Although problems of diachrony have traditionally been prominent in Baltic linguistics, *LgB* will be open to contributions of a synchronic character as well. Along with the diminishing interest in historical and comparative studies after the Second World War, there has also been a decrease in the number of Indo–European and Slavonic scholars using the Baltic languages as a source of data. One of our aims will therefore be to reestablish the links traditionally connecting Baltic Studies both with Slavonic Studies and with Comparative Indo–European Linguistics, now cultivated mainly in the German speaking countries and in the USA.

Whether this aim will be achieved will depend, as always, on the Authors and their willingness to cooperate with the Editors.

For ourselves we reserve the role of coordinators and performers of editorial tasks. Here we wish to thank those scholars who have agreed to be members of the Advisory Board supporting our endeavours. Our thanks are also due to those who, within a short space of time, sent us contributions for the inaugural volume of *LgB*. The wide range of subjects covered by it augurs well for the future.

Starting with the first volume, *LgB* is publishing a *Current Bibliography of Baltic Linguistics*, compiled with the aid of colleagues from various countries. In order to ensure that the bibliographical data are complete, the Authors are requested to send offprints of their publications to the coordinator of the Bibliography, Dr. A. Holvoet.

Our journal is published with modest financial support. As expenses should be kept as low as possible, all editorial work is done by the staff members of the Department of Baltic Philology of the University of Warsaw rather than by the publisher. In order to help them in performing this task, the contributors are kindly requested to submit carefully prepared manuscripts conforming to the instructions contained in the Notes to Contributors. Authors using a computer are encouraged to send us a disk copy of their paper in addition to the manuscript (an IBM compatible editor should be used).

Centum borrowings in Balto–Slavic

Eric P. Hamp

(Chicago Ill.)

Abstract

Stray forms in Balto–Slavic with unexpected reflexes of Indo–European palatals cannot be explained away by ad hoc Lautgesetze. Occasionally the selfsame language shows two forms in seeming conflict as reflexes of a single ancestor; such is seen in Old Prussian *balgnan* and *balsinis*. One of these must then be a loan. Instead of lowering our standards in the search for regularity, we must subdivide our data to discern more restricted regularities, and recognize the social intrusion of borrowing as itself a normal and highly constrained regularity.

The fact that Balto–Slavic must be seen as having had early contacts with centum–type dialects has long been known. Attempts to explain away such forms as Lith. *klausýti* or *kárvė* = Russ. *koróva*, SCr. *krava* as special indigenous sound changes are nothing other than retreats in our two centuries of progress in the formulation of regular linguistic change and the isolation of the effects of social interaction.

In this sense I have attributed (Hamp 1972:179) the etymon of Slavic **bergъ* 'slope' and Lith. *birginti* 'to be stingy' together with related forms in the field of 'hill, barrow, bury, hide, save, conserve' to borrowing from a centum source where **bhergh-* was the normal outcome of IE **bherǵh-* 'increase, grow'.

Within a single Baltic language we find an excellent parallel to this state of affairs. The two divergent developments within a single language clearly call for two separate explanations, two independent derivations. Fortunately,

they harmonize with our other accumulated evidence. In Old Prussian we find both *balgnan* 'satel' and *balsinis* 'kussen'; for detail and philological accounting see V. Mažiulis (1988:130-1).

I believe that I have recently (Hamp 1991:6-9) clarified the reflexes of the IE base *$bhel\acute{g}h$-, from which OIr. *bolg* masc. 'bag' goes together with Germanic *$balgiz$, and OIr. *Bolg* (*Builc*) → *Βόλγιος* together with Germanic *$belgan(an)$ 'swell (with anger)'. Thus the Celtic nouns for 'bag' and 'belly' represent * $bh\acute{o}l\acute{g}ho$-s, while the ethnicon *Builc* (plural) represents *$bhol\acute{g}h\acute{o}$-s, the nomen agentis. The semantics of 'bag' could account for any sense of 'cushion' or 'saddle'; the original palatal in this base is beyond question, but we will come to this matter later.

Therefore the noun *balsinis* < *$bal\check{z}$- reflects the inherited *$bhol\acute{g}h$- in Old Prussian.

It follows that *balgnan* 'satel' must be a loan from a centum dialect. It would be an unnecessary complexity to suppose a borrowing from some pre-IE source. Moreover, by having this borrowing from a centum source present we are all the more assured of the correctness of the attribution of this Balto-Slavic etymon *$bal\check{z}$-(e)in- to the IE base *$bhel\acute{g}h$-, with final palatal aspirate.

Because we find disagreement in the apparent reflexes of the palatals, or "gutturals" (I like Pedersen's old term), we must not abandon our principles, our clear thinking, our fundamental observations. We must defend the regularity discovered by the clear analysis of our predecessors. And we must use orderly argument elaborated by our more recent theory – theory which, be it noted, is not in conflict with our antecedents, and esp. Brugmann and Osthoff 1876. I thus agree for IE *k, *$g(h)$ and *k', *$\acute{g}(h)$ with Chr. S. Stang (Stang 1966:90-91).

