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BALTIC *aušklējas M. & *aušklējā F. ‘BLEAK’

Abstract. The present contribution is devoted to the Baltic designation of the fish ‘bleak / Alburnus alburnus’ in Lithuanian, Latvian, and Prussian toponymy, and in traces of Baltic substrata in North Russian dialects and in Mari from the upper Volga basin. They are studied from the point of view of phonetic history and word formation. Any etymological attempts must be realized together with Slavic counterparts of this Baltic ichthyonym. On the basis of existing etymologies, a new solution is proposed, explaining the fish-name with help of one of characteristic features of this fish, golden slime on its scales. The new etymology demonstrates their common origin in the compound *aus- & *klējo/ā- ‘gold-slimed’ = ‘fish characterized by its golden slime’. This fish-name would further solidify the original Indo-European term for ‘gold’, directly preserved in the Baltic and Italic branches, in another apophonic formation also in Tocharian, but, until now, quite unattested in Slavic.
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0. In European rivers from Southeast England to the Volga basin, and from the Pyrenees, Alps and Caucasus to Scandinavia and North Russia, the fish called ‘bleak’ (Alburnus alburnus) lives. It is small, maximum 30 cm long, and is classified into the family of Cyprinidae. In the present contribution the Baltic designations of this fish including toponyms, wide-spread even beyond the borders of Lithuania and Latvia, are collected and compared with their Slavic counterparts and together analyzed from the point of view of word formation. After a detailed critical discussion of earlier etymologies a new etymology is introduced, including arguments from semantic typology. The process of borrowing of this ichthyonym is monitored in parallel from the Baltic languages into non-Baltic and from the Slavic languages into non-Slavic. The numerous, seemingly isolated, facts are joined here and derived from the common denominator, represented by a common Balto-Slavic protoform.
In the Baltic language territory the ichthyonym is directly attested in the Eastern branch:


1.2. Latvian aukšleja, aukšlēja, ausla, ausle, ausleja, auslejs ‘bleak / Alburnus’ (ME 1, 223, 227). The Latvian forms with -k- would have been borrowed from Lithuanian according to Smoczyński (2007, 33). On the contrary, the lake Aûslas from the Zarasai district in northeastern Lithuania near the Latvian border bears a name more probably of Latvian than Lithuanian origin (cf. Vanagas 1981, 53).

1.3. Berg (1948, 65) formulated a hypothesis that various designations of ‘bleak’ in North Russian dialects may be connected with Lithuanian áukšlė etc. The forms mentioned by him can be arranged into three groups according to the first syllable (examples by Usačeva 1976, 92):

1.3.1. škleja (Vjatka);
1.3.2. šaklejá (Vjatka, Perm’, Kama);
1.3.3. šeklejá (Volxov, Ilmeň). Cf. also East Mari šeklija ‘Plötze’ (Paasonen 1948, 120).

1.4. The Baltic ichthyonym penetrated even into Fenno-Ugric – it can be identified in Mari wiški̮le “уکлейка” (RMS, 783).

1.5. Although ‘bleak’ does not appear among the fish-names summarized in the Elbing Vocabulary, the only source of the Prussian ichthyonymical lexicon (cf. Blažek, Čeladín Běťáková 2004), it could have left traces in toponymy. Przybytek (1993, 54) recognized it in the name of the village Auszlevo, first attested in 1486 and known also as Swersutton (1399) and Menczelsguth (1486). Przybytek mentioned the Polish mediation, identifiable from the possessive ending -wo, i.e. -wo.

1.6. With regard to their probable Baltic origin it is possible to reconstruct a common protoform of the borrowings in North Russian dialects and Mari as *aušklējā ~ *aušklija. After the adoption into Russian we must expect the monophthongisation of au-, leading to the form *ušklēja/*ušklija. The dropping of the initial *u- would not be surprising, since the same process appeared in the Slavic form *klēja, shortened from *uklēja (see §2.2.).
2. Büga (1911, 303; 1916, 151) recognized the close designation of this fish in Slavic:

