

LITH. *nasraĩ*, SLAV. *nozď()ri*, OIR. *srón*, GK. $\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$

A good etymology must account for all the facts. At the same time, the aim of an etymology is to unite observations and make them mutually explanatory, not to dissociate possible connexions unless there is very strong reason. The latter principle is bound up with the fact that we prefer to be able to show that in a given development there has been no replacement, and that all change has been purely superficial¹; this is because the fundamental nature of language (and of culture) is continuity².

For this last reason I feel convinced that O.N. Trubačev is basically correct in refusing to divorce Lith. *nasraĩ* and what appears to be Slav. *nózdri*³. Nevertheless, he loses something — and fails to account for all the data — by excluding the arguments summarized by Vasmer (II 225) as **nos-dbr̥a*; there is no need to explore further the claimed, but unmotivated, suffix **-dhr-*. Inversely, Vasmer struggles to rescue the Ukrainian form *nízdřa*, with its *i* vocalism, but misses the striking and surely fundamental reality that Baltic and Slavic agree closely in their versions of this term.

It is well known that by deriving *nózdri* (regularly) from **nozri* we cannot then directly relate this form to *nasraĩ* etc. since there is no immediate motivation for the supposed voicing of *z*. **nozri* could only contain **ǵ(h)* (> Baltic *ž*). On the basis of *óstrov* or even *óstryj* we would expect as a match of *nasraĩ* something like **nóstri*.

Therefore both for the Ukrainian *i* and for the unexpected voicing we do well to accept (schematically) a form on the lines of **nos-dbr-i* as an *immediate Slavic precursor*⁴. No matter what identity is assumed for the underlying Slavic **der-*, a contamination in early Slavic is unavoidable. This is plausibly explained phonetically

¹ See my further remarks *Baltistica* VIII (1972) 55.

² See also my argument *Papers from the 8th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 14–16, 1972, 470–2*.

³ *Baltistica* I priedas (1972) 225–226.

⁴ Because of the frequent calques in the much infiltrated Old Prussian, *noseproly* is not diagnostic in this context.

on a basis **nóstri* → *nos-d(ɔ)r-i* > *nózdɔri*. To put the argument in slightly different terms, since we need to assume a fresh source of contamination in order to transpose the feature composition of **t* into *d*, we may at no extra cost see in this same element the source of the needed jer.

The total Slavic derivation then becomes **nózdɔri* ← **nóstri* < **nasr-*.

Trubačëv's account of the first vocalism is inadequate. According to him (226) *nósis* < **nās-* is a lengthened vocalism, and he then writes for *nasraĩ* (according to a convention I do not understand) **nos-*. We agree immediately that phonetically (in Brugmann's terms) Skt. *nāsā* (dual) *nāsikā*, Av'estan *nāh-*, OPers. *nāham*, Lat. *nārēs*, Lith. *nósis*, OE *nōse* etc. rest on **nās-*. But this must be in laryngeal terms **neH_as-* (or **neə_as-*). Indic forms such as weak-case *nas-* or *nasya-* 'located on the nose' must be newly formed neo-guṇa, modelled on other paradigms with Skt. *ā*. It then becomes clear that OE *nasu*, OHG *nasa*, Slav. *nosǔ*, and our word *nasraĩ* reflect a zero-grade **nəs-* (= **nH_as-*). Pokorny IEW 755 should be corrected and sifted in these respects.

In other words, morphologically there was in Indo-European an old root noun **neH_as-*. This would have been declined:

sg. N	<i>*neH_as-s</i>	→ [nās]
A	<i>*neH_as-m</i>	→ [nāsm̥] > OP <i>nāham</i> , <i>nósi</i>
L	<i>*neH_as(-i)</i>	→ [nās]
G	<i>*nH_as-os</i>	→ [nəsós] > <i>nosǔ</i>
D	<i>*nH_as-ei</i>	→ [nəséj]
du. NA	<i>*neH_as-e</i>	→ [nāse] > Skt. <i>nāsā</i> , Av. <i>nāṛha</i> , Lat. <i>nārēs</i>
I	<i>*nH_as-bh...</i>	→ [nəzbh_]
etc.		

Trubačëv envisages a compound **nos+srĩ* of "dogrammatičeskaja forma". While I am not sure of the status of such a form, we are clearly in a position to consider a construction of the shape **nəs-sr-*. This suggests a possible syntactic construction analogous to what I have discussed for the name of Demeter⁵. That is to say, a very old syntagm of the form **genitive + noun*, analogous to **dHs-s+māter-*, would explain a sequence **nH_as-s+sr-*. Hence *nasraĩ* = *nózdri* could easily be a genitive of 'nose' + an old noun in **sr-*.

The identity of such a noun in **sr-* is, however, very problematic. The following possibilities for comparison exist.

⁵ *Minos* (n. s.) 9, 1968, 198–204; 10, 1969, 93–5.

