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Preface

The present dissertation is the result of my 3-year Ph.D. scholarship financed by the University of Copenhagen as a part of the five-year programme of excellence Roots of Europe – Language, Culture, and Migrations. It is dedicated to five people who did not live to see the final product, but whose passion for the study of language directly or indirectly continue to exercise influence on my work: First of all my enthusiastic and inspiring teacher, head of centre and initial supervisor Jens Elmegård Rasmussen whose warm and welcoming introduction to the Indo-Europeanist circles in 1994 I will never forget; my good friend, fellow etymologist and inexhaustible source of knowledge and inspiration Jan Katlev; H.E. Ambassador Paul George Jyrkänkallio, who taught me about the wonders of Hungarian grammar and passed on his personally dedicated copy of Aulis Joki’s *Uralier und Indogermanen* to “min unge broder i filologi”; my grandfather, devoted Romanicist, Latinist and Germanicist, professor Povl Kristian Hyllested, whom I never got to know in person, but whose note-scribbled library I have inherited and use every day, probably the main reason I became a linguist; and my great-grandmother Ragnhild Jensen, born Høst, passionate defender and recorder of the Bornholmian dialect and penfriend in the early 20th century with U.S. ambassador to Copenhagen and Belgrade, John Dyneley Prince, who wrote, among other linguistic works, “Tatar Elements in Old Russian” (referred to in this dissertation).

I wish to thank my other teacher and final supervisor, the indefatigable Birgit Anette Rasmussen and the other colleagues at Roots of Europe with whom I have spent five wonderful years: Bjarne Simmelkjaer Sandgaard Hansen, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Guus Kroonen, Jenny Helena Larsson, Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead, Thomas Olander and Oliver Simkin; the tried and tested members of the Roots of Europe evaluation board, professors Douglas Q. Adams, Michael Janda, Joshua T. Katz, Rosemarie Lühr, Brent Vine and Andreas Willi whose advice and criti-
cal comments at their annual visits have proven invaluabley relevant; the ever-growing and talented Indo-European student community in Copenhagen, counting many dear friends; my good colleague, associate professor Tuula Eskeland who has continuously provided me with support, advice and tips on recent literature in the Uralic field; fellow Uralicist Ilda Hallas-Møller whose competent management of the library facilities has been instrumental; and a number of other people with whom I have had fruitful discussions specifically on matters treated in the final dissertation: Henning Andersen, Lars Brink, Johnny Cheung, Paul S. Cohen, Michael Fortescue, Bernd Gliwa, Berit Hildebrandt, Martin Huld, Santeri Junttila, Petri Kallio, Peter Alexander Kerkhof, Pëtr Kocharov, Agnes Korn, Kristian Kristiansen, Martin Kümmel, Ranko Matasović, Craig Melchert, Simon Mulder, Robert Orr, Kaspars Ozoliņš, Janne Saarikivi, Zsolt Simon, Merlijn de Smit, David Stifter, Patrick Stiles, Erik Thau-Knudsen, Seán Vrieland and Nicholas Zair.

This dissertation only forms part of the research I have carried out during the five project years. My employment as a PhD scholar has, in effect, been interwoven with other projects at the Roots of Europe research centre and is hard to view in isolation from them. The best known part is probably my work on the Indo-Uralic hypothesis, which was originally thought to make up the majority of my thesis. The original title of my PhD project was "The Shared Indo-European and Uralic Lexicon", deliberately uniting the stratigraphy of loanwords on one hand and vocabulary which I believe to be inherited from a common past on the other. Scholars who investigate old loanwords tend to see them in every case of similarity, arguing vigorously against the possibility of uncovering inherited material. Adherents of the Indo-Uralic hypothesis, on the other hand, often reject rather obvious instances of borrowing, trying perhaps to maximize the amount of evidence for genetic affinity. My idea was to introduce an open mind to both approaches, including both Indo-Uralic material and older loanwords in a lexical stratigraphy. However, the Indo-Uralic part, comprising also a comparative historical phonology and derivational grammar, grew to such proportions that it will become an independent publication.

During the last half of the project I furthermore became increasingly involved in studies in Albanian language history, especially phonology, morphophonology and etymology. Finally in 2013, I devoted much time to the study of plant-names from alleged European substratum languages, a subject which ideally ought to have been included in this the-
sis but which proved to complicated for me to able to reach a satisfac-
ry conclusion within the time-frame given.
Word Exchange at the Gates of Europe:  
Five Millennia of Language Contact

Introduction

The study of early lexical exchange between Indo-European and Uralic languages has a proud tradition in Denmark, not least by virtue of the pioneering works by Vilhelm Thomsen: Den gotiske Sprogklasse indflydelse på den finske (1869) and Beröringer mellem de finske og de baltiske (litavisk-lettiske) sprog: En sproghistorisk Undersøgelse (1890). The latter still constitutes the most important reference work on contacts between Baltic and Balto-Fennic – in how many other scholarly fields today can you say that about a work written in Danish? Linguistic contacts between Uralic and Indo-European and their respective branches is still today an extensively studied and vibrant field. In some respects, though, I think that important evidence is consistently overlooked because of the power of tradition which affects not only how you carry out your research, but also what you search for, where you look for evidence, and from which angle.

Traditionally, most lexemes shared by Indo-European and Uralic language branches are viewed as having been transferred from the former to the latter. To mention the most obvious example, it is well known that both Balto-Fennic and Saami languages possess an abundance of ancient terms borrowed from (Pre-)Proto-Indo-Iranian, Proto-Baltic, Proto-Germanic, Proto-Slavic and Proto-Scandinavian. Likewise, the vocabularies of more easterly Uralic languages (Mordvin, Mari, Permian and Ob-Ugrian) have been affected by intense contact with Iranian languages – apart from non-Indo-European languages such as Turkic – while Hungarian has added to its lexical stock hundreds of (Medieval) Latin, Pannonian Slavic and Alanic (Iassic) as well as Old and Middle High German loans. Samoyedic languages are even supposed to have loanwords from Proto-Tocharian. Everywhere Indo-
European is automatically assumed to be the provider and Uralic the target language while the assumed share of Uralic loanwords in older Indo-European languages is close to absent. Such an asymmetry is commonly supposed among linguists to be typical for a relationship between two peoples where one had the upper hand, technically and politically, at the time of borrowing. While the amount of borrowings rarely numbers the same on both sides, I find it unlikely that there are any cases where extensive lexical transmission in one direction leaves zero traces in the opposite direction. True, there are famous examples of extreme asymmetry such as Old Germanic languages versus Old Slavic or French versus Breton. However, even in these cases at least a small number of loans in the atypical directions are identifiable. Most such borrowings have a limited semantic and geographical distribution; they typically refer to trade objects, important plants and animals, religion, or other concepts specifically linked to the kind of contact in question.

This thesis aspires to convey to the field of Indo-European and Uralic linguistics a new methodology, where Uralic and Indo-European data are viewed as equally potential sources for loanwords. Much weight is put on our ability to reconstruct shared semantics, not least semantic anomalies, even in cases where the actual lexeme has been replaced. I also seek to underline the importance of using Uralic material as a key to unsolved issues in Indo-European. I stress especially that ignoring variation in the Uralic material (such as dialectal forms, semantic scope, irregular vocalism, forms from less well-known languages, and older attestations) can be detrimental or even fatal, leading the etymologist totally off the scent. Citing one Standard Finnish form is not enough, for example, when Balto-Fennic languages exhibit a multitude of irregular forms and deviant meanings. Finally, but equally importantly, I endeavor to establish a number of new subfields within the field of IE-Uralic contact linguistics by showing that hitherto unheeded lexical exchange took place from Proto-Mari to Proto-Baltic, from Proto-Balto-Slavic to Proto-Fenno-Permian, and from Proto-Balto-Fennic to Proto-Celtic and Proto-Germanic.

The dissertation contains 16 articles which are intended to appear in chronological order, starting with the earliest contacts.
Fenno-Ugric *š- as Laryngeal Substitution in Words of Indo-European Provenance

Abstract

Jorma Koivulehto’s claim that PIE laryngeals in word-internal position are substituted with *š- in Fenno-Ugric must be reformulated. The development is hard to account for phonetically, and a closer look at the material reveals that there is no unambiguous evidence from outside Balto-Fennic, a subgroup of Fenno-Ugric where *-š- regularly yields -h-. This means that, while word-internal laryngeals may very well be preserved in some loanwords (just like initial laryngeals are clearly preserved as *k-, as shown by Koivulehto himself), they can simply have had the manifestation *-h- from the beginning. If this was before the emergence of *h as a phoneme, it could still have occurred as a loan phoneme. This loan phoneme would be one of the factors triggering the development of *-š- > -h- in general and thereby the introduction of a new phoneme proper. One further observation is that only laryngeals before a dental stop (> BF *t) are represented among the certain examples.

1 Frozen PIE laryngeals in loanwords in FU

In a number of ground-breaking investigations, Jorma Koivulehto (1988 [1999], 1991, 2001, 2003) has shown that in early Indo-European loanwords in Fenno-Ugric languages laryngeals are still visible, having been substituted by a variety of sounds depending on their position in the word and the time of borrowing. Most convincing is his manifestation *k- for PIE *H- in an older layer of loanwords, e.g.

1 This paper was presented at the 20th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference on 1 November, 2008.
Fi. kesä 'summer' ← PIE *h₁es-en-'harvest' (Koivulehto 1991: 36-40)
Fi. kaski 'burn-beaten land' ← PIE *h₂ez-g(h)-'ashes' (Koivulehto 2001: 241)
Fi. kalvas, kalpea 'pale', N Saami guolben 'sandy plain; chalky layer underneath the top soil' ← PIE *h₂él-bʰo-s 'white', NHG dial. Alven 'chalky layer underneath the top soil' (Koivulehto 2003: 28)
N Saami guovssu < PSaami *kawsoj- 'dawn' ← PIE *h₂áy-s-o- (Koivulehto 2003: 29)
Fenno-Volgaic *kuđa- 'to weave' ← PIE *h₂ey-dʰ- (Lith. ėudžiu 'id.') (Koivulehto 1991: 50)

Koivulehto argues for a conditioning by which the velar stop k- occurs only in initial position, while any word-internal laryngeal (h₁-, h₂-, h₃-) is substituted with the postalveolar fricative -š- at a certain stage (but not in the oldest layer of loanwords). Fenno-Ugric *-š- remains a postalveolar sibilant all the way through the Fenno-Permic, Fenno-Volgaic and Fenno-Saami (Early Proto-Fennic) stages, but develops regularly into *h- in Middle and Late Proto-Fennic, merging with the results of *kš, *č, *ž and *z (and even the original *-s- of some Baltic and Germanic loanwords which may have been pronounced with a more retracted sibilant than the Fennic dental-alveolar representative). The consequence of this hypothesis is that any Finnish (or Estonian, Veps etc. – any Balto-Fennic) *h- may be a relic of an Indo-European laryngeal.

However, the three PIE laryngeals, although sharing notation, the term “laryngeal”, and certain behaviors such as lengthening, vowel coloring and a tendency to disappear, were clearly distinct sounds, and there is no particular reason to believe that they would all behave the same way in every position. Besides, it makes one a little bit suspicious that these postalveolar fricatives materialized as “laryngeals” (more specifically glottals) again when reaching the Balto-Fennic stage. Koivulehto in his main work on the subject (1991) gives 17 examples:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFU or PFP form</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>alleged NW PIE source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*(j)eshV 'possibility'</td>
<td>Fi. ehkā, ehki 'possibly'</td>
<td>*(j)eh₂-gʷeh₁; (Latv. jēgā 'ability')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(j)esē- 'to have enough power'</td>
<td>Fi. dial. ehtiā 'be able to'</td>
<td>*(j)eh₂-gʷ-人生的 'be able to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*inē 'human being'</td>
<td>OFi. inhe-minen Fi. ihminen</td>
<td>*genh₁- 'beget a child; be born'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*keš-ta 'to dare'</td>
<td>Fi. kehtaa</td>
<td>*gʷeh₁-人生的 'be ashamed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*konē 'tool'</td>
<td>Fi. kone 'machine'</td>
<td>*γγh₁-人生的 'wonder' (ON κ yn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*lešē 'leaf'</td>
<td>Fi. lehti N Saami lasta</td>
<td>*bʰlehi-人生的 'leaf; sprout'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pewšenV 'sieve'</td>
<td>Votyak puž-n-</td>
<td>*peuH-heno-人生的 'winnower'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*poša- 'to winnow'</td>
<td>Fi. pohta-</td>
<td>*puH-ēh-人生的 'sift (grain)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pūša- 'to fry'</td>
<td>Lule Saami pass-</td>
<td>*bʰeh₁-人生的 'bake' (OHG bā(j)en)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*pušas 'clean'</td>
<td>Fi. puhdas</td>
<td>*puH-h-te人生的 'clean' (Sköld 1960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*punšV 'to winnow'</td>
<td>Mordvin ponžavtoms</td>
<td>*pu-ne-H-人生的 'cleans, winnows'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rešo 'line, order'</td>
<td>Fi. rehto</td>
<td>*(h₂)roh₁-人生的 'line' (Da., Sw. rad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rošo 'grass, plant'</td>
<td>Fi. rohto</td>
<td>*gʰroh₁-人生的 'plant; growth'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tašas 'dough'</td>
<td>Fi. tahdas</td>
<td>*(t)eh₂-s-s-人生的 'dough'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tešē 'deed'</td>
<td>Est. teht</td>
<td>*dʰeh₁-人生的 'deed'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wišta 'once; at last'</td>
<td>Fi. vihdoin 'at last'</td>
<td>*yuH-ho-人生的 'course, sequence'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wo(j)ša 'ramification'</td>
<td>E Mari (Cheremis) βοž 'branch'</td>
<td>*wuH-人生的 'branch' (OI vayā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Katz (2003) implicitly supported Koivulehto’s thesis regarding the reflex *š- although he sees them in Indo-Iranian loanwords rather than in NW Indo-European ones. We may add Mari (Cheremis) šōžr 'milk' → PIE *ksih₂-ró-m, which is in fact the only additional example in his book for which *š- explicitly substitutes H-.
2 Analyses of the individual proposals

In the following, I will comment on each of Koivulehto’s relevant etymologies.

2.1 PFP *(j)ešte ‘to have enough power’?

PBF *(j)eskV ‘possibility’ ← PIE *jEH₂-GʷEH₂ ‘power’,

*jEH₂-Gʷ-* ‘be able to’?

PFP *(j)ešte- ‘to have enough power’ (Koivulehto 1991: 77-79; > Fi. ehtiä ‘have enough time for a given purpose’, dial. ehtii olla ‘can be’, N Saami asta- ‘have enough time’, Mari ašte- ‘do’, Komi ješši- ‘be ready; be able to; be in time for; mature’) is traced back to a PIE denominal verb *jếh₂-

gʷ-ješši- ‘be able to’ (> Lith. jėgti, jėgiū ‘be able to’, Latv. jēgt, jēdzū ‘id.’) but this verb is actually only attested in Baltic. Because of its presence in the Permian languages it cannot be a Baltic loanword proper, at least not everywhere, and it may not even be a Balto-Slavic loanword although *-še- could reflect *-že- as a rendering of the palatalized *-je-; instead it could very well instead be a satem reflex of PIE *Hej- ‘to have in one’s power’, *Hikt- ~ *Hoikti- (> e.g. Av. išt- ‘possession’ ~ PGmc. *aihti- ‘possession, belongings, property’), or more specifically a borrowing from Proto-Indo-Iranian into Proto-Fennic. Phonologically, this would make the process more straightforward and account for the missing *(j)- in Balto-Fennic.

Koivulehto (1991: 72-74) further derives a Fenno-Saami (Early Proto-Fennic) *(j)eškä ‘possibility’ (e.g. > Fi. ehkä ‘perhaps’) from the same underlying derivative *jếh₂-Gʷeh₂ ‘power’ with reference to typological parallels like NHG möglich ‘possible’ ~ vermögen ‘be able to’. The relevant Indo-European reflections are Lith. pa-jėga ‘ability’, Latv. jēga ‘id.; sensibility’, Gk. ἰοσ ‘vigor; manliness; young age’. Since this word is only attested as a loanword via Proto-Balto-Fennic (Late Proto-Fennic) *ehkä- (> e.g. Fi. ehkä ‘perhaps’), one can further object that there is no direct evidence for a step *(j)- even if the Indo-European etymology should be correct; it is only reconstructed because BF *(j)- is supposed to have derived from this source.

There are related forms in Ugric (Khanty / Ostyak), but they are considered borrowings from Permian languages (SSA 100).
2.2 PFP *koneš ‘tool’ ← PIE *gṇh₁-i- ‘wonder’?

Fi. kone ‘machine’ goes back to BF *koneh ‘tool’ which must mechanically be transposed to Early Proto-Fennic *koneš. Koivulehto conjectures a PIE ĝn₁h₁-i- ‘wonder’ as the source. Personally, I find this one of the more speculative etymologies – one might say wonderful in the sense ‘full of wonders’. More important than my own subjective impression is that -š in *koneš is a well-known derivational suffix in Fenno-Ugric, which may by the way sometimes represent PIE *-s, cf. *sommeš ‘fungus’ (PGmc. *swambaz), *veneš ‘boat’ (Skt. vána- ‘timber’); so even if this is an Indo-European loan, there is no evidence as such that the laryngeals were not simply lost.

2.3 PFP *inše ‘human being’ ← PIE *gěnh₁- ‘beget a child; be born’

Proto-Fenno-Volgaic *inše ‘human being’ is reconstructed on the basis of Mordvin (Erzya) inže, (Moksha) inži ‘guest’ and Balto-Fennic forms meaning ‘man, human being’, not least OFi. inheminen. However, most Finnish dialects and some of the older attestations point rather to a form *ineh-minen, as do all of the remaining Balto-Fennic languages, e.g. Veps inėhmoi ‘bitch (pejorative of a woman)’, Lude inahmoi, Votic inehmin ‘man, human being’. Although it is of course possible that a lone Old Finnish attestation could be the most archaic one, I find it more plausible that the majority of languages, dialects and old forms in this case reflect the original form. Besides, the Mordvin meaning ‘guest’ is not immediately compelling. A more probable source would then be the PGmc. antecendent of Goth. inahs ‘wise’ (etymologically obscure, but synchronically analyzable as in- + ah- in aha ‘mind’ and ahma ‘spirit’, an n-stem ahman-), either a) directly combined with the productive Balto-Fennic derivational suffix -minen or b) reshaped from a hypothetical *inahman-, consisting of the elements in both inahs and ahman-. In this case, *inzhminen would originally have meant ‘soul’. The original -a- may then have been retained in Lude inahmoi, or the -a- in Goth. inahs may reflect PGmc. *-e- (as in, e.g. fadar < *faðer-, liuhaþ < *leuheþa-). Another possibility is an origin in Baltic, cf. Lith. žmonės.
people’, žmonė ‘woman’ and i-žymi ‘famous’ (Liukkonen 1999); Baltic *ž is regularly substituted with Balto-Fennic *h.

2.4 PFS *lešte ‘leaf’ ← PIE **bʰle₁-t- ‘leaf; sprout’?

Proto-Fenno-Saami *lešte can be reconstructed on the basis of PBF *lehte (Fi. lehti, Est. leht) and PSaami *laštVš (> N Saami luoštaš). Koivulehto (2003: 25), whose own surname contains a derivative of this word, lehte ‘grove’, sees a loan from PIE *bʰle₁-to-(s), a formation reflected in PGmc. *blēða- ‘blossom, sprout, fruit’ and *blaða- ‘leaf’. A dedicated and distinguished Germanicist, there is no doubt that Koivulehto is happy to be able to trace a part of his surname (koivu means ‘birch’) back to Proto-Indo-European times, using a Germanic formation as a model for the protoform. However, *lehte is more likely to have been borrowed from some Balto-Slavic form related to Lith. laiškas ‘leaf’ or lākštas ‘sheet’, OCS listi id. These forms are not completely mutually compatible except semantically, but they seem to be linked neatly by the PFS term. N Saami lasta cannot be from Baltic *lapst’a ‘leaf’ (pace Liukkonen 1999: 83-84), because *-a- is substituted with N Saami -uo- in Baltic loans (e.g. N Saami šuoldni ‘dew’ ← Baltic *šalná, cf. Lith. šalná).

2.5 PBF *taštäs ‘dough’ ← PIE *tēh₂-s-to-s ‘dough’?

A good match both formally and semantically is PBF *taštäs (> Fi. tahdas) ‘dough’ ~ *tēh₂-s-to-s ‘id.’ (> OCS těsto, OIr. tūis, tua and PGmc. *tāis- in OHG deismo ‘sour dough’; Koivulehto 2003: 27). Crucially, however, PIE *-s- reflects the PIE sibilant *-s- rather than the laryngeal. I think this is a quite justified objection, especially since Koivulehto mysteriously does not account for the loss of the PIE *-s- that is implied. Maybe he thinks that it was assimilated into the sibilant, but

---

3 I generally do not favor most of Liukkonen’s etymologies, but this one I would definitely count as a possibility.

4 Yet another possibility, if *inēhminen is the correct reconstruction, is to hypothesize an ancient borrowing from some IE form of *aŋh₂-mo- ‘spirit, soul’; the forms certainly match semantically and share the same skeleton of consonants, but since it is not clear precisely what language we would be talking about (we have no other evidence for a correspondence PIE *a- ~ BF *i-, for example), and since suffixed forms are only found in Balto-Fennic, it does not seem easy to come up with credible evidence for such a solution.
surely Ockham's razor dictates that the sibilant we encounter reflects the sibilant that was there already, while the laryngeal was lost (by assimilation or not) as laryngeals go. I have no other explanation for Koivulehto's hypothesis other than associative influence from his own native language – in Finnish the word acquires -h-, so when Koivulehto first saw the PIE reconstruction he may have been reminded of (and later blinded by) his own word for it. No doubt that the etymon is the correct one, though.

2.6 PFP *péwšenV 'sieve' ← PIE *peuH-eno- 'winnowing'?, PFP *pošta- 'to winnow' ← PIE *pouH-ēje- 'to sift (grain)'?
PFB *puštas 'clean' ← PIE *puh-to-s 'clean'?
PFV *punšV- 'to winnow' ← *pu-ne-h- 'cleans, winnows'?

Sköld (1960: 37) was the first to point to an Indo-Iranian protoform of Ved. pūtā- as the source of BF *puhta- 'clean' (> Fi. puhdas) and *pohta- 'to winnow' (> Fi. poht-i-a). He did not visualize an intermediate step *-š-, and it is implicit that the laryngeal was borrowed directly as *-h-, which is also the point of this article; however, he did not give additional evidence to back this claim up. Koivulehto (1988 [1999: 301-302], 2001: 246, 2003: 26) adds PFV *punšV- 'to winnow' (> Mordvin ponžavtoms) and *pewšenV (UEW 738). These forms can hardly be separated from each other, nor from the forms mentioned by Sköld. While we are definitely dealing with a laryngeal in the root, this becomes less relevant if there are extensions with a sibilant since a sibilant in the target language is more likely to reflect that sibilant than a neighboring laryngeal. I would asserting Baltic *požtas 'clean' (> Lith. puostas) as the common source, following Liuikkonen (1999: 107-108).

2.7 PFU *pešā- or *pušā- 'to fry' ← PIE *bʰeh₁- 'bake'?

This root (Koivulehto 1981: 355-356, Koivulehto 1988 [1999: 301], Koivulehto 1991: 85, fn. 11.6) is not represented in Balto-Fennic, but is reflected in Saami (N Saami bassi- Lule Saami passē-), Permian (Udmurt/Votyak pij-, Komi/Zyryan pčž-, also 'be ready/done (of food)') and Ugrian (Mansi/Vogul pī-, Khanty/Ostyak pāl-, pat- 'to fry in fat').
Koivulehto asserts as the source PIE *bʰeh₁₁- 'to bake' (qʰyw ‘to fry, to bake’, PGmc. baka- ‘to bake’, perhaps including the present-tense suffix *-f₁₁- (PGmc. *bējan- > OHG bā(j)en ‘bake’)⁵.

Again his analysis does not address an inherent and obvious possibility that constitutes a serious weakness for the analysis of -h₁₁- as the reflex of *-s-: If the present suffix is potentially contained in the substituted form, where did it go? Why not just say that *-s- is the rendering of both -h₁₁- and the -i- together, probably realized as a palatal affricate? Of course the laryngeal then plays a role in the emergence of *-s- in this case, but how can it then be used to explain other cases of *-s- where there were no present suffixes or other -i-sounds to be articulated with it. At least the loss of the suffix needs to be addressed if one (like Koivulehto) counts as a possibility that it was contained in the form that was borrowed. Note how similar this problem is to the lack of explanation of the lost -s- in *teh₁₁jistos > *taštus above – if the PIE -s- played a role in the emergence of *-s- how can it be used as evidence that other laryngeals without sibilant neighbors yielded -s- all by themselves?

We cannot rule out that Koivulehto might be on the right track by postulating an origin in PIE *bʰeh₁₁-, but in that case the origin of *-s- is likely to be the PIE cluster *-h₁₁,i- and not the laryngeal alone. In my opinion, however, an origin in an unidentified satem language with secondary palatalization from PIE *pekʷ- ‘to cook’ (Satem *pek- ~ *peč-, cf. Skt. pácati) appears more probable. In that case the attestations do not even have to reflect a single synchronic transmission, but can be the result of several independent borrowings which would explain the difficulties of reconstructing the exact vocalism. If there in fact was a PFU protoform *püšā- the rounding could be explained by the preceding *p-; note that PFU *jüwa- ‘grain’ is from PIE *jeuo- with the same kind of secondary rounding affected by the following *-u- (Koivulehto 1981: 355).

My alternative proposal here obviously stands on less firm ground than those for the other items, seeing as we rarely have additional evidence of the relevant correspondences in material from an early Satem dialect of Indo-European. I do think, though, that the potential existence on PFU *pešā- ~ *püšā- is enough reason to start searching for

⁵ According to Koivulehto (1981: 348-356), BF *paj-sta- > *pajšta- (Fi. paista-) ‘to bake’ and BF *pejštā (Fi. peittā-) ‘to cover’ are borrowed from each of the stems attested in Germanic, the latter via a meaning ‘wrap into something hot or something that keeps the heat’; cf. for a parallel semantic development the relationship between Olonets Karelian sooju ‘cover’ and Est. soov, gen. sooji ‘heat’.
FU *š as Laryngeal Substitution in Words of IE Provenance

such evidence, which could also provide new important information for the discussion whether Satem isoglosses overlapped with actual PIE dialect divisions.

2.8 PFP *wo(j)ša ‘branch; bending’ ← PIE *uojH-éh₂ ‘id.’?

A form *wo(j)ša ‘branch; bending’ may be reconstructed for the Proto-Fenno-Permian stage, but in that case it disappeared completely from Fenno-Saami since it is attested only in Volgaic and Permian. It is reconstructed on the basis of Mordvin (Erzya) užo, Moksha užá ‘corner’, Mari (Cheremis) W βaž E βož ‘branch; bending, point where something bends’, and Komi (Zyryan) vož ‘river arm; fork; branch; (in Permyak also) sprout’. The normal reconstruction is *woša (Itkonen 1953-1954: 165). Koivulehto (1991: 96-99) asserts PIE *uojH-éh₂ ‘branch’ as the source (> Ved. vayá, OCS vějá ‘id.’, derivatives of *yejH- ‘to wind’) and therefore wonders whether the FU protoform had been *woša, which is also a possible reconstruction, though he prefers *woša after all as Balto-Fennic has no inherited words of the structure *CVihV. He shows, however, that Udmurt (Votyak) might have preserved such a structure (cf. vajíž next to Komi vož ‘pole (on a wagon)’ < PFP *ažša)6, thereby providing evidence that it existed, but incidentally no reflex of the IE loan in question is attested in Udmurt. Koivulehto also thinks that it belongs to a younger layer of loanwords and therefore does not constitute an exact parallel to our ‘branch’-word.

In any case, *wo(j)ša is phonetically closer to PIE *uój-s-o- ‘branch’, yielding e.g. Slavic (LCS) *věcha, than *uojH-éh₂ ‘branch’ (> OI vayá, OV), incidentally an extension of the same PIE root. All other things being equal, there is of course no reason why a PIE form with -H- should be a more obvious source than a minimal pair with *-s- attested in the same daughter-languages. On the contrary, Ockham’s razor speaks for the latter. Here Koivulehto makes no methodological error, however, but simply appears unaware of the alternative IE form. Needless to say, there are no semantic problems involved in either case.

---

6 UEW (825-826) thinks that Mordvin (Erzya) ažša also shows the old *-j-, only by metathesis, but this is rejected by Katz (1983: 118) and Koivulehto (1991: 98) who believe that the Mordvin -j- in this word comes from palatalization of *-š-.
2.9 Proto-Mari *šožər ‘milk’ ← PIE (PIIR.) *ksih₂-rō- ‘milk’?

Now let us turn to Katz’ (2003: 193-194) lone clear example with *š- as a reflex of an Indo-Iranian laryngeal, Proto-Mari (Proto-Cheremis) *šožər ‘milk’ > Meadow or Central Mari (Carevokoksaisk subdial.) šižər, Hill Mari (W Mari) šožər, East Mari (Malmyž subdial.) šušər, Urzum Mari šoɾ ‘id.’. He asserts PFP *šašərā ← Pre-PIIr. *kših₄r₃m (in his own unorthodox notation; > Ved. kṣiṛā- ‘milk’, Oss.Dig. aksīɾ ‘id.’). This does not work either since *šožər is not a simplex; the base-word in Mari is šoɾ (Moiso & Saarinen 2008: 715). As shown by Aikio (2014: 131ff.), -ō- in Mari almost exclusively occurs before *r- or between *n and *, even in loanwords.

2.10 PFS *kešə- ‘to dare’ ← PIE *gʷEH₁-Dʰ- ‘BE ASHAMED’?

PFS *rešə ‘line, order’ ← PIE *(H₂)RA₁-TO- ‘LINE’?

PFS *rošə ‘GRASS, PLANT’ ← PIE *GʰROH₁-TO- ‘PLANT; GROWTH’?

PFS *tešə ‘DEED’ ← PIE *DʰEH₁-TI- ‘DEED’?

I will address the remaining examples together (Koivulehto (1988 [1999: 300-301], 2003: 26). They have probably been assigned the right Indo-European etymologies although one can always discuss the exact source language and chronological stage⁷. But note that they are all attested in Balto-Fennic only – where *š yields exactly *h! The only protoforms that we can reconstruct on the basis of direct evidence is BF *kehta- (> Fi. kehdəta, stem kehta- ‘to not be ashamed’, Est. kõhta- ‘to be able to’; BF *rehtə (> Fi. rehtə ‘row, line; side; various kinds of layer’), BF *rohtə (> Fi. rohtə, rohtta ‘medicine, (medicinal) plant; weed; green herb; cattle feed’, Est. roht ‘id.’); and BF tehtə ‘deed’ (> Est. teht). Meanwhile, in all these examples the laryngeal occurs in front of a dental stop, and, correspondingly, the Balto-Fennic *-h- precedes *t-. This means that PIE *-h- cannot provably have been borrowed into *š- in Fenn-Ugric languages at all; in fact, we have no certain examples of borrowings with medial laryngeal substitutions outside Balto-Fennic. What we can say is that we have a handful of examples showing that a PIE aspirated laryn-

---

⁷ Note, however, that Middle Proto-Fennic *-kt- yields Late Proto-Fennic *-ht-. A word like Est. teht ‘deed’ could therefore just as well be an inner-Balto-Fennic formation from teke- ‘to do’.
geal – i.e. *h₁ or *h₂ were transmitted to Balto-Fennic as *h. This is quite surprising since the loans are probably older than Balto-Fennic itself – which means that there must have existed some kind of back fricative (maybe not exactly a glottal *h) at least as a marginal loan phoneme in a stage before Balto-Fennic. Critics would say that this is not necessary since that stage had exactly *š which yielded BF *h anyway, but there is no direct evidence for this phonologically quite odd intermediate step.

3 Discussion and conclusions

A more minute critical analysis of Koivulehto’s and Katz’s entire material remains to be carried out, but on the basis of the above considerations, I vow to conclude that, while Koivulehto’s analysis that PIE initial laryngeals were substituted by *k- in early loanwords in Fenno-Ugric (i.e. at least at the Proto-Fenno-Ugric stage and probably even later) is virtually unchallengeable and counts as a real discovery, his bid for what happened to medial laryngeals is subject to serious misinterpretations and a high degree of uncertainty. First of all, the postulation that these three different phonemes articulated in the back of the mouth were all substituted with the postalveolar sibilant in all medial positions is hard to understand on phonological grounds. It is not so much the cross-linguistic rarity that a back fricative is replaced by a palatal fricative – we would have to accept this anyway if the material showed credible constistency – but the fact that this is combined with an unconditioned regular outcome of all three phonemes in all medial positions, independent of surroundings, makes one suspicious and demands a high standard of evidence to back it up.

This leads us to the next issue: Most of Koivulehto’s etymologies involving word-internal laryngeals are not as good as those with initial laryngeals. The problem is not so much the semantics, a point where Koivulehto is markedly more cautious than many of his fellow scholars (although not necessarily a desirable approach, it is at least an uncontroversial one), but rather the fact that he in several cases overlooks alternative and more obvious candidates for Indo-European source words where *-š- can simply be the reflex of a PIE sibilant.

A handful of Koivulehto’s etymologies are serious candidates, but crucially, in these cases the only evidence comes from Balto-Fennic where *š regularly yields h. This leaves us with no unambiguous piece of direct evidence for *-š- as a manifestation of an Indo-European larynge-
al since \(-h\) in Balto-Fennic can simply be direct reflexes of the similar back fricatives in Indo-European – Ockham’s razor, I would argue, dictates that there is no reason to go through an undocumented stage *-ʃ- especially if this stage is hard to account for on phonological grounds.

Except there might be one reason: It is true that *-h- is normally regarded to have arisen in Middle Proto-Fennic when a postalveolar sibilants, sequences of stop + such sibilants, the voiced sibilant (in loanwords only) and the postalveolar affricate all merged into *-h-. My critics may then object that there was no *h present with which the IE laryngeals could be substituted because it did not exist as a phoneme before the Middle-Proto-Fennic stage – and at that stage the laryngeals are normally supposed to have been long gone from Indo-European. However, we must remember that such thing exists as a loan phoneme, widespread in the world’s languages. It is directly observable today that most languages, when adopting loanwords, preserve some foreign sounds that do not otherwise occur in the system. One can mention as an example -r- in English loanwords in continental European languages like Danish or Dutch which retain their original -r-quality\(^8\). In Danish, voiced sibilants and affricates do not occur, not even in English loanwords, and postalveolar sibilants are commonly substituted with the more fronted, almost palatal, variants, found in Danish native words. Thus, [ʒ] in English loanwords will be rendered by Danes typically as [ɕ]. The fact that r keeps its English pronunciation in the target language sets it apart as a loan phoneme. An example of a loan phoneme which has fully integrated into the system is /ʒ/ in English itself, originally from French loanwords. In fact, a commonly accepted (and inherently uncontroversial) hypothesis in Uralistics is that exactly the adoption of loanwords with *-ʃ- may have triggered the emergence of that phoneme in Proto-Fenno-Ugric. Perhaps, then, the regular rendering of a laryngeal as [h] in stages older than Balto-Fennic became one of the triggering factors that ultimately made Fenno-Saami *ʒ (as well as *č and *kš, and in loanwords even *z and *ž) develop into *h, creating a fully integrated phoneme.

However, I must also conclude that we do not know at this point what the substitution was other than before a dental stop, neither what it was in Fenno-Ugric languages other than Balto-Fennic, nor what the substitution of *-h₃- was in any of the languages. The quest continues.

\(^8\) Of course it is subject to linguists’ interpretation in every individual case when these loan phonemes start counting as real phonemes.
Koivulehto’s important conclusions that a) PIE *ₕ₁ was an aspirated fricative (not a glottal stop), and b) that laryngeals were still around even at the time of NW PIE-PF(P) contacts, remain untouched.
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Stealing the Thunder of alpaš: 
The Fate of PIE *-bʰo- in Anatolian'

Abstract

Finnish kalvas and kalpea ‘pale’ and N Saami guolbben ‘white layer underneath the top soil’ must be Indo-European loanwords as shown by Jorma Koiivulehto, indicating by their initial *k- that the PIE word for ‘white’, *h₂elbʰos, had an initial laryngeal. Kortlandt’s arguments for deeming the troublesome Hitt. alpaš a loanword is supplemented with the surprising fact that both the PIE nominal suffix *-bʰo- and the verbal root extension *-bʰ- are virtually absent in Anatolian. Even PIE roots of the structure CVRbʰ-, of which some might at least be candidates for roots containing original *-bʰ-extensions, turn out to be restricted to one or two examples. This remarkable state of affairs strengthens the hypothesis (presented in Hyllested 2010) that nominal *-bʰo- and verbal *-bʰ- are ultimately identical. It is clear from the material that the use of *-bʰo- was already declining in PIE, gradually becoming replaced by other suffixes such as *-nt- for the present participle. Since Anatolian was the first branch to split off the IE core, it is logical if use of *-bʰ- was weakened further in this branch, paving the way for the multifunctional Anatolian *-nt- that we know so well. It is only to be expected that a few lexicalized forms with *-bʰo- be preserved in Anatolian as relics, but there are simply no unambiguous examples.

1 This paper was presented at the XII. Arbeitstagung of the Indo-European Society in Erlangen, September 2011, and is planned to appear as an article in Münchener Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft. However, there is still time for revision and elaboration.
1 The distribution, function and origin of PIE \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)-

In an earlier article (Hyllested 2010), I have contested the widely-held views that the PIE nominal suffix \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- was used mainly in the formation of a) animal names, b) color adjectives, and c) abstract nouns; and that it originated by thematicizations of the verbal roots \(\text{bh}^1\text{eh}_2\)- 'shine' and \(^*\text{bh}^2\text{ye}h_3\)- 'be; grow'.

I pointed out\(^2\) that animal names with \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- hardly ever denote the same animal in two branches, and that they are virtually all secondary formations in Indic and Greek where the suffix has been added to a vocalic or nasal stem.\(^4\) None of them can be safely reconstructed for PIE, with the possible lone exception of \(^*\text{h}_1\text{él-η-}^*\text{-bh}^o\)- (and this only if Gk. ἐλάφος 'deer' is in fact related to PGmc. *lambaz*/lambiz- 'sheep' and/or the Gaulish month-name Elembiu).

As for the color adjectives, there are no more than four safe examples, some of which even have a limited geographical distribution.\(^5\) Correspondingly, at least 20 PIE colour adjectives occur without a single attested \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- added directly to the root in any language.\(^6\) Thus, \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)-

---

\(^2\) The identification of \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- with the root \(^*\text{bh}^1\text{eh}_2\)- originates from Brugmann Grdr. Bammesberger suggested that \(^*\text{bh}^1\text{eh}_2\)- forms the basis of \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- only in color adjectives, while verbal abstracts would have \(^*\text{-bh}^o\)- from \(^*\text{bh}^2\text{ye}h_3\)-. For a modernized version of this view, see Balles 2010.

\(^3\) For details and examples, I refer to the original article.

\(^4\) In Old Indic, \(-\text{a}b\text{hāₗ}^-\), in most cases with \(-\text{a}\)- from PIE \(^*\text{-η}\)-, became productive in the formation of animal names, e.g. rāsa-bhā- 'donkey', sara-bhā- 'grasshopper'. In Greek, both the conglomerates -a-φο- (\(< \text{-η-}^*\text{-bh}^o\)-), -υ-φο-, -ι-φο- and the diminutives -ά-φι-ν, -ύ-φι-ν became productive and were by no means restricted to animal names; μίρ-α-φος 'fox' (\(- \text{κύρρος} \text{ 'orange'}\)); ἀσκάλ-α-φος 'underworld demon, an owl' (\(- \text{ἀσκάλος} \text{ 'unhoed'}\)); κόσ-υ-φος 'blackbird' (\(- \text{ΣCr. κός} \text{ 'id.'}\)), θηρ-α-φι-ν 'little animal' (\(- \text{θηρ} \text{ 'animal, beast'}\)), χωρ-ά-φι-νον 'little place', διαρ-υ-φι-νον 'little present'; σκίραφος 'trickery, cheating; gambler; dice-box'; and ἔδαφος 'ground', perhaps from \(^*\text{yed}^-\text{ 'water'}\).

\(^5\) These are \(^*\text{dēlH}^-\text{-bhō}^-\) 'yellow' (Arm. delb 'yellow, blond' – Arm. delin 'yellow, wan, pallid', Lat. fulvus 'dark yellow', Early Mo.Du. deliuw, delliw 'light yellow, yellowish pale, sallow, fallow'; Driessen 2005 : 58); \(^*\text{raj-bhō}^-\) 'striped, spotted' (Lith. raibas 'grey-spotted', OPr. raoban 'striped' – Lith. rainas 'grey-spotted, striped', OE rāha, rēge 'roe-deer'); \(^*\text{s(ų)or-bhō}^-\) 'dark red or black' (Lat. sorbun 'serviceberry', OIr. sorb 'stain, dirt', Lith. serbentū 'red currant' – Latv. sārts 'red in the face') and \(^*\text{hēl-bhō}^-\) 'white' (Gk. ἄλφος 'blister', Lat. albus 'white', PGerm. *alba- 'chalky soil' [> NHG Albe(n), Dan. alver], Hitt. alpaš 'cloud' – Lith. albas 'lin', OHG alun 'roach', alant 'elecampane').

\(^6\) Apart from 18 roots mentioned in IEW and M&KA (Hyllested 2010: 210-211), this list also includes PIE \(^*\text{dēydbō}^-\) 'brown' (Skt. duódhata- 'epithet to tāmas-'), Gk.
cannot have been used specifically for color adjectives, neither in PIE, nor in the history of the individual IE branches. The use of *-bʰo- in preference to other adjectival suffixes was not governed by semantics; rather, morphophonotactic restrictions seem to have applied:

a) It occurs almost exclusively with roots ending in a sonorant, and no roots ending in a stop or -s- form adjectives with *-bʰo- added directly to the root. The other adjectival suffixes *-ro- and *-u- are, conversely, nearly always added to obstruents (the internal distribution of *-ro- and *-u- being dependent on the root’s syllable peak; see Rasmussen 2010). Roots ending in a laryngeal can apparently take either ending.9

139a vantḥī,haps it is even a compound *mented *


8 E.g. Ol sthala-bhā- ‘thick’ ~ sthālā- ‘id.’; Gk. στερφοκ ‘stiff, hard, infertile’ ~ στερφοκ, ON starr ‘stiff’; and Alb. n-gjel-bē-té ‘salty’ (< *en-sal-bʰo-). In Hyllested 2010, I included the example PGmc. *halba- ‘half’ (< *kol-bʰo- ~ Lith. šālis ‘side’). The connection with Baltic is, however, uncertain; it is not favored by Orel 154 and not even mentioned as a possibility in Kroonen forthcoming, and even if the connection is correct, there are no obvious candidates for cognates outside the Northern European branches. Nonetheless, no alternative etymologies are generally accepted. I now believe that PGmc. *halba- is a loan from Fennic, cf. Fennic *halpa- ‘reduced’, gen. *halšan-, which cannot be a loan the other way round because the Fennic word comes from *salV ‘cheap’. The motivation for borrowing a word for ‘reduced, cheap’ would exactly be natural in a trade context which the Fennic meanings point to. Later, the Indo-European term for ‘half’ would have been replaced by a semantically bleached and functionally strengthened version of the Fennic word.

9 The sole exceptions are inner-Greek formations of which only λίφος ‘smooth, flat’ (< λιφός ‘id.’) seems to be of non-onomatopoetic character; ὄψως ‘hip’ probably does not reflect *h₁o-st-bʰu- (< *h₁o-st- ‘bone’), but is rather to be segmented *h₁-o-st- and contains the root in σφύρος ‘ankle’ and σφυρ� ‘hurry’ (< *spūt-H/d- ‘move rapidly’ (cf. the connection between Eng. hip and hop). Perhaps it is even a compound *h₁o-st-spu-(H/d)-s of the same type as Ol așṭhivā(nt), Av. ascuua- ‘shin-bone’ < Ir. ast-(s)čiHya- where the second mem-
b) Formations with *-bʰo*- directly added to roots beginning with a labial stop (*p-, *bʰ-*) are avoided. We see no formations such as *þ̣ber-bʰo*- or *þ̣elh₁-bʰo*- in the material.

When -bʰo- occurs in deverbal nouns, these are very often result nouns⁹, but may also have retained an action-noun character, or reflect earlier agent nouns. In some cases, the distinctions are not clear. The multifunctional use of *-bʰo*- constitutes an almost exact parallel to Mod. Eng. *-ing*, thus, a form like *skerbʰo*- corresponds to Eng. *cutting* which is not only a present participle, but also an adjective meaning ‘capable of or designed for cutting’, an action noun meaning ‘the act of cutting’ and a result noun meaning ‘a part cut off from a main body; a clipping’.

The use of *-bʰo*- for the formation of verbal nouns was rapidly declining at the time of the dissolution of PIE and remained productive in the individual branches only when accompanied by other suffixal elements. The oldest function of *-bʰo*- was the formation of present participles, indifferent to voice—i.e., both active and passive present participles.

---


10 E.g. Arm. əlb ‘lamentation’, Gk. ὀλόφυρος ‘id.’ (~ ὀλοφύρωμα ‘lament’ with secondary -o- from the synonymous ὀλοφύρω; Olsen 1999 : 37)


12 E.g. Lith. gārba, garbė ‘(an) honour’ ~ giriū ‘(to) honour’, PIE *lóm-bʰab₂ ‘female water spirit’ > Gr. θάλας ‘nymph’ > Lat. lūmpa ‘id.’, lympha ‘clear water’, Skt. Rāmbhā ‘name of a water nymph’ ~ Lith. Launė ‘water fairy’, older Alb. lumet ‘the fairies’ ~ ‘to enchant, bewitch’; Hyllested 2004b) may be an agent noun or (a concretization of) an action noun.

13 For example, Baltic verbal abstracts in *-i-bā*- (Lith. darýba ‘building’ ~ darýtì ‘build’; Latv. medība ‘hunting’ ~ medīt ‘hunt’; cerība ‘hope (subst.)’ ~ cerēt ‘hope (vb.)’; Lith. nominal abstracts in -ybē, often concretised/individualised (gražybē ‘beauty; beautiful girl’); and Slavic verbal abstracts *-V-ba* and result nouns in *-V-bu* (OCS žuloba ‘evilness’ ~ žulá ‘evil’; gosti-ba ‘party’ ~ gosti ‘guest’, Scr. stūbe ‘ladder, steps’ ~ CS stūlatti ‘spread, stretch’).
The notion that *bʰo- derives from thematicization of the verbal roots *bʰeh₂- 'shine' and *bʰu₂eh₂- 'be; grow' can be easily contested on a number of grounds:

a) The use of the suffix is much broader than initially described by Brugmann; thus, *bʰeh₂- 'shine' makes little sense in most adjectives in question;

b) The physical similarity between suffix and root is limited to a single, very frequent consonant;

c) There are real compounds like Gk. ἐπερφυής 'enormous, marvellous' ~ Lat. superbus and Ved. ábhva- n. 'monster' < *n̥-bʰy-o- (Kuiper 1962, Meier-Brügger 1991) which retain -u-;

d) The alleged "modifying" effect of *-bʰo- ("looking like X, of X's kind", 'shining X') lies in the modifying nature of derivation itself.

The recurring extension *-bʰ- in verbal roots (*glei- ~ *glei-bʰ- 'smear'; *h₂e-r- ~ *h₂u₂-ebʰ- 'weave'; *steh₂ ~ *st₂bʰ- 'stand' etc.) is ultimately identical to nominal *-bʰo- and reflect either lexicalized participial stems or simply the use of present participles for the 3rd person finite. Lexicalized or parallel formations common to IE and Uralic reveal that PIE *-bʰo- must be ultimately related to the PU present participial ending *-pa, indifferent to voice, which is also used as the marker of the (originally unmarked) 3rd person marker of the verb.16 A parallel development took place in Indo-European where another participial element, *-t- ~ *-nt-, came to occupy that function. Formally, then, nothing distinguishes IE verbal root variants with an extra -bʰ- from the 3rd person of the Uralic verb.
2 Alleged examples of *-bʰo- in Anatolian

In any case, the use of *-bʰo- as a suffix must be old in PIE. It is therefore highly surprising that both nominal *-bʰo- and the verbal extension *-bʰ-, are virtually absent in Anatolian. In six cases, *-bʰo- has been suggested as the source for what seems to be a derivational ending, but they can either be refuted right away or remain disputed. Let us have a look at the candidates:

2.1 LyCian xAHBA ‘GRANDCHILD’

Lyc. xahba (suggested by Shevoroshkin 1979: 179, fn. 5), is now known to have meant ‘grandchild’ and not ‘ruler, king’; it goes back to earlier *ḥaswa- which is in itself a thematization of *Honsu- > Hitt. ḫaššu-, HLuw. ḫasu- (Melchert 1994: 63, 307).

