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The Ancient World bequeathed remarkable cultures and, together with them, their unique languages to posterity. Among these, the most important are the Greek, the Roman and the Indian world, and Greek, Latin and some of India’s tongues respectively. Two disciplines are competent to approach the languages of these cultures, as well as any other language of any culture: philology and linguistics.

No one will deny the major importance of Greek, but in linguistics, which will be our main concern, it is perhaps better not to establish an evaluative scale because every language (like every respective culture) can add some details to the whole, that others may not. Linguistics should not be confused with grammar which is also an important kind of engagement in language. As contrasted with the first, a discipline developed in modern times, grammar has ancient roots both in Greece and in Rome. In India, grammatical tradition seems even to be one of the greatest among the spiritual achievements of that country. But traditional grammar, an effective aid when learning a second language, is prescriptive and is, principally, unable to discover the inherent systemic character of a language as well as its changing disposition. Linguistics, on the contrary, is descriptive and its main task is, exactly, to give explanations. Grammar is a familiar concept in linguistics too, but it has an entirely different feature in linguistics: it is the competence each normal native speaker possesses, provided that he or she had acquired one or sometimes more native languages by the 5th to the 7th year usually. Competence, which resembles the earlier Saussurean langue in the distinction langue-parole, is a dimension introduced by Chomsky in the 1960s, and is a particular instance of the more general process of the acquisition of knowledge (Lyons 1981: 244[8.2]), a feature which reminds of the

---

1This essay was first published in the research column of ELINEPA Online (Athens, Greece 2006), with some unwanted omissions and shortcomings. The present text is a revised and updated paper.
Indian concept.²

The Chomskyan position, in this way, is part of a philosophical discussion. Traditionally, we speak of rationalists (such as Plato or Descartes) and of empiricists (such as Locke or Hume). Chomsky sides with the rationalists. Particularly, his approach is frequently called mentalism. With linguistics, this is with certainty the half of the reality. The Neogrammarians in the last three decades of the 19th century were more “realistic”. Historical linguists or Indo-Europeanists know well how one-sided such an approach is. This writer did much textual research in compiling the Corpus of his thesis. One example should be enough: the geographical name “ΝΕΟΘΟΠΟΛΙΣ”, if it were correct, would provide a further argument for the otherwise frequent intervocalic γ-epenthesis in Greek. The early researchers, G.N. Hatzidakis included, accepted the form. This was the case until Claude Brixhe proved that the reading was incorrect and one had to read the name with διγάμμα ("double gamma", “F”) as ΝΕΟΘΟΠΟΛΙΣ, i.e., “Newopolis”, ‘New Town’. It is remarkable that Karl Krumbacher, the “inventor” of the intervocalic gamma-epenthesis in Greek, called by him an “irrational spirant”, was cautious himself in confronting this orthographic case.³

Linguistic science, however, regrettably, finds itself under a double pressure: students of other branches will readily admit – as is the personal experience of this writer in Greek universities – that cultivating the field is not an easy job, and yet, on the other hand, there are numerous self-appointed candidates who, at times, vehemently come out in support of ideas

---

²Recently, the outstanding scholar Kapil Kapoor held a workshop on this issue (19-26 February, 2017) at the Sanskrit Centre of JNU which I was lucky to attend, consecrated to the linguistic tradition in India, to orality and to grammar, underlining several times that - in Indian thinking - through our language we construct reality (Kapoor 2017).

