

Dirk Boutkan and Sjoerd Michiel Siebinga, *Old Frisian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky. Volume I. Leiden, Boston: Brill. Pp. xxxi + 591.

Anatoly Liberman, University of Minnesota

Old Germanic etymological lexicography has not progressed too far. Holthausen's *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* often looks like an Old English index to Walde-Pokorny (WP). The only etymological dictionary of Old Saxon need not have been published. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* is excellent, but it has not reached even the middle of the alphabet. The dictionaries of Gothic (by Feist and Feist-Lehmann) and Old Icelandic (by Jan de Vries) stand out as the greatest accomplishments in this area. Obviously, students of Germanic philology will take good note of the first etymological dictionary of Frisian (old or modern!). I think they will close it with mixed feelings. The book was conceived under an unlucky star. Dirk Boutkan, its main author, died at the age of 37 and left an unfinished draft of the work that was later edited and published. If Boutkan had lived longer, the whole would have looked different (perhaps more consistent and coherent), but one thing should have been done: before the manuscript went into print, a native speaker of English should have read it, introduction and all. The bibliography was probably put together at the last moment; one might hope for fewer blunders in a sixteen-page list.

The title *Old Frisian Etymological Dictionary (OFED)* is not quite accurate, for Boutkan chose to write a dictionary of the words occurring only in the Riustring manuscript. I will refrain from commenting on the self-evident drawbacks of this plan. *OFED* is part of a project whose goal is to isolate the Indo-European component of various languages, be it Tocharian, Modern Albanian, or Old Frisian. In *OFED* all the words except place and proper names are divided into four groups: Proto-Indo-European (PIE), possibly Proto-Indo-European (PIE [?]), Germanic (Gmc.), and possibly Germanic (Gmc. [?]).

In this dictionary, the number of words without even putative cognates is close to zero. It is not specified in the introduction how Proto-Indo-European words were separated from some candidates for this position. *Brother* 'brother', *fiuwer* 'four', and *ik* 'I' are noncontroversial because they have cognates everywhere. But most lack extensive ties from Norway to India. For instance, Old Frisian (OFr.) *breda* 'roast' (verb) has several secure congeners in West Germanic. Boutkan gives Sanskrit *bhurāti* 'moves rapidly, quivers' and Avestan *barənti* 'when it is stormy' as related and rejects Lat(in) *fretus*, *fretum* 'strait, channel, surging of the sea' as traceable to *\*b<sup>h</sup>r-eto-* rather than *\*b<sup>h</sup>rh<sub>1</sub>-é-ti*, yet labels *breda* as PIE (not PIE [?]). *Warf* 'court' (from *\*crowd*) is akin to Old English (OE) *hwearf*, Old Saxon (OS) *warf*, etc. Its Germanic root is *\*hwerb-* 'turn'. The entry informs us that *\*hwerb* goes back to PIE *\*kuorpo-*, attested in Tocharian B and perhaps Classical Greek (less likely in Welsh). The label is the same: PIE. On the other hand, *mar* 'more' probably has cognates in Celtic, Baltic, and Oscan, but it is classified with PIE [?] words. *Fethe* 'father's sister' is opaque (connected with the word for 'father' or with *πóτνια*? a clipped form? an ancient hypocoristic word?). Yet again the label is PIE [?] *Folgia* 'follow' is called Germanic, but all we read in the etymological section is:

“Possible but disputed cognates are only in Celtic, cf. Welsh *ol* ‘trace’ < \**pol*-...” If *fethe* is PIE [?], so is *folgia*.

Thus the status (PIE, PIE [?], and Gmc.) accorded to Old Frisian words is often shaky. Etymologists cannot use Boutkan’s labels for making decisions which belong where, and should evaluate every entry by using their own judgment. Since I had no access to the computerized version of the dictionary, my calculations should be taken with a grain of salt, but the margin of error is hardly significant. Of all the headwords included 1045 are called PIE, 205 PIE [?], and 301 Gmc. (there are also 143 loanwords, along with proper and place names). Three words have not been assigned to any group. However, the word list contains numerous derivatives (forms with prefixes, enclitics, and others), so that the number of significant words comparable with their counterparts elsewhere is between 1300 and 1350.

The labeling in *OFED* breaks down entirely when it comes to compounds. *Wif* ‘woman, wife’ is called Gmc., and *-strewene* ‘snatching’ PIE. The compound *wifstrewene*, glossed as ‘snatching a woman’, emerges among Proto-Indo-European words. Boutkan adheres to the principle of assigning a compound to the group to which the second element belongs. For example, *ben* ‘bone, leg’ is allegedly Gmc. and *widub* ‘collar’ PIE [?]. Therefore, *widuben* ‘collar bone’ comes as PIE [?], too. Such conclusions are not only illogical. They are harmful, for they imply that *wifstrewene* was definitely, and *widuben* possibly coined in Proto-Indo-European; yet both are Old Frisian formations.

Though the structure of all entries is similar, some are very long, while others are short. In accordance with the conception of the dictionary, every word had to be described as part of Frisian vocabulary (first and foremost, its phonetic makeup is examined) and then as part of the Germanic and, wherever possible, of the Indo-European stock. Since two-thirds of the items included in the dictionary are supposedly of Proto-Indo-European antiquity and 40% of the rest have the label PIE [?], writing detailed entries on them could not be envisioned. Even if Boutkan had adopted Feist’s telegraphic style, he would have been obliged to produce several volumes of WP’s format. Nor was it possible to do justice to the literature on every word, even the post-1927-1932 literature (the dates are those of WP’s compendium). It is no wonder that Pokorny expunged bibliographical references from his *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*.

Boutkan gives many references, but they are unsystematic, sometimes counterproductive (when he says “personal communication” instead of pointing to some well-known published work), and insufficient, even misleading. Patrizia Lendinara’s 1990 article “The Survival of Indo-European Words in Old Frisian” is mentioned at the end of most entries, as though within the space of 25 pages she discovered the origin of the words in question, whereas she only isolated, as best she could, inherited Indo-European words in Old Frisian. To return for the moment to *wif* and *wifstrewene*. At *wif*, Boutkan refers to three works: by Holthausen (1920), Krogmann (1960), and, predictably, Lendinara (1990). Holthausen’s treatment of the subject is brief, whereas Krogmann’s is comprehensive and self-confident (as always). Lendinara adds nothing new. We are not informed why only those works have been chosen and why only one hypothesis was found worthy of discussion. (Boutkan had no trust in the connection between \**wīfa* ‘woman’ and *wība* ‘clothing; ?kerchief’, but wasted a line on the

suggestion that Latvian *viept* ‘mask’ is possibly related to the Germanic forms meaning ‘clothe’). The entry *wifstrewene* ends with a sole reference to Krogmann (1960). But Krogmann’s main thesis is that *wifstrewene* does not mean ‘snatching a woman’. Consequently, the reference should be interpreted in the vague sense that if dictionary users open Krogmann’s article, they will find something about the word in it (including a refutation of the gloss). This is not helpful.

