

The Anatolian Origins of the Words ‘Olive’ and ‘Oil’ and the Early History of Oleiculture

Anthony F. Buccini

Introduction¹

A note on etymologies in culinary history. About 150 years ago a renowned scholar, whose grave lies but a few hundred yards from the place where the Oxford Symposium convenes, wrote the following:

Voltaire defined etymology as a science in which vowels signify nothing at all, and consonants very little. ‘L’étymologie,’ he said, ‘est une science où les voyelles ne font rien, et les consonnes fort peu de chose.’ Nor was this sarcasm quite undeserved by those who wrote on etymology in Voltaire’s time, and we need not wonder that a man so reluctant to believe in any miracles should have declined to believe in the miracles of etymology.

At the time Max Müller (1864:238) wrote these words, he was looking back at a field of inquiry which had enjoyed a quasi-independent and respected status from classical times on – one recalls, for example, Plato’s *Cratylus* and Isodore’s *Etymologiae* – but the fruits of which were rapidly being understood to have been little more than exercises in free association of meanings and sound-shapes rather than any elucidations of actual word histories. Müller, as a student of Sanskrit and the then-rising field of Indo-European, was keenly aware that from then on, the real place of etymology would be not as part of the field of philosophy, as it had been, but of the science of language, of historical linguistics, with its foundation in the comparative method.

Precisely the sort of etymology that Voltaire held in such low regard is, despite the establishment of linguistics at every major university in the world, still widely practised. And one of its most solid bastions is the field of culinary studies, a field in which etymologies are potentially very important pieces of historical evidence but also one in which few trained linguists are active. As a consequence, food studies are bedevilled by the invention and propagation of particularly egregious flights of unrestrained etymological fancy. Worse still, one finds too often that a thoroughly unscientific culinary etymology becomes then the basis from which an otherwise unsupported historical tale is spun.

Ironically, in the culinary world, where there is an especially strong popular interest in the origins of foods and prepared dishes and their names, those names often present particularly thorny problems for the would-be etymologist: hypocoristic or sound-

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

symbolic reformations, reanalyses on the basis of folk-etymologies, complex histories as *Wanderwörter* which have passed through multiple languages. Consequently, in many instances, where scholars are forced to declare a given word or name etymologically untraceable by sound linguistic principles until new evidence is uncovered, less scientifically constrained writers on food feel empowered to apply the methodology whereof Voltaire spoke.

The problem of the origins of Greek ἔλαία and ἔλαιον. Among the more important and ancient foods that bear a name generally considered by scholars to be without an ultimate etymology is the 'olive'; the word 'oil' shares the selfsame root as 'olive' and so too is equally bereft of a proper etymology. Now, both of these English words are unproblematically traced back through intermediaries to the classical Latin words *oliva* and *oleum* and these in turn back to the Greek ἔλαία (*eláia*) and ἔλαιον (*élaion*) respectively. It is here that scholars have arrived at the etymological impasse, for these two Greek forms have hitherto resisted analysis as words built on lexical material directly inherited from the Indo-European mother language and it has, moreover, been hitherto impossible to find a source from which the Greeks may have borrowed one or both of the terms: in the attested and deciphered languages of the ancient Near East and Mediterranean, no candidate with the appropriate combination of semantic and phonetic properties has been identified that could plausibly have been the source of the Greek ἔλαία and ἔλαιον.

In this paper, I argue that 'olive' and 'oil' can, in fact, be traced back beyond Greek and specifically to the Indo-European languages of ancient Anatolia. While much of the argumentation naturally focuses on matters of historical linguistics, the solution to the problem also crucially involves the historical context of early oleiculture and in turn has further implications for how we view the development and spread of this quintessential aspect of Mediterranean life.

