

ELWIRA KACZYŃSKA
 KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ WITCZAK
 Department of Linguistics and Indo-European Studies
 Institute of Classical Philology
 University of Łódź

UDC 811.14'02'373.6

PIGS IN LACONIAN

Abstract: In his lexicon Hesychios of Alexandria registered five Laconian names for 'pig'. Three of them demonstrate specific dialectal features (e.g. the development of AGk. *θ to Lac. σ is attested in the name σίκα 'pig'; the initial digamma [ɸ] is preserved in the following two glosses: βορθαγορίσκοι 'piglets' and γέωνα 'female pig, sow'). The Laconian glosses in question are discussed philologically and etymologically. Whenever possible, both the original meaning and the motivation for change are explained.

The animal terminology of Ancient Greek is dominated by the standard dialects (especially by Ionic and Attic). The dialectal names, which appear in the well known Hesychian glossary, are usually omitted in the standard etymological dictionaries (e.g. in Boisacq, DELG; Frisk, GEW; Chantraine, DELG) and monographs.

In this paper we intend to discuss all the Hesychian glosses which belonged to the Laconian dialect of Ancient Greek and which denoted 'domesticated pig'. In the lexicon prepared by Hesychios of Alexandria (5th or 6th c. AD) there are five Laconian glosses which demonstrate some 'pig' connotations:

1. βορθαγορίσκια · χοίρεια κρέα, καὶ μικροὶ χοῖροι βορθαγορίσκοι (βορθάκει cod. Marc.). Λάκωνες (HAL²: I 385, s.v. β-829; HAL²: I 335, s.v. β-822). See also ὀρθαγορίσκος · χοιρίδιον μικρόν (HAL²: II 774, ο-1176). The latter form is quoted and explained by authors of the Greek etymological dictionaries.

2. βωλορύχα [Latte βωλώρυχα] · τὴν σὺν. Λάκωνες (HAL¹: I 408, s.v. β-1384; HAL²: I 355, s.v. β-1375). Not considered by Boisacq and Frisk, but quoted by Chantraine (DELG I 203) under the heading βῶλος m. 'a lump of earth, clod; land, ground, soil'.

3. γέωνα · ὕς θηλεία [so cod. Marc. and K.Latte; recte: ὕς θήλεια]. Λάκωνες (HAL¹: I 427, s.v. γ-478; HAL²: I 374, s.v. γ-477). Not quoted in dictionaries.

4. πετέλα · σῦς ὑπὸ Λακῶνων. ἡ εἶδος δένδρου (HAL¹: III 402, s.v. π-4186). Discussed under the heading *πέτελας* ('wild boar'), but not explained.

5. σῖκα · ὄς. Λάκωνες (HAL¹: IV 1, 28, σ-607). Not discussed etymologically, but mentioned by Frisk (GEW II 824) in his discussion of *σῦς* ('pig').

Our notes and remarks will refer to the derivational and etymological aspects of the relevant lexemes. We will be engaged in establishing the Common Greek (and Indo-European) etyma, their primitive semantics and eventually their dialectal distribution. Some details of their phonology will also be reviewed. We turn now to the first Laconian name for 'pig'.

1. The Hesychian gloss contains two cognate terms: Lac. *βορθαγορίσκια* denotes 'piglet's meal' (= AGk. *χοίρεια κρέα*), whereas Lac. *βορθαγορίσκοι* (m. pl.) means 'small piglets' (= AGk. *μικροὶ χοῖροι*). A different gloss, attested in the Hesychian lexicon (HAL²: II 774, ο-1176): *ὀρθαγορίσκος · χοιρίδιον μικρόν* ('sucking-pig'), demonstrates clearly that the initial graphem β- represents digamma (AGk. *f* - < IE. **w*), i.e. the phoneme characteristic for the Doric dialects. The Laconian origin of the term *ὀρθαγορίσκος* is confirmed independently by Athenaeus (*Deipnosoph.* IV 139b, 140b). An alternative form *ὀρθαγορίσκος* (Pers., *Stoic.* 1.102) is also registered (Liddell, Scott 1996: 1248, 1250).

