic and philological perspective within the general frame of the Indo-European languages, but also with much wider repercussions especially on typological studies. The most relevant part of this book for the 'linguistics *cum* philology' approach advanced here is Part Two, where the semantic dictionary of the protolanguage and the reconstruction of the proto-culture are discussed, a real thesaurus for both Indo-European linguists and philologists.[43]

b. The second book is Mallory and Adams, *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture* (1997), arranged according to an old tradition in Indo-European studies by conceptual fields (e.g. Buck 1949).[44] This encyclopedia is executed on the model of the classic –and still useful– work by Schrader and Nehring, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (1917-29). Along similar lines also moves the authors' latest synthesis (2006).[45]

c. Perhaps, the best illustration of the approach adopted in this study is the classic work by Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire*

---

[43] Perhaps the only mishap of this work, that might discourage the non-specialist or the non-believer, is the peculiar notation system which is in line with the 'Glottalic theory' put forth by the authors. See also Gippert (1998).

[44] As with the previous work, the orthography of some of the contributors, especially with respect to the laryngeal notation, may look to some as a (minor) defect of the book, but as a whole this is no major problem. For a critical review, see Zimmer (1999).

[45] A similar treatment, though less complete in terms of the conceptual fields covered, is Onians (1951).

des institutions indo-européennes (1969). In this work the author brings together into a marvellous synthesis the results of a long research experience on various Indo-European languages with respect to the vocabulary relating to important Indo-European institutions. Applying the method of so-called 'historical ethnosemantics', Benveniste succeeds to a large extent in penetrating the institutional life of a prehistoric people, bringing to light unknown aspects of its cultural, social, legal, and religious life. Despite its deficiencies with regard to some interpretations, the book remains a classic of its kind, and will be difficult to supersede.[46]

  d. Watkins' book *How to kill a dragon. Aspects of Indo-European poetics* (1995) is an illustrious example of how historical linguistics and classical philology can join forces and reach wondrous results. Exploiting finds and using methodological tools of structural linguistics, mainly the advances made by the linguists of the Prague School, and especially the work by Jakobson on poetics and poetic grammar, Watkins develops a theory of Indo-European poetic grammar, its various subparts and its methodology, and then applies it to the 'dragon slaying' theme, which, according to him, is a central theme for Indo-European culture. His motto that 'philology is the art of reading slowly' is his leading guide, meaning by this that every progress in reconstructing the prehistoric past of language and culture goes through the close and careful reading of the texts, the main, and often the sole, source of information. I think that in the case of this book the principle that history is both explanans and explanandum applies most adequately, and this is one of the great merits of the particular work and of its method.[47]

  e. Although not strictly linguistic or philological, M.L. West's recent book *Indo-European poetry and myth* (2007) is a good example for the kind of relations proposed in this study. The study of myth is tightly connected with the study of the texts of classical antiquity, and the comparative framework of Indo-European can offer the necessary basis for analyzing and

---

[46] Benveniste's work represents the "French School" of thought which is in line with structural and cultural anthropology. Many scholars have expressed serious reservations with respect to many of Benveniste's interpretations. The skepticism is stronger among German scholars who charge Benveniste with oversimplifications and naive solutions to very complex problems. For a comprehensive criticism, see Schmitt (1969).

[47] For appraisals of this book, see Bader (1998) and Schlerath (2000).

interpreting a number of recurring themes in the classical languages. This comparative framework, as ably described and amply illustrated by West, offers a holistic answer to many problems of the philological and mythological issues of the individual branches, freeing classics from the kind of introversive attitude that Jäger referred to in the next section, and widening the interpretive perspective. West explains that his method is not just another view but rather a vista to the research that he and other researchers have presented. He says: "Vista is the better word, because the object of perception is not something at a fixed distance like a line of hills on the horizon. Vistas have depth. [...] the elements of shared inheritance that can be abstracted from the extant Indo-European literatures cannot all be followed back to proto-Indo-European. Much the greater number lie in the foreground or the middle distance, corresponding to pools of common tradition that must have extended over wide areas of Europe or Eurasia in the later Bronze or early Iron Age. Perhaps they reach further back, but we cannot see; the mists come and go" (2007: vi). It is sure that within these mists lie many elements of what we could call 'capsules of Indo-European proto-philology', and this method aims at teasing out from among the mist as much of this common inheritance as possible.[48]

