

Václav BLAŽEK
Masaryk University, Brno

BALTIC **aušklējas* M. & **aušklējā* F. ‘BLEAK’

Abstract. The present contribution is devoted to the Baltic designation of the fish ‘bleak / *Alburnus alburnus*’ in Lithuanian, Latvian, and Prussian toponymy, and in traces of Baltic substrata in North Russian dialects and in Mari from the upper Volga basin. They are studied from the point of view of phonetic history and word formation. Any etymological attempts must be realized together with Slavic counterparts of this Baltic ichthyonym. On the basis of existing etymologies, a new solution is proposed, explaining the fish-name with help of one of characteristic features of this fish, golden slime on its scales. The new etymology demonstrates their common origin in the compound **aus-* & **klējo/ā-* *‘gold-slimed’ = ‘fish characterized by its golden slime’. This fish-name would further solidify the original Indo-European term for ‘gold’, directly preserved in the Baltic and Italic branches, in another apophonic formation also in Tocharian, but, until now, quite unattested in Slavic.

Keywords: Baltic; Slavic; Mari; ichthyonym; toponym; substratum; compound; etymology; gold.

0. In European rivers from Southeast England to the Volga basin, and from the Pyrenees, Alps and Caucasus to Scandinavia and North Russia, the fish called ‘bleak’ (*Alburnus alburnus*) lives. It is small, maximum 30 cm long, and is classified into the family of *Cyprinidae*. In the present contribution the Baltic designations of this fish including toponyms, wide-spread even beyond the borders of Lithuania and Latvia, are collected and compared with their Slavic counterparts and together analyzed from the point of view of word formation. After a detailed critical discussion of earlier etymologies a new etymology is introduced, including arguments from semantic typology. The process of borrowing of this ichthyonym is monitored in parallel from the Baltic languages into non-Baltic and from the Slavic languages into non-Slavic. The numerous, seemingly isolated, facts are joined here and derived from the common denominator, represented by a common Balto-Slavic protoform.

1. In the Baltic language territory the ichthyonym is directly attested in the Eastern branch:

1.1. Lithuanian *áukšlė, aukšlė*, acc. *aũkšlę* ‘bleak / *Alburnus lucidus*’ (LKŽ 1, 484; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 25). The fish became an inspiration to name some Lithuanian lakes, *Aukšlinis, Aukšlėnė*, and the river *Aūkšliupis* (Smoczyński 2007, 33).

1.2. Latvian *auksleja, aukšlēja, ausla, ausle, aūsleja, auslejs* ‘bleak / *Alburnus*’ (ME 1, 223, 227). The Latvian forms with *-k-* would have been borrowed from Lithuanian according to Smoczyński (2007, 33). On the contrary, the lake *Aūsļas* from the Zarasai district in northeastern Lithuania near the Latvian border bears a name more probably of Latvian than Lithuanian origin (cf. Vanagas 1981, 53).

1.3. Berg (1948, 65) formulated a hypothesis that various designations of ‘bleak’ in North Russian dialects may be connected with Lithuanian *áukšlė* etc. The forms mentioned by him can be arranged into three groups according to the first syllable (examples by Usačeva 1976, 92):

1.3.1. *škeja* (Vjatka);

1.3.2. *šakleja* (Vjatka, Perm’, Kama);

1.3.3. *škeleja* (Volxov, Ilmeň). Cf. also East Mari *šeklija* ‘Plötze’ (Paasonen 1948, 120).

1.4. The Baltic ichthyonym penetrated even into Fenno-Ugric – it can be identified in Mari *wiškile* “уклейка” (RMS, 783).

1.5. Although ‘bleak’ does not appear among the fish-names summarized in the Elbing Vocabulary, the only source of the Prussian ichthyonymical lexicon (cf. Blažek, Čeladín Běťáková 2004), it could have left traces in toponymy. Przybytek (1993, 54) recognized it in the name of the village *Auszlevo*, first attested in 1486 and known also as *Swersutten* (1399) and *Menczelguth* (1486). Przybytek mentioned the Polish mediation, identifiable from the possessive ending *-vo*, i.e. *-wo*.

1.6. With regard to their probable Baltic origin it is possible to reconstruct a common protoform of the borrowings in North Russian dialects and Mari as **aušklējā ~ *auškljā*. After the adoption into Russian we must expect the monophthongisation of *au-*, leading to the form **ušklēja/*ušklija*. The dropping of the initial **u-* would not be surprising, since the same process appeared in the Slavic form **klēja*, shortened from **uklēja* (see §2.2.).