The Laconian term for 'piglet / cochon de lait', *ὀρθαγορίσκος*, is analyzed etymologically by Boisacq (DELG 1916: 712, s.v. *ὄρθρος*) on the basis of Athenaeus' explanation according to which the term *ὀρθαγορίσκος*, developed from *ὄρθραγορίσκος* by the dissimilation of the liquids, denotes young animals exported for sale at dawn (Athen., *Deipnosoph.* IV 140b: *ἐπεὶ πρὸς τὸν ὄρθρον πιπράσκονται*), cf. Gk. *ὄρθρος* m. 'day-break, dawn, cock-crow' and *ἀγορά* f. 'market-place'. Also Bechtel (1963: II 328) treats the ancient etymology as striking and indubitable, but he explains the Laconian term in question as a kind of "ein Scherzwort". However, most linguists (beginning from Pisani 1958: 143) believe that the ancient etymology is in fact fictitious and the connection between *ὀρθαγορίσκος* and *ὄρθρος* is caused by the so called folk or popular etymology (see Frisk, GEW II 415; Chantraine, DELG III 1974: 818). Pisani (1958: 143) suggests that the Laconians derived their name for 'piglet' from the name of *Ὀρθαγόρας*, the first tyrant of Sicyon and the founder of a dynasty. Frisk (GEW II 415) qualifies Pisani's explanation as noticeable ("Erwägenswert").

According to our opinion, the Laconian term **φοθαγορίσκος* ‘sucking-pig’ represents a three-element compound. The initial component, which seems to denote the squeaking voice of piglets, originates from the verb *ὀρθιάζω* ‘to speak in a high tone; to shriek with loud wailings’ (cf. also *ὀρθίασμα* n. ‘a high pitch of voice’), the final one represents the diminutive suffix *-ίσκος*. The main element appears to go back to the Indo-European root **gor-* ‘young animal, esp. piglet’ (perhaps of onomatopoeic origin), which is also attested in Armenian and Celtic, e.g. Arm. *xoč-kor* ‘piglet’ vs. *korium* ‘young of an animal (esp. young lion)’ (Djahukian 1967: 189); OFr. *gorre*, Fr. *goret* ‘pig’, Burg. *guri* ‘piglet / Ferkel’, Catal. *garrí*, Sp. *gorrino* ‘piglet, hog’ (< Gaulish **gorros*), see Meyer-Lübke (1935: 325, No. 3820). In other words, the Laconian word in question means nothing other than ‘young squeaking piglet’. It should be emphasized that a fish was called *ὀρθαγορίσκος* “wegen des grunzenden Lautes” (Strömberg 1943: 69; Frisk, GEW II 415). Thus both the Greek name for piglet and the one for fish are motivated by a squeaking or grunting sound.

2. The noun *βωλορύχα* (corrected by Kurt Latte into *βωλώρυχα*) is undoubtedly a Laconian compound, containing two elements. The former of them represents *βῶλος* m. ‘a lump of earth, clod; land, ground, soil’, the latter is derived from the Greek verb *ὀρύσσω* (Att. *ὀρύττω*) ‘to dig (the trench), to dig up; make a canal through; to bury’ (< IE. **H₃ruk-* / **H₃rug[h]-*). In other words, it denotes an animal ‘digging the soil’.