53

A brief outline of the development of oleiculture

The olive, both wild and domestic, is the quintessential Mediterranean plant, not only in that it has so long played a particularly important rôle in the cultures of the Mediterranean peoples but also in that it is exclusively native to and so intimately associated with the specific environment of that great sea and its immediately surrounding lands. The olive can thrive only in an area in which the so-called Mediterranean climate obtains: a temperate climate with a dry and not excessively hot summer and a wet winter with a bit of a chill but no excessive or prolonged cold spells. It is thus generally restricted to lower altitudes and so is very much at home along almost the entire coast and islands of the Mediterranean, and in some more or less extensive inland areas in the Maghreb, Iberia, Italy, Greece, Anatolia and the Levant.

There can be little doubt that as the last glacial period receded and both olive trees and humans emerged from their refuges and eventually spread out to occupy the same

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

spaces around the Mediterranean, the humans must have exploited the fruit of the olive trees in many, if not all, parts of the region. Since the olive fruit is generally intensely bitter without prolonged curing, it may have been only a minor food source for hunter-gatherer groups but it was surely also used for medicinal purposes; in particular, its oil was likely much appreciated as a salve.

The first evidence for the development of agriculture in the western world has been found in in the Fertile Crescent, the swath of land that runs from southern Mesopotamia north-westward toward southern Anatolia and thence southward across the length of the Levant. More specifically, the very earliest evidence of agriculture is found in the western part of the Fertile Crescent, the Levant, and points to the initial stage being the gradual cultivation and domestication of annuals, especially grains and pulses, in the period starting roughly around 8,000 BC. Subsequent expansion of agriculture across the Fertile Crescent and into adjacent areas likely involved various modes of direct and indirect influence, as well as some independent or parallel development of innovations, especially regarding the exploitation of new technologies and different kinds of food sources.

Of particular relevance here is the development of arboriculture, the exploitation of woody plants that produce fruits and nuts, of which the earliest to be exploited in the Near East and Mediterranean region were the date-palm, olive, fig, and grape. The cultivation of these plants differs markedly from that of annuals in a number of ways. Most obvious is the fact that they are perennials but one also notes that under domestication, the lag time of several years before these plants bear fruit demands long-term planning and not just sedentism but also considerable social stability. Their propagation involves, moreover, a very different method from that of the annuals: these fruit trees, in order to be genuinely productive, all require vegetative propagation by means of the use of cuttings from individuals that are known to yield ample crops of the desired quality.

The archaeological evidence for the earliest development of arboriculture in the Near East strongly implies that there was an original horticultural 'package' exploited early on in the southern Levant (Zohary & Hopf 2000:142ff., 248–9). This package included four core items: grape, olive, fig and date-palm, but of the four only the olive and the fig have wild progenitors in this area, whereas the other two wild progenitors are found only in nearby regions: the grape on the fringes of the northern Levant and in southern Anatolia, and the date-palm on the southern fringes of the Levant. In light of these facts and that, of the four fruits of the early horticultural package, the one most robustly represented in early archaeological sites in the southern Levant is the olive, we can conjecture that in that region, arboriculture may well have begun with the cultivation and domestication of the olive, probably in a gradual process spanning the Chalcolithic period, late 5th to late 4th millennium BC. Furthermore, given that the evidence for intensive exploitation of the olive from the Levant predates any such evidence elsewhere, we can conclude that oleiculture was first practised there. Since two members of the

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

horticultural package in the Levant were not native to the region, however, it seems likely that arboriculture had found independent beginnings elsewhere, to wit, in the Lower Mesopotamian Basin, with the cultivation of the date-palm (Zohary & Spiegel-Roy 1975:323), and in eastern Anatolia or the Transcaucasus, with the cultivation of the grape (McGovern 2003:19ff., 299ff.).