2. Būga (1911, 303; 1916, 151) recognized the close designation of this fish in Slavic:

2.1. Common Slavic **uklěb* m., **uklěja* f. ‘bleak’ > Bulgarian *oklěj*, *uklija* id., Macedonian *uklev* ‘a kind of a lake fish’ (SMR, 379), Serbo-Croatian *oklija*, *ùklija*, *ukleja*, *uklja* ‘bleak’, Crna Gora *ùkljeva*, Slovak *ukleja*, Old Czech *úklejě* (Klaret’s glossary from the 14th cent. – in the chapter “De piscibus” records: dico capedo *pulec*, polibus *úklejě*, cinapus *dlešč*; see Šmilauer 1937, 188–189), Czech *ouklej*, Upper Sorbian *wuklica*, arch. *wuklija*, Lower Sorbian *hukleja*, Pomerian Slovincian *vukljejă*, Kašubian *uklej* & *uklēja*, Polish *ukleja*, dial. *uklej* ‘*Alburnus alburnus*’, arch. *oklja*, East Polish *okleja*, Belorussian *okleja*, *oklija*, *uklejá*, *vukljajá*, *uklija*, Ukrainian *uklija*, *oklēja*, *oklija*, *oklijá*, *uklija*, *uklija*, dial. (Carpathian) *hukleja*, Russian *ukléja*, *uklejá* ‘*Cyprinus alburnus*’; derivatives *ukléenka* and the adj. *uklějnyj* have their predecessors already in the Novgorodian grammots (charters) (SRNG 47, 67); another variant of this Russian ichthyonym, *ukléina* (SRNG 47, 67), gave the name to the lake of *Uklejno* in the District of Pskov (Vasmer 4, 156; ESUM 6, 27; Kolomic 1983, 89–93; Usačeva 1976, 93–96; Borys 2005, 665). The unattested Polabian equivalent may be preserved in northwest German dialects in the form *Uckelei* (cf. Schuster-Šewc 4, 1703). In older records, especially from the 18th cent., such forms as *ukelei*, *úkeley*, *ucule*, *ucle*, *okelei*, *ickley* appear (DWb 23, c. 716).

2.1.1. The Slavic ichthyonym was adopted into Hungarian, where it appears in the form *ökle* (Šmilauer 1937, 189; Machek 1968, 668), first recorded as *óklye* in 1530, acc. *öklet* 1544 (EWU 2, 1079; it is not necessary to seek its origin in German, if there are much more probable candidates in neighboring Slavic languages, namely in Slovak and Croatian or Serbian; it is also legitimate to think about adaptation of the fish-name from the assimilated language of the Pannonian Slavs).

2.1.2. Romanian *oclei* id. is probably of Bulgarian origin (BER 4, 836; Ciorănescu 2007, 555, #5806).

2.1.3. Modern Greek οὐγλί ‘bleak’¹ is also of Slavic origin.

2.2. For the same fish there is also known the shortened name **klēja*: Serbo-Croatian *klīja*, *kleja* ‘*Alburnus alburnus*’, Slovenian *klēja* ‘some fish

¹ <http://www.fishbase.se/ComNames/CommonNamesList.php?ID=4730&GenusName=Alburnus&SpeciesName=alburnus&StockCode=495>

from the Krka river', Russian dial. *klejá*, *kléja* 'bleak', Belorussian *klejá* id., Ukrainian *kléja* 'Alburnus alburnus' (ESSJ 10, 19).

2.3. It is apparent that the distribution of this ichthyonym covers the whole territory of the Slavic languages, plus some neighboring areas in the Balkan Peninsula.

3. Till the present time the following etymological attempts have been proposed (in chronological order):

3.1. Rostafiński (1900, 398) sought origin of the Slavic designation of 'bleak' in German. But the Common Slavic distribution of the ichthyonym in comparison with the limited area of variants of the type *ukelei* in Northeast German dialects bears witness of the opposite vector of borrowing (cf. e.g. Wick 1939, 18). The South German dialects (Bavaria) probably preserve an original native Germanic term in the forms *Laube(n)* / *Lauge(n)* / *Lauke* 'bleak / *Cyprinus leuciscus*' (DWb 12, cc. 293, 339, 343; cf. Walde, Hofmann 1938, 240, where the older comparison was with Latin *clupea* 'a kind of small fish' [Plinius], whose author was Walde himself; the North Germanic cognates are discussed in §3.5.). Let us mention that Rostafiński did not take in account the Baltic forms.

3.2. Loewenthal (1923, 176; 1928, 60) reconstructed the Indo-European starting-point **auklēā* and ascribed it the meaning 'that which is caught' (from a rather fictitious verb **euk^hō* 'I catch').