These works should be seen not as a complete list of all the works in the spirit put forth here, but only as a small token out of a long catalog of similar works spanning over a period of a two-hundred-year interdisciplinary research. However, they do present the main trends and tenets in the field of comparative Indo-European philology, not just linguistics. Thus, the concept of interdisciplinarity promotes a holistic examination of the area studied, with coverage of all sides of the research object: linguistic, textual, cultural, historical, archaeological, geophysical, and with close consideration of the total context. Such an approach does not disregard the part, nor does it fail to note the particularity of the detail, but tries to produce a new synthesis out of all parts involved. And this is its main attraction. And it is precisely this point that makes the acquaintance with these works by all linguists and philologists necessary. Were that to happen, at least classical philology would have been seen in a much clearer, perhaps

---

[48] For a short appraisal of West's book, see Schmitt (2008).

even more optimistic, light. In this way, when one of the subdisciplines engaged is utilized, all others snap into alignment, and the result is a panoramic view of the total picture. This total picture creates the best possible conditions for plausible solutions, i.e. for the interpretation of the data.

'The future of the past'[49]

For a long time the term 'comparative philology' has been used for comparative linguistics, especially for the comparative study of the Indo-European languages, a fact signifying the close relationship between (classical) philology and historical linguistics. In our view, the comparative dimension is equally necessary for both fields. Civilizations may have a local and an 'ethnic' identity, but they are also historical products; they have roots, relations and influences from and upon other civilizations. Nothing exists in an absolute vacuum, nor is it born out of complete nothingness.

Some deplore a certain 'crisis' that seems to plague classical studies in the last few decades (see, for instance, Hanson and Heath 1998). I am not sure whether one can speak of a crisis or just another phase that classical and in general humanistic studies undergo nowadays. Besides, the appearance of new fields and of new philologies occupied part of the space that was traditionally the exclusive territory of classical philology. All these are an understandable and to a certain extent a just and positive development. The issue is that crucial questions like "what is classical philology today?", "why classical philology?", "classical or modern philology?", and the like are recurrent and are persistently and urgently begging an answer. We cannot (in fact, should not) bypass them with general aphorisms and other such axiomatic statements. In the preceding pages we attempted to suggest a partial answer to these questions, but many other issues remain untouched.

Perhaps the most crucial of all these issues is the relevance of classical philology to modern man. Many specialists and other thinkers rightly cast the stone of the blame for the crisis upon the servants of classical philology, not philology itself. The failure to make philology's message clear to modern man is the responsibility of classical philologists, and this may hide the key to the way out of the stalemate.

---

[49] For the forerunner of the title of this section, see Adkins (1969).

Gerhard Jäger puts the issue in the following way:

> Classical philology must, therefore, answer to a double intermediary role: it has to be ready and capable to assist us to understand the classical texts and their intellectual content, and at the same time to initiate a dialog with modern man. Hermeneutics as the nucleus of philological work should be conceived as part of the communicative process whereby the historical dimension is to be understood and communicated to the present (1975: 31).

Jäger's statement comes as the result of his position that the problem with classical philology is that the philologists fail to communicate with or meet the expectations and the needs of modern man, and thus classical philology:

> [...] has to account for its untimely character, or better for its departure from reality as well as for some kind of introversion, such as a tendency to didactism, instead of manumission, and an adaptation to all sorts of ideological trends. The indifference towards philology is partly due to the relativization of its subject matter by historicism, a fact that leads to estrangement and alienation. A historical approach inevitably detaches the research subject from the familiar surroundings and from modern concerns, exiling it onto a strange context. On the part of the public, there is also a widely held *a-historical* treatment of the present (1975: 29).

