

ERIC P. HAMP

LITH. *javai*, *javiena*

Provided that vowel variations lie within the permitted ranges of Indo-European ablaut, there is a tendency to accept a variation within clear cognates without attempting seriously to motivate it morphologically; and that is, after all, the only way in which ablaut can be motivated.

Cognates to *javai* are found in Indo-Iranian and Greek, as well as in Russ. *ovín*, Ukr. *óvyn*. On the last forms see Vasmer REW 2.249, where curiously *javiená* is not mentioned. Perhaps this omission prevented Vasmer from seeing that Beloruss. *jóvna* must be a borrowing, or at least a contamination, from the Baltic.

I see no way at present of relating OIr. *eórna* 'barley' except through speculation on the first ambiguous syllable.

Though the vocalism of the Indo-Iranian forms is ambiguous, that of Greek  $\zeta\epsilon\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}$  is not. The compounding form —  $\zeta\omicron\omicron\varsigma$  is of course motivated for its ablaut, and quite regular. We thus reconstruct *\*ieu-*, as is customary; see, e.g. Pokorny IEW 512. Therefore the first vowel of *javai* requires explaining, beside *javiená*.

Even though it is not clear that the productive Sanskrit derivative *yavya-* can be traced in just such form and meanings all the way back to IE, the Lith. *jáuja* must be a form of some age, and such derivatives must have always been available to speakers. Latv. *jaũja* assures at least an East Baltic antiquity. Now in these forms the development of the vocalism is quite normal if we start from an *e*-grade; cf. *naũjas* and the references in Fraenkel's discussion Lith EWb. 488. Stang VGBS 32–3 and 73–4 mentions the old problem of *\*eu* only very briefly. The regularity is particularly clear and true for forms with a preceding yod, which would have absorbed the residual palatality of the syllabic. I therefore suggest that it was derivative forms such as *jáuja* that gave the basis in phonetics for a paradigmatic spread of the *a*-vocalism to underlying *av* shapes such as we see in *javai*. Then the shape of *javiená*, with following front vocalism, needs no explaining.

In fact, despite Frisk's (GEW 1.609) hesitation, I am inclined to regard the  $\epsilon\iota$  as a diphthong in  $\zeta\epsilon\iota\alpha\acute{\iota}$ . Because of the change in gender this Greek form is likely in any case to be a derivative; moreover, we seem to have strong evidence for an old stem in *-i-*. This would be a much more likely explanation for the combining form  $\zeta\epsilon\iota-$

than the assumption of an unusual composition vowel -ε-<sup>1</sup>. Whether or not this also explains *javidê* is another question; but it may. I therefore cannot agree with Frisk that \*ζεFt- „leuchtet nicht ein.“

Finally, there is the (later) Greek ζῆνος=ζείνος. Whether or not this is of ancient date, and regardless of whether the East Slavic forms are independent of the Baltic, we have a significant agreement in *javiená* and Avestan *yāvin-*. These could also point to an ancient stem \**ieui-*. In that case we may view *javiená* and *jáuja* as products of considerable antiquity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pace Frisk and Pokorny (IEW 512).