3.3. Wick (1939, 18) derived the ichthyonym from the verb **H₂eug-* 'to become strong, numerous; to grow' (LIV, 274–275) with respect to quantity of fish shoals.

3.4. Mladenov (1941, 377) sought the origin of Slavic 'bleak' in Slavic **klějb* / **kljvb* 'glue, glutinous substance'. Similarly Holub, Kopečný (1952, 170, 402), although without any reference to Mladenov.

3.5. Berg (1948, 65) speculated about some connection of the Slavic designation of 'bleak' and Swedish *löja* id. To the Swedish ichthyonym there are sure Germanic cognates and a transparent etymology: Norwegian *loya*, *løje*, *laue*, Old Danish *loge*, Danish *løjer* (-r is the plural ending), South German dial. *laugen* id. < **laugōn* & **laugiōn* (Hellquist 1957, 613), all from IE **leuk-* 'to shine, light' (Pokorný 1959, 689; LIV, 418–419).

3.6. Leder (1968, 72–73) separated the Slavic and Baltic ichthyonyms and tried to find their explanation independently:

3.6.1. According to Leder the Slavic ichthyonym should be related to Serbo-Croatian *klijati* & *uklijati* ‘to germinate, sprout’, Czech dial. *klíh(a)* ‘sprout’, *klejek* id., in the same way as the German name of a small fish *Sprotte* is connected with the word *Sproß* ‘sprout’.

3.6.2. The Baltic forms were joined by Leder with Lithuanian *áuksas* ‘gold’, with reference to the Serbo-Croatian ichthyonym *zlatva*, *zlatka* ‘bleak / *Alburnus alburnus*’ (RHSJ 22, 900). Less convincing is Leder’s alternative solution based on Lithuanian *áukštas* ‘high’, referring to Russian dial. *verxov(od)ka* ‘bleak’, i.e. the ‘fish moving on the upper stream of rivers’. The ‘golden’ etymology was also supported by Smoczyński (2007, 33), who thought about segmentation **aukšlė* < **auks-lė*.

3.7. Toporov (1975, 170) identified in the Latvian forms *auksleja*, *aukšlēja*, *ausla*, *ausle*, *aūsleja*, *auslejs* ‘bleak’ a witness to the earlier existence of the counterpart of Lithuanian *áuksas* ‘gold’ in Latvian, referring again to Serbo-Croatian *zlatva*, *zlatka* ‘bleak / *Alburnus alburnus*’, quoted by Leder (see RHSJ 22, 900).

3.8. Schuster-Šewc (1988–1989, 1703) proposed the primary meaning of the ichthyonym as ‘shining’, proceeding from Greek ἀύγή ‘shine, daylight’ (Pokorny 1959, 87).

4. Although some etymological attempts look rather skewed (e.g. Loewenthal), from the presented etymologies it is possible to combine a modified solution, explaining both the Baltic and Slavic forms as a common heritage. The first step will be to replace the Balto-Slavic reconstruction **auklējā-* of Trautmann (1923, 18), which represents only a mechanical projection of the Slavic ichthyonym in feminine into the late Indo-European protolanguage, but does not take in account the Baltic data.

The starting assumption is a compound consisting of components bearing the meaning (a) ‘gold’, attested in Baltic, and (b) ‘glue’ or something ‘glutinous’, which is well-known from the Slavic languages. So a defined compound would designate a fish characterized by ‘golden slime’. In other words, this new solution joins the etymologies §3.6.2. of Leder and §3.4. of Mladenov. Let us go through both components in detail:

(a) Baltic **ausa-* m. ‘gold’² > Old Lithuanian *ausas* [Bretke], Lithuanian

² With regard to the acute intonation in Lithuanian Driessen (2003, 352–353) proposed the Early IE protoform **H₂é-H₂us-o-*. The same protoform is applicable to the