As background for the following etymological discussion of Greek *eláia*, we summarize the key points regarding the early development of oleiculture:

- 5–4th millennium BC: The earliest evidence for intensive exploitation of the olive, including pressing of the fruit to extract oil, is found in sites in the southern Levant from the Chalcolithic period; cultivation and domestication must have been well underway at this time.
- 3rd millennium BC: By the early Bronze Age, oleiculture was well established throughout the Levant, including in the north whence oil was apparently exported from North-west-Semitic speaking communities such as Ebla to cities in Mesopotamia. Exports of olives and oil from the Levant to Egypt are amply attested from later in the Bronze Age.
- 2nd millennium BC (a): Oleiculture continued to be widely practised throughout the Levant, in some areas quite intensively. During this time, we also find direct evidence from cuneiform tablets for the practice of oleiculture and the consumption of olives and olive oil in Anatolia among the Indo-European peoples settled there, especially among the Hittites and presumably also the Luvians.
- 2nd millennium BC (b): Evidence for substantial production of olive oil on Crete is generally acknowledged, though precisely when such production began and how substantial it was remains to a degree controversial. Nonetheless, textual evidence of the Linear B tablets from the Mycenaean period establishes both that the Greeks of that time practiced oleiculture and that the classical Greek words for 'olive' and 'olive oil' had already entered the language.

55

The Anatolian origins of Greek *eláia/élaion*

The classical Greek word for both the olive tree and its fruit is ἔλαια, a feminine noun, which appears alongside various derived forms for related words referring to olive products, their properties, olive-related activities, etc. Of these, note especially the neuter noun ἔλαιον 'olive oil'. A dialectal form of interest is Cypriot ἔλαιον 'olive oil', which preserves the intervocalic *-w-* lost in other dialects. That the *-w-* was indeed present in the original form of the word is made manifest by the forms attested in the very earliest Greek texts, namely, in the tablets inscribed with the Linear B script from the Mycenaean period, *ca.* 1400–1200 BC These forms are: *e-ra-wa*, representing *eláiwa*, and *e-ra-wo*, representing *élaiwon*, with *r* appearing in place of *l*, the diphthong *ai* rendered with just the first vowel and the final *n* left off, all regular features of the rendering of Greek in the syllabic spelling system of Linear B which was so ill-suited to

The Anatolian Origins of the Words ‘Olive’ and ‘Oil’

represent the language. The original presence of the *-w-* is also clearly indicated in the Latin words for ‘olive’ and ‘olive oil’, which were borrowed into Latin from a dialect of Greek which still preserved the glide at the time of contact. We can then take as the starting point for examining the etymology of classical Greek *ἔλαία* the presumed early Greek form **eláiwa*.²

Previous views. Greek, like other branches of Indo-European, has many lexical elements that do not readily find a plausible etymology in terms of the language family’s attested and reconstructed collective word-hoard. According to most scholars, the Greeks – or more accurately, the pre-Greeks, the speakers of the Indo-European dialect that would eventually emerge as Greek – migrated into the Aegean area from the Balkan peninsula and upon doing so, entered an already populated area, in which they encountered many unfamiliar natural and cultural items. The olive, limited in its range of natural occurrence to the lands immediately surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, was surely unknown to the pre-Greeks before they migrated south. Given that, they would have perforce had either to invent a new word for the tree and its fruit, apply some old word (perhaps without a good referent in the new environment) to the new item(s), or else borrow a word from an indigenous people. Modern scholarly communis opinio remains very much settled upon the third of these possibilities, namely, that the pre-Greeks borrowed a word for the olive from an unidentified language present in the Eastern Mediterranean region and that word was, at least as adapted into pre-Greek speech, **eláiwa*. As Chantraine (vol. II:331) puts it: ‘Un emprunt méditerranéen est universellement admis.’ In effect then, the etymology is generally considered to be simply unknown.

An Anatolian source. My proposal takes as its starting point the analysis of **eláiwa* as a compound, of which the first element is **el-* and the second **_aiwa*. We leave aside for the moment the question of the identity of the first element and focus on the second.