The Laconian term in question may be treated as an innovative compound. However, it should be emphasized that the verbal root **H₃ruk-* / **H₃rug[h]-* ‘to dig’ (Walde, Pokorny 1926: 353; Pokorny 1959: 869-870) creates some names for ‘pig’ in three different Indo-European stocks:

BALTIC: Latvian *rukša* ‘a digging pig / ein wühlendes Schwein’, also *ruksis* ‘young pig’, *rukse* and *rucis*, *ruīcis* ‘piglet’ (Sabaliauskas 1968: 179);

CELTIC: Old Irish *rucht* ‘pig’ (< Celtic **ruk-tu-* ‘digger / Wühler’ (Pokorny 1959: 870; see also Stokes, Bezzenger 1894: 235; Walde, Pokorny 1926: 353; Vendryes 1974: R-50);

LUSITANIAN: Lat. *ruo* ‘wild boar’ (a substratal name attested in the metrical inscription from San Orente de Entines, Coruña) < Gallaecian **rugos*, liter. ‘digger / hozador’ (Acuña Castroviejo, Millán González-Pardo 1971: 345-351; Millán González-Pardo 1973: 129-155; Witczak 2005: 336).

The Laconian term seems to confirm the well known observation that the Indo-European tribes classified pigs (also wild pigs) as animals digging the soil.

3. The third Laconian term γέωνα denotes evidently ‘female pig, sow’ (= AGk. ὄς θήλεια). Kurt Latte, the well known editor of the Hesychian lexicon, suggested that the gloss in question is corrupted. According to his opinion, it can be related to another Hesychian gloss denoting ‘female pigs’: γρωνάδες · θήλεια σύες (HAL²: 392, γ-964). Mauricius Schmidt, an earlier editor of the Hesychian glossary, seems to be sceptical in the face of this possibility: “Probabiliter ad γρωνάδες retulit Kusterus, sed vix erat (?) quod in γρωνάς mutaret”. The actual existence of Hesychian γρωνάδες (f.pl.) ‘female pigs’ is confirmed by the Modern Greek diminutive form γουρούνι (n.) ‘pig’, which derives from Byz. Gk. γουρούνιν and further from the Ancient Greek archetype *γρώνιον (Andriotis 1990: 71). The development of γέωνα (f.) from γρωνάς seems doubtful both from the palaeographical point of view and the derivational one. It is therefore necessary to distinguish the Laconian gloss γέωνα as a separate term.

The primitive shape of the Laconian gloss may be reconstructed with the initial digamma (F). It is possible to quote a number of glosses in the Hesychian lexicon, where digamma was replaced by gamma, e.g.

[3.1] γαδεῖν · χαρίσασθαι (HAL²: I 357, s.v. γ-19) derives from Proto-Greek *F^hǎδέ^hε^hεν ‘to please, delight, gratify’ and IE. *swād-eye-se(n), cf. Lat. *svavis* adj. ‘sweet’, Skt. *svādú-* adj. ‘sweet’.

[3.2] γέαρ · ἔαρ (HAL²: I 365, s.v. γ-224) and γίαρ · ἔαρ (HAL²: I 376, s.v. γ-544) go back to Proto-Greek *Fé^hαρ and IE. *wesǵ (n.) ‘spring’, cf. Lat. *vēr* n. ‘spring, springtime’. The second gloss in question seems to be of Boeotian origin (γίαρ = Gk. Boeot. Fίαρ).

[3.3] γία · ἄνθη (HAL²: I 376, s.v. γ-543) represents the Greek term *Fία (n. pl.) denoting ‘violets’ and secondarily also ‘flowers’, cf. Lat. *viola* f. ‘violet’.

[3.4] γίσγον · ἴσον (HAL²: I 377, s.v. γ-574) continues undoubtedly Proto-Greek *Fίσφος, -ǎ, -ον ‘equal to; the same as’, cf. Gk. Myc. *wi-so-wo-* (Aura Jorro 1993: 436).

[3.5] γιτέα · ἰτέα (HAL²: I 377, s.v. γ-580) ‘willow, *Salix*’ goes back to IE. *wītewā / *wītuwā f. ‘a kind of willow’, cf. Pol. *witwa* f. ‘a kind of willow, *Salix viminalis*’, OPruss. *witwan* ‘sallow’, Welsh *gwden* ‘id.’, OHG. *wīda* ‘willow, *Salix*’.

