

# ON SPECIFIC ZOOLOGICAL ISOGLOSSES BETWEEN CELTIC AND (BALTO-)SLAVIC

VÁCLAV BLAŽEK

## 0. Introduction

In this contribution, I shall be dealing with three major questions:

(1) Was ‘eagle’ in Celtic and Balto-Slavic extended in *-l-* or in *-r-*?

(2) Can Balto-Slavic ‘swan’ be etymologised as ‘beaked’ with the help of Celtic?

(3) Can words for ‘fox’ be based on a Celto-Baltic or Celto-Slavic isogloss?

## 1. Celtic and Balto-Slavic words for ‘eagle’

Words to denote ‘eagle’ in Balto-Slavic and Celtic languages are similar, but it is difficult to find a common lexeme from which both were derived:

Baltic *\*arelijas* ‘eagle’ > Lithuanian *erėlis*, gen. *-io*, Old (Szyrwid) & dial. (East) *arėlis*, dim. (Szyrwid) *arelaitis* ‘pullus aquilae’, pl. *arelinis*; Latvian *ērģlis* (Gospel 1753) and in Bērzgale and Kārsava *erelis*, Upper Latvian nom. pl. *ereļi* (Fraenkel 1962-4: 122; Smoczyński 2007: 146-7; Mühlenbach & Endzelin 1925: I.570, 575; Endzelin & Hausenberg 1934: I.370; the spelling of the beginning of the word with *e-* rather than with *a-* in Standard Lithuanian and Latvian is explained by Lex Rozwadowski, cit. from Andersen 1996: 141), Prussian *arelie*, in Elbing Vocabulary #709 gl. *are*, i.e. in modern German *aar* ‘eagle’, corr. *\*arelis* (Mažiulis 1988: I.90; Toporov 1975-90: I.101), Narewian *adlif* < *\*ardlis* id. (according to Zinkevičius 1984: 8, a borrowing from German *Adler* is less probable).

Slavic *\*orьlbъ* ‘eagle’: Old Church Slavonic *orьlbъ*, Bulgarian, Macedonian *orėl*, Serbo-Croatian *òrao*, gen. *òrla*, Slovenian *óral*, Slovak *orol*, Czech *orel*, Upper Sorbian *worjol*, Lower Sorbian *jeřel*, Polabian *virál*, Polish *orzeł*, Old Russian *orьlbъ*, Russian *orěl*, gen. *orlá*, Ukrainian *orél*, gen. *orlá/virlá* id. (Vasmer 1953-8: III.150-1; Schuster-Šewc 1984: 1661).

Goidelic: Old Irish *irar*,<sup>1</sup> Middle Irish *ilar*<sup>2</sup> m. ‘eagle’ [*o*-stem], *ilur* gl. aquila, dim. *ilarán* (DIL I 62.17ff).

---

<sup>1</sup> See Thurneysen (1918: 61): “Die altirische Form des Wortes, das mittlere *ilar*, neutr. *iolar*, kymer. *eryr*, mbret. *erer* (korn. neubret. *er*) lautet, ist bisher an der einzigen mir

Brittonic: Middle Welsh *erer*, Welsh *eryr* ‘eagle; hero, chief, prince, leader’, m. & f., pl. *eryrod*, *eryron*, Old Cornish *er*, Middle Breton *erer* m., Modern Breton *er* m. ‘eagle’ (Pedersen 1909: I.491, §336; GPC: I.1240; Matasović 2009: 117-8).

There have been several attempts to explain the relation between the insular Celtic and Balto-Slavic designations of ‘eagle’.

Schulze (1908: 342-7) collected several animal names extended in -*l-* which were meant to support his idea that Slavic *\*orьlb* ‘eagle’ and Baltic *\*arelis* are derived by the same suffix:

Old Indic *gavala-* ‘wild buffalo’: *gav-* ‘cattle, bull’, *chagalá-* ‘buck’: *chāga-* ‘he-goat’, *chāgā* ‘she-goat’.

Latin *capreolus*: *caprea*, cf. French *chevreuil* ‘Rehbock’, Old Provençal *chevrol*, Italian *capriulo*, Romanian *căpriór*.

Old Icelandic *gymbill* ‘he-lamb’: *gymbr* ‘ewe lamb’, similarly *ekkill* ‘widower’: *ekkja* ‘widow’.

Slavic *\*kozьlb* ‘he-goat’: *\*koza* ‘she-goat’.