³See Katonis 2010 i: 77-78. It happened to find even “corrected” readings to be incorrect. Once again, synchrony and diachrony are not to be separated. I have attended the courses of the Indo-European Summer School at the Freie Universität in Berlin-Dahlem from 2004 to 2014 for ten years and I do not remember to have heard Chomsky’s name just once despite the fact that sometimes synchronic methods in syntactic analysis like by the Austrian Professor Thomas Krisch were applied. All this shows how important textual criticism in historical questions is, although what I write does not intend to mean that Chomsky is to be rejected. Chomsky’s case shows that in - basically - synchronic approaches to well attested languages his suggestion is working whereas along the vertical axis “empiricism” is indispensable. A much more level-headed scholar was André Martinet, one of the greatest linguists of the 20th century, with an important contribution both to synchronic and diachronic linguistics. His encyclopedic work is the “Économie”, published in 1955, and republished with additions after his death. This basic problem is discussed by Martinet already in the Introduction to the “Économie” (pp. 13-15), and once again in 2005 (pp. 1-2). Mentalism, one would say, is useful where no linguistic evidence exists but to leave the available material unexploited, is unscholarly.
launched by themselves or by non-professional authors. Such representatives of ideas are to be found perhaps in every country of the world. With certainty, both in Greece and India. Emphasis should be laid on the fact that a good command of a language, and even an outstanding native-level mastery, are not equivalent to the technical knowledge necessary to understand a sophisticated system called human language.

It is not accidental that linguists try to avoid labels. There are further reasons: think what the result would be if every self-confident view were accepted. Patriotic enthusiasm in language issues, indeed, is frequent. How would European feeling react if it came to hear that some Indian scholars maintain that the primary homeland of every important European language and civilization is to be placed in India, or, that the "roots of every word are Sanskrit"? What is called "traditional views about the origin of Yavanasz" is not even known either in Greece or in international scholarship. This ignorance is not welcome but the refutation is correct. The other way round, would Indians and others be pleased, if informed, that in some important European countries the respective languages are thought to be the first and best? Germans think, e.g., that their language has marvelous possibilities in compounding words. This is correct, yet Sanskrit may surpass it. How many of them know this? And how would the whole community feel if they became aware that Hungarian was even considered the unique source for – literally – all the languages of the world, as a "linguist" advocated this cause in the first half of the 19th century? Linguists may realize down-heartedly that with small nations over-compensations arise, with

---

4 A recent book is one of these problematic contributions (Verma 2000). Not only is there a considerable number of annoying printing errors even in Indic words but perhaps most statements postulating an Indian origin are to be rejected. E.g., on p. 35 ff. the Author writes about Sanskrit as the "most primitive of all languages". ("Primitive", tends today to mean first of all 'non-literate', 'pro-literate' whereas Sanskrit, on the contrary, is a foundational language, considered a highly developed and a very rich literary language. The A. wants to suggest "primeval" or "primary"). As to the originality of Sanskrit, it has, indeed, innovations in comparison with cognate languages (see unbiased remarks in Lazzeroni 1998: 102 ff., in Fortson 2004: 185[10.2.3]; 2010: 203: 203[2] and elsewhere, and in Jamison 2004: 675.677). There is one more serious reason why Sanskrit cannot represent the original linguistic conditions: the protolanguage had at least four laryngeals (i.e. glottal sounds resembling /h/) which are not attested in Sanskrit (see for details e.g. Watkins 1998: 40 ff. and Jamison 2004: 680). Further, it is certainly not Max Müller (1823-1900) – see A. pp. 35-36 – who is authoritative today but e.g. as to archaeology, J.P. Mallory (1989), as to linguistics O. Szemerényi (1996), M. Meier-Brügger (2003, first published in German, 7th ed. 1999), B. Fortson (2004; 2010), the contributors to EIEC (1997) in general, and others. This is not the way I am afraid to bring cultures, people and languages together. There is no place for a detailed discussion in a short paper. With regard to the homeland problem, a huge literature exists the A. could have consulted, and for the Greek ethnè he might have had a look at M.B. Sakellariou's works (see a survey of the present writer, as Katona 2000).

bigger nations a “natural”, indeed “sprawling” pride is in work. But competitions of this kind have nothing to do with unbiased scholarship.