2.2 LyCian ŧxNTABA ‘RULE’


2.3 Carian -BA- IN PLACE-NAMES

It was suggested by Neumann (1988: 187 and n. 4) that the recurrent element -ba- in Carian place-names derive from PIE *-bʰo-. Most of the examples mentioned by Neumann are, however, etymologically quite obscure, and some of them surely continue Anatolian *-wa-, e.g. kiūb ‘city of Kindyè’ < *Hinduwa- (cf. Simon 2008). A sound law PA *w > Carian b/C_ can be established on the basis of kiūb and ksbo- ‘PN’ < *ḥaswa- (HLuw. asu-, Lycian ɔxahba- ‘grandson; grandchild’; Simon 2008: 334).
2.4  **Hittite šalpaš** ‘dog’s excrement’

Hitt. šalpaš ‘dog’s excrement’ does not for sure reflect *sāl-bʰo- ‘grey; filthy’ (> Arm. alb ‘dung’) ~ *sal-ulo-, *sāl-o- ‘dirty, grey; dirt’ (Schindler 1978; see also Olsen 1999: 37); an alternative source is still PIE *solp-o- derived from *selp- ‘grease; greasy’ (Jahowkyan 1987). If indeed derived from *sal-, this item would stand alone in the sense that *-bʰo- would form a substantive and not an adjective. In that case, it seems appropriate either to a) reconstruct an intermediate adjective *sal-bʰo- ‘dirty’ which later became substantivised or b) to assert a verbal meaning of the root ‘be dirty, produce dirt’ (cf. as a parallel the double meaning of Dan. griset ‘dirty, filthy’ and ‘messy’) which obtained the meaning ‘dirt’ as a kind of result noun. In any case, šalpaš cannot count as a safe example of a derivative with PIE *-bʰo-.

2.5  **Hittite wašpaš** ‘clothes (of the dead) ; shroud’

Hitt. wašpaš ‘clothes (of the dead) ; shroud’ (Goetze 1969) is related to Lat. vespillo ‘undertaker; grave robber’ (Watkins 1969) and derived from *yos-p- ‘dress’ (see also Katz 2000). Kloekhorst (2008) reconstructs *yos-bʰo- , morphonotactically illicit according to me; I don’t see any reason not to accept *-p- in this context. Even so, Kloekhorst might be right that we are ultimately dealing with the same morpheme – because if *-bʰo- does not occur following -s- and *-p-o- does, we could argue that the extension *-p- in fact reflects an allomorphic variant of -bʰ-.

2.6  **Hittite alpaš** ‘cloud’

Hitt. alpaš ‘cloud’ constitutes a problem because the expected reflex of *h₂- does not surface (Lubotsky 1989). Kortlandt (2003: 11) argues that it is a loanword from a non-Anatolian language. He gives five reasons:

a) it is not found in Indo-Iranian or Tocharian  
b) it has a variant *elbʰ- in Slavic  
c) it has an alternating suffix -it-, -ut- in Slavic and the same suffix with an infixed nasal in Slavic in the word for ‘swan’  
d) it plays a role in Germanic mythology (cf. Eng. elf)
it is frequent in European geographical names (Alba, Albion, Elbe, the Alps)

We might add

the fact that -pa- < *-bʰo- is virtually non-existent in the older Anatolian languages

The initial stop in Fi. kalvas, kalpea ‘pale’ and North Saami guolbben (regularly < *kalpen-; ~ NHG dial. Alven, ODan. alve [mod. al] ‘chalky sand underneath the top soil; sandy plain’) directly reflects a laryngeal in PIE *h₂él-bʰo- (a joint etymology by Petri Kallio and Jorma Koivulehto, see e.g. Kallio 1998 and Koivulehto 2003: 289, 298);

The seemingly absent initial laryngeal is thus secured by loans in Fennic. I do not see any semantic problem in connecting alpaš with Lat. albus ‘white’ and its cognates (as a loanword from a non-Anatolian, but still IE language), pace Puhvel HED 1/2: 38 and Kloekhorst 2008: 169; it does not always refer to dark thunder clouds, which can easily be covered by a generic cloud term anyway. Neither does the unique Hittite meaning need worry us since the motivation for the borrowing was most likely mythological, either going via ‘vapour, spirit’ as in Gmc. *albi- ‘white creature connected with the fog’ (an original dichotomy of white ljósafar as opposed to the dark dakkálfar, cf. also NHG Weiße Frauen, Dutch Witte Wieven) or ‘upper world’ as in Celtic, cf. also Eng. sky ~ ON ský ‘cloud’.

One might visualize a connection with Hitt. alpant- if this is a variant of alwanz- ‘being bewitched, affected by sorcery’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 171). But note that the similarity with Turkic arba ‘hexen, bezaubern, wahrsagen’, at first glance of course superficial, constitutes a parallel to Gk. ἄλφι n. ‘barley-groats’, Alb. elp. -bi ‘barley’ vs. Turkic arpa ‘barley’, Mong. arbaj id. The narrow semantics is in both cases coupled with a correspondence between -l- in the Indo-European forms and -r- in Altaic. At the same time, a form *arpa also occurs in Uralic word for ‘withcraft’. As is well known, religious and agricultural terms are both typical loanwords. While Blažek (2012) prefers an Indo-European (Iranian) origin of the Altaic words for ‘barley’, several facts do point to a borrowing in the reverse direction. First of all, the word is “unusually common in the Turkic languages” (Stachowski 12); the Turkic word is already regarded the source of the Mongolian and Tungusic forms;
within Iranian, the word is not found outside East Iranian (Stachowski); and its only cognates are found in Greek and Albanian, both Balkan languages. As Stachowski writes, most previous works have uncritically quoted previous works about the possible Iranian origin of the Turkic term. Tatarincev (2000) suggests that the word is an inner-Turkic derivative, formed by *ar- ‘multiply oneself, be numerous’ with a suffix denoting intensification, cf. Old Turkic arka ‘multitude; collection; crowd, group’, Mong. arbin ‘plentiful’. Martin (1987) and Omodaka (2000) have added OJap. *apa ‘millet’ as a plausible cognate; I do not see how Stachowski can conclude that this speaks for Tatarincev’s inner-Turkic derivation, but in any case it strengthens the hypothesis that we are dealing with an Altaic agricultural term of great age.

If the ‘barley’-word is indeed of Turkic or even Altaic origin, it seems justified to hypothesize a similar origin of Hitt. alpant- ~ alwanz-. The lambdacization in either word does not have to have happened after the borrowing since confusion between liquids is a common phenomenon already within older Altaic languages (Granberg 2008). However, there is also a possibility that *arpa is a Uralic word borrowed into Turkic at an early stage if -pa could be identified as the participial suffix.

Whatever the exact history of these two words, most signs point to an extra-Indo-European origin of both of them. Hence, alpant- and alwanz-, as well as the designations for ‘barley’, should be kept apart from alpaš until stronger evidence for a connection shows up.

3 Verbal *-bʰ- and roots of the structure CVRbʰ- in Anatolian

Let us now have a look at Anatolian verbal roots of the structure CeR(-)bʰ-, since these are all roots that could possibly contain a verbal extension *-bʰ-:

3.1 Hittite karp-iyezzi ‘to take (away), lift (up), pluck’

Kloekhorst (1998: 453) derives Hitt. karp-iyezzi ‘to take (away), lift up, lift, pluck’ from PIE *(s)kerp- (Lat. carpō ‘pick, pluck’ etc.), as opposed to Oettinger (1979: 345) who traces it back to PIE *gʰreb(h)₁ ‘to dig’. Even in the latter case, it seems to have root-final *-h₁- (see Olsen 1993) and thus does not count as an original example of *-bʰ-.
3.2 HITTITE KARAPI, KARE/IPANZI ‘TO DEVOUR’

Kloekhorst (2008: 442-444) derives Hitt. karapi, kare/ipanzi ‘to devour’ from the root *gʰerbh₁- (> Skt. grbhnāti ‘to seize’ and ON grāpa ‘id.’) But ON grāpa continues < PGmc. *grēP- < PIE *gʰrēbʰ-n- rather than *gʰrēb- (Kroonen 2012). Instead this verb should be grouped with Nw. garva, garpa, gurpa ‘devour, gobble, belch’, assuming the doublets reflect an ablauting iterative doublet *garppōþi, *garbunanþi ~ *gurppōþi, *gurbunanþi < *g(o)rbʰ-n̥h₂-½ti, *gh(o)rbʰ-½n̥-énti. In either case, the aspiration of the root-final *-bʰ- seems not to be original, but reflects PIE *-b(h)- (see again Olsen 1993).

3.3 HITTITE ḤARP(P)- ‘TO CHANGE ALLEGIANCE’

Kloekhorst (1998: 311, 2008: 442-444) connects Hitt. ḫarp(p)- ‘to change allegiance etc.’ to PIE *h₁erbh- (> Gk. ὥρφανος ‘orphan’ etc.). This is the only certain example of a final *-bʰ- in a triconsonantal root, but it still bears no signs of having resulted from extension of a shorter root.

3.4 HITTITE ḤUPPIYA- ‘THROWS, HURLS’

In Hyllested & Cohen (2007), our aim was to show that it is phonologically unproblematic to link Gk. ὑφαίνω ‘weave’ to Hitt. ḫuwapp- (allegedly ‘interlace, entangle’, Puhvel 1991), despite the lack of prothetic vowel in Greek. This is because there are no examples of initial u- diphthongs before a labial in Greek except for late inner-Gk. formations; both full-grade *(H)euP- and zero-grade *HuP- regularly yield Proto-Gk. *uP-. Recently, however, Melchert (2007) has shown that ḫuwapp- rather means ‘throw, hurl’. This obviously does not contradict the Greek rule, but it does remove one important piece of positive evidence, and, more importantly, it seems to undermine the evidence for *h₂ in ‘weave’ (cf. also van Beek 2011).

Since Neu (1998), another candidate for a cognate of weave etc. has been the hapax wepuš wēpta in the fragment KBo. 42.6, 9 (13th c. BC) whose exact interpretation is still debatable:

(8) [...]-zi-mi-iš ḫD-aš ar-ru-ma-ar e-ep-t[a ...]
(9) [...]x-ni ū-e-pu-uš ū-e-ep-ta nu=mu TŪG-an=mi-i[t ...]
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'[sby] took the washing of the river [or in the rivers]
'[sby] wep-ed wep-s and [...]ed my clothing for me'

Reconstructing PIE ‘weave’ as either *$h_1$-ye$b^h$- or *$yeb^b$- is problematic since it precludes a $^b$-extension of PIE *$h_2$-ey- ‘id.’ > e.g. Skt. vāyati, Lith. ėudžiu (< *$h_2$-ey-)$-d$-, whose initial laryngeal is needed to account for the initial *$k$- in the Fenno-Permian loan *kuđa- ‘weave’ (> Fi. kuto-, N Saami godde-, Mordv. koda-, Komi kyj-).

Furthermore, the VN arrumar ‘washing’ is mentioned before the wep-sequence, suggesting this does not refer to fulling. It could refer to the washing of wool fibers before the preparation for spinning, but this was carried out in hot water (i.e. not a river), and the process involved a lot of intermediate activities – drying, beating, cleansing, carding, grading, bleaching – not mentioned in the fragment (Breniquet 2010).

Since the concept of ‘throwing’ is central to also to ancient weaving, cf.:

a) Eng. warp ~ OE weorpan ‘to throw’ and
b) to throw the shuttle

it could be that $huwapp$- belongs with weave after all, having preserved an original PIE meaning that was specialized in Core IE after the Anatolian split-off; Andrés-Toledo (2010), too, suggests a late semantic narrowing, but from an original meaning ‘bind, interlace’, based partly on the now rejected Hitt. meaning, and partly on Indo-Iranian which also displays the meaning ‘weave’. As Melchert notes, the Hitt. hapax $hîpala$- ‘fish-net’ does not have to be derived from a verb ‘weave’ because a net is something you cast out.

The sumerogram TÚG ‘clothes’ represents Hitt. $wašpaš$ (Goetze 1969) which often specifically means ‘shroud; clothes of the dead’, hence Lat. vespillo ‘undertaker; grave robber’ (Watkins 1969) < *$yes$p- ‘dress’ (see also Katz 2000). It occurs elsewhere in Hitt. texts that a dying man himself is calling for his shroud or his washing. In the Old Hittite-Akkadian Testament (§ 3, Kbo III 64-73, Melchert 1991: 183), the dying king Hattušiliš says ‘wash me well; protect me at your bosom from the earth’ (Melchert 1986) and the Soldier’s Dirge reads

Nešaš $wašpeš$ Nešaš $wašpeš$
tiya=mmu tiya
nu=mu annaš=maš katta arnut
tiya=mmu tiya
nu=mu uwaš=maš katta arnut
tiya=mmu tiya

'shrouds of Neša, shrouds of Neša
wrap me, wrap
put me down for burial with my mother
wrap me, wrap
put me down for burial with my forefathers
wrap me, wrap'

It is noteworthy that the passage makes use of alliteration (involving four words):

... ēpta ... wepuš wēpta ... *wašpan ...

Because a figura etymologica of a similar shape, again used with a word for 'toga' in the acc., occurs in the S Picene epitaph TE 2 from Bellante:

'along the road you see / the toga (or covering) of Titus Allius (?) / buried (?) in this tomb (?)

This stylistic feature is of PIE age (Watkins 1995: 131-133, Fortson 2002: 73), and the SPic. vep- even occurs in non-etymological alliterations such as veiat vepeti 'lies … in the tomb' in MC 1 from Loro Piceno:

'The elder lies, the Picene chief, in the middle of the tomb'

Correspondingly, Ved. vap- 'strew' and its derivative vapus- 'wonder', transposed to meanings like 'color; covering; clothing', forms an alliterative pair with vas- 'to wear, to dress' (Katz 2009, Jackson):

RV 3.55 14 (Heaven and Earth according to Sāyaṇa; but perhaps Dawn and her Sun-god husband, Sūrya)

pádyā vaste pururúpā vápuṇṣy ārdhvā tasthau tryávimi rérihāṇā
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rtāsyā sādma vi carāmi vidvān mahād devānām asuratvām ēkam

‘Unten kleidet sich die Vielfarbige in schöne Formen; sie richtet sich empor, das anderthalbjährige Rind leckend. Ich durchwandere als Wissender die Stätte der Wahrheit. Groß ist die einzige Asuramacht der Götter.’

RV 1.160, 2 (Heaven and Earth):

uruvyācasā mahinī asascatā pitā mātā ca bhuvanāni rakṣataḥ
sudhīṣṭame vapuṣyē nā rōdasi pitā yāt sim abhi rūpair āvāsayat

‘Breiträumig, großmächtig, nie versiegend, behüten Vater und Mutter die Geschöpfe. Die sehr kecken (?) Rodasi sind wie zwei schöne Frauen, da der Vater sie in Farben kleidete.’

MŚ 3.11.9

sārasvati manasā peśalam vasu nāsatyabhyaṁ vayati darśatāṁ vāpuḥ peśalam, cf. RV 1.92.4 (Dawn): peśāṇi vapate, but no figura etymologica (Katz 2009)

It is thus conceivable that KBo. 42.6, 9 describes a burial rite with a dying or even dead person speaking, and that both the Hittite and South Picene items represent PIE *u̯ep- ‘to adorn, to make ready by adorning’ (pace Meiser 48-49). Katz (2009) adds to this root Gk. ὀπυίω ‘marry’ on the basis of a new sound-law for Greek that makes *u̯- disappear in this context.

I see no reason to leave out ORu. vapī ‘color’, vapīno ‘chalk’, OPr. woapis ‘color’ and Latv. væpe ‘glaze’ from this family; cf. the parallel in OPr. sirmen ‘funeral rite’ ~ sirmes ‘washing lye made of ashes’ ~ Lith. širmas ‘white; grey’ (Gliwa 2005). On the concept of color in prehistoric funeral rites in general, see Jones-Bley (2005).

The spelling with single -p- in wepuš is problematic, but it is a hapax preceding wēpta which may have influenced it. The plene spelling of huwapp- is no less problematic, but at least the semantic comparison between a verb meaning ‘to throw’ and ‘to weave’ need not be.

Katz connects them with Hitt. wappu- ‘riverbank’ (< ‘heaped-up earth’) and Skt. vápra- ‘heap of earth via the meaning ‘heaped up (finery)’. I propose an alternative: These belong with *ōferaz ~ *ōferan-
‘bank, shore’ (MHG uover, NHG Ufer etc.), Gk. ἤπειρος ‘the land as opposed to the sea’ and perhaps Lith. upė ‘river’. This would be the only case of expected PGmc. *wôf- ~ *wôb-, and it is conceivable that such a sequence with two labial fricatives and a rounded vowel in the middle would be subject to dissimilation.

4 Conclusions

The lack of evidence for both nominal *-bʰo- and verbal extensions in *-bʰo- in Anatolian strengthens the hypothesis that these two elements are ultimately identical. They were not derived from verbal roots in PIE; rather do they belong to a more distant past where they formed present participles indifferent to voice (like PU *-pā), and, like Eng. -ing, it ended up synchronically as a derivational suffix for both agent nouns, abstract nouns, result nouns and adjectives. Its occurrence in animal names is language-specific, based on substantivizations of color adjectives. PIE *-bʰo-, thus already declining as a participle marker, gradually became replaced by *-nt- (which also has a counterpart in Uralic). Since Anatolian broke off the core first, it is logical if the tendency was weakened further (and *-nt- correspondingly strengthened) in this branch. As is well-known, the use of *-nt- in Anatolian goes far beyond the formation of participles. We would expect a few lexicalized forms with *-bʰo- to be preserved as relics, although not necessarily for us to study as attestations in the corpus. What is relevant is not whether we can eliminate the examples altogether, but that we have so few of them in any case.
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On the Precursors of Celtic and Germanic

Abstract

A “Celto-Germanicism” may be defined as a lexeme shared by Celtic and Germanic only and appearing to be older than the emergence of Proto-Celtic and Proto-Germanic. Around 100 such items can be found, some of which are IE archaisms, while others look like morphological or semantic innovations. There is also a group of isolated lexemes which appears to have been borrowed from the same third source. Four fifths fall into two semantic spheres: 1) religion and healing, and 2) warfare and equestrian terminology. Most remarkable is the occurrence of as many as ten common words for ‘wound, injury’. This situation must reflect close contacts between speakers of the Indo-European dialects that later evolved into Proto-Celtic and Proto-Germanic respectively. We may tentatively fix this cultural unity in time and space in Eastern Central Europe around 2000 BCE, when the pre-Celtic Únětice culture bordered late varieties of the Corded Ware culture. Some shared loanwords can be traced back to Proto-Fennic, suggesting a continuum stretching further to the North. There are even indications that Proto-Fennic may have been in direct contact with Pre-Proto-Celtic, not always with Pre-Proto-Germanic as the provider. Words of possible Fennic origin include PCelt. *lubi-i ‘wort’ ~ PGmc. *lubja- ‘poisoning or healing plant’, PCelt. *sanesto- ‘secret advice’, PCelt. *magos ‘plain, open field’, NIr. lón ‘lunch’, PCelt. *klamo- ‘disease’, and PGmc. *haljō- ‘abode of the dead’.

The present article was published as Hyllested 2010. Apart from this footnote (including the reference just mentioned), the abstract, the comments on Zair’s (2012) review and the inclusion of a new item no. 5) *uitelo- (shifting each subsequent footnote by one), the two articles are identical.
1 Loanword or heritage?

While Germanic has quite a few Celtic loanwords (see, e.g., de Vries 1960, Birkhan 1970, Mees 1998, Rübekeil 2002, Schumacher 2007), the share of older Germanic material in Celtic is comparatively small (Lane 1933: 264, and Schumacher 2007: 174-176). However, Celtic and Germanic also share lexical material exclusive to these branches that can be independently traced back to an identical reconstructed protoform. Therefore, it is often hard to determine whether a given Celto-Germanicism is inherited from PIE or borrowed from one branch to the other at a later age. Karsten (1927: 126) wrote on PGmc. *arbja- vs. PCelt. *orbios 'heir' and PGmc. *aifth- vs. PCelt. *oito- 'oath': “kan likaså vara antingen urbesläktat med eller lån [might just as well be inherited as borrowed]”. Krahe (1954: 142) used the same lexeme as an example: “Die Hauptmasse des gemeinsamen nur keltisch-germanischen Wortschatzes reicht – ohne daß vom rein linguistischen Standpunkt Anhaltspunkte für eine Entlehnung aus der einen in die andere Sprache gegeben werden könnten – bis vor die Periode der Lautverschiebung zurück (Typus got. aipbs – air. øeth usw.)”. Olsen (1988: 13) writes on PGmc. *gislo- 'hostage' vs. PCelt. *geistlo- 'id.': “It is not certain whether the Gmc. examples are inherited or Celtic loanwords”. Casaretto (2004: 318, fn. 1051) on PGmc. *rūnō- 'secret' vs. PCelt. *rūnā- 'id.': “Ob diese Parallellität Lohnbeziehungen oder ein gemeinsames Erbe reflektiert, ist unsicher”. Ringe (2006: 296) states: “There are also quite a few words shared only by Celtic and Germanic, which might or might not be loanwords ...”. Matasović (2009: 227) on Proto-Celtic *krumbo- 'round, curved': “Germ. krumm, OE crumb 'round' point to PGerm. *krumba-, which was borrowed either from Celtic, or from the same non-IE source as the Celtic words”. Polomé (1983: 284) summed up the problem complex, listing four possible origins of a Celto-Germanicism: a) the terms represented either a common regional innovation in a marginal area of the Indo-European territory or the localized survival of an archaic term lost elsewhere throughout the Indo-European Linguistic area; b) the terms have both been taken over from a same third source – be it a Pre-Indo-European ('substrate') language or less well-documented Indo-European language in their vicinity; c) the Celtic term was borrowed by Germanic; d) the Germanic term was borrowed by Celtic.” Lane (1933) and Elston (1934) excluded borrowing, i.e. possibility c) and d), whene-
ver it could not be proved directly. In the following, I will use the term “Celto-Germanicism” for items believed to be older than the emergence of Proto-Celtic and Proto-Germanic, but shared by these two branches only, i.e. Polomé’s categories a) and b).

2 Semantic spheres

Scholars already noted long ago that such Celto-Germanicism pertain to certain semantic spheres. Thus, Lane (1933) suggested the following headings:

- a) Political and legal vocabulary
- b) Warfare
- c) Cultural and technical vocabulary, dwelling
- d) Nature, earth, land, plant and animal life
- e) Motion, locomotion, transportation
- f) The body and bodily functions
- g) Mental and emotional activity, vocal utterance
- h) Sense perception
- i) Family
- j) Religion, superstition
- k) Miscellaneous

and Krahe (1959: 139-141):
- a) Religion und Geistiges Leben
- b) Pferdezucht und Reiten
- c) Siedlung, Hausbau
- d) Landschaft, Natur
- e) Metalle
- f) Sonstiges

Elston (1934) and Campanile (1970) had still other divisions. On one hand, it is interesting to observe how an overrepresentation of shared vocabulary in certain semantic fields hints at the character of the rela-

---

2 Schmidt (1984, 1986, 1987, 1991) proposed a five-stratum model: stratum 1, whose Celtic origin is proved by their form; stratum 2, Celto-Germanic isoglosses with the same semantic shift; stratum 3, Celto-Germanic isoglosses without the same semantic shift; stratum 4, a group with special problems in the semantic field of craftsmanship; and stratum 5, name-doublets.
relationship in question. On the other hand, it seems as if Lane’s and Krahe’s lists cover most parts of the lexicon. If the lexical commonalities could be combined with shared innovations and archaisms in the phonological or grammatical system, it would be the obvious thing to hypothesize that Celtic and Germanic formed a subgroup within the Indo-European family. This seems not to be the case. A closer scrutiny of the material indeed reveals a much less blurred and much more unambiguous picture of the character of the earliest Celtic-Germanic relations.

3 The material

Lists of Celto-Germanicisms have been compiled by Lane (1933), Elston (1934), Krahe (1956), de Vries (1960), Chemodanov (1962), Campanile (1969, 1970), and Polomé (1983). What follows is a revised and updated synthesis of their material with the addition of new items. Celto-Germanicisms include a) lexemes with a specialized meaning or use shared by Celtic and Germanic, b) formations particular to Celtic and Germanic (although formed from well-known PIE elements) and c) lexemes whose very roots or root variants are unknown outside Celtic and Germanic. The items have been grouped according to meaning (see section 4 below), but within these semantic groupings they appear in a more or less random order.

3 The features mentioned by Schmidt (1991: 146-147) are either too weak or too common to count as obviously shared innovations.

4 Space does not allow a word-to-word treatment of items that I have refused to include as true Celto-Germanicisms. A few examples may serve as prototypes: Craig Melchert (p.c.) kindly points out to me that *tegu- ‘thick’ in OIr tiug, W tew ~ OE þiċċ, OHG dicki, ON þykkr ‘thick’ vs. Lith. tānkus id. < *tenk-(u/-to)- is probably also attested in Hittite tagu- ‘thick, swollen’ < *tou- (Neu 1995); *luH-s ‘louse’ > W lāu ‘lice’ (< collective *luā < *luH-ch₂) Corn. low, Bret. laou id., OW leu-esc ‘louse-eaten’ ~ ON lis, OE, OHG liis ‘louse’ vs. Toch. B luwo A lu pl. lwā ‘animal’ probably also forms the basis of Lith. liūlė ‘louse’ (where -lė is diminutive, cf. brolė ‘brother’); PCelt. *korkio- ‘oats’ (believed by Matasović 2009 to be of a common substratum origin) corresponds to Shughni sip(i)yak ‘a kind of millet’, sepyak ‘grain of wheat’ according to Stalmaszyk and Witczak (1991-1992); Rasmussen (1998) regards PGmc. *landa- ‘(open) land’ as a borrowing from Celtic proper. Despite the intriguing similarity, OIr. nasc ‘ring; clasp; bond, tie’ (~ nascim ‘to bind’) is most likely unrelated to OHG nusca, OS nuscia ‘clasp, buckle’ which is rather a Balto-Fennic borrowing, cf. Fi. nuska, nurkka ‘corner, nook’, especially since another word for ‘buckle’, ON sylgia, is already known to originate from Balto-Fennic (for the semantics, compare the
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Category 1

A. Unique meaning

1) PCelt. *soito* - 'sorcery' > MW *hut*, Bret. *hud* 'magic' ~ PGmc. *saiða-* > ON 'seiðr' 'magic; spell, charm, enchantment', *sīða* 'work a charm through *seiðr*. Probably identical to PIE *soi-
to-* 'string, rope', derived from *sēh₂-* 'to bind', cf. Lith. saūtās 'sign, soothsaying, soothsayer, talisman', but in Baltic also still 'string, necklace etc.', cf. Lith. sīétas, Latv. sīte id. 5

2) PCelt. *oitos* 'oath' > OIr *óeth*, MW *an-udon* 'perjury' ~ PGmc. *aí paz* 'oath' > OE ēþ, OHG ēid, ON *eídr*, Goth. *aíps* 'oath', OS mēn-ēþ 'perjury'; vs. Gk. *οἶτος* 'faith', all from PIE *h₁-βκφǣἄǿἄκῖǿsġφ*-*to-* 'wALK(ing)', derived from *h₁-ēþ* 'to go', cf. ON *ganga eið* 'take the oath' (see also Schumacher 2007: 176-177) 6.

3) PIE *kor-jo-no-* in the epithet of a god: OBrit. tribal name Coriono-tōtae 'people of the army-lord (a god, probably Lugus) ~ PGmc. *harjanaz* > ON Herjann 'lord of the army', epithet of Odin; vs. Gk. koīrānos 'ruler, commander' < *koīrōnos* (Meid 1991: 48-49)

4) A personalized form meaning 'ghost' of PIE *dʰrougʰós*; OIr. air-drech 'phantom', Mfr. aur-fraich 'ghost' ~ ON draugr 'ghost' vs. Ved. drógha- 'deceiving', Av. draoga- 'lie' (Mallory & Adams) 7.

5) PCelt. *uitelo* > Mfr. fiothál 'dwarf, hag, goblin; anything stunted' ~ PGmc. *wīþila-* > OE widl 'impurity', OHG *widil*, widillo 'homosexual, hermaphrodite, effeminate male'; both personified, vs. Lat. vitilīgō 'psoriasis, skin affliction', deri-

---


6. Nicholas Zair (p.c.) points out to me that since no derivative of *ganga* in itself means 'oath', *ganga eið* does not in itself suggest that *Hōi-to-* is derived from 'to go', and a connection with the root of Hitt. *hā(i)-* 'believe' must also be considered (Puhvel 1991: 10). However, this does not affect its status as a Celto-Germanicism.

7. OIr *drech* may also be identical to *drech* 'vision' < PCelt. *drikā*, derived from *dʰrk-* 'to see'.
ved from *vitilis 'affliction' (Kerkhof 2012). Derivatives from *
ueith₁- 'to twist', cf. also Lat. vitium 'defect, fault'.

B. Unique morphology

6) PCelt. *rūna- > OIr. rún 'secret', MW rhin 'spell, enchant-
ment' ~ PGmc. *rū-nō- 'secret' > OE rūn, OS rūna 'whisper;
secret; a rune', ON rūn 'rune; secret'.

7) Gaul. (Chamalières) ande- dion uēdiū- mi 'I praise a god' ~
Goth. in-weitan guþ 'to praise God' < *meîd- 'see' where an-
de- semantically corresponds to in- (de Bernardo Stempel
2001).

8) PCelt. *nem-eto- 'sacred grove, sanctuary' > Gaul. vēmētov
(Vaison), OIr. nemed 'sanctuary' ~ PGmc. *nemīpā- > OS,
OLFr. nimidas 'sacred grove' vs. Lat. nemus 'sacred grove',
Gk. vēmos 'wooded pasture, glade'.

9) PCelt. *daunā > Mfr. dúan 'poem' ~ ON táfón 'sacrificial
animal' < *dapo-no- vs. Lat. daps 'sacrificial meal' < PIE *dapo-

10) PCelt. *uiro-k(ʷ)ū-, gen. -kunos 'werewolf' > Celtib. (Botor-
rita III) uiroku, OIr. Ferchú, OW Gurci, OBret. Gurki '(na-
me of a) werewolf' (Mc Cone 1987; Mc Cone 2005: 401) ~ OE
wer(e)wulf, Dan. varulv, Fr. loup-garou id. where -garou <
Franconian *war-ulf-.

11) PCelt. *nerto- > OIr. nert 'strength, force', OW, MW nerth,
Bret. nerzh, Gaul. PN Nerto-maras ~ Gmc. *ner-fu- > god-
ness Nerthus 'terra mater', ON Njǫrðr, father of Freyr. Deri-
vatives from PIE *h₂ner- 'man; strong' (Meid 1991: 15).

---

8 The connection to Skt. vetāla- 'demon' (Lehmann 1907) is uncertain. If it is in
fact related, the Celto-Germanic character of the present item should perhaps
rather defined as a combination of morphology (found also in Latin) and sem-
antics (found also in Indic).

9 Rasmussen’s (1986: 1, 310) judgment that "the exact correspondence between
Celtic and Germanic probably reflects an ancient borrowing in one direction or
the other" is based on an isolated view of this lexeme. Contra Rasmussen’s co-
nnection with some Greek material, see Vine (2002: 206ff.).

10 As she notes, Goth. inweitan takes the accusative while the Greek original takes
the dative, i.e. chances are that this is not a Greek calque.

11 The Celto-Germanic morphology also differs from Hitt. tappala- 'person re-
ponsible for court cooking', if in fact belongs to the same root.

C. Isolated lexemes


17) PCelt. *klamo- > OIr clam, W claff ‘grave’ ~ PGmc. *skalmō ‘plague, (cow’s) disease; evil spirit, crook’. Perhaps both from PIE *skalm-os ‘disease, evil spirit’, but the Proto-Celtic vocalism is not entirely clear; syllabic *-l- preceding *-m would normally yield *-li-.14

18) PCelt. *skāx-slo- ‘demon, supernatural being’ > OIr scál ‘phantom’, MW yscawl ‘young hero, warrior’ ~ PGmc. skōh-sla- > Got. skōhslo ‘evil spirit, demon’; both from *skōk-slo-.


---

12 I assume Lat. vātēs ‘prophet, seer’ to be a loan from Celtic.

13 It is no longer necessary to reconstruct a labiovelar for this word to account for -w- in Welsh; cf. Schrijver 1992 and Jørgensen 2010. Zair (2012: 80) in his re-view objects that a connection with Lat. īnsece ‘say’ “still seems very plausible”. I do not quite understand this message, since I indeed do follow Schrijver and Jørgensen in leaving out the labiovelar, paving the way for both forms to match the Latin material. Even if Lat. īnsece is related, I will maintain that the nominal formation with *-lo- (and its meaning) constitutes a Celto-Germanicism, albeit belonging to category II.

14 If Alb. helm ‘poison’ belongs here, the Celto-Germanic connection is less clear.
Category II

A. Unique morphology (and meaning)

20) PCelt. *kol-ino- > Ir. cuilenn, W celyn ‘holly’ ~ PGmc. *hul-isa- > OE holegn, OHG hulis, OFr. *huls > Fr. houx ‘holly’; vs. OCS *klasū ‘ear of grain’, Toch. B klese ‘barley meal’, Alb. kalli ‘straw, chaff’, Skt. kaṭamba- ‘arrow’, all from PIE *kel- ‘sharp, prickly’. According to Pliny, the plant was a popular house adornment among Celtic and Germanic peoples. In Germany and Austria, holly is traditionally placed in stables to protect horses from evil spirits15.

21) *kỳondʰ-neh₂ ‘Angelica’ > Ir. cuinneóg ‘wild angelica, Angelica silvestris’ ~ PGmc. *hwannō > ON hvǫnn ‘holy ghost, Angelica archangelica’ vs. *kỳendʰ-ro- with other meanings in Lith. švéndras ‘reed, reed-mace’; Lat. combrētum ‘a kind of rush’. Angelica is an old medicinal herb and was used against evil spirits (Birkhan 1999).

B. Isolated lexemes


Category III

A. Unique meaning

15 The holly’s connection to both horses and evil spirits may be due to the near-homonymy of PGmc. *marha- m. ‘horse’, *marhjō- ‘mare’ and *marō- f. ‘female incubus’, let alone their complete homonymy in Scandinavian—cf. the ambiguous names of the holly, Dan. mærtorn, mareved, maretisel, marelok, Nw. mærkvist, Sw. markvist, marlock, martova, Icel. marhrísla, MLG marvechte, marlock, małżopf. Other Germanic names refer to the spirits only: Nw. huldrelime, NHG Schrattelbaum, Hexenbesen, Eng. dial. witch’s besom.
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23) PIE *stér-\-bʰeh₂ 'stiffness' in the specialized meaning 'death; plague': OIr. us-\-sarb 'death'\textsuperscript{16} ~ OHG sterbo, OE steorfą 'plague' vs. Gk. στέρφος 'animal skin, leather', all from *stér- 'be stiff'.

B. Unique morphology

24) *(H)órνbʰ-\-m n. 'leavings' and *(H)órųbʰ-\-o-m n. 'inheritance' > OIr orbae 'inheritance', Gaul. Orbio- 'id.', OIr. orb(b)e, orpe 'heir; inheritance' ~ Goth. arþja 'heir', arbi 'inheritance', OHG erbi, OE ierfe 'id.' vs. *(H)orbʰ-o- 'orphaned' > Lat. orbus 'deprived', Gk. ὀρφανός 'orphaned', Arm. orb 'orphan', Skt. ārbha- 'small; weak; child' (McCone 1999).

25) PIE *kɾejiH- in *kɾiH-\-no > PCelt. *kɾiHo- > OIr crin 'enfeebled by old age, decrepit; withered', OW crin ~ *kɾiH-\-yo-\-m > PGmc. *hraiw- n. > Goth. *hraiw in hraiwa-dubő 'turtle dove', ON hrae 'dead body', OE hrǣw 'id.', OHG hrēo 'dead body; grave; funeral; death' vs. the unextended root *khrů-, 'to break' (Casaretto 2004: 164).

26) PCelt. *uer-t- > OIr fertae (< *-iā) 'burial mound', W gwerthyr 'fort' (< *-ero-) geryd (< *-eto-) 'earth, soil; grave' ~ OE weord 'yard', weard 'guarding', ON varða, varði 'milestone', vǫrðr 'warden, watchman, defender; guardian spirit, house spirit, soul of the dead'.

C. Isolated lexemes

27) PCelt. *doueno- > OIr pl. dóini, doíni 'men', poetic sg. doín, doén 'man'\textsuperscript{17} ~ PGmc. *dewena- > Goth. diwans 'mortal', cf. the verb OHG touwen, OS dōian ON deyja 'die'.


---

\textsuperscript{16} OIr -rb- in us-\-sarb may be from *-rųí- instead, cf. marb 'dead' < *mr-\-ųo-s.

\textsuperscript{17} Historically a suppletive paradigm with the sg. duin from PCelt. *gdnio-'earthling' corresponding to Ved. ksāmya- 'earthly, mortal', cf. Gaul. TEVONION (Vercelli) 'of god and men'. Even if Latin funus 'funeral procession' is related, the item still constitutes a Celto-Germanicism in terms of semantics and word-formation (cf. Rasmussen 1988:92–3).
29) PCelt. *trusko-* > OIr. *tros* 'leprous; leper', W *trwsgl* 'rude; clumsy', Bret. *trousk* 'polyps' ~ Goth. *þruts-fill*, OE *drüst-fell* 'leprosy'.

Category IV

A. Unique meaning


32) PIE *kel-* 'strike' used in words for 'battle': PCelt. *kellákō-* > MIr *cellach* 'contention, strife' ~ OE *hild* 'war, battle', OHG *hiltia*, ON *hildr* 'battle' (corresponding to the ethnonym *Celtae*).

33) PCelt. *trex-so-* > OIr. *tress* 'battle' and *trex-s-no-* > OIr *trēn* 'brave, strong', comp. sup. *tressa*, *tressam* ~ PGmc. *þrak-ja-* > OE *þrecc* 'force, oppression', OS *wāpan-threki* 'ability with arms', ON *þrekr* 'strength, bravery'.

34) PCelt. *kagro-* 'enclosure, fort' > W *caer*, Mbret. *ker*; and *kagio-* 'pen, enclosure' > MW *cae* 'fence', OBret. *caio* pl. 'fortification, bulwark' ~ PGmc. *hagan- 'enclosure, fence' > ON *hagi* 'pasture with a fence', OE *haga*, OHG *hac* 'hedge' and *hagiō-* > OE *hæcg* 'hedge'.

B. Unique morphology

35) PCelt. *drungo-* > Ir. *drong* 'troop', MW *dronn* 'multitude', Gallo-Lat. (Vegetius) *drungos* 'groups of enemies' ~ PGmc. *drūhta-* > OE *dryht* 'companion', OHG *truht* 'troop' ON *drōtt* 'company, following', Goth. *drīgan* 'to serve as a soldier' vs. OCS *drūgā* 'friend, other' *draūgas* 'friend'.

36) PCelt. *uik-* 'fight' > Ir. *fichim* 'fight', *fecht* 'military expedition', OW *guith* 'front' ~ Goth. *weihan*, OE, OHG *wihan*
‘fight’, ON vega ‘kill, fight’ vs. Lat. vincō ‘conquer’, Lith. veikti ‘make, work’.18

37) PCelt. *kauno- ‘harbor’ > MIr. cúan ~ PGmc. *haf-na-; originally ‘enclosure, shelter (for vessels)’.


C. Isolated lexemes

41) PCelt. *nanti- > OIr. néit ‘battle, combat’, Néit ‘god of battle, husband of the war-goddess Nemain or Badb’ ~ PGmc. *nanþjana- > OE nēþan, OHG gi-nenden, ON nenna, Goth. ana-nanþjan ‘to dare’.


18 Brent Vine (p.c.) points out to me that while the nasal present in Lat. vincō appears (predictably) beside an old root aorist in perf. viciā, in theory (despite Liv. 670-671) the Celtic and Germanic presents could also be derived from the old root aorist (e.g.: root aorist subjunctive → thematic present is well-attested). In that case, the Germanic and Célto-Germanic material might be closely related, morphologically, to the old aorist (as in Latin), and since the Latin semantics is quite similar to the one shared by Celtic and Germanic, only the development into a thematic present would then point to a Celto-Germanicism.

19 Remarkably, Badb is the sister of Macha, married to Nemed, and of Mor-rígaim; of these four names, the first three are all Célto-Germanicisms, while cognates of Mor- are also found in Slavic.


48) PCelt. *gweilti ‘madman, lunatic’ > OIr. geilt ‘panic-stricken fugitive from battle’, W gwyllt ‘wild, savage, mad’ ~ Goth. wilþeis, OE wilde, OHG wildi, ON vildr ‘wild’.


52) PCelt. *dūno- ‘fortification, rampart’ > Ir. dúin, W din, Gaul. -dūnum in place-names ~ ON and OE tūn ‘hedge or fenced lot, enclosure’; OHG zūn ‘enclosure, hedge’.

53) Ir. clíab ‘*shield (of wicker-work)’ > ‘basket; wicker frame of a boat; chest’ ~ ON hlif ‘shield, protection’, OHG lipen, lipp- ‘protect’, Goth. kleibjan ‘take the part of’.

---

20 Even if Latv. buôzties ‘be annoyed’ belongs here (LIV ² 68 *bʰe₁gʰ-), Celtic and Germanic still share a common semantics.

21 NE booty is a borrowing from Scandinavian.

22 Even if these words are derived from a PIE root *dʰe₁gʰ- ‘be finished, come full circle’ (Watkins 1991:453), the derivative and its meaning are specific to Celtic and Germanic.
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54) NIr taiml, Bret. talm ‘sling’, W telm ‘snare, trap’ ~ ON þjáim ‘sort of snare’. The ON consonantism seems to indicate common heritage.

Category 5

A. Unique meaning


B. Unique morphology


C. Isolated lexemes

63) PCelt. *snad-o- > MIr snaidid ‘to cut; to scratch’, W neddyf ‘axe’ ~ OHG snatta ‘wound; scar; bruise’, ON snata ‘spear’.


**Category 6**

**A. Unique meaning**


**B. Unique morphology**


\(^{23}\) Zair (2012: 80) in his review of Hyllested 2010

\(^{24}\) Even if Lat. saevus ‘wild, ferocious’ and Hittite šāi- ‘be sullen, angry’ (see on the latter Kloekhorst 2008:692–3) are related, the Celtic and Germanic items form a semantic entity.

\(^{25}\) Zair in his review (2012: 80) asks if the Celtic/Germanic meaning ‘hatred’ is unique enough to be seen as a shared feature compared to ‘hostility’ in the Os- can form. The two meanings differ in an important way, namely that hatred refers to a feeling while hostility refers to a behavior.
C. Isolated lexemes

68) PCelt. \*loktu \> OIr. locht ‘fault, blame; mistake’ \~ PGmc. 
\*lahana- \> OE lēan, OHG lahan, ON lá ‘to blame’.

Category 7

A. Unique meaning

69) PCelt. \*reid-o- ‘ride; riding; chariot’ \> Gaul. rēda ‘travelling-
carriage with four wheels’, OIr. riadaim ‘ride (in vehicle)’, Ir.
dē-riad ‘team of two horses’, W rhwyyddau ‘facilitate, speed’ ~
ON riō, OE ridan, OHG rītan ‘to ride’; ON rēd ‘riding; horse-
se-riding band; wagon’ vs. Latv. raidīt ‘send quickly; hunt’.

B. Unique morphology

70) Compounds with \*h₁ekuo- ‘horse’ and \*reidʰ-: Gaul. PN Epo-
rēdo-rīx ~ OE eo-red, OS eo-rid-folc ‘cavalry’, ON PN Jō-
reîdr.
71) i-stem adjectives meaning ‘easy’, ‘ready’ derived from \*reidʰ-
via ‘driving’ or ‘ready to go’: PCelt. \*reidi- \> OIr. rēid ‘simple,
easy, flat’, W rhuidd, OBret. ruet ‘easy, quick’ ~ OHG bi-reiti
72) PCelt. \*axsilā > W echel, MBret. ahel ‘axis’ \~ PGmc. \*ahsulaz
> ON ñxull ‘axis’ vs. formations without \*lo- in Lat. axis,
Lith. ašis ‘id.’.
73) PCelt. \*uegno- \> OIr fēn, W gwain, Gaul. co-vinnus ‘wagon’ ~
PGmc. \*wagna- \> ON vagn, OHG wagan ‘wagon’ vs. other
formations in Skt. vāhana-, Lat. vehiculum ‘id.’.
74) PIE \*sent- ‘to travel’ in nominal formations meaning ‘road;
retinue’; PCelt. \*sentu- ‘path’ \> OIr. sēt, MW hynt ‘path’,
epynt ‘horseroad’ \~ PGmc. \*sinpha- and \*gasinpha- ‘retinue’ \> 
OHG Gisindi ‘war retinue’.

C. Isolated lexemes
75) PCelt. *marko- ‘horse’ > MIr. marc, W march, Bret. march, Gaul. (acc.sg.) μάρκαν ‘horse’, Marco- in place-names ~ OHG mar(a)h, OE meard, ON marr ‘id.’.
76) PCelt. *drux-to- > MIr. drochta ‘tub, vessel’ ~ PGmc. *trugaz > OE, ON trog, OHG troc ‘trough’.
77) PCelt. *kanx-s-ikā- > W caseg, Bret. kazeg ‘mare’, not formally identical to PGmc. *hanhista- ‘horse, stallion etc.’ (Jørgensen 2006), but their similarity can hardly be coincidental in the light of other equestrian commonalities; cf. also that PCelt. *keng-o- ‘to tread, step, walk’ is irregular in the first place.
78) PCelt. *mongo- ‘mane’ > MIr. mong, W mwng ‘id.’ ~ ON mäkki ‘upper part of a horse’s neck’, Dan. manke ‘mane’; cf. also ON mën, OE manu ‘mane’.

Category 8

A. Unique meaning

80) PCelt. *rādi- > OIr rádim ‘to say, to speak’, MW ad-raud ‘to tell’ ~ PGmc. *rōdiana- > Goth. rođan, ON rōda ‘to speak’.

B. Unique morphology

84) PCelt. *sitlā- > MIr. sithlad ‘sieving’, W hidl, MBret. sızl ‘sieve’ ~ PGmc. *sēplo- > ON sāld ‘sieve’, Fi. (< Gmc.) sielka, seula id. all from *seh₁-tlo-, *sih₁-tlo- vs. seh₁-to, *sīh₁-to in Lith. sētas, CS sīto.
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85) PCelt. *qatimā-, *qatami- > Gael. aitheamh, W edafedd 'yarn; thread' ~ PGmc. *faþmaz > OHG fadum, OE faþdum, ON faðmr 'spread arms, embrace; thread' (Hamp 2008).\(^{26}\)

86) PCelt. *iexti- > Ir icht 'tribe', W ieith 'language; nation', MBret. yez 'language' ~ PGmc. *jehti- > OHG jiht 'utterance' (cf. jehan 'to speak') vs. Lith. juokas, Lat. locus 'jest'.

87) PCelt. *rextus > OIr recht 'law, justice', MW kyf-reith 'id.' ~ PGmc. *rehtuz > ON rëttir 'justice, law' < *h₃re- with a shared, unpredictable meaning (Schumacher 2007:177).

88) PCelt. *roino- > OIr roen 'road; mountain range'; Bret. run 'hill' ~ PGmc. *raina- > ON -rein 'strip of land' (in compounds), OHG rein 'ridge of earth as boundary mark'.

C, Isolated lexemes

89) *su̯ek- > W chweg, Bret. c’houek 'sweet, pleasant (of taste)', W chwaeth 'taste' ~ OE swecc, swecc 'taste, (pleasant) smell', OHG swehhan 'to smell (bad)'.

90) *u̯em- > OIr to-seinn 'hunts; follows' ~ OHG, OE swimman, ON svm(m)ja 'to swim', Goth. swum(f)sl 'lake' < *swum-sla- (Bjorvand and Lindeman 2000:893–5, but they reject the connection; Casaretto 2004:408).

91) *su̯eng- 'to bend' in PCelt. *swengo- 'slender' > Mfr. seng, Gaul. PN Singi-dúnnum ~ OE swancor, MHG, MLG swanc 'slender', Dan. svang 'arch of foot' vs. *syeg- and syenk- in other formations and languages (IEW 1047).

\(^{26}\) Hamp includes Alb. pê, pl. penj 'thread', but Celtic and Germanic still agree both on o-grade and semantics.

\(^{27}\) If Zair in his review (2012: 80), following LIV 532-3, is right that to-seinn is related to Hitt. sanahzi 'sought' < *senh₂-, this item is of course not a Celto-Germanicism. Note also Kroonen 2013 forthc.: "The verb has no good extra-Gm. Etymology. The connection with OIr. seinnid is extremely doubtful, both on the formal and semantic side". In fact, eliminating this item would only strengthen the hypothesis presented here since it reduces the number of items belonging neither to category 8. However, the combination of the initial consonant cluster *su-, shared with items 89 and 91, and the derivational suffix *-slo- of PGmc. *swumsla-, shared with items 19 and 51, perhaps point to an origin in the Celto-Germanic stratum after all. Indeed, the PGmc. ablauting forms *swammjan-, with a causative, not denominative, meaning 'make swim', *swamón 'swim' and *sunda- 'sound' (beside *swumsla-), indicates that it is fairly old.


