

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Ovaj rad dostupan je za upotrebu pod međunarodnom licencom Creative Commons Attribution 4.0.



<https://doi.org/10.31820/f.37.1.7>

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

FINNO-UGRIC LEXICAL BORROWINGS IN WEST BALTIC LANGUAGES

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak, Prof. Dr Hab., University of Lodz, Poland
krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl  *orcid.org/0000-0001-8895-974X*

izvorni znanstveni rad

UDK 811.511.1'373.613

811.17'373.613

rukopis primljen: 1. ožujka 2025; prihvaćen za tisak: 22. travnja 2025.

*The paper discusses 27 West Baltic words suspected of being borrowed from a Finno-Ugric source. Five lexical items are evaluated negatively, while several further proposals are considered uncertain. Numerous words are verified as Finno-Ugric loanwords. Among them one can distinguish physiographical terms, e.g. OPrus. jūri 'sea' (← FV. *jār wā 'lake, sea'); OPrus. *salavō 'island' (← FU. *salaw 'island; dry place in the swamp' < Ur. *sala), as well as trees and plants, e.g. OPrus. kadegis 'juniper' (← BFi. *katarja 'id.' ← Ur. *kača 'resin'); OPrus. malko 'wood' (← FU. *malka 'a species of willow', secondarily 'willow stick'); Yatv. sini pl. 'mushrooms' (← BFi. *sēne 'mushroom' < FU. *čānā 'bracket fungus'). There are also lexical units denoting animals, meat and skin obtained from them, e.g. OPrus. sylecke 'Baltic herring' (← *silākkā 'id.' ← Ur. *šilā 'fat'); OPrus. kaywe 'mare' (← BFi. *kēwe 'female horse or reindeer' < Ur. *kāōwā 'female animal'); Yatv. fała 'meat' (← FU. *pala 'bite; to eat'); OPrus. pusne '(knee-high) boot' (← FU. *pučni 'shoe upper' < Ur. *ponči 'hide on reindeer's leg'). Intensive linguistic contacts between the Western Balts and an unknown people of Finno-Ugric origin are strongly confirmed by verbal forms, e.g. Yatv. wał 'was' (← FU. *wol- 'was'); Yatv. wa 'it is necessary' (← BFi. *wajagz 'id.').*

Keywords: Baltic; borrowings; Finno-Ugric; language contact; Old Prussian; substrate; Yatvingian

1. Introduction

The issue of prehistoric language contacts between the Balts and the Finno-Ugric population has substantial literature, which is not easy to trace and critically discuss. However, Uralists have come to the conclusion that in Finno-Ugric languages about 200–300 ancient Baltic loanwords can be distinguished, which were borrowed during the existence of the Balto-Finnic community, sometimes called the Balto-Finnic period (Junttila 2015: 12; Bednarczuk 2017: 187–188). This community included the following Finno-Ugric languages: Finnish, Karelian, Estonian, Võro, Livonian, Veps, Ingrian and Votic. There is also a significant Baltic ingredient in the Saami languages. Some Baltic borrowings even found their way into the vocabulary of the Mordvins and probably the Maris (the Cheremis), although the researchers note that they are independent loanwords, probably taken over from the eastern Galindians (ORuss. *Голядь*), a Baltic population that once lived in the Moscow River basin and partly the Oka. There is also considerable evidence for prehistoric language contact between Finno-Ugric and Germanic (Kowalski, Rychło, Witczak 2020; Witczak, Rychło 2022). As in the case of Germanic, it is believed that prehistoric Baltic borrowings do not go back to the era of the Finno-Volgaic community. Baltic loans are not found in the Permic languages at all, which clearly indicates that contacts between the Balts and the Finno-Ugric peoples began after the disappearance of the Finno-Permic language community.

Prehistoric language contacts between the Balts and the Finno-Ugric peoples also led to borrowings in the opposite (reverse) direction (Bednarczuk 2017: 188–189), although it is quite widely believed that Finno-Ugric influences were definitely weaker due to the fact that the material culture of the Indo-European peoples was higher in relation to the way of life of the former Uralic hunter-gatherers. Some researchers, however, distinguish a large number, e.g. Bednarczuk (1976) notices as many as 66 Balto-Slavic lexical items, including 46 Baltic ones taken from Finno-Ugric languages. Other researchers strongly limit the number of ancient Finno-Ugric loans in Baltic languages, e.g. Junttila (2015: 31) is willing to accept the prehistoric character of only five lexical items. Therefore, the disproportion of influence would be huge, even if we consider a higher level of development of Indo-European peoples (dealing with agriculture and animal husbandry) in comparison with the culture of the Uralic peoples (once presenting a hunter-gatherer lifestyle). It should be noted that numerous borrowings in both directions are observed today on the Latvian-Livonian and Latvian-

Estonian border. Earlier Finno-Ugric borrowings can be found in Lithuanian. It is also accepted in the relevant literature that Finno-Ugric loanwords can also be distinguished in West Baltic languages, which, in historical times, were used in territories far away from areas inhabited by people of Finno-Ugric origin. It should, therefore, be presumed that Finno-Ugricisms found their way into Old Prussian and Yatvingian either in the prehistoric era (as substrate borrowings) or in the historical era through the East Baltic languages (as secondary borrowings).

In this paper, I would like to critically analyze lexical Finno-Ugricisms, i.e. Finno-Ugric loanwords in West Baltic languages (Old Prussian and Yatvingian¹) which until now have been indicated. I also make new juxtapositions and comparisons.

2. Review of Old Prussian and Yatvingian words suspected of the Finno-Ugric origin

In the historical era, West Baltic languages were used in territories located far away from the areas occupied by Finno-Ugric peoples. Neither the Prussians nor the Yatvingians were in direct contact with the Finno-Ugric peoples. Finno-Ugric lexical influences in Old Prussian and Yatvingian will be traced here, highlighted either in the existing literature on the subject or by the author of this study. The question of when and through whom these Finno-Ugric loanwords found their way into the vocabulary of the Western Balts will be raised.

2.1. Yatv. *ajga* ‘end’, *ajgd* ‘to end’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 116 *koniec* (‘end’) – *ajga*; PDN 117 *kończyć* (‘to end’) – *ajgd*.

BALTIC COMPARANDA: Zigmas Zinkevičius points to possible cognates in East Baltic languages: Lith. *pa-baigà* f. ‘the end; dying’, *baĩgti*, *beĩgti* ‘to

¹ The Yatvingian vocabulary is quoted according to Zinov’s copy (made in 1978) of a bilingual glossary known as “Pagan Dialects of Narew” (henceforth: PDN). The text was edited and commented by Zigmas Zinkevičius (1985; 1992). The Yatvingian character of the Baltic part of PDN is perfectly confirmed by numerous Yatvingian or post-Yatvingian place names and hydronyms (cf. Witczak 2004: 312–313; 2015: 274–277; 2019a: 633–661; 2020: 144–146). Most modern scholars (e.g. Dini 2014: 304–307; Schmalstieg 2015: 338–375) accept the Yatvingian hypothesis suggested by the Lithuanian linguist.

finish, to lead to the end’ and Latv. *beigas* f. pl. ‘end’, *bēigt* ‘to finish, to stop’ (Zinkevičius 1985: 68; 1992: 105). The above etymology, however, presupposes an unexpected loss of the consonant **b-* in Yatvingian.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: No reference.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: The lexical material is limited to Western Finnic languages: Liv. *aigā* ‘shore, edge, place, side’, Est. *ai* ‘edge of a garment; hem of a skirt or shirt’, Fi. dial. *aaaja* ‘large area’ (adj.) ‘large, wide’, Kar. *agja* ‘head, peak, tip, top, end’, Ol. *agju* ‘edge, end, border’, Lud. *agdʹ* ‘tip, end (of the string, village, field etc.)’, Vp. *agj* ‘tip, piece, end’ (< BFi. **akja* ‘edge, border’; EES 2012: 46). The Balto-Finnic lexemes in question are usually considered Nordic borrowings (Raun 2000: 2), cf. ON. *egg* f. ‘edge’, OE. *ecg* f. ‘id.’, OSax. *eggia* f. ‘edge, blade, sword’; OHG. *ecka*, *egga* f. ‘edge, angle, corner’, Germ. *Ecke* f. ‘angle, corner; coals’ < PGmc. **agjō* ‘edge, blade’ < PIE. **h₂ék-*iéh₂** (Kroonen 2013: 4), see also OFris. *edze* m. ‘edge, blade’.