Schulze (1908: 343ff.) saw the same suffix in the *l-*extensions of words meaning ‘big, plenty’, e.g. Old Indic *bahú-*: *bahulam*; Greek *μεγάλος* *μέγας*, *πολύ-* *πολλό-* < *\*πολυλό-*; Gothic *mikils*: Old Norse *mjök* < *\*megu-*; Lithuanian *didis* ‘big’: *didelis*, *daũg*: *daũgel* ‘many’.

However, Thurneysen (1918: 61) did not agree with him:

Ir. *irar*, kymr. *eryr* gehen auf *\*eriros* zurück (fn. 2: vgl. Pedersen I: 491). Das zeigt, daß slav. *orьlb* aus *\*orьrb* dissimiliert ist (noch weiter verändert lit. *erėlis*) und nicht mit W. Schulze, *Jagić-Festschr.* 343ff., benutzt werden kann, um eine urindogermanische Augmentativbildung mit *l-*Suffix zu erweisen. Auch seine übrigen Beispiele kommen mir nicht recht beweisend vor. Got. *mikils*, ahd. *mihhil* erklärt man mit Wahrscheinlichkeit als Anbildung an gegensätzliche Ausdrücke wie got. *leitils* ahd. *luzzil* und so wird es sich auch mit gr. *μεγαλο-* und ähnlichen verhalten. Wie der Ablaut in den Vogelnamen hineingekommen ist, ist schwer zu sagen (fn. 3: Pedersen stellt auch arm. *oror urur* ‘Möve, Weihe’ dazu).

---

bekanntes Belegstellen nicht erkannt worden. Es ist der Vers, den K. Meyer, *Fiannaigecht* 30.16, aus Laud 610 druckt: *Dāre Doimthech (ba) ri for Mbruig is é ēm irar irar ngail*, ‘Dare Doimthech (war) König über Mruig, er ist wahrlich ein Adler an Tapferkeit’.

<sup>2</sup> *delbh ilair do dergór alaim, aithlegtha fura barr* ‘and the figure of an eagle, of beautiful, red, refined gold, on the top of the shaft’ (see Robinson 1908: 59, 138).

Vielleicht wurzelte die Form *or-* ursprünglich in der *n*-Bildung: an. *orn* ahd. *arn* gr. ὄρνις. Ob got. *ara* ahd. *aro* usw. zu dieser gehört oder durch Haplologie entstanden war wie korn. nbret. *er*, ist zweifelhaft.

Later Thurneysen (1946: 104, §166) added: “Old Irish *irar* ‘eagle’, which together with Welsh *eryr* points to a primary form *\*eriros*, the neutral *-p-*, despite the *-i-*, is yet unexplained”.

Let us mention that Pedersen’s and Thurneysen’s reconstruction *\*eriro-* is not the only possibility of the insular Celtic starting-point. For example, Stokes (1894: 39) reconstructed *\*eruro-* and Toporov (1975-90: I.101) even *\*erilo-*.

It is also impossible to answer unambiguously whether it was the *l-* or *r-* extension in the Celtic and Balto-Slavic designations of ‘eagle’. Schulze had collected several zoonyms from various IE branches which were apparently extended by the *l-* suffixes. His examples are valid, independently of any relation to the words for ‘big’ and ‘little’ discussed in the polemics of Thurneysen. It is possible to add Latin *aquila* ‘eagle’ and Germanic *\*fuglaz* ‘bird’, independently of its further etymology, whether from Germanic *\*fleugan<sup>an</sup>* ‘to fly’, and further to Lithuanian *plaukti* ‘swim’, or to Lithuanian *paūkštis* ‘bird’ (Buck 1949: 183, §3.64). But there is also the *r-* suffix forming some of the bird-names, e.g. Latin *passer* ‘sparrow’, *hanser* ‘gander’ vs. Slavic *\*gqserb* id.: *\*gqsb* ‘goose’. Taking in account the external parallels, it is possible to quote two proper names:

- (a) Gaulish toponym *Orilus* ‘Rupertsberg by Bingen’ (Holder II.877).
- (b) Palaeo-Balkanian name of the Thracian leader Ὀλορος [Herodotus: VI.39; Thucydides: IV.104.4] and Ὀρολος [Marcellinus, *Vita Thuc.* 2], and the Dacian king *Oroles* [Pompeius Trogus, *Hist.* XXXI, 3.16] (collected in Detschew 1957: 341; Kretschmer 1896: 214).

Both names agree in the initial *o-* and the derivational suffix *-l-*. Unfortunately, their meaning remains unknown, and so they cannot play any substantial role in our solution, although ‘eagle’ belongs to the most beloved motives in both anthroponymics and oronymics.