With regard to the remarkable variety of human languages, two points of view are to be taken into consideration: the majority of them can be grouped along a broader or narrower genetic relationship, i.e., languages have cognates. Those which have not are, very probably, alone for historical reasons. Apart from linguistic affinity, borrowings among them are also frequent. The English vocabulary is quite rich: this is partly due to the borrowings the most important sources for which are French, Latin, and Greek. To decide which word is a loan-word and which is ancestral, one is supposed to have knowledge of the respective history, political and linguistic, as well as to have recourse to reference books like detailed monolingual and etymological dictionaries. Between synonyms there are always differences in register, i.e., in language style. An example of this kind is “marriage” (a loan-word from Middle French) and “wedding” (an ancestral Germanic word). A good knowledge of English implies the correct use of such pairs. French, being a neo-Latin language in origin, may have handed down, again, pure Latin (learned) elements, as well as any of those which French itself received as borrowings (e.g., Celtic words). Orientation within so complicated relations cannot happen by intuition. One is dependent on the linguistic aids of the languages in question, first of all the etymological dictionaries.

Coincidences or accidental similarities are always possible. In this rich diversity, again, only methodical approach can help. It would be curious if somebody tried to suggest that English and Korean are related just because the word ‘man’ occurs in both languages with exactly the same meaning (McMahon 1994: 5), or if somebody else would create a lofty theory for a Hungarian case where the equivalents for ‘writes’, ‘balm’ and ‘Irish’ are exactly the same word: ír. In reality, at least two of the three are loan-words.6

To decide if words or any other linguistic element is related to another element marked by resemblance and consequently, whether a group of the respective languages can be united within broader or narrower sets, a number of verifiable similarities are needed. Systematic similarities, as a rule, refer both to the phonological (i.e., the sound) level and to the morphological one, as well as to other constituents, like the semantic component. It must be underlined that in most cases the history of the respective languages, their literary history and that of the country of their speakers can usefully orientate. This may be important in the case of languages with a

6Having asked a Korean scholar, McMahon’s issue becomes doubtful. She did not know such a word and asked if this was “nam”, the reversed order, the element found in “Viet-nam”. With regard to Hungarian ír, the word meaning ‘balm’ seems to be Ugrian (i.e., “genuine”), whereas the homonym meaning ‘writes’ seems to be a Turkic loan. The third meaning is obviously foreign.
considerable time-depth like Greek is.

A couple of simple examples should elucidate the case. Between English and German, despite the fact that native speakers are unable to communicate without having studied each other’s language, there are numerous striking similarities like:

book — Buch, hand — Hand, milk — Milch, son — Sohn, three — drei,
six — sechs, mother — Mutter, father — Vater, night — Nacht, and many more.

Semantics, too, is important: if book and Buch or three and drei had different meanings, their similarity would probably be meaningless. But they denote the same things. Some of these words can be analyzed further: indeed, two of the kinship terms have a common element: fa-ther — Va-ter, mo-ther — Mu-tter. This is the formant “-ter”, sometimes altered by orthography, found also in English bro-ther and German Bru-der, daugh-ter and Toch-ter, respectively. Orthographic and phonological alterations can be explained. These are shared features and regular and repeated correspondences: similarities too numerous to let us assume that they are borrowings. And if they were, the question should be answered, which language was the borrower and under what conditions. The situation is even clearer with Latin and Greek, both of them being more archaic, a feature more important when dealing with historical data: mā-ter and pa-ter in Latin and mā-ter- (Doric) / mē-tēr (Attic) and pa-tēr in Greek.

More considerations can be added: we already may have been convinced that English and German are related (both of them are called Germanic languages) but Latin and Greek also seem to be related. Like

mother — Mutter, father — Vater, etc., we have

Lat. māter — Greek mātēr/mētēr, Lat. pater — Greek patēr, Lat. frāter — Greek phratēr/phratōr (“brother”), etc.

which show both similarities and — to a minor extent — differences. Both of the latter, however, are systematic.