COMMENTARY: The phonetic and semantic closeness of the Yatvingian and Livonian forms indicates borrowing from some Western Finnic source in which the metathesis of the **gj* consonant group took place (e.g. Yatv. *ajga* f. ‘end’ ← Liv. *aigā*). It should be added that the phonological change **kj* > *ig* is fully regular in Livonian (Orel, Khelimskij 1987: 122), cf. Liv. *raigā* ‘thigh, hip’ = Fi. *raaja* ‘limb’ (< BFi. **rakja*). It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the ancestors of the Livs once lived in the wider territories, closer to the Balts and that they were pushed to the areas occupied in the Middle Ages by the ongoing invasion of the Baltic peoples. Acceptance of the derivative above requires the assumption that the Yatvingian verb *ajgd* ‘to end’ is denominative and represents a typical *verbum factitivum*.

2.2. Yatv. *ajki* ‘time’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 107 *czas* (‘time’) – *ajki* (Zinkevičius 1985: 68; 1992: 103). The Yatvingian form probably represents masculine plurale tantum.

BALTIC COMPARANDA: Lith. *laikas* m. ‘time’, Latv. *laiks* m. ‘time, date, weather’. The Yatvingian form differs from East Baltic forms by the absence of the initial phoneme *l-* (Zinkevičius 1985: 68). OPrus. *kērdan* ‘time’ is of a completely different origin, it is probably also a Finno-Ugric loanword (see No. 12).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Lith. *laikas* is thought to be a Baltic semantic innovation, derived from the verb *lieku*, *likti* ‘become’. Smoczyński reconstructs the etymological meaning ‘spare, free time’ (Smoczyński 2018: 655). It should be emphasized that the East Baltic formation represents the former neuter noun **loik^uóm* (cf. Gr. λοιπόν n. ‘rest; what is left; (of time) remaining, future’, adv. ‘by now, then, consequently, therefore’; Montanari 2018: 1254), as evidenced by metatony, shown by Lith. *laikà* next to *laikài* pl. ‘times’ (Derksen 2015: 269). The Finnish cognate *aika* ‘time’ (if we consider this word a Baltic borrowing) also indicates the neuter gender. The Yatvingian term, in turn, documents a masculine plural formation, cf. Latv. *laiki* pl. ‘times’ (Karulis 1987: 137; Schmalstieg 2015: 338).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: The lexical material is documented in Western Finnic languages: Fi. *aika* ‘time, date, age’, Est. *aeg* ‘time’, SEst. *aig* ‘id.’, Liv. *āiga* ‘time, weather, measure’, Vot. *aika* ‘time’, Ingr. *aiga*, Ol. *aigu*, Lud. *aig*, Vp. *aig* ‘id.’ (< BFi. **ajka*; cf. EES 2012: 43), as well as in Saami languages: Saa.N *âkke* ‘age, life time’, Saa.Ko, Saa.Kd *a_ikk*, Saa.T *a_ikke* ‘id.’ (< **äjikä*).² Balto-Finnic and Saami words are native compound words including the Finno-Ugric appellative **ikä* ‘age, year’ in the second component. The Finno-Ugric protoform **ikä* has extensive attestation in many Finno-Ugric languages, cf. Fi. *ikä* ‘age, years, lifetime, life’, Est. *iga* (gen. sg. *ea*) ‘lifetime, age’. Liv. *igā* ‘id.’; Saa.N *jâkke* ‘year’, Saa.L *jahke* ‘id.’, Saa.Nz *ëkk* ‘id.’, Saa.Kd *ëkk*, *ëikk* ‘year’, Saa.T *jikke* ‘id.’; Mdv.E *ije* ‘year’; Cher. *i*, *ji* ‘year’; OHung. *é* ‘year, age’, Hung. *év* ‘year’ (Collinder 1977, 99; Rédei 1986–88, 98; Raun 2000: 17). A possible hypothesis about a foreign origin of Fi. *aika* ‘time, date, age’ and Est. *aeg* ‘time’ has no justification, cf. the semantic opposition found in Saami dialects: Saa.N *jâkke* ‘year’ vs. *âkke* ‘age, lifetime’, Saa.Kd *ëkk*, *ë_ikk* ‘year’ vs. *a_ikk* ‘age, life time’, Saa.T *jikke* ‘year’ vs. *a_ikke* ‘age, life time’. This opposition is confirmed by a Western Finnic variation with slightly changed semantics: **ikä* ‘age, lifetime’ vs. **ajka* ‘time’, compare Fi. *ikä* ‘age, years, lifetime, life’ vs. *aika* ‘time, date, age’, Est. *iga* ‘age, lifetime’ vs. *aeg* ‘time’.

COMMENTARY: Finno-Ugric borrowings in Yatvingian have been distinguished by Khelimskij (1985: 234–235; 2000: 402–403) and Bednarczuk

² Some researchers (e.g. Rédei 1986–88: 98) consider these Saami words to be Finnish loanwords.

(1992: 106; 1999: 68). The reverse direction of borrowing is also taken into consideration, i.e. Fi. *aika* ‘time, date, age’, Est. *aeg* ‘time’ ← Yatv. *ajki* ‘time’ < PB. **laika-* (Orel, Khelimsij 1987: 123). The latter option is strongly preferred by Zinkevičius (1992: 105), assuming that Finnish words can represent Baltic influence, acquired from the Yatvingian language. In other words, he considers the disappearance of the liquid consonant *l-* as a phenomenon typical of the Yatvingian language. In my opinion, the East Baltic words (Lith. *laikas* m. ‘time’, Latv. *laīks* m. ‘time, weather’) are probably native formations. Western Finnic words (e.g. Fi. *aika* ‘time, date, age’) cannot be considered Baltic borrowings documenting the loss of the initial liquid consonant *l-* as this loss sometimes occurs when unrelated languages come into contact. They are West Finnic (and Saami) derivatives based on an inherited Finno-Ugric root. In this situation, it should be strongly rejected that the Yatvingian *ajki* ‘time’ was borrowed back (i.e. Yatv. *ajki* ‘time’ ← Fi. *aika* ‘time, date, age’, Est. *aeg* ‘time’ ← PB. **laika* ‘time’).

2.3. Yatv. *ałm* ‘apple’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 108 *jabłko* – *ałm*.

BALTIC COGNATES: In other Baltic languages, the native appellative for ‘apple’ is preserved, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language: OPrus. *woble* ‘apple’, Lith. *obuolys* m. ‘id.’, Latv. *ābuōls* m. ‘id.’ (< PIE. **h₂eb-h₁l-*, **h₂eb-oh₁l-*).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The Yatvingian noun *ałm* ‘apple’ can neither be compared with the PIE archetype **h₂eb-h₁l-u* n. ‘apple’, nor with the Hittite word *šamalu* n. ‘id.’, nor with the well-known bunch of the Indo-European words denoting ‘apple’, cf. Lat. *mālum* m. ‘apple; any tree-fruit similar to the apple’, Gk. *μῆλον* n. ‘apple; thin-skinned-fruit (of quince, lemon, peach or apricot)’, Alb. *mollë* f. ‘apple; apple tree; cheek’ (< PIE. **meh₂l-*).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Hung. (from the eleventh century) *alma* ‘apple’ is not a native word of Finno-Ugric origin. Different terms for ‘apple’ are attested in Finno-Volgaic languages: Fi. *omena* ‘apple’, Kar. dial. *omena* ‘id.’, Ingr. *ommeena* ‘apple, potato’, Vot. *õuna* ‘apple’, Est. *õun*, CEst. *oun* ‘apple, potato’, Liv. *umār* ‘apple’; Mdv.E *umar* ‘apple, fruit, (straw)berry’, Mdv.M *mař* ‘apple, berry’ < FV. **omeņa* (Rédei 1986–88: 718; EES 2012: 628).

COMMENTARY: The Finno-Ugric source of borrowing is doubtful. Khelimskij derives Yatv. *alm* ‘apple’ from Hung. *alma* ‘id.’ (Khelimskij 1985: 234; 2000: 402). There is no doubt that the Hungarian *alma* is not a native word but a Turkish borrowing, cf. Karaimic *alma* ‘apple’ (Baskakow, Szapszał, Zajączkowski 1974: 65), Tat. *alma* ‘apple’, dial. ‘potato’, Ott. *elma* ‘apple’, Chuv. *ulma* ‘id.’ (Sevortyan 1974: 138). The Yatvingian appellative thus represents an evident case of Turkish borrowing (Schmalstieg 2015: 339). It seems that the (Proto-)Hungarian language might as well be a possible intermediary for this loanword, but it is more likely to identify sources of this borrowing in Karaim or Tatar. From the 14th century these peoples were settled in the lands of the Great Duchy of Lithuania, later the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth (Bednarczuk 1999: 120–121, 2013: 20; Dini 2014: 522).

