

ERIC P. HAMP

ON BALTIC AND INDO-EUROPEAN *u*-STEMS

Jaan Puhvel has recently pointed<sup>1</sup> to some common archaisms in Anatolian and Baltic. It is certainly interesting and important that such features be carefully investigated. However, while common innovations are essential and diagnostic for the demonstration of genetic subgrouping and relationship, it is not clear what common archaisms can show us beyond the sheer survival of separate items (continuity of human culture) and the continuation or remodelling of a productive grammatical trait or process lost elsewhere. Since the continuation of a productive trait can, and often does, lead to the creation of new forms it will often result that observed individual forms are quite new and unjustified in the old parent system, or, more insidiously, give the appearance of being inherited reflexes of ancient patrimony while in reality being more coincidences of fortuitous shape.

No one will deny that Indo-European grammar provided for the generation of zero-grade deverbative (often antonymic) oxytone *u*-stem adjectives; I have discussed their fate in *Lingua* 61, 1983, 1—8. However, Puhvel's claim (180) that their age is demonstrated by "correspondences where the underlying root may or may not survive in living verbal use in any given language" is faulty. It is always possible for any such formation to have been generated at a time later than proto-Indo-European and for the underlying base then to have been subsequently lost. The best proof comes from non-identical formations which presuppose for each case the identically same formation at an optimally early time formed in the same fashion upon the same base. When we have a closed set of such bases in a considerable number the probative value of the formulation is enhanced. This, crudely put, is the way we recover a proto-grammar; that is, after we have ordered logically multiple sets of such formulations.

When we find observed forms which are exact expected reflexes of the output of such rules we regard them as putative archaisms; they may even be true descendants of proto-forms. But they may also be hysterogenic. They may also represent

<sup>1</sup> "Baltic-Anatolian Lexical Isoglosses" — *Investigationes Philologicae et comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, ed. Erich Neu. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1982, 179—185.

transformations of still older original formations; so it is virtually certain that not all Latin participles in *\*-tó-*, nor all Lithuanian or Latvian infinitives of a single type, have the same pedigree.

Thus from the form presupposed by Slavic *lǫgъ-kъ* and Latin *lenis* 'light' (the latter with a vocalism taken from the comparative) we arrive inductively at the grammatical rule, and then from this we derive deductively Greek ἐλαχύς, which we presume to be an archaism. We cannot actually guarantee that Sanskrit *gurú-* and Greek βαρύς 'heavy' are shared archaisms, although we suspect strongly that such is the case.

We proceed now to comment briefly on the sets of the forms adduced by Puhvel<sup>2</sup> (180 ff.).

I do not believe that Lat. *pinguis* belongs in the set with Gk. παχύς. The Baltic cognate here should be Latv. *biezs*, and not Lith. *bingùs*.

Goth. *filu* and OIr. *il* are out of place here since they represent guna forms of the shape *\*pelH<sub>e</sub>-u-*.

For the sets involving Slavic *lǫgъkъ* and Lith. *leñgvas*, *lengvùs*, see my analysis *Études celtiques* 14, 1975, 461 ff.

On the *o*-grade reflected in Lith. *platùs*, see my article *Baltistica* 20, 1984, 141—2, as also for OCS *mladъ*, Lith. *kartùs*, *gražùs*, *gardùs*, *skanùs*, *gausùs*, *svarùs*, *aršùs*, *alpùs*.

As I have remarked there, the set of Skt. *svādú-* involves, apparently from IE time, the anomalous vocalism *\*eH<sub>a</sub>*.

I have dealt with the family of OCS *ozъkъ*, Skt. *aríhú-* in *Linguistique Balkanique* 30, 1987, 131—2.

Note that OCS *drъzъ* does not belong in this account since it lacks the empty suffix *-kъ*. The set of Lith. *bẽbrus* is irrelevant since it is a reduplicated formation; see my analysis *IF* 77, 1972, 159—70.

On the sets Skt. *vásu-* and Gk. ἑύς, see my analysis *Ériu* 25, 1974, *Varia* (4). On the interesting conditions of the set represented by Gk. ὠχύς, see my article on IE 'horse' in the proceedings of the 1988 Bellagio conference<sup>3</sup>.

On OCS *top* and Hitt. *alpu-*, see now my article in *KZ* 102, 1989, 21—2.

On Gk. ἀμβλύς, see my remarks in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 86 (1), 1988, 88—91, and references therein.

<sup>2</sup> I discuss on another occasion from a different vantage point the valuable article on Baltic and Slavic *u*-stem adjectives by Ю. В. Откупщиков, *Baltistica* 19, 1983, 23—39.

<sup>3</sup> "The Indo-European Horse." — *When Worlds Collide: Indo-Europeans and Pre-Indo-Europeans. The Bellagio Papers*, ed. T. L. Markey and John A. C. Greppin. Ann Arbor: Karoma (1990), 211—26.

I agree with Mažiulis and Benveniste in seeing no strong reason to equate Lith. *gudrùs*, *gùdras* with the Hittite stem *kutruwa-*.

Lith. *aržùs* 'lustful', apart from failing to show the IE zero-grade required in our original formation, has two possible backgrounds in vocalism inherited through the verb. Because Albanian *herdhe* 'testicles' must go back to *\*harði-* < *\*horghi-*, the Lithuanian may reflect either *\*horgh-* > *\*(h)arž-* or *\*hergh-* > *\*hargh-* > *\*(h)arž-*. In any case the vocalism of Lith. *eřžilas* is innovatory and an East Baltic phenomenon and in no wise justified on Indo-European grounds. Our Lithuanian *aržùs* may then be a recent transformation of the cognate of ON *argr* by the rule converting thematics to *u*-stem oxytones.

In this fashion Puhvel's claim is scarcely justified. There can be no doubt that Baltic and Hittite furnish valuable evidence of deverbative *u*-stems, though the attested Lithuanian forms do not show the same formation rule in detail as is observed for proto-IE. Thus Lith. *alpùs*, *svarùs*, *aržùs* and perhaps *gudrùs* do not sustain Puhvel's point, and cannot be claimed in any simple way to "go back to Indo-European itself". In fact the very preserved productivity of the formation paradoxically militates against any such assurance.