The words for “mother” begin, in all four languages, with the same sound /m/ whereas the formant “-ter” undergoes slight changes (a feature to be explained, together with the alterations in the vowels, in the fields of English, German and Germanic linguistics respectively). We find both words in Sanskrit: mātār- and pitār-, again with some minor differences, the explanation of which is a task of Indo-Iranian and Indic linguistics respectively. The words for “father” begin, both in English and German with /f/ (“v” is /β/ in German) but with /p/ in Latin, Greek, and Indo-Iranian. This, again, is not by chance. There are other examples for the correspondence of the initial /p/ and /f/ like Latin piscis, English fish, German Fisch, meaning all of them the same
aquatic animal. There is no place for more examples but the instances given prove one more feature: they demonstrate not only that there is some kind of systematic relation among these languages but also that English and German are closer to each other (exactly for this reason we can comprise them in a family called “Germanic”) and more distant from Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit, which, on the other hand, again, are closer to each other than to either of the Germanic languages.  

These examples provide us with the dimension of time: English and German are two important languages used currently, Latin and Greek were used in the same sense roughly two thousand years ago. Both of them survive. Surviving Latin is called Italian, which, though not the same, has undeniable similarities with the first. French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc. are also surviving daughter-languages of Latin. The similarities are even more conspicuous in the case of Greek: there is no reason to give another name to the language spoken today. It remains ‘Greek’, though it is useful to speak about Ancient and Modern Greek. If we examine the preceding stages of English and German (the first can be traced back until about the 8th c. A.D., the second some centuries earlier) we find that systematic similarities are not only existing but are even greater. In other words, they resemble Greek and Latin, and other cognate languages available, more than they do today. Both Greek and Latin, flourishing in Classical Antiquity, again, have their respective past. The case of Latin is restricted in comparison with Greek which has a longer history: the oldest written record extant is a Mycenaean Linear B text dating from the 17th c. B.C. (i.e., about 800 years before Homer!). Again the time factor is important. If we compare earlier dates in both languages we see that similarities are more numerous (and consequently genetic relations are more apparent). Thus, e.g., we find that a postpositive “kwe” (‘and’) existed, like Classical Latin “-que”, in Mycenaean written as “-qe” with the same meaning whereas in Classical Greek this was the enclitic “te” (‘and’). A Mycenaean example is “a-k0-so-ne-qe” (i.e., “axios-kwe”, ‘and axes’, followed by the numeral 50 indicating the quantity). We may remark that a very considerable number of Mycenaean Linear B words belong to inventories. We find Latin “que”, e.g., in the first line of Vergil’s Aeneid: “Arma virumque cano” (‘Arms I sing and the man’), and “te” is really frequent in Ancient Greek like “andrón te theōn te” (Iliad, 1, 544) meaning ‘of men (=heroes, mortals) and gods’. The alteration between kwe and te appears systematic: cf., e.g., Latin quinque and Greek pente (both meaning ‘5’). 4 We may add Sanskrit panca and Hindi pance which, again, appear systematic /c/ is like “ch” in English much). Latin quinque continues in Italian cinque, and Greek pente appears as pende in Modern Greek. If we

\footnote{The principles of comparative method with abundant examples (“father” and “mother” included are explained in many textbooks, so in Lyons (1981) on pp. 192 ff.}

\footnote{The first qu (kw) of the Latin word is an Italo-Celtic innovation and is the product of assimilation to the second qu (Sihler 1995: 145[141a],413[389.5], De Vaan 2012: 509).}
examined more data from Ancient Italic and Ancient Greek dialects we would find a much richer inventory proving the relationship. We may remember now the correspondence between Latin-Greek \( p \) and Germanic \( f'5' \) appears as “five” in English and “fünf” in German. These numerals are related though other features, being different, need be explained: Gothic \( fimf \) and Old Saxon \( fef \) may bring them closer. It is perhaps clear now that where written history stops prehistory begins. But the two notions are relative: where there is Latin linguistic prehistory, e.g., still Greek written history is effective. Greek, as a fact, has one of the longest known literary histories.