A root of the form **aiwa* with plausibly related semantic value is not found in the inherited IE lexicon of Greek but we do find a Greek word, relating to a fruit-bearing tree, that can be derived from an IE base-form **oiwā*. Looking across other IE daughter languages, we find clear cognates of that Greek form which together bear an obvious semantic kinship:

- Lat. *uva* ‘bunch of grapes’
- Arm. *aygi* ‘grapevine’
- Grk. *όα, οιē, οē* ‘service berry, service tree’

These words are all from an Indo-European root with suffix **h1oy-w-* and are, moreover, all fitted out with the IE nominal stem in **-eh₂* (> Grk. *ᾰ, η*, in classical Greek characterizing the first noun declension, to which *ἔλαία* belonged). Regarding

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

the semantics, note that all three pertain to woody fruit-bearing plants and in two of the languages the word refers to both the fruit and the plant itself. Also noteworthy is the fact that these languages form a neat geographical grouping, with Latin and Greek directly on the Mediterranean and Greek and Armenian standing like brackets on the two flanks of where the Anatolian languages were formerly spoken.

Another set of cognates in a subset of the Indo-European daughter languages needs to be considered here, namely, those forms which reflect the *e*-grade of the same root just discussed:

- Celtic: OIr. *eo*, Welsh *ywen*, OCor. *hiuin*, Brt. *ivin*, Gau. *ivo-* 'yew'
- Germanic: OE *īw*, *ēow*, OHG *īwa*, OIcl. *yr* 'yew'
- Baltic: OPrs. *iuwīs* 'yew'; Lit. *ievà*, Ltv. *iēva* 'bird cherry'
- Slavic: OCze. *jiva* 'yew, willow'; Rus. *iva*, Srb.-Crt. *īva* 'willow'

As was the case with the reflexes of **h¹ioy-w-*, the languages with reflexes of **h¹iey-w-* form a geographic group, ranging from north-western Europe eastward; note that the easternmost of these languages deviate from the application of the term to the 'yew', with the westernmost members of the Baltic and Slavic branches (Old Prussian and Old Czech respectively) agreeing with Celtic and Germanic in this respect, while those to the east have 'bird cherry' or 'willow'. Botanically, the distribution makes sense: the more easterly and northerly Baltic and Slavic languages are spoken in regions where the yew is less prevalent or does not occur. It seems most reasonable to take this evidence as indicating an original use of **h¹iey-w-* to refer to the yew tree, with subsequent shift or reapplication of the word to other trees in dialects spoken in zones in which the yew was rare or absent.

57

Another apparent reflex of the IE root **h¹iey-*, though seemingly without the suffixed *_w-*, is found in the best-attested of the Anatolian languages, Hittite. The word, of neuter gender, appears with a mixture of *n*-stem forms – *eyanaš*, *eyani*, *eyanit* – and *a*-stem forms – *eyaš*, *eya*, *eyaz*; the attested nom./acc. form *eyan* could be either. This word *eyan* appears in cuneiform texts with the Sumerogram determinative for 'tree, wood' (also 'fruit') *giš* and from the contexts in which it occurs, it is clear both that the word refers to a kind of tree and, furthermore, that this tree was for the Hittites imbued with religious and legal symbolic significance. It seems, moreover, almost certain that the *eyan* tree was both cultivated and an evergreen, leading Friedrich (1970:124) to conclude that the Hittite word, like the reflexes of the IE root **h¹iey-(w-)* in Celtic, Germanic and to a degree also in Baltic and Slavic, indicated specifically the yew tree.

As noted above, the languages with reflexes of IE **h¹iey-*, setting aside Anatolian Hittite, comprise a coherent geographical group ranging across northern Europe. The odd outlier of the group, however, occurs amongst the group of Indo-European dialects in southern Europe and neighbouring south-west Asia in which reflexes of **h¹ioy-* occur, as discussed above. The question then naturally arises: is there a possible reflex

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

of **h₁oy-* attested in Hittite or any of the other languages of the Anatolian branch of Indo-European?

According to Kimball (1994:22), Hittite displays '[m]onophthongization of IE **oi*, **ai*, **au* and perhaps **ou* but only in a limited set of phonological environments: in absolute final syllables, medially before **h₂*, and perhaps before stops.' Under this formulation, we would expect a noun with the root **h₁oy-(w-)*, thus with the diphthong not in final position due to the appearance of the following stem vowel, to yield Hit. **ay(w)a*, with the first element of the diphthong reflecting the general development of IE **o* in Hittite to *a*.