dial. *áusas* (Gimžauskas; see LKŽ 1, 500); in the standard form *áuksas* it is possible to explain the internal *-k-* as secondary, likewise in *úoksas* ‘hole’ < **ōs-* : Latin *ōs*, gen. *ōris*; the acute intonation has been explained from such derivatives as *áuksnas* ‘golden coin’ < **aūsinas* (Smoczyński 2007, 33, 704; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 25; Driessen 2003, 352–353 explained the acute intonation from presence of a laryngeal in the partially reduplicated stem **H₂é-H₂us-o-*); Prussian *ausis* ‘golt’ [*Elbing vocabulary* 523], i.e. ‘gold’, acc. sg. *ausin* [*Enchiridion* 43.16: ... *ni sen Ausin adder Sirablan* ..., i.e. ‘neither gold or silver...’] (Mažiulis 2013, 63; Toporov 1975, 168). Cf. also the place-name *Awseynen* z r. 1495, perhaps according to the anthroponym *Awse* recorded in 1409 (Gerullis 1922, 14; Trautmann 1925, 15; Toporov 1975, 169). Derksen (2015, 69–70) reconstructs proto-Baltic **auksas*, assuming that the Lithuanian forms without *-k-*, namely *ausas* ‘gold’, *ausinas* ‘golden’, *auskalis* ‘goldsmith’, mediated by Bretke, are Pruthenisms. Mühlenbach & Endzelin (ME 1, 231) tried to identify the lost Latvian counterpart of the Lithuanian designation of ‘gold’ in one folklore text: *sijājuot auzas* (var. *zēlts!*) *bira, niekājuot sidrabiņš* (BW #8202), where the expected Latvian **aus(a)s* ‘gold’ had probably merged with *āuza*, pl. *auzas* ‘oats’. But the primary meaning ‘gold’ is more logical than ‘oats’ also with regard to the last word *sidrabiņš* dim. ‘silver’, not to mention the parallel variant with *zēlts* ‘gold’, which really translates the word *auzas*. Mühlenbach & Endzelin (ME 1, 231) also mentioned the family name *Aūskalēji* from the locality *Olai*, which can be interpreted as ‘goldsmiths’.

(b) Slavic **klějъ* / **klъjъ* ‘glue, glutinous substance’ > Church Slavonic *klějъ*, *klejъ* ‘κόλλα’, Bulgarian *klěj* m. ‘glue, resin’, Serbo-Croatian *klīja* f. ‘glue’, arch. *klěj* m. id., Slovenian *klēj* ‘glue, glutinous substance’, Old Czech *klí* ‘resin, bitumen’, Czech arch. *klej*, Czech *klíh*, Upper & Lower Sorbian *klij*, Old Polish *klej*, *klij* ‘glue, bitumen’, Polish *klej*, *klij* ‘glue’, Pomerian Slovincian *klij*, *klej*, Old Russian *klěji*, *kleji*, *kliji* ‘glutinous substance, glue, bitumen, thick juice’, Russian *klej* ‘glue’, Ukrainian, Belorussian *klej* id. (Vasmer 1986–1987 2, 246; Machek 1968, 254; ESSJ 10, 19–20). Various

Italic forms: Latin *aurum* n. ‘gold’ [first in *Leges Duodecim Tabularum* X.8., perhaps from the 5th cent. BCE] and Sabinian *ausum* [Paulus Diaconus {8th cent. CE}, *Epitome Festi De verborum significatu* 8–9]. On the other hand, Tocharian A *wäs*, B *yasa* ‘gold’, reflect another apophonic model, **H₂ues-H₂* (Pinault 2008, 444–445; Hackstein, Hiroimi, Bross 2015, 74).

Slavic languages became sources of borrowings into some neighboring non-Slavic languages: Hungarian *kilih* ‘gluten’ (Gyarmathi 1799/1983, 348/280), Romanian *clei* ‘glue’ and Lithuanian *klijas* / *klijus* / *klỹjus*, later also *klejaĩ* pl. id. (Miklosich 1886, 119). Isolated Slovenian *kelje* ‘joiner’s glue’ (18th cent.) may be explained from the protoform **kvlějb* (Miklosich 1886, 119; Berneker 1924, 659; Sławski 1974, 86; Snoj 2003, 277; skeptically Trubačev, ESSJ 10, 20). From the point of view of Slavic word formation it is possible to determine the root **k(ǃ)l-* and two alternating derivational suffixes, **-ějb*/**-ėja*³ and **-bjb*/**-bja*⁴, which are not in ablaut relation, because they reflect **-ējo/ā-* and **-ijō/ā-*, cf. their Baltic counterparts in Lithuanian *-ėjas* / *-ėja*⁵, Latvian *-ējs* / *-ēja*, and Lithuanian *-ijas* / *-ija* ~ *-ē*⁶ (Sławski 1974, 83–84, 86–88). The root **k(ǃ)l-* may be connected with Greek *κόλλα* ‘glue’ [Emp., Hdt.], irrespective of its protoform, **kolī₂* or **koln₂*, and Middle Low German and Middle Dutch *helen* ‘to glue, stick’ < Germanic **haljan-* (Fick 1890, 389; Zupitza 1896, 143; Berneker 1924, 659; Pokorny 1959, 612 etc.).