But this is not the main problem regarding the compatibility of the Celtic and Balto-Slavic data. The most difficult is the difference in initials: Celtic *\*e-* vs. Balto-Slavic *\*o-* indicate the only possible ablaut pair *\*H<sub>1</sub>e-* vs. *\*H<sub>1</sub>o-*, while the Anatolian counterparts, Hittite *haras*, gen. *haranas*, Palaic *ha-ra-a-as(-)* ‘eagle’, Cuneiform Luwian *harran(i)-* ‘a bird’<sup>3</sup> are derivable only from *\*H<sub>3</sub>er<sup>o</sup>* or *\*H<sub>2</sub>er<sup>o</sup>*. The Germanic (*\*aran-* > Gothic *ara*, Old Norse *ari* and *ǫrn* < *\*arnu-*, Old High German *aro* & *arn*), Greek (ὄρνις, -ἴθος, Doric -ἴχος ‘Vogel; Hahn, Henne’, ὄρνεον ‘bird’) and Armenian (*ori* ‘raven’, Olsen 1999: 442) cognates are derivable from *\*H<sub>3</sub>er<sup>o</sup>* or from the *o*-grade *\*H<sub>1/2/3</sub>or<sup>o</sup>*. Summing up, with regard to the existing reconstructions, the Celtic designation of ‘eagle’ is not compatible with its Anatolian semantic counterpart. There are three possibilities:

- (a) Celtic ‘eagle’ is related to the Balto-Slavic, Germanic and Greek forms – the initial laryngeal was *\*H<sub>1</sub>-*, excluding the Anatolian data.
- (b) Anatolian ‘eagle’ is related to Greek, Germanic and Balto-Slavic – the initial laryngeal was *\*H<sub>3</sub>-* or *\*H<sub>2</sub>-*, excluding the Celtic data.
- (c) All forms are related only in the case of a wrong reconstruction of the insular Celtic protoform in *\*e-*.

Let us try to verify the possibility (c). This entails revising all steps in the reconstruction of the Celtic protoform.

In agreement with the traditional reconstruction *\*eriro-*, the Middle Irish form *ilar* implies a dissimilation of the type *r...r* > *l...r*. Although it is not directly attested, it is perhaps possible; an analogical dissimilative process *l...l* > *r...l* or *r...l* explains such forms as Old Irish *aile* ‘other’, *alaile* and *araile* ‘the other’, Welsh *arall* and *ereill* ‘another’, Breton and Middle Welsh *eil* ‘second’, or Irish *lemlacht* ‘sweet milk’ vs. Old Cornish *leverid* id. (Thurneysen 1946: 119, §192b; 307-9, §§486-8). But with regard to the exceptional attestation of the form *irar*,<sup>4</sup> the form *ilar* may represent an original starting point. If the Old/Middle Irish final <sup>o</sup>[C]ar is derivable from *\*<sup>o</sup>[C]ros* or *\*<sup>o</sup>[C]ṽros* (see de Bernardo Stempel 1999:

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also the Lycian dynastic name *Xerēi* (HED: III.137-9; Kloekhorst 2008: 301).

<sup>4</sup> See Thurneysen (1918: 61) at fn. 1 above; an artificial hypercorrection cannot also be excluded.

317), it is also possible to think about a hypothetical pre-Goidelic protoform *\*iloros* or *\*eloros* and via metathesis from *\*\*orilos* or *\*\*orelos*. The following examples can illustrate that metathesis of this type operated in Celtic:

(i) Middle Irish *criol* vs. *clior* (Pedersen 1909: I.493).

(ii) Old Irish *ónn uraid* gl. ab anno priore, Middle Irish *innuraid* ‘from last year’ < *\*per-uti* via metathesized (?) *\*irud* (Griepentrog 1995: 445, fn. 5) with the word for ‘year’ in the zero-grade and loc. sg., or < *\*per-utem* in the fossilized accusative, as it is possible to understand from the form of the definite article (Schrijver 1995: 244, 257; Matasović 2009: 128).

(iii) Celtic verbal base *\*kli-nu-* < *\*klu-ni-* ‘to hear’ (Thurneysen 1946: 357; Kümmel in LIV: 335, fn. 8; Schumacher 2004: 413). The phenomenon of metathesis opens new paths in connection of presumably otherwise incompatible Celtic and Balto-Slavic forms.