Languages have several levels: phonological, morphological, semantic, syntactic. To establish a genetic relationship, correlations at least in the first three of them are needed. Greek, Latin and Sanskrit provide us with many beautiful examples. Take the verb ‘carry’. This is ‘ferō’ in Latin, ‘pherō’ in Ancient Greek and ‘bharāmi’ in Vedic Sanskrit. Stems (roots) can be marked off as follows:

- Latin: \( \text{fer-} \) (deriving from “pher-“), think of the actual Modern Greek pronunciation “fero”, ‘bring’, ‘carry’
- Greek: \( \text{pher-} \)
- Sanskrit: \( \text{bhar-} \)

Two of these have a quite similar past tense (a \textit{Praeteritum Imperfectum} with the Latin term):

- \( \text{é-pher-on} \) \( \text{á-bhar-am} \)
- \( \text{é-pher-es} \) \( \text{á-bhar-as} \)
- \( \text{é-pher-e(t) etc.} \) \( \text{á-bhar-at etc.} \)

‘I was carrying’ etc. (see Fortson 2010: 92[5.12]).

These forms are “too systematic” to be labeled a borrowing. Borrowings have, much more, an \textit{ad hoc} nature.

The case of Latin is somewhat different:

- \( \text{fer-ē-bam} \)
- \( \text{fer-ē-bas} \)
- \( \text{fer-ē-bat etc.} \)
The ending -ban, -bas, -bat, etc. derive from archaic forms of the be-verb: ‘I was’, ‘you were’, ‘he was’, and the philosophy of the word-formation strikingly reminds of English: “I was carrying”.

There are, as is logical, also differences. Latin, though not unrelated, has another ending system explainable within Latin linguistic history, and final -t in Greek (present in Latin and Sanskrit), like in other Greek words as, e.g., in leōn (genitive: leontos, ‘lion’), has dropped. Consequently, the optional -n (the ny ephelkystikon) in Greek e-pher-e(n) is posterior. On the whole, in the examples above we find principled and repeated similarities – features which can be explained. To sum up, we may allude to the so-called Neogrammarian doctrine about the scientific nature of sound-laws or rules (the original word is “Lautgesetz”), put forward in 1878. This means that rules for sound correspondences and changes can be set up which always function under the same circumstances. They must cover all cases whether a few or numerous which fall within their scope to be accounted for. (According to the systemic nature of language, these changes may contribute to subsequent morphological changes). If any data should violate the rule and not be explainable by reference to some linguistic principle the rule is invalidated. Then, one of the possibilities is that we have to deal with an intrusive element. The case of loanwords is exactly of the kind. An example is German Pelz (‘fur’). The word is “irregular” because it is a loan-word from Latin pellicius (‘[made of] leather’). The word Fell, on the contrary, is regular as is the cognate English fell (‘animal skin, hide’) showing the f-correspondence. Many textbooks explain this principle like those by Bynon (1977: 22-23) and Trask (1996: 224-228).

The first declaration dates back to Osthoff and Brugman (1878: III-XX, mainly XIII-XV). Osthoff and Brugman were professors of Comparative Linguistics and of Sanskrit Philology, the first in Heidelberg, the second in Leipzig.

Linguistics, as a science, exists for more than 200 years now. It was exactly the striking similarities between Indian and European languages, and first of all between Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, that gave rise to linguistic investigations after the famous presidential address of Sir William Jones to the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1786. Jones found that Sanskrit had a “wonderful structure” which he compared with that of Greek. He has formulated what is thought today to be certain: the “affinity [...] may have sprung from some common source which perhaps
no longer exists". Today, the "common source" is labeled by the conventional term "Indo-European". This term for the parental language, not existing any more, was introduced by the English Thomas Young in a book review in 1813. Synonymous German "indogermanisch" goes back to Johann Klaproth who, after a French wording, used this expression in a book in 1823. Traditionally, for a long time, German scholarship used, and still uses today, the term Indogermanistik, whereas in the Anglo-Saxon usage Comparative Philology tends to replace "Indo-European Linguistics".