The hypothetical compound consisting of the components, which can be reconstructed in projection into the Late Indo-European as **aus-* & **klējo/ā-*, would designate the fish characterized by its ‘golden slime’. In proto-Baltic we would expect its continuant in the forms **aušklējas* m. & **aušklējā* f. (on vacillation *s* ~ *š* due Lex RUKI and its neutralisation – see Matasović 2005, 149–150, 154), resembling especially the Latvian forms and probable Baltisms in North Russian dialects. The Lithuanian forms may be projected into the protoform **aušklijā*. There is a similar distribution of the derivational suffixes e.g. in the Baltic words for ‘smith’: Latvian *kalējs* ‘smith’ versus Lithuanian *áuksa-kalis* ‘goldsmith’. In the Slavic pair **klějb* / **kľjb* ‘glue’ it is possible to identify the same derivational suffixes **-ējo-* a

³ Cf. Common Slavic **kolěja* ‘track, rut’, **slěpěja* ‘footprint’, **verěja* ‘doorframe’ etc. (Šmilauer 1937, 189).

⁴ Cf. Common Slavic **netbjb* ‘nephew’, **solvbjb* ‘nightingale’, **zmbjb* ‘snake’ (Sławski 1974, 83–84).

⁵ Cf. Lithuanian. *pirkéjas*, f. *pirkéja* ‘merchant’, *pasekéjas* ‘follower’, *gera-dėja* ‘good-maker’, *siuvėjas* = Old Russian *švēj* ‘shoemaker’ (Otrębski 1956, 74–76).

⁶ Cf. Old Lithuanian *prakijas* ‘merchant’ : *prakė* ‘merchandise’; *žūklijas* ‘fisher’ : Lithuanian *žūklė* ‘fishery’; *omenė* ‘intention, aim, memory’, dial. *omenija* (Otrębski 1965, 76–80).

*-ijō-. The compound *a_{us}- & *klējō/ā- should develop into Late Common Slavic *ux- & *klěj_{b/a}, but for its later development there are no credible examples of the cluster *x+k(+l)*. Perhaps it is possible to seek analogy in the development leading to Common Slavic *utro in contrast to *ustro⁷ (Old Church Slavonic *utro* ‘morning, dawn’ vs. *za ustra* ‘in the morning’ – see the discussion by Vykypěl, ESJS 17, 1028–1029, 1026), where the starting-point is the same Late Indo-European root *a_{us}-⁸.

5. As the preceding partial conclusions confirm, the designation of ‘bleak’ in both Baltic and Slavic languages are of common origin. With regard to the transparent etymology reflecting the characteristic feature of this distinct fish, namely the golden slime on scales, it is not necessary to capitulate and refer to a rather imaginary substratum⁹. The assumed primary compound *a_{us}-klējō/ā- ‘gold-slimed {fish}’ consists of the component *a_{us}- ‘gold’, which is independently attested in Lithuanian and Prussian, in traces in Latvian, but quite unknown in Slavic. The present solution implies the existence of the continuant of the component *a_{us}- ‘gold’ also in such Balto-Slavic dialects, from which later the Slavic languages crystalized. The characteristic Slavic change of IE *s > Slavic *x in agreement with Lex RUKI indicates that this archaic designation of ‘gold’ could still have existed in the early stage of development of the independent Slavic protolanguage, before its

⁷ The difference of *utro vs. *ustro is probably explainable from the paradigmatic levelling (cf. Smoczyński 2007, 36 about their Baltic counterparts): nom. *a_{us}ro- ‘dawn’ vs. loc. *user ‘in the morning, at dawn’ → *a_{us}tro- vs. *a_{us}er → *ustro vs. *uxe(r); thanks to their contamination the form *uxtro should originate; it is simplified to *utro (cf. Mikkola 1942, 179). Let us mention that Common Slavic *x, originated according to Lex RUKI, was changed to *s before *t in all cases, i.e. if *x was created from IE *s after *i/*ū or corresponding diphthong, *k or *r, cf. Old Russian *pxati* & *pixati* ‘to stamp’ vs. Russian *pest’* ‘stamper’ (**pěstb*); Old Church Slavonic aor. 1pl. *rěxomъ* vs. 2pl. *rěste* < **rěksomos* vs. **rěkstes* od *rekō* ‘I say’; Russian *pōrox* ‘dust’ (**porxъ*) vs. *pers’* ‘powder’ (Shevelov 1964, 128–130).