In Brittonic, *i*-umlaut of the type *\*o...ĩ* > *e...i* operated, e.g. Old Welsh *elinou*, Middle Welsh *elin*, Middle & Modern Breton *elin*, Cornish *elyn*, *elin* ‘elbow’ < *\*olĩn<sup>o</sup>* vs. the Gaulish hydronym *Olina* (Ptolemy: II.8.2: Ὀλίνα; see Holder II.844) and Old Irish *uilen*, Gothic *aleina* ‘elbow’ etc. (Jones 1913: 92; Matasović 2009: 297-8). This means that *\*eriro-* is also derivable from *\*oriro-*. With regard to the tendency to dissimilation of the type *r...r* > *r...l* or *l...r* (Jones 1913: 160), it is possible to speculate that the Brittonic *\*eriro-* can represent a relatively late formation reinterpreted as the reduplication (cf. Middle Welsh and Middle Breton *erer* or Armenian *oror* ‘seagull’ – see Olsen 1999: 207; Martirosyan 2010: 538) from primary *\*erilo-* and further *\*orilo-*.

The forms discussed here allow us to formulate the following partial reconstructions:

Branch	Branch protoform	Projection in Late Indo-European
Slavic	<i>*orьlь</i>	<i>*orilo-</i>
Baltic	<i>*arelis</i>	<i>*oreliyo-</i>
Goidelic	<i>*elVros</i>	<i>*il[o]ro-</i> < <i>*orilo-</i> or <i>*el[o]ro-</i> < <i>*orelo-</i>
Brittonic	<i>*eriros</i>	<i>*eri[l]o-</i> < <i>*orilo-</i>
Gaulish	?NL <i>Orilus</i>	<i>*orilo-</i>
‘Palaeo-Balkanian’	?NV <i>Oroles</i> ~ <i>Oloros</i>	< <i>*orelo-?</i>

NL – *nomen loci*; NV – *nomen viri*.

If the preceding argument is correct, the primary root was really *\*H<sub>3</sub>er-* and its extension in Balto-Slavic, Celtic and perhaps ‘Palaeo-Balkanian’ was really in *-l-*.

## 2. Balto-Slavic words for ‘swan’

Baltic m. *\*gulbjas* > Lithuanian *gul̃bis*, Latvian *gūlbis*, Prussian *gulbis* ‘swan’, f. *\*gulbijā* > Lithuanian *gulbẽ* id., corresponds exactly to Slavic *\*gьlbь*, reconstructible on the basis of Serbo-Croatian *gūb* id. (ESSJ: VII.190; Toporov 1975-90: II.332). Better documented is the voiceless variant *\*kьlpь* id. This traditionally accepted comparison (BSW: 101) has been classified as an exclusive Balto-Slavic isogloss without any deeper etymology.

However, a key to this etymology can be found in the Celtic word for ‘beak’:

Celtic *\*gulbā*, *-iā* & *\*gulbīno-* ‘beak’ (Stokes & Bezenberger 1894: 115; Matasović 2009: 168-9).

Gaulish *\*gulbia* > Latin *gulbia* (Isidore of Seville), cf. Old Brittonic *Re-gulbium* ‘name of a promontory’;

Middle Irish *gulba* f. ‘beak, jaw’, *gulban* m. gl. *aculeum*, i.e. ‘beak, sting’.

Old Welsh m. and f. *gilbin* ‘acumine’, Middle Welsh *gylf*, *gylfin*, *gylfant* ‘beak’, Old Breton *golbin*, *golbinoc* gl. acc. *rostratam*, Middle Breton *golff*, Modern Breton *golv* ‘without tail’, Old Cornish *gilb* gl. *foratorium*, gl. *geluin* *rostrum*.

Semantic motivation in the ornithological terminology based on the word ‘beak’ has its analogy e.g. in Germanic *\*snīpōn-*, *\*snīppan-* ‘snipe’: Norwegian *snīpa* ‘beak’ (Falk & Torp 1909: 523).

If this solution is acceptable, it is not necessary to speculate about any pre-Celtic substrate source of the Celtic word.