[3.6] γόρτυξ · ὄρτυξ (HAL²: I 388, s.v. γ-860) < Anc. Gk. dial. *ῤόρτυξ m. ‘quail, *Coturnix coturnix*’ < IE. *wort- ‘id.’, cf. OInd. *vārtikā-*, dial. (Eastern) *vartakā-* f., *vartaka-* m. ‘quail’, Pali *vaṭṭakā-* f. ‘id.’, Nepali *baṭṭāi* ‘id.’, Oriya *bhāṭoi*, *bhāṭui* ‘the grey quail, *Coturnix communis*’, Sinhalese *vaṭuvā* ‘snipe, sandpiper’; Khovar *barti* ‘quail, partridge’, Ashkun *uwré* ‘partridge’, Pashai *waṭṭ* ‘id.’; Khotan Saka *baḍye* ‘quail’, Ossetic (Iron) *wærc*, (Digoron) *wærcceæ*, Sanglich *wōrc*, Wakhi *wolč*, Pahlavi *vartak* ‘quail’, NPers. *vardī*š, Kurd. *verdī* ‘id.’; Shughni *gōrδ* ‘quail’, Oroshori *girδ*, Yazghulami *g^wiδ* ‘id.’; Baluchi *gwardāg* ‘Gebirgerebhuhn’, Chwarezmian *wrdyc* [*wardīc] ‘Wachtel, *Coturnix coturnix*’ and so on (see Pokorny 1959: 1180; Frisk GEW II 429; Morgenstierne 1974: 35; Teubner 1974: 304; Abaev 1989: 91; Mayrhofer 1996: 519-520; Steblin-Kamensky 1999: 390-391). Cardona (1985) wrongly suggests that the Greek term for ‘quail’ was borrowed from an Oriental (especially Iranian) source. The Indo-European name for ‘quail’ is also attested in the western periphery: Port. dial. *guarda*, Catal. *guatlla*, dial. (Valencia, Balears) *guatla* ‘quail, *Coturnix coturnix*’ (< *wārtalā, *wārtlā < IE. *wortalā), cf. OInd. *vartīra-*, *vartira-* m. ‘ein der Wachtel oder dem Rebhuhn ähnlicher Vogel’, Gk. ὄρτάλιχος m. ‘chick, chicken; young bird’ (Witczak 2005: 344-345).

[3.7] γρῖνος · δέρμα (HAL²: I 390, s.v. γ-919) is an Aeolic form (φρῖνος) developed from Anc. Gk. φρινός m. ‘skin; hide of an animal, esp. ox-hide’, cf. Gk. Myc. *wi-ri-no* ‘hide’ (PY Ub 1318), Hom. ῥῖνός m. ‘skin; hide of an animal, esp. ox-hide’ (Palmer 1963: 463; Aura Jorro 1993: 434-435). The Aeolic character of the Hesychian gloss in question is established on the basis of the accentual shift.

If the initial γ- is an indication of digamma (ǰ-), then the Laconian form can be derived from IE. *wés-ōn- ‘fat animal’. This name seems to derive from the Indo-European term for ‘(animal) fat, grease, suet, brain, marrow’: *wesā (f.) and *wesmǵ (n.). This term is attested in five Indo-European subgroups:

INDIC: OInd. *vāsā*, also *vasā́* (f.) ‘fat, grease; brain’, Pali *vasā* (f.) ‘fat’, Prakrit *vasā* f. ‘fat; marrow’, Sindhi *wahā* f. ‘fat, grease, blubber of fish’, Kumaoni *baso* ‘fat’, Nepali *boso* ‘id.’; Oriya *basā* ‘fat, suet’ (Turner 1966: 667, No. 11443).

DARDIC: Kashmiri *was* f. ‘marrow, brain’ (< Dardic *wasā, according to Turner 1966: 667, No. 11443).

