E. P. HAMP

ON TWO BALTIC ETYMOLOGIES

1. Lithuanian *liežùvis*

I have proposed[1] that Balto-Slavic *deunó-* '9th' and *debes-* 'cloud' reflect *ʔneunó- *ʔnebes-* by a shift in perception of the stop element (< IE *$H_e$néun *Hnebhes-), that *n̥žū-* 'tongue' and *l̥go-* 'long' reflect *ʔn̥žū- *ʔl̥go- < *dn̥žū- *dl̥go-* by a reverse of this misperception (< IE *dnĝhuH$_a$ *dlHghó-), and that *li-* (Lith. *lìzdas* 'nest') < *dl'i- < *dn'i-* (a non-permitted sequence from IE on) < *ʔn'i- < *$H_e$ni- by the palatalizing effect of *i*. Slavic *gnězdó* 'nest' (with Balto-Slavic thematic neoguṇa; cf. Lith. *dienà*) shows a resolution of non-permitted *dn- < *ʔn-* by simple gravity dissimilation: [-contin] → (+grv) $\left(+ \begin{bmatrix} + \text{ contin} \\ - \text{ grv} \end{bmatrix} \right) \Big| \begin{bmatrix} + \text{ nas} \\ - \text{ grv} \end{bmatrix}$. Taking account of this output constraint, it is clear that it is not necessary for an intermediate stage *dn-* to have surfaced in order that Baltic *dli-* and Slavic *gn-* be reached.

As we have seen, *dn̥žū- > *ʔn̥žū- > inžuu̯i-* (the expected *i*-stem) will account for OPruss. *insuwis*. However, Lith. *liežùvis* is insufficiently explained in detail: „mit Umbildung der Wurzelsilbe", according to Stang VGBS 214. But exactly how was the transition made? On the pattern of *lìzdas*, it is possible that *dn̥-* behaved (e. g. after preceding vocalic final) like *dn-*. Thus we would have $^+\begin{bmatrix} \text{i} \\ \text{dn̥žū-} \end{bmatrix}$ → $^*\begin{bmatrix} \text{i} \\ \text{dl̥žū-} \end{bmatrix}$, with *i*-coloured syllabic resonant, instead of developing to *dližū-*, which would have led directly (perhaps immediately) to *ližuu̯(i)-*. Such a form was then easily taken as a zero-grade of the semantically appropriate *leiž-(i̯e/o-)* 'lick' > Lith. *liẽžia* (:Skt. *rédhi* < *leiĝh-ti*). Then, derived as an *-i̯o*-stem (VGBS 214, 191) forming a noun of agent or instrument (Endzelīns, trans. Schmalstieg and Jēgers, CPMBL 89—90 § 98), the neo-guṇa derivative *liežùvis* results as semantically clear, morphologically well formed, and phonetically of perfectly clear ancestry — scarcely deviant from what could have been predicted.

2. Old Prussian *kērmens* 'body'

It has been suggested[2] that OPruss. *kērmens*, gen. *kermenes* is related to Skt. *kr̥pá* (instrumental) 'form', Avest. *kərəfš kəhrpəm* 'form, body', and Lat. corpus <

---

[1] Chicago Linguist Society Book of Squibs 1977, 46—8. In addition to the references there given it will be seen that I explicitly reject Vasmer's (Russ. et. Wb. I 334) claimed dissimilation of *n—n* in '9', which is totally ad hoc.

[2] Ernout—Meillet DELL₃ 258, but not mentioned by Pokorny IEW 620. Endzelin's attribution (Senprūšu valoda 1943, 192) to Skt. *carma* 'skin', following Levi, is semantically weak.

< *kr̥p-es-. I have also adduced to this set Welsh *cryf* 'strong' < *kr̥(p)-mo-[3]; the Welsh would serve to assure us that the initial of the root was *k and not *kʷ, which we cannot tell from the OIr. *crí*.

In that case, *kermens* would show a different suffixation *kerp-men-*, but the motivation for such a suffixation would not be clear. In form, however, *kerp-men-* seems to go together with deverbal nouns of the type *semen* and with *emmens*; see Endzelīns (trans. Schmalstieg and Jēgers) Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages 1971, 97 § 114. Besides, we must also assume that, unlike the case of the ordinal *sep(t)mas*, the *p was phonetically absorbed in *ker(p)men-*; that is of course quite possible.

But the morphology would be immediately explained if we derived *ker-men-* from the verbal base *kʷer- seen in Skt. *kr̥-*, Welsh *peri parat* etc. (Pokorny IEW 641—2). The semantic development would parallel that of Welsh *pryd*, OIr. *cruth* 'form, shape' *kʷr̥-tu-. Of course if *k(e)rp- also existed in Baltic, it could have been conflated in *ker-men-*.

SMULKMENA

XXXIX

Anksčiau esu daręs prielaidą (Baltistica, 1976, t. 12(1), p. 37, smulkmena XIX), kad šiaurinių panevėžiškių sangrąžinės formos *sọ̃kọs*[1] 'sukúosi', *sọ̃kęs* 'sukíesi', suponuojančios senesnes *sukuõs(i), *sukiẽs(i), galėjo gauti cirkumfleksą vietoj akūto dėl *ā kamieno *rašaũsi* (> tarmėje *ràšọs*) įtakos. Tokia prielaida, žinoma, visai galima. Tačiau yra dar ir kita galimybė. Cirkumfleksinių formų *sukuõs(i), *sukiẽs(i) tarmėje galėjo visai nebūti. Mat šiame krašte pasitaiko, kad veiksmažodžių paradigma būna išlyginama, priderinus galūnių vokalizmą prie vyraujančios formos. Pavyzdžiui, pagal 3. praes. *sáuga* < *sáugā 'saugo' buvo pasidaryta ir 1. pl. *sáugam* 'saugome', 2. pl. *sáugat* 'saugote', 3. pers. refl. *sáugas* 'saugosi' vietoj laukiamų formų *sáugọm, *sáugọt, *sáugọs. Taigi ir šalia 1. sg. *sọ̃kọ* < *sukù, 2. sg. *sọ̃kę* < *sukì galėjo būti pasidaryta *sọ̃kọs* 'sukúosi', *sọ̃kęs* 'sukíesi'. Tokią galimybę laiške šių pastabų autoriui yra kėlęs mums rūpimos tarmės bene geriausias žinovas, Žeimelio vidurinės mokyklos mokytojas Juozas Šliavas (miręs 1979.VI.10). Kuri iš šių dviejų prielaidų yra tikra, parodys tolesni tyrinėjimai.

Z. Zinkevičius

---

[3] Études celtiques, 1960, vol. 9, p. 139.
[1] Nurodytame straipsnyje įsibrovė klaida: parašyta neteisingai *sọ̃kas*.