In historical linguistics, one more problem deserves special attention. In Indo-European linguistics one arrives at a hypothetical "initial" stage, the one where an expansion can be hypothesized. One would think at first instance that from that point the historical course of people and languages was unbroken until this day. This is a wrong concept. The first idea was a so-called "Family Tree" suggested by August Schleicher about 160 years ago, literally in a tree form, from the stem (i.e., the Proto-Indo-European language) of which the individual languages arrive at a stage he could establish in his time. Critiques to this concept were not late. The "tree diagram" shows very conveniently the relationship between the single languages but it is easy to see that carriers of various languages could meet and separate again in history causing linguistic consequences. Latin and Greek are just two among these. A relatively new concept, that of the punctuated equilibrium, i.e., a sudden interruption, has been introduced by R.M.W. Dixon in 1977. According to this theory, in linguistic developments an equilibrium with slow advancement exists provided that no external impacts occur. Dixon worked mainly on minor languages of the Pacific and of Australia. Giannakis (2015: 73-74.110.132-134) quotes some objections. However, a good example seems to be the case of Celtic and Italic (Latin) mentioned by the Celtologist P. Schrijver in his lectures given a couple of years ago in Berlin in the frame of the Dahlem Indo-European Summer School: Latin and Celtic had for a long time a parallel development and, additionally (they form the Italo-Celtic group of languages), were very similar in their phonological and morphological structure. If we have a look at the actual Celtic

\[\text{Cf., e.g., Sandy 1908, Vol. II, pp. 438-439, Lyons 1981: 188-189, Mallory 1989: 12, Vassiliades 2000: 14, Cavazza 2005: 28, and Trautman 2015: 5 (with an interpretation on p. 3). We may add that at the time of Jones, and more intensively before him, the biblical concept of the languages was wide-spread. Jones was under the influence of this tradition, but still his approach is sound. Indeed, the first attempts at reconstructing the protolanguage had as their aim to find the language God had "mixed up" so that the architects of the tower in Babel could not understand each other. The systematic work which followed, with a first major contribution by Franz Bopp, proved that this aim was unrealistic.}

\[\text{Cf. Giannakis 2015: 23, where he discusses also the German term (pp. 23-24).}

\[\text{The Tree in its original form has been published, among others, in Cavazza (2005: 453). The initial linguistic terminology ("family", "daughter languages", "stem" and more), influenced to a great extent by biology, shows the impact of Darwin with whom the linguists of the epoch cooperated.}
languages, their phonetic appearance is rather peculiar, in other words, they are - though in a principled and repeating way - radically different from the other Indo-European languages, and especially from Latin. The Celtic tribes were present in Europe everywhere, from the British Isles to Asia Minor, they invaded even ancient Rome\textsuperscript{12}, and it is a task for the historians to understand why the Celts did not arrive at the idea of establishing a state. In any case, in Schrijver’s opinion, it is reasonable to assume that the unquestioned and relatively rapid Roman conquest interrupted their normal linguistic development: the conquest brought a punctuated equilibrium to their language with serious consequences for the dialects in question. Whatever the historical reality, such facts show that the Chomskyan mentalism is far from being enough to understand linguistic developments. Language most certainly is not only a biological (or psychological, as was assumed earlier) object - language is - as required by its speakers - also a social institution.

One of the tasks of research remains to understand why the Indo-Europeans lost awareness of their common ancestry after the expansion (cf. Dumézil 1993: 188), or to investigate if they lost it at all. Haudry thinks that perhaps they did not and quotes a passage from Aeschylus’ Persians which may prove the feeling of affinity (1981: 124). Atossa, the Persian Queen Mother is speaking: “I dreamed that two women in fair vesture, one apparelled in Persian garb, the other in Dorian attire, appeared before mine eyes; both in stature far more striking than are the women of our time, in beauty flawless, sisters of the same race. As for country wherein they dwelt, to one had been assigned by the lot the land of Hellas, to the other that of the barbarians” (181-187). It is “sisters of the same race” which deserves special attention. The closest linguistic cognates of Greek are exactly the Indo-Iranian languages. Latin may give the impression of being closer but this is due to the fact that both Latin and Greek left a very rich and important literary heritage having fundamentally influenced European and world culture and languages and, that Latin, moreover, under Greek influence, borrowed a most considerable Greek vocabulary and much of Greece’s civilization. Once again the difference between ancestral (core) vocabulary and borrowings must be underlined.