95) PCelt. *druxt- (< *drup-tu*) > OIr *drucht* ‘dew, a drop’ ~ PGmc. *drupa- > ON *dropi, OE *dropa, OHG *tropfo* ‘drop’.


97) *gan(dʰ)-no- in MIr *gann* ‘vessel, jug, pitcher’ ~ PGmc. *kanno* f. > ON *kanna, OE *canne, OHG *channa* ‘can, jug’.

**4 Revision of semantic areas and their implications**

Our revised list may be said to fall into the following categories:

- (1)-(19) cosmology, spirits, supernatural creatures
- (20)-(22) medicinal herbs or plants connected to popular beliefs
- (23)-(29) sickness and death
- (30)-(54) battle and warfare, fortifications, weaponry
- (55)-(64) words for ‘wound’, ‘injury’, ‘defect’
- (65)-(68) hostility
- (69)-(79) equestrian terminology
- (80)-(97) words belonging to other parts of the vocabulary

Or, in a boiled-down version (excluding (80)-(97)):

- (a) religion and healing ((1)-(29))
- (b) warfare and equestrian terminology ((30)-(79))

---

Quite a few of the lexemes in question can be placed in either category. Remarkably, as many as nine words for ‘wound’ turn out to be Celto-Germanicisms in one way or another.

Only 1/5 of the lexemes fall outside the two main categories, and, with a couple of exceptions, even these are typical culture-words. Such a distribution militates against the possibility of a Celto-Germanic genetic subgroup (pace Mansion 1912) and, obviously, the existence of Italo-Celtic need not be refuted on this basis; cf. also that the list of NW IE innovations compiled by Oettinger (2003) contains not a single Celto-Germanicism. Instead, the situation presented here seems to reflect contacts between speakers of the IE dialects that later evolved into Proto-Celtic and Proto-Germanic. Religion and warfare seem to have been of particular concern.

Linking reconstructed prehistoric languages to archaeological findings is always risky business, but we may tentatively fix this cultural unity in time and space in Eastern Central Europe around 2000 BCE, when the pre-Celtic Únětice culture in the present-day Czech Republic bordered late, possibly pre-Germanic, varieties of the Corded Ware culture. This scenario is at least partly compatible with conclusions reached by Kristiansen & Larsson 2005 and Kristiansen 2009: They envisage contacts between Pre-Germanic peoples and Pre-Celts immigrating from the South, spreading out over W Europe 2500-2000 B.C., not least by means of warfare and horses, until more hierarchical societies arise in the second millennium B.C.

5 A Fennic connection?

Most of the items in question look old and probably represent regional IE innovations, while others may have been taken over from the same third source. Interestingly, some of them seem to be shared with Balto-Fennic languages, suggesting a larger cultural continuum stretching further to the North. Particularly intriguing are Fi. hepo, hevonen, Est. hobune ‘horse’, Fi. ratsu ‘riding-horse’ and kavio ‘hoof’ (dial. kapja) since they all look Indo-European, but at the same time do not show the regular sound substitutions displayed by any attested Indo-European branch. Fi. luppo ‘lichen’ is inherited from Proto-Uralic, so if it is con-

---

29 Únětice bodies are typically buried with jugs – meaning that *gan(d)*, too, could justifiably be categorized as belonging to the religious vocabulary.
nected to item no. 22, it must have been borrowed from Fennic into Celtic and Germanic.

If Balto-Fennic belongs to this cultural continuum, the question arises whether lexical exchange has taken place directly between Late Proto-Fennic and Pre-Proto-Celtic, or whether Pre-Proto-Germanic was always the provider: PCelt. *sanesto- ‘secret advice’ (Matasović 2009: 322) is suspiciously reminiscent of Fi. sanasto ‘list of words’ (synchronically analyzable as sana ‘word’ + collective -sto), cf. the semantics of PCelt. *rūno- and PGmc. *rūna- (item 6 above) which in itself must be identical to Fi. runo ‘song; poem’. The vowel in runo is unexpectedly short, i.e. it does not behave as loanwords from Proto-Germanic normally do and may have been borrowed at an earlier stage. Mod. Ir. lón, pl. lóinte (> Eng. lunch) could represent Late Proto-Fennic *louna ‘southwest; noon; lunch’ (Fi. louna) which is derived from Proto-Uralic *luwe ‘south’. Note that this word is already known to have been borrowed into Baltic (Latv. launags ‘lunch’, Lith. lāunagas ‘dinner’). Fi. maa ‘land’ and its Balto-Fennic cognates go back to Proto-Uralic *maye, reminiscent both in form and semantics of PCelt. *magos ‘plain, open field’ > Olr mag ‘plain’, W ma ‘place’, Gaul. PN (Arganto-)magus), cf. Schrijver 2001:423. Fi. tuoni ‘dead’ < Late Proto-Fennic *ōđne could formally represent Proto-Celtic *doueno- (item 27). Fi. kalma ‘grave; disease, Death-goddess, guardian of the abode of the dead’ could belong with PCelt. *klamo- ‘grave’ (item 17)

For the same concept, PGmc. *haljō- f. can be reconstructed (cf. e.g. ON Hel ‘death goddess’). It is most often seen as reflecting PIE *kol-je₂h₂, derived from *kel- ‘to cover, conceal’. However, if Fi. Koljo ‘name of a giant’ is a Germanic loan (IEW 553-554), the Finnish vocalism constitutes a problem—why is PGmc. *-a- substituted with -o-? Moreover, a Proto-Finno-Ugric form *kolja can be reconstructed also on the basis of Komi kul ‘water spirit’ and Mansi (Pelym dial.) kul-nⱡ>y ‘master of the netherworld, devil’. This word is internally analyzable as a participial form or agent noun derivative consisting of the Proto-Uralic verbal root *kole- ‘to die’ and the agent-marker -ja with root-final -e regularly being dropped when a suffix is added30. Formally, nothing speaks against this word being a borrowing in the reverse direction, from Proto-Fennic into Pre-Proto-Germanic, i.e. at a stage before the Germanic sound shift and the development of *o > *a.

30 For a slightly different analysis of the Uralic word, see Katz (2003:183).
6 Conclusions

An analysis of the NW Indo-European lexical material shared by Celtic and Germanic only is suggestive of the following scenario: The precursors of Celtic and Germanic evolved from different Indo-European dialect groups. Shortly after their migrations into Europe they came to form part of a cultural community, possibly influenced by indigenous populations or migrants from elsewhere. This had a significant impact on specific parts of the vocabulary, notably terms for religion and warfare. New derivatives were formed on the basis of Indo-European material, while some of the old ones were preserved in this area only. Some shared loanwords can be traced back to Late Proto-Fennic, spoken in their Northern vicinity. There are even indications that Late Proto-Fennic may have been in direct contact with Pre-Proto-Celtic, not always with Pre-Proto-Germanic as the provider. Celtic and Germanic peoples continued to influence each other, linguistically and in other respects, as they gradually developed the characteristics by which we define them.
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Again on Pigs in Ancient Europe:
The Fennic Connection

Abstract

Proto-Celtic *mokku- ‘pig’, *sukko- ‘sow’ and *turko- ‘wild boar’ are borrowed from Proto-Fennic where they are analyzable as inherited formations. Other Northern European terms can be shown to have an Indo-European origin: Welsh cranan ‘wild sow’, OIr cráin ‘sow’ belong to an earlier layer comprising both Germanic (OLFr. chrammi-chaltia ‘pig’s den’) and Baltic (Lith. šėnas ‘wild boar’), while Fi. karjas ‘wild boar’ is borrowed from an otherwise unattested PGmc. *garjaz corresponding to Gk. χοιρός, Alb. derr, from PIE *ghor-jo-s. Latv. cūka ‘pig’ is not related to Lith. kiaulié ‘pig’ as usually assumed, but borrowed from PFc. *tsuka ‘pig’ (> Fi. sika, Karel. čugu → N Saami sokki id.). NW PIE *porko- ‘pig(let)’ is identified as an Altaic newcomer to the NW IE area on the basis of its widespread irregular variation in both IE and Fenno-Ugric, and the similarity with European words for ‘badger’, an animal typologically often compared to pigs. The lessons to be drawn are significant both culturally and linguistically: The great importance that boars played in Celtic and Germanic mythology must have been preceded by a centre of cultural gravity further to the North.

1 Hyonyms in Celtic – substratum material or Fennic loans?

It is well known that the wild boar played a significant role in ancient Celtic and Germanic (as well as in ancient Greek) mythology. Hamp (1987) has argued that the importance of boars and pigs went back to a

1 The greater part of this article will be published in Birgit Anette Olsen & al. (eds.): Etymology and the European Lexicon, proceedings from Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Copenhagen (September 2012).
or North or Central European pre-Indo-European substratum. A number of non-Indo-European pig terms, which we may conveniently name “hyonyms”, are of obscure origin, and many look non-Indo-European. For Celtic alone, Hamp lists the following as unexplained:

1. *mokku- ’swine’ (OIr mucu, W moch, Gaul. PN Moccus, a swine divinity)
2. *sukko- ’sow’ (W hwch, OIr socc-)
3. *turko- ‘(wild) boar’ (W twrch, OIr torc)
4. *banu- ‘young pig’ (W banw, OIr banb)
5. W cranan ‘wild sow’ (White book of Rhydderch), OIr cráin f. ‘sow’
6. OIr mat, mata f. ’pig’
7. OIr cribais, cribus i’s ’pig’
8. OIr fithend m. ’boar (?)’

1.1 PCelt. *mokku- ’swine’

Hamp (1987: 187) began his overview with Proto-Celtic *mokku- ’swine’, which is reconstructed on the basis of OIr mucu f. (originally a u-stem), W moch (collective; singulative mochyn), Breton moc’h (collective; singulative penmoc’h), Corn. māgh, late mōw ’id.’, and Gaul. Moccus, the name of a pig divinity. Hamp defined it as “perhaps the most prominent term … notably lacking in IE cognates, a striking fact for the most pervasive generic lexeme for the pig”. He did not mention MLG and MDu. mocke f. ’sow’, but as rightly stated by Kroonen (2013, pace Matasović 2009: 274-275) these Germanic forms are most likely to be loanwords from Gaulish and not directly from a third, unrelated source, since they

---

22 Hamp (1987: 187) supposes that the cultural importance of the pig in Ancient Greece goes back to the same substratum, seeing that “Pre-hellenic was not a satem language in type … [and] is to be classed among IE dialects with the North European group … We must look, therefore, for a pre-Greek movement of Indo-Europeans into the Aegean from the North, from as least as far North as Central Europe. It is clear then that the IE Prehellenic speakers could have brought with them to Greece the North European cultural values and institutions relating to the pig, these later to be incorporated into the Eleusinian mysteries”. He further ascribes the irregular variant σύς (next to the regular ὕς) to this Prehellenic IE language. Fascinating as this scenario may sound, the prehistory and shaping of Greek culture goes beyond the scope of this article and will not be treated here.
are confined to the Southwestern (Franconian) part of the Germanic area. Hamp credited the substratum language even for the source of the u-stem formation, according to him typical of substratum words in Celtic, and found in one more pig-term, Welsh *hob (see further under *sukko- below).

Remarkably in the light of Hamp’s scenario, very similar terms specifically for ‘sow’ occur elsewhere in Northern Europe, namely among the Balto-Fennic languages. On the basis of Finnish *emakko, Karelian *emakko, *emäkkö, Olonets *emäččü, Lude *emäčču, Estonian *emak, Votic *emakko, *emäkko we are able to reconstruct Balto-Fennic *emasemakko, *emäkkekkö while Fi. *emokki reflects BF *emokke. Following Hamp’s line of reasoning, it would be natural to conclude that the North European substratum terms for pigs then stretched all the way to the Balto-Fennic area. Crucially, however, these words are internally analyzable within Balto-Fennic itself, even partly synchronically in the individual languages, as perfectly normal derivatives with the denominal suffix -kko from the noun *emä ‘womb; mother (also of animal)’. The Finnish variant with -okki (which, if regular, would go back to Balto-Fennic *-okke) has been formed to emo ‘mother of animals, dam’, in itself formed with a frequent denominal and deverbal suffix -o and common in Finnish compounds (e.g. emo-lehmä ‘calver, mother cow’, emo-yhtiö ‘parent company’).

Since derivatives with *-kko to the stem *emä must go back to the Balto-Fennic protolanguage, I will propose that Proto-Celtic *mokku- is simply borrowed from Early Balto-Fennic.

Prehistoric Celtic is normally attached to the Urnfield Culture of Central Europe (1300-750 BC), and its descendants, the Hallstatt Culture (800-500 BC, continuing into the historic La Tène Culture). Candidates for “Pre-Proto-Celtic” cultures are the Unétice culture (2300-1600 BC) and the Tumulus culture (1600-1200 BC). Kristiansen and Larsson (2005) and Kristiansen (2009) place the emergence of Pre-Celtic culture in Western and Central Europe 2500-2000 BC. As I

---

3 BF *emakko has undergone a common, but not entirely regular, morphophonemic development of a > a / eC,C(C)o (cf. e.g. Fi. kesä ‘summer’ ~ kesakko ‘freckle’, elä- ‘to live’ ~ elanto ‘livelihood’) while the variant *emäkkö displays the expected vowel harmony. -kko (and -ikkö) as in Votic emikko mostly occurs after stems in -e- or -j-, but sometimes even after -ä-stems, cf. Fi. silmä ‘eye’ ~ silmikkö ‘bud’, heinä ‘grass’ ~ heinikko ‘meadow’. These processes have been described by Campbell 1980 (257-258 with references) from a purely Finnish perspective, but they must be regarded as common Balto-Fennic phenomena because reflexes of all types occur throughout Balto-Fennic.
stated in Hyllested (2010) there are other lexical indications that Middle and Late Proto-Fennic\(^4\), spoken in the northern vicinity of these cultures, may have been in direct contact with Pre-Proto-Celtic, not always with Proto-Germanic as the provider\(^5\). Late Proto-Fennic (Proto-Balto-Fennic) is often assumed to have emerged around 1500 BC (see e.g. Janhunen 2009), preceded by the Middle and Early Proto-Fennic (Proto-Fenno-Saami) stages.

The most important argument for regarding \(*mokku-\) as a loan from Fennic\(^6\), however, is the big lexicological picture: The fact that other Proto-Celtic hyonyms also have good candidates for a source in Balto-Fennic.

### 1.2 PCelt. \(*sukko-\) ‘sow’?

Another well-known puzzle concerns PCelt. \(*sukko-\) (\(W\ hwch, OBret. hoch, Mod.Bret. houc’h, Corn. hoch, OIr soscc- ‘sow’) which looks intriguingly similar to the most common Indo-European hyonym \(*suH-s\) (Lat. \(s\tas\), Gk. \(\sigma\varsigma\), Alb. \(\theta\i\), Toch. B \(suwe\)), but whose final part -\(kk-\) has been difficult to account for. The classical handbooks reconstructs a root variant \(*seau-k-\) next to \(*seau-H-\), more or less explicitly interpreted

---

\(^4\) I use Kallio’s (2007, 2012) trichotomy of Early, Middle, and Late Proto-Fennic. Of these, Early Proto-Fennic, the stage before any distinctively Balto-Fennic innovations, is the traditional name for Proto-Fenno-Saami (I hesitate to accept Kallio’s inclusion of Mordvin here), and Late Proto-Fennic equals Proto-Balto-Fennic, the protolanguage of all the Balto-Fennic languages (perhaps except South Estonian, see Kallio 2007). Important for our discussion, Middle Proto-Fennic is ‘the stage largely recoverable by internal reconstruction immediately before the development \(\*ti > \*ci\)’ (Kallio 2012: 166, fn. 9).

\(^5\) Among my proposals for direct loans from Proto-Fennic into Proto-Celtic are PCelt. \(*sanasto-\) ‘list of words’ (from \(*sana\) ‘word’ + loc.suff. \(*-sto\) → PCelt.\(*sanesto-\) ‘secret advice’ (compare the semantics of the reverse loan Fi. \(ranu\) (traditional) song, poem' < PGmc. \(*r\ï\-
\(n\)-or PCelt. \(*\ï\-
\(n\)-‘secret’); \(*loua\) ‘southwest; noon; lunch’ (from PU \(*luwe\) ‘south’ + suff. \(-\(na\)) → Nlr. \(l\o\n\), pl. \(li\ë\i\ë\) ‘lunch’ (further borrowed into Eng. \(lunch,\) luncheon; also a Fc. loan in Baltic, Latv. \(l\a\u\a\n\a\g\) ‘dinner’); PCelt. \(*m\a\y\a\) ‘land’ → PCelt. \(*mag\o\) ‘plain, open field’; Pfc. \(*k\a\l\m\a\) ‘disease; grave; Death-goddess’ PCelt. \(*kl\a\m\o\-
\(m\)-‘diseased, leprous’. Pfc. \(*\t\o\ë\ë\de\a\d\) ‘dead’ may represent a reverse borrowing from PCelt. \(*d\e\w\ë\n\o\) ‘(mortal >) man’ id. into Pfc. (cf. PGmc. \(*d\ë\w\ë\n\a\) ‘mortal, \(*\d\a\w\j\ë\n\-\(\)to die’), parallel to the hyonyms. Cf. Hyllested 2010: 123-124.

\(^6\) A hypothetical hybrid form \(*em\o\k\k\) would appear even closer to the Celtic forms. The deletion of -\(e\)- seems to presuppose stress shift to the second syllable -\(m\o\k\)-. We will deal with this below.
either as an old morphophonemic alternation or as an extension proper whereby an old “determinative” -k- has been added to the root in its strictest sense, i.e. *seuh-. The extended version would then make up the protoform not only of Celtic *sukko-, but also of Germanic -k-variants like OE sugu, OS suga ‘sow’, as well as Latin sucula ‘young sow’ and Skt. sukára- ‘(male) boar’.

Reconstruction of root variants and root extensions is problematic in general because it gives etymologists an extra chance to replace or add a root-final consonant whenever these final elements turn out not to match. The field of Indo-European studies have now reached a stage where scholars should try to either identify the source or function of such irregular and unexpected elements. If they are just conveniently reconstructed whenever a solution is needed, without an explanation of their origin or function, it jeopardizes our chances of staying on the right track and discover the actual conditions of the past. Unexplained root-final elements simply leave too many options open. Hamp (188) justifiably states “We have no license to drop the laryngeal in IE *suH-, and in fact the claimed Indo-Iranian comparande conserve the *ű. I therefore see here a substratum *suk-, geminated in Celtic”.

Even those scholars who accepted *seuk- as a variant to account for PCelt. *sukko- still have had difficulties explaining the Celtic gemination. Needless to say, “expressive gemination” has been among the suggestions (Polomé 1953: 541). Testen (1999) analysed the pig-names as original compounds where -kku- reflects PIE *-pku- ‘livestock’ (the zero-grade of *pěku n.), but an animal name like *brokko- ‘badger’ can hardly count as a term from the field of animal husbandry; besides, other stems than u-stems are found in the Celtic material.

Kroonen (2011) makes a successful case in trying to eliminate the PIE variant *seuk-k- altogether: He shows, first of all, that West Germanic forms with -g- (OE sugu, Mod.Du. zeug) simply owe this velar to a regular development of hiatus or -w- between two high vowels if at least one of them is u. Norwegian sugge, Sw.dial. sågg ‘sow’ would have arisen by normal verschärfung of *-ww- to *-ggv- in Nordic. Second, he points out that Lat. sucula is simply formed with the normal diminutive ending -
cula that is added to vocalic stems (cf. auri-cula 'little ear', avi-cula 'little bird', api-cula 'little bee'); a **sū-(u)la would be impossible, and the only way to form a diminutive with -la to sūs would be to add -cula to the stem. Hence, there is no need to believe that -c- belongs to the root in the Latin case either. Third, as already suggested by Fick, Falk & Torp (1909), Skt. sū-kāra- m. 'wild boar’ is probably simply a compound, meaning literally ‘pig-reproducer’.

Kroonen’s conclusion is that PIE *seyk- did not exist, since only Celtic *sukko- cannot be explained away and needs a source. His solution is to assert for the Celtic animal names in -ko a Germanic source where -kk- derives from n-stems to roots in -k- via Kluge’s Law. However, of the Celtic animal names, only PCelt. *bukko- ‘billy-goat’ has a safe counterpart in Germanic.

Besides, there is one more Indo-European term to take into account. Interestingly, PCelt. *sukko- is somewhat reminiscent of Latv. cūka ‘pig’ whose etymology is also disputed: In native Latvian words c- usually occurs before -e-, -i- because it has developed from late palatalization, or it is a borrowing from Estonian, cf. Latv. cīrele ‘lilac’ < Est. tsirel, dial. for standard sirel. Jānis Endzelins simply described c- in cūka as irregular from *sūka which he equates with the Germanic, Latin and Indic forms in the previous paragraph (Kaspars Ozoliņš, p.c.). Karulis (1992) prefers to group cūka with Lith. kiaulė ‘pig’, visualizing a zero-grade of *keu-/*kū-, cf. kaitk ‘yell; howl’, and various toponyms such as Kūkas, presumably ‘place with a lot of wild pigs’. This would imply an analogically mixed root where the original PBalt. distribution *kiau-/*kū- was analogically levelled to *kiau-/*kiū-. While not impossible, the Latvian and Lithuanian words actually do not have that much in common, and as shown by Hamp (1986), the original meaning ‘pig’ was probably connected specifically to a stem containing the -l-. Hamp equates kiaulė with the element Cul- in the Welsh PN Culhwch, referring to a divine pig, a cousin of Arthur, of the same class as Twrch Twyth. This means

---

Formally corresponding to the Middle Persian proper name Hukar < Proto-Iranian *hūkara- (Blážek 2010: 90)

Middle Persian xūk, Modern Persian xūg (Blážek 2010: 88, 90), not mentioned by Kroonen, probably derives from a typical secondary formation in Iranian, *hū-ka-, whereby the suffix *(i)a*ka is added to stems that would otherwise be very short. Alternatively, it may have been a diminutive formation denoting the piglet, cf. e.g. Alb. derk ‘piglet’ < Proto-Alb. *dar-ika next to derr ‘pig’ (Orel 1998: 61). Other Iranian forms show expected reflexes of the root-noun, e.g. Young Avestan hū- ‘pig’, Ossetic (Digor) xu, (Iron) *x*y id. Laconian Greek dikā (?<*rikā), likewise absent in Kroonen’s account, may simply be onomatopoetic (Katz 2003: 206-207), cf. also Polish dzik ‘pig’.
that Culhwch is basically a tautological formation, simply meaning ‘(the) pig’. Hamp reconstructs *keuliā, not as a PIE form, but rather as a form borrowed from a North European substratum language into at least Celtic and Baltic. He includes in this word-family Lith. kulys ‘boar’, strikingly reminiscent of Culhwch’s father’s name, Cilydd < *kūlos.

Another possibility for Latv. cūka would be to assert an onomatopoetic origin parallel to that behind Pol. dzik ‘pig’, a sound sequence which seems to be geographically widespread as a word used for attracting the pigs. However, such words often seem to originate from real nouns, cf. e.g. Ukr. gus’, a word used for calling geese, and Da. hyp, a word used for making horses move (cf. hoppe ‘mare’ < *huppan-).

In this particular case, there is no need to go far for a source. I believe that the obvious source of Latv. cūka is the term for the same animal in the languages spoken to the north of Latvian, namely the Balto-Fennic languages. The situation within Balto-Fennic itself is unclear, too, seeing that while Finnish sika reflects *sika, some of its dialects have tsika, pointing rather to Balto-Fennic *tsika; Karelian čugu meanwhile points to *tsuka (BF *suka would have yielded Karelian **šugu), and borrowings into Saami such as N Saami sokki point to a fourth variant, *suka. This messy situation has led some Fennicists to believe that we are dealing with different etyma, but this is too hasty a conclusion. First of all, the irregular vocalism, although its distribution is unaccounted for, is not unparalleled: for example, it makes little sense to separate BF lintu ‘bird’ from FU *lunta ‘bird’ (cf. N Saami loddi), and this word also shows up with -i- for expected -u- in Fennic only. The situation is admittedly not exactly parallel since, unlike the pig-word, the bird-word does not have alternating vocalism within Balto-Fennic, but in fact this exactly speaks for uniting the pig-words since in their case we are not only conjecturing the occurrence of a -u-; we see it attested in front of our eyes. In other words, if we accept lintu < *lunta in the first place, there is no reason to doubt *(t)sika ~ *(t)suka < *tuka on the basis of the vocalic variation. The consonantal variation in the onset is pretty straightforward: ts- is not phonotactically allowed in Finnish, and although the development of Fennic-Saami (Early Proto-Fennic) *ti- > *si- and *tiu- > *sii- is not regularly extended to the third high vowel, one might still visualize a few cases where this tendency initiated, especially if there was a dialectal variation between *tsi- (maybe still *tsii- at the time) and *tu-. Besides, the Fenno-Volgaic reconstruction is actually *tuka as can be seen from Mordvin tuvo, so the Balto-Fennic onset al-
ready presents an irregularity that needs to be explained, regardless of the situation within Balto-Fennic.

These observations mutually confirm each other: While the reconstruction of a BF *tsuka renders it possible to provide a straightforward source for Latvian cūka ‘pig’, correspondingly the identification of Latvian cūka as a Balto-Fennic loan confirms the BF reconstruction with *ts-. Incidentally, both elements of the Latv. compound mežacūka ‘wild boar’ therefore have the same etymological source as those in Fi. metsäsīka ‘badger’ (since metsā ‘forest’ is a borrowing from Baltic *medja- ‘id.’).

Despite the obvious chronological differences between the situation for Latvian cūka and PCelt. *sukko-, I believe that the most probable origin for the latter is also Balto-Fennic *tsuka. Note that while Latvian shows a secondary lengthening in its reflex, Saami sokki has a geminate consonant. These different kinds of lengthenings probably reflect different attempts to render what was heard as a kind of heavy syllable in the target language. As a parallel, Modern Fennic words of the structure CVCV (e.g. sīka) are frequently perceived by e.g. speakers of Danish as having an unexpectedly long (or partly stressed) second syllable, since the vowel of this second syllable is longer than in Danish words of the same structure (e.g. moka’ [café] mocha’, sikahjort ‘sika deer’), making it sound like a compound to Danes. My guess is then that both the Balto-Fennic consonantal alternation in paradigms and the persistent stress on the first syllable had some effect on the foreign renderings of Fennic *tsuka, resulting in a geminate in Saami sokki and PCelt. *sukko- but as vowel length in (the probably younger, but not necessarily very young) loan in Latvian, *cūka. The Balto-Fennic -k- was thus only rendered by a geminate consonant in the languages where such consonants existed, whereas Latvian, not possessing geminates, expressed the length in the preceding vowel instead. One may also note that secondary lengthening of both vowels and consonants is pretty commonplace in Fennic itself, even in inherited words.

The u-stem formation in *mokk-u- and *sukk-u-o- (>* W hob) that Hamp (1987) identifies as part of the substratum features do not seem to be detectable in Fennic; the Karelian -u is regular from -a, and *tsuka looks like a normal Fennic a-stem.
1.3 PCelt. *turko- `wild boar’

A third puzzling term is PCelt. *turko- (W [obs.] twrch `pig’ m., pl. tyrch(-at), OCorn. torch, OBret. torch, MBret. [Catholicon] torch ikd., OIr torc [masc, o-stem] `wild boar’). It is remarkable that even this term ends in -ko. The sequence -Rkk- was non-existent in Proto-Celtic (the Brythonic development to -ch is regular after resonant) so we can even define the last part of all three words as identical”. McCone (1992, 1993) identified the Celtic term with Avestan ṯβərəsō (occurring once in a Pahlavi fragment accompanying the Dādestān-i Dānīg), reconstructing PIE *tuɔrkōs with an original meaning `cutter’ (referring to the boar’s “notorious talent for tearing and uprooting with his sharp tusks”) which has since been generally accepted (with some reservations Lubotsky 1994; Mallory & Adams 2006: 139). The word would then rhyme with *pørβαηκǣηġũρċἄxos `(young?) pig’ and even with *iɔrβαηκǣηġũρċἄxos ‘deer’, seemingly revealing a structure for the formation of names for mammals (cf. *h₂rtβαηκǣηģũρcbd; PGmc. *elha- `elk’, *selha- `seal’, e.g. Kroonen 2013 under entry *baruga).¹²

As already noted by Hamp (1989: 188), McCone’s reconstruction of an o-grade in *tuɔrkōs is misleading since the attested Celtic forms unanimously point to a persistent zero-grade *turkos. This is significant since, as later shown by Lubotsky (1994), no other ablaut grade is to be found in derivatives underlying this postulated root `to cut’, neither in Indo-Iranian nor in Greek which would be the two other branches to have allegedly preserved reflexes of it (however, in Greek and Indo-Iranian the vocalization is different, pointing to *tuvk- and not *turk-)¹³. This similar behavior obviously speaks in favor of a connection between the Celtic boar-word and the ‘cut’-root.

Meanwhile, however, several factors speak against this. Not only is the attestation of Av. ṯβərəsō restricted to a hapax in a Pahlavi fragment;
its very existence is uncertain and it may in fact be an invention by the scribe as suggested by Hoffmann (1969: 35). As he writes, the passage \textit{yāda vā azō sacainiš yāda huś ṭḥərsō}, functioning as the subject of a following phrase in Pahlavi meaning ‘(are) to be killed in the sacrifice for the gods’, corresponds to an almost identical fragment in the Nīrangistān that reads \textit{yaϑa vā azō sačainiš yāda huś ṭḥərsō}; since the context is about sacrificial animals about to be slaughtered, it seems very likely that in the Rivāyat the obsolete \textit{pərəsō} was reshaped under the influence of the verb ṭḥərsəiṭi ‘to cut’ (although of course the replacement would be natural if the two words were really synonyms in the first place). If ṭḥərsō is really a scribal innovation, the semantic bridge between Indo-Iranian and Greek ‘to cut’ on one side and Celtic ‘boar’ on the other is obviously destabilized.\footnote{McCone was of course aware also of this part of Hoffmann’s article, but writes (1992: 99): “Convincing though the interpretation of \textit{pərəsō} as \textit{pərəsō} < *porkos is, its corruption to a non-existent ṭḥərsō somewhat reminiscent of the verb ‘to cut’ is a less attractive postulate.”}

Furthermore, the rhyming word \textit{pōrkos} (> Av. \textit{pərəsō}) as we shall see later, probably does not go all the way back to PIE and may be of non-Indo-European origin. Besides, whatever the reason for the all-dominant zero-grade in Greek and Indo-Iranian reflexes of *\textit{tuŋk}-, an isolated view on Proto-Celtic *\textit{turkos} as a pig-name would result in an interpretation of the odd zero-grade as signs of a non-Indo-European origin (cf. Hamp 1989: 188; “the scarcely IE sequence *\textit{ur}”).

Balto-Fennic again provides us with an unheeded candidate for a source which is remarkably close both semantically and formally: Karelian \textit{torakko}, \textit{torikkko} means nothing less than ‘tusk of wild boar’, and this word, too, is an unproblematic internal formation within Balto-Fennic, namely as derivative of \textit{tora}, also ‘tusk of wild boar’, with the denominal suffix -\textit{kko}, cf. Fi. \textit{tora-hamma}s ‘tusk’ (\textit{hamma}s ‘tooth’). The noun is widespread within Fenn-Ugric and identical to the verbal stem FU *\textit{torV}- (e.g. Fi. \textit{tora}-) ‘to struggle, to fight, to battle’ whose Saami reflexes such as N Saami \textit{doarro}- and Lule Saami \textit{tårro}- specifically mean ‘to fight with the horns; thrust (of mammals)’, denoting actions typically carried out by boar tusks. Thus, while the ultimate underlying semantics may not be very far from what McCone suggested, the word’s character as Proto-Fennic loanword seems clear to me especially in the light of similar scenarios for *\textit{sukko}- and *\textit{mokku}-.
2 Indo-European terms

2.1 PIE *kerja- ‘wild boar’ ← ‘tusk; bristle’?

PFP terms seem to confirm the cultural importance of the pig in prehistoric Northern Europe, even in cases where nothing points to a Fennic origin. Hamp (1987: 189) declares himself incapable of etymologizing OIr. *crain f. ‘sow’, but suggests Welsh *cran an ‘wild sow’ (attested in the White Book of Rhydderch and then once later) as cognate. An exact Proto-Celtic reconstruction is admittedly not possible on the basis of these two forms. However, the common Lithuanian word for the ‘wild boar’, šėnas, with a variant šernūkas, is suggestive of a formation from the PIE stem *kerja- ‘horn’, referring to the boar’s tusk; cf. the double meaning of Skt. śṛṇ-gā- ‘horn; elephant’s tusk’. It is tempting to include the first member of OLFr. chranni-chaltia ‘pig’s den’ (Quak 1983) whose first member has so far been considered obscure. A term *kerja- designating the wild boar, thus seems to unite Celtic, Germanic and Baltic.

2.3 PIE *gʰorjo- ‘wild boar’

The form *kerja- mentioned immediately above may appear similar to Fi. karjas, karja ‘wild boar’, karja ‘livestock’ (cf. also Est. karjane ‘shepherd’) but these Balto-Fennic forms notably lack the nasal element. They are conventionally connected to the Finnish verb karja ‘to roar’ and the noun karjainen ‘rut, rutting (of male animals)’, but the question is in what direction the derivational process originally went. The ending -as in karjas suggests that we are dealing with an Indo-European loanword. A PIE *gʰorjo-s can indeed be reconstructed on the basis of Gk. χοίρος ‘wild boar’ and Alb. derr (Mallory & Adams 2006: 142). The Proto-Albanian form was *darja (Orel 1998: 61), corresponding perfectly to the Greek form; an alternative shape *gʰoj-r-ɔ-s (preferred by Demiraj 1997: 131-132) would admittedly also be possible on the basis of Greek and Albanian only if the original Alb. sg. **darr was generalized the unlauted

15 Lith. šėnas with métonomie rude also exists. Smoczyński (2003: 10, 92) prefers an inner-Baltic derivative from šeriai (also šerės) ‘bristle’. Cf. also Hyllested & Gliwa 2009: 56) on the mechanisms behind this derivational process.

16 I thank Guus Kroonen for having drawn my attention to this form.
pl. derra\textsuperscript{5}. However, note that the Fennic forms now confirm a PIE *\textsuperscript{g}h\textsuperscript{h}ör-\textit{i}o-s if they are borrowings from an otherwise unattested, but perfectly matching, PGmc. *\textit{garjaz}. One might visualize that another kentum language than Germanic, known or unknown, could be the source of \textit{karjas}, but it would have to be a language that lost the velar-palatal distinction since PIE *\textsuperscript{g}h\textsuperscript{k}- would otherwise be attested as a sibilant, cf. Fi. \textit{salko} ‘pole, stake’ ← PIE *\textsuperscript{g}h\textsuperscript{k}ał\textsuperscript{h}-. In forms old enough to have retained an o-vocalism, palatals are usually substituted with sibilants in FU, cf. Fi. \textit{koipi} ‘leg of a bird; (colloq.) human leg’ < (NW) PIE *\textit{koipo-} ‘pole, stake’ (Skt. \textit{śēpa-} ‘tail, penis’, Alb. \textit{thep} ‘peak, point, cog, tooth’, Lat. \textit{cippus} ‘pole, stake’),\textsuperscript{18} but the a-vocalism in \textit{karjas} points to Germanic as the most probable source. This would, conveniently for our reconstruction of the prehistoric situation, mean that Indo-European borrowings of hyonyms into Fennno-Ugric took place much later than the borrowings of hyonyms in the reverse direction.

3 Motivation for borrowing

That Celtic and Germanic hyonyms that can be shown to have originated in Fennic should strike one as unexpected, partly since boars play a significant role in Celtic and Germanic (as well as in Greek) mythology, partly since wild boars are generally ‘Southern’ animals in Europe. However, there are chronological layers to distinguish: These terms must go back to a time from before the emergence of these specific traits in at least the “Celtic” (and probably also the “Germanic”) cultures and religions. The terms themselves and the cultural significance they reveal must both emanate from a common non-Indo-European source. The question then remains if we can trace any extralinguistic evidence for a special importance of pigs among the Fennic peoples. Tacitus wrote on the Aestii, a Northeast European tribe in the Baltics:

“They worship the mother of the gods: as an emblem of that superstition they wear the figures of wild boars: this boar takes the place of arms or of any human protection, and guarantees to the votary of the goddess a mind at rest even in the midst of foes”

\textsuperscript{5} Huld’s (1984: 148) reconstruction of an unparalleled derivative *\textit{skojn-ro-} from the stem occurring in PGmc. *\textit{swīna-} (PIE *\textit{suH-\textit{il},\textit{no-}}) is thus unnecessary.

\textsuperscript{18} In fact, the Fennic form confirms IE o-vocalism which is not otherwise directly attested in this form.
While the name of the Aestii (also *Aestiorum gentes*) is no doubt the source of that of Estonia, it has generally been assumed that the Aestii were in fact speakers of Baltic and not Balto-Fennic languages, whose name was later transferred to the Balto-Fennic Estonians. However, Bammesberger & Karaliunas (1998) convincingly show that the Aestii, and that the original ethnonym, definitely denoting a Fennic people from the point of view of the Scandinavians, had an extra *r* in stem (*Eistr-*)\(^{19}\). As I demonstrate elsewhere (Hyllested forthcoming), the Baltic stem *aistra-* had a meaning synonymous to that of PGmc. *finōn,*\(^{20}\) and is in all probability a loan translation, clearly indicating that the name denoted Fennic peoples.

Archaeological evidence can be supplied. Sites from the Pitted Ware culture (3200-2200 BC) on southern Scandinavian coasts from Svealand and Åland to the Danish island of Funen contain pig bones in large quantities emanating from domesticated pigs rather than wild boar. It is known that they lived side by side with battle-axe peoples, traditionally attached to Indo-European and Pre-Proto-Germanic expansions. The people of the pitted ware were not direct ancestors of Northern Scandinavians, but more closely related to peoples of the contemporary Baltic region (Rowley-Conwy & Storå 2007; Malmström & al. 2009), and blending of styles and techniques between pitted ware and battle-axe peoples took place especially in the later half of the period, 2700-2200 BC (Larsson 2003). It is clear from the datings listed above that this period does not fit exactly with the Balto-Fennic protolanguage but rather with the traditional dating of Fenno-Volgaic or Fenno-Saami. But at least we have reason to believe that the cultural significance of the pig continued into the Balto-Fennic period, and perhaps, in the light of Tacitus’ account, even into historical times.

---

\(^{19}\) Cf. Eista dolgi ‘the Estonian enemy’ (Ynglingatal) and *devenit in Eistriam, puer Olavis Eistriis in servum venundatur* (Historia Norvegiae). The original vocalism *ai*- is secured by Old Gutnish *utan foru i aina oy viðr Aistland, sum haitir Dagafbi* [they] travelled to an island off Estonia called Dagö’ (Guta Saga).

\(^{20}\) ‘Pimple’ or other protuberances from the skin of humans or animals such as ‘fish scale’, ‘fin’, ‘larvae under the skin of cattle (causing follicy)’. The Baltic meaning is reconstructed on the basis of a loanword in Livonian *āister* ‘pimple’ (the dialectal variant *visiar* can only be explained on the basis of Baltic) and Lith. *aistra* ‘intense passion’; cf. Gk. οἰδός ‘tumor’.
Also seal bones are prominent among the findings in Pitted Ware sites; note that the dating fits perfectly with Schindler’s etymology for PGmc. *selhaz ‘seal’ mentioned in fn. 11 above.

4 Badgers and pigs

It is relevant now to introduce PCelt. *brokko- ‘badger’ (Ir. broc, W broch)\(^{21}\), into the discussion for two reasons: First, it is an animal name of obscure origin containing the geminate -kk- that we recognize from the pig terms. Second, it is typologically common to compare badgers to pigs and their offspring to piglets, cf. e.g. the aforementioned Fi. metsušika ‘badger’ (lit. ‘forest pig’ ~ Latv. mežacūka ‘wild boar’), Nw. svin-toks ‘badger’ (1st part svin ‘swine’, 2nd part *pahsu- ‘badger’), Eng. sow, Da. so ‘female of pig’, but also ‘female of badger’, Eng. boar ‘male of pig’, but also ‘male of badger’, and Da. gris ‘piglet’, but also ‘young of badger, cub’. \(^{22}\)

Hence we should consider the possibility that PCelt. *brokko- could be derived from word for ‘pig’ of non-Celtic origin. It is almost for certain connected to W Germanic *brakka- ‘(scent) hound, dog used for hunting’ (OHG bracko, MDu. bracke ‘sleuthhound’) since hounds have been used for hunting game such as (very often specifically) badgers or boars since ancient times\(^{23}\), cf. also the modern term dachshund < NHG

\(^{21}\) Borrowed into OE as brocc; from Eng. it has further been borrowed into Danish as brok, mostly used in the definite form brokken (Broksen) as a kind of semi-personal name, especially common in hunter’s language.

\(^{22}\) More examples can be found in Ritter (1975). We might add as a modern example the name of the ‘hog badger’ (Arctonyx collaris) from Southeast Asia. In this light, it might be worth investigating whether the otherwise opaque Eng. word badger could be a borrowing from Brythonic (cf. W baedd) and perhaps even confirm the reconstruction *badjo- rather than the alternative *basjo-. The root in Lat. fodiō, Hitt. padda- ‘to dig (the ground), bury’, Lith. bediū ‘dig’ comes to mind when you compare e.g. Danish grævling ‘badger’ ~ grave ‘to dig’ (and grav ‘fox or badger earth, burrow’). The root is attested in Celtic but with innovative meanings (cf. Hyllested 2010: 115).

\(^{23}\) I find Kroonen’s (2013) alternative reason for linking the two words, that the badger is an “animal with a strong sense of smell” less relevant. His semantic reconstruction ‘sleuth dog’ is also somewhat anachronistic since he seems to prefer that the word is Proto-Germanic; ‘sleuthhound’ is admittedly the meaning in both Middle Dutch and Old High German, as well as in modern Dutch bruk and modern German Bracke (hence Eng. bracke) but the breed does not go back to ancient times. An less specified meaning ‘hound, hunting dog’ or ‘scent dog’
Dachshund, lit. ‘badger dog’. The origin of the latter breed is uncertain, but probably not bred as early as when Proto-West Germanic was spoken. Cf. also ON Brokkr, the name of the dwarf who creates the mythological boar Gullinbursti.

Ru. barsuk ‘badger’ is a loanword from Turkic *borsuk (*borsuq) id., derived internally in Turkic from *bor, *boz ‘grey’ and akin to Written Mongolian borki ‘old badger’ (Khalkha Mongolian bor, Buryat burxi, Kalmyck bork ‘badger’) borrowed into Tuvin (a Turkic language spoken to the North of Mongolian in Central Asia) as murgu ‘male marmot’ (Khabtagaeva 2009: 159). The word has also been borrowed into Hungarian as borz ‘badger’. Fi. mäyrä comes from older *mäkrä, cf. Karelian mäkrai, Est. mäger. The Balto-Finnic word can only be connected via dissimilation from *mäkrä. Celtic *br- can come from older *mr-, and a stress shift with vowel loss in the first syllable is reminiscent of the hypothetical process *emokk- > *Ô-mókk- sketched above. That we are dealing of a wanderwort of Altaic origin thus seems conceivable, but its routes are not entirely clear.

5 *porko- and its many variants

The protoform *porko- (> MFr orce [m. o-stem] ‘young pig’, Lat. porcus id., Lith. pašas ‘young pig; castrated male hog’, OCS prasę ‘young pig’, Av. parsà id., PGmc. *farha- ‘pig’ > e.g. OE fearh, OHG farah) is almost universally accepted as a major PIE ‘pig’-word. Since Benveniste (1969) the meaning has been reconstructed as ‘young pig’ or ‘piglet’.

However, as already noted by Hamp, the word is actually geographically confined to the Northwestern half of the Indo-European area. It is not found in Albanian, Greek, Armenian, Anatolian, Indo-Aryan, or Tocharian, and within Iranian, it is exclusively attested in the Northern fringes, geographically speaking. An Indo-Iranian preform is admittedly widely assumed as the basis for Fenno-Permian *poršas or *porčas would be better. Kroonen further declares that the relationship of this word with the rhyming *rakka- is unsolved. Since both Sw. by-racka ‘mongrel dog’ and hundracka ‘cur’, the loanword in Fi. rakki id., and MDu. rekel ‘bad dog, male dog’ (> Du. rekel ‘villain’) are clearly pejorative, I wonder if it is not simply derived from the verb *ragg/kórn- ‘to move to and fro, to stroll’, cf. Sw. racka ‘to roam, to wander about (used typically of dogs)’.  

Da. gravhund, lit. ‘grave dog’, cf. grevling ‘badger’, derived from grav ‘grave’.  
As Hamp (189) says “The question is not one of domestication, but of cultural value”.

---

25 As Hamp (189) says “The question is not one of domestication, but of cultural value”.  

---
'pig' (Benveniste 1949), but as some scholars (notably Napolskikh 2002) have pointed out, the Balto-Fennic forms may just as well have been borrowed from a stage of Balto-Slavic, while the Eastern (Mordvinian and Permian) forms either suspiciously lack the Indo-Iranian ending or are aberrant in other ways. Outside Europe, the only attested forms are therefore Av. *parśō and Khot. pāsa (Kurdish purs is a ghostword, cf. Hoffmann 1967: 35). These are both important culture languages of Central Asia, spoken close to Altaic and especially Turic languages. As we shall see in a moment, there is a possibility that *pərkō- is really a Central Asiatic culture-word.

First, it is important to note that the main justification for starting to look for a non-Indo-European source for *pərkō- is the variation within which similar words with similar meanings occur in Europe, displaying a remarkably colorful variation of irregular correspondences: Alongside *pərkō- it seems necessary to reconstruct a variant *porō- as the basis for PGmc. *farkina- 'pig' and CSL. *porzō 'boar; ram; bull'. Furthermore, PGmc. *harga- (OHG barug, OE bearg, Eng. barrow, OICorn. ṣōgr, MidDu. barg) would have to go back to a PIE form *bʰorko-, *bʰorko- or *bʰorgo-.26 If the Germanic protoform was actually *baruga-, the stem *baru- correspond to Slavic forms like Ru. bőrov [m.] 'hog, castrated boar', SCr. brāv [m.] 'sheep', dial. 'hog, castrated boar'. Finally, OHG bēr, OE bār 'boar' most likely go back to PGmc. *baira-.27

26 It is perhaps conceivable, but hardly provable, that *porzō was reshaped from earlier *porzo under the influence of Slavic *kən- orzō '(domesticated) boar', lit. 'with testicle' (on this form, see Kretov 1994), and that PGmc. *farkina- can theoretically be interpreted as a diminutive *farhkina- of *farha-. All things considered, I find it more economical and therefore more probable to assume that we are dealing with a true irregular variation, and that both forms go back to what would have been PIE *porō-.

27 Not to be reconstructed *baruga-, cf. Ball & Stiles 1983.

28 *baiza- is also possible. Kroonen (2013) regards *baira- as more likely because the ON hypocoristic form bassi is more likely to have been derived from *bǎrr < *baīra- than *bīrr < *baīza-. However, bassi may just as well be a hypocoristic form of baggi 'small and thick, compact animal', cf. Da. basse 'piglet', but also 'small, fat male horse, wether, dog, bull etc.', 'thick insect', rather the same meanings as those of baggi. Polomé (1986) and Schrijver (1997), in the light of the irregular correspondence with MW bazd, W bazd, OCorn. bāhet 'boar', conclude that both the Germanic and the Celtic form are of the same non-Indo-European origin. However, if the PGmc. form was really *baira- and especially if at the same time the Brythonic forms are from *bādio- and not from *basio-, in my opinion they are not even sufficiently alike for us to regard them as the same word.
Germanic even had a *pōr-o- (PGmc. *fōra-), but this is clearly derived from *per- ‘to give birth’, Gmc. *farzan-.

therefore think that the irregularities of the Fenno-Permic forms are due to the fact that some of them were borrowed from R-Turkic, cf. the Chuvash form porš 'badger' (via 'piglet'? Note the exact meaning of *porkos) with initial p- and without reminiscences of the suffix -uk, into the Eastern Fenno-Permic languages: Mordvin (Moksha) purč, purc, Udmurt parš, parš, pars, pariš, Komi porš39, with their *-š- actually reflecting Turkic -š- (= Chuvash -š) and not an alleged PIE *-k-. The Balto-Fennic languages (*porsas) and perhaps Erzya Mordvin (purkos, purčís, pursuz) instead borrowed their forms from a stage of Balto-Slavic, which comprised the still productive ending -as. The Balto-Slavic form, in turn, like the Germanic and Italo-Celtic forms, would ultimately have derived from older Turkic *borsuq. Again, the exact directions are not clear, but a culture-word situation would account for the geographical distribution, the irregular variations of similar ‘pig’- and ‘badger’-words across Europe, aberrancies in Fenno-Ugric and perhaps even the exact meaning of *porkos if the meaning went via ‘young of badger’ (Da. gris, also ‘pig’). Finally, the motivation for a borrowing from Altaic would be straightforward, namely the fact that badger is a common traditional dish among Turkish and Mongolian peoples.30

6 Conclusions

Etymological analyses that take Uralic material into account confirm Hamp’s (1987) claims that 1) most Celtic terms for pigs derive from a non-Indo-European language in Northern Europe, and that 2) the pig occupied a special cultural position among the speakers of this language. Three terms specifically can be traced directly back to the Balto-Fennic protolanguage (Late or Middle Proto-Fennic), and it seems possible to link this to extralinguistic data ranging from prehistoric archaeology to

39 From Komi it has been borrowed into Khanty as V porš, DN purš, O porš; and into Mansi as KU pūrs, P pūrs, So. pūrs; Nenets Sj. pūrs; and from Khanty it has been borrowed further into Nenets O as pūrš, Nj. pūrs.