And a little later Jäger points to the 'guilty part' for this situation, saying that "[...] classical philology as a scientific field should not be held in any way whatsoever responsible for this. The decisive question is whether its practitioners adopt an unrealistic approach, which is accountable for the above held responsibilities..." (p. 29), and he concludes with the emphatic statement that "[...] our slogan should not be 'antiquity *or* modern world' but 'antiquity *and* modern world'" (p. 231).[50] The resolution of the above pseudo-dilemma is made of the same stuff as the other pseudo-dilemma that we faced earlier, namely 'linguistics *or* philology?' and which we

---

[50] See also his 1987 study. Similar concerns were expressed by Hanson and Heath (1998).

resolved with the conjunctive synthesis 'linguistics *cum* philology'.

In our approach special emphasis has been placed upon the diachronic and the comparative aspects of the problems addressed, two features that transcend and imbue the 'linguistics *cum* philology' method as a whole. Considering the nature and the character of both philology and historical linguistics as described in the paper, it is evident that one needs to possess a general theory for language change, as well as a general theory of social and historical change, since the scientific method is not meant as the simple description of things but one that seeks their interpretation and, if possible, their explanation. Agreeing with Traugott (1982: 463-64) in her concluding remarks on the Panel on Historical Linguistics and Philology, the 'sociolinguistic enterprise', as she calls it, consists of the textual analysis, the reconstruction of the sociocultural setting, and the theory-construction. Text, context, and theory are fundamental prerequisites of either philological or (historical) linguistic operation, or of both of them combined.

The first gain for classical philology from its collaboration with historical and comparative linguistics is the widening of its spatial range and the extension of its comparative and diachronic horizons. As with linguistics, so also with philology, certain things that are the philologist's concern can be projected back into the past and up to their distant origins. And as with linguistics, so also with philology, the comparison with cognate traditions can shed light on otherwise dark or unknown aspects of the classical texts. The results of the research assume a wider and longer perspective, and ultimately a higher degree of plausibility. The comparative perspective will also help to overcome the limits and the limitations imposed by the individual researcher's (especially the philologist's) range of experience and knowledge, and give to the investigation greater universality. The conjunctive method of diachrony and comparison may ultimately lead to what one would call 'proto-philological' prototypes or primes, both as regards linguistic and other such expressive means but also with regard to generic, thematic, or other aspects of the tradition of classical philology. Such a proto-philology could contain common cultural features, such as myth, institutions, ideas, genres (e.g. epic poetry, sacral poetry, legal codes, etc.).

The tradition of Indo-European poetic language has made good advances in the area of formal organization of such features in language (e.g. formulae and other expressive devices). On the level of thematics comparative mythology has also produced some promising results. Using language as its vehicle, philology too can try its luck in the area of Indo-European traditions. The comparative apparatus creates more favourable conditions for the method to penetrate deeper into the prehistory and illustrate more effectively common origins, as well as the variations in individual philological traditions, see what may be of universal character, what is inherited from Indo-European, and finally what could be an innovation of one branch alone.

One clarification is perhaps in order here. Unlike the reconstruction of protolanguages, which is the end-result of the comparative method applied in linguistics, it would be vain to seek such a result in philology. In other words, above the level of short syntagms like the formulae or similar lexical combinations it is impossible to reconstruct proto-texts. Philological reconstructions must be confined to the level of what we termed 'thematics', i.e. general motifs and themes that are reconstructed for the common proto-philological source. Such a reconstruction is possible only through the close reading of the available texts from the various languages.[51] Watkins describes this procedure as follows:

> "Philology is the art of reading slowly." My methodology throughout has been a combination of extremely close reading of text passages in the original [...] with the traditional Comparative Method. It is my claim that what may be legitimately if tendentiously termed the "genetic intertextuality" of all the versions of certain particular formulas and themes, varying in time, place and language, constitutes a background without which one cannot fully apprehend, understand and appreciate the traditional elements in a given poetic text in an early

[51] By 'texts' is meant not only texts of the old literary tradition, but also various texts of the oral tradition that have been survived either by their recording in writing (e.g. the Homeric epics and many similar products from other traditions) or came down to our days in different ways of oral transmission (e.g. all sorts of oral stories, heroic songs, riddles, fables, etc.). However, it goes without saying that the prior screening and sieving by means of the comparative method of all these types of texts in order to appraise their value for the reconstructive procedure are a basic prerequisite.