2.4. Yatv. *chad* ‘house’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 150 *dom* (‘house’) – *chad*.

BALTIC COMPARANDA: Three different formations are attested in Baltic languages, e.g. OPrus. *buttan* n. ‘house’; Lith. *nāmas* m. ‘residential building’, pl. *namai* ‘house, home, family nest, flat’ (= Latv. *namas*, m. ‘central part of a house, kitchen, smokehouse, annex to the bathhouse’); Latv. *māja* f. ‘house’. None of them is cognate with the Yatvingian form.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Iranian and Slavic forms are relatively close, cf. Av. *kata-* m. ‘storage room, cellar’, Pers. *kat* ‘house, flat’, Yagn. *kat* ‘home’, Yazg. *kūd* ‘house, building’, Oss. (Dig.) *kæt* ‘stable’, Wakhi *kut* ‘roof’ < Iran. **kata-* (Edel’man 2011: 340–345); OCz. *kot* m. ‘hut, stall’, dim. *kotec* m. ‘booth, stall; loft, playpen’, SCr. dial. *kôt* m. ‘sheep farm, poultry cage, pigsty’, dim. *kòtac* m. ‘small farm, lamb stable; poultry cage; pigsty, piglet pen’; ORu. *котыць* m. ‘cage, nest’; OPol. *kocieć*, Pol. *kojec* m. ‘poultry cage; pen in a barn for separated animals’ < PSŁ. **kotъ*, dim. **kotъcbъ*. The Polish word *chata* remains in some secondary relation to the above Iranian-Slavic formations. The phoneme *ch* [x] was originally unknown to Baltic languages, which is why the Yatvingian word *chad* should be considered a relatively late borrowing.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *kota* ‘chum (Saami hut), yurt’, dial. *koti* ‘home, house, flat’; Kar. *koti*, *kodi* ‘house’; Est. *koda* ‘house, building, apartment’; Saa.N *goatte* ‘chum, hut, yurt’; Mdv.E *kudo*, Mdv.M *kus* ‘home; living room’; Cher. *kudo* ‘Cheremissian summer cottage, summer-hut’;

Udm. *kor-ka* ‘home, chamber’, (Kaz.) *kwa-la* ‘Votyak summer-kitchen’; Zyr.S *ker-ka* ‘home’, Zyr.P *ker-ku* ‘home’; Kh.V *kat*, Kh.D *χot*, Kh.Obd *χat* ‘home’; Hung. *ház* ‘house, home; family’ (formerly also ‘room’) < FU. **kota* ‘shelter, kennel, house’, dim. **kotzka* (Collinder 1977: 142; Rédei 1986–88: 190; EES 2012: 168). Finno-Ugric words are usually considered Iranian borrowings (Collinder 1977: 142; Holopainen 2019: 126–127), but the reverse direction of borrowing is more acceptable for a number of reasons. Firstly, the distribution of the reconstructed Indo-European word is limited to two groups only (Iranian and Slavic). Secondly, there is no trace of the analyzed word in the oldest Indo-European languages (i.e. in Hittite, Luwian, Greek and Vedic), as well as in the West Indo-European languages. Thirdly, both the Iranians and the Slavs were in a strong language contact with the Uralic people in historical and prehistorical times. Fourthly, the Slavic languages demonstrate two different variants: **kotъ*, dim. **kotъcbъ* and **χata*, **χatъ* (see below). Both these variants seem to be foreign loanwords taken from two different sources. Fifthly, the Finno-Ugric languages demonstrate one uniform prototype (FU. **kota*), as well as a regular continuation, rich attestation and a broad distribution.

COMMENTARY: A direct West Finnish borrowing in Yatvingian seems rather doubtful. Khelimskij assumes borrowing from the Proto-Hungarian language **χād* ‘home’, from which Hungarian *ház* ‘id.’, stressing that Finno-Ugric words are considered ancient Iranian borrowings (Khelimskij 1985: 234; 2000: 402). This word could have found its way to the Yatvingian language through Hungarian (Orel, Khelimskij 1987: 124). It would be much easier to accept Zinkevičius’s hypothesis about borrowing from Pol. *chata* ‘country house; a simple structure, usually wooden’ (Zinkevičius 1992: 109; Schmalstieg 2015: 341). The Polish word, attested since the 17th century, is, however, a probable East Slavonic loan, cf. Ukr. *xáma* f. ‘cottage, house, flat’, Bel. *xáma*, *xámka* f. ‘id.’, Ru. *xáma* f. ‘peasant house in Ukraine and southern Russia’ (Sławski 1952–56: 61–62; Boryś 2005: 57). It can be suggested that the Yatvingian term *chad* was borrowed from some Slavic source. In Slavic languages we also find the former *i*-stem formation, which fits Yatv. *chad* very well, e.g. Morav. *chať* f. ‘tiny house’, Pol. dial. (from Wielkopolska) *chać* f. ‘chata, buda’ (Sławski 1952–56: 61). Researchers most often point to Iranian languages as the final source of borrowing. The anlaut *ch-* [x] in Slavic languages seems to indicate an unknown intermediary.

2.5. Yatv. *dumo* ‘dark’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 134 *ciemno* (‘dark’) – *dumo*.

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *dūmas* adj. ‘smoke-colored (of ox or cow); dark as smoke’, Latv. *dūms* adj. ‘dark red, dark gray’ (Zinkevičius 1985: 71–72, 1992: 110). The derivational base is the noun meaning ‘smoke’, cf. OPrus. (EV 39) *dumis* m. ‘smoke’ (gl. *Rouch*), OLith. *dūmas* m. ‘smoke’, Lith. *dūmai* m. pl. ‘smoke’, Latv. *dūmi* m. pl. ‘id.’. An alternative relation of the Yatvingian word with Latv. *tūmsa* f. ‘darkness’, *tūmss*, dial. *tūmšs* adj. ‘dark’, *tumst* ‘to get dark’, Lith. *témti* ‘to grow dark, to darken’ (Smoczyński 2018: 1469) can additionally be taken into account, though such a hypothesis seems hardly acceptable for phonological reasons (e.g. Yatv. *d-* does not normally correspond to Latv. *t-*).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The above Baltic words clearly derive from PIE. **d^huh₂mós* m. ‘smoke’, adj. ‘dark as smoke, smoke-colored, smoky’, cf. OInd. *dhūmāḥ* m. ‘smoke’, Lat. *fūmus* m. ‘smoke, vapor’, OHG. *toum* m. ‘steam, vapor, fume, smell’, Gr. *θυμός* m. ‘breath, fume, life force’ ← PIE. **d^heu_h₂-* ‘to smoke, burn incense, breathe, give off a fragrance’ (Pokorny 1959: 261–263; Rix 2001: 149–150; Smoczyński 2018: 262).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Khelimskij only provides the Finnish word-formation nest: Fi. *tumma*, dial. *tymmä* adj. ‘dark’, *tumea* ‘dark, cloudy’, *tummentaa* ‘darken’. He also indicates that the distribution of related words is limited only to West Finnic languages (Khelimskij 1985: 235, 2000: 403; Orel, Khelimskij 1987: 124). In this situation, the Finnish words seem to be borrowed from a Baltic source (e.g. Latv. *tūmss* adj. ‘dark’, *tūmsa* f. ‘darkness’), which is postulated by Khelimskij himself.

COMMENTARY: The Yatvingian word *dumo* ‘dark’ represents a doubtful Finno-Ugric loanword, because it has exact cognates not only in Baltic, but also in other Indo-European languages.

2.6. Yatv. *fała* ‘meat’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 146 *mięso* (‘meat’) – *fała*.

BALTIC COMPARANDA: No exact cognates. A common origin of Latv. *gaļa* f. ‘meat’ (Zinkevičius 1992: 110) seems doubtful. The Latvian phoneme *g-* is not congruent with the consonant *f-* of the Yatvingian word. Words attested in other Baltic languages (OPrus. *menso* f. ‘meat’, Lith. *mėsà*, dial. *męsà* f. ‘meat’) have the Indo-European origin.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: According to W. Schmalstieg (2015: 343), the word is etymologically vague (“The word is very unclear”). Yatv. *fala* f. ‘meat’ has no cognates in other Indo-European languages.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *pala* ‘bite, piece, crumb’, Est. *pala* ‘id.’, Liv. *palā* ‘section, piece, part’; Saa.N *buola* ‘small bite; piece, frustulum’; Mdv.E *pal* ‘bite, piece of bread or meat’, Mdv.M *pal* ‘meat’; Cher. *pul-tâš* ‘piece of (bread or meat)’; Kh.D *pül-* ‘to swallow’, *pül* ‘piece, bite, sip’, Kh.V *pulj* – ‘to lap, taste’, *pul* ‘piece, bite’, Kh.Obd *pulot* – ‘eat greedily’, *pul* ‘bite, piece’; Vog.S *pōl*, Vog.N, Vog.E *pül*, Vog.W *pulō* ‘piece, bite’; Hung. *fal-* ‘to eat greedily, to devour’, *falat* ‘mouthful, bite’ (< FU. **pala* ‘a bite; to eat’). Finno-Ugric words have evident Uralic provenance, with the Samoyedic languages documenting both the verbal sense ‘to eat, to swallow’ and the nominal meaning ‘mouthful’, cf. Nen. *pāle* ‘to devour, to swallow’; Slk.T *poli-* ‘to swallow’, Slk.Ty *pol-* ‘to devour’; Koib. *ноолдола* ‘sip’.