⁸ Polish *uścieć*, *uścić się* ‘to shine’; Lithuanian *aūšti*, Latvian *aust* ‘to dawn, become light’, besides Lithuanian *aušrà* ‘dawn’, Latvian *āustra* id.; Latin *aurōra* ‘dawn’ (**ausōs+ā*); Greek ἠώς, Aeolic αὔος ‘dawn’, αὔριον ‘tomorrow’; Vedic *uṣās-* ‘dawn’, voc. *uṣar*, *vī ... āvas* ‘ist hell geworden’ (Pokorny 1959, 86–87; EWAI 1, 236; LIV, 292–293: **H₂ues-*).

⁹ Even Machek (1968, 668) preferred that the Slavic and Baltic forms are mutually related and did not speculate about pre-European substratum, otherwise so beloved by him.

replacement by the term *zðlto. A similar process began in the Baltic branch, but was not as consistent as in the sister Slavic branch. The Baltic correlate with the *e*-vocalism is dominant in Latvian, where *zēlts* ‘gold; golden’ is used. In Lithuanian it is represented by the East Lithuanian adj. *želtas* ‘gold-yellow, green-yellow’. In Prussian it is hidden in the ornithonym *sealtmeno* / **žēltmenā* / ‘wedewal’ [Elbing Vocabulary 748], i.e. ‘oriole’ < Old French *oriol* < Latin *aureolus* ‘golden’; cf. also German *Goldamsel* ‘oriole’, lit. ‘golden blackbird’ (ME 4, 706; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 1296–1297; Mažiulis 1997, 87–90; Smoczyński 2007, 776; Derksen 2015, 514).

6. Concerning the analogical designations of ‘golden fish’, besides Serbo-Croatian *zlatva* & *zlatka* (§§ 3.6.2., 3.7.) there is e.g. the Latin ichthyonym, mentioned by Festus {2nd cent. CE} in his treatise *De verborum significatione, epitoma Verri Flacci*, 182: *orata genus piscis appellatur a colore auri, quod rusticorum dicebant*. Isidore of Sevilla {?570–636 CE}, *Etymologiae sive origines* 12.6.6., added: *a colore quidam pisces nominati sunt ... ut auratae, quia in capite auri colorem habent* (Maltby 1991, 67). This means that the ichthyonym was formed from Latin *aurātus* ‘gilded’. At the same time Fest’s witness mediates that already in the time of life of Verrus Flaccus {55 BCE–20 CE}, the main source of Festus’ lexical data, there existed in Latin the rustic variant *ōrum*, besides classical *aurum* ‘gold’ (cf. OLD, 1272).

Another ‘golden fish’ may be identified in the Gaulish gloss *ausaca*, recorded by Polemius Silvius in his treatise *Nomina cunctarum spirancium atque quadrupes* {449 CE}, ed. Th. Mommsen, *M.G.H., A.A.*, IX, 543–544 (cf. Bily 1993, 20; Schuchardt 1906, 720).

7. Summing up, the results of the present contribution demonstrate that both the Baltic and Slavic designations of the fish ‘bleak / *Alburnus alburnus*’ are compatible and derivable from a common source, which can be reconstructed as a compound **aus-* & **klējo/ā-* ~ **klijo/ā-* {fish characterized by its} ‘golden slime’. Only this protoform explains both the Baltic and Slavic forms in agreement with their later sound rules, while the protoform **auklējo/ā-* proposed by Trautmann does not explain the Baltic forms. Remarkable is the broad impact on the neighboring languages: Mari *wiškjile* ‘bleak’ is of Baltic origin, while East Mari *šeklija* ‘Plötze’ is borrowed from a Russian dialect ichthyonym such as *šeklejá* (Volxov, Ilmeň) or *škeja* (Vjatka), which are themselves of Baltic origin. On the other hand, the Slavic origin is apparent in the case of Hungarian *ökle* (1530 *öklye*), Romanian

oclei and Modern Greek ουγλί ‘bleak’. The northwest German dialectisms from the 18th cent. as *ukelei*, *ükeley*, *ucule*, *ucle*, *okelei*, *ickley*, today *Uckelei*, indicate an unattested Polabian equivalent, in like manner as the village name *Auszlevo* (1486) probably indicates the unattested Prussian counterpart to the East Baltic designation of ‘bleak’. In other Indo-European languages, e.g. in Latin or Gaulish, ‘golden fish’ may also be recognized, but with different word formation. The Balto-Slavic designation of ‘bleak’ thus represents a unique Balto-Slavic innovation.