30 At the conference leading to this publication, I argued that Turkic *borsuq could have been borrowed to Gmc. as *barzůq- yielding *bārruq- that could then have been transferred to PCelt. brokko-, involving the same stress shift to the penultimate syllable -bV-r-úk- as in *mokku- < *e-mók-. However, this is of course not possible if the PGmc. form was in fact *burgu- and not *barugo-. See above on the role of PFC. *mákra.
historical accounts. These conclusions have important implications both linguistically and culturally since they strengthen the hypothesis sketched in Hyllested (2010) that lexical exchange took place directly between the speakers of Proto-Fennic and Proto-Celtic, and that parts of the Celtic vocabulary have a Fennic origin. Other Northern European pig-terms are of Indo-European origin, but their exact reconstruction in some cases is only possible if Uralic material is analyzed on an equal footing. Studies in language contact within a given region can benefit from the involvement of all languages actually spoken in that region. It seems worthwhile to investigate whether other portions of the IE lexicon of Northern Europe that allegedly derive from long-gone substrata, are actually just loanwords from (different stages of) the adjacent language family, Uralic.
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The Other Horse:
Germanic Cognates of *caballus*

Abstract

Simon’s (2005) reconstruction of a second PIE term for ‘horse’ as the source of Lat. *cabō, caballus*, Iranian *kaba-*; OCS *kobyла* and Fi. *hepo* (via Germanic) is accepted, but its shape must have been *kebʰ-*, not *keb-*, and the PGmc. form was *hebō*, not *hepa-. The Germanic evidence is not restricted to loanwords in Finnish; in this article, Da. *hoppe* ‘mare’ and its Germanic relatives are interpreted as the old oblique form of a PGmc. n-stem paradigm *hebō ~ *huppaz whose nominative was transferred into Northern Balto-Fennic as *hepo* while the Southern languages borrowed *huppaz (perhaps even in a Pre-Germanic shape with *-p-n- before Kluge’s Law operated). This solution provides the first serious explanation for the irregular variation within Balto-Fennic, notably the difference between Fi. *hepo* and Est. *hobune, hopene*.

1 Reconstructing PIE *kebʰ- ‘the slow horse’

Alongside the famous PIE term *ʰ₁ekyos* ‘horse’ (most recently treated by Huld 2004, de Vaan 2009, Blažek 2010), Simon (2005) has reconstructed another Indo-European word for this animal, PIE *keb-*, on the basis of the following forms:

a) OCS *koby-la* ‘mare’ (< *kob-ôn; borrowed into MHG dial. as kobel’ jade, hack, nag, crowbait’, and, as a back-formation, Swabian kob ‘id.’);

---

1 Mod.Eng. *cob* ‘thickset horse’ might be unrelated if simply identical in origin to the numerous other meanings of Eng. *cob*, most of which can be united by the meaning ‘plump or roundish object, animal or person’. 
b) late gloss Lat. *cabō ‘castrated horse’ (< *keb-ōn);

c) Iranian *kaba-, *kabala- (borrowed into Greek as καβάλλης ‘working horse’ [Hes.] and into Latin as caballus) > Khotan Saka *kabā ‘horse’ (borrowed into Karakhanidic Middle Turkic [11th c. AD] as kevel (at) ‘quick horse’), ModPers. kawal ‘mule’; and
d) PGmc. *hepa-, reconstructed solely to account for supposed loanwords in Balto-Fennic languages, e.g. Fi. *hepo, *hevonen ‘horse’

Simon gives convincing arguments for leaving out Slavic *kon’b and *komon’b (pace Snoj 2003) and for rejecting alternative loan directions such as Greek into Persian. On the whole, the proposal looks quite acceptable, despite Indo-Europeans’ usual reluctance to accept inherited lexemes with the rare unaspirated *b for PIE.

On closer inspection, it turns out that it is unnecessary to reconstruct this unaspirated *-b- since the only element that precludes its aspirated counterpart *-bʰ- is exactly the PGmc. *-p- which Simon supposes to only be reflected in Balto-Fennic loans. Since Balto-Fennic did not possess voiced stops⁴, the language would be unable to show evidence of original voicing, so PGmc. *-b- < PIE *-bʰ- is just as possible in this instance. In fact, the lack of Winter’s Law in Slavic (not *kabyla) unambiguously points to an aspirate, if kobyla is inherited at all (see Blažek 2010 on the East Iranian animal-term suffix *-ūla-; Goląb 1985).

2 The problem of Balto-Fennic variation

A serious obstacle not addressed by Simon is that only the forms occurring in the Northern Balto-Fennic languages (Finnish, Karelian, Lude and Veps) differ from each other in regular ways. Most forms in the Southern languages (Votic, Estonian, South Estonian, and Livonian) exhibit variation which is both internally irregular and deviates from the Northern forms. The biggest issue is the vocalism with *-o-, but the variation in the suffixes between *-u- and *-e- and between *-p- and *-pp- is not unproblematic either. Next to hebu, Estonian variants include

⁴ In Modern Finnish, voiced stops occur in very recent loanwords, and *-d- occurs as the weak form of *-t- in consonant gradation, but in Balto-Fennic times it is reconstructed as a voiced dental fricative.
hobune, hobu, hobene (<b> = /p/), even hopen with geminate /p:/ (rendered in writing as <p>) and Votic has opõn next to õpõn:³

Northern Balto-Fennic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>hepo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karelian</td>
<td>hebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lude</td>
<td>hepo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veps</td>
<td>hebo, h’ebo, h’öbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingr. dial.</td>
<td>heppoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olonets dial.</td>
<td>heboine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➔ Kukkuzi Votic

hepoina

Southern Balto-Fennic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>dial. hebu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livonian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>hobu, hobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opõn, õpõn</td>
<td>hobune, hobene, hopen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation in both vocalism and consonantism between different Balto-Fennic forms has been close to ignored in virtually all etymological proposals for hepo. To mention some of the most recent proposals, Liukkonen (1999) argues for an origin in Baltic *ešva- with metathesis, cf. Lith. ašvienis ‘working-horse’ that also has a nasal suffix; and Kortlandt (1997) surmises a loan directly from (some stage of) PIE *h₁ékyos with the laryngeal preserved⁴. LÄGLOS (I: 95-96) does mention the

---

³ Est., Vot. and Liv. ð represents an unrounded mid-high back-vowel which most often originates from BF *e.

⁴ It is tempting to suggest as an alternative Iranian etymology of the word, involving completely different elements, cf. Chin. chibô < Middle Chin. *ti’s’ot puat, borrowed from Sogdian čerδpâδ- (ṣyr̩pôδ) ‘horse used in the valleys’, a formation identical to Lat. quadru-pons ‘four-legged (animal)’ (Yoshida 2009). Uralic, Fenno-Ugric, Fenno-Permian and Fenno-Saami *č become *h- in Balto-Fennic. However, neither such a proposal would solve the issue of variation in Balto-Fennic material; even if one disregarded the suffixes and argued that the alternation between *-pp- and *-p- (~ weak grade *-ß-) could be due to different renderings of the Iranian cluster *-rδp- the occasional o-vocalism would remain enigmatic.
Southern forms, but fails to account for their occurrence. The possibility of a Germanic origin (from < *ehwa-), again with metathesis, is left open, but the entry ends with the judgement “Kaum ein germ. Lehnw.”.

3 Danish hoppe and its closest relatives

The earliest attestation of Da. hoppe ‘mare’ as a common noun is from 1621, but it is known much earlier from a place-name Hopstrup near Haderslev in S Jutland, 1287-1307 Hoptorp, 1289 Hoppetarp, 1421 Hoptorpe. Nothing points to an original meaning ‘mare’: The names correspond structurally to other towns in S Jutland: Hostrup, attested 1298 as Horstrop (near Tønder), ca. 1325 Horstorp (near Esbjerg), 14th. c. Hors-torp (near Vejle) where the first member is hors ‘horse (obs.)’ (Jørgensen 1994). We also know that hoppedreng (obs., attested 1653) simply meant ‘groom, stableboy’ and did not refer to mares in particular. Its Swedish counterpart is a false friend hoppa ‘old meagre horse’ (dia., att. 1683), and the Nordic word has been borrowed into OE as hobin > ME hobyn ‘nag’ > Eng. hobby. The semantic development ‘horse’ → ‘mare’ is quite common, cf. e.g. PGmc. *marha- > Older Da. mar ‘mare’ (alongside mar from the original fem. *marhjōn-) and PGmc. *hursa- ‘horse’ > Bornholm dial. of Da. horse ‘mare’.

On the basis of these forms and LG dial. huppe, we can reconstruct a PGmc. *huppaz. The standard Danish and Swedish handbooks (e.g. Svenska Akademins Ordbok, SAOB) otherwise assume, often with some hesitation, that hoppe is an inner-Scandinavian derivative of the word hoppe ‘to hop, jump’ < *huppon-. However, a homonymous verb existed in Germanic with the meaning ‘move backwards, retreat (especially of horses)’ and for the latter non-iterative variant *happon-, and judging by the Swedish and English semantics, this is a more obvious connection (which however does not work completely, see below). So far, on the basis of these forms and LG dial. huppe, we can reconstruct a PGmc. *huppaz ‘slow horse’.

The surname Hoppe, known from 1410 onwards, according to Gammeldansk Ordbog’s note collection (www.gammeldanskordbog.dk) may instead be from hoppe in the meaning ‘shrimp’, derived from the verb hoppe ‘to hop’ (cf. also Mod.Da. græshoppe ‘grasshopper’), or from MLG hoppe ‘hop (the crop)’.

4 A Germanic ablauting n-stem

I suggest that Proto-Germanic possessed an n-stem *hebō 'horse' with gen. *huppaz of the type with vocalism alternating between -e- and *-u- described by Kroonen (2011). Although none of the items listed by Kroonen constitute an exact parallel to such a paradigm, i.e. no item with an alternation between nom. *-eD- ~ gen. *-uTT-,* one example of *-eT- ~ *-uTT- does occur (*wekō ~ *wukkaz 'wick') as does *-eD- ~ *-uRTT- as well as numerous other similar types like *-euD- ~ *-uTT- and *-aD- ~ *-uTT-. The system thus leaves the possibility open of the existence of a subtype *-eD- ~ *-uTT.

If the Germanic form of the horse-word suggested by Simon (2005) was actually *hebō ~ *huppaz originating from *kebʰ-ōn- ~ *k(ə)bʰ-nō-s, the -u- at first glance would have to have arisen from an analogical Germanic use of *-u- in zero-grade surroundings because no sonorant or *-u- was ever present to trigger the Gmc. -u- vocalism in the weak stems on regular grounds (as in PIE *grebʰ-on- ~ *grbʰ-nō-s > PGmc. *krebō ~ kurppaz 'basket'). However, there is also the possibility that the ablaut of the iterative verbs was exported to the nominal level as Kroonen (2011: 211-212) suggests for parallel cases like *dabō ~ *duppaz 'puddle' next to the verb *duppōn-. The vowel *-u- became productive as a zero-grade marker in Germanic iteratives even derived from strong verbs (cf. Kroonen 2012: 193). And it seems reasonable to assume that the iterative verb *hupp/bōn- and its non-iterative counterpart *happōn-8 to move backwards, retreat (especially of horses) influenced the paradigm of *hebō, especially if Simon is right that this word originally denoted the "slow" horse.

---

4 Kroonen (2011: 335-351) rejects an original paradigmatic alternation *kredō- (OHG chreta, MHG krete) ~ *kruttaz (OHG chrota, MLG krode) for 'toad', explaining the Upper German forms with <e> as renderings of umlauted forms with -ō- corresponding to NHG Kröte.

7 Cf. ON hopa 'fall back', Icel. hopa 'turn back, retreat', Far. hopa 'draw back, recede, retreat', Nw. hop(a) or hoppa 'retreat, drive backwards (esp. of horses)'. Da. dial. hoppe sig 'move backwards, drive backwards (Kroonen 2013: 257).

8 Cf. Nw. haba, habba 'retreat, drive backwards (esp. of horses)', Sw. dial. habba 'to turn back, drive backwards' (Kroonen 2013: 257).
5 From Germanic to Balto-Fennic

If the Balto-Fennic words for 'horse' are borrowed from such a Proto-Germanic -n-stem, the vocalic and consonantal variation among Balto-Fennic forms can be explained by the Germanic paradigmatic alternations. The Northern Balto-Fennic form *hepo and Est. dial. hebu are then simply a rendering of the old Germanic nominative, while Southern Balto-Fennic borrowed oblique forms with new zero-grade, perhaps with the -n- of the stem still retained and reinterpreted as domestic derivational suffixes:

*hebō → (loan) Fi. hepo, Est. hebu
† *huppaz < *hup-nan → (loan) Est. hobune /hopune/, hopene /hop:ene/ etc.
   > Da. hoppe, Sw. Hoppa (Scand.→ OE hobin, ME hobyn, hobin, Eng. hobby), LG dial. Huppe

Both forms were easily incorporatable into the Balto-Fennic system because BF already possessed the nominal suffixes *-o and *-(i)nen. It happens quite often that originally borrowed strings come to be interpreted as native suffixes (cf. e.g. BF *hom-eh 'fungus' < *šomeš ← Gmc. *swambaz).

6 Concluding remarks

It cannot surprise us that yet another term for 'horse' turns out to be a culture-word as the invention of riding spread with human migrations, expansions and trade. The exact directions of culture-words are notoriously difficult to trace, not least because they often involve transmission via unattested languages, and their etymologies therefore often remain disputed. From a purely Indo-European perspective, Simon’s proposal might be considered as plausible as any other. It is his inclusion of borrowings into non-Indo-European languages that suddenly made the evidence for an inherited PIE word worth considering. Correspondingly, in this article, a closer look at the Balto-Fennic material led us to revise his Germanic etymology and ultimately the Indo-European one, and consulting the latest research in Proto-Germanic morphophonology made it possible for us to explain the otherwise enigmatic differences between Balto-Fennic forms.
Simon’s observations already shed new light on the motivation of denoting the horse ‘the quick one’: because if *kebʰ- was ‘the slow horse’ then *h₁éḱuos is not simply ‘the swift one’ understood as swift runners compared to other animals, but rather ‘the swift (kind of) horse’, i.e. the kind used for riding, as opposed to the slower working-horse.⁹
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⁹ PIE *kopHo- ‘hoof’ (PGmc. *hōfaz), despite the similarity, appears unrelated to *kebʰ- even though ON hófr means both ‘hoof’ and ‘horse’; this probably just reflects a pars pro toto semantic extension of the type ON horn ‘horn’, but also ‘ox’.
Balto-Fennic Loanwords in Proto-Germanic¹

Abstract

This article consists of four entries treating what is argued to be Proto-Balto-Fennic (Middle and Late Proto-Fennic) loanwords into Proto-Germanic. Many of the candidates for loanwords begin with h- – this feature makes them more easily detectable in cases where Balto-Fennic h- have cognates elsewhere in Uralic beginning with š- or č-.

1 Four entries

1.1 PGmc. *HAMARA- ‘HAMMER’ ← BF *HAMARA ‘BACK OF AN AXE’

PGmc. *hamara- m. (> ON hamarr, OE hamor, hamer, OFris. hamer, homer) has traditionally been viewed as inherited from PIE *h₂éḱ-mon- or *ák-mon- ’(sharp) stone’, yielding Slavic *kamy/*kamen- ‘stone’, Lith. ašmuõ and akmuõ, Gk. ἀκμῶν ‘anvil’, Skt. áśman- and Av. asman- ‘stone, sky’ (via ‘vault’). Just like PGmc. *wajju- ‘wall’ as a derivative of PIE *yeiH- ‘to wind, plait’ tells us that there was once a time when walls consisted of plaited branches, quite independently of any archaeological evidence, we also think because of the standard etymology that we are able to tell that hammers in Pre-Proto-Germanic times were made of stone.

However, it is by no means certain that PGmc. *hamara- is really cognate with the other forms mentioned. Slavic *kamy/*kamen- is mysteriously distorted. For those who reconstruct a laryngeal in the PIE word it looks like a late metathesis: *h₂áḱ-mon- > PBSI. *Húk-men- >

¹ This paper was presented at the symposium “Germanic, Romance and Slavic in the Early Middle Ages” at the University of Leiden, 29 November 2012.
*kåH-men. However, the vowel PGmc. *hamara- is short, which rules out the metathetic explanation that works for Slavic. For those of us who prefer an initial a-vowel, a metathesis does not even suffice because Slavic -a- reflects a long vowel.

Furthermore, PGmc. *hamara- is a masculine thematic stem, and animate *-men-stems are normally not heteroclitic. If it is Indo-European, it could be either a secondary thematicization of an old *-mer/*-men heteroclitic, or the thematic suffix *-ero- added to a root ending in *-m-. The existence of a neuter *ák-my/-m(e)n- underlying the masculine 'stone'-word is possible but there seems to be no surviving reflexes of such a form. Indic derivatives such as the adjective aśmarā- ‘stony’ can just be interpreted as *ák-my- + suffixal *-ro-.

On hamarr meant: (1) hammer, (2) back of an axe, (3) crag, precipice (rather than just “stone”); in compounds it could be used of rocks, e.g. berghamarr ‘rocky precipice’, hamarrifa ‘rift in a crag’ (Zoëga 1910). The latter meaning, however, is more likely figurative than primary. Correspondingly, in the Da. place-name Hammer Odde, Harnknuden (on Bornholm, 1539 Hammar), Hammer Bakker (1503 Hammer) the name refers to the hammerhead-shaped crag of granite – again, the meaning ‘hammer(head)’ is primary, its use of a rock is a figurative description of a steep rugged mass of rock projecting outwards and upwards. It mostly occurs in coastal areas and never seems to be used just of rocks or stones in general that are not protruding or hammer-shaped. This use is confirmed by a common noun hammer ‘(steep) crag’ in Danish dialects. There is thus no particular need to reconstruct the meaning ‘stone’ or ‘rock’ for PGmc. *hamara-.

The first and second meaning of the Old Norse word match perfectly that of Balto-Fennic *hamara (> Fi. hamara ‘back of an axe’, Est. hamar, hammar ‘back of a knife’). In my opinion, PGmc. *hamara- has not been borrowed into Proto-Balto-Fennic a is otherwise assumed, but is simply a borrowing the other way around. The most important reason is that the word must be inherited in Balto-Fennic from at least the Fenno-Volgaic stage. It can be connected to Saami *symērē ‘back/pole of an

---

2 Scholars in general seem to regard the meaning ‘rock’ as primary in Germanic, but that may simply be circular reasoning – i.e. because they suppose from the outset that it is connected to PIE *h₂ek-men-.

3 Or at least into NW Germanic since no reflexes are known from Gothic. However, it must have entered the NW Germanic area already in the 2nd or 3rd c. AD because it occurs in the personal name Chamarus in the Zülpich-Enzen dedication: Lat.-Gmc. *Matronis M(arius) Chamari f(ilius) et Allo ‘To the mother goddesses, Marcus, son of Chamarus, and Allo’.
Thus, a possibility is left open that PGmc. *ši- ( < Proto-Saami *sī-) here must actually be the regular outcome of Fenno-Ugric/Permic/Volgaic *ša- in the position before nasal (the only other example being *šama ‘aparition, shape’ mentioned below). While Uralic and Fenno-Volgaic *š- indeed normally yields Saami *s-, the actually attested forms, which are comparatively few, reveal that when followed by the vowel -a- the sequence yields Saami *ši- before *-m- (probably: any nasal, but there are no examples with *-n- and *-ŋ-); in fact there seems to be only one alternative surrounding attested which is *su- before a labial stop (N Saami suhpi ‘asp’ ~ Fi. haapä). When followed by other vowels, both these vowels and *š- behave as expected (e.g. N Saami savvi ‘heal a wound’ < FV *šenā and N Saami soārvi ‘dead pine-tree < PU *šorva- ‘to dry (out)’). *ča- in front of a nasal is not affected either, cf. N Saami čuoži ‘membrane, fleshy fibres on the inner side of the skin’ (*-m- regularly goes to Ø via *-w- in these surroundings, cf. muošmi < Pre-PGmc. *mams-ma-; see elsewhere in this publication).

There is a way to get around it all: The Fenno-Volgaic form *šama ‘shape’ might, in turn, originally have been borrowed from some stage of Balto-Slavic. This would have been a language with regular satem reflex but the same metathesis or ablaut form as Slavic. This would have been a borrowing from Proto-Erzya čovne ‘fish skin’. Bjorvand & Lindeman (2000: 342) mentioned below). While Uralic and Fenno-Volgaic *š- indeed normally yields Saami *s-, the actually attested forms, which are comparatively few, reveal that when followed by the vowel -a- the sequence yields Saami *ši- before *-m- (probably: any nasal, but there are no examples with *-n- and *-ŋ-); in fact there seems to be only one alternative surrounding attested which is *su- before a labial stop (N Saami suhpi ‘asp’ ~ Fi. haapä). When followed by other vowels, both these vowels and *š- behave as expected (e.g. N Saami savvi ‘heal a wound’ < FV *šenā and N Saami soārvi ‘dead pine-tree < PU *šorva- ‘to dry (out)’). *ča- in front of a nasal is not affected either, cf. N Saami čuoži ‘membrane, fleshy fibres on the inner side of the skin’ (*-m- regularly goes to Ø via *-w- in these surroundings, cf. muošmi < Pre-PGmc. *mams-ma-; see elsewhere in this publication).

1.2 PGmc. *hama- ‘shape’ ← BF *haamo ‘shape’

PGmc. *hama- or *haman- ‘shape, physical form’ (> ON hamr ‘skin of animal; guardian spirit, tutelary spirit’, Da., Nw. ham ‘skin of animal; apparition, ghost’, OS hamo ‘covering’, OE hama, homa ‘id.’, OHG hamo ‘skin; covering; fishing-net’)4 can likewise be a borrowing from Proto-

4 Initial *š- in Samic is basically regarded as a loanword phoneme, consistently indicating loans from Balto-Fennic, Baltic and Late Scandinavian. The inherited postalveolar fricatives turned into dental-alveolars in Proto-Saami (PU *ć, *š → PS *č, *š). The conditioning presented here might indicate that it rather deserves to be characterized as a “marginal” phoneme, most common in loanwords but also occurring elsewhere.

to-Balto-Fennic. For BF we must reconstruct *haamo ‘shape; apparition’ on the basis of Fi. hahmo, haamu ‘apparition, facial characteristics, looks; ghost; shadow’, Karelian hoamu ‘shape, contour; apparation, ghost’, Votic āmo ‘id.’ The medial -h- in standard Fi. hahmo is secondary as indicated by the shape of its cognates. The medial -h- in Finnish can either have arisen by influence of the initial /h/, as also in huumar ~ huumar ‘mortar’; via metathesis from a derivative *haamo-h-; or less likely, by transmission via an extinct Sami language, as in kahlata ~ kaalata ‘to wade’ ~ Proto-Sami *kālē- < PU *kālā-).

This form, in turn, goes back to Fenno-Volgaic *šama which also yields Lule Saami sjipnō ‘similarity’ and Mordvin M šama, E čama ‘face’. The Saami form at first glance appears irregular with its *sjim- for expected *tsoum-, but as mentioned before, Saami *ši- here must actually be the regular Saami outcome of Fenno-Ugric/Permic/Volgaic *ša- in the position before nasal (the only other example being *šama-ra mentioned above).

The aforementioned čuožī ‘membrane, fleshy fibres on the inner side of the skin’ is a reflex of a similar Fenno-Ugric root which exhibits almost the same semantics as *šama: FU *čamčV ‘skin (of animal), membrane’ is reconstructed on the basis of forms from all Saami languages compared with Khanty (Ostyak) čunč ‘skin, hide’. The reconstruction of Proto-Saami *-m- in this root is based exclusively on Kildin Sami tsaments, while all other Saami languages point to a protoform *čôncē. However, that a reflex of a sequence *-mD- (i.e. -m- + dental) is preserved only in a single daughter-language and assimilated everywhere else is typologically common because (also sporadic) dental assimilation of -m- before a dental is in itself very common5. Crucially, a reconstruction *čôncē would leave the Kildin form unexplained, while *čôncē accounts for all of them (by preservation, in the case of Kildin Sami, or assimilation). Therefore I will reconstruct Proto-Saami *čôncē. It should be noted that even if the Proto-Saami form was *čôncē (which I find unlikely), this form, in turn, could of course just as easily as the individual Saami forms be the product of sporadic assimilation of an original cluster with *-m-.

5 reconstruct a PGmc. *hami-, which could form the basis of *hamja-, next to *haman-, while Orel (2003: 158) only sees a thematic stem *hama- m.

6 The situation is parallel to Indo-European where usually only Baltic preserves *-mD- whereas all other language groups assimilate (not necessarily by a rule-governed development). Note also the assimilation of Uralic *-mt- > Fenno-Ugric *-nt- in the ordinal suffix (and in lexemes as well).
The Mordvin forms might just as well < *čama. Since Balto-Fennic *h- is the result of PU *č-, too, we might as well assert *čama as the source. Both *čama and *čamčV are reconstructed for stages later than Proto-Uralic, and their variation may be due to their identity as Eurasian culture-words, cf. e.g. Written Mongolian čamča 'shirt' ~ Persian jāma 'apparel'.

1.3  PGMC. *HALBA- 'HALF' ← BF *HALPA, HALβA- 'CHEAP, REDUCED'

Among the classical, more or less successful, attempts to etymologize the PGmc. adjective *halba- 'half' is the reconstruction of a derivative *kol-bʰo- with the adjectival suffix *-bʰo- added to the root of Lith. šalìs 'side; strip of land; coast; direction'. The original meaning would then have been 'belonging to one side, having to do with one side', and such a development finds a semantic parallel in Slavic (OCS pols means both 'side' and '(a) half'. The connection with šalìs is, however, uncertain; it is not favored by Orel (2003: 154) who labels it "difficult word", rejected outright by Bjorvand & Lindeman (2000: 341-342) and not even mentioned as a possibility in Kroonen (2013: 204). Besides, even if the connection should be correct, there are no obvious candidates for cognates outside the Northern European branches. No alternative etymologies are generally accepted. Orel assumes that it is in some way related to Skt. kālpate 'succeed; fit; be partaken by', kālpa 'crossbeam'. This is rejected by Kroonen as semantically unconvincing; he simply states that the word has no clear etymology. Bjorvand & Lindeman likewise give up on most old proposals, vouching that the only possible solution is to operate with a derivative of the PIE root *skel- 'to split, share' (probably *skelH-) without s-mobile, an idea going back to Uhlenbeck (1905: 287). A serious issue is then that the root is unattested with s mobile – all attested forms have *s- in the root.

7 In Hyllested (2009: 204) I adhered to this etymology which I now reject. It goes back to at least Brugmann Grdr. (II, 1: 388-389) although indirectly ascribed to von Grienberger (1900: 107-108) by Orel (2003: 154) who gives a summary of the classical proposals.

8 I do not quite understand that their rejection seems to be based on the difference in semantics; cf. that the derived substantive *halbéν- f. means 'side' (Ofris. halve, OS, OHG halba) and 'region, quarter' (ON halfr), to a great extent overlapping with the Lithuanian semantics.
It is important to take into account the semantic scope of the word which can be inferred from its use in the attested languages. PGmc. *halba-* seems to have three (related) meanings: 1. incomplete, partial, reduced; 2. ‘a significant portion of; 3. ‘exactly ½’. There is no particular reason to think that the latter meaning, historically speaking, is the (only) primary one – numerals and terms related to measurement most often originate from words with broader meanings.

For Proto-Balto-Fennic a word *halpa-*, gen. *halβan-* can be reconstructed with the meaning ‘reduced, cheap of prices’. The reflexes in the individual Balto-Fennic languages are Fi. *halpa*, gen. *halβan*; Est. *halβ*, gen. *halβa* ‘bad, evil; poor (e.g. of prospects, arrangement); ill; low (of spirits)’, SW and SE dial. also ‘cheap (favorable of prices)’; Votic *alpa* ‘bad’ (Adler & Leppik 1990: I, 99; attested only in folk tales). From Northern Balto-Fennic it has been borrowed into several of the Saami languages, e.g. N Saami *hålb* ‘cheap of price and goods’, Lule Saami *(h)alpö- ‘become cheaper (of goods)’.

Koivulehto (1982; via Hofstra 1985: 162) has proposed that it is a borrowing from Proto-Germanic into Fenno-Saami (= Early Proto-Fennic), namely from the word *salva-* ‘filthy, dirty’ (> ON *sλλr ‘dark grey’) which would be manifested in Fenno-Saami as *šalva-*, later yielding Late Proto-Fennic (= Balto-Fennic) *halpa- ~ *halva- where *halpa* is one example of -h- corresponding to PGmc. *-s- in the oldest loans. Sammallahti (1998: 247-248) adds this etymology with a question mark.

However, Balto-Fennic *halba-* cannot be a loan from Germanic as it is cognate with Mari (Cheremis) Nw *šul-δς*; E Ki *šul-δo* ‘cheap’ (cf. UEW 782)⁹ and thus come from a Fenn-Volgaic *šalV-* with the adjec-

---

⁹ Cf. further Est. *halvustama* ‘to hold cheap, belittle’. Salaca Livonian *alu* ‘cheap, favorable (of prices)’ has been borrowed from from SW Estonian *alv* (Kettunen 1938: 9).

*Proto-Mari *-u-* is not the most common outcome of Proto-Fenno-Volgaic (or Proto-Uralic) *-a-*, which is normally *-a-* ~ *-o-* depending on the dialect. UEW (782) mentions, however, that there are more examples of Mari *-u- < Fenn-Volgaic *a*. We can at least find examples of Balto-Fennic *-a-* corresponding to Mari *-u-*, one of which is mentioned by Bereczki (1988: 338), namely Fi. *tammö* ‘oak’ ~ Mari *tumbo W tum*; but the question is which language group is conservative in this respect since Balto-Fennic seems to have many secondary *a’s* which might be due to a yet undetected conditioning. In other words, the correct Fenn-Volgaic reconstruction might in fact be *šulV*. It is also conceivable that the Mari word was contaminated with *šulβa*(la-)* ‘to cut a little bit’ (cf. *šulβa-las* ‘one cut across, one single cut’), a derivative of *ša-, šala- ‘to cut’ which, however, itself may derive from a FU root with *-a-, *šala- ‘to cut, split’ (pace UEW 459-460). Most important for our purposes here is that the Balto-
tival and participial suffix \textit{-pa} added to it. Accepting Koivulehto’s etymology implies a rejection of the Mari cognates and the reconstruction of a Fenn-Volgaic term.

I therefore propose instead that the word was borrowed from Proto-Balto-Fennic into Proto-Germanic. Note that \textit{*halpa-}, even including its derived verb (Fi. \textit{halventa} ‘make cheaper’) is already known to have been borrowed into Saami at a later stage. It is also important that there are no plausible cognates on the Indo-European side. Even if Mari cognates for \textit{*halpa} are not accepted, this would not hinder a Finnic \rightarrow Germanic etymology.

Germanic must then have borrowed the oblique stem with weak grade (\textit{*-b-} before a closed syllable in the paradigm, gen. \textit{*halβan}) which explains the Germanic voiced fricative; the reason cannot be Verner’s Law since the word would have had initial stress all along\footnote{Thus, Gmc. \textit{-b-} next to \textit{-h-} here cannot be used as evidence for the Germanic sound shift having preceding Verner’s law.}. The Fennic word would have been borrowed first with the primary meaning 1. incomplete, partial, reduced, while the originally secondary meanings 2. ‘a significant portion of’; 3. ‘exactly \(\frac{1}{2}\)’ (which of course can overlap completely in practice, but do not have to) would be semantic specializations within Germanic, eventually replacing the original PIE word for ‘half’, \textit{*sēmi-}, \textit{*sni-tero-}. The motivation for the borrowing is clear: ‘reduced’ of prizes and ‘cheaper’ of goods would surely have been an important concept in trading contexts.

1.4 \textbf{PGMC.} \textit{*punga-} ‘purse’ \leftarrow \textbf{BF} \textit{*punka-} ‘cheap, reduced’

Turning to words with a different initial consonant, another mystery in Germanic etymology is \textit{*punga-} ‘purse, pouch, small bag’ (> Goth. \textit{puggs} /\textit{pungs}/, ON \textit{pungr, OE} \textit{pung}, ODu. \textit{pung}, \textit{pong}, MLG \textit{punge} ‘id.’ [> Scandinavian], OHG \textit{scaz-pfung} ‘money-bag’). With its initial \textit{*p-}, it looks more than anything like a loanword. Most proposals seem to have just postponed the problem by suggesting as a source languages where it it likewise has the air of a foreign origin (cf. Orel 2003: 293) – In fact, MLat. \textit{punga}, Rumanian \textit{pungă} and MGk. \textit{ποῦγγα} are most likely to be Gothic loanwords (Bjorvand & Lindeman 2000: 707), and then we are back to square one. Neither they nor Orel (2003: 293) or Kroonen (2013)
offer any solutions except that the two latter surmise that there is some kind of relationship with *pukôn-. Bjorvand & Lindeman laconically state that it may very well be an old Wanderwort, but obviously wanderwörter have origins in specific languages, too, although they are harder to trace by definition. There is no reason *a priori* why some of the European wanderwörter would not turn out to have an origin in Uralic – or even be pure loanwords, borrowed in a bilateral process between a Uralic language and the target language.

Balto-Fennic had a word *punka* which goes back to Proto-Uralic *puncta* (or *ponka*) 'swollen or expanded object' (UEW 404, SSA 427) and has cognates in Saami, Permian and Ugrian languages. It is reflected in Fi. *punka* Est. *pung* 'something chubby or protruding, clod, bump, swelling; leaf bud; bag, purse'. While the latter meaning in Estonian may well be due to Middle Low German or even later Swedish influence (Mägiste 1982-1983 [2000] VII: 2230-2231), the semantic development from 'something swollen' via 'bag' to 'purse' is straightforward, cf. Welsh *balleg* 'purse' < PIE *bʰl̥-no-* from *bʰel-* 'swell'. Besides, Est. also has a variant *pong*, corresponding to Fi.dial. *ponki, ponka, ponko*, a variation in line with the one found in rest of Uralic.

I suggested already in Hyllested (2008: 136) that PGmc. *punga-* is a borrowing from Balto-Fennic, and, more tentatively, that the forms that look as if they go back *puh/kkôn-* (ON *poki* 'bundle, purse', OE *pocca, pohha* 'id.', Orkney Norn *buggy* 'belly', MDu. *poke* 'bag for wool', NHG *Pfoch* 'bag') may in fact be borrowings from a Western Saami precursor of Mod. N Saami *buggi* 'bump, lump, hump; swollen or expanded object' and/or *boggi* 'short fat one (person, animal or thing)'. The medieval assimilation of nasal plus stop (*-NT-* to *-TT-*) in Western Saami serves as terminus post quem since this development took place after 1000 AD and spread to Central Saami not until the late 1500’s (Sammallahti 1998: 29, Hyllested 2008: 134). The transmission can have taken place in several steps, most likely with Nordic as the middleman. Note that the words *bag* (< ME *bagge*) and *pack* itself is already a borrowing from Western Saami *pakke-* (> N Saami *baggi*) via Old Norse *baggi* (Hyllested 2008: 136) 'package, bundle; plump animal'. Medieval Saami and Balto-Fennic material in Norse and West Germanic relate typically to hunting and fishing, the fur trade, the production of hide and down, and trade concepts in general. Terms for 'purse' or 'bag (made of hide)' – with emphasis on either meaning – obviously fit in this picture.
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Gothic *mammo* ‘meat’ in the Light of Saami Evidence

**Abstract**

The Gothic hapax *mammo* [f.] ‘meat’ reflects Pre-PGmc. *mamz-mōn* ‘flesh’, which goes back to PIE *moms-mo*, a body-part derivative of *mems*- ‘meat’. Decisive evidence for this exact formation is delivered by North Saami *muošmi* ‘meat between the thigh and ribs (of a reindeer)’ which is not a Palaeo-Laplandic substratum word, but a regular substitution of the Pre-Proto-Germanic word.

1 Gothic *mammo* – attestation and earlier proposals

Gothic *mammo* [f.] ‘meat’ is a hapax legomenon occurring in the gen.sg. *mammons* from the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, 1, 22:

\[\text{in leika mammons is pairh dau} \ \text{du atsatjan izwis weihans jah un-wammans jah usfairinans faura imma}\]

\[\text{νυνί δὲ ἀποκατῆλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἅμωμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ}\]

“In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and un-blameable and unproveable in his sight”

---

1 The Gothic translation of the relevant passage is handed down to us via Codex Ambrosianus A and Codex Ambrosianus B, both of which are now kept in Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan.
Uhlenbeck (1905) originally suggested that the word had arisen as pure nursery language via the meaning ‘mother’s breast’ like Lat. mamma ‘breast’, but a year later (cf. Uhlenbeck 1906) he had abandoned that viewpoint. Nonetheless it was maintained by Scardigli many decades later (1973: 72). Today most scholars regard mammo as an o-grade formation based on PIE *mēms-ð- (⚙ *mens-ð-) > PGmc. *mimża- [n.] > Goth. mimz ‘meat’. This was first suggested by Mikkola (1897) who at the same time left the possibility open that it could be derived from a PGmc. *mazmōn based on the root in OHG muos ‘food’. His etymology was admittedly received with some hesitation by the standard etymological dictionaries of Gothic, e.g. Lehmann (1984: 243) who earnestly mention the possibility without directly endorsing it. Lehmann tags the label “disputed” on it, and Casaretto (2004) loyally maintains that the etymology is “unclear”.

Things did not start to develop until Polomé (1967). Kroonen (2013) express similar thoughts in his new dictionary, stating that mammo can reflect either

a) Pre-PGmc. mamzōn- < *moms-ð- with an uncertain assimilation of *-mζ- > *-mm-, or
b) Pre-PGmc. *mamz-mōn < *moms-mō- (*moms-mēn-) involving the well-known assimilatory development *-zm- > *-mm-.

He notes that the same problem is relevant for PGmc. *kramma- ‘moist, humidity’ (which correspondingly can come from either *kramzōn- eller *kramzōn-), embracing Polomé’s viewpoint that *-zm- is the more probable reconstruction on phonological criteria because it is uncertain whether an assimilation of *-mζ- into *-mm- took place at all; the most obvious counterexample is PGmc. *mimza- itself.²

² On this basis, the reconstruction has been characterized as problematic by Grienberger (1900: 154), Trautmann (1906: 62), Falk/Torp (1909: 310), and Casaretto (2004: 235), but although the sequence must be morphologically segmented *-mζ-m-, it of course forms a phonological string *-mzm-, and while it is true that *-z- generally is not assimilated to a preceding *-m- in Gothic or Germanic in general, it does assimilate to a following *-m-. Thus, reconstructing mammo as *mamz-ma- only appears problematic if the formation is supposed to have taken place in Gothic itself (when the assimilation process was no longer operating); but there is no need to think that it did not happen in Germanic or even PIE already.
From a morphological perspective, however, *mamz-mōn is more difficult to understand: It is the only attestation of *mems- ~ *mēms- with an o-grade anywhere in Indo-European. And one wonders what the motivation would have been for forming a new *-mo/-*men-stem from a nominal (pseudo-)root which already contains two labial nasals.

2 North Saami *muošmi and its implications

Turning to neighboring languages, new evidence has appeared. The North Saami word *muošmi means ‘meat between the thigh and ribs (on a reindeer)’ and has no generally accepted etymology. Aikio (2012) on the basis of its phonological structure deems it as a loanword. Moreover, he includes it in a long list of reindeer terminology inherited from the original language of the present-day Saami populations, called “Palaeo-Laplandic” (he explicitly avoids Saami here in order to distinguish it from modern Saami language and culture). It is generally acknowledged that the Saami populations were not speakers of Uralic from the outset but at some point took over a Uralic language, and that an abundance of terms from the old sunstratum language survived, accounting for hundreds of words which cannot inherited nor borrowed from any known language group. Aikio is the forerunner in the identification and analysis of this substratum; another important work in this field is his essay from 2002 where *muošmi however is not mentioned.

It has been known for much longer that Saami languages, like Balto-Fennic, have borrowed hundreds of words from Germanic through different periods in history, and that there are also Pre-Proto-Germanic loanwords, i.e. items whose present-day Saami shapes reveal that they were borrowed before the sound changes that define Proto-Germanic had all taken place. While it is beyond doubt that a large part of the Saami lexical stock can be ascribed to one or more non-Uralic and non-Indo-European substrate languages, we should therefore not be surprised if at least a small part of the proposed substratum words turn out to be Germanic or Pre-Germanic after all.

The Proto-Saami form of *muošmi would mechanically be reconstructed as *masmV-. However, *mamsnV- is in fact also possible: The normal development of Proto-Saami *-amC- is undoubtedly North

---

3 Nielsen & Nesheim (1932-1965, bd. II 1934 by Nielsen only: 702) gives the more elaborate definition: ‘layer of fat and muscles between the thigh and ribs of reindeer and other animals (goes with the side when the carcase is cut up)’. 
Saami -uovC-, cf. ruovda ‘border, edge’ ← Pre-PGmc. *rantpa- (*ramda- ) > PGmc. *ranþa-. However, the sequence -uov- is apparently phonotactically illicit before *-š- (with or without a consonant following), meaning there are simply no words in contemporary North Saami containing the structure †-uovš-. I could find none in the extensive Nielsen & Nesheim (1932-1962).

Although *muovšm- could very well have existed at some stage, Proto-Saami *mamsmV- would regularly yield the North Saami end result muošmi which is also what we find. It therefore simply seems to be a Pre-Proto-Germanic loan from the very same word that yielded Gothic mammo. Semantically there are already no problems, but even the specific Saami meaning may reveal something about the history of the formation.

3 Motivation for formation in *-mo-

One might argue that even if Pre-PGmc. *mamz-môn- or PIE *moms-mo- was formed on the basis of *menzan- or *mens- respectively, the motivation for using exactly the *-mo- or *-men- suffix could still be based on the iconic nature of reduplicative semantics. Danish nursery terms like mam(-mam) and mamse ‘food’, although they clearly look as if they are formed like nursery words in any other language, are perceived by speakers as derived from the adult term mad, which may even partly be historically true (or impossible to determine). In other words, the use of specific morphological elements in word-formation, although formally allowed, can still be motivated by conditions outside the morphological system – such as association to children’s language or even just a general human delight of playing with sounds and fascination of phenomena such as alliteration4.

4 One might also speculate that Wulfila associated *mammo with *mammona ‘mammon, wealth’ (a masc. n-stem, only attested in the dat.sg. mammónin) in a religious context where the concept of ‘meat’ could be contrasted with spiritual properties and values (cf. “the hunger for wealth”). However, it is hard to imagine such an association among the heathen speakers of Pre-Proto-Germanic who would never have heard of any such Greek-Aramaic word, let alone the biblical concept it denoted. My guess is that if Wulfila felt an association between the two, the similarity of mammón- f. to mammónan- m. was simply a convenient coincidence of the kind that translators sometimes stumble upon and are happy to exploit for literal and pedagogical purposes (to the extent that they have a choice at all).
Still, in this case there is in fact a possibility that we might be dealing with word-formation based on a very clear semantical motivation. Quite a few Indo-European names for body parts occur with a suffix *-mo- or *-men-; although a few of them can be shown to have originally meant something else, e.g. substantivizations of adjectives (PCelt. *skama- 'lung', but also the adj. 'light'), they cannot all be explained in this way. Even when the term looks like productive deverbal nominal formation (such as PGmc. *barma- 'bosom' < PIE *bʰer- 'to carry') one may wonder why exactly *-mo- was used in these cases. I think that there are enough examples for us to at least claim that its use was still in (marginal) use in PIE, and that it reflects an earlier grammatical marking of inalienable possession, using the 1st person verbal and pronominal marker *-m-:

PIE *gʰeh₂₂-mo- 'gum' (or *gau₂-mo-; deverb. from *? *gʰeh₂- 'gape')
PIE *pley-môn 'lung', Skt. klóman-
Plr. *caz-man- 'eye'
Gk. δέρμα, Ru. dermó 'skin'
Gk. ὄμμα 'eye'
Gk. ὀφθαλμός 'eye'  
Gk. ἄτη, Olr cnāim 'lower leg', PCelt. *knā-mi- 'bone'
Lat. abdomen 'belly, abdomen'
Lat. rūmen (≈ Skt. romanthā- 'chewing the cud')
P Celt. *skama- 'lung' (< adj. *skama- 'light')
Alb. zemër 'heart' (< *-men; root?)
P Gmc. *armaz 'arm' ≈ Lat. armus 'upper arm' (< PIE deverb. from *ar- 'link')
P Gmc. *barma- 'bosom' (< PIE deverb. From *bʰer- 'to carry')
P Gmc. *parma- 'gut, intestine' (< PIE deverb. 'drill (?)')
P Gmc. *skama- 'shame; nakedness' < genitals, naked skin, flin skin, hairless skin' (< *sk₂-mo- from *sekh₂- 'cut', cf. sex, Latin secāre)
P Gmc. *skerma-, *skermí- 'skin, hide' (< *sker- 'cut (off)'
ON hvarmr 'eye lid', Far., Icel. hvarmur, Nw. Kvarm, Elfd. agen-walm via Swedish < PGmc. *hwal(b)-maz
German Kieme 'gill' (? < OHG kiuwa, kewa, kouwa)

This situation is parallel to Uralic where I believe to have uncovered a specific use of the denominial suffix for specifically for body-parts. The suffix seems to have stayed productive in several branches – at least it
must have lived longer than in Indo-European, judging by the impressive number of examples:

**Proto-Uralic (attested in both Fenno-Ugric and Samoyed):**
*şiılmä 'eye'
*šeđmä 'kidney'
*şiū-m 'heart'
*pisV-m, *pi'(p)se-m 'lip'
*umV 'waist'
Proto-Saami *kâîmä 'marrow, brain' — Samoyed: Selkup küûma, Nenets xæwa 'marrow', Nganasan kojmu id. (~ Selkup küüñ 'marrow, brain')

**Proto-Fenno-Ugric (attested in both Fenno-Permian and Ugric)**
*ńaŋkçe-m 'tongue, palate' (PU *ńajkçe 'tongue, palate')
*ńâłmâ 'tongue'
*ńâlmV 'loin'
*ńarma 'groin' (formed from *ńarV 'hairless skin', FU)
*kel'mâ, *keš'mâ 'skin' (formed from *keš'e 'skin')
*kul'ma 'corner of the eye; eyelid; temple'

**Proto-Fenno-Permian (attested in both Fenno-Volgaic and Permian)**
*kurm' 'fist; handful'

**Proto-Fenno-Volgaic (attested in both Fenno-Saami and Mari-Mordvin)**
*cliV-mV 'canine tooth'
*sorme 'finger'
*wajimV 'heart'
*pjra 'crop (of animals)' has *-mV in Saami and Mordvin

**Individual branches / languages**
PU *pijV 'fist' has *-mV in Koibal Samoyed pam, Mator ojme
PU *tâwe 'lung' has *-mV-kV in Selkup tyymâtkâ, tyymieko
PU *kâînche 'nail' has *-mV in Mator Samoyed kadam
PU *konV + 2nd element 'arm pit' has *-mV in Ostyak xonnm pat
PU *tâktâ 'bone(s)' has *-mV in Hung. tetem
PU *kunV 'abdomen' has *-mV in Komi kynõm
PU *polwe 'knee' has *-mV in Mordvin pulma, puma-
PU *vVykV 'Adam’s apple' has *-mV- + -s- in N Saami guoggom(as)
PU *aju ('ajwe 'brain' has *-mV in Lule Saami vuojjam < PS *voiŋnêm
PFP *čVIV 'small finger' has *-mV in West Saami *čVIV-čV-mV (the base with *-čV- is common Saami)
PU *ikene 'gums, gills' has -ne replaced by -me in Fi.dial., ikemet, Kar. igimet, Vot ičemet, Est. igemed, igem, igim, ikem, ikim, Liv. igmõd (in Est. and Liv., only forms with -m- occur; nom. -n can come from both consonants)
Estonian habe(me) ‘beard’
Finnish siera(-im-(inen)) ‘nostril’
Finnish helma ‘lap, bosom’
Votic siaamis ‘inner parts of animal’s body’

4 Conclusion

Although Goth. mammo is normally translated as ‘meat’, our knowledge of it is based on a single attestation where it clearly refers to the human flesh. And N Saami means not ‘meat’ as a kind of prepared food, but exactly a kind of ‘flesh’, i.e. meat as a certain part of the animal’s body.