COMMENTARY: The Yatvingian word can represent a Finno-Ugric substrate loan. A similar meaning (‘meat’) is only attested in the Mordvin language: Mdv.M *pal* ‘meat’ vs. Mdv.E *pal* ‘bite, piece of bread or meat’. Khelims kij suggests that the Yatvingian word reveals Hungarian phonetics (through the change of **p* > *f*) and the Mordvinian semantics (Khelims kij 1985: 234, 2000: 402). He also admits the possibility that Hungarian had the noun **fala* with the specific meaning ‘meat’, which was early eliminated due to a collision with the synonymous Hungarian word *hús* ‘meat’ of unclear origin (Orel, Khelims kij 1987: 125).

2.7. OPrus. *gentars* ‘amber’

ATTESTATION: OPrus. *gentars* ‘amber, gl. Bernstein’ (Mažiulis 1988: 352).

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *giņtaras*, m. ‘amber’, Žem. *gintars* m. ‘id.’; Latv. *džiņtars* dial. *zītars* m. ‘id.’; Cur. *dziņtars*, m. ‘id.’ (Fraenkel 1962: 152).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Baltic words meaning ‘amber’ remain etymologically unclear (Sabaliauskas 1993: 46; Smoczyński 2018: 180). Comparing them with Slavic terms such as Pol. *jantar* m. ‘amber’, Ru. *янтарь* m. ‘id.’ is impossible from the phonetic point of view (Mažiulis 1988: 353).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: There are few possible references in the Finno-Ugric languages, cf. Hung. *gyanta* ‘resin; rosin’, dial. *gyantar* ‘amber’; Cher. *jamdar* ‘glass’, adj. ‘clear, transparent, glass’, see also Chuv. *jandar* ‘a

glass vessel, a cup' (Bednarczuk 1976: 47, 1999: 95). The above Finno-Ugric words are probably old borrowings from an Iranian source, cf. Av. *yama-*, *yāma-* m. 'glass; glass vessel', Pahlavi *jām* 'glass', Pers. *jām* 'glass, glassware' < Iran. **yāma-* 'glass' (Horn 1893: 92; Bartholomae 1904: 1264, 1286), from where the derivative **yāma-tāra-* 'something similar to glass; transparent stone', secondarily 'amber'.

COMMENTARY: This is a case of an uncertain Finno-Ugric loanword, which has been postulated by some researchers (Bednarczuk 1976: 47–48, 1977: 101, 1999: 95–96; 2016: 86; Mańczak 2008: 150), while strongly criticized by others (Junttila 2015: 22; Holst 2015: 165). In the literature on the subject, it is emphasized that the source of borrowing could not be West Finnic languages that use different and innovative terminology (Witczak 2019: 50), e.g. Fi. *meripihka* 'amber' (literally 'sea resin', cf. Fi. *pihka* 'tar, resin' < FU. **piška* 'resin'; Rédei 1986–88: 385–386), Est. *merevaik* 'amber' (literally 'sea resin'), Est. *pihkakivi* 'amber' (literally 'resin stone', cf. Est. *pihk* 'resin'; Est. *kivi* 'stone' < FU. **kiwi* 'stone'; Rédei 1986–88: 163–164).

2.8. OPrus. *jūrī* 'sea'

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 66) *luriay* [= Iuriay] gl. *Mer* 'sea'; C III 107 *en iūrin* 'in the sea'; C III 119 *en vrminan iūrin* 'in the Red Sea' (Trautmann 1910: 373; Mažiulis 1993: 54).

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *jūra* f. 'sea' (Pl. *jūros*), also *jūrė*, *jūria* f. 'id.'; Latv. *jūra*, also *jūra* f. 'sea, great lake' (Smoczyński 2018: 239–240). See also Lith. *jāura* f. 'swamp, deep water, whirlpool', also 'podzol soil, wet, heavy, infertile soil; clay admixed soil', *jāuras* m. 'marsh, deep water, whirlpool', *jaurūs* adj. 'slushy'.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Difficult to propose and accept. Suggested relationship with IE. **ūr-* (cf. ON. *úr* 'drizzle', Lat. *ūrīna* f. 'urine', *urium* n. 'kind of river mud')³ requires interpreting the initial *j-* sound in terms of prothesis, which, in the case of the Baltic languages, is not a common phenomenon. In addition, the basic sense 'sea, lake' is not available elsewhere.

³ The Indo-European material is extremely uncertain. It is also emphasized that the root **ur-* 'water' seems to be of foreign origin. It occurs, among others, in Basque and Northeast Caucasian, cf. Basque *ur* 'water'; Udi *orein* 'source', Avar *or* 'river', Lak *bj-ar* 'lake' (Bouda 1950: 665).

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Fi. *järvi* (gen. *järven*) ‘lake’; Est. *järv* (gen. *järve*) ‘inland lake, standing water’; Liv. *jōra*, *jāra* ‘inland lake’, SLiv. *jāru* ‘lake’; Saa.N *jaw're* ‘lake’, Saa.L *jau'rē* ‘lake (especially inland lake)’, Saa. Ko, Saa.T *jäivre*, Saa.Kd *jaivr*, Saa.Nz *javr* ‘id.’; Mdv.E *ērke*, Mdv.M *är'kä*, dial. (Penza) *jär'kä* ‘lake, pond’; Cher. *jär*, *jer* ‘sea’ < FV. **jārwā* ‘lake / See, Binnensee’ (Rédei 1986–88: 633; EES 2012: 105). Finno-Volgaic words are cognate with Ur. **jurma* ‘deep water (in a river or lake)’ (Rédei 1986–88: 105), see Fi. dial. *jurmu* ‘a deep place in a lake or river’; Saa.N *jor'bme* ‘a deep place in the river, bathing place’, Saa.L *jārme* ‘a deep place in the river or stream’; Zyr. *jir* ‘a deep place in a river or lake’; Nen. *jor* ‘depth’, *joře* ‘deep (of water, snow)’; En. *jođe*, *jore* ‘deep, thick’; Ngan. *juraga* ‘deep’; Mat. *čūra* ‘id.’.

COMMENTARY: The Old Prussian word in question represents the Finno-Ugric loanword of substrate origin (Bednarczuk 1977: 101, 2016: 86). The Samoyedic cognates of the Finno-Volgaic terms for ‘lake, pond’ clearly demonstrate that the opposite direction of borrowing should be completely rejected (Jakob 2024: 87).

2.9. OPrus. *juwis* ‘common yew, *Taxus baccata* L.’

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 599) *Juwis* – *Jwenbom* [= Germ. *Eibenbaum*] (Mažiulis 1993: 58); cf. also the Old Prussian place name *Iwegarge*, *Iwogarge* 1331, glossed as “huwinboum” [= ‘yew-tree’] (Gerullis 1922: 50; Mažiulis 1993: 51).

BALTIC PARALLELS: Latv. *īve* f. ‘yew’ (as if borrowed from MLG. *iwe* f. ‘yew’).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Baltic words are usually considered to be borrowings from some Germanic source, cf. MLG. *iwe* ‘yew’, MHG. *iwe* ‘id.’ (Trautmann 1910: 349; Smoczyński 1989: 22; 2000: 186). Indo-Europeanists often reconstruct the archetype **iṷos* (or **eiṷos*) f./m. ‘common yew, *Taxus baccata* L.’, which lacks a clear structure and motivation (Pokorny 1959: 297; Blažek 2001: 39–40). The term for ‘yew’ is widespread in Germanic and Celtic languages, cf. ON. *ýr* m. ‘yew’; OE. *éow*, *íw* m. ‘yew’, E. *yew* ‘id.’; MDu. *ijf* m. ‘yew’; OHG. *iwa* f. ‘yew’, MHG. *iwe* f. ‘id.’, Germ. *Eibe* f. ‘id.’ < PGmc. **iṷaz* (Kroonen 2013: 271); OIr. *éo* m. ‘yew’, MWel. *yw*, *ywen* ‘yew; yew wood’, OCorn. *hiuin* ‘yew’ (gl. *taxus*), MBret. *ivin* ‘yew’, Bret. *iwin* ‘id.’, OFr. *if* ‘yew’ (< PC. **iṷos* ‘yew’; Matasović 2009: 173). Further Indo-European cognates are uncertain (Smoczyński 2018: 417). The reference to various deciduous trees,

such as bird cherry, willow, rowan, and even to the grapevine is not compelling, e.g. Lith. *ievà*, dial. *jievà* f. ‘bird cherry, *Padus avium* Mill., syn. *Prunus padus* L.’, Latv. *iēva* f. ‘id.’; SCr. *īva* f. ‘willow, *Salix*’, Cz. *jíva* f. ‘willow, *Salix*’, Pol. *iwa* f. ‘a species of willow, *Salix caprea* L.’, Russ. *uša* f. ‘willow’; Gr. Ion. *οἴη*, *ὄη*, Att. *ῥα* f. ‘service tree, sorb tree, *Sorbus domestica* L.’ (< **oiuā*); Alb. *vadhë* / *vodhë* f. ‘rowan, mountain ash, *Sorbus*’; Lat. *ūva* f. ‘vine; grape’ (< **oiuā*). All kinds of conifers, such as pines, firs, spruces, yews and junipers, can be easily distinguished from deciduous trees. The prehistoric identification of conifers with deciduous trees seems hardly possible.

