ERIC P. HAMP

LITHUANIAN *šáukštas*

It is worth pointing out that the excellent explanation of this word recently given, Baltistica I (1) 83−4, 1965, by A. Sabaliauskas, can be further strengthened by two additional considerations.

First, a derivation from the root of *šáuti* has the advantage over other previous explanations of accounting in a simple and natural way for the acute accentuation of the diphthong.

Second, this derivation makes very good sense as a clear agentive noun of function from a verbal root, when one considers that it must have been a replacement of an older word in relatively recent Baltic history (though, perhaps, still within the Proto-Baltic period). That is to say, if we are to look for a replacement for an older word, it is satisfying if it can be shown to be a transparent derivation of a root-morpheme and sense attested in the language rather than a remote derivative from a dubious base attested in a distant branch of Indo-European. Although there is no clearly recoverable etymon for 'spoon' in IE, and some forms are clearly innovations based on function (*Löffel*, Lat. *ligula*, OIr. *liag* gen. *léige* = Welsh *llwy* Breton *loa* < Proto-Keltic **lēgā* < **leig'hā*), we must suppose, as Jokl has suggested, that Slavic *lbžíca* (Croatian *žlĭca*, Czech *lžice*), and Albanian *lugë* share an etymon. In that case, it is only reasonable to suppose that the Proto-Baltic word for 'spoon' was once **lugã*.

This leads us to a possible improvement in the account of some of these 'spoon' words. It has been supposed that **lugã* originally developed in sense somewhat along the lines of OEng. *spōn* and its relatives, i.e. from the meaning 'wooden chip'. There is, of course, nothing inherently against this; but in the case at hand, the formal difficulties are much greater than the etymological dictionaries imply. Jokl, LKU 144 ff., esp. 151, is responsible for the claim that the Albanian form (and hence the Slavic cognate) is to be analyzed *lu-g-*, with a Wurzelerweiterung, or suffix. But that depends on his desire to link up *flugë* (a kind of board used by the mountaineers to close up their houses, granaries, etc.), as **vë-lugë*, and other words; I am not at all persuaded by Jokl's Wurzeletymologie. It seems to me much safer to work from full attested forms and to observe the possibilities of the interaction of one form on another through time. Moreover, there is a concealed difficulty in the supposed Wurzelerweiterung since Skt. *rujáti, rugná-, logá-* superficially fail to agree (with -g) with Lith. *láužti, lúžti* (with -g'), and Albanian appears, paradoxically, to go with Sanskrit rather than with Lithuanian in this respect. Furthermore, it is easy to explain, as inter alios Fraenkel LEW 347 argues, how the Skt *j* got

analogically back-formed to *g*. This then reduces both the Sanskrit and Lithuanian to *g'*. However, such a reduction still leaves the Avestan *uruxti-* unexplained. But, in any case, the assumption of such a root-extension raises more problems and uncertainties than it solves.

It seems safer to claim that Balto-Slavic and Albanian *lugä* 'spoon' and *láuž-* 'break' are simply different roots (note the different intonations, too), and to leave possible solutions and connexions for the Indo-Iranian forms aside. It might be easier to attach this etymon for 'spoon' ultimately to the root *leug-* 'bend', seen in *lùgnas* (Fraenkel LEW 388—9).

Perhaps we may also see here a source for the Keltic forms by folk etymology: Once *g and *$g'h$ fell together in Proto-Keltic, it would have been relatively simple to reshape *$lugä$ into *$l\bar{e}g\bar{a}$. Similarly, based on *lingō*, an earlier Latin *$lugul\bar{a}$ (strengthened by the relation *lubet* : *libet*) could have been refashioned into *ligula*. The Greek form λύγοϛή may also be more directly related than by root identity.

In sum, perhaps we may see underlying all these forms an IE etymon which could have meant 'spoon' (perhaps along with some related meanings), and which *šáukštas* replaced.

University of Chicago