Indo-European language. In this sense we may speak of a genetic Indo-European comparative literature (1995: vii).[52]

Closer to historical linguistics, we would agree with the idea of reconstruction as the *re-enactment* of the past. The comparative method is at the same time anamnestic and proleptic, reconstructing and interpreting the past but also looking into the future by way of making inferences for possible future developments. The concept of historical investigation as re-enactment of the past is as old as man's effort to interpret his past, but was developed into a full-blown methodological procedure in the composite idea of *Altertumswissenschaft* of the nineteenth-century German philology and history.[53] Anttila (1989: 285) explains this idea in the following way:

> Reconstruction thus means piecing together a possible chain of events, a state of affairs, i.e. inferring the case. The inference involved is abduction (and induction [...]), not deduction, and the frame is classical hermeneutic anamnesis (re-enactment through interpretation and understanding), not natural science. What we are doing here is interpreting circumstantial evidence in the manner of hunters, sailors, physicians, and particularly detectives. It is important to note that such various contexts have called forth sundry names for

---

[52]Although it is implicitly understood in Watkins' statement, we would make it explicit by adding in the first sentence the phrase 'and in context' and read as follows: "Philology is the art of reading slowly *and in context.*" And this principle applies to both philology and historical linguistics.

[53]See further Collingwood (1946: 218) who gives the following comprehensive definition of this matter: "Historical knowledge is the knowledge of what mind has done in the past, and at the same time it is the redoing of this, the perpetuation of past acts in the present. Its object is therefore not a mere object, something outside the mind which knows it; it is an activity of thought, which can be known only in so far as the knowing mind re-enacts it and knows itself as so doing. To the historian, the activities whose history he is studying are not spectacles to be watched, but experiences to be lived through in his own mind; they are objective, or known to him, only because they are also subjective, or activities of his own." And to complement the historian's view with a linguistic one, Lass (1997: 24) adds: "The past is not after all anything very special; it's simply a present that doesn't exist any more." Therefore, the historian's task is to re-make this past and bring it to the present by making it as relevant to the present as possible.

the indexes involved: *sign* (track, trace), *symptom, syndrome, clue.…*[54]

The past is alien, and its reading intends to make it familiar again to the interpreter through its resemanticization as required by the interpreter's experience. In this sense, then, the reading of the past by means of reconstruction is like the historians' task to decipher the hieroglyphs of history (von Ranke). The clues that lead the historian in this struggle are precisely the signs, the symptoms and other such traces that he locates and interprets during the course of his investigation.

Conclusion

Summarizing our methodological procedure, we underline the main features of the 'linguistics *cum* philology' approach. This method is inderdisciplinary and combines a number of 'paleosciences', i.e. sciences that deal with prehistory; the leading fields are of course historical linguistics and classical philology. The method is also comparative, comprising many languages, texts, genres, themes, etc. The comparison takes place on various levels, e.g. language per se, etymology, syntagmatics, poetic language, textual and intertextual, myth, themes, etc.; it can also be applied both in terms of geographical areas and on the entirety of the linguistic family. It is important to keep the comparison within reasonable limits and conduct it with care, moderation and frugality.[55] Since our approach is also historical and the target is the remote past, the method is also reflective, aiming at the reconstruction and the interpretation of this past. Thus, the aim of interpretation is not simply the knowledge but rather the re-enactment of the past, an act that legitimates the engagement of modern reality as well. It always involves a mediating between the

---

[54] But see also Lass (1980: 45ff. and 1997: 21ff., 332ff. and *passim*).