Boutkan’s view of Proto-Indo-European is so clear that he ends up knowing more about the protolanguage than about Old Frisian. It is assumed that Proto-Indo-European had three laryngeals, but had neither /a/ nor initial /b/. Certain vocalic alternations (erratic ablaut) and certain root structures (described by de Saussure) were prohibited. The Indo-Europeanization of Eurasia presupposed multiple language contacts and the inevitability of substrates, superstrates, and adstrates, all subsumed under the generic term “substrate.” The Leiden school distinguishes three substrate layers: 1) the layer “of Old European hydronymy” (“Judging from the distribution of Old European hydronyms, the language reflected in them was spoken over large parts of [W]estern and [N]orthern Europe, including the British Isles, Scandinavia, Germany, Poland and the Baltic region. . . the suggestion that this substratum played an important part in donating lexical material to IE is generally rejected”); 2) the layer heavily present in Germanic but also in Celtic and Balto-Slavic (the so-called language of geminates). “[T]he territory of this language may be found somewhere in Northern Europe.” Its characteristic features are the variation of the final root consonant, which may be single or double, voiced or voiceless, and prenasalized” (geminates apparently did not occur after long vowels), and “the frequent occurrence of word initial *kn-* and *kl-*.” The vowels /a i u/ were allowed, though /a/ was less frequent than the other two. The Germanic variation *i ~ a ~ u* goes back to this substratum. “Continental Germanic also shows *\*a ~ \*e* variation, which cannot be explained by an ablaut pattern (*\*o >*) Gmc. *a ~ (\*e >*) Gmc. *e-*; 3) the “European” (or “Atlantic,” or “North Balkan”) substrate, characterized by the prefix *\*a* (probably stressed) and the frequent occurrence of the vowel *\*a*; a stop system in which labial and velar stops alternated; initial *\*b-*; a category of stops, probably having aspiration; the fricatives  $\chi$  and  $\theta$ ; such non-Indo-European vowel alternations as *a ~ au*, *a ~ ai*, *u ~ ū* (PIE  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{u}$  derive only from *i*, *u*, followed by a laryngeal), *a ~ ā*,  $\bar{a} \sim a$ , and *i ~ ī* (the freedom that may point to non-phonemic length), and initial *\*k-*, “if this is a plain velar and not a palatal.” There was also a substrate present mainly in the Mediterranean; Germanic etymologists may disregard it. See pp. xiv-xvii of the introduction.

A word can be recognized as belonging to a substrate if it has limited geographical distribution and displays phonological or morphological irregularities, unusual phonology, unusual word formation, and specific semantics, that is, “belongs to a semantic category which is particularly liable to borrowing” (p. xiv). Of 215 words labeled PIE [?] only 23 have been assigned to the substrate (approximately 9.74%). By contrast, of 301 allegedly Germanic words 238 are said to be of substrate origin (slightly over 79%), but among the remaining 63 words in at least 11 cases the material makes one wonder why a non-Indo-European origin has not been suggested for them. If we add 11 to 238 we will come up with about 80%. Thus the chance of a word labeled PIE [?] to be taken over from a substrate is roughly one in ten, while the chance of a Germanic word without established cognates outside Germanic to be posted among borrowings is eight times higher. To put it differently, a word with dubious Indo-European antecedents was

hardly taken over from a substrate, whereas a Germanic word isolated in its group is most probably a loan from a substrate language. We get no information about what to do with Germanic words not assigned to the substrate, such as *heta* ‘be called, order’ or *hlia* ‘declare, establish’. At *helich* ~ *helech* ‘holy’, the Germanic cognates are listed, and nothing else is said. Such cases are rather numerous.

Before having a closer look at presumable borrowings from unidentified languages, a few remarks should be made. Boutkan’s version of substrate studies is unusually broad. The reader of Martinet’s 1937 book *La gémination consonantique d’origine expressive dans les langues germaniques* detects considerable overkill in the author’s use of a single factor: many words he cites are not expressive, but some examples are convincing. At the end of the 19th century, Kluge-Kauffmann’s theory reigned supreme: every *pp*, *tt*, *kk* was traced to *\*-pn’*, *\*-tn’*, *\*-kn’*. At that time, too, some forms seem to have been explained correctly. Now geminates have emerged as a feature of the substrate. Shouldn’t the new explanation take cognizance of its predecessors, or does an alternative explanation nullify all previous ones by the fact of its existence? *Skuva* ‘shove, push’ has secure cognates in Lithuanian and Slavic (Boutkan refers to Pokorny but does not discuss the probable cognates in Indo-Iranian). In the entry *skuva* Gmc. we read: “The Gmc. pattern *\*skūb* ~ *\*skupp-*, i.e. the presence of root variants showing a long vowel before a single consonant as against a short vowel followed by a geminate is a well-attested feature of North European substratum words (Kuiper’s category A<sub>2</sub>).” But verbs designating a strong physical effort are among the best examples of words with expressive gemination.

The substrate theory, as it is applied in the dictionary, knows almost nothing about a living, developing language. All words are said to be either inherited or (probably) borrowed. Once the phrase *folk etymology* turns up, several times onomatopoeia and Germanic-Celtic innovations are mentioned, but the idea that new words can be coined by the hundreds hardly bothered Boutkan. Every modern language has countless nouns, verbs, and adjectives of undiscovered origin. Most slang is such, and when an argotic word can be traced to a foreign source, it often turns out that in the lending language it is also impenetrable from an etymological point of view. In American slang, a state of nervous excitement can be called *tizzy*, *dither*, and *swivet*. Their phonetic shape is somewhat unusual, their related forms have not been found, and their origin, except possibly for *tizzy*, is “unknown.” To complicate matters, *tizzy*, recorded only in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, first surfaced in texts with the meaning ‘sixpence’ (the same word?). *Tizzy*, *dither*, and *swivet* are not substrate words, are they?

Phonetic laws work across the board, but onomatopoeia, sound symbolism, taboo, and other processes (partly ludic) interfere with regular correspondences. Whoever the earliest speakers of Proto-Indo-European (and by the same token, of Germanic) were and wherever their homeland may have been, they had ample time to coin new “regional” words. The material they used for “innovations” is often beyond recovery, and the same holds for *swivet* and its kin. Most of them need not be borrowings from unknown languages. Boutkan says about *buk-* ‘belly’ Gmc.: “No certain Indo-European etymology.” He stops short of calling it a substrate word and leaves it in limbo. However, words beginning with *bu-* ~ *pu-* designate swollen objects (some of which inspire fear) all over Eurasia. They are onomatopoeic or sound symbolic (or both) and searching for their “Indo-European etymology” is a waste of time. Jan de Vries ascribed, imprudently as it

appears, many Dutch words to the substrate, but he was open to the idea of language as a living organism, while Boutkan was not.