No such simplex is attested in Hittite, nor does there appear to be any obvious dialectal reflex of **h₁oy-(w-)* elsewhere in Anatolian. However, a possible occurrence of the posited Hittite **ay(w)a* is found as the second element of a compound, namely *allayani-*. This word appears with the aforementioned Sumerogram determinative *giš* 'tree, wood, fruit' – e.g. *giša-al-la-ya-nu-uš* (acc. pl.) (Neu 1980:226) and from the contexts in which it appears, one concludes that *allayani-* is indeed the name of a bush or tree. Interestingly, Puhvel (1984:26) says of this word: 'Probably a culture tree, possibly olive, usually *zertum*, often listed with *hassikka-* "fig-tree", in which case one may entertain an affinity with Gk. *ἔλαία*, Lat. *olea*, *oliva* "olive-tree", Arm. *iwt*' He offers, however, no discussion of the possible 'affinity'.

The tentativeness of Puhvel's suggestion is justified, as there are some obvious problems which require explanation in order to link Hit. *allayani-* to early Grk. **eláiwa*. For one problem, namely, the presence of an extra suffix *_ani-* on the Hittite form, Puhvel himself offers a possible, though tenuous, resolution: 'The suffix *_ani-* resembles Arm. *_eni* forming tree names, e.g. *last* "boat": *lesteni* "alder-tree" (p. 26). From our perspective, however, *allayani-* should be considered alongside Hit. *eyan*, which shows *_n-* in some forms, being sometimes treated as an *n*-stem; (*all-*)*aya* may likewise have been treated as an *n*-stem, thus *allayan-*. The final *_i* may then be best seen as an instance of the phenomenon of i-mutation, found in Hittite as a result of Luvian influence (Hoffner & Melchert 2008:86; Rieken 1994:44); on this, see further below.

A second problem is that of the seeming lack, from a Greek perspective, of the medial *_w-* in the Hittite form. This lack of congruence cannot be reasonably accounted for morphologically, for if we claim that Hittite *eyan* and *allayani-* reflect forms originally built without the *_w-* suffix (**h₁ey-/h₁oy-*), we must still posit some further dialect in which the suffix did appear in these forms to serve as the source for Greek **eláiwa*: the problem is thus not solved but merely displaced. We must therefore look for a possible phonological explanation of the absence of *_w-* in the two Hittite forms. In addition, we would have to account for the irregular maintenance of *_y-* in *eyan* and *allayani*, for between vowels *_y-* was regularly lost in Hittite and Luvian.

Given the relatively limited number of secure Indo-European etymologies we have for Hittite and the other Anatolian languages, it is not surprising that lexical reflexes of sound sequences comparable to IE **_oiwo-* are not readily found. We therefore can only

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

tentatively suggest that there may have been a loss of *_w*- in the forms under discussion by phonological rule; in effect, we suggest a phonotactic instability of the cluster of glides *_yw*-, perhaps resolved here by loss of the *_w*-. So far, the only analogous sound sequences I have found are first-plural forms of verbs with roots ending in *_ai*; since the first-plural ending was *_wenil-wani* (present) and *_wen* (past), the sequence posited in **aiwa* occurred regularly in these verbal forms. Counter to the just proposed sound change of **aywa* to *aya* we find verbal forms in Hittite such as *paiwani* 'we go', *paiwen* 'we went', *naiwani* 'we turn', *daiwen* 'we put', etc. (Hoffner & Melchert 2008). We also find, however, variants in which this sound sequence is absent, of which some cases can be attributed to morphological factors, especially the use of a different root formation, e.g. *neyaweni* alongside *naiweni* (p. 223) or *tiyawen* alongside *daiwen* (p. 224). In other instances, however, there are variants which suggest the possibility of the phonotactic instability of *_yw*- posited above, e.g., *pāweni* alongside *paiweni* and *pāiweni*, *pāiwen* alongside *pāwen*. In such forms as *pāweni* the reduction of the glide cluster has apparently been achieved through loss of the *_y*- but this differing path of resolution may have been brought about by the paradigmatic stability of the desinences *_weni* etc. Forms without reduction of the glide cluster could then be straightforward analogical restorations, reflecting the natural tendency for speakers to reconstruct the combination of roots in *_ai* with the otherwise stable first-plural desinences. From this perspective, one notes that the seemingly anomalous lack of *_w*- in Hittite *eyan* may be the result of the same instability of the cluster *_yw*- suggested here to explain its absence in *allayani*- and the verbal forms such as *pāweni*. In other words, Hittite *eyan* may well ultimately reflect the same IE **h1ey-w-* 'yew' attested in the northern branches.

