NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY
CORNELL UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
ITHACA, N. Y.

April 2, 1946

DEPARTMENT OF ENTOMOLOGY

Dear Miss Kober

I have also been in a sort of extra special super jam, but merely entomological. Took my trip to Washington, and this on top of Cambridge, New York and Ottawa left me so far behind on routine that I shall probably never catch up. Also finished up one article (not archeological--- on the Lepidoptera of St. Croix) and am working on final clean copy of a more serious one. So I can only answer so far as no checking is involved.

The aspirate thing was between two languages or dialects both presumably preHellenic, but was based on the place names on Blegen and Haley's map of PH names in Greece. I noticed that the names with aspirates and those without grouped themselves rather definitely— the former mainly maritime (but also Attica) and the latter mainly mainland and even inland, but also including a strong majority of the Cretan ones. So I got the idea of two languages side by side just before the Hellenic invasion (or revival). Then further comparison convinced me that they were related to each other, and my whole thing started in, looking for those pairs of words in the dictionary. I soon decided that where the meanings were <u>identical</u> they probably fell together, and one form or the other got levelled out, but where there was a difference they might both survive. So I got three classes: 1, meaning identical, surviving only as casual instability of the aspirate, and on the whole the weakest class, since we might have a dialect of Greek proper, or the weird misspellings of the late classic period. 2) words where one was terrestrial and one maritime in meaning ... these are the best ones e.g the words for "snail". 3) words merely of different but related meaning, and in this case the aspirated one most often with the more specialized meaning, as if it were the language with the lesser or later contact with Hellenic. Then there were the words with identical meaning, or overlapping meaning but totally different stem (such as <u>skolex</u> and <u>helmins</u>, apparently both meaning earthworm primarily, but specialized in different directions). These make a sort of limbo, suspicious, but no better than that. Of course so far as these word-pairs are IE there should have been also a cognate in Hellenic, and I suppose this wouod fall together with one or the other as a rule. In the case of <u>g</u> roots (e.g. <u>gen</u>) they should be distinguishible all three, but I haven't found a clear case.

I know that the roots of the <u>nth</u> words have been considered not IE, but never got clear what the argument was. (unless the naive one that the only possible IE language in the area must be Hellenic, and therefore obey the Hellenic sound-shift rules, which I take as not worth demolishing). It seems

to me that for some of the nth words the case is strong, even obvious (e.g helmins, from √ver, vel; Korinthos as cognate with kore). Of course this doesn't prevent the possibility that others may be "Carian", since undoubtedly there was a non-IE element involved, and if the nth suffix was active, it would doubtless be attached to words of either stock alike. At this stage it would of course be hopeless to decide which of the two elements was primary and which a mass of loan-words; though I do not see why the nth cannot be the good old present-participle ending, modified in the aspirate language (or dialect).. in fact I suspect that the Asianic nd, nn and the mainland -ene would be rubbed down forms of the same suffix.

Right!

My position would not be that the non-IE element was not present, but that I personally have no background to identify it,-- will have to leave that to Dr. Speiser et al. But I really feel that the IE element is primary and the Asianic loans, even though that is no better than a hunch. Incidentally the aspirate-pair idea would pick out words whether or not IE, and so would the Polynesian link. It is mainly the fact that so high a percent are approximations to IE roots, that makes me think they come from that side, only modified under laws we are not yet in position to codify.

I think perhaps my interpretation of the Newton principle was a shade different;- namely a way of expressing what physicists now call the principle of least hypothesis: do not set up two hypothetical rules, when a single (third) one can be found,- e.g, in the Newtonian case, drop the cycles, epicycles etc., as soon as it is shown that the single inverse square law of gravitation fits all the facts he knew.- - But now we have found it doesn't quite fit, we have to try a different law (e.g. one or another relativity law, or some law of contraction of moving bodies,-- or even as the latest, the idea that there are two kinds of time, related to each logarithmically ... i.e the same way that pitch and frequency are related in sound).

I take it the p/m# alternation is original IE; at least it is still functional in Celtic and I understand there are plain traces of it in Latin and Greek, but perhaps it is limited to the centum languages. I use it to explain Latin facio, English make, Greek mēkhane, Polynesian faka (of course this would mean that the supposed Latin derivation from √dhe, put, is wrong,- after all the meaning is not at all the same.)

Now back to the insects.

Yours sincerely

W. T. M. Forbes

Wm. T.M.Forbes

*I suspect originally f/m or v/m - cf. Guankumara = Guinevere

Dumnonia = Devon

mit-with-μεγά-πεδα

Belgian

Hellenic

~~formica = [illegible]~~

formica = μυρμηξ

√vel = μεγας