BALTŲ **aušklējas* MASC., **aušklējā* FEM. ‘AUKŠLĒ’

Santrauka

Straipsnis skirtas baltiško žuvies aukšlės ‘*Alburnus alburnus*’ pavadinimui, paliudytam lietuvių, latvių ir prūsų toponimijoje, taip pat baltiškame substrate šiaurinėse rusų tarmėse ir marių kalboje aukštutinės Volgos baseine. Pavadinimas nagrinėjamas fonetinės raidos ir žodžių darybos aspektais. Bet kokie etimologizavimo bandymai negali būti atsieti nuo šio baltų ichtionimo slaviškųjų atitikmenų. Esamų etimologijų pagrindu siūlomas naujas sprendimas, žuvies pavadinimą aiškinantis remiantis viena iš būdingų jos savybių – auksinėmis gleivėmis ant žvynų. Pagal naująją etimologiją pavadinimas kildinamas iš dūrinio **aūs-* & **klēio/ā-* *‘auksinėmis gleivėmis’. Žuvies pavadinimas toliau galėtų patvirtinti pirminį indoeuropiečių aukso pavadinimą, tiesiogiai išlaikytą baltų ir italikų (kitokiu apofoniniu variantu ir tocharų) kalbų šakose, tačiau nepaliudytą (iki šiol) slavų kalbose.

REFERENCES

BER 4 – Vladimir Georgiev et al. (eds.), *Balgarski etimologičen rečnik* 4, Sofija: Akademično izdatelstvo prof. Marin Drinov, 1995.

Berg, Lev Semenovich 1948, Nazvanija ryb i etničeskie vzaimootnošenija slavjan, *Sovetskaja etnografija* 1948(2), 62–73 (<http://histfishing.ru/biblio/tema/4-lexicon/48-berg-l-s-nazvaniya-ryb-i-etnicheskie-vzaimootnosheniya-slavyan>).

Berneker, Erich 1924, *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1: A-L, Heidelberg: Winter.

Billy, Pierre-Henri 1993, *Thesaurus Linguae Gallicae*, Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Olms-Weidmann.

Blažek, Václav, Jindřich Čeladín, Marta Běťáková 2004, Old Prussian fish-names, *Baltistica* 39(1), 107–125.

Boryś, Wiesław 2005, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Büga, Kazimieras 1911, *Baltica*, *Russkij filologičeskij vestnik* 65, 302–326.

Büga, Kazimieras 1916, Slavjano-baltijskie étimologii, *Russkij filologičeskij vestnik* 75, 141–156.

BW – Barons, Kr[išjānis], H[enrijs] Wissendorffs, *Latwju dainas* 1–6, Jelgavā: Drawin-Drawneeka general-komisijā; Peterburgā: Keisaristas Zinibu Akademijas speestavā, 1894–1915.

Ciorănescu, Alexandru 2007, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, București: Saeculum.

Derksen, Rick 2015, *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Driessen, Michiel 2003, **h₂é-h₂us-o-*, the Proto-Indo-European term for ‘gold’, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 32, 25–42.

DWb – Jacob Grimm, Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1838–1961 (<http://dwb.uni-trier.de/de/>).

ESJS 17 – Iлона Janyšková (ed.), *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* 17, Brno: Tribun EU, 2014.

ESSJ 10 – Oleg N. Trubačev (ed.), *Étimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov* 10, Moskva: Nauka, 1983.

ESUM 6 – Tatjana Borisovna Lukinova, Hryhorij Petrovič Pivtorak, Orest Borisovič Tkačenko (eds.), *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy 6: U-Ja*, Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 2012.

EWAI – Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter, 1986f.

EWU – Loránd Benkő (ed.), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen* 1–2, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1994–1997.

Fick, August 1890, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* 4 1, Theil, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Heidelberg: Winter.

Gerullis, Georg 1922, *Die altpreußischen Ortsnamen*, Berlin, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

Gyarmathi, Sámuel 1799 [1983], *Affinitas linguae hungaricae cum linguis fennicae originis grammatice demonstrata. Nec non vocabularia dialectorum tataricarum et slavicarum cum hungarica comparata*, Göttingae: Dieterich / *Proof of the affinity of the Hungarian language with languages of Fennic origin* (= *Amsterdam Classics in Linguistics* 15), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Hackstein, Olav, Hiromi Habata, Christoph Bross 2015, Tocharische Texte zur Buddhalegende 2: Die Geschichte von Devadatta und Ajātaśatru (B21–22), *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 69, 51–121.