59

The last issue to consider here regarding Greek **eláiwa* and Hittite *allayani*- involves the first element of the compound. The correspondence of Greek *el-* to Hittite *all-* looks peculiar in light of, for example, the correspondences in the reflexes of IE **melit-* 'honey', Grk. μέλι, Hit. *milit-*: both the vowel quality and the geminate *l* seemingly point to a mismatch and so, if Greek borrowed the word for 'olive' from an Anatolian dialect, as we are proposing here, the actual form borrowed was clearly not identical with the attested Hit. *allayani*- . Indeed, in light of the two issues discussed above, it seems clear that we must posit the borrowing either from a dialect in which the *-ani* suffix was not in place on the word and the suggested loss of *-w-* had not occurred or the borrowing had occurred early enough that these processes had not altered an earlier form **el-aiwa*.

As for the meaning of this first element, I propose that it reflects the IE root **h1elu-* or, in compounds, **h1el-*, meaning '(dull) red', 'reddish brown' (cf. English *elk*) (Mallory & Adams 2006:332). From this perspective, I suggest that what we see attested in Hittite could itself well be a borrowing from Luvian, a sister Anatolian language which was long in close contact with Hittite: in Luvian, the inherited sequence **el-* develops to *all-*, as in the aforementioned word for 'honey', Luv. *mallit-* (Melchert 1994:238); the occurrence of *i*-mutation – the *_i*- in *allayaniš* – in this noun also points toward it

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

possibly being a Luvian borrowing into Hittite. It should be further noted that there is a more general correspondence between Greek *e* and Luvian (or Luvian-like Anatolian dialects) *a*, as seen in such place names as Ephesos/Apasa, Perge/Parha, Lesbos/Lazpa. With regard to the plausibility of a borrowing of a word for 'olive' into Hittite from Luvian, this would in fact be a very reasonable thing to expect, insofar as the historical centre of the Hittites was in the highlands of central Anatolia, where the olive does not grow, whereas their cousins, the Luvians, inhabited territories to the south of the Hittites, from the Konya Plain to the area of south-eastern Anatolia known then as Kizzuwatna and later Cilicia, where the olive thrives (Yakubovitch 2008:124). But we should note too that both the Hittite and Luvian heartlands lay well to the east of the Aegean and any place where the pre-Greeks were likely to have been in contact with Anatolians in their earliest period of settlement in the Aegean area.

In concrete terms then, we must posit the borrowing of **el-aiwa* not directly from the Hittite and Luvian dialects as attested in cuneiform texts from central and south-eastern Anatolia of the eighteenth or seventeenth centuries BC but rather from an Anatolian dialect of the Aegean area, in which at the time of contact – sometime from the twenty-first to nineteenth centuries BC – the Anatolian word for 'olive' had not yet undergone any dialect-specific developments – addition of *_ani*, loss of *_w*, development of *él->all-* – other than the early (and almost universal in Anatolian) development of **o* to **a*. The posited form, seen in the perspective of the other IE reflexes of **h₁ioy-*, fits into a pattern of use observed in the other southern branches to use the root in the names of fruits or fruit-bearing plants of especial prominence in the southern lands. Anatolian **el-aiwa* may well then have originally meant 'reddish-brown berry tree' or 'reddish-brown berry', an apt description of the ripe olive.