2.1. Common Slavic *uklějь m., *uklěja f. ‘bleak’ > Bulgarian oklěj, uklíja id., Macedonian uklev ‘a kind of a lake fish’ (SMR, 379), Serbo-Croatian oklija, uklija, ukleja, ukla ‘bleak’, Crna Gora ukljeva, Slovak ukleja, Old Czech ùklejè (Klaret’s glossary from the 14th cent. – in the chapter “De piscibus” records: dico capedo pulec, polibus ùklejè, cinapus dlešč; see Šmilauer 1937, 188–189), Czech ouklej, Upper Sorbian wuklica, arch. wuklija, Lower Sorbian hukleja, Pomerian Slovincian vuklejá, Kašubian yuklej & yukléja, Polish ukleja, dial. uklej ‘Alburnus alburnus’, arch. oklija, East Polish okleja, Belorussian okleja, oklija, uklejá, vukljajá, uklija, Ukrainian uklija, okleja, oklija, uklija, ukléja, yukléja, yokléja, dial. (Carpathian) hukleja, Russian ukléja, uklejá ‘Cyprinus alburnus’; derivatives ukleenka and the adj. uklényj have their predecessors already in the Novgorodian grammots (charters) (SRNG 47, 67); another variant of this Russian ichthyonym, ukleína (SRNG 47, 67), gave the name to the lake of Uklejno in the District of Pskov (Vasmer 4, 156; ESUM 6, 27; Kolomiec 1983, 89–93; Ušačeva 1976, 93–96; Borys 2005, 665). The unattested Polabian equivalent may be preserved in northwest German dialects in the form Uckelei (cf. Schuster-Šewc 4, 1703). In older records, especially from the 18th cent., such forms as ukelei, ükeley, ucule, ucle, okelei, ickley appear (DWb 23, c. 716).

2.1.1. The Slavic ichthyonym was adopted into Hungarian, where it appears in the form ökle (Šmilauer 1937, 189; Machek 1968, 668), first recorded as öklye in 1530, acc. öklet 1544 (EWU 2, 1079; it is not necessary to seek its origin in German, if there are much more probable candidates in neighboring Slavic languages, namely in Slovak and Croatian or Serbian; it is also legitimate to think about adaptation of the fish-name from the assimilated language of the Pannonian Slavs).

2.1.2. Romanian oclei id. is probably of Bulgarian origin (BER 4, 836; Ciorănescu 2007, 555, #5806).

2.1.3. Modern Greek oγγλι ‘bleak’\(^1\) is also of Slavic origin.

2.2. For the same fish there is also known the shortened name *klöja: Serbo-Croatian klǐja, kleja ‘Alburnus alburnus’, Slovenian klěja ‘some fish

\(^1\)http://www.fishbase.se/ComNames/CommonNamesList.php?ID=4730&GenusName=Alburnus&SpeciesName=alburnus&StockCode=495
from the Krka river’, Russian dial. klejá, kléja ‘bleak’, Belorussian klejá id., Ukrainian kléja ‘Alburnus alburnus’ (ESSJ 10, 19).

2.3. It is apparent that the distribution of this ichthyonym covers the whole territory of the Slavic languages, plus some neighboring areas in the Balkan Peninsula.

3. Till the present time the following etymological attempts have been proposed (in chronological order):

3.1. Rostafiński (1900, 398) sought origin of the Slavic designation of ‘bleak’ in German. But the Common Slavic distribution of the ichthyonym in comparison with the limited area of variants of the type ukelei in Northeast German dialects bears witness of the opposite vector of borrowing (cf. e.g. Wick 1939, 18). The South German dialects (Bavaria) probably preserve an original native Germanic term in the forms Laube(n) / Lauge(n) / Lauke ‘bleak / Cyprinus leuciscus’ (DWb 12, cc. 293, 339, 343; cf. Walde, Hofmann 1938, 240, where the older comparison was with Latin clupea ‘a kind of small fish’ [Plinius], whose author was Walde himself; the North Germanic cognates are discussed in §3.5.). Let us mention that Rostafiński did not take in account the Baltic forms.

3.2. Loewenthal (1923, 176; 1928, 60) reconstructed the Indo-European starting-point *əukléiä and ascribed it the meaning ‘that which is caught’ (from a rather fictitious verb *eukhō ‘I catch’).

3.3. Wick (1939, 18) derived the ichthyonym from the verb *H2eug- ‘to become strong, numerous; to grow’ (LIV, 274–275) with respect to quantity of fish shoals.


3.5. Berg (1948, 65) speculated about some connection of the Slavic designation of ‘bleak’ and Swedish lōja id. To the Swedish ichthyonym there are sure Germanic cognates and a transparent etymology: Norwegian lōya, loje, laue, Old Danish lōge, Danish lōjer (–r is the plural ending), South German dial. laugen id. < *laugōn & *laugōn (Hellquist 1957, 613), all from IE *leyk- ‘to shine, light’ (Pokorny 1959, 689; LIV, 418–419).