Not all languages have the same distinction as English, but we may conveniently use English to illustrate a word-formation scenario where *-mo- transformed the meaning from ‘meat’ in general into ‘flesh’ specifically:

PIE *mems- ‘meat’
+ body-part term suffix *-mo-

→

PIE *moms-mo- (with body-part term suff. *-mo-) ‘flesh’

Since the suffix does not appear to have survived in any of the Indo-European subgroups, I prefer to assume that the formation took place in PIE itself. However, most examples of Indo-European body-part terms with *-mo- are Germanic so we cannot exclude that it was still productive at least at the Pre-Proto-Germanic stage where *mamz-mön- would have been formed (perhaps first as *mamz-mō). This word was borrowed into Proto-Saami as *mamsmV and developed ultimately into North Saami muošmi (perhaps via *muovšmi) but disappeared from the other Saami subgroups.

It perhaps appears surprising that a word belonging to reindeer terminology was borrowed from (Pre-)Proto-Germanic into Proto-Saami. Judging by the number of reindeer terms that survived from Palaeo-Laplandic into Saami, one might at first glance conclude that reindeer breeding was important already in Palaeo-Laplandic times. Domestication...
tion of reindeer may have taken place in the transition period between the North European Bronze Age and the Iron Age (1200-600 BC). However, it is worth noticing that most Palaeo-Laplandic terms do not specifically refer to breeding; it could just as well reflect a way of life characterized by reindeer hunting.
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The Mysterious Elder:
Common Traits in European Names for
*Sambucus nigra* and *Viburnum opulus*

Abstract

No PIE names for the elder species (*Sambucus*) or the smaller water elder (*Viburnum opulus*) can be reconstructed although they are indigenous in all of the possible homeland areas. However, Lat. *sambucus* can be traced back to a meaning ‘the dusty tree’, referring to powdery mildew on canes, leaves and berries which gives the tree an overall dusty impression. This meaning also lies behind Lith. *šėivä-medis* (cf. *šyvas* ‘grey; mildew’), a relic of the old Balto-Slavic word which was borrowed into Fenno-Permian as *šewa*. In common Slavic it was replaced by the loan *bǔź*, *buz* < Old Turkic *boz*, *buz* ‘grey’ (cf. Ru. *büsel’* ‘mildew’) while in the NW Slavic fringes the old name only still survived at least until the 20th c. in the amalgamated and folk-etymologically reshaped Sorbian form *dźivi bōz* and as a loanword in neighboring German dialects (*Schibchen*, *Ziwecken*). Berries of the water elder are called *šaršō* in Mari (Cheremis) which can be traced back to a loan from (East) Baltic *šeršas* ‘moldy’. Germanic words for ‘elder’ correspondingly can be analyzed as containing PIE *pelH*- ‘grey’.

The frequent renamings of both species all over Europe may be due to taboo, linked to popular beliefs of the elder being guarded by “The Elder Mother” and her abilities to ward off evil. She was associated with spinning, considered a partly magical activity with links to the otherworld, which triggered a folk-etymological reshaping of the Balto-Fennic forms after words for ‘thread’. The denotation ‘the grey one’ could have had a double connotation ‘elder tree’ and ‘old lady’, remarkably alike the homonymy covered by Mod. Eng. *elder*. 
1 The elder is no beech: Lat. *sambucus

As is well known, the Indo-European word for ‘beech’ has played a very important role in scholarly attempts to locate the Proto-Indo-European homeland, not least because the distribution of *Fagus sylvatica at the period in question was known to have been restricted to areas to the West of a line from Kaliningrad to Odessa. For decades the classical reconstruction of the ‘beech’-word was PIE *bhāg-o- ~ *bhau̯g-o- (or *bʰeu̯g-o-), although the mechanisms behind such alternations were not really understood – they were just thought to be reflected in the material. This outdated reconstruction can still be encountered once in a while. At the same time, the ‘beech’-word served as the eternal parade example of how the reconstruction of a homeland and names for species often rely on specific denotations which may have changed as populations migrated to new areas.

While most scholars nonetheless agreed on a PIE meaning ‘beech’ on the basis of Latin *fagus, PGmc. *bōkō-, *bōkijō-, and Continental Celtic *bāk- in Gallo-Lat. *Bacena silva ‘beech forest’, they also had to consider a) Greek φηγός ‘Kermes oak’ which phonetically corresponds to the Western European forms, but has acquired a new meaning; b) Albanian *bungë which agrees with Greek semantically but contains a mysterious nasal; c) Kurdish *būz ‘elm’ and d) the Slavic word for ‘elder’, *būzū (Cz. bez, Bulg. băz etc.) or *buzů ‘elder’ which combined several problems of phonology – reflex of both u-vocalism not present elsewhere and a palatal stop not matching the Albanian word – as well as the fact that they designated other trees (to the extent that the elder can be called a tree at all). Furthermore, Germanic with its reflex of an unaspirated voiced stop seemed to be incompatible with the lack of Winter’s law in Slavic.

Scholars should have put more weight on the suspiciously sparse occurrence in Eastern languages in general and Satem languages in particular – the term seemed to be absent in Baltic, Armenian, Indic, and most Iranian, as well as Anatolian and Tocharian). An excellent histor-

---

1 Probably just a regular development of *bʰag-n- (cf. my article on Alb. hundê elsewhere in this publication.

2 Blažek 2002: 201-202 mentions the need to operate with an analogous *baz on the basis of the genitive *baza to account for Bulg. băs, SCr. baz. However, this is unnecessary since these forms come regularly from *bʰazê.

3 Kroonen (2012) mentions that beyki can just be an irregular continuant of ON *bæki, a form directly continued by Icel. bæki.
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cal overview as well as detailed and important considerations based on lots of new evidence, including from satem languages and Anatolian, can be found in Blažek (2002 with references). His most important conclusion for purposes here is that, based on the last 50 years of research, no evidence remains for any irregular alternations in the word. In fact, before Blažek himself, Mod. Icel. beyki is the only form reflecting -uy- that is associated with the beech. He argues that the Icelandic word is not inherited at all, but a 17th century rendering of Dan. bag with pseudo-etymological restitution of -ey- for Da. -o- (as in inherited words); he adds the not important factor that no beech forests, or even any kind of proper forests, are found in Iceland. Henning (1963): buz 'elm' is not related at all, but instead a regular Central Kurdish reflex of PIE *u̯e̯ibreveinvsub-ĝʰ- (corresponding to wiz in other Kurdish dialects; Slavic *vęźî, Eng. witch). Blažek shows that there Iranian reflexes showing exactly -āg- namely Gilaki fax. Slavic *bōzъ, *buzъ (also *buzina, *bōzina, cf. Ru. buzină) is probably not related. Quoting Blažek, "it is surprising how many excellent scholars were ready to accept the relation between *bʰāg(o)- and the Slavic forms indicating *b(ʰ)u̯g(ʰ)- (…) in spite of the difference in root vowel and in semantics". One might add that, even even for the excellent scholars mentioned, the Slavic ‘elder’-word remained the only clear indication of a) an irregular variation between -ā- and -u- and b) the palatal character of the following stop. Based on typological evidence, Blažek himself suggests that *bōzǔ, *buzǔ is derived from PIE *bʰug-

‘he-goat’ (Eng. buck; this is the case e.g. in Caucasian languages). He considers Lat. sa(m)būcus ‘elder’ a loan from Gaulish, formed with an alleged IE tree-name prefix also found in e.g. Gk. σμῖλαξ ‘yew’ ~ Lat. ilex ‘holm oak, kermes oak’.

While I agree completely with Blažek that the Slavic word should not be included in the ‘beech’ word-family, I have difficulties accepting his alternative etymological proposal, mainly because of the structure of the Latin word. It cannot be ignored in this context that sa(m)būcus clearly appears to contain the well-known plant-name suffix -ūcus, -ūca as in albūcus ‘asphodil’, lactūca ‘lettuce’, deriving from PIE *-u-h₃ʷ-o- ‘looking like X’. Moreover, the Latin words displays a variation between

4 Kroonen (2013) mentions that beyki can just be an irregular continuant of ON beyki, a form directly continued by Icel. beki.

5 Thus unrelated to sambūcus ‘harp, flute’ which, like the synonyms ambūbāia, Gk. ἁμβύκης, σαμβύκη is a later loanword from popular Aramaic with secondary -mb- from -bb-, cf. Literary Aramaic sabbākā, Syr. ‘abbūbā (see
samb- and sab- as mentioned by Blažek himself: The form sabūcus is also attested. Unless we are dealing with a folk-etymology, it therefore seems that we are dealing with an inner-Latin formation to a stem samb- alternating with sab-. We know one word which shows such alternation, and that is sabulum ‘sand’, although forms with a nasal are not otherwise found within Latin. Before we consider possible links between the elder and the meaning ‘(looking like) sand’, let us return to the Slavic word.

3 The Turkic origin of Slavic *buzo, *bozo, Mod.Gk. μπούζα

In my opinion the best candidate for the Slavic word is a borrowing from an early Turkic language. OTurk. boz ‘grey’ and its relatives are already known to be the source of numerous words in East Slavic, not least Old Russian, displaying various manifestations of the original vowel and sibilant – and notably a word among them meaning ‘mildew’. One of them also occurs in West Slavic (examples from Vasmer, Räsänen 1969, Dyneley Prince 1919).

ORu. busyj, bosyj ‘grey’, buséty, busovéty ‘to become grey, blue or dark’, cf. O.Ru. bosym volkom ‘as a grey wolf’ (in the Tale of Igor’s campaign) and busoví vrani ‘grey crows’
Mod.Ru. buzlák ‘Crocus reticulatus’
Mod.Ru. buzlúk ‘traces of ice on the boots’ (Tat. bozluk; boz ‘ice’)
Mod.Ru. buzán, búsol’, Ukr. busel’, Belaru. busel ‘white stork’
Mod.Ru. buzún ‘salt from salt lakes’
Mod.Ru., Ukr. búsel’ ‘mildew’
Pol. busiel, busko, buś, busek ‘young stork’

The reason for the large representation of this Turkic word as a loanword in Russian is no doubt the importance it has played in the history of Turkic and Mongolian identity from the times of the ancient steppe cultures to the present day, mainly connected with its function as epithet of the wolf which functioned as a totem animal for the early Turkic peoples, cf boz kurd, boz börü. Correspondingly, in the Secret History of

Schwyzer 238-239 with numerous parallels). Bruch’s attempt to relate it to Lat. scabo must be rejected, although we cannot exclude his claim that sabūca could have been reshaped to sambūca under the influence of sambucus.
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the Mongols, the forefather of Temujin is a grey wolf called Börte Chino (born 758), with Börte meaning 'grey-blue, grey-white'.

These are all East Slavic, but Late Common Slavic bordered areas inhabited by Altaic tribes (Birnbaum 1998, Andersen 2003), and the etymon is also known from the Bulgarian grey drink buzá 'a grey kvas-like drink', borrowed by Turkish and perhaps the source of Eng. booze via Romani (cf. also Chagatai, Osmanic Turkic etc. boza 'drink made of camel’s milk' and Chuv. pora, its r-Turkic counterpart, which may ultimately the source of the Gmc. beer-word). Quite remarkably, Mod.Gr. μπούζα, obviously a late loan, means 'water elder' – either it is a South Slavic loan although South Slavic forms seem to reflect only *bъzъ – or it is directly from Turkish with a meaning not attested there, having replaced the name for the same plant as in Slavic earlier in history.

The final Slavic -ъ does not historically represent a vowel, but is just the automatic LCS (and OCS) manifestation of a word-final non-palatalized consonant in loanwords, cf. LCS *klobukъ 'hat' (< Turkic, cf. Crimean Tatar kalpak 'cap'), OCS ковчегъ 'box, casket' < supposedly Avar; cf. Mongolian qagurčag), and LCS *тълмаčь 'interpreter' (< Turkic dolmač).

4 Lithuanian šeivã-medis, West Slavic *šiv-

Interestingly, a meaning ‘grey’ turns out to be compatible with a Baltic word for the elder. Lith. šeivã-medis ‘elder’ a compound that can be analyzed synchronically as the ’spool’-tree, because of its hollow branches that can be used as bobbins on a loom, cf. šeivã (cf. also šeivã-kaulis ‘radius (bone)’ next to šeivã-kaulis and šeivã-filmė ‘spool film’). However, one of the established PIE reconstructions for ‘grey’ is the formally identical adjective *keiH-uo- ‘grey’ whose zero-grade *kiH-uo- occurs in Lith. šývas ‘white; light grey; ”moldy” (mostly of cows)’, šývis, šývis ‘mildew’, OPr. sywas ‘white’, Slavic *sivo ‘dark grey’. Lith. šeivã– in šeivã-medis simply looks like the feminine counterpart *keiH-ueh₂. Gliwa (2008) derives the name of the tree exactly from šeivã ‘spool’ but he regards the etymology presented here as equally possible (p.c.)⁶. One im-

⁶ Admittedly, it must be noted that there are parallels to the development ‘spool’ > ‘elder’. At least Wichmann, Uotila & Korhonen (1987: 231) note that in the old handwritten Udmurt-Russian dictionary by Islenčev, it is noted that in the Jelabuga dialect, šerj has come to mean Sambucus. It is a borrowing from Chuvash
Important fact is that the name šeivė-medis not only denotes the elder proper (Sambucus ff.) but also the so-called water elder, also called dwarf elder or danewort (Viburnum opulus) which has red berries. The designation is probably the old Balto-Slavic one which can be inferred partly from a loanword in Permian languages denoting the water elder only (see below), partly from what look like relics from the Northwest Slavic fringes which notoriously retain archaisms from even before the Late Common Slavic period. In the German dialect of Upper Saxony the elder is called Schib-chen, and the Mansfeld dialect has ziwecken; both forms must belong with Sorbian džiwi bóz, which is synchronically ‘wild elder’ (Brüch 233, fn. 1), but probably a folk-etymology; it must be based on the use of the term wilder Flieder in NE German dialects that arose in order to be able to distinguish the locally preserved term Flieder ‘elder’ from that of the lilac, a new meaning that Flieder has acquired in High German after the introduction of the lilac into the country in the 16th c. (Kluge-Seebold 1989: 220). Sorbian dialectal convergence could easily have caused confusion between initial postalveolar sibilants and affricates even without the folk-etymology (Mucke 1891) but we cannot exclude that the similarity is a coincidence if the Sorbian loans in German dialects are misunderstandings as asserted by Brüch. With less certainty than for the Baltic and Permian attestations, then, we can reconstruct a West Slavic *šiv-‘elder’.

For PGmc. we can reconstruct *fliþra-~fliðra- on the basis of definitely a derivative with the three-name suffix *-ðra. It is now feasible to assert that the first part is the other widespread PIE adjective meaning ‘grey’ (probably originally a different nuance) *pelh-, known from e.g. Slavic *plěšnī ‘mold’, Lith. pilkas ‘grey’. The zero-grade was originally *pliH- which should yield PGmc. *fli-, but alternative zero-grades exist (Lit. pilkas < *pl-) which might either indicate analogy from formations where the laryngeal had merged with the suffix (e.g. participial *pliH-to- > *pli-tho-) or that the laryngeal and perhaps even the *-i- are extensions of an originally shorter root *pel-, *plej-.

šörö́, šör ‘spool’ into Votyak from where it has been borrowed further into Komí as šerí; here, it reportedly only means ‘spool’.

It is perhaps also worth noticing that the old o-grade possibly occurring in the Lith. dialectal form of ‘spole’, šaivà, and at least in Latv. saiva, does not occur in the tree-name (although that would be formally possible). The tree-name also occurs as šeivmedis.

Kroonen on the basis of a dialectal Dutch (N Hollands) form vlaar reconstructs Old Frisian *fiar and thereby PGmc. *fiypra-, but considering how many Dutch forms are reshaped after verbs for ‘to beve, flagre’ (cf. vlinder,
5 Why ‘the grey one’?

At first glance it seems odd that a name for several species of edible tree-like plants, which, depending on the season, are dominated either by an impression of shining black or red berries or bright white flowers would be designated by a color adjective ‘grey’. We can consider the possibility of a semantic shift from either:

a) The white flowers of *Sambucus nigra* and other species
b) The white pith of the elder, a traditional material for anglı
c) The black berries of *Sambucus nigra* (cf. NHG Hölunder ‘elder’ and Ru. latina ‘water elder’ < PIE *kel- ‘black’ which already reveals that this species and not e.g. *Viburnum opulus* with its red berries was the first plant to bear this name), or
d) Grey properties of the willow, cf. that Fi. selja ‘elder’ is borrowed from PGmc. *salhjō- ‘willow’, which is normally regarded to be ultimately derived from PIE *sal- ‘grey, dirty; ? salt-like’; the willow can grow as a parasite in elders (Tholle 1944)

As mentioned before, the linking of *Sambucus* species in popular taxonomy to *Viburnum opulus*; cf. e.g. Eng. water elder, NHG Traubenholunder, Dan. dværghyld and Ru. kalina ‘water elder’ is quite remarkable seeing that the latter has orangy berries but is still derived from the root *kel- ‘black’. This must mean that its name originally designated *Sambucus nigra*; conversely, OIr. ruis also covers *Sambucus nigra*, although it is derived from the PIE word for ‘red’. From a designation ‘grey’ with no semantic shift we can imagine the following motivations:

e) The particularly grey bark, common in botanic descriptions of *Sambucus* species (if used as a material)
f) Blue-grey dye can be produced from the berries of *Sambucus nigra*

---

*vliender, vlerk after vlinderen, vlerken, cf. fladderen and even vlieden, vlien ‘move in the wind’), almost as if by a process of phonaestetic value of the sequence *vl- and fl-, I so far hesitate to put to much weight on vlaar. Cf. also the parallel in Fi. heisipuu becoming hörskipuu after hörskyä ‘be frayed, sway’ and similar forms from Balto-Fennic below. Note that the Gmc. word is not crucial for the points presented in this paper, and that a root *pley- could theoretically also be an extension of *pel-.*
g) Powdery mildew on berries, canes and leaves can give elder trees a grey impression (cf. the second meaning of Lith. šyvis 'mildew')

I prefer the latter possibility for two reasons. First of all, if the elder was once denoted 'the dusty tree, the powdery tree', we can suddenly understand the formation of its Latin name. The root sa(m)b- we were left with after having subtracted the productive plant-name suffix -ucus from Lat. sa(m)bicus in is identical to the root in Lat. sab-ulum 'sand' < PIE *bʰsam-dʰ-o-. I quite agree with Garnier (2006) that the causes for this alternation goes back to variants of a PIE collocation *bʰs-m-eh₁₂ dʰeh₁- ‘to reduce to powder, to pulverize’ vs. *bʰs₂₂-bʰo- ‘pulverize’; cf. Skt. bhásma- `dust' and similar meanings in other IE languages. While I believe that sambucus was formed in Italic rather than all the way back to a PIE *bʰs₂₂-m-bʰ-u-h₁₂-o- or PIE *bʰs₂₂-dʰ-u-h₁₂-o- `(plant) looking dusty', I do find it very likely, having accepted that ‘sand’ comes from a word for ‘powder, dust’, that this was still the meaning of *sa(m)b- at the time of formation. This means that sambucus would be exactly 'the dusty tree', i.e. 'the moldy tree', and not as such ‘the sandy tree’ which would be an anachronistic interpretation. Thus, the Latin name can correspond exactly in meaning to Lithuanian and almost with the Slavic and Germanic ones, meaning rather 'the grey(ish) tree', but supposedly still referring to mildew.

6 What loans in Fenno-Ugric can tell us

That at least the Balto-Slavic perception of the elder as 'the grey one' may be much older than the Slavic-Turkic contacts is indicated by the following facts:

a) The Fenno-Permic name of the water elder is reconstructed as *šewe or *šewa, attested in Erza Mordvin čev-gel ‘water-elder berry’, and in the Permian languages: Udmurt (Votyak) šu ‘id.’, šu-pu ‘water elder’ and Komi (Zyryan) žo(č)-pu ‘id.’. This already appears to be a loanword (having *š- and no relatives within Uralic), so I suggest that it is borrowed from a hypothesized Balto-Slavic word for ‘elder’, *šeja- which is then only attested in Lithuanian and via this loanword. Note that the Fenno-
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Permic word only denotes the water elder which eliminates possibilities b), c), d), e) and f) as naming motivations;

b) In Cheremis (Mari), the berries of water elder are called šarša, which must likewise be a loan in the first place; in my eyes the only obvious source is East Baltic *šeršas ‘moldy’, cf. Lith. šerkštas ‘id.’ with intrusive *-k-. Note once more that we are dealing with Viburnum opulus, this time leaving g) as the only motivation (since a) referred to the flowers and *šeršas must have meant ‘moldy’, not a specific color, at the time of borrowing.

Baltic loanwords in Balto-Fennic are quite numerous (around 330); in Saami there are some too, and Volgaic languages (Cheremis, Mordvin) have also borrowed directly from Baltic (van Pareren 2005, 2008; Suuronen 1988). However, no direct lexical exchange has so far been detected between Permic and Baltic, and at the Proto-Fenno-Permic stage (= Fennic, Saami, Volgaic + Permic), estimated around 2000 BC, Proto-Baltic proper could hardly yet have evolved as a distinct dialect of the Balto-Slavic unity.

If we accept the Slavic word as a Turkic loan, Slavic must consequently have had another word for ‘elder’ in the preceding centuries – perhaps *siv- preserved in *šiv- in Northern West Slavic. And since it is possible to derive the Lithuanian word from IE, it is conceivable that *šeiv- is a manifestation of is the old Balto-Slavic term *šeiv-ā, borrowed into neighbouring Fenno-Permian languages during the Bronze Age. This would then be the first piece of evidence for a Balto-Slavic word borrowed into a Uralic stage as old as Fenno-Permian⁹. The etymology is confirmed by the fact that the Mari name for the berries of the same plant, šarša, can be traced back to another Baltic word for ‘moldy’.

7 The Elder Mother and Indo-European beliefs

Since both Sambucus nigra and Viburnum opulus are indigenous to all possible PIE homeland territories (including Anatolia), the Proto-Indo-

⁹ Note that this stage will have to be considered even older by many uralicists in Finland now, since a consensus seems to have arisen that Uralic did not split into Fenno-Ugric and Samoyedic before Fenno-Ugric then split into Ugric and Fenno-Permian, but rather that Uralic was divided into West Uralic and East Uralic where the former would equal Fenno-Permian.
Europeans must have had names for them. ‘Elder’ belong to what we could justifiably characterize as “surprising lacunae in the IE lexicon” (‘sturgeon’ is another one).

The frequent renamings of both species all over Europe may be due to taboo, linked to popular beliefs of the elder being guarded by “The Elder Mother” (Mother Hulda, NHG Frau Holle, Dan. Hyldemo(e)r and its abilities to ward off evil; the Danish tradition is described by Tholle 1944). The Elder Mother was associated with spinning, considered a partly magical activity with links to the otherworld; this may have triggered a folk-etymological reshaping of the Balto-Fennic forms; cf. Fi. heisi ‘elder’, Est. (h)õis ‘bloom’ ← Baltic *žeidas ‘bloom’) after words for ‘thread’ (see Mägiste 1970:357-358):

- a) Regular: Fi. heisi, heisi-puu ‘elder’, Est. (h)õis ‘bloom’
- b) Influenced by Fi. (Lönnrot) höytö, S Est. hää ‘thread’: Fi. höisi-, höysi-puu, Olonets Karelian höüdöi, Lydian höüdü-öi ‘elder’
- c) Influenced by hörsk(y)ää, hersyää ‘be frayed; sway’: Fi. hörski-puu, hersi-puu ‘elder’

In Danish folk-tradition it is told that an elder (a water elder?) will grow from the middle of Viborg Lake when the enemy (often “the Turk”) arrives, which is perhaps the reason for the English alternative name Danewort of the water elder; on the connection between Mother Hulda and Baltic folk-belief regarding lakes and spirits, cf. Gliwa 2005.

If these religious connotations are very old, we may even cautiously interpret ‘the grey one’ as having a double meaning, remarkably, but presumably incidentally, alike the ones covered by Mod. Eng. elder. In English folk-belief, Mother Elder is also known as The Old Lady. The Eng. name itself is reshaped from OE ellærn, partly after other tree-names in -der (cf. MLG eldern), corresponding to MLG alhorn. It may very well be that this has happened with the meaning of the homonym in mind.

8 Concluding remarks

We may summarize the scenario as follows: The (unknown) PIE term for ‘elder’ became replaced in NW PIE by different terms all meaning ‘the grey one’ or ‘the dusty one’, referring to powdery mildew and perhaps only later to Mother Elder. In Balto-Slavic, a reflex of *kei̯h-uo-
was used and borrowed into neighbouring Fenno-Ugric languages. In Late Common Slavic, the new indigenous term was replaced with its synonym in Old Turkic, used by adjacent Turkic or mixed Altaic tribes; perhaps the original Balto-Slavic word survived in the Northwesternmost fringes. Several of the Balto-Fennic forms were reshaped under influence from the word for 'thread', referring to Mother Hulda’s magical spinning techniques.

We may illustrate the course of events in a chart like this:

Stage 1
An unknown PIE name ‘X is the original common name for two kinds of plants ‘Sambucus; viburnum opulus’, perhaps already personified as ‘mother elder’ and colloquially replaced by ‘the grey one’, ‘the dusty one’ because of taboo

Stage 2
NW PIE the term ‘the grey one’ or ‘the dusty one’ gets lexicalized and becomes the normal term for both species

Stage 3
a) Italic uses ‘the dusty one’ (anachronistically *bʰs₂-m-bʰ-u-h₃°-

b) Balto-Slavic uses ‘the grey one’ or ‘the moldy one’ (*keiH-υο-

c) Germanic uses the ‘the grey tree’ (PGmc. *fli-pra-)

d) Germanic and Slavic also has ‘the black one’ (*kel-ŋ-) referring originally to Sambucus nigra, but later also to Viburnum opulus

e) Celtic may have used ‘the red one’ (OIr ruis) of certain species and later transferred it to Sambucus nigra

Stage 4
The Balto-Slavic word is borrowed to Proto-Fenno-Permic (*šewa) as the designation for Viburnum opulus only

Stage 5
Another (East) Baltic expression for ‘moldy’ (*šerša-) is borrowed by Mari (Cheremis) as the name for the berries of Viburnum opulus

Stage 6
a) Late Common Slavic replaces the domestic word with a Turkic synonym *buz̥ > buz; the original word survives in the extreme Northwest as *šiv- (Sorbian, and as a loan in German dialects)
b) Balto-Fennic forms are reshaped after names for ‘thread’ (heisi ‘elder’ > höisi after höytö etc.

c) The Old English form ellærn is reshaped after other tree names in -ærn (such as alder), probably not creating a homonym for ‘old person’ by sheer coincidence.
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Balto-Fennic *kakra ‘oats’, the Etymology of hail, and another Exception to the Germanic Sound Shift

Abstract

Labials develop regularly into velars when preceding -l- and -N- in various Scandinavian dialects past and present. Since delabialization is not common before -r-, Nw. dial. hagre, OGutn. hagri, Mod.Gutn. hagre, Elfd. ager, all ‘oats’, have been interpreted as reflecting an original PGmc. variant *hagran- alongside the more widespread *habran-. Kroonen (2013) separates the two forms, reconstructing a meaning ‘broom grass’ for *hagran-., with reference to especially Da. hejre id. However, it has been overlooked that Proto-Balto-Fennic *kakra, an early Germanic loan, points to a meaning ‘oats’ attached to the velar variants in Proto-Germanic already. Witczak’s (2003, 2004) PIE reconstruction *kop-r ‘grass; vegetables’ is accepted, but a semantic and derivational stratigraphy reveals that core IE remnants of the old heteroclitic stem (such as Alanic zabar) acquired a specific meaning ‘oats’, while purely thematized forms were attached to less specific, non-agricultural, meanings. PGmc. *hagla- ‘hail’ can be related; deriving terms for ‘hail’ from ‘grain’ is typologically common, and a sound-law whereby PIE *-opl-, *-apl- yields *-agl- or *-ak(u)- would allow for five other Germanic words of disputed origin to be assigned quite straightforward etymologies: *tagla- ‘tail’ could go back not to *dok-lo- but to *dop-lo-, derived from the root in Sw. tase ‘tuft’—an alternative also applicable to OIr. dúal, but leaving out otherwise irregular Slavic forms; OSw. sakla ‘to drool’ is linked to EFr. sabben ‘to drool’ and PGmc. *safta- ‘juice’ rather than NWGmc. *sakkan- ‘sink slowly’, Sl. *soků ‘juice’; Da. rakle ‘catkin’, Sw. dial. rackel ‘long thing; tall, slim person’ are equated with Lith. räplės ‘thongs’, akin to Sl. *repěji ‘burdock’, Alb. rrap ‘plane tree’, PGmc. *rafra- ‘long, thin pole’; *skakulaz ‘whippletree; traces for harness horse; schackle’ is deemed identical to Lat. capulus ‘halter for horse; towing rope; handle’, scapula ‘shoulder’, derived from
the root in scāpus, PGmc. *skaftaz ‘shaft’; and *hakulaz ‘cloak’ is seen as a derivative of the root in MLat. cappa, cāpa id., which can be shown to be of IE rather than Semitic origin.

1 Balto-Fennic *kakra and Germanic words for ‘oats’

Labials have developed into velars in the position before -n- and -l- in various North Germanic dialects, cf. for *-pn- ON vākn ‘weapon’, OSw. (Västgötaland, Östgötaland, Hälsingland, Västmanland, Söderkalix) vākn, Far. dial. vāk and even Fi. vaakuna, an old Scandinavian loanword, next to ON vápn, OSw. vápn, Far. vápn < PGmc. *wēpna- id.; Norrland Sw. göcken, Mod.Gutn. gauken, Far. geykn ‘handful’ ~ Sw. göpen, MDa. giøben, ON gaupn ‘both hands held together’, OHG goufana ‘handful; empty hand, palm’ < PGmc. *gauptnō-; OSw. (Västgötaland) and Norrland Sw strågna ‘suffocate’ < *stroppnα, from strypa ‘strangle’; for *-fn- OSw. ugnen, Sw. ugn, SW Nw. and Inner Trondelag Nw. ogn, Icel. ömn ‘oven’ next to ODa. (Haderslev Stadsret 1292) ufen, Sw. dial., Nw.  omn < PGmc. *ufna- id.; for *-pl- Nw. drøygla ‘to secrete from the uterus (of a cow in rut)’ ~ Nw. dropla ‘drip quietly’, PGmc. *draupa- ‘a drop’; and for *-fl-, *-bl- *-vl- Sw. dregla ‘to drool’ ~ OE dreflian ‘to dribble or run at the nose, slobber’, Eng. drivel, drool < PGmc. *drablōjan-; OSw. sughl ‘meat’ ~ OSw. sufl, Sw. sovel < PGmc. *subla-; and OSw. swagel, Sw. dial. svagel ‘sulphur’ ~ Standard Swedish svavel, borrowed from MLG swavel.

---

1 For delabialization in this item in Nordic specifically, cf. Bjorvand & Lindeman (2001: 704) and Kroonen (2013: 446). Traditionally, OSw. ugnen, Sw. ugn have been considered Verner variants of another form *u(h)w(na)- reflected in Goth. aūhns. However, Gothic in fact seems to have undergone a similar, although more restricted, development of f > h before nasal (cf. aūhuma ‘upper’ < *uʃumani-); not contested by any obvious counterexamples (cf. also lauhmuni ‘lightning’ in fn. 40; see Hyllested & Cohen 2007: 15–16). Not a single Germanic attestation thus points unambiguously to a variant with labiovelar *u(h)w(na)- or *u(g(w)na-; hence, we need not reconstruct any other forms for ‘oven’ in Germanic than *ufn-, with perfectly regular developments throughout the daughter-languages (that is, if one disregards late dialectal confusion resulting in variation in, say, Modern Standard Swedish where *umn would be the expected outcome).

2 These etymologies for Sw. dregla and Nw. drøygla respectively are new. The two words have otherwise been grouped together (Tamm & Noreen 98; Hellquist 1898) but are usually not assigned further certain etymology.
Mostly, this is described as a sporadic, yet common phenomenon\(^5\), however, judging from the material in e.g. Rydquist (1868: IV, 239, 249), it appears quite if not altogether regular in some dialects of (Old) Swedish (especially Norrland and Västgötaland) and Norwegian (confined to Old W Norwegian, Mod. SW Norwegian and the dialects of Inner Trøndelagen [Lierne]), and it dominates in Faroese\(^6\), while, on the other hand, it is completely absent from (Middle) Danish\(^1\) and Old Gutnish\(^8\).

\(^5\) Thus Wessén 1965 (I: 46) for Swedish in general, Olson (1904: 116) for the old dialects of Östergötland and Seip (1931: 188) for Old (S)W Norwegian. However they only mention the development of “\(p > k, g / n\).”

\(^6\) Also after loss of intervening -\(t\), cf. akna ’become evening’ < ON aftma id.; Old-Fris. *aktb\(\dot{\text{n}}\) < *akt\(b\) > (Lockwood 1961: 57).

\(^7\) Unfortunately the situation in Modern Danish is often ambiguous because of the merger between -\(g\)- and -\(v\)- and sometimes -\(b\)- in relevant positions, and the possibility of spelling the ultimate result [\(w\)] both with <\(g\)> and <\(v\)>, and sometimes even <\(b\)>. This is also the case for forms with <\(v\)> in Bokmål Norwegian, and Old Gutnish, even pronounced with labiodental [\(v\)], that are historically Danish (e.g. own ’ovn’).

\(^8\) According to Kroonen (2013), OSw. lijung-eld, Mod.Gutn. liugn ‘lightning’ constitute another example and must come from Old East Norse *ljúfn (OSw. lyghna f. id. < *ljúfn), which would in itself be a secondary labialization of Proto-Norse *\(-\)\(uh\)- into *\(-\)\(uf\)-. Kroonen here implies that an old Verner variant PIE *\(ly\)\(yk\)-\(n\)- would not have yielded PGmc. *\(le\)\(ug\)na- but *\(le\)\(ukka\)- with Kluge’s Law instead. Nw. ljôn, lyn, Da. lyn ‘lightning’ (and Mod.Icel. ljón ‘hurricane’, attested from the 19th c.) would still point more directly to a Germanic and Norse protoform with *\(-\)\(hv\)-. At first glance, the supposition that *\(ljúfn\) was a general East Norse form seems to be contradicted by ODan. liuhnedh ‘lightning’ since the developments *\(\text{f}v\)- > -\(g\)- /\(l\)/\(n\) and *\(p\)- > -\(k\)- /\(l\)/\(n\) do not occur in Old Danish; however, -\(gh\)- in this word can simply reflect a difficulty of identifying the fricative [\(\gamma\)] following -\(t\), cf. the orthographic variants frughe ~ frue << O Sax. fría or MLG frúa and (Brøndum-Nielsen). On the other hand, liuhnedh is the only example where a purely “orthographic” (unetymological) -\(gh\)- would occur outside hiatus, so we cannot exclude that *\(-\)\(gh\)- does reflect a Proto-Norse *\(-\)\(gn\)-, which, because of Kluge’s Law, must still be explained as secondary from a Proto-Germanic point of view. In fact, no Germanic forms even point unambiguously to its unvoiced counterpart, PGmc. *\(le\)\(uh\)na-. In Gothic, first of all, lāuhnumi f. ‘flash’ may straightforwardly reflect *lāuhmunjo- (see the previous footnote). Second, we cannot be completely sure of the final outcome of a PGmc. full-grade sequence *\(\text{euf\(\dot{\text{n}}\)}\)-, *\(\text{eub\(\dot{\text{n}}\)}\)-, *\(\text{auf\(\dot{\text{n}}\)}\)-, or *\(\text{aub\(\dot{\text{n}}\)}\)- in Old West Norse; what we have apart from Nw. ljôn ‘lightning’, Mod.Icel. ljôn ‘hurricane’ (attested only from the 19th c.) is the variation between ON, Mod.Icel. ofn ‘oven’ on one hand and Mod.Icel. ónn ‘…’, attested from the 1500’s, on the other. There is a possibility that ónn is borrowed from Danish (since ð from that century onwards has been pronounced as a diphthong close to Da. -\(ov\)-), but ÓI prefers an old variation in OWN. The latter remaining a pos-
Since delabialization is not common before -r- anywhere, Nw. dial. *hagre, OGutn. *hagri, Mod.Gutn. *hagre, Eld. *ager, all ‘oats’, have been interpreted as old forms reflecting a PGmc. variant *hagran- (~ *hagrōn-) m. alongside the more widespread *habran- (~ *habrōn-) m. (> ON hafri, Sw. havre, OS haboro, OHG habaro, NHG Hafer). While the forms reflecting a variant with velar are simply left out in Orel (2003), Kroonen (2013) tries to separate the two variants historically, and on the basis of especially Da. hejre ‘brome grass’ and, with less weight, Mod.Icel. hellin-hagra ‘mother-of-thyme, Thymus praecox; wild thyme, Thymus serpyllum’, he tentatively reconstructs the meaning ‘bromus’ for PGmc. *hagran-. He further notes “Brome grass is closely related to the wheat-grass lineage, and is known to infest grain fields”, leaving open various possibilities of relationship to PCelt. *korkio- ‘oats’, OIr *corc ‘hair’ and Nw. dial. *hagr, harg ‘coarse hair from a horse’s mane or tail’ via dissimilation or metathesis. In any event, he chooses to separate *hagran- with a velar from *habran- with a labial, assuming an old meaning ‘oats’ only for the latter.

Both Orel and Kroonen derive *habran- from *habra- ‘goat’, thus operating with an inner-Germanic origin of this word. However, Witzczak (2004) makes an excellent case for a broader Indo-European origin, we cannot exclude that Icel. ljón, Nw. ljon reflects the same kind of variation, and that *-eufN- and *-euhN- merged in (variants of) OWN. The remaining form mentioned by Kroonen, ME leven ‘lightning, flash, flame’, is traced back to a form *laufhumna- but may equally well reflect *laufjumna-. Now, even a lone PGmc. *leuf- needs an explanation: From an Indo-European point of view, we would obviously expect ‘lightning’ to be derived from *leyk- ‘light’, which occurs in other derivatives as PGmc. *leuh-; however, the word for ‘lightning’ in ON is actually leiptr (Mod.Icel. leiftr) which belongs with Lith. liepsnà ‘id.’, going back to an altogether different root *leip-. A Proto-Germanic contamination between *leuh- in leuhman- ‘beam of light’ (ON ljómi, OE lēoma) etc. on one side and *leif- in leifstraz ‘lightning’ (ON leíptr-) on the other, resulting in new PGmc. words for ‘lightning’ beginning with *leuf-, appears to have been unavoidable.

Thus, Da. havre can theoretically reflect both *habra- and *hagra-.

Glossed in Kroonen (2013) as ‘a kind of thyme’. The common name in Modern Icelandic today is blöðberg.

Elsewhere in the entry he supposes a “broader meaning” than just ‘oats’.

An equestrian term common to Celtic and Germanic would match the results reached in Hyllested 2010 quite well; there, I argue that old vocabulary common to Germanic and Celtic can be grouped into a few semantic categories; one of the important subcategories is exactly terms pertaining to horsebreeding and riding. Another word meaning ‘horsehair’, shared by Celtic and Germanic, is mentioned later in this article.
word family involving Hitt. kappar- ‘vegetables’; Skt. sāpa- m. ‘drifting reed; reed washed onto a riverbank’; Alan. zabar ‘oats’, ModPers. sabz ‘grass; green; dark’, Pashto sābah ‘grass; vegetables’, Shugni sip(i)yak ‘a kind of millet’ (< Plr. *sāpar-ku-), Roshani sabēc ‘pod of bean’; Lith. sāpas ‘straw, grass’, sāpai ‘what remains in the field after a flood’; Mr. corca, coirce ‘oats’; W ceirch, MBret. querch (in the Celtic forms, *p- has regularly disappeared, and -ch- is seen as reflecting a suffixal *-k-o-, cf. the Iranian forms). Although Witczak reconstructs both PIE forms, a heteroclitic *kop-r and a thematic *kop-o-, with very broad meanings ‘grass; vegetables’, especially the Alanic meaning underlines that the meaning ‘oats’ can be old. More specifically, ‘oats’ seems to have become the specialized meaning of the non-Anatolian IE remnants of the heteroclitic form, while the thematic form is rather attached to meanings like ‘grass’, ‘straw’, or dead plants floating in the water. In PIE including Anatolian, the exact meaning is less precise, but it appears that PGMc. n-stems are built upon secondary thematicizations to the original heteroclitic.

Several other of Kroonen’s points can be contested. Designations for ‘brome grass’ can be transferred from those from ‘oats’ or vice versa simply because of the strong physical similarity between the plants; cf. e.g. Danish hejre-havre ‘bromus’. An Icelandic name like hellin-hagra does not tell us much about the original meaning of *hagrōn- since it only makes up the last part of a compound of a type common for grass-like or edible plants or fodder, cf. besides hejre-havre also Dan. drap-havre ‘oatgrass, Arrhenaterum’. Furthermore, hejre could theoretically be connected to Nw. hagr, harg ‘coarse hair from a horse’s mane or tail’ (and Shetland Norn hegri ‘thin yarn of wool’) without having anything to do with the ‘oats’-word, cf. the almost exact parallel source of Nw. fakse, Sw. faxe ‘bromus’ < ON faxi ‘horsetail’. While I do find it possible that a contamination or maybe even a reshaping took place involving the horsetail-word, so that for example a PGMc. *harga- ‘horsehair’ merged with *habra- ‘oats’ into the variant *hagra- ‘oats’, this would not have taken place earlier than in Common Scandinavian for the following reasons:

The velar variant is attested in all languages of the Balto-Fennic group, everywhere with the meaning ‘oats’, and unanimously pointing to a Proto-Balto-Fennic form *kakra, cf. Fi. kaura, E dial. kakra, Kare. kagra, Veps kagr, Est. kaer, Vot. kagra, Liv. kagr. Since Proto-Balto-Fennic is usually regarded to be at least as old Proto-Germanic, we must maintain a form *hagra- with the meaning ‘oats’ alongside the
synonymous *habra- already in Proto-Germanic (although it is of course theoretically possible that the various branches of Balto-Fennic borrowed the word individually at a later stage, say, from a stage close to Proto-Norse, a possibility not preferred by Ockham’s razor). In other words, Balto-Fennic confirms that *hagra- did not primarily mean ‘bromus’ which would perhaps be a less obvious culture-word anyway.11

Summing up, it seems clear that PGmc. *hagran- m. ‘oats’12 and *habran- m. both existed in Proto-Germanic as variants of a word meaning ‘oats’, and that the latter variant was borrowed into Proto-Balto-Fennic as *kakra. It is an n-stem formed from a secondary thematicization *kop-ró- of an old heteroclitic *kop-r which in core IE acquired a meaning ‘oats’ (in some Eastern Iranian languages, it has further come to signify a local kind of millet). Derivatives outside the heteroclitic system retained meanings of a less specific and less agricultural character such as ‘grass’, ‘vegetables’, ‘straw’ or ‘plants flowing in water’. This provides us with a stratification of meanings that neatly match what we claim to know about the cultural history involved: That the speakers of PIE were less hard-core agriculturalists than the speakers of later Western IE offshoots.

2 PGmc. *hagra- ‘oats’ and *hagla- ‘hail’

Regardless of its precise meaning, the existence of a PIE root *kap- or * kep- used in words for crops, everywhere occurring in what could be

11 Neither do I agree with Hofstra (1995: 95) that Fi. kakra and its Balto-Fennic cognates can be loanwords from Old Gutnish during the middle ages. As mentioned before, the delabialization is not even specifically Gutnish in the first place, cf. vapn ‘weapon’, hamn ‘harbor’, stefna, stemna ‘to point out’, afla ‘breed’, gafi ‘fork’, cafli ‘piece cut out’, although at least gauken ‘handful’ and probably liaugg ‘lightning’ show that it occurs (sporadically) in Modern Gutnish which is not an uncontaminated descendant of Old Gutnish. What we need is a the most plausible scenario to explain the presence of velar forms in all Balto-Fennic languages.

12 Several people have contested my use of the term “delabialization” in this case since by delabializing a labial you do not get a velar. I maintain the use of the term, for which there is no good alternative, because delabialization in this case refers to phonological rather than phonetic conditions. The velar stop is simply the stop you get by removing the feature [+lab] from the labials. Typologically, dentals also become velar when preceding sonorants, so that velars can be said to make up the unmarked stops in this position.
the o-grade, paves the way for etymologizing the otherwise mysterious PGmc. *hagla- 'hail'.

According to the etymological standard handbooks, PGmc. *haglaz m. ~ *haglan- n. 'hail' (> ON hagl, OE hægel, hazol, OFris. heil, OS, OHG hagal) derives from a PIE protoform *kagʰ-lo-, whence also Gk. κάχληξ 'pebbles'. The Germanic-Greek equation indeed appears acceptable from both a semantical and a formal point of view. However, Greek also possesses unexplained variants like κόχλαξ with divergent vocalism, and ἄχλαξ where the first consonant is missing; such a variation is normally interpreted as a sign of Pre-Greek substratum origins (Beekes 2010: 606; Kroonen 2013). Bjorvand & Lindeman (2000: 336), as well as Orel (2003: 150) believe that we are rather dealing with an inherited Verner variant of a PIE o-grade noun, *βαηκǣηġũρċἄx okló-, whereby *hagl- corresponds to PGmc. *hahla- 'slippery' with original stress on the first syllable, *köykló- This word would have been formed by means of reduplication from the root *kelH- 'freeze' (reconstructed with a laryngeal because of the acute in Lith. šálti 'freeze (of ice)') ; cf. also pā-šalas 'frozen ground', Du. hal id. ; reduplicated formations with -i- in the first syllable are known from Skt. šīśrā- 'cold', ON héla 'hoarfrost' < *ki-kīH-o-. Neither etymology can be excluded, and, so far, the origin of *hagla- must be regarded as unsolved.

Semantic typology often proves a fruitful starting-point in etymology: When designations for 'hail' actually are synchronically analyzable, what do they then reveal? In many languages they turn out to constitute parallels to the classical etymology involving the Greek word for 'pebbles'; beginning with Modern English, a single piece of hail is called hailstone, in Dutch correspondingly hagelsteen and in Portuguese pedra de granizo, literally 'stone of hail'. This is also the most common way of designating hailstones in the older Germanic languages: ON haglstein, OE hagolstān, MLG hagelstēn, MHG hagelstein. On the other hand, calling hailstones 'grains of hail' appears typologically just as common, cf. e.g. NHG Hagelkorn, Da. haglkorn, It. chicco di grandine and the etymology of Sp. granizo (a derivative of Lat. grānum 'grain' which is also the source of the last part of the Portuguese word). Besides, the term for the hail-like meteorological phenomenon 'graupel' contain words for 'grain' in Da./Nw. iskorn and Dutch iskorrel, lit. 'ice-grain', and the word graupel itself is related to both MHG is-grüpe 'hail' and NHG Graupe 'grain', historically a derivative of PGmc. *gręupan- ~ *grüpan- 'to cut

It should be noted that Beekes represents the Leiden school where a-vocalism in itself is regarded as a typically non-Indo-European feature.
up, grind’ (Kroonen 2013). Furthermore, in Danish and Norwegian lexicography, hail itself is typically defined as *iskorn*, literally ‘grains of ice’.

The connection between hail and grain goes further: the H-rune in the runic alphabets, which in the younger futhark looks much like a stylized snowflake, was called *hagall* in Old Norse and *heægl* in Old English. Although these names are not completely identical to the word for ‘hail’ (ON *hagl* < *hagla*- n., not *hagall* < *haglaz* m.) there is no doubt that the name refers to hailstones. In the Anglo-Saxon rune poem from the 8th or 9th century, it is described in the following way:

---

_Hægl byþ hwitust corna_
 hwryft hit of heofnes lyfte
 wealcôþ hit windes scûra
 worþep hit tô wæþere syðdan

**Hail** is the whitest of grains;
It whirls down from the heaven’s height (air)
And gusts of wind toss it about;
Then it is transformed to water

---

The Norwegian rune poem, dating back to the 13th. century, reads:

---

_Hagall er kaldastr korna_
_Kristr skôp hæimenn forna_

**Hail** is the coldest of grain;
Christ created the world of old

---

The Icelandic rune poem, from the late 15th century onwards, says:

---

_Hagall er kaldakorn_
 ok knappa drîfa
 ok snaka sótt

**Hail** : cold grain

---

14 In the meaning ‘graupe’ it is less of an everyday word and therefore sufficiently little lexicalized to be used as a productively formed noun whose two parts are understood literally.
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and driving sleet
and sickness of snakes

Griffiths (2006) argues that in the famous Old Irish work *Auraicept na n-Éces* ('the scholar’s primer’, originally from 650, preserved in the *Book of Ballymote* from 1390), a word-play involving the word for ‘grain’, OIr. *gráin*, can lay behind the naming of the h-rune in the Ogham alphabet, *(h)Úath*, since both *húath* and *gráin* also mean ‘horror’. The word-play would then also involve Latin *horror*, meaning both ‘horror’ and ‘shivering (from cold)’. In the so-called arboreal tradition, where Ogham runes are named after trees, *(h)Úath* is glossed as ‘white-thorn’ (probably referring to hawthorn, but according to Griffiths deliberately described like hail). Judging from the different kennings of the rune, it is obvious that the rune-name is connected metaphorically and mythologically with its homonym *húath* ‘horror’ (translations by McManus 1988):

1 (Bríatharogam Morainn mac Maoín)
*condál cúan*
‘assembly of packs of hounds’

2 (Bríatharogam Maic ind Óc)
*bánad gnúise*
‘blanching of faces’

3 (Bríatharogam Con Culainn)
*ansam aidche*
‘most difficult at night’

Thus, the typological perception of hail as ‘grain’ is clear. It is therefore worth considering if PGmc. *hagla-* contains the same root as *hagra-* 'oats'; cf. that *corn* in Scots and Hiberno-English means both ‘oats’ and ‘grain’ in general. Such conditions could also explain the similarity between the most widespread Indo-European words for ‘hail’ and ‘grain’, respectively: a) Lat. *grandō*, OCS *gradǔ*, Arm. *karkowt*; and b) Lat. *grānun*, PGmc. *kurna-*. Lat. *grandō* results either from regular metathesis -nd- < -*d-n-* following suffixation with -*no-* (Rasmussen 1999 [1984]: 152-154) or a contamination of -*d-* in the ‘hail’-word with -*n-* in

---

15 Translations from Griffiths 2006: 90.
the ‘grain’-word. Cf. that although Spanish and Portuguese derive from Latin, their words for ‘hail(stone)’, despite the great similarity, do not derive regularly from the Latin ‘hail’-word, but seem to be derivatives of the ‘grain’-word.

