Pfiffig A. J. 1969. Die etruskische Sprache. Versuch einer Gesamtdarstellung. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.

TLE = Pallottino 1968.

Toporov V. N. 1974. Slavjanskie kommentarii k neskol'kim latinskim arhaizmam. *Ètimologija* 1972, 3—19. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.

SUMMARY

A. Gluhak: ETR. *K U R P U*

The Etruscan word *kurpu* means „dwarf" and it is not connected with Lat. *curvus* „crooked, bent", but it came from **kur* „short?, little?" (< Nostr. **KUrE* „short") and **pu* „young person?" (< Nostr. **Poj[*l]i* „young"). *Kurpu* is a compound word as, f.e., θ*evr umines* „Munotaurus", *ram*θ*va* f. PN, θ*upl*θ*a* „female underworld demon", *cezp* „eight" *nur*φ „nine", *zama*θ*i* „gold" and *parni*χ, *par*χ*i*, titles, are.

ERIC P. HAMP   UDC 807,653—54
University of Chicago
Department of Linguistics
Chicago

TWO PREHELLENIC POSSIBILITIES

1. χλαμύς, χλαῖνα 'cloak'

It is pretty well agreed (see Frisk *GEW* 2.1102) that χλαῖνα and χλανίς -ίδος have the same origin. Specifically, χλανίδ- must be derived latterly from χλαῖνα, i.e. **χλάνι̯α*. I would then follow Fraenkel in relating χλαῖνα and χλαμύς -ύδος. Just as we derive βαίνω from **g^wam-i̯ō*, we may easily see **χλάνι̯α* as χλάμ-ι̯α. Our base must therefore be **χλαμ-*.

Since I am not persuaded of the claimed satem nature of Prehellenic (with sibilant output), I therefore propose that we see here a Prehellenic base derived from **k'lom-*. The latter would be in origin an extended form of the IE root **k'el-* 'hide, cover', which also occurs as **k'lā-*; cf. Latin *clam*. Such a root pairing may be compared to **g^wem-*: *g^wā-* 'go'. The formations continued in Skt. *śárman-*, Ir. *colum* (-*n*-), Germanic *helm-* may well reflect this extended form.

2. ἄσιλλα 'yoke'

A. J. van Windekens, *Le Pélasgique* (Louvain 1952) 71, would have ἄσιλλα with a suffix in -ι-λ- (op. cit. 39 § 73) from a base *u̯oǵh-. I have however rejected[1] the claimed satem nature of Prehellenic.

If this word is at all to be explained along lines proposed by van Windekens, I propose that we start from Pokorny's (*IEW* 1116) root 3. u̯edh-. We then find in OIr. 2. *feidil* 'yoke' (*Dictionary of the Irish Language* F [1950] 62) a close parallel. It is difficult, on the slender attestation of case forms of *feidil*, to be certain of its original stem formation; it appears to be *u̯edeli.- We might then schematically reconstruct ἄσιλλα as *u̯odh-s-(i)l-, or conceivably *u̯odh-t-(i)l-[2].

On the basis of our present knowledge it is difficult to be precise about the morphology of such forms. The *-s- of *u̯odh-s-(i)-l could be credited to sigmatic forms of the verb, as we see in Celtic, Greek and Latin nominalizations of verb stems. We would then have at bottom a formation resembling that of Greek ζεύγλη. On the other hand, we might have a nomen instrumenti in *-slo- such as Lat *scāla*[3]. But it is also possible that we have here some development of the well known nomen instrumenti in *-tlo-; yet for such formations we do not expect an *o*-grade of the root.

Received 30. aug. 1981.

---

[1] *Živa Antika* 29, 1979, 209 footnote 1.

[2] See also my discussion of this root, *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12, 1969, 161.

[3] Cf. *AJP* 101, 1980, 331—2. Compare also the Slavic selection of *-slo* for dental-final roots.