## 3. Is ‘fox’ a Celto-Baltic or Celto-Slavic isogloss?

Irish *lois* f. ‘fox’ (Dinneen 1927: 672 who also quotes variants *loise*, *luis*) is without any unambiguous etymology. Macbain (1911: 232) reconstructed Celtic *\*luxo-*, deriving it from IE *\*luks-* ‘lynx’. Jones (1953: 43) saw the closest cognate in Cornish *lostek* ‘fox’, deriving both from Celtic *\*losto-/ā* ‘tail’ (Old Irish *los(s)*, Welsh *llost* f., Cornish & Breton *lost* m., Stokes 1894: 256; but Elsie 1979: 137 reconstructs *\*lust-* ‘tail’, comparing it with Old Icelandic *lustr* ‘cudgel’). Finally, Mann (1984-7:

17) included Irish *lois* in his entry *\*alōw-pěks* ‘howling dog, fox’. Among these solutions the derivation from ‘tail’ looks most convincing, cf. Old Indic (Śilarika) *lomataka-* ‘fox’ vs. *lūma-* ‘tail’ or Germanic *\*fuχōn-* and *\*fuχsa-* ‘fox’, Torwali *puš*, Khowar *pūši* id. < Indo-Aryan *\*pucchī* vs. Old Indic *púccha-* ‘tail’ etc. But there are also other possibilities for the internal reconstruction of Irish *lois(e)*: (a) *\*lopsī, -iā-*; (b) *\*loipsā* (concerning the development *\*-ps-* > *-s-*, cf. Old Irish *ós, úas* ‘over, up’ < *\*oup-su*, see Pokorny 1959: 1107).

The alternatives (a) and (b) have their promising cognates in Baltic and Slavic respectively, but not together, since they exclude one another:

(a) Baltic *\*lapsā* f. continues in Latvian *lapsa* ‘fox’, while the unique *lapse, lapsis* attested only in *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum* can reflect *\*lapsijā, -ijas* (Mühlenbach & Endzelin 1927: II.422; Karulis 1992: I.501). The masculine counterpart *\*lapas* may be identified in Kurish *laps* m. (El Mogharbel 1993: 245) and Yatvingian *lapf* (Zinkevičius 1984: 14), cf. Lithuanian *sėnas* ‘old’ vs. Yatvingian *senf*. The component *laps-* in the Lithuanian river name *Laps-kójis*, lit. ‘fox’s leg’, represents more probably the syncopated genitive *lapės* (Vanagas 1981: 181).

The asigmatic variant *\*lapijā* f. appears in Prussian *lape* (Elbing Vocabulary #658 ‘Vochz’), Lithuanian *lāpė* (Bammesberger 1970: 38-43; Toporov 1975-90: V.83-9). Identifying the same suffix *\*-iyā* in the feminine *vilkė* ‘she-wolf’, Bammesberger (1970: 39) assumes the following development: *\*włk<sup>v</sup>-ī-* (= Old Indic f. *vṛkī-*) + feminine marker *\*-ā* > Baltic *\*vilk-ij-ā* > Lithuanian *vilkė*. This idea also implies the existence of the form *\*lapas* corresponding to the masculine *vilkas* (cf. Kurish *laps*, Yatv. *lapf* analyzed above). The Baltic nom. sg. ending *\*-as* can indicate not only the masculine *o*-stem, but also the neuter *es*-stem with the nom. sg. in *\*-os* (cf. Brugmann 1906: 524 quoting e.g. Lithuanian *kvāpas* = Latin *vapor*, gen. *-ōris*). If we accept this hypothesis, the following scenario could explain the origin of both variants: the verbal root *\*lAp-* (*A* = *\*o* or *\*a*) extended in *-es-* resulted in the abstract noun *\*lAp-os*, gen. *\*lAp-es-os*. Its plural *\*lAp-es-eH<sub>2</sub>* could be reinterpreted as the feminine *\*lAp(e)sā* > Latvian *lapsa*. On the other hand, the nom. sg. *\*lAp-os* gave Baltic *\*lapas* and this form could be reinterpreted as a masculine. Later the corresponding feminine *\*lap-ī* was formed, too; its final shape came into being by adding the most wide-spread feminine ending *\*-ā*: *\*lap-ī-ā* > *\*lap-ij-ā* > *\*lapē* (Bammesberger 1970: 39).

The hypothesis based on the primary *s*-stem explains sufficiently the existence and mutual relations of both *lapsa* and *lapě* forms. The same cannot be said about the alternative derivation of the sigmatic extension from *\*-k̑-*.