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Kh. *juγ*, *juχ* ‘tree, timber / Baum, Holz’; Vog. *jīw*, *jiw*, *jūw* ‘id.’ < FU. **juw3* ‘tree (coniferous); timber’ < Ur. **juw3* ‘Scots pine, *Pinus sylvestris* L.’ (Rédei 1986–88: 107). Further cognates are richly attested in Samoyedic languages, cf. *je?* ‘pine’; Slk.T *tjō*, also *tjōöl-pu* ‘pine’, Slk.Tur *sō* ‘id.’, Slk.Nar *čwé*, Slk.MOb *kye* ‘pine’; Kam. *dū*, *d’ō* ‘spruce, pine’; Koib. *džä* ‘spruce’; Mat. *tčia* ‘spruce’; Tg. *džä* ‘spruce’ (Rédei 1986–88: 107). It seems that the above words are related to other Finno-Ugric terms meaning ‘coniferous forest’, e.g. Udm.S *jag*, Udm.K *lag* ‘coniferous forest’, Udm.G *jag* ‘spruce growing on sandy soil’; Zyr. *jag* ‘pine forest’, dial. ‘cemetery, burial place’; Kh.V *jaγəm* ‘heath (on sandy soil)’, Kh.D *jaχəm* ‘heath covered with pine forest’, Kh.Obd *jaχəm* ‘pines covered with reindeer moss’ < FU. **jakk3* ‘pine forest, spruce forest / Kiefernwald, Fichtenwald’ (Rédei 1986–88: 88), see also Cher. *jäktä*, *ja-kte* ‘spruce’ (from where vigil *jaχtā* ‘pine, *Pinus sylvestris* L.’). It cannot be ruled out that the FU. **jakk3* was created as a result of simplification of the Finno-Ugric proto-form **juwakk3* ‘conifer, especially pine’, cf. Fi. *juko* ‘yew’, *juko-puu* ‘yew-tree’, Liv. *jougūz* ‘yew’, Est. *juga*, *juga-puu*, dial. *juha*, *juha-puu* ‘common yew, *Taxus baccata* L.’ (Campbell 1990: 169).

COMMENTARY: The word Old Prussian *juwis* ‘common yew, *Taxus baccata* L.’ has not yet been seen as a possible Finno-Ugric loanword. What is noteworthy, however, is the phonological and somewhat semantic relationship between OPrus. *juwis* and Ur. **juw3* ‘conifer, esp. pine’. The Uralic word left some traces in West Finnic languages (including Finnish and Estonian) with the meaning of ‘yew’. This is why it cannot be ruled out that the Uralic term **juw3* assumed the specific meaning ‘common yew, *Taxus baccata* L.’ in an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate. The yew was exceptionally valuable and desirable, but at the same time a rarely encountered conifer in northeastern Europe.

2.10. OPrus. *kadegis* ‘juniper’.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 608) *Kadegis* – *Eynholcz* [= Germ. *Wacholder*] (Mažiulis 1993: 65–67).

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *kadagys*, dial. *kadugys*, *kaduogys* m. ‘juniper, *Iuniperus communis* L.’; Latv. *kadiķis*, dial. *kadēgs*, *kadags* m. ‘id.’ (Blažek 2001: 40).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: “Without good etymology” (Smoczyński 2018: 242). Comparison of the Baltic words with Gaulish *pados* ‘coniferous tree, pine / picea’ (Witczak 1999: 171) is phonologically and semantically possible, but the lack of motivation and lack of other Celtic and Indo-European cognates makes this conjecture quite poorly justified. Pol. dial. (North-East) *kaduk* m. ‘juniper’, Germ. dial. (Prussian) *Kaddig* are borrowings from a Baltic source (Liaučiute 1982: 78). Latv. *kadiķis*, dial. *kadiģis* ‘juniper’ was borrowed back from German (← MLG. *kadik* or Germ. *Kaddig* ‘juniper’).

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Numerous words resembling the Baltic terms meaning ‘juniper, *Iuniperus communis* L.’ appear in Western Finnic languages: Fi. *kataja*, dial. *katava*, *kataa* ‘juniper, *Iuniperus*’, Lud. *kadai*, Ol. *kadai*, Ingr. *kattaa* ‘id.’, Est. *kadak*, *kadakas* (gen. sg. *kadaka*) ‘juniper’, Võro *katai*, Liv. *kadāg*, *gadāg*, Vot. *katagō* (gen. *kataga*), Vp. *ka-dag* ‘id.’ (< BFi. **kataja* ‘juniper’). In other Finno-Ugric languages there are only complex forms with very similar semantics: Saa.N *gās’kās* ‘juniper’, Saa.S *gās’jēsē* ‘id.’, Saa.Kd, Saa.Nz *kəs-kas* ‘id.’, Saa.L *kas-kas* ‘juniper bush’; Cher. *lūme-kož* ‘juniper’; Zyr. *kač-pomel’* ‘small juniper tree’, (cf. Zyr. *pomel’* ‘young tree, shrub’); Vog.E *kās-pjiw*, Vog.W *kašā-pjiw* ‘id.’ (< FU. **kāčz*: *kāčä-jä* ‘juniper / Wacholder’; Rédei 1986–88: 133), they are motivated – as one might think – by the native term denoting the resin, cf. Mdv.M *kāšä* ‘resin, tar’, Mdv.E *kekše* ‘resin’, Cher. *kiš* ‘resin’ (< FU. **kāčä*). Karoly Rédei wrongly separates these two groups of words and alternatively combines Western Finnic juniper names with Saami-Vogul terms meaning coniferous tree or parts of it, which derive from FU. **koča* ‘species of coniferous trees / eine Art Nadelbaum’ (Rédei 1986–88: 165), see Saa.N *goac’ce* ‘pine needles’, Saa.Kd, Saa.Nz. *kuo_hhcev* ‘coniferous branch’, Saa.L *kāhttsē* ‘needles (coniferous)’; Vog.E *koš* ‘large coniferous tree’, Vog.W *koos-pəjuw* ‘wood (coniferous)’. What seems more likely from both the phonological (the root vowel: **a*) and semantic point of view (the juniper is a resinous

tree) is the relationship between the Western Finnic word **kata-ŋa* ‘juniper’ and the Finnish dialectal appellative *kata* ‘dry, resinous pine / trockene, harzige Kiefer’, *tervas-kata* ‘resinous tarry-pine / teerige Kiefer’ (< Ur. **kača* ‘resin’), see Saa.N *gačče*, *gac’ce* ‘resin’, Saa.L *kassē* ‘hard, partly molten resin’, Saa.T *kāššē*, Saa.Kd *kāššē*^E, Saa.Sko, Saa.Nz *kāššē*^E ‘ear wax; wood resin’; Nen. *χāde?* ‘resin, tar’, dial. *kātāes* ‘resin (larch resin)’; En. *kāde* ‘resin’ (Rédei 1986–88: 112). In other words, the Western Finnic term for ‘juniper’ has very good motivation and indisputable Uralic origin (BFi. **kata-ŋa* ‘juniper’ ← BFi. **kata* ‘resin tree; resin’ < Ur. **kača* ‘resin’).