The passage is remarkable, nevertheless, linguistics, too, accepts the Roman rationale: unus testis nullus testis. However, we can perhaps add something essential to the question: the word Aeschylus uses in line 187 is κοίμος the dictionary definition of which is ‘lot’, secondarily ‘casting by lot’. The case recalls to mind Françoise Bader, the outstanding French Indo-Europeanist, and her ingenious assumptions on the ideological bases of the Indo-European

\textsuperscript{12}The known expression Vae victis (‘Alas for the conquered!’) was heard from the Celts in Rome on this occasion. The Romans, in the following almost always victors, brought the expression into general use.

\textsuperscript{13}English text according to the translation by H. Weir Smyth, Aeschylus, I, (LCL, 1922). Italicizing mine.
expansion. In her opinion, intellectuals such as the Prehellenic Selloi\(^4\) were charged with assigning apppellations to groups before they began their migration. The word κληρος is familiar from the Athenian Democracy, immediately following Aeschylus, the oldest among the three tragic poets, and its afterlife, too, though with a semantic change (clerus ‘clergy’, ‘priesthood’), is known.\(^5\) It goes without saying that shaking the lots cannot happen between strangers or even enemies.

One should not forget: in 1777, nine years before Jones’ address, Friedrich August Wolf initiated Classical Philology. He enrolled as “Studiose Philologiae”, and not as “Philosophiae”, in Göttingen University (see, e.g., Sandys 1908, Vol. III, pp. 50-60). He became a renowned Homeric scholar. Classical Philology and Historical Linguistics then, for many decades to come, were considered as “allies”. One is inclined to suppose that the two dates are not fortuitous.\(^6\) Together with Classical Philology, Indological Studies were, and still often enough are, considered as constituents of a greater unity: Classical Studies.

The achievements of both philology and linguistics, reached during the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, are indeed amazing. Therefore anyone having linguistic ambitions must either thoroughly study introductory works in theoretical, historical and comparative linguistics, special treatises like “Greek” or “Latin Linguistics” included, or must trust himself to specialists who have coped with this laborious task. Those concerned should be aware of the basic handbooks, and etymological and other dictionaries. In the case of Ancient Greek like

\(^4\)The Selloi (Σελλοι) were worshippers and priests of Zeus, the chief God, in Dodone in Western Greece. The word may have some relationship with the name “Hellenes” and the first administrative centre of the Greeks in their country, the ἄρχων Ελλάς, according to Aristotle (cf. GEW 1498-499, DELG 340-341,996).

\(^5\)In Bader’s original wording: “La dation de ces noms, en une chaîne si structurée, ne peut avoir été le fait que d’intellectuels (comme les prêtres Σελλοι de Dodone), présidant à une organisation des migrations qui n’est que l’un des témoignages de la puissance de pensée des hommes de langues indo-européennes, pensée qui explique l’expansion de celles-ci”. To all this, cf. Katonis 2012: 4.8.23.