[55] The comparative method is not a panacea, and cannot be applied indiscriminately to all sorts of cases or data. The great danger that derives from overenthusiasm about or from the overconfidence in the merits of comparison lies in that it may give legitimacy to superficial and arbitrary reflection. This is the reason why the most crucial step (perhaps, the most difficult as well) for the adequate application of the method is the choice of the things to be compared, as well as to determine the limits of the comparison: comparison and reconstruction cannot be conducted ad infinitum.

text's ideas and the ideas of the interpreter, what Gadamer calls 'fusion' of two horizons, that of the text and that of the interpreter. In other words, the historian, in the broad sense of the term as the interpreting mind, has to re-live the past and thus to understand by recreating it through reconstruction, but at the same time he must bring this past up to his time and make it relevant to today's concerns. And this can be done only by remoulding this past according to today's weights and measures. Despite their objective worth only thus can the value of classics be meaningful to modern man: this value must constantly and continually be re-interpreted and re-evaluated.

History is the overall teacher that illustrates many otherwise obscure, ambiguous or unexplained aspects of our endeavour, or, to put it in Gadamer's words, "[...] what makes sense can be understood at sight, and what does not can be understood 'historically'" (2004: 182).[56] Since our sources are primarily textual, the critical editions of these texts are significant, and this is both a philological and a linguistic operation. Holistic methods lead to holistic constructs. Our plea is for more linguistics in philology and, conversely, for more philology in (historical) linguistics. This helps classical philology to reunite with its progenitors, its many siblings, as well as with many of its offspring. This reunion adds to our analysis the necessary elements of width and depth and to the interpretation a higher degree of plausibility and conviction, and it may ultimately regain for the field of classical studies some of its lost optimism.

References

Adkins, A. W. H.
    1960   *Merit and responsibility. A study in Greek values.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
    1969   Classical studies: has the past a future? *Didascalos* 3, 19-35.

---

[56] Seen from the real-life vantage point, where hermeneutics is grounded and whence it springs, Gadamer, commenting on Dilthey's idea of hermeneutics, notes: "Life itself, flowing temporality (i.e., history - G.K.G.), is ordered toward the formation of enduring units of significance. Life interprets itself. Life itself has a hermeneutical structure. Thus life constitutes the real ground of the human sciences" (2004: 220-221).

1972   *Moral values and political behaviour in ancient Greece from Homer to the end of the fifth century.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc.

Ahlqvist, A. (ed.).
1982   *Papers from the 5ᵗʰ International Conference on Historical Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Andersen, H.
1982   *Discussion* (on the Panel on Philology and Historical Linguistics). In Ahlqvist 1982, 457-459.

Anthony, D. W.
2007   *The horse, the wheel and language. How Bronze-Age riders from the Eurasian steppes shaped the modern world.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Anttila, R.
1975   Linguistics and Philology. In: *Linguistics and neighboring disciplines*, Bartsch, R. and Th. Vennemann (eds.), 145-55. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
1989   *Historical and comparative linguistics.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
2000   *Greek and Indo-European etymology in action. Proto-Indo-european *aĝ-.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
2002   The role of parallels (in historical work). *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 22, 28-37.

Arbuckle, J.
1970   August Schleicher and the linguistics/philology dichotomy: a chapter in the history of linguistics. *Word* 26, 17-31.

Bader, Fr.
1993   *Anagrammes et allitérations.* Paris – Louvain: Peeters.
1998   Review of Watkins 1995. *BSL* 93/2, 116-130.

Bartoněk, A.
2003   *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Benveniste, E.
1969   *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, 2 vols. Paris: Minuit.

Beyer, K. and D. Cherubim.
1973   Linguistik und alten Sprachen: eine Polemik? *Gymnasium* 80, 251-279.

Boeckh, A.
1968   *On interpretation and criticism.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. (German edition under the title *Enzyklopädie und Methodenlehre der philologischen Wissenschaften*, Leipzig 1886).

Bolling, G. M.
  1929   Linguistics and philology. *Language* 5, 27-32.

Bréal, M.
  1878   Sur les rapports de la linguistique et de la philologie. *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire ancienne* (2e série) 2, 1-10.

Brugmann, K.
  1885   Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. In *Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft*, 1-41. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Buck, C. D.
  1949   *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Campanile, E.
  1993   Reflexions sur la réconstruction de la phraséologie poétique indoeuropéenne. *Diachronica* 10, 1-12.

Cannadine, D. (ed.).
  2002   *What is history now?* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Carr, E. H.
  1987   *What is history?* (2nd ed.). London: Penguin.