More than anything, *hagla- now simply looks as if it contains the same root as our ‘oats’-word, obviously with a similar delabialization like the one in *hagran-. This kind of delabialization is already known to occur sporadically in Germanic preceding liquids, cf. e.g. Dutch heuvel next to NHG Hügel ‘hill’, and Limburgish swegel < *swebla- ‘sulfur’ (Kroonen 2013).

Now, one could of course hypothesize that *g- for expected *b- not only in *hagra- but even in *hagla- is due to sporadic delabialization or word contamination. However, for the latter it seems more likely that a sound-law is applying. On closer inspection, it indeed turns out that examples with a preserved labial before -l- and following PGmc. *-a- are totally absent: There are simply no cases of the expected outcome PGmc. *-afl- ~ *-abl- from PIE *-apl- or *-apl-. Quite a few instances of Germanic *-afl-,*-abl- do occur, but they always come from PIE *-abh₁-, *-obh₁- (e.g. PGmc. *kabl m. ‘a piece cut off’ > ON kafl, OLFr. cavele, cf. Lith. žabas ‘branch’). This indicates that *hagla- could be the regular

16 Since I first made this claim, Kroonen (2013) has presented two candidates in his dictionary that seem to contradict it: *afla- ‘hearth’ (ON afl id., Far. alvar, alvi ‘fireplace, forge’) which he compares to Hitt. ḫappenaš ‘baking-klin, fire pit, broiler (oven)’, tentatively reconstructing an l/n-stem *ḫ₃ep-(ӑ), gen. *ḫ₃p-n-ōs. He admits that the Hitt. word can alternatively be compared to PGmc. *ufna- ‘oven’, which, according to him looks like an old wanderwort. Even if one is willing to accept the existence of PIE l/n-heterocritics different from r/n-heterocritics (on this topic, see now Kerkhof 2012), *ufna- has a better match in Hitt. ḫupparr ‘oven’ (< PIE *h₃u ERP, *h₃up-n-), while Hitt. ḫappenaš rather belongs with Gk. ὄρνος ‘baked’ (< *h₃ep-). Original PIE word-final -l probably already developed into *-r while the few safe examples seem to reflect a conditioned preservation of *-l in *-ul-/yen- stems only. In this particular case, one might admittedly argue that -ol- could represent original *-ołr- whose labial consonant would automatically be lost after -p (as would be the case after any other labial); this demands, however, that the loss of labial is older than the development of *-l > -r which does not seem likely. Kroonen’s other example is the homonymous *afla- ‘strength, power’ (ON afl n., Far. alv n. id.), reconstructed as *h₁ep-lo- on the basis of Hitt. ḫapp-. The Germanic noun is traditionally reconstructed as *afalan- (OE afl) where the labial does not immediately preced the -l-. The PIE reconstruction in -elo- (classical *apelo- before the inclusion of Anatolian reflexes) is based mainly on Greek which admittedly proves little since Greeks apparently avoids even original suffixation with -l- directly added to a root, replacing it with *-elo-. Even from a purely Germanic viewpoint, a
reflex of *kop-lo- or *kap-lo-, possibly in PIE already, but more likely in a late stage of (non-Anatolian) IE when more agricultural meanings of the original heteroclitic had arisen.

3 Other etymologies with delabialization

Regular delabialization of PIE labials into velars between a PGmc. low vowel on one side and -l- on the other would render it possible to clarify five additional, otherwise disputed etymologies:

3.1 PGMC. *TAGLA-(HORSE)TAIL’

PGmc. *tagla- ‘horsetail’ (> ON tagl, Goth. tagl id.; Da. tavl, Zealand dial. taggel ‘horsetail’; Nw. dial. tagl ‘fibre’; OE tegl, Mod.Eng. tail, OHG zagal ‘tail’) corresponds to OIr. dúal ‘tail’ and is normally reconstructed as PIE *dok-lo-. Whether -k- here was palatal or not cannot be decided on the basis of Germanic and Celtic alone; at first glance, a plain velar seems to be needed to account for the alleged Slavic cognate *dolka, yielding SCr. dlàka ‘a single hair’ and Cz. dlák ‘branch’. Matasović (2009: 102) reconstructs a palatal to be able to include Skt. daśā- (f.) ‘fringe’¹⁷. However, this word-family rests on a shaky ground; notwithstanding the semantic developments, in Slavic an irregular metathesis is needed, involving the original suffix (with subsequent depalatalization of the original palatal before a sonorant), and, besides, it is far from certain that the Common Slavic form was *dolka since there are no descendants outside Serbo-Croatian and Czech where *-olC- og *-ülAC- merge into -láC-. Another possible Slavic reconstruction is thus *důlaka.

From a semantic viewpoint it is just as possible that the Slavic words are related to ON tálkn ‘baleen’ ~ MLG tolle ‘branch’, from PIE *del-g(h) -. OIr. -űáR- can come from -akR-, but is also regular from -apR-, cf. cúan ‘harbor’ next to PGmc. *hafna-, meaning the Old Irish form dúal is fully compatible also with an original PIE *p- instead of *k-.

Reconstructing *-p- i *tagla- furthermore has the advantage that it renders possible an equation with other Germanic words of similar

vowel seems to have intervened, thus preventing the delabialization from taking place at the time in question.

¹⁷ Matasović (2009) reconstructs *dok-eh₂ but the lack of Brugmann’s Law dictates e-grade.
meaning, but without the -l-suffix: Dan. tave ‘fibre’, tavse, tjavs ‘tuft’, Sw. dial. tafse, S Sw. dial. tav(e) ‘tuft’ and even PGmc. *tappan- ‘tap’. A close connection between these forms and *tagla- may be reflected not only in the meaning of Nw.dial. tagl ‘fibre’, but also in the Scandinavian sayings Nw. med topp og tagl18, Da. med top og tavl, med tap og tavl ‘completely (i.e. with all its body)’. These sayings of course function as alliterational figures regardless of the etymologies of their elements, but the Danish expressions with tap instead of top at least show that they can be hendiadytic (lit. ‘with hair and hair’ = with every [kind of] hair) rather than referring to two opposite extremities like the type Eng. from tip to toe, head over heels 19. An intermediate type, comparable in meaning to med top og tavl is Da. med hud og hår, lit. ‘with skin and hair’.

For phonotactic reasons it is already clear that *-la- in *tagla- must be a suffix and cannot belong to the root. I will therefore tentatively reconstruct *dap-lo- or *dop-lo- as the PIE form behind PGmc. *tagla- and OIr. dúal, with other derivatives *dap- having reflexes in Germanic only. Relationship with Skt. daśā- ‘fringe’ of course remains a possibility, in which case the reconstruction is *dōk-lo-.20

3.2 ODa. saklæ ‘to drool’, Sw. dial. sakkel ‘drool’

A third relevant item is the Scandinavian verb for ‘to drool’, Da. savle, ODa. saklæ, Older Mod.Da. sagle, søgle, Sw. dial. sakla, sagla. It is probably denominal from Da. savl ‘drool’, Older Mod. Da. sagel, sagle, søgle, Sw. dial. sakkel. This noun has traditionally been connected to NWGmc. *sakkan- ‘sink slowly, sag’ (> Da. sakke (bagud) ‘lag (behind), fall behind’), Mod.Icel. sagga ‘become moist’, Du. zaken ‘drop, sag’, and, outside Germanic, Slavic *sökù ‘juice’. Semantically, though, it is as

---

18 Nw. topp, Da. top, from PGmc. *tappa- (> ON toppr ‘tuft, lock of hair’, Far. toppur ‘crest’, OE topp ‘top’, OFris. topp ‘tuft’, OHG zopf ‘plait of hair’) can most easily be etymologized as a pseudo-etymological zero-grade of the root in *tappa-, cf. the almost identical semantics of several forms and the lack of obvious alternative etymologies. The complexity of Germanic reflexes seem to confirm an origin in NW European IE and the “Germano-Celtic” vocabulary (Hyllested 2010).

19 In lack of an established term for the latter type of idiom, Petr Kocharov (p.c.) suggests to introduce polarindrome.

20 Kroonen (2013) as an alternative presents an inner-Germanic etymology according to which *tagla- would be the diminutive to either *tahjan- ‘to unravel’ or to *tāgan- – *tākan- ‘prickle, branch’.
close you can get to E Fris. sabben ‘to drool’, LG sabbe ‘drool; spit’, and further Du. sabbelen ‘to suck’, which contains PIE *sap- (> PGmc. *sap/ppan-, *sạpta- ‘sap, juice; moist’, Lat. sapa ‘must, new wine boiled thick’, Arm. ham ‘juice’; Kroonen 2013: 336). Here, too, I would therefore reconstruct an original labial and assert another derivative with *-lo-, PIE *sap-lo- > PGmc. *sakla-, with no exact equivalents outside Germanic.

3.3 DA. rakle ‘catkin’, SW. dial. rackel ‘long thing; tall, slim person’

Da. rakle ‘catkin, ament (flower cluster on trees)’ and Sw. dial. rackel ‘long thing; tall, slim person’ are etymologically obscure. A PIE reconstruction *rop-lo-, however, would render possible the establishment of a larger word-family, seeing that the Danish meaning comes close to Slavic *repijî ‘burdock, arctium’ (> Ru. repej id., Ukr. repiyk ‘sticklewort, Agrimonia’) and Alb. rrup ‘plane tree’ (whose fruits, achenes, are reminiscent of burdocks or round catkins of e.g. a hazel tree), while the Swedish meaning matches PGmc. *rafr- ‘long, thin pole; rafter’ (> ON raptr ‘rafter’, OE ræfter ‘small beam’); both of these are derived from PIE *rep- ‘stick to, pick up’ (> ON ráfr ‘roof on rafters’; Lat. rapīō ‘to snatch’, Gk. ἐρέπτομαι, Alb. rip ‘tear off’, Lith. ap-rēpiu, ap-rēpti ‘to grasp’; LIV² 507), and formally they can even be equated with Lith. râplės, réplės f.pl., OPr. raples f.pl. ‘thongs’, albeit with an alternating ablaut grade. The original meaning of *rop-lo-, *rep-lo- would then be ‘snatcher’ and secondarily ‘burdock’, preserved best in Slavic, only later

21 The unexpected -k- for -g- in Danish has not yet been explained. Rakle is not common in the singular; it is my impression that quite a few speakers only have the plural in active use. It is thus conceivable that rakle is a comparatively recent back-formation from the pl. rakler (Older Mod.Dan. pl. rackle), in turn from an older sing. *rakkel (a structure for which the modern pl. would also be rakler), corresponding to the Swedish form; cf. the parallel change of the sg. skagel into skågle below. In Danish, -Vkke- and -Vgge- are graphic renderings of the same pronunciation, so maybe *raggel was simply a dialictal form of the type Zealandic søggel for savi, søg (see the previous entry). If *raggel was interpreted as the homophonous rakkel, a new plural rakker could arise. It is also possible that the irregular consonatism is due to contamination with dial./obs. Dan. rakke, also meaning ‘catkin, ament’, which is otherwise unrelated and constitutes a pair with the non-assimilated ranke ‘floral vine’. However, I find it more likely that the meaning of rakke, in turn, was influenced semantically by rakkel.
transferred to flower clusters of a burdock-like shape. A reconstruction *rap-lo- would not match the root vocalism of Balto-Slavic, Greek or Albanian, so the Germanic *-a- must reflect o-grade, and e-vocalism in the PIE root is ensured.

A problem compared to *hagla-,*tagla- og *sagla- is of course that *rakla- has PGmc. *-k-, not *-g-, an issue curiously repeating itself in Danish with rakle for expected †ragle (see the previous footnote). We will return to this variation below. Two further items point to a Germanic reflex *-akul- from PIE *-apl-:

3.4 PGMC. skakula- 'whippletree; towing rope; shackle'

PGmc. *skakulaz m. (> ON skókull 'car pole', OE sceacel, sceacul 'shackle, gyve, hobble', MDu. schakel 'chain link'; Da. skagle (< OMod.Da. skagel), Sw. skakel, Nw. skøkle have two basic meanings 'whippletree, double tree' and 'traces for harness horse, towing rope'; as a loanword in Fi. kak(k)ula, ka(k)kuli it only means 'whippletree'. As stated in LÄGLOS (II : 18) the shape of the Finnish material is too unmarked to determine at what stage the borrowing took place; the limited geographical distribution—Finnish only, and mainly West Finnish dialects—tips the scale in favor of a late borrowing from Scandinavian/Norse rather than Proto-Germanic, maybe even as late as Old Swedish. Still, LÄGLOS leaves both possibilities open since theoretically kak(k)ula can also represent the Proto-Germanic accusative.

In either case, the meaning of the Finnish word is still important for our etymological purposes since it confirms that the meaning 'whippletree' is old in Scandinavian and apparently the only meaning exported eastwards. In combination with the many Danish meanings only referring to a piece of wood, both meanings must be reconstructed for common Scandinavian. The meaning 'shackle' is particularly West Germanic, but may have fallen within the Proto-Germanic range, too.

According to the standard etymology, PGmc. *skakulaz is a diminutive formed with the suffix *-ula- of the root in Nw.dial., Sw.dial. skåk, Sw. skak 'towing rope; fettle for animals' < *(s)kenk-, cf. Lat. cingere 'to gird', Lith. kinkytį 'to harness horses'\(^{22}\). Semantically it is an acceptable match, but there is no satisfying explanation as to why the nasal would

\(^{22}\) Orel (2003: 332) instead derives *skakula- from the root in the Sw. and ON verb skaka 'shiver, quiver' < PGmc. *skakana-, with W Germanic meanings 'run away'.
have disappeared in Germanic, and, again, it cannot be excluded that a contamination between two words has taken place.

Latin provides a clue. It is remarkable that Latin capulus displays a range of meanings similar to those of PGmc. *skakulaz: a) ‘hackamore, headstall’, b) ‘halter for catching and fastening cattle; lasso’, c) ‘sword-hilt, handle’ and d) ‘coffin’. An original *skap- can be found in Lat. scāpus ‘shaft’ and the otherwise disputed word for ‘shoulder (blade)’, scapula. Scāpus is already known to be related to PGmc. *skaftaz ~ *skaftan- m./n. ‘shaft; pole’ (> ON skapt, OE sceaf, OHG sclaft id.), so the root *skap- probably originally referred to a piece of wood connected to another part of a tool, rather than a rope-like device. I therefore suggest reconstructing PIE *skap-lo- ‘shaft; double tree, whippletree’, which later, but already in NW IE, acquired the secondary meaning ‘traces for a harness horse; towing rope’ and ‘shackle(s)’. In Latin the missing s- in capulus can be explained by contamination with the near-synonymous capistrum ‘headstall, harness’, derived from caput ‘head’; thereby it is perhaps unnecessary to operate with s mobile in this case.

The meaning ‘coffin’ can be viewed as an enlargement of ‘handle’, but may simply be a historically different word, cf. the next item and especially the meanings of MLat. cappellum ‘chapel’, Lith. kāpas ‘grave’, Port. campa id.: 

3.5 PGMC. *HAKULAZ ‘CLOAK, MANTLE’

A very parallel formation can be seen in PGmc. *hakulaz ~ *hakulōn m./f. ‘cloak, mantle’ (> Goth. hakuls, OHG hähhl, ON hōkl, OE ha-cele id., Da. hagel ‘cloak; (dial.) shawl’). It is usually regarded as a derivative of *hakōn ‘hook, nook; buckle’ (Orel 2003: 154). I have earlier argued, however (Hyllested 2010), that MLat. cappa, synonymous to *hakulaz, is not a medieval Semitic loanword as otherwise assumed, but inherited from PIE *kāpo- which underwent the littera-rule whereby a long vowel plus a single consonant can be replaced by a short vowel followed by a geminate. Incidentally, the variant cāpa is attested in this

23 Capulus itself can of course also be derived from caput, which, however, makes less sense when you consider the meanings b), c), and d). It should be noted that, regardless of etymological origins, Latin speakers probably had a feeling that both capulus in the meaning ‘headstall’ and capistrum belonged with caput synchronically, i.e. a contamination would not only be based on historical states of affairs.
case, and must represent the original form. *kāpo- is not attested in the meaning 'cloak' outside Latin, but this problem can be solved by assuming that 'cloak' was not the primary meaning of the derivative. *kāpos is already known as the PIE word for 'piece of land; holy enclosure; garden'. It appears in Gk. κήπος 'garden', PGmc. *hōf- '(holy) enclosure' (> ON hof 'hill with holy place') ~ *hōbō- 'piece of land', and, with a PIE suffix *-i-st₂- used for nomina loci in ORu. kapīste 'holy place, idol' and Alb. kohst 'garden'. This word-family was established by Witzcaž 2004; in Hyllested (2010) I added MLat. cappellum 'chapel; holy enclosure'; Lat. castrum in the meaning 'fortification', dim. castellum; Lat. campus field; Capitōlīum, the name of various hills with holy places scattered around the Roman realms, most famously the one

---

24 Cf. e.g. Gk. πλατάνιστος 'plane-tree grove', OHG ewist 'sheepfold', ON vogt f. 'fishing ground'.

25 Said to be named after the small enclosure in the cathedral of Aachen where the relics of Saint Martin of Tours, including his cloak, are preserved. There can be no doubt that cappellum is formally secondary to cappa, but on the other hand there is no evidence that the meaning moved from a primary 'cloak' to a secondary 'chapel' in the middle ages (the French name of Aachen, Aix-la-Chapelle, is named after Charles the Great's grave).

26 Lat. castrum 'fortification' is most often understood as a result noun 'piece cut out, strip of land' corresponding to the homonym agent noun or instrument noun castrum 'knife' < PIE *kas- 'cut (out)'. Formally, though, castrum in the sense 'fortification' can equally well be derived from PIE *kap-i-st₂-ro-m whose first two parts can be identified with the aforementioned nomen loci formation *kap-i-st₂-. It would regularly yield Lat. castra- via syncope (of short vowel before *-st(r)-) as in monstrum 'evil omen; monster' < *monstrum, sēstertius 'two and a half; sesterce' < *semi-s-tertos; this happened in the 6th-5th c. BC, cf. Meiser 1998: 66) and subsequent assimilation (or loss, of *-T- > O₁_ S₁T₁, e.g. Oscus 'Oscan < Opscus [Enn. Ann. 296], asper 'raw' < *ap-sper-; cf. Meiser 1998: 117).

27 Lat. campus 'field' can formally be identified with PIE *kāmpos 'wave' (> Gk. καμπός), but semantically it corresponds more closely to the aforementioned *kāpos which has otherwise left no trace in Latin. The most probable scenario is therefore that a contamination between *kampos and *kāpos took place on the way to Latin, resulting in a single word that retained the shape of the former and the meaning of the latter. There are signs that the contamination was not fully completed even in Vulgar Latin, since the original meaning of *kāpos 'enclosure' seems to have been retained in Port. campe 'grave' (cf. also Lith. kąpas 'grave'), although a homorganic nasal infix would be no less different that the one in the name of the region Campānia - Osc. Kapvans, Etr. capevane, Gk. Καππάνια or It. Campidoglio, literally 'the oil-plant fields', but from Lat. Capitōlīum.
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in Rome itself; the name of the Thracian fortification Καπιστόριον (cf. Duridanov 1987); the name of the temple Secca di Capistello for Diana and Aeolus from the 4th century BC on the Aeolic island of Lipari; Capistrello, an Italian place-name historically connected to Roman and Oscan fortifications; and the name of Santiago de Compostela, the famous catholic pilgrimage city in Galicia which also functioned as a holy place in Pre-Christian times.

A double meaning ‘cloak, blanket, cover’ on one side and ‘piece of land’; (holy) enclosure’ on the other is typologically rather common, cf.:

a) Skt. namata-. Av. namata- ‘cloak’ next to P Celt. *nem-eto ‘holy enclosure’ (> OIr. nemed, Gaul. Nemeto-) and PGmc. *nem-ita- (OLFr. nimidas and the Swedish farm-name Nymden); cf. also Latin nemus ‘holy enclosure’

b) W caen f. ‘cover, blanket; skin, hide’ ~ Lat. cailae < *caholae ‘enclosure’, PGmc. *hagan- ‘garden’

c) ON kogurr ‘blanket’ ~ Kagra, Swedish village- and farm name (Elmevik 1975)

In a parallel fashion, we can now establish:

d) Mlat. cappa, câpa ‘cloak, mantle’, PGmc. *hakula- id. ~ PIE *kāp-o-, *kap-ist-o- ‘piece of land; (holy) enclosure’

Semantically this makes sense if the basic verbal meaning is ‘encircle, surround’ < ‘get hold of, hold’ < ‘catch, take’, cf. that the examples in a) above probably are derived from PIE *nem- ‘to take’ (> PGmc. *neman-

---

8 Capitólium can also go back to PIE *kap-i-sth₂-. According to Roman grammarians, an earlier form was Capitódiunum, which renders possible an etymological segmentation capi-tód-, cf. cus-tód- < *cus-to-sd- ‘he, who guards the treasure’; a derivative *káp-ist-o-sd-ı- would mean ‘he who belongs to the káp-ist-o-sd’, in turn ‘he who guards the *káp-ist-o-’, the holy hill’, and a sequence -sd-...-st could easily be subject of dissimilation, i.e. *kápitostidion > *kápitostidion. The guardian referred to can either ne Rēx Nëmorënsis ‘the king of the holy grove’ (= Gaul. Rigonemeti), the goddess of the holy grove Diana, or (Loucetios) Mars.

9 In Old Portuguese (the forefather of Modern Portuguese and Modern Galician), there was a confusion between the spelling variants <am> and <om> (cf. e.g. or-fom ‘orphan’, found in king Duarte’s Leal Conselheiro, 1428-1438, from Romance orfanu-) it is possible to assert an original *Campustella or *Campistella, simply meaning ‘the holy place’. Again, the variation between forms with nasal and forms without point to confusion between *kampos and *kāpos at a late stage.

Correspondingly, d) can originally be identical to the verbal root *kap- ‘to catch’ nown from PGmc. *habēna- ‘to have’ and Lat. capire. I conclude that PGmc. *hakula- ‘cloak’ can be derived from PIE *kap-lo-, a derivative of the same root as in MLat. cappa, cāpa ‘cloak’.

4 Conclusions

We end up with six potential examples of the postulated development PIE *-apl-, *-opl- > PGmc. *-agl-, *-akl-, *-akul—and, crucially, no obvious counterexamples:

PGmc. *hagla- ‘hail’ < PIE *kop-lo- (≈ Late PIE *kop-ro- ‘crops, grain’ > PGmc. *habra- ≈ *hagra- ‘oats’)
PGmc. *sagla- ‘drool (sb.)’ < PIE *sap-lo- (≈ E Fris. sabben ‘to drool’, LG sabbe ‘drool; spit’, PGmc. *saf/ppan-, *safata- ‘sap, juice; moist’; Lat. sapa ‘must’)
PGmc. *skakula- ‘whippletree; towing rope; schackle’ < PIE *skap-lo- (≈ PGmc. *skafa- ‘shaft; pole’, Lat. capulus ‘hackamore; lasso; handle’, scapula ‘shoulder’, scāpus ‘shaft’)
PGmc. *hakula- ‘cloak, mantle’ < PIE *kap-lo- id. (≈ MLat. cappa, cāpa ‘cloak, mantle’)

The extra -u- in the two final examples has been explained by Kümmel (2004) as a reflex of partly analogical, partly regular developments within the paradigms of Germanic nouns with a stop followed by a sonant in the stem.

The division into three items with voiced spirants and three other items with unvoiced stops also needs an explanation. Such an alternation is reminiscent both of Verner’s Law (voiced vs. unvoiced) and parts of Kluges’ Law (retention of an original unvoiced stop before sonant; here -l- which is retained, and not a nasal assimilated into the stop) and could reflect original accent alternation in exactly this position. The development itself can perhaps be characterized as a sort of assimilation, if *-l- at the point in question was of the thicker, velar kind.
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Future studies can perhaps reveal whether other kinds of delabialization processes in Germanic (see e.g. Markey 1979) can be explained as the result of similar processes. It is important to note that the situation outlined in this article does not necessarily contradict Kortlandt’s (1997: 48) hypothesis that labiovelars went in the opposite direction and became real labials next to sonorants.
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Two Issues on Indo-European Substrates in Slavic

Abstract

Georg Holzer’s (1989) identification of an Indo-European substrate language in Slavic – Temematian – is correct, as also argued by Kortlandt (2004). However, Kortlandt’s skepticism regarding the specific sound development PIE *R > Temematian *Ro has proved unfounded. Holzer did not give any examples of substantivized past passive participles, an otherwise very common word-type which, if containing a liquid in the root, would surface as *CRodъ or *CRonъ in Temematic words in Slavic. It is suggested that at least LCS *plŏdъ ‘fruit’ and *grozdъ ~ *groznъ ‘grape; cluster’, perhaps also *drozdъ ‘thrust’, are Temematic borrowings. Another possible Temematism is zabar ‘oats’ in the Alanic (Iassic) word-list.

Trubachëv’s hypothesis that Baltic and Slavic *-st- can reflects PIE *-k- in lexems from another Indo-European substrate is rejected, seeing as in all of his examples, st can be accounted for in other, more transparent ways.

1 The problem of identifying related substrate languages

Virtually all specialists would agree that Indo-European languages are newcomers in Europe which replaced most of the indigenous languages in several steps from the Bronze Age onwards. To which extent this lin-

---

1 This article forms part of a larger paper, “Indo-European Substrates in Slavic Revisited” that was presented at the 17th Conference of Scandinavian Slavists in Copenhagen, August 2007; at the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, 2 November, 2007; and at the 14th International Congress of Slavists in Ohrid, Macedonia, 11 September 2008. Most of the points in section 3 were printed in Hyllested 2004, while the etymology for plŏdъ only was presented at the XVI Conference of Scandinavian Slavists in Uppsala, August 2004.
guistic replacement reflects actual human migrations, let alone entire "population shifts", is another (albeit related) matter and a matter of debate – but the great changes that took place may in any case be characterized as "Indo-Europeanization". The encounter between indigenous Palaeo-European cultures and what we now define as Indo-European culture, however, was most certainly not the only interaction that took place. By the time of arrival in Europe, the Indo-European languages and populations were already fragmented and scattered in many directions – some were still immediate neighbours and must have exchanged lexemes to some extent.

Convergence between closely related languages in the past constitutes one of the greatest challenges for historical linguists, especially when one of them is neither directly attested nor has any attested descendants. The bulk of the vocabulary is simply either directly inherited or borrowed from closely related dialects who got their terms ultimately from the same precursor. The consequence is typically that linguists overlook the language which disappeared because loanwords from it are not interpreted as preserved traces of a forgotten language, but merely irregular varieties of inherited material in the related language that borrowed them.

2 Holzer’s Temematisch

Holzer (1989) suggested an extinct and otherwise unknown Indo-European language, which he calls “Temematisch” (Eng. Temematian) to account for a variety of irregular consonant correspondences in Slavic. He ascribes 62 lexemes in Slavic to this hypothetic extinct language – basically all lexemes with troublesome or unsatisfying etymologies. The language name is an acronym based on the asserted developments: PIE tenues (unvoiced stops) became mediae (voiced stops), and mediae aspiratae became tenues. Other Temematian features, according to Holzer, are that zero-grades of liquids surface as *-Ro-, and that long vowels become shortened before sonant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIE</th>
<th>Temematic (in Slavic)</th>
<th>Normal Balto-Slavic corresp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bʰ, *dʰ, *gʰ</td>
<td>&gt; *p, *t, *k</td>
<td>~ *b, *d, *g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p, *t, *k</td>
<td>&gt; *b, *d, *g</td>
<td>~ *p, *t, *k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*r, *l</td>
<td>&gt; *ro, *lo</td>
<td>~ mostly *il, *ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V/ _R</td>
<td>&gt; V</td>
<td>~ distinct reflexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among Holzer’s best examples (in my opinion) are:

PIE *su̯o-poti- ‘one’s own lord’ (cf. Vedic svāpati- id.) > LCS *svobodi ‘free’ (for expected †svopoti)

PIE *dʰel-(ent-) ‘suck, nurse’ (cf. Latvian dīle ‘sucking calf’) > LCS *telę ‘calf’ (for expected †dele)

PIE *bʰr̥s-o- ‘grain, crops’ (cf. CSL. brašino ‘flour’, ON barr ‘barley’) > LCS *proso ‘millet’ (for expected †brisū or †brisō). Compare now Toch. B proksa (pl.) ‘grain’, but cf. also LCS *būră ‘millet’ < *puH-ro-

Kortlandt (2004) evaluated Holzer’s theory positively, also in a historical context, but had one minor remark: He did not consider Holzer’s specific Temematic development *R > Ro more than theoretically possible, pointing to the fact that the evidence is limited to five lexemes, and that in none of these zero-grade is to be expected:

2. LCS (via Tem.) *proso < PIE *bʰrsō ~ Lat. far
6. LCS (via Tem.) *loboda < PIE *l-podā ~ Lat. olor
10. LCS (via Tem.) *krotū < PIE *gʰrdo- ~ Goth. garda
27. LCS (via Tem.) *prokū < PIE *bʰrgo- ~ Goth. baírgan
30. LCS (via Tem.) *slobodū < PIE *sI-poti- ~ ON slár

While I agree with Kortlandt that this is one of the weaker Temematic correspondences judging from Holzer’s own material, I find it remarkable that no past passive participles in *-tó- are represented since they are common and constitute the zero-grade environment par excellence. According to Holzer’s rules, such participles if borrowed from Temematic would end in LCS *-dū. If the stem ended in a liquid (perhaps followed by a laryngeal) it would be easy to check if Holzer’s rule is correct since in that case they would have the shape *CRodū corresponding to regular Slavic *ČRt̊o and PIE *CR(H)-tó-. Since the participles formed part of the conjugational system and could be formed productively as adjectives and substantives even in the daughter-languages, we would expect at least a couple of those containing liquids in the root to show up in the Temematic material – but of course they can only be identified if Holzer was right that their zero-grade was markedly different from the regular Slavic one.
The Slavic word for 'fruit', OCS plodъ, although of disputed origin (see e.g. Bezljaj 1995), is most often taken for a loanword from PGmc. *blaða- 'leaf, ? fruit' < PIE ppp. *bʰλάð-, ultimately from the root *bʰel- 'swell'. However, the exact phonological representation remains a problem: Why is PGmc. *b- replaced by p-, and why is the vowel -o-?

Shevelov (367) equated it with Celtic forms like Ir. loth 'foal' and Welsh llwdu 'young person', while Bezljaj (1995) proposes a back-formation from PIE *pled-men (with voice assimilation) < *plet-men 'rope; thread', whence the meaning 'lineage; offspring' (LCS *plemę); he refers to typological parallels with double meanings such as Skt. tantu 'thread; offspring'; Slov. pasma 'race; train column'; and Scr. lůza 'rope; fruit tree'.

Curiously, a PIE participle *bʰλ[(H)-]tő- of this root, where a zero-grade is obviously expected, would in fact yield Temematic *plodъ. It corresponds formally to PGmc. *bulð-i/ō- which is attested e.g. as Dan. byld 'abscess'. The root could also have contained a laryngeal because it is the loss of long-short distinction is another Temematic feature ( *bʰβčǣκῖἀsģφ₄-H₁-t´:抽象 > Ro-; Kortlandt 2004).

The meaning 'fruit' in PGmc. occurs only with full-grade and feminine gender: OE blæð t., MLG błat f., but on the other hand we encounter a similar semantics in zero-grades of other extended root-forms like Sw. dial. bōljon 'blueberry' (< PGmc. *bulyi- < *bʰλ-[gʰ]-i-), Dutch bolster 'fruit shell, husk', and Gk. φλυδαρός 'overripe'.

The same semantic sphere – fruticulture and viticulture - remarkably features another good candidate for a substantivized Temematic participle. LCS *grozdъ likewise has an unexpected -Ro- while ending in -dů. The traditional etymology, deriving it from PIE *gʰerzd- 'barley', does not explain the synonym groznъ. However, nasal participles are preserved in Slavic, so the variation *grozdъ ~ *groznъ is yet another sign that we have encountered a Temematic participle. They can be completely identical to PGmc. *hursta- 'shrubbery' (< *kʷrs-tő-) and OIr crann (< *kʷrs-nó-) 'tree' (meaning originally 'vine?') respectively. But there is also the possibility that the Russian meaning ‘cluster’ represents an archaism, and that ‘grape’ is secondary – in that case, the word could
be identical to Latv. *gūrste ‘linen bundle’ and OCS *gōst’ ‘handful’ < PIE *gṛt-sti-.

2.3 LCS *dروزدُ ‘thrust’

A Slavic *drozd (e.g. Ru. дрозд) ‘thrust’ exists alongside the more widespread variant *trozd (OCS трозд). However, this case is less certain because forms from other Indo-European languages show that a) *-dο is not participial, but comes from an original PIE sequence *-d-o-, and b) while zero-grade forms do occur, like Lat. turdus (< *t̥rdos), the more closely related Lith. strāzdas with o-grade (< *strozd) shows that the sequence *-rV- is original in the full-grade, and Slavic *-ro- does therefore not have to reflect a Temematian zero-grade. However, *drozd would be the expected Temematian outcome of the word in any case.

2.4 ALANIC (IASSIC) zabar ‘oats’

Johnny Cheung (p.c.) has suggested that zabar in the Alanic (Iassic) word-list is simply a rendering of Hungarian zab which is loanword from Slavic. This solution, however, does not satisfactorily account for the second part of the word –ar – although Cheung suggests that it might be Hung. ār ‘price’. Incidentally, zabar is the only word on the list without a counterpart in Modern Ossetic. However, all other words in the left column are consistently Iranian, so it seems reasonable to interpret zabar ‘oats’ as the corresponding Iassic word for ‘oats’.

Holzer includes Slavic *zob in his list of Temematian words. The Iassic word could either be inherited from Proto-Iranian or reflect yet another Temematian agricultural term in Slavic (subsequently borrowed into Iassic). In either case, zabar would be semantically and morphologically identical to the West Indo-European ‘oats’-words (PGmc. *habran-, PCelt. *korkio-) versus the more archaic formations and meanings in the East (Hitt. kappar ‘vegetables’, Skt. śāpa- ‘drifting reed’), thus reflecting a morphological and semantic innovation pointing rather clearly to an agricultural specialization that follows the earliest dissolution of the Indo-European dialects and migrations into Europe. Iassic).
3 Trubachëv’s substratum reflex -st- < *-k-

Another Indo-European substratum language, more specifically an extinct Balto-Slavic dialect or Satem dialect, was established by Trubachëv (e.g. 1991) mostly to account for the numerous discrepant dorsals, i.e. kentum-like reflexes of PIE palatal stops. However, another reflex ascribed to ancient dialect convergence is Baltic or Slavic st for expected s from PIE *k. Three examples are mentioned by Andersen (2003):

3.1 Lith. stírna, Latv. stīna ‘deer’

Lith. stírna, Latv. stīna ‘deer’ are seen as substratum reflexes of PIE *ker-n-, cf. PSIl. *sirnā. However, not only Slavic, but also Old Latvian has s-, cf. pl. *Ssirnos>. The forms with st- thus appear recent and are likely to have been influenced by German in medieval times, cf. OHG stiora (NHG Stier) ‘bull’ or OHG stírna ‘forehead; skull pad on war-horse’ (< ‘blaze, characteristic forehead’)

3.2 Lith. tūkstantis, Latv. tūkstotis ‘thousand’

Lith. tūkstantis, Latv. tūkstotis ‘deer’ is another of Trubachëv’s prominent examples, but here -st- stands in medial position and reflects the regular Baltic development of the Balto-Slavic cluster *-s-ts- with *-ts- as the intermediate stage between k and its final unmarked outcome s. Pedersen (1942) thought that this only happened in position before front vowel whereas the regular outcome in front of back vowel is -sk-. However, note Lith. laiškas ‘leaf’ vs. OCS listū id. This Balto-Slavic word is a more obvious source for Fi. lehti ‘leaf’ (< *lešte) and Mari lištaš, laštš ‘id.’ than (NW) PIE *bj₁h₁-to/*bleh₁-to- as suggested by Koivulehto (1995).

Irregular initial position seems to be common in names for big mammals. Even Lith. stuðbras ‘bison’ has an unexpected st- although from PIE *h₁. Latv. sumbrs ~ CSL. šbrā; cf. parallels like OIr. fearb ~ earb ‘deer; cow’; ON þjörð ~ stjörð ‘bull’ (PGmc. *þeura- ~ *steura-).
3.3 **Old Prussian Parstian 'pig'**

The sequence in OPr. Parstian, rendered <prastian> (Elbinger Vocabulary 686) is to be segmented parse-tia-n where -tia-(n) forms a diminutive, as in e.g. western 'little bull' calf' (EV 674) vs. Lith. vešis 'calf', wosistian <volistian> 'kid' (EV 677) vs. Lith. ožys 'goat', and eristian 'lamb' (E 681) vs. Lith. ėras id. Thus, only -s- and not the entire sequence -st- reflects *-k- in (NW) PIE *porko-.

According to Leskien (1891: 583) and Skardžius (1943: 332) the suffix shape is -istian and may be connected with Lith. -iščia- (see also Schmalstieg 2003: 271), assuming that forms without -is- have undergone dissimilation, e.g. western < *versistjan. It remains that -t- is suffixal (whether it belongs with -s- or not) and cannot reflect PIE *-k-.
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The Story of ‘time’:
The Etymology of Finnish aika

(with an excursus on aita ‘fence’ and Balto-Slavic v-prothesis)

Abstract

The traditional etymology deriving aika from Germanic *aiwa- ‘time’ must be rejected because PGmc. *-w- would not be rendered as Balto-Fennic *-k-. Instead, it is a borrowing from a different Germanic derivative from the same PIE stem, namely *ajuka- ‘life, age’, an old thematic noun forming the basis of the adjective *ajukí- ‘eternal’, which can be reconstructed on the basis of Old English ēce and Gothic ajuk- in ajukdāps ‘eternity’. The development of *-u- > *-e- in Middle Proto-Fennic and subsequent loss in Late Proto-Fennic is regular in the medial position of such loans.

While BF *aita ‘fence’ can be reconstructed for Fenno-Ugric, it might ultimately be a late Indo-European borrowing from *h₁oīto- ‘delimitation, demarkation’ that yielded the Celto-Germanic word for ‘oath’, Lith. viétà ‘place’ and Slavic větô ‘council; convention; oath’. BF *aita and větô then form a pair systematically corresponding to *aika vs. Slavic věkô ‘time’, indicating a development of initial PIE *(H)oι- to Balto-Slavic *vai- in sandhi contexts.

1 Finnish aika ‘time’ cannot come from PGmc. *aiwa-

Kari Liukkonen (1999: 18-19) justifiably characterizes the traditional etymology deriving aika from Germanic *aiwa- ‘time’ as phonetically impossible: Germanic *-w- would not be rendered as Balto-Fennic *-k-. Instead he proposes that Balto-Fennic *aika ‘time’ (> Fi. aika) is a rendering of Baltic *eigū ‘course (of events)’ (> Lith. eigû), an old derivative of the verb eiti ‘to go’, cf. also eigoje ‘during’ (< PIE *h₁ei- ‘go’).
However, this does not work either. Proto-Baltic *ei is regularly retained as Balto-Fennic *ei which only later develops into ai in South Estonian and Livonian. Larsson (forthc.) states:

“It must first and foremost be clarified that PBalt. *ai can indeed yield EastBaltic ie (e.g. Lith. dieveris ‘brother-in-law’ and ORu. děvero, Gk. dāer. Lat. laevir, Arm. taygr […] Another key example is Fi. taivas ‘heaven, sky’ which is generally said to be a borrowing from Balt. *deiumas (Lith. diėvas, Latv. dievs, OPr. EV deiwis ‘god’) […] However, this example is better explained […] as an early loan from Indo-Iranian, i.e. Ilr. *daiuas”.

One could add that the study of semantic fields speaks for an Indo-Iranian origin. Fi. jumala ‘God’, attested already in Ottar’s account as ON Jómáli is a derivative from an old name for the sky, formed with the productive nomen loci suffix *-la. The base word juma is of Indo-Iranian origin and identical to Skt.dyúman- ‘sky’ (derived from PIE *dei-, *di-ey-, famous for its occurrence in names of Indo-European gods. Together with taivas, religion already seems to constitute a visible semantic field among Indo-Iranian loans.

A late development of initial *e- to *a- (not only when it forms part of diphthongs) is known from Lithuanian (cf. dial. aĩgis), but not from Baltic as such, and since cognates of aika are found all over Balto-Fennic, the word must be a very old borrowing. One might of course conjecture that *ei- regularly yielded ai- exactly in initial position, but there are not many examples (Andersen 1996 does not mention any), so such an argumentation would be circular. We have a motivation for initiating a search for alternative etymologies.

2 The oath and the fence – an origin in Balto-Slavic?

One possibility is that aika could be older than Baltic, going back to Balto-Slavic. Fi. aita ‘hedge, fence’, with attested cognates in all Balto-Fennic languages but Livonian, is of a similar structure and relevant in this context. Koivulehto (1973) suggested that aita reflects Proto-Germanic *aipä- ‘oath’, mentioning the semantic parallel in Greek ἕρκος ‘fence, hedge’ next to ὅρκος ‘oath’. Unfortunately he withdrew the etymology in his 1999 version, but the idea was not bad. The common semantic denominator would have been something like ‘delimitation’, ‘demarkation’ or ‘restriction’.
Germanic *ai̯pa-* is otherwise regarded as a Celto-Germanicism (Hyllested 2010), corresponding to Celtic *oitō- (> Old Irish őeth) and usually interpreted as a lexicalization of PIE ‘a walk’ (< *H₁oi-to-) because of the ON expression ganga eð, but this parallel does not really hold water since the meaning ‘walk’ is lost when one removes ganga. Another possibility is that we are dealing with PIE *h₂eit- ‘fetch’, established by Tichy (2004) on the basis of Gk. οἴσομαι ‘to fetch, take along’ and Lat. ētor ‘to use’ and supported by Melchert (2007) who supplies Cuineiform Luvian ḫizza(i)- ‘fetch’ (in collocations with a motion verb). As a semantic parallel we could recall PIE *kagʰ- ‘to hold’ > Gmc. *hagān- ‘garden’.

**BF** Gmc. Baltic Slavic IE
*aika* *ajuka-* *vaika-* *vēkʰ* *H₂oiu-go-,* *H₂oiu-kो-
*aī-h-ta-
*aīta* *aǐpa-* *vaita-* *vētʰ* *H₁oi-to- or *H₃eit-o-

We already know that PIE *(H)oi- can yield Baltic *vai-, e.g. *oiH-no-ś ‘1’ > Lith. vienās and *Hoistro- > Lith. āstra- ‘vehement passion’ ~ Liv. aistar – dial. vistar ‘pimple’, a Baltic loan (cf. both meanings of the Greek cognate elsewhere in this publication). What is the Slavic reflex of such an initial diphthong? There seems to be only a single relevant, but contradicting, example: jėdro ‘disease mark on tree’ ~ in Latv. idra, idrs which happens to be related to the root of the aforementioned Baltic word < PIE *Hoid-ro- ~ *Hoid-tro-. PIE *oiH-no- ‘i’ is only attested in the zero-grade as jėd-ina ‘i’ and ino-rogə ‘unicorn’.

Finnish aika and aîta form a curious double pair with Slavic *vēkʰ- ‘time’ and *vētʰ- ‘council; convention; oath’ (cf. also Lith. vietą ‘place’). I see two possibilities:

1) Slavic *vē- could be the regular reflex of some subset of PIE *(H)oi-, e.g. *H₂oi- (*H₂ being a labial consonant)? This solution, however, would be based on circular argumentation since none of the etymologies are properly established. More examples are needed.

2) Slavic *vē- < could have arisen in sandhi of PIE *(H)oi- in cases when a rounded element proceeded – since a rounded element follows as well. Cf. so-vētʰ ‘convention’ (Ru. soviet). One weakness of this possibility is that jėdro is not an obvious 2nd member of compounds.
It is important to note that Baltic *vaitā 'place' and *vaika- 'child' can come from PIE *(H)oi- without a problem. Could Balto-Slavic *(H)oi- yield Slavic *vē- in sandhi for expected *jē-, parallel to regular Baltic *vai-? It is of course theoretically possible that the Slavic words are borrowings from Baltic, but the conclusion would be the same.

3 Rather ← PGmc. *ajuka- 'time' → *ajuki- 'eternal'

As mentioned above, Liukkonen justifiably characterizes the traditional etymology aika < Germanic *aiwa- 'time' as phonetically impossible: *-w- would not be rendered as Balto-Fennic *-k-. However, it has been overlooked that Germanic possesses a related derivative, PGmc. *ajuki-, albeit an adjective meaning 'eternal', which can be reconstructed on the basis of Old English ēce and Gothic ajuk- in ajukdūps 'eternity'. As already mentioned in a different context by Weiss (1994: 134-135), *ajuki- could formally be based on an old thematic noun *ajuka- 'time; eternity'. PGmc. *ajuka- would have been borrowed as Middle Proto-Fennic *ajeka, as shown by the following well-known parallels:

Baltic *angurias 'eel' → Fi. ankerias
Baltic *perkūnas 'oak; the thunder god' → perkele, a swear-word

and subsequent deletion of the *-e- as in:

Middle Proto-Fennic *kojera > Fi. koira /kojra/ dog'

We would expect the Germanic noun not only to have meant 'eternity, vitality', but also 'life, age', a double meaning detectable from comparison with other Indo-European languages. Cf. also the meaning '(n)ever' of *h₂óju kʷid 'what(ever) time'.

4 Conclusion

The course of events may be summarized as follows:

1 I thank Petri Kallio for pointing out to me the chronology of these developments.
The Story of 'time': The Etymology of Fi. aika

a) PIE *h₂oī-u-g(*)-o- became PGmc. *ajuka-
b) PGmc. *ajuka- ‘time’ was borrowed to Middle Proto-Fennic and regularly substituted as *ajeka
c) PGmc. *ajuka- forms the basis of the adjective *ajuki- ‘eternal’ (may also have happened before step a)
d) Middle Proto-Fennic *ajeka regularly becomes Late Proto-Fennic *ajka

The Fennic meaning may in any case have been affected by contamination with the inherited lexeme ikä ‘age; life; lifetime’, as has been suggested to me by Michael Fortescue (p.c.).
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Albanian hundë ‘nose’, and Faroese, SW Norwegian skon
Finnish kuono ‘snout’

Abstract

Alb. hundë ‘nose’ has no accepted etymology, but the stem corresponds regularly to Far. skon, Nw. dial. skon ‘snout’ if these go back to PGmc. *skuna-. Mod.Icel. skon(n)r, a fem. nick-name, seems to rule out the alternative reconstruction *skanō-. The Balto-Fennic root reflected in Fi. kuono, Est. koon ‘snout’ is problematic in the light of the vocalism (the only parallel of *ō substituting PGmc. *-u- is ruoste, ruosma ‘rust’), but may nonetheless be a Germanic loan. Former proposals deriving hundë from PIE *skeu- ‘spring forward’ turn out to be correct, but a derivative *sku-n- ‘projection’ (also > Alb. hu ‘penis’) must have been formed already before the emergence of Albanian. The suffixal part, PAlb. *-tā > -dë, either reflects an inner-Alb. formation or goes back to the PIE root extension known from PGmc. *skundjan-, *skundōn- ‘drive forward’.

1 Albanian evidence for PIE reconstruction

Among Indo-Europeanists today, Albanian has acquired, at least unofficially, a discredited reputation as the more or less “useless” Indo-European language branch: it has allegedly retained all too little of the original lexicon, having replaced many everyday words with borrowings from (especially) Slavic, Greek, Latin, and Romance; many other innovations belong to the notoriously shadowy “Ancient Balkan” vocabulary; Albanian often exhibits odd phonological irregularities and aber-

---

1 The present article was published as Hyllested 2012. Apart from this footnote (including the reference just mentioned), the abstract and the exact title, the two articles are identical.
rant derivational patterns; and Albanian lexemes in general are so short that “anything goes” in etymology, provided your semantic analysis is creative enough. In many cases, Albanian forms are mentioned merely to show the geographical representation of a given lexeme.