IRANIAN: Avestan *vanhā-* f. ‘ein Teil of Rückens’ (Bartholomae 1904: 1348).

ALBANIAN: *vjamë* f. ‘(animal) fat, lard, suet, tallow’ (< IE. **wes-m̥* n.) (Orel 1998: 83).

ANATOLIAN: Hittite *wašši-* n. ‘Ingredienz, Heilmittel, Salbe’ (Friedrich 1991: 248).

The Laconian term for ‘sow’ belonged originally to the *n*-stems. It is uncertain, however, whether the lemma γέωνα is registered in the accusative singular (with the ending -α) or in a secondary nominative sg.

The *n*-stem forms are also attested in Middle Latin, Germanic, Sanskrit and the Iranian languages, cf. MLat. *ueso*, *uesonis* ‘polecat’; OHG. *wiessa* ‘polecat’, Luxemb. *feis*, West Flam. *fisse*, OFr. *voisson* ‘polecat, weasel’ (< West Gmc. **wesōn-* m.); Skt. *vasin-* m. ‘otter’ (lex.); Kalasha *bišun* ‘marmot’, Khowar *bišin* ‘id.’ (as if from Dardic **vašini-* ‘marmot’); Kati *uṣē* ‘marmot’ (< Nuristani **vašin-*); Ishkashim *un-k* ‘marten’, Sanglichi *yūnek* ‘id.’; Munjani *wīng* ‘marmot’ (cf. also Munj. *xar-wāng* ‘rat; hamster’, orig. ‘donkey’s marmot’, *kārwuṅgiy* ‘mole’, orig. ‘blind marmot’), Wakhi *wināk* ‘marmot’ (Stebline-Kamensky 1999: 389), Yidgha *wūp* ‘id.’, Tadjik dial. *unduk*, *wunduk*, *wəndək* ‘marmot’, Old Wanji *məndək* ‘id.’ (< Iran. **wahinaka-* ‘marmot or a similar animal, esp. marten, rat, hamster, mole’). See also Burushaski *ainaq* ‘marmot’ (usually treated as a borrowing from an Eastern Iranian source).

The cognate words which appear in Celtic (cf. OIr. *fial* ‘ferret’ < Celt. **wīsalo-*) and Germanic (cf. OHG. *wisula* f., MHG. *wisel(e)*, G. *Wiesel* ‘weasel’, OE. *wesle*, *wæsulæ*, Dan. *våsel* < Gmc. **wisulōn-*) are derivatives formed by means of the diminutive suffix *-lo-*. Also Alb. *vjedhullë* f. ‘badger’ (= Roum. *viezure*, Aroumanian *vizur* ‘id.’) derives from **wesd-ulo-* ‘fat animal’, cf. Av. *vazdah-* n. ‘fatness’, Pashto *wázda* f. ‘animal fat, grease’, Parachi *yāzd*, Yidgha *wāzd*, *wōzd*, Kurd. *baz* ‘id.’ (Tsabolov 2001: 135; Morgenstierne 2003: 94).

The semantic difference between the Laconian term in question and other Indo-European words is noteworthy. However, it is easily explainable on the basis of the original semantics: ‘fat (or fattened) animal’, as a sow is an excellent example of a fattened animal. Therefore the suggested semantic development of ‘fat(tened) animal’ to ‘female pig, sow’ is obvious.

4. According to Hesychios, the term πτελέα (f.) demonstrates two different meanings: ‘pig’ in the Laconian dialect (σῶς ὑπὸ Λακόνων) and ‘a kind of tree’ (εἶδος δένδρου) in the standard language. The latter sense (actually ‘the elm’) is attested as early as