- 1) Welsh *ffroen* (f.), Gaulish **frogna* (> OFrench *frogne* > Eng. *frown*, OIr. *srón* (f.) 'nostril, nose' < **srognā* or **sroknā*⁶. A Celtic variant in **(s)tr-* may be Welsh *trwyn* (m.), OCorn. *trein* < **(s)trognī*; Gaulish **trugna*⁷.
- 2) Breton *fri* (m.) 'nose' Cornish *frig* (f.) 'nostril' are highly ambiguous in form; all that is certain is **sr-*⁸. If *fri* is from **sreg-* (perhaps **sregos*, an old neuter like **tegos* > *ti* 'house')⁹ then Corn. *frig* could reflect a hypocoristically geminated form **sregg-*. The relation would be that of Welsh *croen*, OCorn. *croin* 'skin' < **krok-no-*; Med. Corn. *crohen*, Breton *kroc'hen*, OIr. *crocenn* < **krokk-enn-*.
- 3) Greek ῥέγγω ῥέγγω 'snore', ῥύγγος 'pig's snout', Armenian *ṙngun-k'* (pl.) 'nose'; OIr. *srennim* 'snore'¹⁰. It is customary, since Hübschmann, to pair Arm. *ṙngunk'* (*n*-stem; instr. *ṙngambk'*) with ῥύγγος; but this obscure vocalism is not necessary. All other Greek forms point to **srengh-/k-*. Therefore, especially since we expect Greek and Armenian to go together and since ῥύγγος may on semantic grounds reasonably reflect some expressive alteration, we may equally posit for *ṙngun-* **ṙngun-* < **srongh-on*. We reconstruct then for Greek, Armenian and Celtic **srengh-*. The Galatian δροῦγγος¹¹ may represent a variant of **srongo-* parallel to **trugna* mentioned above.

To summarize the above, Greek, Armenian, and Celtic appear to attest for us **sregh-*, **srogh-n-*, and **sre-n-gh-*. The last has the appearance of being a verb form. The Armenian **srongh-on-* looks like a cross of this with the nominalization in nasal suffix seen in Celtic **srognā*. We seem to have a verb 'snore', and a nominalization *'snorter'. The Greek forms in *-k-* could easily be back-formations from *-χ-*, in which the aspirate was taken as being a derived shape belonging to the aspirated perfect. We thus arrive at a simple IE root **sregh-*, and, on this and other grounds, I now abandon the explanation for OIr. *srón* etc. which I advanced in Glotta 38, 1960, 209–11, and which Frisk GEW 2.659 has rightly rejected as „Schallwort“ However, I do not see the root of ῥέγγω as explicated by being called „willkürlich“. (Frisk 2.647); moreover, **sregh-* could also help to account for ῥοχμός, ῥώγω etc.

- 4) There remain the Greek forms ῥέθεα (pl.) and ῥώθωνες; on the latter Frisk GEW 2.667–8 says as much as seems to be safe. It seems artificial and ad hoc to credit a stem **sr-edh-* to a root **ser-* 'flow' (IEW 1001–2). The Greek could

⁶ Wolfgang Meid, IF 65, 1960, 39; 267. OBret. *fron* is not aberrant; it belongs to a group of spellings with *o* for *oi*. See L. Fleuriot, Dictionnaire des gloses en vieux breton, Paris, 1964, 172.

⁷ IF 65 (1960) 44; 267.

⁸ See Meid, op. cit., 40.

⁹ For the phonetics see E. P. Hamp, Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 16 (1956) 277ff.

¹⁰ See Pokorny IEW 1002; Meid, op. cit., 39, 43.

¹¹ See Meid, op. cit., 266.

of course easily reflect a different initial; these words seem quite ambiguous, and Frisk's prudent account of ῥέθρος, which may not even mean 'nostril', is excellent.

5) Finally there is ῥίς ῥῖνός, which Pedersen¹² suggested might be related to Lat. *frēnum*. In any case, **srēi-*, *sri-* is an unsatisfactory and contrived reconstruction¹³ that corresponds to nothing that we know of Indo-European structure; it is semantically and phonetically opaque, and explains nothing. At the same time I see no virtue in my own attempt, Glotta 38.210–11. In these circumstances, there seems to be little motivation in attempting to relate Skt. *sr̥kvan-*, *sr̥ákva-*, 'corner of the mouth', as Lewis and Pedersen and I (following them) tried. Frisk GEW 2.659 offers no further positive suggestions.

At present I see only one possibility for further analyzing ῥίς ῥῖνός. I have recently¹⁴ discussed Karl Hoffmann's perceptive analysis (MSS 6, 1955, 35–40) of the old-layer suffix which we may write **-Hon-* or **-əon-*. It seems possible, though not at all assured, that we have a zero-grade of this suffix generalized in position after vowel, where alternations would have led to shapes of unclear relation. Thus **sri-Hon-* ~ *sri-Hn-* would have been levelled to **sriHn-*. If this is so, the original base for ῥίς was **sri-*.

Whether then a construction **nH_as-s + sri-* 'nostril of the nose' once existed is a matter for speculation¹⁵.

¹² Ériu 16 (1952) 5.

¹³ IEW 1002.

¹⁴ MSS 30 (1972), 35–37.

¹⁵ A version of this paper is also appearing in *Ériu* (1974) so that the Celtic aspects of the above argument may receive the attention and criticism of Celticists.