Another question concerns the situation of languages in contact. Learning to speak the language of one's neighbors without an accent is not easy. People borrow foreign morphemes and foreign words, but phonemic importation is rare. Why did the Proto-Indo-Europeans take over unpronounceable vowels and consonants and acquire new speech habits? Judging by their propensity to learn words and sounds from languages vastly different from their own, they must have found "foreignisms" appealing. No doubt, they appropriated a good deal of non-Indo-European morphology too (cf. imported ablaut series). We obtain a picture of conquerors who retained their language but borrowed numerous phonological elements from the conquered and adopted alien speech habits (for example, gemination). Unable to produce [a] and initial [b], they borrowed words with them (without modifying either the vowel or the consonant) right and left. They went so far as to absorb roots with a structure prohibited in their language. This picture is not realistic.

Theories of massive foreign influences are many. Kusmenko seeks the origin of several basic features of Scandinavian phonetics and grammar in Saami (Lapp). Venneman has for years been on the lookout for borrowings by Proto-Indo-European from Basque and Semitic. Koivulehto's list of borrowings from Germanic into Finnish grows every year. In Romance linguistics, the substrate is one of the most popular topics, so that Boutkan is in good company. To see how he holds his own in the substrate club, we will now examine the Old Frisian words allegedly borrowed from non-Indo-European substrates, as they appear in *OFED*. I tried to divide them into more or less homogeneous groups. After every word I will cite the reason for which it has been assigned to the substrate.

ACTIONS: *-bijenna* 'begin' Gmc. ("the various present and preterite formations, the unclear geminate *-nn-*, and perhaps also the variation in prefixes (attached to a hardly attested simplex) may point to a non-IE adstratum"), *branga* 'bring, etc.' Gmc. (no specific reason given), *breka* 'break, etc.' (probably "an Italic-Celtic-Germanic word which may have a substratum origin"), *drega* 'carry' PIE [?] (origin problematic, "perhaps... a non-IE word"), *fa* 'catch, etc.' PIE (words like *pack* ~ *bag* reflect a non-IE consonant variation; Du. *pakken* 'seize' is an unshifted substrate form; if I understand the idea correctly, *fa* < *\*fāhan-* is a shifted form of that word and is unrelated to Du. *pak* 'luggage, pack'), *halia* 'get, take away, etc.' WGmc. (isolated; hence from a substrate), *helpa* 'help' Gmc. (isolated; hence probably from a substrate), *hlapa* 'walk, run, etc.' Gmc. (short *a* is strange; the only IE cognate is the unclear Baltic *\*klub<sup>h</sup>/p*), *have* 'possessions' Gmc. (but I added it to actions, that is, verbs on account of *habēre*, etc. discussed in the entry; the consonantal variation *\*kap-* ~ *\*g<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-* seems to point to "a European substratum word"), *ja* 'confess, etc.' Gmc. (no secure cognates outside IE), *kerva* 'cut, carve' Gmc. (no IE etymology, unless Old Irish *cerbaim* 'cut' is related; a substrate word with *k-* unshifted), *kriapa* 'creep' Gmc. (no IE etymology, the variation short vowel + long consonant ~ long vowel + short consonant: *\*krūp-* ~ *krupp*), *-kwinka* 'disappear' Gmc. (limited distribution: the only questionable cognate in Lithuanian and a possibility of comparing *\*kwink-* with *wīn-*), *lathia* 'invite, summon' Gmc. (the same as above, but a substrate origin is not suggested), *muga* 'be able' Gmc.; (discussed

at *-machtich* ‘mighty’ Gmc.; comparable only with a form in O[ld] C[hurch] S[lavonic]), *niga* ‘bend’ Gmc. (no clear IE etymology; the alternation *\*-b<sup>h</sup> ~ \*g<sup>w</sup>*), *risa* ‘rise’ PIE [?] (PIE *\*h<sub>3</sub>rei-* [?]; “[s]ince only Gmc. *\*rīsanaN* and its cognates are attested as *s* derivations of this PIE root, it is possible that we must look in a different direction for the origin of this etymon, i.e. a European substratum”), *skeppa* ‘create’ PIE [?] (PIE [?] *\*skob-*; the cognates are not secure), *-skrida* ‘stride’ Gmc. (“probably we are dealing with a North European substrate root showing variation of root final consonants”), *skuva* ‘push’ Gmc. (cognates only in Lithuanian and OCS; the Gmc. pattern *\*skūb- ~ \*skupp-*, cf. *kriapa*), *sla* ‘hit, slay, etc.’, Gmc. (only Celtic cognates, the ablaut *\*a ~ \*ō ~ \*u* and the alternation *-g ~ -k*, the latter as in OS, OFr. *slēk* ‘hit, blow, mintage’), *sletel* ‘key’ PIE (given here, for the word in question is *slūta* ‘close’; cognates only with *s*-mobile, “which makes the assumption of a PIE heritage somewhat suspect”), *-snitha* ‘cut’ Gmc. (possible cognates only in Celtic; “[l]ikely to be a North European substratum etymon..., which would also explain the variation of root-final consonants (coupled to different root vowel quantities) *\*snitt- ~ \*snīþ* (rather than expressive gemination...)), *steka* ‘rise, put up’ PIE [?] (“...the relationship between PGmc. *\*steng-a-* (or *\*sting-a-*?) and *stik-a-* remains unclear. Can we, as an alternative, assume variants of a non-IE root *\*sti(n)K-* with optional prenasalization and different root-final consonants...?”), *swilla* ‘swell, rise’ Gmc. (the only possible cognate is in Latin. “The variation of forms with double and single *\*-l-* is also suspect as a non-IE feature. Most likely a substratum etymon”), *-thanka* ‘think’ Gmc. (few secure cognates), *thurva* ‘need, have to’ PIE [?] (perhaps cognate with a verb in Old Prussian; variation of root final consonants sharing the same place of articulation: *\*b ~ \*p*), *treppe* ‘step’ (also the verbs meaning ‘stamp’) Gmc. (only Baltic and Slavic cognates, the alternation *\*i? ~ \*a ~ \*u*, prenasalization, variation of final geminates and short consonants).

ARTIFACTS: *bed* ‘bed’ Gmc. (unclear etymology), *hod* ‘hat’ Gmc. (hardly any non-IE cognates, the impossible IE structure *\*k-d<sup>h</sup>*, gemination), *klath* ‘cloth’ (no etymology), *nette* ‘caul’ Gmc. (this is the Germanic word for “net”; unclear etymology), *-ponna* ‘pan’ Gmc. (no etymology), *skat* ‘lap, skirt’ PIE [?] (no convincing etymology), *skip* ‘ship’ Gmc. (no convincing etymology), *stapul* ‘scaffold’ Gmc. (no convincing etymology; the words usually cited display the ablaut *\*i ~ \*a ~ \*u*, long and short), *stol* ‘throne, chair’ PIE [?] (limited and uncertain cognates; “[a]re we dealing with a North European substratum etymon?”).

