E. P. HAMP

A PHONAESTHETIC RULE OF BALTIC

V. Urbutis has greatly illuminated a difficult corner of Baltic lexicon and word formation by explaining the derivation of *trum̃pas*; Kalbotyra, 1966, 14, 131 — 138, reprinted Baltų etimologijos etiudai (Vilnius, 1981) 85 — 95. He has shown that this adjective must be derived as *tru-N-p-as* from the base *trup-* seen in *trupéti, trùpinti, trùpti, trum̃pa trùpo*, Latv. *trupêt, trupinât, trupt trùp*, OPr. *trupis*, SCr. *trûp*, Pol. *trupieć*, Greek τρῡπάω etc.[1]

---

[1] These forms have been credited to a base *treup-* (IEW, 1074), to a root 3. *ter(ə)-* etc. (IEW, 1071), but this account cannot by exact. The background of this root **ter-* is complicated and, no doubt, obscured by further modifications in the separate languages. There appears to be evidence for an aniṭ base: τείρω (seemingly **teri̯ō*), τετραίνω (**tetr̥ni̯ō*, if mechanically reconstructed), Lat. *terō* (most simply **terō*); but these could have been generated hysterogenically from **terH-* in pre-vocalic position. In fact, Lith. *tiriù tìrti* and OCS *tьrǫ trěti* can be satisfactorily explained as **tr̥H-(i̯)ō* etc. (Note that Pokorny's equation [IEW, 1072] of SCr. *tȓti* = Lith. *tìrti* is non-significant since the Slavic infinitive is acuted by rule.) As Ernout-Meillet DELL₃, 1213 and Frisk GEW, 2. 865 remark, we surely have secondary formations in the attested presents to this base.

Greek τρη- and τέρετρον (and from the latter, τερέω) appear to rest on **terHe-*. However, τόρνος and its variant τόρονος (apparent **torHo-no-*), τόρος, and τιτρώσκω (apparent **titr̥Hoskō*) could easily reflect **terHo-*. (τερηδών belongs to a quite separate formation in -ηδω- which I discuss elsewhere.) Now we may see the formation τερε- (and consequently τρη-) as a back-formation from τορο- (**torHo-*) and **τερο- (**terHo-*) parallel to κέλευθος : ἀκόλουθος etc., which I have explained (MSS, 1978, 37, 61) as modelled on the situation of ἐρέφω : ὀροφή / ὄροφος etc. Old English *ðrāwan* may represent a different set of intrusions, including conflation with the Vernerized outcome of **trek-* (IEW, 1077), on which see my remarks Živa Antika, 1979, 29, 72. Lat. *terebra* and OIr. *tarathar* = Welsh *taradr* are ambiguous on our present concern; on the problem of the Celtic first vowel see A. Bammesberger, Études celtiques, 1981, 18, 118.

All the forms without „Erweiterungen" could therefore be explained as originating in **terHo-*. The forms which have been credited to **trēi-/trī-* (e. g. Lat. *tritum, tribulum*) can easily be from **trHo-i- → triHo-*. Likewise Greek τρίβω, to which the short-vowelled τρῐβ- formations are secondary; see Frisk GEW, 2, 931 — 932. To the last, A. J. van Windekens (Le Pélasgique, Louvain, 1952, 91) would also relate Prehellenic θρίψ θριπός 'wood worm'.

Although a root **teru-* (IEW, 1072 — 1073) is undeniable, I do not at present see a principled way of uniting it with or deriving it from the above **terHo-*. (Of course, speculative guesses are possible in such cases.) This pair of bases seems to have undergone interaction to some extent, no doubt through semantic proximity. Thus, Greek τρῶμα and τιτρώσκω can be readily derived from **tr(e)Ho-*, while τραῦμα and perhaps τρώω may show crossing with **treu-*. Similarly Welsh *taraw*

Now by prevailing rules of Indo-European word formation we do not expect an infixed nasal of the present tense to be transported to a substantival formation unless it has already become incorporated in the lexicalized verbal base, as e. g. in *jùngas* (: Skt. *yugám, yuktá-, yugma-* 'pair, couple, joining') beside *jùngia jùngė jùngti* = Latv. *jũdz jũdza (ē) jũgt* (: Skt. *yunákti*, passive *yujyate, yukti-* 'union'). Therefore we cannot derive *trumpas* directly from the present *trumpa*.

Urbutis has marshalled a highly instructive set of evidential forms parallel to *trumpas : klumbas -à* 'šlubas', *klumpùs -ì, stùngis* (: *stùgti*, Latv. *stugs*), *strungas* (: *strùgas*), *dùmbra* (: *dubra*), *grumba* (: dialect *groba < gruba*), *gumba* (: *guba*), dialectal *kumburs* 'gumbas', *kumburas* 'kauburys'. The combined semantics and phonology of these is striking. The meanings of all of these carry a component which we may label 'blunt, broken, lumpy, clumsy, vel sim'. Their phonologies are remarkably homogeneous; the base shape is

$$C \begin{bmatrix} + \text{ grave} \\ + \text{ high} \end{bmatrix} \overset{V}{(} [+ \text{ nasal}] \overset{}{)} \begin{bmatrix} + \text{ grave} \\ - \text{ contin.} \end{bmatrix} \overset{C}{-}$$

It seems clear in the presence of this semantic component that a consistently [+grave] sequence of V and C in the final of a base has encouraged the insertion of a nasal, which itself by the phonotactic rules of Baltic must be [+ grave]. That is to say, in Baltic between *u* and a following [+grave] C we cannot have a [−grave] nasal. We may therefore restate the function of this nasal insertion as one of lengthening (i. e. presumably emphasizing or heightening) the domain of the gravity feature; in a Baltic syllable only *R* (= resonant) is possible in this rôle.

We may now enquire further: Why is the insertion a nasal segment? We know that the rules of Baltic phonotactics would equally permit *r* or *l*. But only a nasal insertion will supply automatically a [+ grave] feature in this position. Why is the insertion not made before the vowel? The answer is because in that position [*n*] is possible and gravity would not be assured.

We may generalize: In the sequence -*VC*- semantically characterized as [+ grave] a segment *R* (= resonant) is inserted so as to conserve and prolong automatically the characterization [+ grave] of the base.

pret. *trewis* (and other British Celtic forms) may well reflect **tarw- ~ traw- < *tru-V- ~ *tra-u- < *trū- < *trH-*. Greek τρύω and τρύχω likewise could come from a conflation of the last pair. Other "Erweiterungen" seem to me of quite unclarified status.

All these indeterminacies leave Greek τρῡπάω etc. (I E W, 1074) in a completely uncertain relation, as Frisk G E W s. v. would imply, to 3. *ter(ə)-* (or **terH₀-*). A stem **trH₀-u-p-* would be simply a fiction — a phonologically computable form without a grammatically motivated basis. G. R. Solta has made a noble attempt (I F, 1974, 79, p. 96, 101, and 128) to find some kind of meaning or function in labial extensions to roots, especially when associated with a labial vocoid *-u-*. Unfortunately his attempt leads to no formulable result. A base **treu-p-* must therefore remain for he present an unanalyzed prime.