LITH. nasraĩ, SLAV. nozd( )ri, OIR. srón, GK. ἰς

A good etymology must account for all the facts. At the same time, the aim of an etymology is to unite observations and make them mutually explanatory, not to dissociate possible connexions unless there is very strong reason. The latter principle is bound up with the fact that we prefer to be able to show that in a given development there has been no replacement, and that all change has been purely superficial\(^1\); this is because the fundamental nature of language (and of culture) is continuity\(^2\).

For this last reason I feel convinced that O.N. Trubāčëv is basically correct in refusing to divorce Lith. nasraĩ and what appears to be Slav. nózdri\(^3\). Nevertheless, he loses something — and fails to account for all the data — by excluding the arguments summarized by Vasmer (II 225) as *nos-druľa; there is no need to explore further the claimed, but unmotivated, suffix *-dhr-. Inversely, Vasmer struggles to rescue the Ukrainian form nizdřa, with its i vocalism, but misses the striking and surely fundamental reality that Baltic and Slavic agree closely in their versions of this term.

It is well known that by deriving nózdři (regularly) from *nozri we cannot then directly relate this form to nasraĩ etc. since there is no immediate motivation for the supposed voicing of z. *nozri could only contain *ǵ(h) ( > Baltic ž). On the basis of óstroľ or even óstryj we would expect as a match of nasraĩ something like *nóstri.

Therefore both for the Ukrainian i and for the unexpected voicing we do well to accept (schematically) a form on the lines of *nos-dur-i as an immediate Slavic precursor\(^4\). No matter what identity is assumed for the underlying Slavic *der-\(^{\prime}\), a contamination in early Slavic is unavoidable. This is plausibly explained phonetically

---

\(^1\) See my further remarks Baltistica VIII (1972) 55.

\(^2\) See also my argument Papers from the 8th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 14-16, 1972, 470-2.

\(^3\) Baltistica 1 pridjas (1972) 225—226.

\(^4\) Because of the frequent calques in the much infiltrated Old Prussian, noseproly is not diagnostic in this context.
on a basis *nōstri → nos-d(ē)r-i > nōzdrī. To put the argument in slightly different terms, since we need to assume a fresh source of contamination in order to transpose the feature composition of *t into d, we may at no extra cost see in this same element the source of the needed jer.

The total Slavic derivation then becomes *nōzdrī←*nōstri < *nasr-.

Trubačev's account of the first vocalism is inadequate. According to him (226) nōsis < *nās- is a lengthened vocalism, and he then writes for nasraī (according to a convention I do not understand) *nos-. We agree immediately that phonetically (in Brugmann's terms) Skt. nāsā (dual) nāsikā, Av'estan nāh-, OPers. nāham, Lat. nārēs, Lith. nōsis, OE nōse etc. rest on *nās-. But this must be in laryngeal terms *neHₐs- (or *neHₐs-). Indic forms such as weak-case nas- or nasya- 'located on the nose' must be newly formed neo-guṇa, modelled on other paradigms with Skt. ā. It then becomes clear that OE nasu, OHG nasa, Slav. nos̄, and our word nasraī reflect a zero-grade *nās- (=*nHₐ*ₐs-). Pokorny IEW 755 should be corrected and sifted in these respects.

In other words, morphologically there was in Indo-European an old root noun *neHₐs-. This would have been declined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>*neHₐs-</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>[nās]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg. N</td>
<td>*nēHₐs-s</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nāś]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>*neHₐs-m</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nāśm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>*neHₐs(-i)</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nāś]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>*nHₐs-os</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nāsō] &gt; nos̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>*nHₐs-ei</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nos̄i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du. NA</td>
<td>*nēHₐs-e</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nāse] &gt; Skt. nāsā, Av. nāṛha, Lat. nārēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>*nHₐs-bh...</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>[nəzbh...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.

Trubačev envisages a compound *nos+sri of "dogrammatičeskaja forma". While I am not sure of the status of such a form, we are clearly in a position to consider a construction of the shape *nas-sr-. This suggests a possible syntactic construction analogous to what I have discussed for the name of Demeter. That is to say, a very old syntagm of the form *genitive + noun, analogous to *dHs-s + māter-, would explain a sequence *nHₐs-s + sr-. Hence nasraī = nōzdrī could easily be a genitive of 'nose' + an old noun in *sr-.

The identity of such a noun in *sr- is, however, very problematic. The following possibilities for comparison exist.