BODY PARTS, ORGANS, SENSES: *berd* ‘beard’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; *a* in the reconstructed form *\*b<sup>h</sup>ard<sup>h</sup>ā*), *blod* ‘blood’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology; “I rather assume a non-IE word”), *bos(e)m* ‘bosom, breast’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology; “[n]ote that the word occurs in WGmc. only, which might point to a substratum word”), *flarde* ‘lobe (of a lung)’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “[w]e may be dealing with a common substratum word”), *flask* ‘flesh’ PIE [?] (the same criteria as always, but no mention of the substrate), *haved* ‘head’ Gmc. (no reliable cognates outside Latin, the alternation *\*au ~ \*a*, the unexplained *\*-id- ~ \*-ud-* variation in the suffix, the status of similar but incompatible forms in Celtic), *henda* ‘catch’ Gmc. (here *hond* ‘hand’ is discussed: unclear IE etymology), *her* ‘hair’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “[p]erhaps we are dealing with a substratum word common to Gmc. and Celtic”), *kenep* ‘moustache’ Gmc. (no IE

etymology, ablaut with *\*a*, variants with *kn-*, variation of root final consonants), *lippa* ‘lip’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology, *a* in Latin *labia* and *labra* ‘lips’ is of unclear origin), *maga* ‘stomach’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *smek* ‘taste’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, limited distribution, the variation of root final *\*kk ~ \*k ~ \*g*), *sthiake* ‘jaw’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, the non-IE ablaut pattern, the Germanic protoform *\*keuk < \*gVg* has a structure not allowed in a PIE root), *swarde* ‘skin of the head’ Gmc. (the only cognate is in Latvian; “[p]robably a North European substratum word”), *top* ‘lock, strand of hair’ (that is, ‘top’) Gmc. (no IE etymology), *were* ‘lip’ PIE [?] (unclear, but the substrate is not mentioned), *wliti-* ‘visible part of the body’ Gmc. (no IE etymology).

EMOTIONS (NEGATIVE): *frase* ‘danger’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “[n]ote the different verbal and nominal formations, which may also point to a non-IE origin”), *kar-* ‘affliction, sorrow, mourning, penitence’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “...it is difficult to analyze and group such (partly) expressive and onomatopoeic formations.... I see semantic difficulties with respect to the Gmc. etymon under discussion here, because an expressive formation would only be compatible with the specific meaning ‘sorrow, mourn’. This meaning seems secondary to me. The meaning ‘care (for)’ may be the original one in Gmc. and is not really compatible with a ‘Schallwurzel’. I rather start from a substratum root *\*kar-* ‘care’ > ‘care, mourning’”), *klagi* ‘charge, complaint’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology, limited distribution even in Gmc.), *nith* ‘hatred, feud’ Gmc. (the same as above).

HABITATION: *-burch* ‘city’: loanword [?], Gmc. [?], PIE [?] (“The possibility remains that *\*burgs* directly represents a substratum word in Gmc., related to Gr. *púrgos*”), *hof* ‘yard, etc.’ Gmc. (“[n]o certain IE etymology.... The poor evidence for an IE etymon (the sole Greek/Albanian parallel) contrasts with the abundance of formations and ablaut forms.... This may be interpreted as an indication for a substratum origin”), *therp* ‘village’ PIE [?] (“...cognates are only found in Italic, Celtic and Baltic, perhaps in Gr[EEK], which... makes the root strongly suspect of being borrowed from a (North) European substratum”).

HEAVEN AND EARTH: *Dele* ‘downwards’ Gmc. (here words for “dale” are discussed; no certain etymology; no cognates except perhaps in Slavic; “[i]t seems obvious to assume a substratum word”), *himul* ‘heaven’ Gmc. (a long discussion; no IE etymology. “...we may reconstruct a European substratum word *\*hamip-* ‘shirt’ on the basis of OHG *hemidi* and Gmc. cognates, Welsh *hefys*, Gallo-Lat. *camisia* ‘skirt’), *irthe* ‘earth’ (no IE etymology; “...the reconstruction of an IE etymon would require three different formations in three (four?) different branches, i.e. *\*h<sub>1</sub>er-*, *\*h<sub>1</sub>er-t*, *\*h<sub>1</sub>er-u-*”), *-lende* ‘land’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, limited geographical distribution), *sol-* ‘dirt, vomit’ PIE [?] (uncertain and unclear cognates), *wase* ‘slick, mud’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; cognates found only in Baltic), *-worth* ‘mound, hill’ PIE [?] (“the remarkable ‘apparent’ ablaut in Gmc. [see Boutkan’s article in *Historische Sprachforschung* 111, 1998, 102-33] and the strange dental suffix showing unexpected vocalic variation”).

KINSHIP: *-mech* ‘relative’ Gmc. (a particularly detailed discussion; no IE etymology, dubious cognates), *megith* ‘virgin’ Gmc. (“We may be dealing with a loan from MDu....

which would render the evidence of this form no longer useful for reconstructing PFris. The unexplained ablaut patterns point to a North-West European substratum origin of the word”), *stiap-* ‘step-’ Gmc. (“[p]erhaps the unexplained variation of root-final *-f-* and *-p* may be attributed to the substratum origin of the word”).

METALS: Here two words are mentioned (*lad* ‘lead’ and *selover* ‘silver’), both of which have been discussed extensively in the etymological literature.

MONEY, EXCHANGE: *borgia* ‘borrow, take up money’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *jeld* ‘money, recompense’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; the earliest reference, in Tacitus’s Germania, was to sacred banquets. “...the concept of sacred banquets represents a typical feature of early Gmc. society, probably of non-IE origin”), *-lotha* ‘tax’ Gmc. (Boutkan connects *-lotha* in *hūslotha* ‘tax on a house’ with words for “rag”; no IE etymology; long vowel + short consonant alternating with short vowel + long consonant; Boutkan calls this alternation, I think only here, “syllabification pattern”), *panni(n)g* ‘penny’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *skelde* ‘tribute, debts, crime’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “[t]he alleged PIE root *\*(s)kel-*... is limited to Gmc. and Balto-Slavic and is likely to represent an innovation on the basis of [the] North European substrate material”), *thiaf* ‘thief’ Gmc. (Boutkan repeats Lehmann’s explanation that the word probably refers to a specific type of theft due to a social innovation with respect to the ideas regarding property and theft, hence “innovation on the basis of a substratum word”; I am not sure I understand what a specific type of theft means), *wixle* ‘exchange’ PIE [?] (limited distribution).

MUTILATION AND BODILY DEFECTS: *dolch* ‘wound’ PIE [?] (questionable cognates; *\*a*), *hemilinge* ‘mutilation’ PIE [?] (unclear etymology, *\*a*, *\*-b-*; the same doubts are mentioned at *lemithe* ‘paralysis, mutilation’ PIE [?], but a substrate origin is not suggested), *secht* ‘disease’ Gmc. (no IE etymology).