- Hellquist, Elof 1957³, *Svensk etymologisk ordbok*, Lund: Gleerup.
- Holder, Alfred 1896–1907, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz* 1–3, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Holub, Josef, František Kopečný 1952, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Státní nakladatelství učebnic.
- Kolomic, Vera Titovna 1983, *Proisxoždenie obščeslavjanskix nazvanij ryb (K IX Meždunarodnomu sjezdu slavistov)*, Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Krahe, Hans 1964, *Unsere ältesten Flussnamen*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Leder, Irmgard 1968, *Russische Fischnamen*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- LIV – Helmut Rix, Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- LKŽ 1 – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas 1: A-B*, Vilnius: Mintis, 1968.
- Loewenthal, John 1923, Worterklärungen, *Wörter und Sachen* 8, 176–178.
- Loewenthal, John 1928, Wirtschaftsgeschichtliche Parerga III, *Wörter und Sachen* 11, 54–63.
- Machek, Václav 1968, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Academia.
- Maltby, Robert 1991, *A lexicon of Ancient Latin etymologies*, Melksham: Cairns.
- Matasović, Ranko 2005, Toward a relative chronology of the earliest Baltic and Slavic sound changes, *Baltistica* 40(2), 147–157.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas 1997¹, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* 4, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas 2013², *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- ME – Karl Mühlhnbach, *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4 (redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J. Endzelin), Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium, 1923–1932.
- Mladenov, Stefan 1941, *Etimologičeski i pravopisen rečnik na bālgarskija knižoven ezik*, Sofija: Danov.
- Mikkola, Josip J. 1942, *Urslavische Grammatik 2: Konsonantismus*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Miklosich, Franz 1886, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*, Wien: Braumüller.
- OLD – Peter G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Otrębski, Jan 1956, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego 2: Nauka o budowie wyrazów*, Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Paasonen, Heikki, Paavo Siro (Hrsg.) 1948, *Ost-Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch* (= *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae* 11), Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean 2008, *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*, Leuven, Paris: Peeters.
- Pokorny, Julius 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, München: Francke.
- Przybytek, Rozalia 1993, *Ortsnamen baltischer Herkunft im südlichen Teil Ostpreußens*, Stuttgart: Steiner.

RHSJ – J. Jedvaj et al. (eds.), *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika 22*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1975.

RMS – I. G. Ivanov, A. A. Savatkova, D. E. Kazancev, F. I. Gordeev et al. (eds.), *Russko-marijskij slovar'*, Moskva: Sovetskaja ěnciklopedija, 1966.

Rostafiński, Józef 1900, *Symbola ad historiam naturalem medii aevi 1*, Kraków: Sumptibus Universitatis Cracoviae.

Schuchardt, Hugo 1906, Zu den Fischnamen des Polemius Silvius, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 30, 712–732 (<http://schuchardt.uni-graz.at/id/publication/528.pdf>).

Schuster-Šewc, Heinz 1978–1996, *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache 1–5*, Bautzen: VEB Domowina-Verlag.

Shevelov, George Y. 1964, *A prehistory of Slavic. The historical phonology of common Slavic*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Sławski, Franciszek 1974, *Słownik prasłowiański 1*, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Ossolineum.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński.

SMR – Ğ. Milošev, B. Gruik, M. Ķorveziroski, B. Blagoeski, A. Cukeski (eds.), *Srpsko-xrvatsko-makedonski rečnik*, Skopje: Prosvetno delo, 1964.

Snoj, Marko 2003², *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Modrijan.

SRNG 47 – Valeria B. Kolosova, E. V. Kološko, O. N. Krylova, E. I. S'janova (eds.), *Slovar' russkix narodnyx govorov 47: užom-uros*, Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 2014.

Šmilauer, Vladimír 1937, Výklady slov, *Naše řeč* 21, 188–192 (<http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/archiv.php?lang=en&art=3202>).

Toporov, Vladimir N. 1975, *Prusskij jazyk 1*, Moskva: Nauka.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1923, *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1925, *Die altpreußischen Personennamen*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Usačeva, Vladimira 1976, Materialy dlja slovarja slavjanskix nazvanij ryb 3: semejstvo Cyprinidae, *Ėtimologija* 1974, 81–116.

Vanagas, Aleksandras 1981, *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Vasmer, Max 1986–1987, *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka 1–4*, Moskva: Nauka (Russian translation of Oleg N. Trubačev from the original *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 1–3*, Heidelberg: Winter, 1950–1958).

Walde, Alois, Johann B. Hofmann 1938–1954, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 1–2*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Wick, Philipp 1939, *Die slavischen Lehnwörter in der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache*, Dissertation, Marburg.

Zupitza, Ernst 1896, *Die germanischen Gutturale*, Berlin: Weidmann.

Acknowledgement

The present contribution was prepared thanks to the The Specific Research Fund at Masaryk University, Nr. 2817. The deepest thanks belong to John D. Bengtson for his correction of English.

Václav BLAŽEK
Department of Linguistics and Baltic Studies
Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University
A. Nováka 1
CZ-60200 Brno
Czech Republic
[blazek@phil.muni.cz]