COMMENTARY: A Finno-Ugric loanword in Baltic with a rather ancient (at least medieval) chronology. Numerous foreign and Polish scholars supported the Western Finnic etymology of the Baltic words (Diefenbach 1880: 225, 230; Setälä 1909: 126–128; Mikkola 1932: 442–443; Zeps 1962: 116–117; Kolbuszewski 1973: 150; Bednarczuk 1976: 48, 1993: 104; Rédei 1986–88: 165; Smoczyński 2000: 36–40; Blažek 2001: 40; Szcześniak 2014: 89–99; Wojan 2014: 123–124; Smoczyński 2018: 462). The reverse direction of influence, assumed, among others, by Donner (1884), Thomsen (1890: 116) and Collinder (1977: 95), seems unbelievable due to the Uralic motivation and etymology of the Western Finnic name of the juniper.

2.11. OPrus. *kaywe* ‘mare’.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 433) *Kaywe* – *Kobele* (Mažiulis 1993: 81–83).

BALTIC EQUIVALENTS: Lith. dial. (north) *kėvė* f. ‘thin, weak, bad mare or cow’ and Latv. *kēve* f. ‘mare, nag, jade’ (in a pejorative sense), also *kaive* f. ‘horse, mare’. Lith. *kėvinas*, *kėvinas* m. ‘miserable horse, nag, jade’ is secondary, as it is a derivative formed from the feminine *kėvė* by means of the productive suffix *-inas*, identifying males.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: No reference.

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Finno-Ugric material is limited only to Livonian and Saami forms: Liv. *kēu*, *kēv*, *keev* ‘mare’; Saa.Ko *giev-bielle* ‘female reindeer’, Saa.T *kiev* ‘female reindeer’, Saa.I *kieu^v* ‘female reindeer’, Saa.S *kiäka* ‘female reindeer / rangifer femina’, Saa.Kd *kieu^v*^(a), Saa.Nz *kieu^{vva}* ‘female wild reindeer’ < BF. **kēwe* ‘female animal’ (Rédei 1986–88: 152). The Finno-Ugric character of Livonian and Saami forms cannot be questioned, as the ancient status of the lexeme is con-

firmed by ample Samoyedic data, cf. Nen. *šibekü* ‘bird’s mother’; Slk.T *šyyma*, Slk.Ke *syywa*, Slk.Nar *šöwa* ‘female capercaillie’; Kam. *šejmuu*, *šejma* ‘mare’; Koib. *sjuima* ‘mare’, Mat. *keibe* ‘id.’; Tg. *kéibe* ‘id.’ < Ur. **käöwä* ‘female animal, esp. mare’ (Toivonen 1929: 144; Collinder 1977: 44; Rédei 1986–88: 152).

COMMENTARY: The lexical material of the Baltic languages contains multiple Finno-Ugric borrowings of different chronology. The older loan shows diphthong (OPrus. *kaywe*, Latv. *kaive*) and represents an evident lexical trace of an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate, while the younger documents vocalization [e:]. I can agree with the opinion of Junttila (2015: 24) that the Latv. *ķēve* f. ‘mare, nag, jade’ and Lith. dial. *kėvé* f. ‘thin, weak, bad mare or cow’ are relatively late borrowings from the Livonian source, cf. Liv. *kēv*, *keev* ‘mare’ (Toivonen 1929: 144; Bednarczuk 1977: 101, 2016: 86). It is absolutely impossible to derive the indicated diphthongic forms from the Livonian source.⁴

2.12. OPrus. *kērdan* ‘time’.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (C III 99) *en kērdan* ‘currently / zur Zeit’; (C III 88, III 97) *prei swaian kērdan* ‘in his time / zu seiner Zeit’; (C III 111) *enstan kērdan* ‘zu der Zeit’ (Mažiulis 1993: 163).

BALTIC COGNATES: In other Baltic languages, we encounter completely different appellatives, cf. Yatv. *ajki* (plurale tantum?) ‘time’ (see No. 2); Lith. *laikas* m. ‘time’; Latv. *laiks* m. ‘time, date, weather’.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: In Slavic languages, the word **čerda* f. has two meanings: (1) ‘order, series, variability, sequence’; (2) ‘a herd of domestic animals, especially cattle, sheep’ (Ślawski 1976: 150–151). Indo-European cognates above all confirm the second meaning, cf. Goth. *hairda* f. ‘flock, herd’, *hairdeis* m. ‘shepherd’, Germ. *Herde* f. ‘flock, herd; cluster, mass, crowd’, Lith. *keřdžius* m. ‘senior shepherd’ (cf., however, OHG *herta* ‘change, order’) – for a discussion of further Germanic and Indo-European cognates, see Rychło (2013). Smoczyński (2018: 527) rightly separates the Old Prussian appellative *kērdan* obl. sg. ‘time’ from the Lithuanian agent noun denoting ‘shepherd’ and expresses reasonable doubt whether the Old Prussian form should be

⁴ Euler (1985: 88) assumes that the source of the forms with diphthongs was the nowhere witnessed Lithuanian dialectal form ***kėvė*.

derived from the Proto-Indo-European archetype **kerd^h-eh₂* (f.) ‘herd, flock’.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Saa.N *goérde* ‘time; layer (clothing, thread); bunch; order, succession / time, layer, tuft, round’; Fi. *kerta* ‘once, order, set, jar, layer’ (see *kerran* adv. ‘once’, *kaksi kertaa* ‘twice’, *kolme kertaa* ‘three times’); Est. *kord*, *kõrd* ‘order, sequence, layer, floor’, SEst. *kõrd*, CEst. *kerd* ‘id.’; Mdv. *kirda* ‘time’; Cher. *kerδa* ‘time’ in common phrases of the type *pülä-yerδa* ‘long ago / vor Ziemlich langer Zeit’, *šukerδa* ‘long ago / schon längst, vorlängst’ (< FV. **kertä* ‘order, layer, sequence, time / Reihe, Schicht, Ordnung, Mal, Zeit’) (Rédei 1986–88: 659; EES 2012: 178). It seems that the Finno-Volgaic archetype **kertä* is an irregular transformation of the former FU. **kentä* ‘czas / Zeit’, cf. Zyr. *kad* ‘czas’, Zyr.P *sĭ kadę* ‘at this time / zu der Zeit’, Zyr.S *kežan-kad* ‘sowing time’ (cf. Zyr. *kež-* ‘to sow’); OHung. *kedig*, Hung. dial. *ekkédig* ‘so far’ < Proto-Hungarian **kéd-* ‘time’ < **kent3* ‘time / Zeit’ (Rédei 1986–88: 146).

COMMENTARY: Rédei (1986–88: 659) derives Finno-Volgaic words from a Baltic source, specifically Old Prussian. The wide distribution of the words in Finno-Ugric (from Saami to Finnish, Estonian, Mordvinian to Mari) seems to point to a different direction of borrowing. The lack of native motivation of the Old Prussian appellative also indicates its foreign origin. Slavic mediation (due to the semantics of the Old Prussian word) seems unlikely. In my opinion, OPrus. *kērdan* represents a prehistoric borrowing from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate.

2.13. Yatv. *łausa* ‘will’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 32 *wola* (‘will’) – *łausa*.

BALTIC EQUIVALENTS: In East Baltic languages (and also in Slavic ones) we have adduced different forms: Lith. *valià* f. ‘will, the pursuit of something; free choice; power, strength, freedom’, Latv. *vaļa* f. ‘will, strength, order’, PSl. **volja* f. ‘will, desire’ (Zinkevičius 1985: 75, 1992: 114; Smoczyński 2018: 1597). Karulis (1987: 137) juxtaposes the Yatvingian word *łausa* with the Latv. *ļauja* f. ‘permission’ (cf. Latv. *ļaut* ‘to allow’), which is semantically close to the concept of ‘will’ (Schmalstieg 2015: 347).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The Yatvingian word is considered etymologically vague (Zinkevičius 1985: 75, 1992: 114). Some scholars assume borrowings from Germanic **lausaz* adj. ‘free’ (Orel, Khelimskij

1987: 125) or from the Gothic *laus* adj. ‘empty, void, devoid’ (Orel 1986: 270; Regan 1974: 73), which seems semantically justified. Theoretically, it cannot be ruled out that the Yatvingian word *laus* ‘will’ (originally ‘freedom’) is cognate with the Germanic adjective.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *lausua* ‘to say, express, pronounce, recite’, *lausia* ‘swear, talk’, Est. *lausuda* ‘speak, say, swear, beg’, *laus* ‘ordering, spell, charm’, Vot. *lausua* ‘to speak, say’, Kar. *lausuo* ‘to say, to charm’ (Khelinskij 1985: 235, 2000: 403). These forms are semantically very distant from the Yatvingian appellative. On the other hand, Western-Finnic adjectives (cf. Fi. *lausas*, *laus* adj. ‘impermanent, fragile, weak, soft, delicate’, Est. *laus* adj. ‘sincere, free, clear, overt’) are considered to be Proto-Germanic loanwords (cf. Khelinskij 1987: 125; EES 2012: 231).