in the archaic Mycenaean Greek dialect (14th c. BC), cf. *pe-te-re-wa* (KN So 894.1; So 4429.b) and *pte-re-wa* (KN Se 879.b; Se 880; 891.B; 892; 893; 5729; 7920; So 4429.b; So 4431; So 4437; 4440.b; 4445; 4448; 4449) = *πετελέα* f. ‘elm, *Ulmus campestris* L.; elm-tree’s wood’ (Aura Jorro 1993: 165-166), see Attic *πετελέα*, Ionic *πετελέη*, Epidaurian *πετέα* ‘id.’. This term derives from IE. **(t)peléwā* f. ‘a hydrophilous tree’, cf. Arm. *t’eli* ‘elm-tree, *Ulmus*’, Ossetic *færvæ* ‘alder-tree, *Alnus glutinosa*’ (Abaev 1958: 455-456), OHG. *fēlawā*, German *Felber* ‘a kind of willow, esp. sallow’ (Boisacq, DELG 820).

The Laconian term for ‘pig’ represents undoubtedly a different question, though Frisk (GEW II 610) and Chantraine (DELG III 946) are inclined to accept (both with a question mark) the connection of it with the noun *πετελέα* f. ‘elm, *Ulmus campestris* L.’. However, we must refer to Anc. Gk. *πέτελας* m. ‘wild boar’ (Lyc., *Alex.* 833), explained as *κάπρος*, *ἄγριος χοῖρος* by an ancient scholiast, who informs us that this word was known to the Cilicians (παρὰ Κίλιξις). Unfortunately, it is unclear whether the term in question was used by the Greeks in Cilicia, or perhaps by the non-Greek inhabitants of Cilicia. If the latter suggestion is correct, the name for wild boar must be treated as a borrowing taken from the Cilician language, whose filiation remains uncertain. However, the word *πετελέα* denoting ‘sow’ was registered by Hesychius as belonging to the vocabulary of the Doric Laconians, thus both words in question, used in Cilicia and Laconia, respectively, as well as in the literary language (only by Lycophron in his *Alex.* 833), seem to indicate their purely Greek origin.

The etymology of both words *πέτελας* (m.) ‘wild boar’ and *πετελέα* (f.) ‘pig’ is claimed as obscure (Boisacq, DELG 820: “Étym. obscure”; Frisk, GEW II 610: “unerklärt”). The relation to Lith. *kiaũlė* (f.) ‘pig’ and *kuiļys* (m.) ‘wild boar’, suggested by Fick (1890: 392), or to Sanskrit *kiriḥ* (m.) ‘wild boar’ (lex.) and *kiryāpī* (f.) ‘wild sow’, proposed by Prellwitz (1892: 265-266), is not accepted in the standard etymological dictionaries (cf. Boisacq, DELG 820; Frisk, GEW II 610-611; Chantraine, DELG III 946).

5. The gloss *σίκα · ὄς*. *λάκωνες* is discussed by Neroznak (1978: 185), who believes that it was borrowed from a Paleo-Balkan source. He refers to Alb. *thi* ‘pig’ (< **si* < IE. **sūs*, cf. Orel 1998: 477) and also Finnish *sika* ‘id.’ and some Baltic forms. His way of thinking runs as follows:

“σίκα · ὄς ‘свинья’, ср. греч. *σίαλος* ‘жирная свинья’, *si-a₂-ro* (Frisk, GEW, 699). Если ὄς является чисто греческим

отображением общеиндоевропейского этимона, то глосса Гесихия относится к палеобалканскому источнику. В связи с этим особый интерес вызывает алб. слово *thi* < **si*, промежуточной ступенью для которого к и.-е. **sūs* можно считать глоссу Гесихия σίκα. Слово явно ареального характера, ср. также фин. *sika* ‘свинья’. На возможность контактов иллирийцев с угрофинами указывал Н. Йокль. Расширение *-k-* встречается и в балтийских языках, ср. лит. диалект. *siuka*, а также *sukis* ‘подсвинок’, неясное русск. диалект. *жижка*, *жишка* ‘поросенок’ [...] . Ср. также лтш. *sūka* ‘свинья’, *sūciņa* ‘свинка’, *jurās sūciņa* ‘морская свинка’.