(b) The second alternative is as follows: Slavic m. *\*lisъ* continues in Old Church Slavonic *lisъ*, Serbo-Croatian dial. *līs*, Slovenian *lis*, gen. *lísa*, Upper Sorbian, Polish *lis*, Kashubian *lēs*, Slovincian also *lās*, Belorussian *lis*, Ukrainian *lys*, Russian (archaic) *līs*. In Czech, *lis* has shifted its meaning to ‘press’ (= ‘choking’); f. *\*lisa* is attested in Bulgarian *lísa* (further the dialectal forms as *lesá*, *ljása* reflecting *\*lěsa*; they are probably influenced by *les* < *\*lēsъ* ‘forest’), Macedonian, Old Czech *lisa*, Belorussian, Russian *lisá*, Ukrainian *lýsa*. The most widespread form is extended in *\*-ica*: Church Slavonic & Macedonian *lisica*, Bulgarian *lisíca*, dial. *lesíca*, Serbo-Croatian *lisica*, Slovenian *lisíca*, dial. *lesica*, Polabian *lajsajčə*, Polish *lisica*, Belorussian and Russian *lisíca*, Ukrainian *lysýcja*. This form is missing in Slovak, Czech and Sorbian, where *liška* and *liška* respectively appear. With respect to the complementary distribution it seems probable to identify here the diminutive *\*lisičьka* (Bulgarian *lisíčka*, Slovenian *lisíčka*, Polish dial. *lisiczka*, Ukrainian *lysýčka*, Russian *lisička*), assimilated in *\*lišička* and finally syncopated in *\*liščka* > *liška* (cf. Machek 1971: 336 and Trubachev in ESSJ: XV.142, 151).

The accentuation *\*lisъ* indicates the original diphthong *\*-ei-* (Sławski 1970: 277-8). The absence of the change *s* > *x/š* (the *RUKI*-law) implies the original cluster *\*-Ps-* or *\*-Ts-*. The reflex *\*k̑* should be taken into account, too, but for the same arguments as in Baltic it is omitted. Consequently, the reconstruction *\*(w)leipso-/ā* has usually been chosen. But among numerous zoonyms with the similar consonantal skeleton (*\*(w)-l-p-(s-)*) there is only one form compatible also with Slavic in vocalism, namely Irish *lois*, if it is a continuant of *\*loipsā*. The only difference lies in the root vocalism, namely the opposition *ei* vs. *oi* can reflect the old ablaut, cf. e.g. Old Irish *froech*, Welsh *grug* ‘heather’ (*\*wroiko-*) vs. Greek ἐρείκη id. (Pokorny 1959: 1155).

The preceding analysis isolated the primary (‘Brugmannian’) roots *\*lop-* or *\*lap-* (*\*lǫp-*) in Baltic and *\*leip-* in Slavic. The Irish counterpart is derivable from both *\*lop-* (but not from *\*lap-*) and *\*leip-*. Although *\*lop-* (and *\*lap-*) and *\*leip-* are not directly compatible, they agree in semantics, which the following examples demonstrate:



(a) *\*lop-/lap-*: Ossetic *laefīnæ* ‘bright ray, light’ (Abaev 1973: 19; the vowel of the first syllable reflects Iranian *\*a* and not *\*i* < IE *\*ǵ* = *\*H*), Hittite *lap-* ‘to glow’, *lappiya-* ‘fever’, (?) <sup>GIS</sup>*lappiya-* ‘embers, kindling’ (CHD: 39, 44), Greek λάμπω ‘I shine, I am bright’ (with a frozen nasal infix), λοφνίς ‘torch’ (*\*lop-sn<sup>0</sup>*) (Chantraine 1968: 617, 647), Old Irish *lassaim* ‘I flame’, *lassair* ‘flame’, Welsh *llachar* ‘coruscus, igneus’ (*\*laps-*; but also *\*laks-*) vs. Old Irish *loscain* ‘I burn’, Welsh *llosgi* ‘urere’ (*\*lop-sġ-*) (Stokes 1894: 238, 256); Old English *lēven*, *-in* ‘lightning’ (Holthausen 1921: 62), Lithuanian *lópė*, Latvian *lāpa* ‘torch’, Prussian *lopis* [Elbing Vocabulary 44] ‘Flamme’ (Fraenkel 1962-5: 386; Toporov 1975-90: V.353ff.). The Baltic forms reflect *\*lāp-* in ‘Brugmannian’ reconstruction, i.e. *\*leH<sub>2</sub>p-* in the laryngealistic reconstruction. The ‘Brugmannian’ pair *\*lap-* & *\*lop-* is compatible only starting from the apophonic opposition zero grade: *o*-grade, i.e. *\*lHp-*: *\*lHop-*. The identification *\*H* = *\*H<sub>2</sub>* (Beekes 1988: 27, 36) is based on Baltic *\*ā* (different from *\*ō*), pre-Celtic *\*laps-* or *\*laks-* and Greek λάμπω, rather differing from the formation of nasal presents in Greek (cf. e.g. Hirt 1902: 372-7 and Kuiper 1937: 118, 152).