\(^6\)Sandys points out that Wolf insisted that he proposed to study, not Theology, but Philology, and that there had been isolated entries of philologiae studiosi at Erlangen in 1749-74 (ib. p. 52[1]), see also Turner 2014: 118-119, and elsewhere. Similarly, Jones was not the first to note the linguistic similarities between Latin, Greek and Sanskrit as Vassiliades informs us correctly (2000: 14). To his list of names we might add perhaps the philosopher G.W. von Leibniz (1646-1716), one of the precursors of modern linguistics. As for Jones, Sandys has him among the classicists (ib. vol. II, pp. 438-439)!
those by H. Frisk (GEW), P. Chantraine (DELG) and Beekes 2010, e.g.\textsuperscript{17}, for Latin, those by A. Walde – J.B. Hofmann (LEW), A. Ernout – A. Meillet (DELL) and De Vaan 2008, for Indo-Iranian and Sanskrit those by M. Mayrhofer (KEWA and EWAia), for the English language that by C.T. Onions, to mention just one name out of a number, and for German that by Fr. Kluge – E. Seebold and many others. The Onions dictionary, e.g., explains what etymology is (see p. V), and, like every other serious dictionary, gives first attestations and datings, e.g., for Latin words (see p. VIII). For Indo-European there is the dictionary by J. Pokorny (IEW), outdated today but providing useful material\textsuperscript{18}, and the latest encyclopedia, abbreviated as EIEC; for Italian that by G. Devoto, e.g., for Modern Greek the dictionaries by N. Andriotis, K. Dangitis, G. Babiniotis (both a monolingual and an etymological one for Modern Greek), the dictionary (LKN/ΔKN) by the Institute for Modern Greek Studies in Thessaloniki, and that by Chr. Haralambakis (2014), then historical grammars (e.g., by Sihler 1995), and many more (Babiniotis has two good examples for the latter: 1985 and 1998). The “Epimetro” of the Babiniotis dictionary gives a Greek lexicographical survey from the 16th c. until late 20th c.

Special dictionaries and handbooks give an inventory and a survey respectively, of what already has been established in research. Every new explanation or suggestion, without reasoned statements and refutations of the former positions, is worthless. The present writer thinks too, that philology and linguistics continue to be “allies”. Historical, Comparative, and Indo-European Linguistics are almost unthinkable without (Classical) Philology (a good aid to reliable access to literary sources), whereas traditional Philology only wins when supported by linguistic knowledge.\textsuperscript{19}

As to the reception of the classics, one would readily assume that a similar thinking is only natural in countries like Greece and India, successors to very important cultures and unique languages. In Greece, a recent volume of studies (Christidis et al. 2004) tries to come up with

\textsuperscript{17}Two subsidiary volumes complement Chantraine’s work, one of them published in Greece: Jucquois-Deviamminck (1977) and Papanastassiou (1994). A Greek translation of this work is in progress in the Institute for Modern Greek Studies, Thessaloniki, to be published by the Institute. The translation is foreseen to contain Corrections and Addenda found posthumously in Chantraine’s notes (personal communication by G. Papanastassiou, Director of the Institute, April 2006).

\textsuperscript{18}A Revised Edition by G. Starostin and A. Lubostky (2007) can be retrieved online. By google search several Indo-European dictionaries and etymological works can be found. To use them, some expertise and critical sense are needed. Both the old IEW and the revised one can be dowloaded in pdf format.

\textsuperscript{19}There are several common areas among the two main branches of linguistics along the “historical” axis which, indeed, cannot be separated. As a methodological hint, however, it is useful to keep in mind that historical linguistics consists first of all in an “upward” following of developments of whichever linguistic process whereas Comparative Philology (Indo-European Linguistics) is interested first of all in reconstruction, i.e. in a “downward” movement.
this task. But things are more complicated. Issues of heritage are combined with those of the “language question”, another heritage brought by unfavourable historical conditions: how the relations between the classical language and the one used actually should be. This burdens the contributions, as did and still does everyday practice, with a superfluous historical dimension. Such “ankyloses” – so that I take recourse to the Greek word often heard currently in a figurative sense – have been touched upon by Rhéa Delveroudi on p. 45 (Greek translation) and 95 (French original) for example. Similarly, the short paper by Th. Papanguélis (pp. 55-59 and 103-107 respectively), consecrated to the role of Latin in Greece, cannot elude these “ankyloses” either: Latin language and Roman spirit, as seen from Hellas, are a bit different than seen from a third country, as is, similarly, Greece and Greek, on native soil. Actually India, equally heir to a very important linguistic and cultural past, may have similar problems though continuity seems there to be more organic. Discussion of all these problems should be, however, the topic of another contribution.
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