3.6. Leder (1968, 72–73) separated the Slavic and Baltic ichthyonyms and tried to find their explanation independently:
3.6.1. According to Leder the Slavic ichthyonym should be related to Serbo-Croatian *klijati & ukljitai ‘to germinate, sprout’, Czech dial. klih(a) ‘sprout’, klejek id., in the same way as the German name of a small fish *Sprotte is connected with the word Sproß ‘sprout’.

3.6.2. The Baltic forms were joined by Leder with Lithuanian áuksas ‘gold’, with reference to the Serbo-Croatian ichthyonym zlatva, zlatka ‘bleak / Alburnus alburnus’ (RHSJ 22, 900). Less convincing is Leder’s alternative solution based on Lithuanian áukštas ‘high’, referring to Russian dial. verxov(od)ka ‘bleak’, i.e. the ‘fish moving on the upper stream of rivers’. The ‘golden’ etymology was also supported by Smoczyński (2007, 33), who thought about segmentation *aukšlė < *auks-lė.

3.7. Toporov (1975, 170) identified in the Latvian forms auksleja, auksleja, ausla, ausle, aūsleja, aūslejs ‘bleak’ a witness to the earlier existence of the counterpart of Lithuanian áuksas ‘gold’ in Latvian, referring again to Serbo-Croatian zlatva, zlatka ‘bleak / Alburnus alburnus’, quoted by Leder (see RHSJ 22, 900).


4. Although some etymological attempts look rather skewed (e.g. Loewenthal), from the presented etymologies it is possible to combine a modified solution, explaining both the Baltic and Slavic forms as a common heritage. The first step will be to replace the Balto-Slavic reconstruction *auklēja of Trautmann (1923, 18), which represents only a mechanical projection of the Slavic ichthyonym in feminine into the late Indo-European protolanguage, but does not take in account the Baltic data.

The starting assumption is a compound consisting of components bearing the meaning (a) ‘gold’, attested in Baltic, and (b) ‘glue’ or something ‘glutinous’, which is well-known from the Slavic languages. So a defined compound would designate a fish characterized by ‘golden slime’. In other words, this new solution joins the etymologies §3.6.2. of Leder and §3.4. of Mladenov. Let us go through both components in detail:

(a) Baltic *ausa- m. ‘gold’ > Old Lithuanian ausas [Bretke], Lithuanian

\[\text{With regard to the acute intonation in Lithuanian Driessen (2003, 352–353) proposed the Early IE protoform } *H₂é-H₂us-o-. The same protoform is applicable to the\]
dial. áusas (Gimžauskas; see LKŽ 1, 500); in the standard form áuksas it is possible to explain the internal -k- as secondary, likewise in úoksas ‘hole’ < *ős-: Latin ŏs, gen. ŏris; the acute intonation has been explained from such derivatives as áuksnas ‘golden coin’ < *aũsinas (Smoczyński 2007, 33, 704; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 25; Driessen 2003, 352–353) explained the acute intonation from presence of a laryngeal in the partially reduplicated stem *H₂ė-H₂us-o-); Prussian ausis ‘golt’ [Elbing vocabulary 523], i.e. ‘gold’, acc. sg. ausin [Enchiridion 43.16: ... ni sen Ausin adder Sirablan ..., i.e. ‘neither gold or silver...’] (Mažiulis 2013, 63; Toporov 1975, 168). Cf. also the place-name Awseynen z r. 1495, perhaps according to the anthroponym Awse recorded in 1409 (Gerullis 1922, 14; Trautmann 1925, 15; Toporov 1975, 169). Derksen (2015, 69–70) reconstructs proto-Baltic *auksas, assuming that the Lithuanian forms without -k-, namely ausas ‘gold’, ausinas ‘golden’, auskalis ‘goldsmith’, mediated by Breteke, are Pruthenisms. Mühlenbach & Endzelin (ME 1, 231) tried to identify the lost Latvian counterpart of the Lithuanian designation of ‘gold’ in one folklore text: sijājuot auzas (var. zēlts!) bira, niekājuot sidrabinš (BW #8202), where the expected Latvian *aus(a)s ‘gold’ had probably merged with àuza, pl. auzas ‘oats’. But the primary meaning ‘gold’ is more logical than ‘oats’ also with regard to the last word sidrabinš dim. ‘silver’, not to mention the parallel variant with zēlts ‘gold’, which really translates the word auzas. Mühlenbach & Endzelin (ME 1, 231) also mentioned the family name Aûskalěji from the locality Olai, which can be interpreted as ‘goldsmiths’.