Neroznak’s discussion explains little, as he does not take into account the well known phonological processes which appeared in the Laconian dialect of the Ancient Greek language. The term σίκα ‘pig’ (Gk. σῆς), quoted by Hesychius as a Laconian gloss, contains the initial phoneme σ-, which goes back evidently to Ancient Greek *θ- (Buck 1955: 59). The Laconian use of σ for θ is confirmed by Aristophanes in his comedy *Lysistrata* and by numerous Laconian inscriptions beginning from the fourth century BC, e.g. Gk. Lac. ἀνέσηκε (= Att. ἀνέθηκε), Lac. σιῶ (= Att. θεοῦ). The Laconian form σίκα (< Greek Doric *θίκα f.) cannot be separated from the Slavic adjective **dikъ* ‘wild, savage’ (see e.g. HSorb. *diki*, *džiki*, Russ. *дикий*, Ukr. *дикий*, Pol. *dziki* ‘id.’, cf. also Lith. *dýkas* adj. ‘empty, hollow, idle, free; barren, sterile’, Latv. *dīks* ‘id.’, Welsh *dig* adj. ‘angry, irritated’) and the Slavic names for ‘wild boar, wild sow’: Ukr. *дук*, Russ. dial. (Western) *дук* ‘id.’; Pol. *dzik* m. ‘boar, *Sus scrofa* L.’, *dziki wieprz* m. ‘wild boar’, *dzika świnia* f. ‘wild sow’ (Sławski 1952-1956: 204; Bańkowski 2000: 332; Boryś 2005: 144). The comparison of the Laconian and Slavic terms for ‘(wild) pig’ allows to formulate the following two conclusions: (1) the distribution of the Indo-European adjective **dhikos* was not restricted to the North-Western area, as a substantivized form appeared in the Laconian dialect of Ancient Greek. (2) the Laconian term gives strong evidence for initial **dh-* (the Celtic and Balto-Slavic languages do not distinguish the reflexes of IE. **d* and **dh*, and the North-Western data are ambiguous as to the primitive value of the dental phoneme). It is possible that Alb. *dikë* f. ‘desire, lust’ continues PAIb. **dīkã*, being a substantivized feminine adjective related to Lith. *dýkas* and Slavic **dikъ* (so Orel 1998: 65).

Conclusions.

Our analysis of five Laconian terms for ‘swine’ has clearly demonstrated that the Laconians preserved two Indo-European names: IE. **wes-ōn-* ‘fat animal’ (hence Lac. *φέωνα* f. ‘female pig, sow’), and IE. **dhikā* ‘wild pig’ (hence Lac. *σίκα* f. ‘pig’). A different term **φορθαγορίσκο* (‘piglet’) seems a Laconian innovation, perhaps of onomatopoeic origin. Also Lac. *βωλορύχα* (or perhaps *βωλώρυχα*) ‘pig’ (liter. ‘digging the soil’) demonstrates a relatively recent character, though some Indo-European parallels may indicate a possibility of an older derivation. The primitive filiation of Cilician *πέλέα* (‘wild boar’) and Laconian *πελέα* (‘pig’) cannot be determined with certainty.

