

E. P. HAMP

LITH. *ėžeras*

A. L. Prosdocimi compares (Studi baltici 1969, 10, 130–142) Lith. *ėžeras* with Lat. *Egeria*. This now cannot be so in light of Werner Winter's establishment¹ that in Baltic and Slavic the reflex of a syllabic preceding an IE media coincides with that of the corresponding IE long syllabic. The Latin *g* cannot of course be derived in a simple way from IE **ǵh*; therefore one would expect a Lithuanian correspondence to Lat. *Egeria* to show *ė-*. On the uncertain relation of Thracian Αζαρατον and Greek Ἀχέρωντ- see my remarks BzNF NF. 5 (1970) 301².

¹ Fisiak J. Recent Developments in Historical Phonology. – The Hague, 1978, p. 431–446, esp. 435, § 4.4.

² It is additionally possible that Ἀχέρων, Ἀχέλης, and Ἀελλῶς are originally Prehellenic; see van Windekens A. J. Le Pélasgique (Louvain 1952) 38, 39, 144, and Contributions à l'étude de l'onomastique pélasgique (Louvain 1954) 41, where the Lithuanian hydronym *Akelė* is compared. According to this theory we would have **ǵk^wer/l-*, or *(*H_e*)*H_ek^w-*; see now Cubbin G. – IF, 1979, 84, 231, 234.