Carroll, J. B.
  1955   *The study of language. A survey of linguistics and related disciplines in America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chantraine, P.
  1968-80 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Collingwood, R. G.
  1946   *The idea of history.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Costa, G.
  1998   *Le origini della lingua poetica indeuropea.* Firenze: Olschki.

Curtius, G.
  1845   *Die Sprachwissenschaft in ihrem Verhältnis zur klassischen Philologie.* Berlin: W. Besser.
  1886   Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft. *Kleine Schriften I: Ausgewählte Reden und Vorträge*, E. Windisch (ed.), 132-150. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Debrunner, A.
  1930   Sprachwissenschaft und Klassische Philologie. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 48, 1-25.

Diebold, R. A., Jr.
  1987   Linguistic ways to prehistory. In *Proto-Indo-European: The*

archaeology of a linguistic problem. Studies in honor of Marija Gimbutas, S.N. Skomal and E.C. Polomé (eds.), 19-71. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.

Eichner, H. and H. Rix (eds.).
   1990   *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute.* (Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft 13.-15. Oktober 1989 in Basel). Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

Finley, M. I.
   1978   *The world of Odysseus.* New York: Viking Press.

Fisiak, J. (ed.).
   1990   *Historical linguistics and philology.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Förster, K. G. J.
   1851   *Gesetz der deutschen Sprachentwicklung,* oder: *Die Philologie und die Sprachwissenschaft in ihren Beziehungen zu einander und zum deutschen Geiste.* Berlin: Silvius Landsberger.

Frisk, H.
   1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Gadamer, H. -G.
   2004   *Truth and method.* London – New York: Continuum.

Gamkrelidze, T. V. and V. V. Ivanov.
   1995   *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A reconstruction and historical analysis of a protolanguage and a proto-culture.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gardiner, P.
   1961   *The nature of historical explanation.* London – Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Gasparov, M. L.
   1996   *A history of European versification.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Giannakis, G. K.
   1993   On the Indo-European mythopoetic formula **(H)nomn̥ dhē-* "put/make a name". *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* 187-198. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
   1997   *Studies in the syntax and the semantics of the reduplicated presents of Homeric Greek and Indo-European.* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 90). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
   2000   Classical Greek studies on the verge of the millennium: a linguist's view. *Phasis (Greek and Roman Studies)* 2-3, 136-140.

2005   *The Indo-Europeans. Part I: Language and culture.* Athens: Institute of the Book - A. Kardamitsa (in Greek).

2005a   Classical philology from the perspective of a historical linguist. *Dodoni: Annual Scientific Review of the Department of Philology of the University of Ioannina* 34, 239-267 (in Greek).

2008   The Indo-European poet and his craft. Ἀλεξά̓νδρεια /Alessandria (*Rivista di glottologia*) 2, 47-65.

Gimbutas, M.
1974   An archaeologist's view of PIE in 1975. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 2, 289-307.

Gippert, J.
1998   Review of Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995. *Beiträge zu Namenforschung* 33, 39-54.

Gonda, J.
1970   *Notes on names and the name of god in Ancient India.* Amsterdam and London: North-Holland.

Hahn, A. E.
1969   *Naming-constructions in some Indo-European languages.* (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association No. 27). Case Western Reserve University Press.

Hajnal, I.
1998   *Mykenisches und homerisches Lexikon. Übereinstimmungen, Divergenzen und der Versuch einer Typologie.* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 69). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

2003   *Troia aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht. Die Struktur einer Argumentation.* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 109). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Hale, M.
2007   *Historical linguistics. Theory and method.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hanson, V. D. and J. Heath.
1998   *Who killed Homer? The demise of classical education and the recovery of Greek wisdom.* New York: Free Press.

Hehn, V.
1976 [1870] *Cultivated plants and domesticated animals in their migration from Asia to Europe. Historico-linguistic studies.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hjelmslev, L.
1961   *Prolegomena to a theory of language.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Hildebrandt, R.
    1975   Linguistik contra Sprachwissenschaft. In *Neuere Forschungen in Linguistik und Philologie: Aus dem Kreise seiner Schüler Ludwig Erich Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1-6. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Hofmann, D.
    1973   Sprachimmanente Methodenorientierung – sprachtranszendente 'Objektivierung': Zum Unterschied zwischen Linguistik und Philologie. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 40, 295-310.