This reputation, I would argue, is based on a skewed perception of the actual state of affairs. It is true that we know comparatively little about the history of Albanian from its split from the Indo-European core until its earliest attestation, and the internal history of a language branch is indeed more difficult to uncover when the branch in question has few members or only a single one – Proto-Albanian must be reconstructed by dialect material and internal reconstruction (disregarding the poorly attested candidates for close relatives, such as Messapian). But Albanian has potential: a fair description would be to say that much of the lexicon can be defined not as obscure loanwords, but rather as unexplained. In other words, unheeded archaisms might be hiding even in the basic vocabulary, waiting for us to give it another try, applying today’s broader knowledge of PIE and the individual branches. One way forward, which is becoming more and more widespread, seems to be the inclusion, in Indo-European etymology, of evidence from even more peripheral languages and dialects. Peripheral, to be sure; but as it turns out, they may still be extremely relevant and provide crucial information about details in PIE reconstruction. This is at least the case with minor Eastern Iranian languages and Nuristani languages, and in recent years this has proven to be true not least of all in the case of Germanic dialects (cf. Kroonen forthcoming). This article is an attempt to solve an obnoxious etymological riddle by straightforward comparison of forms in peripheral languages.

2 Albanian _hundë_ ‘nose’; previous proposals

It is indeed a nuisance for comparativists when lexemes from the very core of the basic vocabulary defy a generally accepted etymology. One good example is Albanian _hundë_ ‘nose’. As a term for a body part, it belongs to the basic vocabulary par excellence. Hamp (1965: 130) hinted at the initial _h_ as a potential clue to discovery: “It belongs to a list of very basic Albanian words in _h_ which have consistently resisted etymology”.

Since a well-known source of Albanian _h_ is PIE *sk-*, scholars have tried to search for possibilities among established roots in PIE or just lexemes in other Indo-European languages with this initial sequence.
Meyer (1891: 153-154) was perhaps on the right track by relating it to PAlb. *skuna- > Alb. hu ‘penis’ (Gheg hû, gen. hûni, Tosk hari ‘pole; limb’), Gk. κύνδαλος ‘peg’, and Skt. skándate ‘spring forth’. Schmidt (1930: 19) accepted Meyer’s etymology right away, and it is also embraced by Ölberg (1972) and reappraised by Orel (1998: 152), who reconstructed for hundë a prestage *skun-tā, derived from *skuna-. However, this classical proposal has not won general acceptance because it suffers from the fact that some of the suggested cognates themselves have disputed etymologies. Beekes (2010: 803) regards Gk. κύνδαλος as a sub-stratum word.

Pedersen (see Tagliavini 1937: 276) equated hu with Lith. skujà ‘pine needle’ instead, leaving hundë as simply unetymologized. Barić (1919) related hundë to Lat. sentiō ‘to feel’ (via the meanings ‘sense’ and ‘smell’). Çabej (1953) connected it with Rum. dial. hudā, hudrā ‘hole, crack’ (which would then be an “Ancient Balkan” loan of IE origin) and Skt. kuhara- m. ‘cavity’, suggesting an original meaning ‘nostril’. Hamp (1965:126) also prefers a development via ‘nostrils’, originally ‘entrances’, from a Proto-Alb. *hun- meaning ‘(an) insert’, the base of the modern verb hyj, Gheg hŷj ‘to enter’ (of disputed origin). He rejects an otherwise formally possible derivative *skud-V-ni- ‘projection’ (< *skeyd- ‘shoot’) because the Arvanitic dialect of Sophikó (Greece) has a crucial short vowel that rules out such a contraction. Huld (1984) envisages an Old Alb. metathesis of the PIE ‘nose’ word: *noh- > *hon- + the suffix -tā, ultimately from PIE *nas- ‘nose’; but this would involve both suffixation, the as yet shady raising of *o > u before nasal (perhaps in bungē f., pl. -a, ‘chestnut oak, Quercus sessiliflora, Quercus petraea’), and a metathesis which may seem ad hoc, although not unprecedented: cf. the fact that Alb. hobe ‘catapult, sling’ seems to be a development of an originally dialectal bahe ‘id.’, a singularized plural of the archaic sg. bahë, a loanword from Common Slavic *bojë ‘fight’ (Orel 1998: 14, 150).

---

2 Cf. Kümmel (2010) on the relatively poor occurrence of safe PIE roots containing the sequence -ND.-

3 According to Orel (1998: 42), Hamp’s reconstruction bungē < *bug-nā finds support in peng ‘security, pledge’ < Lat. pignus (also Demiraj 1997: 312-113), but this is not true if Lat. /gn/ was pronounced [ŋn] (see, e.g., Meiser 1998: 52, 121 on the details). In that case Alb. -ng- is just the rendering of Lat. -ngn-, written <gn>, with loss of the final nasal (by assimilation) in such a cluster.
3 The background of Albanian initial \(h\)-

Let us begin our own analysis by having a closer look at the different sources for initial \(h\) in Albanian. Original \(h\) is retained in loanwords from Slavic (e.g., Alb. *hitas ‘to hurry’ < Common Slavic *xytati, Alb. *hukas ‘to shout’ < Common Slavic *hukati) and Latin (e.g., Alb. *herë ‘moment of time, hour’ < Lat. *hora). But in the case of *hundë, there is simply no obvious candidate from any neighboring language (disregarding the aforementioned proposal by Çabej).

It cannot be excluded that Alb. initial \(h\)-sometimes reflects a PIE initial laryngeal. Hamp (1965) reconstructed *\(h\_\_\rangle\) Alb. \(h\)- (as in herdhë ‘testicle’ ~ Gk. ὥρχις id.) while all other laryngeals disappeared. This was heavily criticized by Ölberg (1972) and has never been widely accepted, although it is accepted by Mallory and Adams (1997: 10); and according to Kortlandt (1998). *\(h\)e- and *\(h\)e- yield Alb. ha- (cf. also Demiraj 1997). Alb. \(h\)- may indeed show up in the position of an original laryngeal, e.g., Alb. (h)ethe ‘fever’ < PIE *\(h\)e\(-\) and Alb. *\(h\)ut ‘empty, deserted’ < PIE *\(h\)u-t\(-\) (Goth. auþes ‘barren, desolate’). However, the very occurrence of a laryngeal is not assured in the material in question; and even if one insists on initial consonants in all PIE roots, the picture is blurred by a notorious tendency to insert a spontaneous \(h\)- before initial vowel in Albanian:

(h)ark ‘bow’ ← Lat. arcus id.
(h)armë ‘weapon’ ← Lat. arma id.
(h)ikërr ‘sour milk; buckwheat’ ← an inner-Albanian derivative from ikëj ‘to run, go (away)’
(h)okë ‘joke, jest’ ← Lat. iocus id. (note that secondary -j- and -j- in loanwords is regularly substituted by Alb. h-, e.g., krahinë ‘region, district’ < Scr. krajina: cf. Rasmussen 1985)
(h)urdhe f.pl. ‘ivy’ < PIE *\(\_\_)\langle-\) ‘root, wort’ (OE word ‘thorn-bush’)
(h)urdhë ‘pond, pool’ ~ Common Slavic *virō ‘whirlpool’

The rare PIE onset cluster *\(ks\)- regularly yields Alb. h- (cf. i/e huaj ‘foreign, strange’ ~ Gk. ἕνεγος id. and hirrë f. ‘whey’ ~ Skt. kṣirā- ‘milk’). Again, there is no obvious candidate available. We are left, finally, with PIE *\(sk\)- and *\(sk\)-, which merge into Alb. h-, at least before a back vowel (also in inlaut; see, e.g., Huld 1984: 149, Matzinger 2006: 78):

---

**Albanian** hundë, Faroese, Norwegian skon, Finnish kuono

halë f. ‘chaff’ < *skol-je4h₂ (Goth. skalja, Lith. skeliu, skelti ‘to hew; to split’)
harb ‘rudeness’ ← < *skor-bʰo- (OHG scarf, Latv. skarbs ‘sharp, harsh’)
heed ‘throw’ ~ hudh ‘hurl’ < *sku-ya- (ON skjóta) ‘shout; spring forward’
helm ‘poison’; disputed, but probably connected to OHG scalmo ‘plague’, W claf ‘sick’ (cf. Hyllested 2010: 111-112)
hënë, Gheg hânë ‘moon’ < *skand- (Skt. cándra ‘moon’, šcand- ‘shine’, Bret. cann ‘moon’; Lat. candeō ‘glow’, Gk. κανδαρός ‘ember’)
hi, def. hiri, Tosk dial. hī, Gheg hî, def. hîni ‘ash’ < *(s)keniso-
(hi)je f. ‘shadow’ < *skh₂-eh₂ (Gk. σκιά, Toch. B skiyo) ~ *sk̂eh₂-eh₂ (Skt. chāya)
humb ‘to leave, to lose, to spoil, to miss’ < *sku-m-bʰ-, nasal present to < *skeubʰ- (Lith. skumbū, skūbti ‘to hurry, to hasten’, Goth. af-skiuban ‘to push away, to reject’)
hurdhë, hudhër ‘garlic’ ~ Gk. σκόροδον

4 A new proposal

It seems to have escaped everyone’s attention that several West Nordic languages possess words with almost identical semantics as well as a strong formal similarity to Meyer’s reconstruction: Faroese skon f., -ar, -

---

5 With PIE *e > Alb. i either by umlaut from -i- in the following syllable (Orel 2000: 145, de Vaan 2004: 70-71) or in secondary consonant clusters such as oblique forms of s-stems (which are later contracted); cf., e.g., vit ‘year’ < *vetso- < *veteso- (Hamp 1971: 121-122). Meyer’s (1891: 152) reconstruction *skino-, accepted by Tagliavini (1937: 312), Huld (1994: 74), and Orel (2000: 131, 218), renders impossible the otherwise almost universally accepted equation with Gk. κόνις (with o-grade); Lat. cinis does not reflect original i-vocalism, but results from a vowel assimilation *keni- > /kini-/, as in similis (< *semilis) ‘similar, like’. Alternatively, if one prefers to avoid s-mobile on the basis of Albanian only, one could derive hi from Early Proto-Alb. *skāja (~ Gmc. *sknja ‘cloud’, Eng. sky) with Early Proto-Alb. ūi > ū (~ y) preceding *(C)- (Orel 2000: 11-12, cf. shi ‘rain’ < *süh₂ ~ OPr. suge/ sueje/ id., and mizë, myzë ‘a fly’, with dimin. suff. -zë, ~ ON mý id. < PGmc. *mäja-); but then, in return, one would have to accept secondary nasalization of the vowel as in Gheg sj ‘eye’, drū ‘wood’.
ir ‘nose; snout; face; (colloqu.) mug’ has a counterpart in SW Nw. dial. (Hardanger, Vossemål, Sogn, Nordhordland; cf. Grunnmanuskriptet) skon ‘snout, muzzle’, but is otherwise a hitherto obscure and isolated word, not even represented in ON, let alone East Nordic or the rest of Germanic. There are two possible Germanic proto-forms:

a) ~ ON *skon < *skanō- (like Far. lón f. -ar, -ir ‘longhouse’ < ON ł gn [~ NE lane] or mon m. < ON mōn ‘mane’, or

b) ~ ON *skon with a-umlaut of PGmc. *-u- < PGmc. *skunā-, *skunō

The latter finds support in the Mod. Icel. fem. nickname skon(n)r, because the Norwegian dialect of Vik i Sogn has a similar skon ‘hag, poor woman’ (Blöndal 1989), and the alternative would result in Mod. Icel. †skön(-).

5 Finnish kuono and its relatives

Furthermore, Jorma Koivulehto suggested in 1982 (see Kylstra et al. 1991-2012, II: 125-126) that the Germanic proto-form of skon (or an early reflex thereof) had been borrowed into Balto-Fennic, cf. Fi. kuono

---

6 Grunnmanuskriptet (Norwegian ‘Basic manuscript’) is a manuscript dictionary from the 1930’s (completed 1940) which was meant to be released as the first major dictionary of Norwegian in which both lemma and definition were given in Nynorsk. Entries were taken from other monumental dictionaries of Norwegian from that period by Ivar Aasen, Hans Ross, Steinar Schott, and others, but it does not contain all dialectal forms from minor dialectal dictionaries, which were meant to be added later. For various reasons, the manuscript was never published as a complete dictionary; but Dokumentasjonsprosjektet (‘The Documentation Project’) at the University of Oslo has made the entire manuscript available in searchable electronic form (see the References below). It now serves as one of the basic sources for the 12-volume Norsk Ordbok (‘Norwegian Dictionary’), edited at the University of Oslo, which is projected to be finished in 2014.

7 PGmc. *skēnō- is not an option since this would yield Early ON *skôn. In Late ON, ɑ merges with ą, but not if it was nasalized, in which case it (often) merges with ę. Cf. for the whole train of events Proto-Norse *nāhtu > Early ON nött > Late ON, Mod. Icel. nótt. In Faroese too, nasalized ɑ would give ą, cf. ON vǫn, pl. vānir > Far. vón, pl. vānir. Thus Far. skon with short –o- and the pl. skonir precludes a reconstruction *skēnō-. The same is true for Nw. skon, as Grunnmanuskriptet cites the word with the vowel ą, which can go back to either ON ɑ (< PGmc. *u) or ą (< PGmc. *u), but not to ON ą or ą.
‘snout, muzzle’, Est. koon, Votic kòn id. These forms together point to a proto-form *kōnV, with secondary lengthening of PGmc. short *u, as in Fi. ruoste (Est. rooste) and Karel. ruosma ‘rust’ (< *Balto-Fennic *rōsteh and *rōsma respectively) – but this is the only other example of such a lengthening; otherwise PGmc. *u is substituted with a Fennic short vowel, mostly *u, but sometimes *o (see Kylstra & al. 1991-2012, I: xviii); examples:

*hurskas ‘pious, devout’ (only in North Balto-Fennic; Fi., Karel. hurskas) ← PGmc. *hurskaz
*kulta ‘gold’ (Fi. kulta, Est. kuld) ← PGmc. *gulþa
*kuningas ‘king’ (Fi., Est. kuningas) ← PGmc. *kuningaz
*lukko, *lukku ‘lock’ (Fi. lukko, lukku, Est. lukk) ← PGmc. *lukôn-
*multa ‘humus, topsoil’ (Fi. multa, Est. muld) ← PGmc. *mulþô-
*murkina ‘breakfast’ (Fi. murkina, Est. murgin(a)) ← PGmc. *murginaz
*ruysis ‘rye’ (Fi. ruis, Est. rukis) ← PGmc. *rugiz
*turβeh, *turvas ‘peat, turf’ (Fi. turve, Est. turvas, dial. turv) ← PGmc. *turbaz, *turbz

*kotti ‘bag; scrotum; uterus; trough, etc.’ (Fi. kotti, Est. kott) ← PGmc. *kudzan-
*porðas ‘degree, step, level; (pl.) stairs: staircase (N only; Fi. porras, Veps pordaz) ← PGmc. *burðaz
*sorta-ða ‘to oppress’ (as a verb only in North Balto-Fennic; Fi. sortaa ‘to oppress’; Est. sõõrd ‘clearing; margin of a field’) ← PGmc. *sturtjan-

Secondary lengthening, however, does occur in Germanic loanwords with front vowel, cf. Fi. viikko < PGmc. *wikôn- ‘week’ and liikkiö ‘ham’ ← PGmc. *flikkija-, and there is no doubt that ruoste and ruosma must be substitutions for PGmc. *ruste- and *rusma-, respectively. The three different outcomes are probably dependent on chronology rather than phonological conditioning. Thus, it cannot be ruled out that *kuono comes from *skuna-.

Nikkilä (see Kylstra & al. 1991-2012, II: 125-126) connects the Fennic word with PGmc. *gōnô (Mod. Icel. góna ‘snout, esp. of seal, shark, or wolfish’) instead, and this etymology is perhaps to be preferred, also since the -o in Finnish often substitutes a Germanic ð-stem. This -o,
however, can also represent a Balto-Fennic suffix, and is not present in all of the Balto-Fennic languages in either case. Both etymologies are in any case possible. I find Koivulehto’s proposal that PGmc. *skuna- (via ‘muzzle’) also stands behind Karel. kynà ‘trough’, Est. küna, Liv. kinà (Kylstra et al. 1991-2012, II: 137) rather far-fetched.

6 PIE reconstruction: Formal possibilities

Now, a PGmc. *skuna- ‘snout’ obviously fits well with Proto-Albanian *skuntà ‘nose’, even if there are different ways of accounting for the Albanian *-t-. Considering the range of meanings of hundè, it would make sense to maintain relationship with the ‘shoot’ root:

a) ‘nose’
b) ‘point, tip, summit’
c) ‘projection, overhang’
d) ‘promontory, headland, cape’

Affinity with Lith. skutnà ‘bald head’ is formally possible since its expected Albanian counterpart would be exactly *hundè (< *skuntà < *skutnà; cf. the metathesis in bung(ë) ‘chestnut oak’ described above in 2.). Since the Lith. forms and the underlying verb skùsti ‘to shave, to peel’ are most likely connected to MIR. scoth f. ‘point, edge’ < PCelt. *skutà, it does not appear semantically impossible either. Note also the Hesychian gloss σκύτη, of similar shape, which is given the meaning κεφαλή ‘head’.

It is also conceivable, however, that *skuntà simply reflects the original order of nasal and stop. We know Germanic forms like OHG scutent, OE scyndan, ON skunda → Eng. soon (→ schooner), scun ’fly forward’ < PGmc. *skundjan-, *skundôn- ‘drive forward’, and these either go back to PIE *skundh- or Verner variants of *skunt-; when compared to No. dial. skut m. ‘projection, overhang’, ON skúta ‘kind of ship;
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schooner* (→ OIr. *scúta*, NE *scout*, MDu. *scûte*), Lith. *skudrûs* ‘fast’, Skt. *côdati* ‘drive forward’, it is clear that we must assert at least two root-variants with different stops, hence probably old extensions of an original root *skeu*-.. Nasalized forms may represent generalized nasal presents. Alb. *hundë* cannot reflect a variant with a voiced stop, which would be lost in the position after a nasal, yielding †*hunë*.

I conclude that *hundë* is ultimately related to Alb. *hu* ‘penis’, *hedh* ‘to throw’, *hudh* ‘to hurl’, *hyj* ‘to enter’ and *humb* ‘to leave; to lose; to spoil; to miss’ as originally suggested by Meyer (and followed by Schmidt, Ölberg, Orel, and partly Hamp), but this word-family cannot be safely established by internal reconstruction alone. It is Germanic *skuana*-, reconstructed on the basis of Faroese and Norwegian material, as well as possible ancient Germanic forms in Balto-Fennic, that have provided the clue.

Since a primary word for ‘nose’ is already known from most Indo-European languages, and since this word is known to be at least of PIE age (PIE *nas-*),10 it seems reasonable to reconstruct the meaning of *skun-o-, skun-to-* rather as ‘snout’ (i.e., ‘nose of an animal [as opposed to the human nose]’), preserved in Germanic and having replaced the original ‘nose’ word in Albanian only. Thus *skun-o-, skun-to-* would be of at least Northwest Indo-European age.

References


---

10 Details of the reconstruction vary, but everyone agrees about the existence of the etymon.
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Estonia and the Aestii: 
Baltic Etymology as a Key to Fennic Ethnonyms

Abstract

The name of the Estonians, Est. Eesti, goes back to the tribal name *Aestii first mentioned by Tacitus, denoting inhabitants of the Baltic in the broadest sense. Several sources reveal that the name originally had an -r- in the stem. That the original diphthong was *ai- as in the Latinized forms is assured by the Old Gutnish attestation Aistland. The name must come from Baltic *aistra- ‘pimple (m.); vehement passion (f.)’ which can be reconstructed on the basis of a) a loanword in Livonian aistar ‘pimple’ and its variant vistar; b) Lith. aistrà and c) cognates in other Indo-European languages with the same double meaning. The name was given to the Estonians as a translation of PGmc. *finôn-. Numerous parallel sexists among Fenno-Ugric ethnonyms, perhaps pointing to an old designation referring to fish scale as money or fish skin as valuable garment.

2 Attestations of the name

The name of Estonia, Est. Eesti, goes back to the tribal name *Aestii first mentioned by Tacitus in 98 BC (gen.pl. Aestiorum gentes Germ. 45, 2) and later by Cassiodorus 523-526 BC (H(a)estis Theodoricus rex, Variae 5, 2); Jordanes, d. 552 (gen.pl. Aestorum natio, Get. 23, 119); Einhard in 830 (Aisti in Vita Karoli Magni); Wulfstan in 890 (to, mid Ėstum in his travel account); and Adam of Bremen in 1073 (Haiist and Aestland, Hamburgische Kirchengeschichte, 12 and §17). On the basis of these attestations, we can identify a Latinized ethnonym Aestii or Aesti and a stem Aest- (Aist-).

According to A. Bammesberger & S. Karaliūnas (1998), rather than denoting a specifically Baltic tribe, it was probably a cover term for all
inhabitants of the East coast, including those of Balto-Fennic origin. They point to the fact that, even if the Aestii of the antique and early medieval sources denoted Southern Baltic tribes (speaking Baltic languages), the ethonym has been used by Scandinavians since the Viking Age to denote the Fenno-Ugric forefathers of the contemporary Estonians. Since the 10th century the country and their inhabitants were called Eistr, more rarely Eistir and Eistland.

That the original diphthong was *ai- as in the Latinized forms (the only option if the name is inherited into Old Norse, but not if it is late loan) is assured by the Old Gutnish attestation utan foru i aina oy viðr Aistland, sum hattir Dagaiipi ‘[they] travelled to an island off Estonia called Dagö’ (Guta Saga, 13th c.). Furthermore, -ai- occurs in ethnonymic compound Tafaistr ‘inhabitant of the Häme region in Finland’, used as a personal name on an 11th c. runestone (U 722) from Löts parish, Trödgs Härad in the Swedish region of Uppland: tafaistr · lit · raisa · stain · at · a[----- b]røpur · sin ‘Tafeistr raised this stone in memory of his brother’. Otherwise this name occurs with -ei-, although the modern Swedish term is tavaster (cf. also Tavastehus ‘the Finnish province of Häme’).

2 Etymology

Bammesberger & Karaliūnas (1998: 47) further establish on a balance of probabilities that the name originally meant ‘(agricultural) land; acre’ and is derived from Proto-Baltic *āist- ‘to burn’ either via a meaning ‘dry land’ (as opposed to the sea), or, more plausibly, referring to the use of slash-and-burn cultivation techniques. They detect this stem also in Baltic place-names like Aīstere and Aisterniki in Latvia and Eistrai in Lithuania (with secondary Ei- for *Ai-), the typically Latvian suffix -ere of the former showing that the name is indeed of Baltic origin; and they compare e.g. Lit. dogmē ‘glade; acreage, strip of land’ ~ dėgti ‘to burn’; Lat. terrā ‘land’ < *ters- ‘dry’. Their main single argument is that other names of Baltic and Balto-Fennic tribes are etymologized as ‘land’, and that the traditional Estonian self-designation maarahvas still in the modern language is literally ‘land-people’, maakeel ‘Estonian language’

---

1. I thank Sean Vrieland (p.c.) for having pointed this out to me.
correspondingly lit. 'land-tongue', _maa-sõna_ 'genuine Estonian expression', lit. 'land-word', etc. Since this term is synchronically analyzable it is of course a late variant which may nonetheless preserve semantics and connotations from earlier ethnonyms.

What Bammesberger & Karaliūnas fail to mention is that this term contrasted specifically with the name of another Balto-Fennic population, the closely related Livonians, who were primarily fishermen and literally called themselves 'inhabitants of the coast', _rândalist_, who spoke _rândakēl_ 'Livonian', lit. 'coast(al) tongue'.

As the authors note themselves, there are indications that the original stem contained an -_r_-: The Old Norse Ynglingatal talks about _Eistradolgi_ 'the Estonian enemy', and in _Historia Norvegiae_, the name shows up as _Eistriam_, _Eistrīis_ (in the passage _devenit in Eistrīam, puver Olavis Eistrīis in servum venundatur_ 'came to Eistria and bought the boy Olav from Eistria as a slave'). They seem to interpret this as an indication that the ethnonym was borrowed from the suffixed form occurring in the place-name _Aistere_. However, the suffix -_ere_ is almost certainly not common Baltic; it is typical of Latvian place-names only and specifically names connected to lakes. Būga (1923: 383) simply considers it a borrowing from Balto-Fennic *-_järvi_ 'lake' (Fi. _järvi_; cf. also Balode & Bušs 2007: 37).

If the basis for the full sequence *-_aistr_- is common Baltic, there are other possibilities, however. Asserting -_r_- as an original part of the stem provides a formal basis for comparing it to Lith. _aistrā_ 'intense passion' and Livonian _āistar_ 'pimple, blister; maggot or worm in animal skin; cockchafer grub'. Since Thomsen (1890) the latter has been considered a loan from the Baltic word behind Lith. _ankšṭirai_, _inkštrās_ 'pimple', Latv. _ankštrās_ 'larva under the skin of cattle'. However, there are several structural problems implied in this etymology. The expected form is rather something like †_ahtar_ since Baltic *-_(n)kš_ normally is substituted with -_h_ in Balto-Fennic, cf. e.g. _ahingas_ 'fish-spear, rake' ~ Lith. _ąkštinas_. One further issue is the Livonian dialectal variant _viistar_ which is even further away from the alleged Baltic point of departure.

3 Alternative Etymology: Baltic *-_aistra_- is a translation of PGmc. *-_finōn_

I suggest instead that the Livonian word is borrowed from a hypothetical Proto-Baltic *-_aistra_- whose feminine-collective counterpart is at-
tested as Lith. aistrà. The former would make up a form identical even in gender to Gk. οἶστρος 'gadfly; intense passion', otherwise missing among the IE cognates, and both meanings of the Greek word would then also be covered by Baltic. In Late (Western) PIE *ojastr- probably arose as a merger of two originally independent words:

a) *(h₂)ojd-tro- 'one who makes (sth) swell' from *h₂ejd- or *ajd- 'swell' (cf. -d- in e.g. Latv. idra 'disease mark on tree', Gk. oídos <oído> 'tumour', oídēω 'to swell', PGmc. *aita- 'abscess, ulcer', *aitra- 'pus', Lat. aemidus).

b) *h₃eis-tro- (*h₃ois-tro-) 'irritator, one who sets (sby) in vehement motion' from *h₃eis- 'set in vehement motion, urge, irritate' (cf. *-s- in Av. aśma- m. 'anger', Lat. irda 'id.' next to Gk. oĩma 'rush, attack, rage (of animals)').

Such a merger could have been facilitated not only by the sudden homonymy (after loss of laryngeal and development of *TT > sT), but even by the semantic connection between stinging insects and swellings on the skin of animals caused by bugs that operate there.

The etymology proposed here also makes it easier to explain the Liv. variant vîstar as an East Baltic variant *viestra- with prothetic *vie- as reflex of *(H)oi- as also in *vienas 'i' < PIE *oīH-no-s.

The comparison can be justified semantically, seeing that many other Fennic ethnonyms bear strong similarities to appellatives with meanings covered by the PGmc. word *finōn-. These meanings are:

1) 'fish fin' (Sw. fena, older fina, MLG vinne, OE finn > Eng. fin)
2) 'pimple; abscess' (Sw. finne, NHG Finne, Da. finpens < finne-pind)
3) 'kornaks' (Sw. Dial. fen(a) etc.)
4) Nw. dial. finn(e) 'small horn on animal', 'stiff grass species'
5) 'any protuberance on the skin of humans or animals related to diseases, including larvae under the skin, notably on fish (MLG vinne, Dutch vin, NHG Finne)
6) 'finne' > 'patch', cf. NHG Flosse 'fin' ~ Da. flosset

I reconstruct the common Proto-Germanic meaning as 'protuberance on the skin (including fins and fish scale, larvae under the skin). That

---

3 Beekes (2010: 1062) regards *h₃eis-tro- as the only source of οἶστρος.
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the meaning 5) of *finōn- matches Baltic *aistra- so well is in itself hardly a coincidence. When compared to homonyms of neighbouring Balto-Fennic tribes, the equivalence becomes even more striking, cf. that Fi. Suomi ‘Finland’ is very reminiscent of suomu ‘fish scale’. The two are normally considered unrelated, but has been suggested as one possible etymology of the name (cf. Grünthal 1997; Kulonen 1998). Some of the other names have also been viewed as loan translations (Napol’skich 2007): Lapp ~ Danish lap ‘patch’, Veps ~ Saami *veapsē ‘fin’, Fi. Vatja ‘Vote’ ~ Balt. *vadja- ‘patch’, the ethnonym sambi, sembi ~ Fi. sampi ‘sturgeon’, which is known to derive from an earlier meaning ‘horn core on sturgeon’ < ‘back-fin of a fish’ (Napol’skich 2003).

In South Moravian dialects of Czech, the word madar means both ‘Hungarian’ and ‘pimple’, but in this case the primary meaning of madar is clearly ‘Hungarian’, coming from Hung. magyar, meaning that the signification ‘pimple’ must originate from a wordplay on the double meaning of uher. This example thus serves merely as a typological parallel where the semantic shift went in the reverse direction, from ethnonym to appellative.

This situation probably reflects several erroneous translations and folk-etymologies through time, cf. further Old Norse seðmenn ‘Saami people’, originally ‘sorcerers’, but synchronically also understandable as ‘pollack men’; and ON taf-eistr ‘inhabitant of Häme’, lit. ‘tap Estonian’ ~ latinized in as Historia Norvegiae cornuti fenni, Old Norse horn-finnar. Correspondingly, *aistra- might simply be the Baltic translation of what had at some point ended up as the default designation for Balto-Fennic tribes.

4 Other possibilities than mere translations

Although wordplay, erroneous translations and folk-etymology does seem to have played a role for the emergence of some of the ethnonyms, it is on the other hand quite hard to imagine a scenario where these phenomena took place so consistently and repetitively through the ages in different geographical areas, and that they would have resulted in a surviving established ethnonym in every single case. It is thus hardly credible to present the whole story entirely as one of unconscious and incidental calques and misunderstandings. It seems at least worth investigating whether an inherited conceptual association between Fenno-
Ugric peoples and at least one of the meanings involved could be held accountable for some of the homonymies.

Interesting in this context is Widmer’s (2003) reconstruction of a Uralic word for ‘fish scale’, *kämV, which after the beginning of minting (at least after the first half of the 7th c. BC) became used as a term for ‘coin’, especially ‘silver coin’, ‘copper coin’, but also ‘silver in general’, ‘silver jewel’ and in Ob-Ugrian folklore even established as an image of wealth, partly as an attribute to the Urmutter (kam naj ‘wealth(y) noble-lady’), partly of any material making up status symbols of heroes (weapons, booty). In a version of an Mansi legend, the last word in the formula šopər-nē koam-nē ‘silver woman, wealth woman’ has been replaced with a word meaning ‘Russian’, šaper-nē kaper-nē, and in another version, even the first word has been replaced with ‘Siberian’, šaper-nē köäpər-nē. If some of the Fenno-Ugric peoples had once been named or named themselves after precious metal, it would not be much different from deriving türk from the word for ‘silk’.

It is also conceivable that a term ‘fish-skin’ could have constituted an exact parallel to türk, referring to an important garment. As noted elsewhere in this dissertation, Fenno-Ugric forest peoples have traditionally produced clothing – coats, boots, and caps – from fish-skin, justifying an analogy with terrestrial animals hunted for their pelt (Armstrong 1997). The burbot along with the sturgeon and sterlet were so important for the Khanty (Ostyaks) in the time of Russian expansions in the 1600s that a particularly bad fishing season could threaten the very existence of a tribe.
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Word Migration on the Silk Road: 
The Etymology of English silk and its Congeners¹

Abstract

European terms for ‘silk’ display exceptional variation for deriving ultimately from a single Old Chinese source. It is suggested here that ON Norse silki ‘silk’, transmitted via the Varangians’ trade in Byzantium through Kievan Rus’ to Scandinavia in the 9th c., and OE seoluc, OHG silihho possibly in a separate wave a couple of centuries earlier, are loanwords from the Iranian language Alanic (Sarmatian) at the Western end of the Silk Road. It reflects a regular Alanic development of *ri > l, the original form being *sirika- which leaves several possibilities open: Either a) it is a productive inner-Iranian formation with the suffix *-(V)ka-, possibly meaning ‘silk man, inhabitant of Silis’; b) it is a nativization of Gk. σηρικόν; or c) it has entered Alanic via Turkic *sir(e)-lek ‘silk garment’ or Mongolian sirkeg ‘silk fabric’. Modern Ossetic zely, zeldag, despite its typical loanword characteristics, may be inherited directly from Alanic *silika-, only reshaped in analogy with zeldæ (today ‘young grass; turf’) which must have preserved its original meaning ‘golden; yellow’ into medieval lassic and preserved with that meaning as a loanword in Hungarian zöld.

¹This article will be published in Berit Hildebrandt (ed.): Exchange along the Silk Roads between Rome and China in antiquity: The Silk Trade. Oxford: Oxbow 2014. Apart from the notations (abbreviations of language names and transliterations of Greek words) the two versions are almost completely identical.
1 ‘Silk’ in Europe and Asia

The exchange of silk along the Silk Road is often examined through archaeological finds and the interpretation of historical texts. This contribution seeks to address the question of exchange along the Silk Road and especially the ways through which the silk reached the West by discussing the etymology of silk in Western and Northern European languages from antiquity to modern times. The chronological scope of this article is vast in order to better understand the different national concepts through which the material was classified, the different routes the silk trade could take and the ethnic groups that were involved.

Most etymological dictionaries (notably ODEE 827, de Vries 1962: 487, Vasmer 1953-58, III: 387, Falk/Torp 1960: 966-967) agree with and basically just repeat the standard etymology of Eng. silk, OE seoloc, seoluc, sioloc, seolc, and its immediate congeners in Germanic (ON silkí, Da., Nw., Sw. silke\(^3\)), borrowed into Finnish and Karelian as silkki and into the Western Saami languages, cf. SKES IV: 1025\(^4\); OHG silehho ‘toga’, selachin ‘cover’), Baltic (Lith. šilkas, šilka, Samogitian dial. šilka, borrowed into Latvian in the expression silkuots ‘sewn with silk’; OPr. šilkas) and East Slavic (ORu. šilkă, borrowed into the New Curonian dialect of Latvian as šils and continued in Standard Ru. šělk, Belaru. šolk, Ukr. šovk and N Ru. šulk, from where it has been transmitted to North-Eastern Balto-Fennic languages, and, via Karelian, further into Eastern Saami\(^5\)). The Baltic forms are regarded as old loans from Slavic (Fraenkel 1962-65: 983-984). Schrader (1904-1905: 84) states that the Germanic forms must have been transmitted via Slavic.

---

\(^3\) I owe my sincere gratitude to Peter Kerkhof, Seán Vrieland, Berit Hildebrandt and two anonymous referees for their insightful comments and invaluable amendments.

\(^4\) Swedish is one of the very few languages that distinguishes two basic words for the silk thread (silke) and woven silk (sidén). The name of the Silk Road is called Sidenvägen, thus referring to the fabric.

\(^5\) S Saami silke, Pite Saami silhke, Lule Saami silhkē, N Saami silki, Inari Saami silke (SKES IV: 1025).

The Balto-Fennic forms borrowed from Northern Russian are Eastern (Karelian and Ingrian) Fi. sulkku, Karelian proper and Ononets šulkku, Lude šulk(u), Veps šök (cf. Ploger 1973: 190). From Karelian proper comes Skolt and Kildin Saami šolkk, while in Votic, the only Southern Balto-Fennic language to possess the word, šolkka, šotkk is borrowed directly from Standard Russian. Cf. SKES IV: 1103.
All refer to the ultimate source as Old Chinese, the language of the area where the silk industry began and became important as early as the 3rd millennium BC (cf. Wang 1993: 225). Most scholars further envisage that the journey of this word towards the West in some way involves Written Mong. *sirkeg ‘silk fabric’ and Manchu sirge, sirhe ‘silk thread, silk floss from a cocoon; string of a musical instrument’, thus pointing to the important role nomadic tribes played in the distribution of silk. Hardly surprising, the standard handbooks also agree that the word was transmitted in antiquity with the trade of silk fabric along the silk road. It is a typical wanderwort of the later, historical kind, where the ultimate origin is at least superficially rather obvious but the ways of transmission less certain (while, for prehistoric culture-words, even the source is often obscure). In this particular case, to our benefit, the transcontinental Silk Road constitutes a concrete historical track on which we can hope to trace the word and its intermediate stations on its way from East Asia to Europe and catch glimpses of the transmission of not only the word, but also the material along the Silk Road.

The Chinese source is the precursor of the Mod.Ch. 丝 ㄔ ˇ ‘silk; thread; string’; it is commonly reconstructed as OCh. *sɔ or *siɡ (thus Wang 1993 with references) and Middle Ch. *si. It is related to other Sino-Tibetan words denoting ‘thread’, ‘string’ or ‘sinew’. Neighbouring Asiatic languages all reflect a final r-element, which, if not reconstructable for Old or Middle Chinese, must be explained as suffixal in one of the lending languages from which it can have been transferred further: Middle Kor. sir (> Mod. Kor. shil), Manchu sirge, sirhe, Written Mong. sirkeg. It is however possible that the -r- does go back to Chinese and reflect a second noun 人 ˇ ˇ ‘people’ (Genaust 1996: 578) in which case the word borrowed from neighbouring languages would not be a designation for ‘silk’ as such, but rather a compound-like ethnonym already at the time of contact (whose meaning would correspond exactly to Gk. Σήρες ‘silk men’; see the next paragraph). Whatever the exact details of this entanglement, there can be no doubt about a starting-point in East Asia, as far as its identity as a culture-word is concerned.

6 “Written Mongolian” (or Literary Mongolian) is the scholarly term for an independent Mongolian language variety, attested in the old Mongolian script and different from both Classical Mongolian and Middle Mongolian. Although documented from the Middle Mongolian period, it represents an earlier linguistic stage.
3 The Silk Men

Neither is it at all disputed (e.g. Frisk 1960-66: 697) that Gk. σηρικός ‘silken, of silk’, substantivated σηρικόν ‘silk’ and transferred into Latin as sēricus, sēricum respectively, is formed from the same root as Eng. silk. It referred however not only directly to the raw silk and silk fabric, but also to its oriental origins. The Σηρες ‘silk men’ were initially of unknown ethnicity to the Greeks and Romans because they bought the silk via middlemen who transported it to the west from trade stations in Central Asia. Consequently, the "land of the Sērēs" acquired legendary associations until geographical knowledge of the Orient increased in the first centuries AD (Genaust 1996: 578-579; Thau-Knudsen 2000). At least Ptolemy knew in his Geographia from 150 AD that their land stretched beyond the Imauni, i.e. the Pamir mountains in Central Asia. The Chinese sequence sī rén, or whatever exact form was the starting-point, must have been transferred via Central Asiatic peoples to Europe and European languages; it cannot have been borrowed directly by European languages. The question then remains: What kind of Central Asians?

There is clear evidence that not only Europeans used the ‘silk’-term to denote the peoples of Central Asia, and that the term was not only used about traders, but about entire populations, again matching the translation ‘silk people’. First, on the famous Tonyukuk monument from 720 AD, found on the right bank of the upper course of the Tuul (Tola) river in Mongolia, the third and the fourth line of the Western side reads “türk sir bodun yerintä / bod qalmadi” ‘in the land of the Turkic sir people, no group of people were left (any longer)’ (Ramstedt, Granö & Aalto 1958: 30-31), and the term is mentioned again later in the inscription. Furthermore, the very ethnonym Türk in all probability derives from a translation of this name, cf. that similar words meaning ‘silk’ are found in all three Altaic branches: OTu. torgū ‘silk fabric’, MMong. żurge, torkan, Written Mong. torgan ‘silk, satin’, Solon Evenki tōrga ‘silk’.

7 Transliterated Sēres, but the Latin form is Sērēs.
8 Cf. also Fi. turkku ‘fur’ and O̱Ru. *torgū ‘marketplace, square’, borrowed into ON torg id. I do not necessarily embrace Wang’s (1993) idea that Türk and silk are ultimately etymologically identical, but in the light of a series of interesting of loanword proposals showing an alleged loan correspondence *svIC- vs. *tVrC- the idea seems at least worth pursuing.
While it seems clear to everyone that the root-element *sil*- of the word *silk* and its congeners must be identical to the *ser*- in Gr. σηρικόν and the Sērēs, and that the source of this element is Chinese, it has not yet been cleared out how an *-ilk*-form might have arisen next to the *-ērik*-form, and why the variant with *-l*- is found exactly in some Germanic languages, in Baltic and in East Slavic (leaving aside the aberrant South Slavic forms *svila*). In fact, etymological handbooks in general seem to avoid explaining the variation. Vasmer (1953-58, III: 387) surmises that the Germanic forms are borrowed directly from Latin, which, however, does not explain the lambdacism, and that the Old Russian form, because of its initial consonant *š*- which constitutes yet another difference from the Mediterranean form, must rather have come from some unknown Eastern source. While it is very plausible that the first intermediate stations were Altaic (Turkic, Mongolian, Tungusic) and perhaps Tocharian (Wang 1993, cf. also Hilmarsson 1984 on Tocharian *šorkām* 'string'), pointing to the nomadic peoples of North-Western China and the Tarim region, no language of these groups preserves a form with *-l*- and the meaning 'silk fabric'. What we are searching for is therefore a language at the Western End of the Silk Road that can have transformed *-r*- into *-l*- and which, at least linguistically, played a crucial role in the transmission of silk from east to west.

4 A Northeast European isogloss

The geographical distribution of the *silk*-word in Europe provides some clues to its further migrations. As can be seen from the above list, it occurs in Germanic languages (from where it has been borrowed into North-Western Balto-Finnish and Western Saami), in Baltic languages, and in East Slavic (borrowed into North-Eastern Balto-Finnish, Southern Balto-Finnish and Eastern Saami). In Western Europe, the successor of Latin *saeta* ‘stiff hair, bristle’ has become the dominant term, however

---

9 *Svila*, found in all South Slavic languages (Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian and Bulgarian) is technically unrelated since it formally seems to derive from a preverb *sū- and the feminine of a participial form *vīla* of the verb *viti* 'to wind, to roll, to twist, to bend’, cf. e.g. Slov. *svila* 'bent' (fem.), but this is likely to be due to folk-etymology (see Bezlaj 1995: 351 with references).

10 Russian *š*- is regular from *s*- in Nordic loanwords; thus, it seems more likely that the East Slavic terms have been borrowed from Old Norse (Miller 2012: 66-67).
from the expression *saeta sērica* ‘silk thread’ (lit. ‘silk hair’)\(^{11}\). Thus, MHG Seide, Du. zijde, Sw. siden, Latv. zīds, Est. siid (in the two latter via MLG, from Latv. further into Liv. as zīd’) and terms in the Romance languages (Fr. soie, Sp. and Port. seda, It. seta) are all ultimately, the Romance forms directly, from Lat. *saeta* and thus unrelated to the word *silk* despite superficial similarities. In other words, the *l-*form seems to be confined to Northern and Eastern Europe – and the full form involving both *-l-* and *-k-* is certainly only found there\(^{12}\).

During the Viking Age, silk was brought to Northern Europe by the Varangians, Nordic merchants who traveled through Kiev Rus and reached Constantinople where they traded with local merchants. One prominent example from the Icelandic sagas is the account of the Norwegian king Sigurd the Crusader’s visit to Miklagard (Byzantium) 1110, recorded in Snorri Sturluson’s *Heimskringla* (III, 238, cf. Blöndal 2007: 136), and from Nestor’s Chronicle we know how Russian envoys were gifted with impressive silken brocades during a visit to Byzantium 912 (Krag 2013). Given the geographical distribution of the *silk*-word and our knowledge, it is likely that the Varangians brought the word with them through Russia all the way to Scandinavia.

### 5 An Alanic sound-law

To sum up so far, although it is undisputed that the Chinese silk word must be the ultimate source of the several similar European terms for *silk*, the reason for the irregular variation between them has remained a mystery, and the exact languages that transferred them into Europe via Central Asia have resisted discovery. While inherited words

---

\(^{11}\) Lat. *sērica* survives only via the Llat. form *sareca* in OFr. *sarge*, Fr. *serge* in the meaning ‘twill worsted’ or ‘twill silk’, and, via MLat. *sarcia* and OE *s(i)erc, syrc, s(i)erce* ‘shirt’ in ON *serkr* (Da. *særk*, Sw. *särk*, Nw. *serk*) ‘undergarment of silk or flax canvas’. Today, the Danish word has either historical or pejorative connotations, depending on context; in the latter case, the meaning is less specific and can refer to any kind of loose garment. The directions of transmission involving ME *serk*, Mod.Eng.dial. *sark*, OCS *sraky*, sraka, srutiča ‘garment’, Ru. soročka ‘shirt’, id., Lith. šarkas ‘garment’, and Balto-Fennic forms like Fi. *sarkki*, Est. särk, Liv. *serk*, pl. sērki ‘shirt’, is not entirely clear (cf. de Vries 1962: 471 with discussion and references).

\(^{12}\) The exact relation of Pashto *sālū* ‘silk veil’ and Mod.Pers. *sirah* to *silk* as well as to each other is uncertain (Cheung 2002: 254, Vasmer 387), but cf. below on other Iranian terms.
generally obey to the regularity of sound-laws, culture-words, because of their tumultuous history as terms for migrating products and inventions, typically occur in numerous shapes whose internal relations are hard and sometimes impossible to disembroil. In the case of ‘silk’, the geographical distribution of the varieties may hold the key to a solution. We have seen how the -l-variants are found primarily in Northern and Eastern Europe, notably in Old English, Old High German, Old Norse, Baltic and Old Russian, while the r-variants have basically spread from Greek. A scenario where this variant of the silk-word migrated northwards from Byzantium through present-day Russia and Ukraine to Central and Northern Europe is compatible with the historical records. Since Chinese (and Manchu, Mongolian etc.) word-forms start out with -r-, it seems reasonable to assume that the Greek form of the word would be the more archaic one. What we search for is then a language near the Western end of the Silk Road that would regularly have transformed -r- into -l- before the 7th century AD (but possibly much earlier), and which would be sufficiently culturally important as to provide or disseminate important culture-words.

Crucially, the regular development of older (Proto-Iranian) *-ri- and *-ri- in the subgroup of Scytho-Sarmatian languages within Iranian, comprising Scythian, Sarmatian, Alanic, Iassic and Ossetian, is exactly -l- (Bielmeier 1989: 241). This can be seen, first and foremost, in the name of the Alans themselves, Gk. Ἀλανοί, since it derives from the same (Indo-)Iranian self-designation *arjāna- that has yielded the very name of Iran and the infamous politically misused term Aryan (originally, and among linguists and historians still, denoting Indo-Iranian, but not other Indo-European peoples). We know that this name does not derive from a language that turned r to l in general because a subgroup of the Alans were called Ρωχολανοί which must reflect Plr. *rauxs-alana- ‘shining Alans’ (where *rauxs- in itself comes from PIE *leuk-s- with regular Iranian development of *l- > r), and, more indirectly, by the amalgamated name Ἀλανορσοί, mentioned by Strabo, where the second member is the name of the other subgroup, the Ἀορσοί whose name derives from Plr. *aruša- ‘white’ (Mod.Oss. urs / ors; Cheung 2002: 7). At the same time, it known to have been an endonym, i.e. the Alans’ name for themselves. A widespread alternative name, originally an exonym but later adopted as an endonym, was Άσιοι, reflected in the

---

When silk first occurs on the British Isles, simultaneous with the Old English velar umlaut of *siluc to seoluc, cf. Miller 2012: 67.
name of Iassians, the Iazyges and the Ossetes, with no certain etymology.

The PIr. form *āryan- is also indirectly attested as an Alanic loanword in the NE Caucasian Nakh languages: Chechen ēla 'prince (of a principality), chieftain', Ingush āla id. and Tsvoa-Tush (Batsbi) ālē 'lord, gentleman' can be reconstructed with a Nakh protoform *ālā that, in all likelihood, was borrowed from Alanic *ālā < PIr. *ārja-, cf. Oss. Allon, a mythological tribal name (Bielmeier 1989: 243; Thordarson 2009). Furthermore, the term occurs with the typical Iranian suffix *-ka-in Oss. Alegate (a Nart tribe) < PIr. *ārjaka- (Thordarson 1989: 478).

Another old attestation of the sound-law occurs in Herodot's Scythian name Κολάξαϊς since this most likely comes from PIr. *xwari-akšai 'sun-king'. Alkman's ἱππός Κολαξαῖος shows that the development had taken place at least in the 7th century BC (Hinge 2005).

One further old example of the development *-ri-, *-ri̯- > Alanic *-l- comes from the much later bulk of Alanic (Iassic) loanwords in Hungarian, transferred via the Iassic settlements in the 13th century. Hung. zöld, zeld means 'green, unripe' and is borrowed from Alanic *zalda- < PIr. *zarita- (corresponding to Ved. hárita- and ultimately the same PIE formation as Eng. gold, only with different ablaut). Most examples of the sound-law are from Modern Ossetian, e.g. the preverb fæl- < *pari-; Iron dialect mælin, Dīgōr mælun 'to die' < *mrja- (the same IE root as in Lat. mortuus 'dead', and, as a loanword from French, Eng. mortal); Dīgōr zælde 'young grass; grass; turf' < *zarita 'yellow' (∼ Av. zairita-, Ved. hārita- 'yellowish' and, with a different ablaut grade, Eng. gold), and næl 'male' (Dīgōr originally nælæ) < *narja- (∼ Av. natriia 'male, virile').