Slavic languages became sources of borrowings into some neighboring non-Slavic languages: Hungarian kilih ‘gluten’ (Gyarmathi 1799/1983, 348/280), Romanian clei ‘glue’ and Lithuanian klijas / klijus / klūjus, later also kleja pl. id. (Miklosich 1886, 119). Isolated Slovenian kelje ‘joiner’s glue’ (18th cent.) may be explained from the protoform *kъlějь (Miklosich 1886, 119; Berneker 1924, 659; Sławski 1974, 86; Snoj 2003, 277; skeptically Trubačev, ESSJ 10, 20). From the point of view of Slavic word formation it is possible to determine the root *k(ъ)l- and two alternating derivational suffixes, *-ějь/*-ěja and *-ьjь/*-ьja, which are not in ablaut relation, because they reflect *-ějo/ā- and *-iō/ā-, cf. their Baltic counterparts in Lithuanian -ėjas / -ėja, Latvian -ējs / -ējā, and Lithuanian -ijas / -ija ~ -ē (Sławski 1974, 83–84, 86–88). The root *k(ъ)l- may be connected with Greek κόλλα ‘glue’ [Emp., Hdt.], irrespective of its protoform, *koḷε̯ or *kolṇε̯, and Middle Low German and Middle Dutch helen ‘to glue, stick’ < Germanic *haljan- (Fick 1890, 389; Zupitza 1896, 143; Berneker 1924, 659; Pokorny 1959, 612 etc.).

The hypothetical compound consisting of the components, which can be reconstructed in projection into the Late Indo-European as *aus- & *klējo/ā-, would designate the fish characterized by its ‘golden slime’. In proto-Baltic we would expect its continuant in the forms *auškle̯jas m. & *auškle̯ja f. (on vacillation s ~ š due Lex RUKI and its neutralisation – see Matasović 2005, 149–150, 154), resembling especially the Latvian forms and probable Baltisms in North Russian dialects. The Lithuanian forms may be projected into the protoform *auškli̯ja. There is a similar distribution of the derivational suffixes e.g. in the Baltic words for ‘smith’: Latvian kalējs ‘smith’ versus Lithuanian āuksa-kalis ‘goldsmith’. In the Slavic pair *klějь / *klьjь ‘glue’ it is possible to identify the same derivational suffixes *-ējo- a


*-iio-. The compound *aus- & *klējo/ā- should develop into Late Common Slavic *ux- & *klējo/a, but for its later development there are no credible examples of the cluster x+k(+l). Perhaps it is possible to seek analogy in the development leading to Common Slavic *uto in contrast to *ustro7 (Old Church Slavonic uto ‘morning, dawn’ vs. za ustra ‘in the morning’ – see the discussion by Vykypěl, ESJS 17, 1028–1029, 1026), where the starting-point is the same Late Indo-European root *aus-.8

5. As the preceding partial conclusions confirm, the designation of ‘bleak’ in both Baltic and Slavic languages are of common origin. With regard to the transparent etymology reflecting the characteristic feature of this distinct fish, namely the golden slime on scales, it is not necessary to capitulate and refer to a rather imaginary substratum9. The assumed primary compound *aus-klējo/ā-*’gold-slimed {fish}’ consists of the component *aus- ‘gold’, which is independently attested in Lithuanian and Prussian, in traces in Latvian, but quite unknown in Slavic. The present solution implies the existence of the continuant of the component *aus- ‘gold’ also in such Balto-Slavic dialects, from which later the Slavic languages crystalized. The characteristic Slavic change of IE *s > Slavic *x in agreement with Lex RUKI indicates that this archaic designation of ‘gold’ could still have existed in the early stage of development of the independent Slavic protolanguage, before its

7 The difference of *uto vs. *ustro is probably explainable from the paradigmatic levelling (cf. Smoczyński 2007, 36 about their Baltic counterparts): nom. *ausro- ‘dawn’ vs. loc. *user ‘in the morning, at dawn’ → *ausro- vs. *auser → *usto vs. *uxe(r); thanks to their contamination the form *uxtro should originate; it is simplified to *uto (cf. Mikko lá 1942, 179). Let us mention that Common Slavic *x, originated according to Lex RUKI, was changed to *s before *t in all cases, i.e. if *x was created from IE *s after */*ũ or corresponding diphthong, *k or *r, cf. Old Russian pěxati & pixati ‘to stamp’ vs. Russian pest ‘stamper’ (*pěstb); Old Church Slavonic aor. 1pl. rěxomъ vs. 2pl. rěste < *rěxomos vs. *rěxstes od rekǫ ‘I say’; Russian pórx ‘dust’ (*porxъ) vs. persť ‘powder’ (Shevelov 1964, 128–130).