Ivanov, V. V.
    1981   *Slavjanskii, Baltiiskii i rannebalkanskii glagol: indoeuropeiskie istoki.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".

Jäger, G.
    1975   *Einführung in die Klassische Philologie.* Munich: C.H. Beck.
    1987   Philologie und Linguistik. Historische Notizen zu einem gestörten Verhältnis. In *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie*. I. *Zur Theorie und Methode der Geschichtsschreibung der Linguistik*, ed. by P. Schmitter, 198-223, Tübingen: Narr.

Jakobson, R.
    1960   Closing statement: linguistics and poetics. In *Style in language*, ed. by T. A. Sebeok, 350-377. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
    1987[1960] The poetry of grammar and the grammar of poetry. In *Language in literature*, 121-144. Cambridge, MA and London: Belknap - Harvard.

Jankowsky, K. R.
    1972   *The Neogrammarians. A re-evaluation of their place in the development of linguistic science.* The Hague – Paris: Mouton.
    1973   Philologie – Linguistik – Literaturwissenschaft. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 17, 21-35.

Kazansky, N. N.
    1995   Indo-European onomastics as an historical source. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 23, 157-177.

Koerner, E. F. K.
    1989   On the historical roots of the philology vs. linguistics controversy. In: *Practicing linguistic historiography. Selected essays*, 233-244. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Lass, R.
    1980   *On explaining language change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
    1997   *Historical linguistics and language change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latacz, J.
   Klassische Philologie und moderne Linguistik. *Gymnasium* 81, 67-
   89.
   2004   *Troy and Homer: Toward a solution of an old mystery.* Oxford: Oxford
   University Press.

Leukart, A.
   1994   *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tas und -as. Untersuchungen zu ihrer*
   Herkunft und Ausbreitung (unter Vergleich mit den Nomina auf -eus).
   Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Phil.-Hist.
   Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 558).

Lord, A. B.
   1960   *The singer of tales.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maher, J. P.
   1977   *Papers on language theory and history.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Malkiel, Y.
   1968   *Essays on linguistic themes.* Berkeley – Los Angeles: University of
   California Press.

Mallory, J. P.
   1989   *In search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, archaeology and myth.*
   London: Thames and Hudson.

Mallory, J. P. and D. Q. Adams
   1997   *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture.* London – Chicago: Fitzroy
   Dearborn.
   2006   *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-*
   European world. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Matasović, R.
   1996   *A theory of textual reconstruction in Indo-European linguistics.*
   Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Meid, W.
   1989   *Archaeologie und Sprachwissenschaft. Kritisches zu neueren Hypothesen*
   des Ausbreitung der Indogermanen. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur
   Sprachwissenschaft, Kleinere Schriften, Band 43). Innsbruck:
   Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Meid, W. and H. Schmeja (eds.).
   1983   *Philologie und Sprachwissenschaft. Akten der 10. Österreichischen*
   Linguisten-Tagung, Innsbruck, 23.-26. Oktober 1982. (Innsbrucker
   Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 43). Innsbruck: Institut für
   Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Meillet, A.
   1967   *The comparative method in historical linguistic*s. Paris: Champion.

Onians, R. B.
  1951 *The origins of European thought about the body, the mind, the soul, the world, time, and fate.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Papanastasiou, G. K.
  2001 *Issues of Ancient Greek within Indo-European. Initial A-.* University of Thessaloniki Ph.D. Dissertation (in Greek).

Parry, M.
  1971 *The making of the Homeric verse.* (Edited by A. Parry). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pictet, A.
  1877 [1859-63] *Les origines indo-européennes ou les Aryas primitifs. Essai de paléontologie linguistique.* Paris: Sandoz and Fischbacker.

Pinault, G. -J.
  1982 L'expression indo-européenne de la nomination. *Études indo-européennes* 3, 15-36.