QUALITIES: *balu-* ‘bad, evil’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, *\*a*; “[p]erhaps a [N]orth-European substratum word *\*balu?* ‘evil?’ may somehow (folk etymology) have interfered with the IE word”), *depa* ‘baptize’ PIE [?] (here the words for “deep” are discussed; limited distribution and problems with *d<sup>h</sup>eu-p* “may suggest a European rather than PIE etymon”), *hel* ‘complete, full, etc.’ Gmc. (limited distribution), *het* ‘hot’ Gmc. (limited distribution, the abundance of Germanic formations”), *kalde* ‘cold’ PIE [?] (noun; here the corresponding adjective is discussed; partly incompatible cognates), *klene* ‘small’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, limited distribution; “I doubt the current assumption of one Gmc. etymon that developed from [the] meaning ‘shining’ (*\*gelH-* ... or *√glei-*) through ‘fine’ to ‘small’ (i.e. of size). Why not assume a set of two homonyms, i.e. a word ‘clean, shining, etc.’ beside ‘small’? ... Moreover, the ‘clean’ word has unclear by-forms showing *\*ī*.... ...I think that *\*klainja-* ‘small’ and *\*klainja-* ‘clean’ represent two substratum words”), *long* ‘long’ Gmc. (“[o]n the basis of the geographical distribution, I tend to assume a Central-North European substratum word; ... but there are no positive formal indications confirming the attribution of the word to this layer”), *-nath* ‘bold’ Gmc. (no clear IE etymology, limited distribution), *rede* ‘ready’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; only Baltic cognates), *skadu* ‘sharp’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “[t]he vocalic variation *\*ē* ~ *\*o* (= Gmc. *\*a*) ~ *\*ō* may reflect different vowel substitutions in an original European

substrate etymon”), *unideve* ‘indecent’ Gmc. (= *un-i-deve*; no certain PIE etymology; \*a), *wrak* ‘crooked’ Gmc. (no IE etymology).

RELIGION: *god* ‘God’ PIE [?] (“...perhaps... a non-IE substratum word”), *helich* ~ *helech* ‘holy’ (“the different suffixal formations confirm the substratum origin of the word”), *wia* ‘consecrate’ PIE [?] (“...variation of root final consonants is a common feature of North European substratum words”).

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION: *drochten* ‘lord’ (used for God) PIE [?] (“...limited dialectal distribution. It cannot be excluded that [the word] represents a European innovation on the basis of substratum material”), *eth* ‘oath’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology; “...we may perhaps assume a common non-IE heritage, i.e. a Gmc. loan from Celtic”), *folk* ‘people’ PIE [?] (“...can we assume a substratum word common to Gmc. and B[alto]-S[lavic]?”), *nat* ‘companion or comrade (in arms)’ PIE [?] (from \**neut* ‘to use’; no PIE etymology; limited distribution in Germanic and Baltic), *nathe* ‘rest, mercy, help’ (no clear etymology), *ni* ‘authorized, rightful claim to’ Gmc. (Gmc. \**næh*<sup>w</sup> - < \**nēk*<sup>w</sup>... is difficult to explain from an Indo-European perspective, but a North-West-European substratum origin is unlikely, too, due to its semantics”), *plicht* ‘obligation, responsibility, risk’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *skalk* ‘servant’ (no IE etymology), *-skirma* ‘protect, defend’ PIE [?] (limited distribution; unconvincing semantic reconstruction), *swera* ‘swear, etc.’ (uncertain IE etymology), *-tegia* ‘accuse’ PIE (PIE \**dei*’k-; “the forms with root-final \*g [as in Gothic *taikns*]... perhaps showing another extension to an actual root \**dei*. On the other hand, these forms are only found in Gmc., which makes them suspect as non-IE words), *thiade* ‘people’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *wed* ‘pledge, bail, fine’ Gmc. (no IE etymology).

STICKS, STUBS, STUMPS: *steb-* ‘stump (of a limb)’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *stef* ‘stick, etc.’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *walu-* ‘staff, stick’ PIE [?] (limited distribution, \*a).

TREES AND VEGETATION: *espen* ‘aspen’ PIE [?] (“Are we dealing with a Gmc.-BS word?”), *gers* Gmc. [?], ‘grass’ (only a Latvian cognate), *hethin* ‘heathen’ (here the word for “heath” is discussed; “most probably, a substratum word” common to Germanic and Celtic), *laf* ‘leaves’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; only in Germanic and Celtic).

UNITS OF MEASURE, MULTITUDES, ETC.: *del* ‘part’ Gmc. (no PIE etymology), *half* ‘half’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology; “the best solution seems to be the assumption of a substratum word”), *hap* ‘heap, crowd’ PIE [?] (etymology uncertain; “probably the word is not IE”), *ked(de)* ‘crowd’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; both the Germanic word and its Lithuanian cognate “may... reflect a substratum word”), *meni* Gmc. ‘crowd, common property’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; Boutkan assumes “a North-European substratum underlying the Uralic forms, on the one hand, and the Gmc., Slavic and Celtic ones, on the other”).

WARFARE, WEAPONS: *-ger* ‘spear’ PIE [?] (etymology uncertain; “[w]e may assume a Gmc.-Celtic substratum word”), *-had* ‘battle’ (as part of proper names) PIE [?] (no certain IE etymology, limited distribution), *kletsie* ‘spear’ Gmc. (no IE etymology;

prenasalization and variation of root-final consonants), *ord* ‘spearhead, spear’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *skeld* ‘shield’ PIE (“Allegedly from a root meaning ‘split’.... The shield would originally have been called after the wooden plants (‘split off’ from a tree) it was made of. If we accept the derivation of the word from this root, it seems more probable to me that the word designated a means of protection, i.e. separation between the fighter and the enemy. Given the specific meaning, it cannot totally be excluded that the word does not belong here at all, but represents a non-IE word that coincidentally resembles the members of the IE etymon ‘split’.”), *spiri* ‘spear’ PIE [?] (limited distribution), *strid* ‘battle, legal fight’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; prothetic *s*-, not identical with *s*-mobile), *wepin* ‘weapon’ Gmc. (no cognates outside Germanic), *wich* ‘struggle, battle’ Gmc. (limited distribution, geminates, variation of root-final consonants).

WATER, FISH, ETC.: *fil* ‘fall, steep shore, deep point in the sea’ (only in this Frisian manuscript; Boutkan connects *fil* with Latin *palūs* ‘marsh’, “which probably represents a substratum etymon”), *fisk* ‘fish’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *hef* ‘sea’ Gmc. (“Probably a substratum word \**kap*- taken over from the non-IE inhabitants of the coastal area”), *hop* ‘ring (fig.: the ring of dikes around Frisia)’ Gmc. (no certain IE etymology), *over* ‘shore, bank’ Gmc. (no IE etymology), *pol* ‘pool, puddle’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; initial \**p*), *pet* ‘pool, puddle’ Gmc. [?] (an obscure word; substrate origin possible), *se* ‘sea’ (no IE etymology), *wapul-* ‘pool, etc.’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, the ablaut \**a* ~ *i* ~ *ō*).