8 Polish uścieć, uścić się ‘to shine’; Lithuanian aūšti, Latvian aust ‘to dawn, become light’, besides Lithuanian aūsrā ‘dawn’, Latvian āustra id.; Latin aurōra ‘dawn’ (*ausōs+ā); Greek ηύς, Aeolic αὐς ‘dawn’, αὐριον ‘tomorrow’; Vedic uṣās – ‘dawn’, voc. uṣār, vī ... āvas ‘ist hell geworden’ (Pokorny 1959, 86–87; EWAI 1, 236; LIV, 292–293: *Ḥạus-).

9 Even Machek (1968, 668) preferred that the Slavic and Baltic forms are mutually related and did not speculate about pre-European substratum, otherwise so beloved by him.
replacement by the term *zölto. A similar process began in the Baltic branch, but was not as consistent as in the sister Slavic branch. The Baltic correlate with the *e*-vocalism is dominant in Latvian, where *zēlts ‘gold; golden’ is used. In Lithuanian it is represented by the East Lithuanian adj. *želtas ‘gold-yellow, green-yellow’. In Prussian it is hidden in the ornithonym *sealtmenō / *źēltmenā / ‘wedewal’ [Elbing Vocabulary 748], i.e. ‘oriole’ < Old French *oriole < Latin *aureolus ‘golden’; cf. also German *Goldamsel ‘oriole’, lit. ‘golden blackbird’ (ME 4, 706; Fraenkel 1962–1965, 1296–1297; Mažiulis 1997, 87–90; Smoczyński 2007, 776; Derksen 2015, 514).

6. Concerning the analogical designations of ‘golden fish’, besides Serbo-Croatian *zlatva & *zlatka (§§ 3.6.2., 3.7.) there is e.g. the Latin ichthyonym, mentioned by Festus {2nd cent. CE} in his treatise *De verborum significatione, epitoma Verri Flacci, 182: orata genus piscis appellatur a colore auri, quod rustici orum dicebant. Isidore of Sevilla {?570–636 CE}, *Etymologiae sive origines 12.6.6., added: a colore quidam pisces nominati sunt ... ut auratae, quia in capite auri colorem habent (Maltby 1991, 67). This means that the ichthyonym was formed from Latin *aurātus ‘gilded’. At the same time Fest’s witness mediates that already in the time of life of Verrus Flaccus {55 BCE–20 CE}, the main source of Festus’ lexical data, there existed in Latin the rustic variant *ōrum, besides classical *aurum ‘gold’ (cf. OLD, 1272).


7. Summing up, the results of the present contribution demonstrate that both the Baltic and Slavic designations of the fish ‘bleak / Alburnus alburnus’ are compatible and derivable from a common source, which can be reconstructed as a compound *augs- & *kľo/a-/ ~ *klijo/a- {fish characterized by its} ‘golden slime’. Only this protoform explains both the Baltic and Slavic forms in agreement with their later sound rules, while the protoform *aūkľejo/a- proposed by Trautmann does not explain the Baltic forms. Remarkable is the broad impact on the neighboring languages: Mari wiśkile ‘bleak’ is of Baltic origin, while East Mari šeklija ‘Plötze’ is borrowed from a Russian dialect ichthyonym such as šekleja (Volxov, Ilmeń) or škleja (Vjatka), which are themselves of Baltic origin. On the other hand, the Slavic origin is apparent in the case of Hungarian *ökle (1530 *öklye), Romanian
*oker* and Modern Greek ούγλι ‘bleak’. The northwest German dialectisms from the 18th cent. as *ukelei, ükeley, ucule, ucle, okelei, ickley*, today *Uckelei*, indicate an unattested Polabian equivalent, in like manner as the village name *Auszlevo* (1486) probably indicates the unattested Prussian counterpart to the East Baltic designation of ‘bleak’. In other Indo-European languages, e.g. in Latin or Gaulish, ‘golden fish’ may also be recognized, but with different word formation. The Balto-Slavic designation of ‘bleak’ thus represents a unique Balto-Slavic innovation.

**BALTŲ *aušklėjas MASC.*, *aušklėjā FEM. ‘AUKŠLĖ’**

Santrauka
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