Pulgram, E.
  1947 Indo-European personal names. *Language* 23, 189-206.
  1960 New evidence on Indo-European names. *Language* 36, 198-202.

Reid, T. B. W.
  1956 Linguistics, structuralism, and philology. *Archivum Linguisticum* 8, 28-37.

Robinett, B. W., R. A. Hall, Jr., H. Kurath, H. M. Hoenigswald, H. L. Smith, Jr., W. F. Twaddell and C. C. Fries.
  1952-53 Classics and linguistics. *Classical Weekley* 46, 97-100.

Robins, R. H.
  1979 *A short history of linguistics.* (2nd ed.). London – New York: Longman.

Scherer, A. (ed.).
  1968 *Die Urheimat der Indogermanen.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Bechgesellschaft.

Schleicher, A.
  1850 Linguistik und Philologie. In: *Die Sprachen Europas in systematischer Uebersicht,* 1-5. Bonn: H.B. König. (New edition by E.F.K. Koerner, Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1983).

Schlerath, B.
  2000 Review of Watkins 1995. *Kratylos* 45, 36-46.

Schmitt, R.
  1967 *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1969   Review of Benveniste 1969. *Kratylos* 14, 39-46.
2008   Review of West 2007. *Kratylos* 53, 62-71.

Schrader, O.
1906-7   *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*. Jena: Costenoble.
1917-29   *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, 2 vols. (hrsg. von A. Nehring). Berlin – Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Schramm, G.
1957   *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache*. Göttingen: Vandehoeck and Ruprecht.

Schulze, W.
1966   *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Sergent, B.
1995   *Les indo-européens. Histoire, langues, mythes*. Paris: Payot and Rivages.

Solmsen, F.
1922   *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Starobinski, J.
1971   *Les mots sous les mots. Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris: Gallimard.

Stechow, A. von.
1970   Sprachwissenschaft vs. Linguistik: Kritische Bemerkungen zu Leo Weisgerbers 'Hat das Wort "Muttersprache" ausgedient?'. *Muttersprache* 80, 396-399.

Stuart-Smith, J.
2004   *Phonetics and Philology. Sound change in Italic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sturtevant, E.H. and R.G. Kent.
1929   Linguistic science and classical philology. *Classical Weekley* 22, 9-13.

Szemerényi, O.
1979   Etyma Graeca IV (22-29): Homerica et Mycenaica. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 20, 207-226 (= *Scripta Minora III*, 1494-1513).
1996   *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thieme, P.
1953   *Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
1964   The comparative method for reconstruction in linguistics. In *Language in culture and society. A reader in linguistics and anthropology*, D. H. Hymes (ed.), 585-598. New York: Harper and Row.

Traugott, E. C.
  1982   Concluding remarks. In Ahlqvist 1982, 460-466.

Vendryes, J.
  1951   Linguistique et philologie. *Revue des études slaves* (= *Mélanges André Mazon*) 27, 9-18.

Watkins, C.
  1962   *Indo-European origins of the Celtic verb. I. The sigmatic Aorist.* Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
  1981   Language, culture, or history? *Papers from the Parasession on Language and Behavior*, 238-248. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
  1989   New parameters in historical linguistics, philology, and culture history. *Language* 65, 783-799.
  1990   What is philology? In Ziolkowski 1990, 21-25.
  1992   Culture history and historical linguistics. In *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, W. Bright (ed), vol. I, 318-22. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  1994   *Selected writings*, 2 vols. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 80). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.
  1995   *How to kill a dragon: Aspects of Indo-European poetics.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wellek, R. and A. Warren.
  1956   *Theory of literature.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

West, M. L.
  1997   *The east face of Helicon. West Asiatic elements in Greek poetry and myth.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
  2007   *Indo-European poetry and myth.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, D. S.
  1953-54 Classics and linguistics. *Classical Weekley* 47, 42-43.

Zimmer, St.
  1999   Comments on a great book: *The encyclopedia of Indo-European cultute*, ed. by J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 27, 105-163.

Ziolkowski, J. (ed.).
        On philology. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.