COMMENTARY: A doubtful Finno-Ugric loanword. Relationship between Yatv. *laus* ‘will’ and Est. *laus* ‘ordering, spell, charm’ seems superficial and illusory.

2.14. Yatv. *ławe* ‘boat’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 96 *łodź* (‘boat’) – *ławe*.

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *laivė*, dial. *laivė* f. ‘boat’, *laivas*, dial. *laivas* m. ‘boat, ship’, Latv. *laīva* f. ‘boat, ship’; Latg. *lāiva* f. ‘boat’.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Without native etymology. ORu. *лоўба* f., Ru. *лоўба*, *лаўба* f. ‘big two-masted boat’, Bel. *лаўба* f. ‘id.’, Ukr. *лаўба* f. ‘id.’ and Pol. *tajba* f. ‘a kind of big boat; poor, old ship’ are also borrowings from a Finno-Ugric source (Bańkowski 2000: 84).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *laiva* ‘ship, steamer’; Kar. *laiva* ‘ship’, Ingr. *laiva* id.’; Liv. *lōja* ‘boat’; Est. *laev* ‘ship, big boat’, SEst. *laiv*, CEst. *laiva* ‘id.’; Võro *laiv*; Vot. *laivō* ‘ship, boat’, Vp. *laiva* ‘ship, vessel, (poor) boat’; Saa.S *lai’va* ‘boat’; Mdv.E *luv* ‘manger, crib’ < FU. **lajwa* ‘boat, canoe’ (Rédei 1986–88: 682–683; EES 2012: 220). The Finno-Ugric word is widely regarded as a Norse borrowing (cf. EES 2012: 220), see ON. *fley* n. ‘ship’, Norw. *fløy* ‘id.’, Far. *floy* ‘vessel, ship’ < PGmc. (North) **flauja-* ‘ship’ (Kroonen 2013: 145), see also OE. *floege* ‘small ship / navicula’ (Nordic borrowing).

COMMENTARY: Zinkevičius (1985: 75, 1992: 114) rightly assumes a Finno-Ugric borrowing both for the Yatvingian word and for Eastern Baltic terms (“it may be a Finnish loanword”). Similar conclusions are drawn

by some researchers with respect to the Lithuanian language (e.g. Fraenkel 1962: 335; Smoczyński 2018: 660). Junttila (2015: 24) also indicates a West Finnic borrowing, but due to the Lithuanian circumflex accentuation, he suggests its late and secondary origin (via the Latvian language). It should be noted, however, that Mikalojus Daukša (died in 1613) wrote the Old Lithuanian form *laiwe* with an acute (Fraenkel 1962: 335). Lithuanian dialects also show the expected acute intonation (dial. *laivas* m. 'boat, ship', *lāivė* f. 'boat'; Kruopas 1966: 73, 74; Kurschat 1970: 1277; Bańkowski 2000: 84), which agrees with the Latvian accent. Literary forms with the circumflex probably come from a peripheral dialect, which has a different accent system. In this situation, all the Baltic appellatives (including the Yatvingian term) can successfully represent a prehistoric borrowing from some Finno-Ugric substrate.

2.15. OPrus. *malko* f. 'timber, wood'.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (GrG 18) *Malko*, gl. Holtz [= Holz] 'timber', *Malcko* 'id.' (GrC), *nalko* gl. *holtz* (GrA 43); *Nalco* (should be: *Malco*) gl. lignum 'timber, wood' (GrF 43) (Mažiulis 1996: 105–106).

BALTIC COGNATES: The Old Prussian word has exact cognates in East Baltic languages, cf. Lith. *mālka* f. 'firewood, logs; chopped wood stacked in layers, also a pile (of manure, soil, potatoes); group', *mālkos* f. Pl. 'firewood'; Latv. *mālka* f. 'firewood, splinter'.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: According to Wojciech Smoczyński (2018: 746), the origin of the Lithuanian word is unclear ("Etymology uncertain"). For semantic reasons, it is not convincing to compare the word with PSl. **molka* f. 'swamp, marsh', cf. SCr. *mlāka* f. 'marsh, wetland, boggy ground', Bel. *мо́лока* f. 'boggy place in the meadow; wetland, quagmire, Pol. *pomłoka* f. 'fog, rain cloud'. The Baltic and Slavic words do not have any obvious parallels within other Indo-European languages.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *malka* 'strip of wood, wooden slat, timber'; Est. *malk* (gen. sg. *malga*) 'stick, rod, pole', Liv. *mālka* 'log, pole', Vot. *malkka* 'roof timber, pile timber'; Saa.N *mal'ga* 'young pine-tree with a deal of sapwood'; Kh. *māyli* 'common willow, *Salix alba* L. / Silberweide', dial. *māxtə*, *mōχaa* 'id.'; Hung. dial. *malágy* 'broad-leaved willow flourishing in early August, fit for basketing / eine breitblättrige, Anfang August blühende Weidenart, zum Korbflechten sehr geeignet', dial. *malát*,

molád ‘bushy place consisting of willows and shrubs / von Weiden, Sträuchern bestandener, buschiger Ort’, also ‘shrubs growing after a flood from muddy ground’, dial. *malász* ‘all kinds of weeds washed ashore or floating on the water surface’ < Ugric **malkz* ‘a species of willow / eine Weidenart’ (Rédei 1986–88: 866) < FU. **malka* ‘a species of willow’, secondarily ‘willow rod’, later ‘rod, stick, slat’.

COMMENTARY: In the literature on the subject, it is generally believed that Western Finnic (and Saami) forms were borrowed from a Baltic source (Donner 1984: 267; Raun 2000: 88; EES 2012: 274; Junttila 2012: 284). Karoly Rédei, the author of the Uralic etymological dictionary (*Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*), reconstructs the Ugrian archetype **malkz* ‘a species of willow / eine Weidenart’ solely on the basis of Ugrian (Ostyak and Hungarian) forms. He rejects Baltic-Finnic and Saami data on the principle that “das ostseefinnische Wort ein baltisches, das lapp. ein finn. Lehnwort ist” (Rédei 1986–88: 866). The first argument is the dubious assumption that the unmotivated Baltic word is the source of the West Finnic words, which can be easily connected with the Saami, Khanty and Hungarian lexemes. The reverse direction of borrowing (OPrus. *malko*, Lith. *málka* ← BFi. **malka*, cf. Fi. *malka*, Est. *malk*) is definitely more likely. The second argument is very doubtful in terms of semantics. In my opinion, the Western Finnic and Saami words provide sufficient grounds for the reconstruction of FU. **malka* f. ‘a willow species’, with a secondary semantic development: ‘(young) willow rod’ > ‘rod, stick, slat’.

2.16. Yatv. *mard* ‘man’, *mort* ‘to die’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 133 *człowiek* (‘man’) – *mard*; PDN 123 *umrzeć* (‘to die’) – *mort*.

BALTIC COGNATES: The Yatvingian verb has close cognates in the East Baltic languages, cf. Lith. *miřti* ‘to die’, Latv. *mirt* ‘id.’ (Smoczyński 2018: 810–811). Yatv. *mard* ‘man’ (in the original sense ‘mortal’) therefore seems to be a fully motivated word, especially since semantically similar words can easily be found in other Baltic languages (e.g. Lith. *marùs* adj. ‘easily dying, mortal’, *miřtinas* adj. ‘mortal’, Latv. *miruonis*, m. ‘dead, corpse’).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Phonologically and semantically close comparanda of Yatv. *mard* ‘man’ can be found in other Indo-European languages, e.g. OInd. *márta-* m. ‘man’, *mártya-* adj. ‘mortal’; Av. *maša-*

m. ‘man’ (< Iran. *mṛta-), *marəta-* ‘lethal’; Arm. *mard* ‘man’, Gr. Hom. *βροτός* m. ‘mortal man’ (Pokorny 1959: 735). They are nominal derivatives formed from the verbal root *mer- ‘to die’ with the suffix *-to-. Schmalstieg (1986: 59–61) assumes that the Yatvingian *mard* was inherited from Proto-Indo-European, just like Arm. *mard* ‘man’.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *marras* (~ *marta-*) ‘mortal, deceased; male’, Kar. *marras* ‘id.’ (< BFi. **martas*); Zyr. *mort* ‘man’; Udm. *murt* ‘man; nation, people’, also ‘stranger, alien’; Mdv.M *miṛde* ‘husband, man’ < FP. **mertā* (Collinder 1977: 143). All these words are widely recognized as prehistoric borrowings from an Indo-Iranian source (Holopainen 2019: 137–138; 143–146).

COMMENTARY: Not necessarily a Finno-Ugric loanword. The hypothesis of borrowing from an Iranian (or Finno-Ugric) source is completely superfluous. The Yatvingian word *mard* ‘man’ (originally ‘mortal’) is sufficiently motivated by the Yatvingian verbal form *mort* ‘to die’.