---

1) Welsh **ffroen (f.), Gaulish *frognā (> OFrench frogne > Eng. frown, OIr. srón (f.) 'nostril, nose' < *srognā or *sroknā. A Celtic variant in *(s)tr- may be Welsh trwyn (m.), OCorn. trein < *(s)trognī; Gaulish *trugna.7

2) Breton *frī (m.) 'nose' Cornish frig (f.) 'nostril' are highly ambiguous in form; all that is certain is *sr-8. If *frī is from *sreg- (perhaps *sregos, an old neuter like *tegos > ti 'house')9 then Corn. frig could reflect a hypocoristically geminated form *sregg-. The relation would be that of Welsh *croen, OCorn. *croin 'skin' < *krok-no: Med. Corn. *crohen, Breton krochenn, OIr. *croenn < *krokkenn.

3) Greek ἤχων, ἡχῶς 'snore', ἤχος 'pig's snout', Armenian ūngun-k' (pl.) 'nose'; OIr. *srenim 'snore'10. It is customary, since Hübschmann, to pair Arm. ūngunk' (n-stem; instr. ūngambk') with ἤχος; but this obscure vocalism is not necessary. All other Greek forms point to *srengh/*k-. Therefore, especially since we expect Greek and Armenian to go together and since ἤχος may on semantic grounds reasonably reflect some expressive alteration, we may equally posit for ūngun-*ūngun- < *srogh-on. We reconstruct then for Greek, Armenian and Celtic *srengh-. The Galatian ḗσούγος11 may represent a variant of *srongo-parallel to *trugna mentioned above.

To summarize the above, Greek, Armenian, and Celtic appear to attest for us *sregh-, *srogh-n-, and *sre-n-gh-. The last has the appearance of being a verb form. The Armenian *srogh-on- looks like a cross of this with the nominalization in nasal suffix seen in Celtic *srognā. We seem to have a verb 'snore', and a nominalization *'snorter'. The Greek forms in -k- could easily be back-formations from -χ-, in which the aspirate was taken as being a derived shape belonging to the aspirated perfect. We thus arrive at a simple IE root *sregh-, and, on this and other grounds, I now abandon the explanation for OIr. srón etc. which I advanced in Glotta 38, 1960, 209–11, and which Frisk GEW 2.659 has rightly rejected as „Schallwort“ However, I do not see the root of ἤχων as explicated by being called „willkürlich“. (Frisk 2.647); moreover, *sregh- could also help to account for ἤχος, ἤχων etc.12

4) There remain the Greek forms ἤθεα (pl.) and ἤθων; on the latter Frisk GEW 2.667–8 says as much as seems to be safe. It seems artificial and ad hoc to credit a stem *sr-edh- to a root *ser- 'flow' (IEW 1001–2). The Greek could

---

7 IF 65 (1960) 44; 267.
8 See Meid, op. cit., 40.
9 For the phonetics see E. P. Hamp, Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 16 (1956) 277ff.
10 See Pokorny IEW 1002; Meid, op. cit., 39, 43.
11 See Meid, op. cit., 266.
of course easily reflect a different initial; these words seem quite ambiguous, and Frisk’s prudent account of ṭéθos, which may not even mean ‘nostril’, is excellent.

5) Finally there is ṭίς ṭίννός, which Pedersen\textsuperscript{12} suggested might be related to Lat. frēnum. In any case, *srēi-, srī- is an unsatisfactory and contrived reconstruction\textsuperscript{13} that corresponds to nothing that we know of Indo-European structure; it is semantically and phonetically opaque, and explains nothing. At the same time I see no virtue in my own attempt, Glotta 38.210–11. In these circumstances, there seems to be little motivation in attempting to relate Skt. srkvan-, srākva-, ‘corner of the mouth’, as Lewis and Pedersen and I (following them) tried. Frisk GEW 2.659 offers no further positive suggestions.

At present I see only one possibility for further analyzing ṭίς ṭίννός. I have recently\textsuperscript{14} discussed Karl Hoffmann’s perceptive analysis (MSS 6, 1955, 35–40) of the old-layer suffix which we may write *-Hon- or *-aon-. It seems possible, though not at all assured, that we have a zero-grade of this suffix generalized in position after vowel, where alternations would have led to shapes of unclear relation. Thus *srī-Hon- ~ *srī-Hn- would have been levelled to *srīHn-. If this is so, the original base for ṭīs was *srī-.

Whether then a construction *nH₃s-s-srī- ‘nostril of the nose’ once existed is a matter for speculation\textsuperscript{15}.

\textsuperscript{12} Ériu 16 (1952) 5.
\textsuperscript{13} IEW 1002.
\textsuperscript{14} MSS 30 (1972), 35–37.
\textsuperscript{15} A version of this paper is also appearing in Ériu (1974) so that the Celtic aspects of the above argument may receive the attention and criticism of Celticists.