(b) *\*leip-/loip-*: Irish *laom* ‘blaze’ (*\*loipsm<sup>0</sup>*), Old Icelandic *lifa* ‘to blaze’, *leiptr* ‘lightning’, Lithuanian *liepsnà* ‘flame’, *līpst* ‘burns’, *pālipas* ‘Holzspan’, Latvian *liesma* ‘flame’, *lipt* ‘glänzen, anzünden’ (Pokorny 1959: 653; Fraenkel 1962-5: 366-7; Mann 1984-7: 704).

(a/b) Old Irish *loise* ‘flame, blaze; splendour’ (DIL: L-190-91) is derivable from both *\*lopsiā* and *\*loipsā*.

The preceding thoughts imply that the primary abstract noun *\*lop-es-* proposed above could mean ‘brightness’. Similarly, in Slavic we may expect a synonymous primary abstract noun *\*leip-es-*. Thematized, it gave *\*leips-o-/ā* ‘that characterized by brightness’. The same process is evident for Indo-Iranian *\*vatsá-* ‘calf’ derivable from *\*wét-es-* ‘year’ (Mayrhofer 1995: 495). It is quite possible that almost all the animal names in *-s-* originated in a similar way (cf. Brugmann 1906: 546-7).

The semantic motivation ‘fox’ = ‘shining’, i.e., ‘that with shining hair or tail’, is well-known, cf. Old Icelandic *skolli* ‘fox’ vs. *skulla* ‘to

shine' (Vries 1962: 498) or Greek Λάμπουρος 'name of a dog', lit. 'that with shining tail', or the appellative f. λάμπουρις 'fox' (Aeschylus; see Chantraine 1968: 617).

Masaryk University, Brno

### Abbreviations

BSW = Trautmann, R., 1923 [1970], *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen.

CHD = Güterbock, H.G. & Hoffner, H.A., 1989, eds., *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, L-N*, Chicago.

DIL = Quin, E.G. *et al.*, 1990, eds., *Dictionary of the Irish Language (Compact Edition)*, Dublin.

Elbing Vocabulary = Mažiulis 1988-93.

ESSJ = Trubachev, O.N. *et al.*, 1974ff., eds., *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov [Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Languages]*, Moscow.

GPC = *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru I (A-Ffysur)*, 1950-67, Caerdydd.

HED = Puhvel, J., 1984-91, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary 1-2 (A, E & I), 3 (H)*, Berlin – New York – Amsterdam.

LIV = Rix, H., & Kümmel, M. *et al.*, 2001, eds., *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben<sub>2</sub>*, Wiesbaden.

### References

**Abaev**, V.I., 1973, *Istoriko-ėtimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka [Etymological Dictionary of the Ossetian Language]*, vol. 2, Leningrad.

**Andersen**, H., 1996, *Reconstructing Prehistorical Dialects: Initial Vowels in Slavic and Baltic*, Berlin – New York.

**Bammesberger**, A., 1970, 'Litauisch *lāpė* und lateinisch *volpēs*', in: Rūķe Draviņa, V., ed., *Donum Balticum: Fs. Christian S. Stang*, Stockholm, 38-43.

**Beekes**, R.S.P., 1988, 'PIE. *RHC-* in Greek and Other Languages', *IF* 93, 22-45.

[Bielowski, A., ed., 1853,] **Trogus**, Pompejus, *Fragmenta: quorum alia in codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecae Ossolinianae invenit, alia in operibus, scriptorum maximam partem Polonorum, iam vulgatus primus*

- animadvertit, fragmenta pridem nota adiunxit, ac una cum prologis historiarum philippicarum et criticis annotationibus*, Leopolis.
- Buck**, C.D., 1949, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, Chicago.
- Bernardo Stempel**, P., de 1999, *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen*, Tübingen.
- Blažek**, V., 1997, 'Lisъ', *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* 7, Praha, 427.
- Brugmann**, K., 1906<sup>2</sup>, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 2.1. Strassburg.
- Chantraine**, P., 1968-, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris.
- Detschew**, D., 1957, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*, Wien.
- Dineen**, P., 1927, *An Irish-English Dictionary*, Dublin.
- El Mogharbel**, Ch., 1993, *Nehrungskurisch. Dokumentation einer moribunden Sprache*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Elsie**, R.W., 1979, *The Position of Brittonic*, Bonn (Inaugural Dissertation).
- Endzelin**, J. & Hausenberg, E., 1934-8, *Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu K. Mühlensbachs Lettisch-deutschem Wörterbuch I-II*, Riga.
- Falk**, H. & **Torp**, A., 1909, *Wortschatz der Germanischen Spracheinheit*, Göttingen.
- Fraenkel**, E., 1962-5, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg – Göttingen.
- Griepentrog**, W., 1995, *Die Wurzelnomina des Germanischen und ihre Vorgeschichte*, Innsbruck.
- [Groningen, B. A., van, ed., 1963,] **Herodotus**. *Historiën*, Leiden.
- Hirt**, H., 1902, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre: eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Griechischen*. Heidelberg.
- Holder**, A. T., 1896-1907, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, Bd. I-III. Leipzig.
- Holthausen**, F., 1921, 'Wortdeutungen', *IF* 39, 62-74.
- [Hude, K., ed., 1898-1901,] **Thucydides**, *Historiae*, Leipzig.
- Jones**, J. M., 1913, *A Welsh Grammar*, Oxford.
- Jones**, D. M., 1953, 'Etymological notes', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 43-51.
- Karulis**, K., 1992. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*, Riga, 2 vols.
- Kloekhorst**, A., 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston.