To sum up, early Greek **eláiwa* is a prehistoric borrowing from an Anatolian dialect of a word that is in fact attested in a different Anatolian dialect from at least a few centuries later, namely, the Hittite *allayaniš*. The Greek word ultimately reflects a form from early on in the post-Proto-Anatolian, i.e., early (western) dialectal period, which the Greeks acquired in the Aegean area upon their arrival there from the Balkans.

Conclusion

A proper etymology must account for all the phonological, morphological, and semantic aspects of the posited development; the preceding discussion, though condensed, does address all the relevant linguistic issues. But an etymology, especially one in which borrowing is invoked, should also make sense in terms of the broader sociohistorical context in which the transfer is posited. In this regard, the present proposal not only makes sense in terms of the form of the borrowed item and the time and place of borrowing but also sheds light on the history behind the form *allayaniš* in Hittite, which, according to my analysis, itself may be a borrowing from Luvian; such a scenario harmonizes linguistic facts with sociolinguistic facts and further with the facts regarding the distribution of the olive in Anatolia.

The Anatolian Origins of the Words 'Olive' and 'Oil'

There are two further issues omitted here due to space considerations but which I will explore in subsequent publications:

1) The implications of this etymology for the religious significance of the olive among the Greeks. Specifically, I argue that after the migration of Indo-European groups into the Mediterranean area, where the olive flourishes and the yew does not, the olive in effect took over several aspects of the symbolic and cultic rôle of the yew.

2) The implications of this etymology for the history of arboriculture and, in particular, of oleiculture. While there are excellent reasons to believe that intensive exploitation and cultivation of the olive developed first in the Levant, the proposed etymology, seen in the broader context of early agricultural developments in the Transcaucasus and eastern Anatolia, suggests that oleiculture in Anatolia was developed independently or quasi-independently from the Levantine developments. The Greeks' introduction to Mediterranean arboriculture is to be seen then as another aspect of the increasingly appreciated relationship between the early Greeks and their Anatolian cousins.

Notes

1. Due to space limitations, I offer here an extremely condensed treatment of the subject; the topic will be discussed *in extenso* in Buccini (forthcoming). Thanks to Amy Dahlstrom and Craig Melchert. Usual disclaimers apply.
2. There have been some attempts to give **eláiwa* an Indo-European etymology but they have found no general support.

61

References

Buccini, Anthony F., forthcoming, *From Green to Gold. A History of Olive Oil* (tentative title).

Charnraine, Pierre, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1966–80.

Friedrich, Paul, *Proto-Indo-European Trees*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr., & H. Craig Melchert, 2008, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Part 1, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kimball, Sarah, 'The IE short diphthongs *oi, *ai, *ou and *au in Hittite,' *Die Sprache* 36 (1994): 1–28.

Mallory, J.P., & D.Q. Adams, *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

McGovern, Patrick E., *Ancient Wine. The Search for the Origins of Viticulture*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Melchert, H. Craig, *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.

Müller, Max, *Lectures on the Science of Language* (Second Series), London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1864.

Neu, Erich, *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1980.

Puhvel, Jaan, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Vol. 1, Berlin: Mouton, 1984.

Rieken, Elisabeth, 'Der Wechsel *_a-/i-* in der Stammbildung des hethitischen Nomens,' *Historische Sprachforschungen* 107 (1994): 42–53.

Yakubovitch, Ilya, 'Luwian Migration in Light of Linguistic Contacts,' in Billie Jean Collins, et al. (eds.), *Anatolian Interfaces. Hittites, Greeks, and their Neighbours*, 123–34, Oxford: Oxbow, 2008.

Zohary, Daniel, & Maria Hopf, *Domestication of Plants in the Old World*, Oxford University Press, 2000.

Zohary, Daniel, & Pinhas Spiegel-Roy, 'Beginnings of Fruit Growing in the Old World,' *Science* 187 (1975): 319–27.