OLD PRUSSIAN ANCTAN

V. N. T о р о г о v, Прусский язык: Словарь A-Л (Москва 1975), р. 91 s.v, anctan writes, after reciting cognate testimony for the IE, base *ong*- (OHG ancho, Umbr. umen, umne, Skt. áñjas) "В прусск. слове – в свете внешнего сравнения – выделяется элемент -t(a)- (как в лат. unguen-t-um, см. Specht Urspr. 51), который отмечен в ряде других слов того же значения, ср. лит. svies-t-as, готск. smair-b-r "жир". Следовательно, для прусск. восстанавливается *ang-t-an". But such a generalized *-t- explains nothing; moreover the inner syntaxes of the concatenations in which these instances of *t are found are non-comparable. The -t- of Latin (and of Greek) which occurs with *-(m)en- is of disputed background, but its role in combination with *-(m)en- is quite specific. The Gothic form is probably simply misdivided. The Lithuanian formation may well be the same as the Old Prussian.

V. M a ž i u l i s, Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas 1 (A-H), Vilnius 1988, certainly gives the correct segmentation -ta-<*-ta-<*-to-(p. 80).

I have analyzed (Revue roumaine de linguistique 14, 1969, 489) the Romanian unt, Aroman untu 'butter', as well as clearly related areal equivalents in Albanian, as participial in origin, and at that time I also considered anctan in this context. There can be no doubt that the Balkan forms are rightly regarded as nominalized participles.

But I now see that the *o- grade thematic neuter (even if *ong^w- is not in origin o- grade in Indo-European) which we find in anctan<*ong^w-to-m cannot the same formation as that which we have in the Balkan forms. We must have here an ancient nomen instrumenti exactly comparable to dalptan, q.v. M a ž i u l i s op. cit. 175-176, and T o p o- r o v 291-294 (to which the Albanian daltë is an important correspondence). These o-grade nomina instrumenti were always a quite separate formation from the *-tó- participle.

OPruss. anctan is a precious IE formation.