As always, some words ended up in “Miscellaneous.” There are six of them: *dom* ‘nostril’ PIE [?] (the word designates any partition; cf. Engl. *dam*; no certain IE etymology), *gadur* ‘together’ PIE [?] (limited distribution, the unclear variation *-il-* ~ *-ul-* in the *o*-stem derivatives), *hunig* ‘honey’ Gmc. (no IE etymology, suffix variation), *-liaga* ‘lie, tell lies’ Gmc. (no IE etymology; “the geminate need not be due to Kluge’s Law (\**lukk-* < \**lug-n*), but may instead reflect a variation of root-final \**-g* (after a diphthong) and \**-kk-* (after a short vowel) that was present in the substratum language”), *opa* ‘on, in, up, etc.’ PIE [?] (no certain IE etymology, the variation \**ūp* ~ \**upp*), *stige* ‘twenty’ (a loanword; “given the limited geographical distribution and the relation to the pre-IE vigesimal counting system, we are probably dealing with a North European substratum word”). About *ploch* ‘plow’ Boutkan says: “...the word may represent a North-European innovation.” If “innovation” stands for “substrate,” then this word belongs with “artifacts.”

The following picture emerges. Every word that lacks an impeccable Indo-European etymology is suspected of being borrowed from a substrate, and, under Boutkan’s pen, this suspicion usually turns out to be justified (the most cautious version is “we may be dealing with a substrate word”). Irregular ablaut and few other features (\**a* in the protoform, an aberrant structure of the root, prenasalization, initial \**b-*, and especially V:C ~ VC:) that allegedly mark substrate elements are statistically inferior to the criterion of limited distribution within the Indo-European family. All kinds of words can be borrowed, and those pertaining to new “realities,” material culture, and nature cross language borders easily. But among the substrate words in *OFED* we find such as designate the most basic actions: *help*, *bring*, *begin*, *rise*, *speak*, *need*, etc. Very little human anatomy proved to be native; borrowings were presumably needed for the names of the beard, head, hand, hair, stomach, blood, and flesh; at least one word for the lip

(*lippa*) is also said to be a borrowing. To the list above *ben* ‘bone, leg’ (Gmc.) can be added. It has no Indo-European etymology, and I do not know why the idea of a substrate was not invoked in this entry. Markey’s and Hamp’s suggestions (Boutkan cites both of them) are uninspiring. Markey’s reference to *h<sub>3</sub>ost* that was replaced by *\*baina-* and to Engl. *key* (< *cæg*) / OFr. *kāi* has no support in the data, for *cæg* ~ *kāi* never referred to the keyhole, while Hamp’s etymon (*\*b<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>inom h<sub>3</sub>ost* ‘cut off bone’) is no more than an exercise in producing asterisked forms.

With regard to the environment we are prepared to encounter substrate words for “sea,” “shore,” and “fish” (after decades of acrimonious debate, Feist’s idea no longer seems to be totally wrong!), but in their homeland the Proto-Indo-Europeans may at least have discovered mud and puddles. However, all three words for “pool; puddle” and both words for “mud; dirt” joined Feist’s maritime vocabulary. The invaders preferred to use new words for “leaves” and “grass,” “hot,” “cold” and “long.” Even such foundational words as *irthe*, *-lende*, and *himil* (‘earth; land; heaven’) are presumed borrowings. If Boutkan’s findings in the area of social relations are trustworthy, the conclusion is inevitable that, as far as the organization of society is concerned, the Indo-European conquerers were in every respect inferior to the peoples they subjugated, for they either did not have the institutions for which they borrowed new words or considered native words inadequate. Here we face substrate names for “people,” “lord,” some administrative units, “assembly,” “oath,” “pledge,” “servant,” kin terms, various money operations, and “thief.” *Helich* ‘holy’ and *god* were, it appears, also imported. Nor did the invaders retain their military vocabulary, though in that sphere everybody else would supposedly have had to learn a good deal from them. Yet *-had*, *strid*, and *wich* (‘battle’), four words for “spear,” as well as *skeld* ‘shield’ and *wepin* ‘weapon’ fared no better than the words for “sea,” “shore,” and the rest.

In my opinion, from an etymological dictionary of Old Frisian we expect a detailed discussion of multifarious specific problems of Frisian and Germanic rather than an attack on Indo-European antiquity. Some reviewers assert that a Germanic etymologist of our time cannot ignore laryngeals. This pronouncement is open to doubt. Indo-European should be left to Indo-Europeanists, who are welcome to edit Pokorny’s lists according to their lights (with reference to Benveniste or Kuiper, or whomever). We may suggest that 5000 years ago the root of the Indo-European word for “bone” was *h<sub>3</sub>ost-* rather than *\*ost<sup>(h)</sup>-* or *\*od-thi*. But we still will not know whether *k-* in Slavic *kost-* ‘bone’ is a prothetic consonant or a trace of another laryngeal and why the old word was lost in Germanic (assuming that it ever existed). One will be hard put to find a single example in *OFED* in which “Indo-Europeanization” produced more than a rewrite of asterisked forms in accordance with certain guidelines.

Boutkan was not an Indo-Europeanist. Nor was his knowledge of Germanic profound. He died too early and was not equal to the task he undertook. He had investigated the history of several words and carried the principles of the school from which he emerged to an extreme, but an etymological dictionary requires greater tolerance and a broader platform. More experienced people than Boutkan found themselves in a similar no-win situation. Weekley possessed a thorough knowledge of the onomastics and the French element in English. Mitzka knew the history and dialectology of German inside out, but once they stepped outside the areas of their expertise, they were obliged to copy uncritically from their predecessors. If Boutkan had concentrated on

the Germanic aspect of Frisian and read more about the origin of seemingly isolated Germanic words, his contribution would have been weightier.

Boutkan's opinions about word origins, to the extent that they go beyond Frisian, are seldom worth considering. Two examples will suffice. The source of the geminate in the Germanic word for "man" (Gothic *mann*, etc.) has been debated for a century and a half. Adalbert Kuhn traced *nn* to *\*nw*. Later, his view (initially accepted with enthusiasm) was abandoned, and today I am aware of only Rosemarie Lühr and Alexander Lubotsky's support of Kuhn's idea. However, both mentioned the Germanic form in passing and may not have known the history of the question. By contrast, someone who writes an entry on *man* in an etymological dictionary is expected to present the entire picture. Boutkan did not realize how much was at stake (his article on OFr. *man* in *It Beaken* deals only with the alternation *man* ~ *mon*). He referred to Lubotsky but added: "...alternatively, we can perhaps assume *\*monH-u*, both forms yielding regular gemination of the "-n-." Who needs such ad hoc reconstructed forms? (Anything can "perhaps be assumed" to give a pseudo-explanation of an unclear phenomenon. Phlogiston accounts for the process of burning in a most elegant way. The only problem is that phlogiston does not exist. Neither did, in all probability, *\*monH-u*, unless we agree to write in a laryngeal every time we encounter a geminate of unclear origin.) In the entry *hunig* 'honey', Boutkan says: "With a slight change of perspective, we can adduce [as a cognate] Toch. B *kronkše*, Toch. A *kronkše*, bee < *\*knHonk-ōn* with dissimilation of the first *\*n* (Hilmarsson 1986:34-7)." A slight change of perspective from "bee" to "honey"? (from "cow" to "milk," from "head" to "horn"?).