REFERENCES

- Abaev, V. I. [Абаев В. И.] 1958. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*, vol. 1 (A–K’), Moscow, Leningrad.
- Abaev, V. I. [Абаев В. И.] 1989. *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*, vol. 4 (U–Z), Leningrad.
- Acuña Castroviejo F., Millán González-Pardo I. 1971. “Dos voces indígenas en nuevas inscripciones galaico-romanas, I. Ara, con texto métrico, de San Orente de Entines (Coruña)”, *Emerita* 39, pp. 345–361.
- Andriotis, N. P. [Ανδριώτης Ν. Π.] 1990. *Ετυμολογικό Λεξικό της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής*, 3rd ed., Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Aura Jorro, F. 1993. *Diccionario Micénico*, vol. 2, Madrid.
- Bańkowski, A. 2000. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, vol. 1 (A–K), Warszawa.
- Bartholomae, Ch., 1904, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg.
- Bechtel, F. 1963. *Die griechischen Dialekte*, vol. 1–3, Berlin (first edition 1921–1924).
- Boisacq, DELG = É. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, Heidelberg – Paris 1916.
- Boryś, W. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Buck, C. D. 1955. *The Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*, Chicago.
- Cardona, G. R. 1985. “Un ornitonimo greco di origine orientale”, [w:] *Studi indo-europei*, a cura di E. Campanile, Pisa 1985, pp. 55–62.
- Chantraine, DELG = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, vol. 1–4, Paris 1968–1977.
- Djahukian, G. V. [Джаукян Г. Б.] 1967. *Очерки по истории дописьменного периода армянского языка*, Erevan.
- Fick, A. 1890. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, I. Teil: *Wortschatz der Grundsprache, der arischen und der westeuropäischen Spracheinheit*, 4. Auflage, Göttingen.

- Friedrich, J. 1991. *Kurzgefaßtes hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*, Heidelberg.
- Frisk, GEW = Hj. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band 1–3, Heidelberg 1960–1973.
- HAL¹ = *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, post Ioannem Albertum recensuit Mauricius Schmidt, vol. 1–4, Ienae 1858–1862 (re-edited in 1965 in Amsterdam).
- HAL² = *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*, recensuit et emendavit K. Latte, vol. 1–2 (A–O), Hauniae 1953–1966.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott R. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. With a Revised Supplement, Oxford.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, B. 2, Heidelberg.
- Meyer-Lübke, W. 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Millán González-Pardo I. 1973. „Galeco *ru(g)ós ‘hozador > jabali’ y otras voces emparentadas”, *Emerita* 41, pp. 129–155.
- Morgenstierne, G. 1974. *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group*, Wiesbaden.
- Morgenstierne, G. 2003. *A New Etymological Vocabulary of Pashto*, Wiesbaden.
- Orel, V. E. 1998. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- Palmer, L. R. 1963. *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford.
- Pisani, V. 1958. “Ὀρθαγορίσκοι”, *Paideia* 13, p. 143.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern – München.
- Prellwitz, W. 1892. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen.
- Sabalaiuskas, A. 1968. „Baltų kalbų naminių gyvulių pavadinimai (jų kilmė ir santykis su atitinkamais slavų kalbų pavadinimais)”, *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 10, pp. 101–190.
- Sławski, F. 1952-1956. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, t. I (A–J), Kraków.
- Stebline-Kamensky I. M. [Стеблин-Каменский И. М.] 1999. *Этимологический словарь ваханского языка / Ethymological Dictionary of the Wakhi Language*, Sankt Petersburg.
- Stokes, W., Bezzenberger A. 1894. *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*, Göttingen.
- Strömberg, R. 1943. *Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen*, Göteborg.
- Teubner, J. K. 1974. “Einige chwaresmische Tiernamen”, [w:] M. Mayrhofer, W. Meid, B. Schlerath, R. Schmitt, *Antiquitates Indogermanicae. Studien zur Indogermanischen Altertumskunde und zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der indogermanischen Völker. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert zur 25. Wiederkehr seines Todestages am 23. April 1973*, Innsbruck, pp. 301-305.
- Tsabolov, R. L. [Цаболов Р. Л.] 2001. *Этимологический словарь курдского языка* [An Etymological Dictionary of the Kurdish Language], vol. 1 (A–M), Moscow.
- Turner, R. L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London.
- Vendryes, J. 1974. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*, t. 2 (lettres RS), Dublin – Paris.
- Walde, A., Pokorny J. 1926. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 1, Berlin – Leipzig.
- Witczak, K. T. 2005. *Język i religia Łuzytanów. Studium historyczno-porównawcze*, Łódź.