One could even entertain a dissimilation argument as Meillet did (see Stang 1966:17 and 91-2). But apart from the objections which Stang raised (Stang 1966:92), which rest essentially on the inconsistency of these arguments as applied to the separate cases (*klausýti* = Latv. *klàusît* : *slově* = Latv. *slava*; *žąsìs* but *gǫsь*; OPr. *sasins* = OHG *hasō* > *Hase*; *širšuõ* = Latv. *sir̃sins* = OPr. *sirsilis* 'wasp' = SCr. *sr̀šljen* = OHG *hornuz* = Lat. *crābrō*; *kláusti* : Slavic *slyšati*; *šẽšuras* : Slavic *svekrъ, but *smakrà*), such a set of inconsistencies will not be rescued simply by spreading their relations more broadly over a range of kinship. Moreover, there are sub-consistencies which this argument misses, e.g. the neutralization before sonant which Albanian

regulary shows. This latter argument could be used to rationalize the loan source, as I have done for Polish *karw* = OPr. *curwis* and the other etyma displaying a liquid (Hamp 1969:44-5). Furthermore, a dissimilation argument would be persuasive only for the chronology when the reflex of IE *k' approximated the retracted sibilant *$\underset{.}{s}$. On the last situation see my essay (Hamp 1973).

Note, too, that as my argument in Hamp (1969:45) made clear, the source of the consonantisms involving neutralization before sonant would not be properly called "centum" in the conventional sense.

We see that in addition to normal satem-type descent (e.g. Lith. *šáuti*, *sim̃tas*, *širdìs*, *širšuõ*) and borrowing from neutralization source(s), a descent that is also in its own way governed, we must further allow for borrowing from neighbouring true centum-type dialects. Such a situation is socially quite normal and expectable in the historic and geographic background that we must accept as a major element of our assumptions. Such a situation would easily explain the presence of Slavic *gǫsь*, as well as Slavic *$berg\sigma$, Lith. *birginti*, and related forms, and OPr. *balgnan*.

Even though, as in any orderly endeavor, we always seek formulations, or laws, of greatest possible simplicity, coverage, and generality, we must be prepared in linguistics, just as workers in the natural sciences are, to find our greatest regularities (e.g. those of Grimm, Lidén, satem, centum, etc.) intersected by those of narrower scope (e.g. Verner's, Saussure's accent retraction, the štokavski or Latvian leftward shifts) and by rule-governed multi-context adjustment or substitutions such as we have been occupied with here. These changes, including events called conflations, interference, and borrowing, are not essentially or necessarily different in kind from those we call laws or regularities provided we make the requisite effort to define, describe and understand them. But we must accept the responsibility for that effort.

Bibliography

Hamp, Eric P. (1969), "Notes on *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* III, 2", *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 30, 44–5.

— (1972), "παρϑένος and its cognates", in: *Homenaje a Antonio Tovar*, Madrid: Gredos, 177–180.

— (1973), "North European 1000", in: *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 13–15 April 1973, Chicago: CLS, 172–178.

— (1991), "*Bouges, Boug(e)y, Bolg, Blatobulgium*", *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 44, 6–9.

Mažiulis, Vytautas (1988), *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, vol. 1: *A–H*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Stang, Chr. S. (1966), *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo etc.: Universitetsforlaget.

University of Chicago
Dept. of Linguistics
1010 E 59th St.
C h i c a g o , IL 60637, USA

Eric P. Hamp

ДВОЙНОЙ ОБЪЕКТНЫЙ ВИНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ И ТРАНЗИТИВНЫЕ ВОЗВРАТНЫЕ ГЛАГОЛЫ В БАЛТО-СЛАВЯНСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

ВАДИМ КРЫСЬКО

(Москва)

Abstract

This article is devoted to Baltic and Slavic constructions with the double object accusative and to transitive reflexive verbs. The double accusative rection of the verbs of movement and teaching takes roots in their causative character. The research of Old Russian sources which has been carried out by the author makes it possible to enlarge the list of such constructions in Slavic area and at the same time supplements the few Baltic data. The phenomenon in question has evident parallels in oldest Indo–European languages and has probably the Proto–Indo–European origin. The specific Balto–Slavic reflexives derivated from the causatives corroborates the long–standing status of the double accusatives. These structures have also a common ground in the Baltic and Slavic languages and can be considered as a legacy and development of the Indo–European semantical and syntactical relations.

До настоящего времени в письменных памятниках, фольклоре и говорах балтийских языков засвидетельствованы лишь отдельные примеры двойного объектного винительного, т.е. сочетания транзитивного глагола с двумя независимыми друг от друга аккузативами, обозначающими неоднородные объекты (чаще всего – лицо и предмет), на которые в равной степени (по крайней мере, формально) распространяется глагольное действие. Эти примеры относятся главным образом к глаголам двух лексико-грамматических групп: движения и обучения. Так, А. В. Попов (1881:246) отметил в сборнике латышских народных песен Я. Спрогиса (1868: 92) (напечатанном, как известно, кириллицей) следующий оборот: Irbīt maṅī *целю веда* 'Куропатка вела меня по дороге (букв. дорогу)'; аналогичную конструкцию при каузативном глаголе обнаружил Я.