The use of some concepts of phonetics could also have been more precise. What is "half-stress" mentioned in the entry *abbitt* 'abbot'? Whether Gmc. *\*ga-* is related to PIE *\*kon-* has been debated since Sophus Bugge made use of Verner's Law to explain the origin of *g-*. In the entry *e-2*, we read: "Although this derivation has been doubted, a transition *\*k* > Gmc. *\*g* under weak stress is unproblematic." Obviously, Boutkan did not know what he was talking about. All the Neogrammarian textbooks of Germanic mention palatalized and velarized *l*. Braune, Sievers, Franck, and their followers were not phonologists, but we cannot afford to speak about "sounds," without specifying their distinctive features. Boutkan ascribes the alternation *ol* = *al* 'all' "to the velarising effect of the following /l(1)/." This is a comparatively rare use of phonemic notation in OFED (*ll* is given in slants). Likewise, the spelling <auld>, <aud> for *ald* ~ *old* 'old' "indicate[s] the velar character of /l/" (the slants are again Boutkan's). Was velarization a distinctive feature of /l/? For what is "the velar character" of the Old Frisian liquid?

It is the Old Frisian, rather than Indo-European, part of OFED that will make it useful to researchers. Considering how critical I have been of Boutkan's work, I will reproduce three entries in which he can be seen to advantage.

**hof 2** subst. n. 'yard, garden, premises; churchyard; court' Gmc.

•PFRIS: *\*hof*

ON *hof* 'premises; temple', OE *hof* 'dwellings, farm, OS *hof* 'dwellings, court, OHG. MHG *hof* 'yard, dwellings, court, MDu. *hof* 'yard, dwellings, court'

•PGMC: *\*hufaN*

• No certain IE etymology

The word has been explained as a formation *\*keu-p-* referring to heights, heaps, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 591-2) to *\*keu-* ‘bend’, e.g. OPers. *kaufa-* ‘mountain’, Lith. *kaũpas* ‘heap’; cf. also s.v. *hāch*. The argument is that dwellings were built on high points in the landscape. The semantic part of this comparison has been doubted, however. The word must originally have referred to an (enclosed) piece of land, i.e. to the premises on which a building (house, temple) could be constructed (de Vries 1992 s.v. *hof*). In this connection, I also refer to such collocations as Dutch *huis en hof* ‘house and yard’, i.e. the building and its premises. From this semantic perspective, de Vries starts from a basic meaning ‘wicker-work’ (viz. of the enclosure) maintaining the traditional comparison of such forms as ON *húfr* ‘hull of a ship’, OE *hyf* ‘beehive’, Lat. *cūpa* ‘barrel’. etc. (Pokorny 1959: 591 s.v. C.III *keu-p-a*.) This is semantically not compelling and yields formal problems in view of the long *ū* that cannot represent ablaut with *\*u* in *\*hufa-*.

I am tempted to start from a word more specifically referring to a piece of land. Perhaps, we can compare Dutch *hoeve* ‘piece of land, farm’, OS *hōba*, OHG *huoba* ‘piece of land’ < PGmc. *\*hōbō*. This word shows a strong formal and semantical resemblance to *\*hufa-*, but cannot represent an IE ablaut form. It only has possible cognates in Gr. *kēpos* (Doric *kāpos*) ‘garden’, but also *kāpus* (Hes.) ‘fallow land’, and Alb. *kopshtës* ‘garden’. The poor evidence for an IE etymon (the sole Greek/Albanian parallel) contrasts with the abundance of formations and ablaut forms (PGmc. *\*hōbō* < a-st. *\*keh<sub>2</sub>pa*, Gr. *kēpos* < o-st. *\*keh<sub>2</sub>pos*, *kāpus* < u-st. *\*kHpus*; Alb. *kopshtë* < *\*kep-*). This may be interpreted as an indication for a substratum origin (pace Pokorny 1959: 529, de Vries 1992 s.v. *hoeve*). Demiraj (p.c.) connects the Alb. word with Alb. *kep*, *qep* ‘till (a piece of land), cultivate’ to  $\sqrt{(s)keh_2p}$  ‘cut, cleave’ (Pokorny 1959: 931-3), cf. also Gr. *(s)kāpetos* ‘hole, ditch’.

see also: *hovia*

### **kona** ?? ‘??’ ??

Only attested in  $R_{1, 2, 4}$  as a complement to *skilling*, viz. in Gp *skillinga* *cona* and Dp *skillingon conon*, which suggests that the word could be inflected for case.

Suggestions (after Buma 1961 s.v., Gerbenzon 1982: 270-1 fn. 11 + reff.):

(1) [Jaekel] *cōna* < *\*colna*, i.e. NL *Cologne*. The required assimilation is not attested in the actual NP *Kolne*, q.v.

(2) [Siebs] *cona* < Lat. *cuneus* ‘stamp (coined)’, possible, but the use of coined money remains restricted to the Carolingian era, and restarts only after 1266 (Gerbenzon loc. cit.).

(3) [Van Helten] < elliptic *pallia cana* ‘white pieces of sheet’ (once in the *Traditiones Fuldenses*); but why would *pallia* be left out and *cana* be borrowed as *cona*?

(4) [Gerbenzon, accepted by Hofstra 1984] < Russ. *kuna*, MLG *kunne*, Swe. *cunas*, *kunen* ‘skin of a marter’; possible, because skins were used as a currency standard in N-E Europe and those of marters were very valuable.

(5) [Hammerich] ‘female slave’, cf. Danish *kone*, etc. < PGmc. *\*kunō* < PIE *\*g<sup>w</sup>enh<sub>2</sub>*, Gs *\*g<sup>w</sup>neh<sub>2</sub>s* (Gr. *gunē*, Goth. *qino* ‘woman’, etc.); improbable as there is no evidence for slaves, even hardly for *serfs* in 12th, 13th century Riustringalond.

The fourth explanation is most probable. It has a parallel in Finnish *raha* ‘money’ < ‘skin’ (cf. also Hofstra 1984: 40-1), but also in the use of such standards as the *wedmerk*, *reilmerk* and *leinmerk* (q.v.).