- Kretschmer**, P., 1896, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen.
- Kuiper**, F.B.J., 1937, *Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia*, Amsterdam.
- Lidén**, E., 1929, 'Zur vergleichenden Wortgeschichte', *KZ* 56, 211-22.
- Macbain**, A., 1911, *An Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language*, Stirling.
- Machek**, V., 1971, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Czech Language*], Praha.
- Mann**, S.E., 1984-7, *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*, Hamburg.
- Marcellinus**, 1840, *Vita Thucydidi*, in: *Thucydidis Historia belli Peloponnesiaci acc. Marcellini Vita, Scholia Graeca emendatius expressa, et indices nominum et rerum*. Paris.
- Martirosyan**, H. K., 2010, *Armenian Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden – Boston.
- Matasović**, R., 2009, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden – Boston.
- Mayrhofer**, M., 1995, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Heidelberg, 2 vols.
- Mažulis**, V., 1988-93, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. I (A–H). II (I–K)*, Vilnius.
- Mühlenbach**, K., & **Endzelin**, J., 1925-7, *Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Riga, 2 vols.
- Olsen**, B. A., 1999, *The Noun in Biblical Armenian*, Berlin – New York.
- Pedersen**, H., 1909, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen I*, Göttingen.
- Pokorny**, J., 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern – München.
- Rapallo**, U., 1991, 'Cimr. *eryr* 'aquila' (ExR-): problemi e perspective della ricerca etimologica', *AIQN* 13, 129-170.
- Robinson**, F.N., 1908, 'The Irish Lives of Guy of Warwick and Bevis of Hampton', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 6, 9-180.  
[Nobbe, C. F. A., ed., 1966,] **Ptolemaeus**, Claudius, *Geographia*, Hildesheim.
- Schrijver**, P., 1991, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- Schrijver**, P., 1995, *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam – Atlanta.
- Schulze**, W., 1908, 'Vom idg. *l*-Suffix', in: *Jagić-Festschrift: Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*, Berlin, 343-7.

- Schulze**, W., 1913, 'Der Fuchs', *KZ* 49, 287-8.
- Schumacher**, S., 2004, *Die keltischen Primärverben*. Innsbruck.
- Schuster-Šewc**, H., 1981-4, *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache* 2, Bautzen.
- Skok**, P., 1971-4, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* [*Etymological Dictionary of Croatian and Serbian Language*], Zagreb, 4 vols.
- Slawski**, F., 1970, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego IV* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Polish Language*], Kraków.
- Smoczyński**, W., 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language*], Wilno.
- Stokes**, W. & **Bezenberger**, A., 1894, *Urkeltischer Sprachschatz*, Göttingen.
- Toporov**, V. N., 1975-90, *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar'* [*Dictionary of the Prussian Language*], Moscow, 4 vols.
- Thurneysen**, R., 1918, 'Irisches', *KZ* 48, 48-75.
- Thurneysen**, R., 1946, *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin.
- Vanagas**, A.P., 1981, *Lietuvių hidronimių etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius.
- Vasmer**, M., 1953-8, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 3 vols.
- Vries**, J. de, 1962<sub>2</sub>, *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Leiden.
- Zinkevičius**, Z., 1984, 'Pol'sko-jatvjažskij slovarik?', *Balto-slavjanskie issledovanija* 1983, 3-30.

### **Acknowledgements**

This study originated in cooperation with the Centre for the Interdisciplinary Research of Ancient Languages and Older Stages of Modern Languages (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University, Brno, and was supported by the grant no. IAA901640805. I am grateful to John Bengtson for his kind correction of my English.