This means that if a foreign word containing the sequence *-ri- (or *-ri̯-) was borrowed into Alanic or another stage of Scytho-Sarmatian early enough, it would have yielded *-l- in Alanic itself by regular sound development. It would have to have happened in antiquity already since the Alanic self-designation with -l- is mentioned by Strabo and Ptolemy. According to Pliny the Elder (The Natural History, 6.49), both the Jaxartes river and the Tanaïs (present-day Syr Darja and Don respectively) were called Silis by the Scythians, suggesting a

14 The Sarmatian names Ἴρβιδος and Ἴργανος, attested in inscriptions from the Eastern part of the area North of the Black Sea, are perhaps also developments of *ārya-, but they occur in the Western ("Scythian") part as the variants Ἡμάνων, Ἡλμανος, which may reflect a dialect continuum where the change into *l* was not yet completed in the Sarmatian area (Hinge 2005).
development of *-r- to “Scythian” -l-. Even though it is far from certain that the name of Syr Darya has any etymological affiliation to Silis, at least it shows that Scythian already possessed an l-sound.

6 The Iranian suffix *-(i/a/â)ka-

Furthermore, while the Iranian suffix *-ika- formally corresponds to Greek *-iko-, it became productive in the formation of nouns in Iranian languages, most often however in the form *-âka, *-aka (originally formed to stems in *-â- and *-a-) or plain *-ka-, and was often added to words that would otherwise be or end up as monosyllabic. Thus, if a word *sir or *ser was borrowed into Alanic before the operation of the sound-law, or while it was still productive, it is very likely to quickly have formed part of a new derivative *sirika- which would then develop into *silka-. It would have stayed as *silka- until it was finally picked up by Varangians and other traders from the North in Byzantium.

Ciancaglini (2012a: 27-28 and 2012b: 95) notes about the Old Persian use of the suffix: “It seems that it occurs especially in toponyms and ethnonyms designating non-Iranian peoples, or peoples geographically distant or little known to the Persians”; among the examples she mentions Karka adj. ‘Carian’, Karkâ ‘Caria’ where the suffix has been added to the original stem, but also e.g. Katpatuka- m. ‘Cappadocian’ where the final syllable in the foreign name seems to have been interpreted as the Old Persian suffix. It is at least conceivable that the word could spread via Old Persian areas with the meaning ‘(the somewhat remote) silk people’ even if it was formed in Scytho-Alanic itself directly to *Sil-i-ka- ‘people of Silis, i.e. the area of Tanais and Jaxartes’. Based on what little we know about Scytho-Sarmatian and Alanic, we would at least expect a word *silika ‘silk’ to be homonymous to an ethnonym (which, though hypothetical, is a possible productive formation). From the Black-Sea inscriptions we now know *-(a)ka- in Sarmatian names (Hinge 2005), at least in the variants Φλιμάνακος, Φλείμναγου, Φλείμναγος, Λιμάνκου and Λίμνακος, representing Scytho-Sarmatian *(F)liyamanak/gos, formed with this suffix to the Iranian appellative *frija-manah- ‘liebgeistig; having a loving mind’15.

---

15 Except in Old Avestan where it is practically absent due to its low sociolinguistic connotation (Ciancaglini 2012a).
which, in turn, is attested in Sarmatian Άειμανος and Mod.Oss. łyman 'friend'. It may even be attested via the Scythian name of the Amazons mentioned by Herotodus, Οιορσατα or Οιορσατα (with alternating dia-critica) if Hinge is correct that ΟΙΟΡΓΑΤΑ is simply a corruption of *ΟΙΟΡΓΑΤΑ < *αιγαμαραγάτα 'one-breasted' (cf. Av. aēwua- ‘1’ and var-ah ‘breast’).

Another possibility is that a Greek loanword reflecting σηρικόν was already around in Roman-age Alanic and that the Alanic word was simply formed on the basis of a Greek model where the Greek suffix -ικο- was interpreted as the Iranian -(i)ka- (cf. the parallel in OP katpatuka ‘Cappadocian’ above). Even if we interpret Alanic *silka- as a Greek loanword lock, stock and barrel, it could still have been borrowed early enough for the sound-law to operate⁷. It is also possible that, after the completion of the sound-law, new sequences of *-ri- and *-ri̯- were so slow to reappear that -l- simply was the realization of a phonemic sequence /ri/ for some time – meaning that if the language absorbed a foreign word with *-ri- or *-ri̯- it would automatically have this sequence substituted with phonetic [l]. However, we know that this is at least no longer the case in Byzantine 13th century Alanic where new cases of -ri- emerged from an old sequence -raCi̯- (Cheung 2002: 104, 254; Engberg & Lubotsky 2003: 43).⁸

A third possibility is that the culture-word indeed entered Alanic from some other language than Greek, but a language which nonetheless already contained an unrelated suffix with *-k-, cf. that such forms are already known in words for ‘silk’ or ‘thread’ from both Mongolic and Tocharian. Turkic in fact possesses a widespread suffix *-lek (*-lak after back vowels), which is already reconstructed in a textile term (Lubotsky & Starostin 2003: 261), namely PT *köjŋe-lek ‘shirt’ (attested both in Modern Turkic languages and in loanwords in both Tocharian and Mongolian, and occurring in Altaic cognates with the meaning ‘silk’, ‘string’ and ‘thread’). A Turkic form *sirlek is likely to have turned into Alanic *silka via *sirlika. Also in this case the word could either have been interpreted by the Alanic borrowers as a completely foreign element and assigned a local phonetic rendering

⁷ A loan from Byzantine Greek could account for the -i-vocalism (Miller 2012: 67), but it is uncertain if this is chronologically compatible with the consonantal development of *ri to l. At least it would rule out a connection with the province of Silis because in this name the development of *r to l would have taken place many centuries earlier.
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(*silka*), or it could have been reanalyzed by the speakers as a local formation with an inherited suffix (*sirl-ika > *silka*), which is a perfectly normal development in loanword processes.

In any of these cases, the special Alanic sound-law *-ri-* > *-l-* plays an instrumental role. Despite the many uncertainties and possible subscenarios, it seems likely that the reason for the existence of the -ilk-form and its confinement to Northern and Eastern Europe is that it spread here via some stage of Alanic. Whether the derivative is formed with an Iranian suffix or has been borrowed with the suffix into Alanic from Turkic is less certain, as is its exact relationship with the Greek derivative, but it is important to note that the cultural and historical implications of all three scenarios are basically the same.

7 Golden silk – a reflex in Modern Ossetian?

An Alanic *silka*- is not directly attested, not even in Iassic or Modern Ossetian. This is no serious problem since the loss and replacement of lexical items in a given language is a phenomenon that takes place in all languages over time. However, it is interesting that the Modern Ossetian word for ‘silk’, while not corresponding regularly with the Alanic reconstruction, is at least superficially similar and has no known alternative source. It occurs both as zaeldag, zaeldage ‘silk’ (Abaev IV) and without the *-āka suffix as zaely, Digor izaely ‘silk; of silk, silken; silk scarf’ (Cheung 2002: 254). According to Abaev, Digor i- here is simply the definite article although prothetic i- elsewhere can have other sources (a Proto-Iranian syllable *i̯a* or the prepositions *u̯i- and *abi-).

Cases of Ossetic z- normally come from Pfr. *z*- (e.g. zerdæ ‘heart’ < Pfr. *zarita-, zad ‘born’ < Pfr. *zätə; zerond ‘old, old man’ < Pfr. *zaranta-). On the other hand, there are quite a number of Ossetic words of unexplained origin beginning with z-. e.g. zaapaz ‘elevated or submerged grave-chamber of stone’, if this is akin to Mod.Pers. sabad, Arm. sap’at ‘basket’ (cf. Cheung 2002: 254).

However, we would have expected Alanic *silka*- to develop regularly in Ossetic since Ossetic derives directly from Alanic. One alternative possibility in the particular case of ‘silk’ is that zaely, zaeldag(æ) can have been influenced by the precursor of Oss. zaeldæ ‘young grass; grass; turf’ (Cheung 2002: 253). This implies that the meaning must still have been
‘golden’ at the time of reshaping, and we know that as late as Iassic this was still the case because the word has been borrowed into Hungarian as zöld with that meaning. ‘Golden’ would then either have referred to a particular golden type of silk garment, for example Byzantine embroidery, or to the golden Muga silk type from Assam, which reached the West alongside Chinese silk, or simply to the value or the glistening appearance of silk in general\(^a\). Such a contamination or folk-etymological reshaping could clearly have happened at any time in the history of Alanic from the time of its absorption of the supposed silk-term *sirika-* till the semantic narrowing of zældæ from ‘golden’ into ‘yellow grass’, since apart from the supposed Alanic loanword in surrounding languages, only the Modern Ossetian output zældag(æ), (i)zæly is known.

8 Concluding remarks

Whether Oss. zæly, zældag indirectly continue Alanic *silka-* or not, a hypothetical Alanic form remains the most plausible mediator between Central Asia and ON silki, not least in view of the East Slavic attestations. Historically, this points to medieval trade routes on the Northern shores of the Black Sea. While the Alanic shape of the word seems to have reached Western Europe from at least in the 7\(^{th}\) century AD (judging by the phonological shape of the OE forms) it is possible that the Alans imported it northwards in several waves, and it might not have reached Old Norse until the 9\(^{th}\) century around the birth of Kievan Rus’ and the first attestation of the word in Germanic literary sources.

As can be expected, the export of silk terminology from China westwards comprises not only the word silk but a range of terms from this domain whose exact meaning are not always entirely clear (see, e.g. Ching 2011 on Tocharian kaum and other terms, and Lubotsky and Starostin 2003: 261 on the cognates of PT *køjye-lek). Tracking the exact routes of such Wanderwörter and their chronology requires minute phonological and morphological analyses compared with facts from cultural history.

\(^a\) In the tenth-century Old English medical work now known as Bald’s Leechbook, jaundice is said to cause the body of the patient to ‘turn yellow like good yellow silk’ (ägeolwæp swā góð geolo seoluc; Biggam 2006: 3).
Postscript

This article arose from discussions I had with the Danish balkanist Erik Thau-Knudsen who contributed with an essay on the history of silk terminology to the Danish National Encyclopedia (Thau-Knudsen 2000) of which I was the editor of etymologies at the time. We did not reach a satisfactory solution, although Thau-Knudsen hinted at another Iranian language, Parthian, as the provider. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen (p.c.) gave us the tip that Ossetian, with its frequent development of original */r* to */l*, might have played a role. On May 20, 2000, I presented the idea at a symposium at the University of Copenhagen (Komparativ Sprogforskning på Vej) that Alanic might have been the provider not only of the */l*-variants, but even the derivative itself, seeing that a) */-(*V)ka-* is a frequent nominal suffix in Iranian, b) the development of */r* to */l* was in fact older than Ossetian proper, and c) this sound-law does normally not work for Iranian */r* alone, but involves a following */-i-*/ that we also find in the Greek ‘silk’-word. I reconstructed the same form */silika-* as Thau-Knudsen did, only for Alanic, and was now able to account for both morphological and phonological developments on the basis of our knowledge of Iranian in general and Alanic in particular. Only at the very end of editing the present article, I discovered that C. Gary Miller in his recent book External Influences of English: From its Beginnings to the Renaissance presents an almost identical solution (Miller 2012: 66–67), in fact with additional details; for example, he notes that */i* is regular in East Slavic borrowings from Old Norse. He suggests, too, that Oss. */zæly* derives from */silika-* (which he reconstructs with long */i*)
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English *mink*, Finnish *portimo* ‘ermine’,
and Baltic Fur Trade from Antiquity to the Hanse

Abstract

Eng. *mink* and its Germanic cognates are loanwords from Baltic where today in Lithuanian *menkė* means ‘cod’, while related Slavic forms denote the ‘burbot’, a closely related species of freshwater fish. This species shared its name with the weasel in both Latin (mūstela) and Greek (γαλέη). In Baltic it is itself a borrowing from Proto-Mari *men* ‘burbot’ which is a Uralic name (cf. Hung. *mény-hal* ‘burbot’ ~ ményét ‘weasel’). This explanation finds support in Kalima’s (1936) etymology, deriving Lith. šėškas ‘polecat’ from Mari šōška, šaške ‘weasel’. The spread of these terms are likely to be connected to fur trade around the Baltic. It is further suggested that Fi. *portimo*, dial. *porttimo* ‘stoat, ermine’ is a derivative of a medieval loan from MDu. *furet*, Late ME *forette*, ultimately from Lat. *fūrō* ‘polecat’, brought to the North Baltic via the Hanseatic trade.

1 Introduction

Strikingly many Northern European terms for the group of predatory mammals referred to in biology as *mustelids* (weasel, stoat/ermine, polecat, ferret, mink, marten, otter, sable, wolverine, badger etc.) have no established etymologies, e.g.: Eng. *stoat* ‘ermine’; Eng., LG *mink*, Sw. *mänk*, menk, originally ‘European mink’; Fi. *kärppä* ‘stoat, ermine’; Lith. šėškas, Latv. sesks ‘polecat, ferret’; Fi. *portimo*, dial. *porttimo* ‘stoat, ermine’ and its cognates in Karelian, Lude and Veps; and Nw. *jerv* ‘wolverine’, just to mention a few. It is likely that this situation reflects early language contacts connected to fur trade along the coasts of the Baltic Sea from the Roman Ages onwards. This article seeks to cast new light on a few of terms and their etymologies. New proposals are presented
which have implications for our understanding of this part of European cultural history and its reflections in language.

2 Lithuanian šėškas ‘polecat, ferret’

Lith. šėškas, Latv. sesks ‘polecat, ferret’ were first compared to Ved. (YV) kāśa- and the Rigvedic hapax kaśikā- by Fick (1879: 165) who identified the correspondence Ved. *ī ~ Balt. *-O- as PIE *a. These forms were later analyzed by numerous scholars (see Kalima 1936: 102-103) as a reduplicative formation of the root in śikti ‘to shit’, i.e. *še-ś(i)ka-s with typical loss of -i-. The reconstruction of a PIE form *kek- (*kek-) on the basis of Vedic-Baltic comparison, despite the aberrant initial consonantism, has almost become a generally accepted etymology, mentioned as the only option in standard handbooks. However, the meaning of neither Vedic word is decidedly certain (Katz 2002: 303). Equally important, while numerous “kentum reflexes” occur in Baltic with regular counterparts in Slavic and Indo-Iranian, the reverse irregular correspondence Lith. š- ~ Indo-Iranian and/or Slavic *k- is at best very rare. This is understandable since the centum-satem isogloss must have divided the Core Indo-European homeland approximately in the middle, so that the languages spoken in the westernmost fringes of the Eastern parts absorbed more kentum forms than the other satem languages. One might ask whether examples of Baltic š- ~ Indo-Iranian *k- other than the one discussed exist at all – and cases of Baltic š- ~ Slavic *k- where k- does not precede a sonorant (an environment that would probably depalatalize it) are close to absent. Thus, if LCS *körme ‘fodder’ (~ Lith. serti ‘to feed’) really has k- because of the following sonorant, the only example seems to be Lith. šeivā ‘spool’ < *šaiya- alongside Slavic céva < *kaiya- ‘id.’.

Thomsen (1890: 223) was the first to etymologize Veps hähk ‘otter’ and its Balto-Finnic cognates, Fi. dial. hähkä, Olonets Karelian heähku, Lude heähkäine ‘European mink’, as a loanword from the Baltic predecessor of Lith. šėškas.2 Wichmann (Kalima (1936: 102) instead suggested that the Baltic word was the one that had been borrowed, and

1 Like most scholars today, I use Core Indo-European about the protolanguage being left behind after the departure of Anatolian and Tocharian.

2 Older Baltic loanwords with *i show up with h in Balto-Finnic languages in line with the fact that Early Proto-Finnic *i regularly yields h. *Livonian sāšk is a Latvian loanword.
that Balto-Fennic was the provider. He pointed to the fact that Mari (Cheremis) has a word šäškä, šaškä, meaning either ‘mink’ or ‘otter’ depending on the dialect – some dialects have ßüt-šäškä (the 1st element being ßüt ‘water’), meaning ‘otter’ only. This word corresponds nicely with the Balto-Fennic protoform *hähkä, and Wichmann saw that the two must be cognates. His hypothesis was then that the borrowing had taken place at the Early Proto-Fennic stage, when the form would still have been *šäškä.3

It has now become an established opinion (see the overview of research in van Pareren 2005, 2008) that Baltic exercised at least a modest influence upon Mordvin lexicon and toponymy. Thomsen (1890) and Kalima (1936) thought that even (Proto-)Mari had come into some contact with Baltic. Although Mägiste (1959), much to his own chagrin, was mostly negative, he did not exclude the possibility completely. Likewise, the inference that Baltic contributed to the Mari lexicon is implied by a handful of entries in UEW.

Volgaic languages4 historically stretched further to the West, bordering areas inhabited by Baltic tribes. Conversely, Baltic languages reached much further East, not least reflected in the huge area covered by the Grand Duchy of Lithuania which extended almost all the way to Moscow.

Here I would like to propose the further possibility that lexical borrowings within at least one semantic field, animals coveted for their pelts, even took place in the opposite direction, from Mari to Baltic. Mari šäškä, šaškä ‘mink; otter’ is already known to have been borrowed into neighbouring Turkic languages (Kalima 1936: 102, Räsänen 1969: 105): Chuvash šäskä ‘European mink’, Bashkir šäskä ‘id.’, (dial.) šaška ‘marten’, Tatar čäškä, čäška ‘a water animal’. It can still be a Fenno-Volgaic word with remnants in Balto-Fennic and Mari. But note the important

3 Junttila (2012: 268) nonetheless seems to prefer Thomsen’s etymology, grouping it in his category A: “Relatively clear etymologies”.
4 Most Uralicists now reject that Mari and Mordvin once formed a genetic subgroup of Uralic. I leave the question open, but in any case it can be used about a geographical group of Fenno-Ugric languages which must have been subject to some convergence (e.g. a tendency to assimilate sequences of two nasals), especially since the ethnic groups are regarded to have constituted a historical entity. From Kievan Rus’ we know the names of three more westerly Volgaic groups, the Merya, the Muromians, and the Meshchya. The latter survived at least into the 16th c., judging by Russian chronicles. Curiously, although the five Volgaic ethnonyms are likely to have at least four different etymologies, they all begin with M- (except that the non-native name of Mari is Cheremis).
fact that Mari has a similar word, Meadow Mari šeške ‘daughter-in-law; young lady’ (Paasonen/Siro 1948: 121), Hill Mari ‘daughter-in-law’ (Ramstedt 1902: 129); in some dialects the meaning is more specific, such as ‘the wife of one’s son’, ‘the wife of one’s younger brother’, ‘the wife of one’s husband’s younger brother’ and ‘the wife of one’s wife’s younger brother’ (Moisio & Saarinen 2008: 678). The use of words for ‘bride’, ‘daughter-in-law’, ‘sister-in-law’, or ‘(small) young female’ about weasels and other mustelids, historically connected to a symbolism for pristine, virginal and desired young women, is extremely widespread across the West Eurasian area (see e.g. Falk 1998: 93-94, Witczak 2004, Martirosyan 2010: 799-800, Olsen 2010: 16, fn. 17), e.g. Da. brud ‘bride; least weasel, Mustela nivalis’, PGmc. *marþu- ‘marten’ ~ Lith. marti ‘bride’, Latvian māraš ‘sister-in-law’; It. donnola and Port. doninha ‘weasel, little god-mother’, Basque satandre ‘weasel’, < *sagut- ‘mouse’ + andre ‘lady’; Gr. γαλές ‘weasel’ ~ γάλας ‘sister-in-law’, Mod.Gr. vuqitσa ‘weasel; little bride’; Hung. hőly ‘weasel, bride’, Ru. kunica ‘(little) marten; bride (in traditional wedding rituals)’, Arm. hašn-owk ‘weasel’ ~ harsn-owk ‘little bride’ and Turk. gelin ‘bride’, dim. gelincik ‘little bride, little young woman; weasel’ ~ just to mention a few. This is also the case in the cultures of Western Siberia from where furs were provided, e.g. the Komi (or Zyryans; Laakso 2005).

This makes it probable that Mari šeške ‘daughter-in-law; young lady’ is related to šäška, šaško ‘otter, mink’, at least indirectly. The former is likely to be formed as a diminutive of the word for ‘sister’, which today is KB šašar, U šužar, B šužar. Two protoforms of this word are reconstructed for Fenno-Volgaic, *sasare (reconstructable also for the Fenno-Permian stage) and *sisare or *sesare; the former is regarded as Early Indo-Aryan or Indo-Iranian, the latter as Baltic, and the Mari word can come from either of them; the rounded vocalism in the first syllable is secondary from assimilation to the sibilant (UEW 752, 762). Mari has to velar diminutive suffixes; -γα and -ka ~ -(i)kai, going back to PU *-kV and *-kkV respectively. The former is realized as the allomorph -k after a sibilant (Wichmann 1913-1918: 7-9, 11-13). It is therefore likely that both šaška, šaško ‘mink; otter’ and šeške ‘daughter-in-law; young lady; sister-in-law’ are diminutives of the ‘sister’-word, the former of *sasare and the latter of *sesare, at an early time when the vocalism in the Mari ‘sister’-word had not yet become rounded.
In the following, I will discuss another possible loanword from Mari in Baltic which ended up ultimately in English as the name of a North American species.

3 English mink and Lithuanian menkė, Sorbian mjenk ‘burbot’

English *mink*, attested as ME *menks, mynkes* from the 15th-16th c., and its cognates in Germanic, LG *mink* ‘otter’, Sw. *mänk, mink* ‘id.’, are of unknown origin. Today the English term denotes a North American animal, but it was originally used only of the European mink (*Mustela lutreola*, German Nertz). Etymological dictionaries typically treat it as an ancient culture-word connected to fur trade around the Baltic sea, without speculating further about its origins.

Lat. *mūstēla* and Gk. *γαλή*, both have a curious double meaning ‘weasel’ and ‘burbot’, a sweetwater fish species (cf. Schaffner 2006) with which it shares similarities both in visual characteristics and behavior. While the double meaning in Latin could have been taken over from Greek, connections between the two animals also show up in Eastern Europe. The Hungarian name for the burbot is *mény-hal* (hal ‘fish’), lit. ‘weasel-fish’, cf. *ményét* ‘weasel’, *mény* ‘daughter-in-law; (OHung.) ‘bride’; and a West Slavic name for the ‘burbot’ is Sorb. *mjenk, Cz. mnik*, whose Baltic cognate is Lith. *ménkė*, Latv. *mēnca*, which was transferred to the salt-water cod, a word that obviously shares great superficial similarities with our *mink*.

It thus seems reasonable to establish the Germanic word for ‘mink’ as a loanword from a Baltic or a West Slavic language. Since the mink is often designated by its wet habitat (Lith. *audinė*, cf. Young 2001; Fi. *vesikko*, cf. *vesi* ‘water’; Da. *flodilder*, lit. ‘river polecat’) the recurrent element *min-* in Baltic river names comes to mind. But the line of transmission does not begin in Baltic or West Slavic. The formation mentioned above is also found in Slovenian *menk, menká* and derived from LCS *tyńć, reconstructed on the basis of Ru. *men*, Ukr. *min*, Slovak *mieň* and the rarer Czech simplex *men* The root *man-* in Scr. *manić*, curiously missing from Vasmer (1953-1958), also fits in (cf. *pas ‘dog’ < *tyńć), while the Lechitic derivatives Pol. *miętus* (→ Belaru. *mjantúz*), Kashubian *miитus*, as well as Rusyn *mn’uh, Ru.dial. *ment’uk* (→ Moksha Mordvin *ment’uk, Erzya Mordvin *mänt’uk*), are less well understood. These Balto-Slavic forms are normally regarded to constitute a word-family with PGmc. *muniwō (> Eng. minnow) and Gr. *μινη ‘small fish,
sprat’; a root *menH- with the zero-grade of an i-stem form the basis of the Germanic, Common Slavic and Greek forms while the Baltic and West Slavic forms extended with a suffix -k- have full-grade. It is noteworthy, however, that the Germanic and Greek forms designate specifically small kinds of fish and could just as well have been formed independently from (Pre-)PGmc. *min-u- ‘small’ and (Pre-)PGk. *mei-n- ‘id.’ respectively. The Balto-Slavic forms are terms for a completely different kind of species, overlapping almost completely with Fenno-Volgaic forms: the aforementioned Hung. mëny-hal and Hill Mari (West Cheremis) men, men-gol, also ‘burbot’.

At first glance it appears that Mari simply borrowed their terms for the fish from Russian men’, while the Hungarian word, first attested 1395, would have been taken over from Pannonian Slavic. However, there are several problems with this seemingly straightforward scenario. First, the Hungarian vocalism is wrong since the manifestation -ë- (which is not distinguished from -e- in the standard language) normally points to back vocalism in the stressed syllable of the lending language, but this Slavic word only had front vowels. Second, it would be an amazing coincidence, in the light of other European connections between terms for ‘burbot’ and ‘weasel; young lady’ if the Slavic loanword meaning ‘burbot’ just happened to have the same shape in Hungarian as the inherited word for ‘daughter-in-law; weasel’ (PU *miňâ ‘daughter-in-law; young lady’, UEW 276).

Moreover, the Hungarian and Mari words actually correspond to each other as from a common protoform, and Skolt Saami has manij '(big) whitefish, Coregonus (lavaretus)', moanjî, moanjigaž ‘id.’ (Collinder 1977: 115; SKES 347-348). Since *šěkas already constitutes a possible Mari loanword in Baltic, I find it plausible that the stem *men- in the meaning ‘burbot; weasel’ was transferred to from Volgaic to the Baltic Sea region as well. Among other possibilities, it could have happened from Proto-Mari to Late Common Slavic and (East) Baltic. The suffixated Slavic forms could either be borrowings from Baltic or parallel formations. From burbot skin Fenno-Ugric forest peoples have traditionally produced clothing – coats, boots, and caps – justifying an analogy with terrestrial animals hunted for their pelt (Armstrong 1997). The burbot along with the sturgeon and sterlet were so important for the Khanty (Ostyaks) in the time of Russian expansions in the 1600s that a particularly bad fishing season could threaten the very existence of a tribe. Novgorod and Moscow exploited the fur resources of the North
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for its foreign trade, and luxury furs from mustelids like ermine and sable were called the “gold of ancient Rus” (Platonov & Andreev 1922).

Whether the Baltic and Slavic forms are Indo-European or borrowed from Fenno-Volgaic, it seems clear that the Germanic term for the mink must derive from the Balto-Slavic fish-name. It is further conceivable that the term mink spread in Western Europe under the influence of Du. minneken ‘playful term for a female’ > Eng. minikin (attested from the 16th c.).

4 Finnish por(t)imo

Leaving the question of Volgaic loans into Baltic, let us turn to the Finnish name of the ‘stoat, ermine’, portimo, dial. porttimo, and its cognates in Karelian, Lude and Veps. Previous proposals are unsatisfying: Kivulehto (1979) derives it from Fi. porras, gen. portaan ‘step; staircase etc.’ with reference to the animal’s habitat in human houses and farms; and Liukkonen (1999) imagines a rendering of a hypothetical Baltic †sparteiva ‘swift animal’, cf. spartús ‘swift’.

That -ti- fails to assimilate into *-si- speaks for a Germanic rather than a Baltic origin, because most of the Baltic loanwords in Balto-Fennic were borrowed before the assimilation. Since the distribution is confined to the Northern branch of Balto-Fennic, a somewhat recent origin in Germanic is likely. BF *portti- would be the expected substitution of Late ME forette, MDu. furet ‘ferret’, borrowed from OFr. fiuret < Vulg.Lat. *furittus, lit. ‘little polecat’, derived from,fūrō ‘polecat’. The name could have spread Northwards with the Hanseatic trade between between the 13th and the 17th century, perhaps even from the end of the 12th century (See Bentlin 2008 for a new account on MLG loanwords in Finnish). Substituting forett- with portt- would be expected, cf. Fi. perjantai ‘Friday’ alongside MLG vridach, Old Bavarian pferintag ‘id’. (Bentlin 2008: 156).6

The suffix -imo is not excessively common in Fennic but occurs in many place-names and a few nouns like tuhkimo ‘ashtray’ from tuhka

---

5 Junttila (2012: 268) groups this proposal under his category B: “Dubious etymologies”, rather than in C: “Erroneous etymologies”.

6 In fact one may wonder if Eng. polecat is not a folk-etymological reshaping of the word *pol’čka that yielded e.g. North Saami buoidaga ‘weasel’, brought Southwestwards with the Hanseatic trade or perhaps earlier in connection with the fur trade.
‘ash’ (Koivulehto 1979; Hakulinen). However, -mo here may represent a Karelian dialectism for original *-ma, cf. another name for a mustelid, Kar. ohmo, ahmo for Fi. ahma ‘wolverine’. In that case, the original distribution of the word would be confined to the Northeastern Balto-Fennic languages. This at first glance perhaps renders a Middle Dutch or Middle Low German origin less likely. One could however also argue the other way around – that a limited geographical distribution is an argument for a relatively late migration connected to urbanism – prehistoric and early historic vocabulary typically occur with a more scattered distribution. Likewise, the very limited morphological variation speaks for a historically late introduction of the word. When a non-native term has been present in a given area for a long historical period, we typically expect to encounter more kinds of domestic derivatives formed on the basis of this term, with different nominal suffixes.
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Abstract

Eugen Helimski (1998) showed that the accented vowel of High German, Latin and Slavic words governs whether they acquire front-vowel or back-vowel harmony as loanwords into Hungarian. While the German material appears exceptionless, some words of Slavic and Latin provenance exhibit unexpected back-vowel harmony. This article shows that if a labial sound follows the originally accented vowel, front-vowel harmony is blocked. The rule applies without exception to both Slavic and Latin loanwords; it is thus an economical solution.

It follows that variation in Slavic loanwords in Hungarian cannot serve as a testimony of Old Slavic accent shifts, but merely of the place of the original (pitch) accent; and that the Slavic language that provided loanwords in early Hungarian must have been fairly uniform. As for Latin, it likewise renders an appeal to late accent shifts unnecessary.

Helimski also showed that a subset of Latin words containing a medial cluster *-CiV- could trigger front-vowel harmony even if the original accent fell on a back vowel. Here it is shown that the distribution of front and back vocalism in this type is further governed by the vowel of the initial syllable. This minor rule possibly applies to Slavic as well.

1 Hungarian vowel harmony and Helimski’s rule

Hungarian, like many other Uralic languages, possesses vowel harmony, which is usually defined as a system of progressive assimilation by which vowels in the first syllable of a word dictates the vowel quality in suffixal syllables (inflectional endings, derivational endings etc.). From a diachronic viewpoint, since the harmony does not only affect suffixes, it
is more correct to say that any given word, derived or underived, must contain vowels from a certain restricted group, and that it is not necessarily a progressive assimilation – it may have started out as regressive, or even both at the same time, if the trigger occurred in the middle of the word. Vowel harmonic rules vary from language to language. In Hungarian, all native words must contain either back vowels (a, o, u, á, ó, ú) or “intolerant” front vowels (e, ü, ö, ē) while they can always contain “tolerant” front vowels (i, ē and ē).

In a brilliant and important article, Helimski (1992) showed that original stress in the lending language determines whether loanwords in Hungarian acquire front (“palatal”) vocalism or back (“velar”) vocalism. As he mentions, there has been no issue regarding the many Turkic loanwords because they were already subject to a similar vowel harmony from the outset (and in general consist of vowels that form part of the Hungarian phonemic system). However, Hungarian also absorbed many loanwords from languages without vowel harmony since the Magyar migrations into Central Europe in the 9th century, especially (unspecified) Slavic, Latin and different stages of High German, all of which have exported numerous polysyllabic words with back-vowel syllables interchanging with front-vowel syllables into Hungarian. Although in a few cases Hungarian ended up with both a back-vowel and a front-vowel variant, most often there is only one form.

Helimski showed that the outcome was determined by the original vocalism of syllable carrying the main stress in any of the three source languages. The rule is completely consistent for High German loanwords. In this article, I will try to explain a number of loanwords from Latin and Slavic that seem to deviate from the rule.

2 Loanwords from German

In loanwords from Old High German, Middle High German and Early Modern High German, the stressed syllable was normally also the first syllable; however, as Helimski pointed out (1998: 46), this was not always the case. The dialectal Hungarian word ispotály ‘hospital’, borrowed from Middle High German, is important because it was itself a loanword in Middle High German where it had retained the original stress on the last syllable (as still in Modern High German Spital):
Helimski further showed that in Latin loanwords the same rule applied, however only in such loanwords where vocalic harmonization was not blocked because of their bookish character and influence from the liturgical tradition. The affected words comprise many proper names. The following heterovocalic Latin words acquire back-vowel harmony:

- **Hu. PN Adorján** < Lat. Hadriánus (Fludorovits 1930: 17, 44)
- **Hu. angyal’ angel** < Lat. ángelus (TESz)
- **Hu. PN Damján** < Lat. Damiánus (Fludorovits 1930: 17, 44; see below on the variant Dëmjén)
- **Hu. kamara ‘chamber’, kamra ‘storeroom’** < Lat. cámara (Fludorovits 1937: 41, TESz)
- **Hu. kanonok (about 1405: kananok) ‘clergyman’** < Lat. canónicus (TESz)

1 This word was probably borrowed via OHG kamara, kamera (Mollay 1982: 337-339)
Heterovocalic Latin words that acquire front-vowel harmony are more numerous. They comprise words with original stress on a front-vowel:

Hu. PN Elek (1219/1550 Elexius) ← Lat. Aléxiu (Fludorovits 1930: 9)
Hu. PN Erzsébet ← Lat. (?) Elisabeth or Elisábeth (Fludorovits 1930: 9)
Hu. PN Ferenc ← shortened form of Lat. Francíscus (Fludorovits 1930: 9)
Hu. PN Lőrinc (1138/1329 Leurenci) ← Lat. Lauréntius (Fludorovits 1930: 12)
Hu. PN Mise (1372/1448 mifet acc.sg.) ‘mass’ ← Lat. missa (TESz)
Hu. Petrezselyem ‘parsley’ ← Lat. petrosílium (added by me; cf. Benkő & Imre 1972: 187)
Hu. sekrëstye (1510 sekreftye-) ‘sacristy’ ← Lat. sacrístia (TESz)
Hu. szerecsén (1138/1329 Szerecin) ‘Saracen’ ← Lat. Saracénus (TESz)
Hu. zsöllye (about 1510: sellye) ‘armchair (obs.); stall (in a theatre), orchestra seat, parterre seat’ ← Lat. sélá ‘seat, chair’ (TESz)

Latin words with a medial cluster containing a palatal element in it, i.e. words containing a medial structure -CiV-, occur mostly with front vowels even if the originally stressed vowel (and many other vowels of the word) is a back vowel. In such cases variation sometimes occurs, and in the case of Adorján mentioned above no front-vowel variant is known:

Hu. PN Adorján ← Lat. Hadriánus (Fludorovits 1930: 17, 44)
Hu. PN Cerjék, Cirjék ← Lat. Cyriácus (Fludorovits 1930: 7)
Hu. PN Démjén, variant of Damján ← Lat. Damiánus (Fludorovits 1930: 17, 44)
Hu. PN Sebestyén ← Lat. Sebastiánus (Fludorovits 1930: 7)

Helimski does not ascribe the variation in these four individual cases to any kind of regularity. It is noteworthy, however, that the first vowel in both Hadriánus and Damiánus are back-vowels, leading to back vocalism (Adorján, Damján) with a front-vowel variant in one of the cases (Démjén), while the first vowel of Cyriácus and Sebastiánus are front
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vowels, leading to front-vowel forms only (Cerjék/Cirjék, Sebestyén). Although the material is limited we may tentatively assume that if a Latin word contained medial consonantal -i-, it will always end up having front vocalism in Hungarian (regardless of the quality of the stressed vowel) unless both the original first vowel and the original stressed vowel are back vowels.

Helimski ran into two real exceptions which exhibit back vocalism although the stressed vowel in Latin was a back vowel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hungarian</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dézsma 'tithe'</td>
<td>décima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>téglá 'brick'</td>
<td>tégula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He suggests (p. 50) that "the high degree of compatibility of the harmonomically tolerant vowel é with the back vowels overweighed its palatal character". While these two words are indeed the only examples containing an open-syllable -e- in Latin, Helimski does not formulate his suggestion as a rule, in fact he exactly counts these examples as exceptions; and it is still a bit difficult to account for the fact that they did not end up as †dézsme or †tégle respectively. Below we will see how another rule must have applied which can also explain similar exceptions within the bulk of Old Slavic loanwords.

4 Loanwords from Slavic

Slavic loanwords into Old Hungarian poses difficulties to a higher extent. First of all, we do not know all details of the exact language which was the main or perhaps even the only provider of Slavic loanwords, in all probability the Pannonian dialect of Late Common Slavic (Helimski 50). It is therefore crucial that we can find clear patterns in the material. Helimski shows that by using the same indicator, the accented syllable of the Slavic word, which is generally preserved in Russian (though as stress rather than pitch accent), we can see that, again, the place of ar-

---

2 As he notes, other exceptions are actually not direct borrowings from Latin, but have been taken over from Old High German, as in the case of monostor 'monastery' where the immediate source was OHG munusturi, munsturi and Latin monastērium only the ultimate source. This is most likely also the case of several proper names like Márton (< Mártin rather than Lat. Martīnus) and Ágoston (< Augustin, not Lat. Augustinus).
ticulation of the stressed vowel in the source language governs the vowel harmony of the Hungarian word:

Hu. acél 'steel' (not †tecél) ← LCS *őcél; Kniesza 1974: 59-60)
Hu. csahol 'long shirt' (not †csehol) ← LCS *čexol, cf. Ru. čexol 'cover')
Hu. csata 'fight; (obs.) military team' (not †csate) ← LCS *četa, cf. Ru. četá 'match, pair'
Hu. csónak 'boat' (not †csőnek) ← LCS *čelnok, cf. Ru. čelnok 'small boat'
Hu. csorda 'herd' (not †csőrdé) ← LCS *čerda > črédá, cf. Ru. čeredá 'turn, order'
Hu. csüörtök 'Thursday' (not †csutortok) ← LCS četvrtok, cf. ORu. četvörtok (changed in Mod.Ru. četvertok 'four pieces')
Hu.dial. deget 'wheel-grease' (not e.g. †dagat) ← LCS *degôt, cf. Ru. degot 'tar, pitch'
Hu. ebéd 'dinner' (not †abéd) ← LCS *obéd (Kniesza 1974: 166-167)
Hu. kalapál 'to hammer' (not †kelepél) ← LCS *klepa-, cf. Ru. klepát' 'to rivet'
Hu. morotva 'old riverbed' (not †mőrövé) ← LCS *mortva, cf. Ru. mertvá 'dead (fem.)'
Hu. ösztön 'stimulus, drive' (not †osztón) ← LCS *ostnò, cf. Ru. os-tén id.
Hu. rosta 'sifter, sieve' (not e.g. †restő) ← LCS *rešeto, cf. Ru. rešető id.
Hu. szalonna 'lard, bacon' (not e.g. †szelöinne) ← LCS *solnìná > *slaniná '(larded) lard' (Kniesza 1974: 487)
Hu. szélence 'casket, small box' (not e.g. †szalonca) ← LCS *solnǐca 'box for salt, salt-cellar' (Kniesza 1974: 495-497)
Hu. szérda 'Wednesday' (not e.g. †szarda) ← LCS *serda > *srédá, cf. Ru. sredá id.
Hu. dial. (and obs.) szosztra ~ szesztra 'junior nun' (not e.g. †szösztre or †szesztre) < LCS *sestra, cf. Ru. sestrá 'sister'

Helimski finds the following exceptions which he notes might be explained by Pannonian accent shifts shared by Kaikavian Serbo-Croatian dialects of Slavonia (a suggestion by Sergej Nikolaev and G. Zamjatina):

The same Slavic word entered Hungarian later via Romanian slaniná, when the adaptation rules had stopped working, and became szlanina (Bakos 1977: 132).
There are also harmonic doublets of Slavic origin which are tentatively ascribed to accentual doublets in Slavic:

- Hu. csalad ‘family’ ← LCS *čeljadь
- Hu. ketręc ~ dial. katroć ‘cage’ ← LCS *kotarьcь
- Hu. varsа ~ dial. verse, vörse ‘fishweir’ ← LCS *vyrьšа

respectively. Below we will see how another rule must have applied which can also explain similar exceptions within the bulk of Old Slavic loanwords.

5 Explaining the exceptions

The exceptions all contain a labial sound following the original stress which could have triggered a strategy for nativization dominated by back-vocalism. Perhaps Latin -l- also had this effect since Lat. -u- is likely to represent a centralized epenthetic vowel:

- Hu. dézsmа ‘tithe’ ← Lat. décima
- Hu. tégла ‘brick’ ← Lat. tégula

At the same time, none of the regular examples contained an original labial. This may then also provide an alternative explanation for

- Hu. PN ibolyа (1340 iwola) ‘violet’ < Vulg.Lat., LLat. vióla < Class.Lat. Viola

where we do not have to appeal to a Late Latin or Vulgar Latin pronunciation, even if it did apply, because our rule works perfectly even with the Classical Latin pronunciation.

The rule seems to be exceptionless. In Helimski’s material I can find the following other words with a (non-initial) labial, one from Slavic and one from Latin; in both cases you have front-vocalism because the
source word had an accented front vowel, and this is allowed because the labial sequence precedes, not follows, the accented vowel.

Hu. *ghéd ‘dinner’ (not †abéd) ← LCS *obéd
Hu. *fúlemîle, fûlemîle (1395 filemîle) ‘nightingale’ ← Lat. philomêla

Another example might be added, namely

Hu. *bashlikom (not e.g. †bezselikem) ← Lat. basilicum

where front-vowel harmony, which should otherwise occur because of the Latin stressed front-vowel -i-, is blocked by virtue of the labial sequence -um⁴. Another herb name, not mentioned in Helimski’s article either, is

Hu. *petrezselyem ‘parsley’ (not †patrazsalyam) ← Lat. petrosîlium

The latter does have front-vowel harmony throughout the word despite the labial element– because here our other rule of medial palatal sequences -CiV- triggers it. The two words are further distinct by their place of vowel articulation in the first syllable which may have played a role at least for *bashlikom in the sense that it could have contributed to add up the factors in favor of a back vowel.

With this rule we can even get solved where the stress was in the Latin form of Elisabeth; it is now clear that it must have been on the last syllable because it could not have preceded the labial -b- which would have resulted in a different vowel harmony with at least one back vowel substituting the -a-. This may even be applicable if the name was borrowed via another language than Latin. Some Slavic languages have stress on -bêt- (e.g. Serbian jelisavêta) but the Hungarian form shows no trace of the feminine ending –a that has been added to the name. Thus, in a revised version:

Hu. PN Erzsébet ← Lat. (?) Elisabéth (not † Elisabeth)

⁴ This example was suggested to me by Seán Vrieland.
6 Conclusion

I have tried to demonstrate that the accented vowel of a word in the source language governs whether it ends up in Hungarian with front-vowel or (predominant) back-vowel harmony to an even more regular extent than discovered by Helimski. He inferred that exceptions and variation within the Slavic material may be due to accent shifts reminiscent of those known from neighbouring Kajkavian dialects and is a potentially useful source for research in Balto-Slavonic accentology. As for the Latin material, he ascribed exceptions to the back-vowel tolerance of the neutral front-vowel ē in Hungarian itself, and to accent shifts from Classical to Late and Vulgar Latin.

I hope to have shown that all these exceptions can be explained by a rather simple conditional rule of adaptation: If the accented vowel of the source language, whether (Pannonian) Slavic or Latin, was followed by a labial sound and/or -l-, front-vowel harmonization was blocked, and original vowels were substituted with back vowels and neutral front-vowels only. Although it may disappoint Slavists who could wish for Hungarian as yet another testimony of old Slavic accentuation developments, I find it much more economical to embrace a solution that explains the Slavic and Latin irregularities by the same exceptionless rule.

With less certainty, we may also set up adaptation rules for a subset of Latin words (incidentally, all proper names) with a medial palatal cluster -CiV-. Helimski showed that this type mostly turns out with Hungarian front-vowel harmony even if the originally stressed vowel (and many other vowels in the word) was a back vowel. Again, he had to deal with variation and exceptions, but he simply deduced that vacillation between front-vowel harmony and back-vowel harmony was the result of two conflicting tendencies pulling in different directions. I pointed out that, although based on scarce material, there are at least no exceptions to a rule by which Latin words with a palatal medial cluster -CiV- acquires back-vocalism only if both the stressed vowel and the first vowel of the source word has back vocalism. Without these two triggering factors working together, front-vowel harmony overrules the default law.

Finally, I have suggested that harmonic doublets in the Slavic material, although potentially reflecting Slavic accentual doublets, may partly reflect the same tendencies, cf. that e.g. család ‘family’ vs. cseléd ‘domes-
tic, servant’ is the only example with a medial structure *-CjV- that is similar to the Latin structure *-CiV- causing variation above.

The rules can be formalized this way, where VH represents vowel harmony and SL stands for source language:

\[ \text{VH} [+\text{front}] \text{ if SL has } \text{V}[+\text{stress}][+\text{front}] \]
\[ \text{VH} [+\text{back}] \text{ if SL has } \text{V}[+\text{stress}][+\text{back}] \]
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English Summary

Word Exchange at the Gates of Europe: Five Millennia of Language Contact

Indo-European and Uralic languages dominate present-day Europe, but both families are newcomers which replaced most of the indigenous languages step by step from the Bronze Age onwards. The encounter between indigenous and intrusive cultures, however, was most certainly not the only interaction that took place. By the time of arrival in Europe, the Indo-European and Uralic populations had already broken up and constituted a patchwork of languages and cultures that continued the process of convergence and interchange. Whether contacts were connected to trade, war, social interaction, or exchange of inventions is revealed by the character of the loanwords in each individual case – while the shape of the loanwords expose the time depth and the direction of borrowing.

Traditionally, scholars have thought that basically all loanwords between Indo-European and Uralic languages went in one direction – from the former to the latter. Such an asymmetry is supposed to reflect a past relationship between two peoples where one had the upper hand, technically and politically, at the time of borrowing.

In this dissertation it is shown that cultures of the Northeast played a surprisingly important role in the shaping of our continent from prehistoric to Medieval times; and it is shown how these circumstances are reflected even in the vocabularies of modern European languages.

The Indo-European tribes, shortly after their migrations into Europe, came to form part of new cultural communities, influenced by Uralic populations from the North. This had a significant impact on specific parts of the vocabulary, notably terms for religion and warfare. Many trade terms (such as Danish pung ‘purse’), and words for tools (e.g. hammer) and religious concepts (e.g. hell) originate from Fenno-Ugric
and other languages spoken in Northeastern Europe at the time. Even our word *half* can be shown to derive from an old Fennic trading term meaning ‘reduced, cheap (of prices)’.

Some terms denote animals hunted for their pelt (e.g. *mink*) and were exchanged in connection to centuries of fur trade along the Baltic coasts from the Roman Ages to the Hanseatic period. Other words for animals, among them quite a few used for pigs and boars, are, quite astonishingly, much older loans going back the pitted-ware culture around 3000 BC. Some loanwords show, for the first time, that (Proto-)Celts and Fennic peoples must have been in direct contact with each other.
Dansk Resumé

Orduveksling ved Europas porte:
Fem årtusinders sprogkontakt


Traditionelt har sprogforskerne ment, at nærmest alle låneord mellem indoeuropæiske og uralske sprog var lånt netop fra indoeuropæisk til uralsk – stort set aldrig den anden vej. Man regner med, at sådanne asymmetrier afspejler fortidige relationer, hvor folkeslaget med det långivende sprog var teknologisk og politisk overlegent på lånetidspunktet.

I denne afhandling påvises det, at nordøstlige kulturer har spillet en overraskende vigtig rolle for udformningen af vores kontinent fra forhistorisk tid til langt ind i middelalderen, og hvordan disse forhold stadig afspejles i moderne europæiske sprogs ordforråd.

Kort tid efter at de indoeuropæiske stammer ankom til Europa blev de hver især en del af nye kulturelle fællesskaber, påvirket af uralske folkeslag nordpå. Dette fik stor indflydelse på bestemte dele af ordforrådet, især termer inden for religion og krigsførelse. Mange handelstermer (fx punq), ord for redskaber (fx hammer) og religiøse termer (fx helvede) stammer fra finsk-ugrisk og andre sproggrupper fra datidens nordøst.
Selv vores ord halv kan påvises at gå tilbage til en gammel finsk handels-term, der betyder 'reduceret, billig'.

Nogle af termerne har med pelsdyr at gøre (fx mink) og er udvekslet i forbindelse med den pelshandel, der foregik langs Østersøens kyster i århundreder fra romertid til hansetid. Andre dyretermer, fx en lang række ord for grise og svin, er overraskende meget ældre lån, der har forbindelse måske helt tilbage til den grubekeramiske kultur omkring 3000 f.Kr. Nogle låneord viser for første gang, at (ur)keltere og finske folk må have været i direkte kontakt med hinanden.