**itsil** subst. m. ‘spur’ LW

Ofris. also *e(e)tsel*, *ezel*, *-il*, *e(e)tzil*, *-el*, *eitzel*, *ethzel*

The form containing *i-* shows the typical Riustring reflex of i-mutated \*a. The medial palatal /-ć-/ is written *ts*, *tz*, *thz*. *z*. The vowel of the unstressed syllable may be weakened to *e* /ə/. The form *eitzel* (E<sub>3</sub>) shows a development of *e* (< \*ä) to *ei* that is typical for this MS (van Helten 1890: 31). It is also found in D, however. I assume that it represents a long vowel (in open syllable) there, as in its by-form *eetsel* (D) and in *eetzel*, *eetzil* (J).

•PFRIS: \*ičil

From Lat. *aculeus* ‘prickle, spur’ with replacement of the suffix \*-ul- by \*-il- (suggestion by Krook 1964: 65). The identification of the Latin source word has yielded difficulties.

The current derivation seems to be that from \**aciale* ‘steel’ (actually only attested as *acuale*, cf. Krook 1964: 65). Holthausen and Hofmann 1985 s.v. *etzil*, *itzil* derive the form from an alleged Lat. *acile*, which seems to be a reconstruction rather than an attested form (Krook 1964: 65). In Holthausen 1921 s.v. *ezil*, *izil* (sic), we find *aciālis*, which is equally untraceable. Wollmann (1990: 532) quotes ‘*acialis*’, but cf. fn. 75 (‘*aciale*’).

Krook (1964: 64) gives a short overview of the earlier explanations. He explains the form from a Gmc. etymon \**hakil-* (OHG *hechel*, etc.); this leaves the absence of \**h-* unaccounted for, however. Sjölin (1963: 79-81, 186 + reff.) favours Krook’s explanation and explains the loss of \**h-* through a folk etymology after a verb \**etta*, cf. ON *etja* ‘incite’ and the first element of OFris. *etgēr* ‘spear’.

Lit: Holthausen 1921 s.v. *ezil izil* (sic); Wollmann (1990: 532 fn. 75 + reff.)

Finally, a few comments on individual words. *Bifela* ‘give orders’. Its cognates mean ‘bury, conceal’, and Boutkan calls the semantic development unclear. The meaning of prefixed formations like OE *bifēolan* and Go. *ana-filh* ‘tradition’ suggests that ‘place something somewhere for safe keeping’ was a main “*seme*” in this verb. So perhaps ‘place for safe keeping’ > ‘entrust’ > ‘recommend’ > ‘command’? There is no certainty; a semantic bridge can be drawn between any two points, including an inkwell and the freedom of will (which, according to Trubetzkoy, no one would want to compare). That said, I feel puzzled by *gersfal* ‘the chopping off of body parts, mutilation’. Throughout the Germanic speaking world, *gras*, *græs*, *gers* mean only ‘grass; weeds; vegetation.’ Boutkan calls *gersfall* PIE (because *fall* is PIE) and leaves the compound without even a short comment. The next entry is on *gersfalle*, which, along with its Middle Low German cognate *grasvallende*, is glossed as ‘chopped off (of body parts), mutilated’ PIE. Nothing can be less “PIE.” Was the original meaning of *gersfal* \*‘grass fall’, that is, \*‘falling to the grass (in battle)’? Cf. OI *hníga í gras* ‘bite the dust’. Then from \*‘falling helpless to the grass in battle’ to ‘being mutilated by the enemy’ and so on?

Boutkan tentatively supports the derivation of Gmc. *\*ganga-* ‘go’ from *\*ga-* followed by the root *\*-ung* (see *ganse*). Germ. *Gnade* and *Glied* are anthologized examples of an old prefix merging with the root, but attempts to dissect Icelandic words in the same way have proved to be largely unsuccessful. *G-* has recently been separated from *-od* in *god* (an unlikely hypothesis). I am not aware of any convincing Proto-Germanic etymologies along these lines. Even Go. *bnauan* ‘rub (apart)’ cannot be shown to go back to *\*bi-nauan* (though such is the prevailing view).

OFr. *haldere* ‘accused (in court)’, derived from *halda* ‘hold’, is not unique: Boutkan cites MDu. *houdere*, which means ‘possessor, etc.’ and also ‘accused’ (the same in MLG *holder* ~ *holdere*). He reconstructs the semantic development so: *\*‘possessor’* > *\*‘possessor of disputed goods’* > ‘accused’. OI *sannr* means ‘true’, but *vera* (*verða*) *sannr* (*at einhverju*) means ‘be found guilty/convicted (of something)’. Lat. *sons* ‘guilty’ is a cognate of *sannr*. The legal process appears to have assumed the existence of guilt as reality; hence the connection between truth and transgression. OI *syn* ‘denial’ (a cognate of Engl. *sin*) fits into this scheme well: “being there” — “standing accused” — “guilt/denial.” Is it possible that *haldere* was ‘the holder of guilt’? If so, this word may be a legal term that reflects an attitude widespread among the early Indo-Europeans.

*Kona* (see the full text of the entry above). If Gerbenzon was right, the etymology of the equally obscure Russian *sorok* ‘forty’ may be used as an approximate parallel. *-monda* ‘(sexual) intercourse’. In my review of *The Handbook of Frisian* (NOWELE 45, 2004, 104-5), I suggested a connection between *-monda* and *-mundy* in Engl. dial. *grizzle-de-mundy* ‘stupid person who is always grinning’, as well as Proto-Slavic *\*mādo* ‘testicle’ (some of its reflexes mean ‘penis’). See also James Clackson’s article on Engl. *minge* ‘vagina’ (allegedly from Romany, from Armenian) in the J. E. Rasmussen Festschrift *Per Aspera ad asteriscos* (Innsbruck 1904, 109-15).

In the entry *stunde* ‘time’, Boutkan says that “[t]he relation to formally similar ON *stund* ‘labour’, OE *stundom* ‘industrious’ remains unclear.” Apparently, the original meaning of *\*stund-* was, ‘work, exertion’ (OE *stund* ‘hard time’ has been recorded), then ‘period of work’ (like Germ. *Stunde* ‘lesson’), and finally, ‘time’. A similar explanation can be found in Jan de Vries’s *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, with a gratuitous reference to Trier. If this reconstruction makes sense, *stund-* should be separated from the verb *stand-* once for all. At *wada* ‘wade’ Boutkan suggests “a connection with words denoting a less specific way of moving than wading.” OFr. *wada* and its cognates almost certainly go back to a verb meaning ‘make a strong effort in moving’, as is shown by OI *vaða*. However interesting Kern’s comparison of *walduwaxe* ‘spine’ and Bavarian *hārwachs* / Du. (Kiliaen’s) *haerwachs* ‘spine’ may be, his idea that *waldu-* means ‘hair’ is incredible. A homonym of *hār* ‘hair’, a possible product of folk etymology, must be assumed. Words like Engl. *spine*, Russian *khrebet* (despite its unexplained [xr]), Germ. *Rückgrat* ~ Dutch (*rugge*)*graat*, and so forth should refer to something straight and solid.