2.17. OPrus. **palwe* (in place names).

ATTESTATION: Germ. dial. (in Eastern Prussia) *palwe* (← OPrus. **palvē*) ‘wasteland; empty, swampy area overgrown with juniper’ (Bednarczuk 1977: 102, 2016: 87).

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *palvė* f. ‘coastal lowland, waste seashore’; Latv. *paleja* f. ‘lowland’.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Possible cognates in OInd. *palvala-* n. ‘puddle, pool’ and Lat. *palus* (gen. sg. *paludis*) f. ‘swamp, marsh’. Other Baltic cognates are also cited: Lith. *pālios* f. pl. ‘great swamp, bog’, Latv. *paļas*, *palas* f. pl. ‘muddy shore of the lake’, *paļi* m pl. ‘flood, spring or autumn flooding’ (Smoczyński 2018: 902).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *palva* (in geographical names of the type *Palvajärvi* – a lake name, *Palvala* – a place name); Kar. *palvi* ‘inhabited place, living place, flat’; Kh.V *puyəl*, Kh.Obd *poχəl*, Kh.D *puχət* ‘Ostyak village’; Vog.S *pawəl*, Vog.W *pēwəl*, *pēl* ‘village’; Hung. *falu* ‘id.’ < FU. **palʏz* ‘village / Dorf’ (Collinder 1977: 94; Rédei 1986–88: 351), see also Est. *palu* ‘brushwood, clearing in the woods; sandy coniferous forest; dry plain overgrown with bushes’ (Raun 1958: 30).

COMMENTARY: Probable Finno-Ugric loanword of substrate origin (Bednarczuk 1976: 51, 1977: 102; 1993: 107; Wojan 2014: 116–117). The Baltic languages generally indicate flood plains, muddy areas, generally unin-

habited. A similar term, though not semantically identical, can only be found in Estonian (Bednarczuk 1976: 51). The sense ‘village’ is mainly documented by Ugric languages, although Western Finnic appellatives also denote a residential place. It is possible that the word entered the Baltic lexis when Western Finnic peoples were still leading a nomadic (hunter-gatherer) lifestyle.

2.18. OPrus. *pusne* ‘(knee-high) boot’.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 499) *Puſne – Stefel* [= Germ. *Stiefel*] ‘(knee-high) boot’.

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *pušnis* f. ‘(knee-high) boot’, pl. *pūšnys* ‘high legged boots’, also ‘fisherman’s waders’.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: “Hard to explain” (Smoczyński 2018: 1047). It is impossible to distinguish any related words in the Indo-European languages.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Cher. *pušam* ‘cloth hem, wrapper or hem of the shoe’; Zyr.P *pičjn* ‘seam, rim on the upper of the shoe’, also *pōčon* ‘the edge, rim of the shoe’; Vog. *pāšən* ‘a double piece of fabric sewn to the upper edge of fur boots’; Kh.D *pešən*, Kh.Kaz *pāšnji* ‘hem, cloth edge of the rim of women’s shoes’ < FU. **pučn3* ‘shoe upper / Rand, Verbrämung am Schuh’ (Rédei 1986–88: 739). The above Finno-Ugric words should not be separated from the Finnish appellative *ponsi* ‘end of the upper; shoe upper’ and Kh.Kaz *pošəχ*, Kh.Obd *posəχ* ‘instep; tip (of a shoe or footwear)’ (< FU. **pōnči*), and especially from numerous Samoyedic forms: Nen. *peana* ‘leg warmer / Beinling’; En. *fedda* ‘id.’; Ngan. *fantu* ‘id.’; Slk.T *puondš* ‘leg warmer’, Slk.Ke *póns*, *poonds* ‘ts.’, Slk.Ty *pōnč* ‘leg warmer, reindeer leg skin, shoe upper / Beinling, Haut der Rentierfuße, Schaft’; Kam. *phana* ‘predator’s paw, leg warmer / Tatze, Beinling’ < Ur. **ponča* ‘reindeer leg skin used in the form of a leg warmer or boot-leg’ (Collinder 1977: 69; Rédei 1986–88: 394).

COMMENTARY: The word is well attested not only in Finno-Ugric languages (FP. **pučn3*), but also in Samoyedic. The comparison of cognates shows that in Finno-Ugric the metathesis of consonants *-nč- > *-čn- took place. Rédei (1986–88: 394), based on Samoyedic cognates, reconstructs the original meaning of ‘skin from reindeer legs; (leather) leg warmer / Haut der Rentierfuße, Beinling’. There is no doubt that the boot tops were originally made of reindeer leg skin or other large game

or farm animals. This is evidenced by the Selkup forms showing the meaning of ‘leg warmer, reindeer leg skin, shoe upper / Beinling, Haut der Rentierfüße, Schaft’. It seems that in Finno-Ugric the original meaning changed and initially began to mean ‘the upper of the shoe’, and then ‘the edge, the outer edge of the upper (protected or decorated with fabric)’. The Finnish language retains both of these meanings and the form without metathesis, cf. Fi. *ponsi* (gen. sg. *ponnen*) ‘end of the upper; the upper / Ende des Schafts; Schaft’. The Baltic words are reminiscent of the secondary form **pušni* (< FU. **pučni*), attested, among others in Mari, Vogul and Ostyak. It should be thought that the Old Prussian word *pusne* f. ‘(knee-high) boot’, similarly to Lith. *pušnīs* f. ‘id.’, represents an ancient borrowing obtained from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate. It is impossible to derive Baltic words from a Western Finnic source, because the Finnish words show a different form (see Fi. *ponsi*).

2.19. OPrus. **salavō* f. ‘island’.

ATTESTATION: The Old Prussian proper name *Solovo* (documented as early as 1263) refers to Żuławy. The following appellatives come from an Old Prussian source: Germ. dial. (Gołdap) *sulava* ‘island’; Pol. *żuława* f. ‘fertile ground, flooded or situated near water’, Kash. *zława* ‘low-lying area, wetland’ (Bednarczuk 1993: 81–84, 1999: 32). The discussed term can hardly be related to OPrus. (EV 63) *Salus* gl. *Reynflis* ‘rain stream’, which is a derivative noun of the verb **salti* ‘to flow’, cf. Lith. *salti* ‘to flow, to run, to spill’

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *salà* f. ‘island (on a river, lake, sea); dry hill climb; muddy river bank’, (obsolete) *salava* f. ‘sandbar or island on the river’, *salijà* f. ‘riverside meadow’; Latv. *sala* f. ‘island; elevated spot on the swamp’, also ‘a wood’.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The Baltic words for ‘island’ have no convincing explanation (Jakob 2024: 123). Neither comparison with the Latin appellative *insula* ‘island’ (< **en-salā* f. ‘located at sea’), nor with the Lithuanian verb *salti* ‘to flow, run, spill’ is not convincing (Bednarczuk 1976: 52; 1993: 103).

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Fi. *salo* ‘an island overgrown with trees; woodland, wilderness, backwoods, forest’; Kar. *šalo* ‘id.; a large uninhabited forest’; Est. *salu* ‘hill, grove, dry place in the swamp’; Liw. *sala*

‘island’; Saa.N *suolo* ‘island, dry place in the swamp’, Saa.L *suoloi* ‘island’, Saa.T *sjelaj* ‘id.’; Kh. *sot* ‘cape, place in a bend of the river’; Nen. *sale*, *saľaku* ‘cape’ (Collinder 1977: 73). Recently, there has been a suspicion that the Finno-Saami words are borrowed from an unknown substrate (Saarikivi 2004: 208; Aikio 2004: 24; Häkkinen 2009: 48; De Smit 2018: 108–109). The above hypothesis does not take into account the possible Khanty and Samoyedic cognates.

COMMENTARY: Collinder (1977: 73) reserves that Western Finnic terms may be a Baltic loan word. Other researchers show skepticism about the Baltic borrowing (Aikio 2004: 24; Saarikivi 2004: 204). Bednarczuk (1976: 52, 1977: 102; 1999: 33; 2016: 87) is in favor of the reverse direction of borrowing, rightly noting that the Baltic nouns are completely isolated on Indo-European grounds, while Finno-Ugric terms have their equivalents in Samoyedic languages. This is why the Finno-Ugric loanword (of substrate origin) in Baltic seems certain.

2.20. Yatv. *sini* ‘mushrooms’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 145 *grzyby* (‘mushrooms’) - */ini*.

BALTIC COGNATES: The closest equivalent is Latv. *sēne* f. ‘mushroom’, pl. *sēnes* ‘mushrooms’ (this word is widely recognized as a Finno-Ugric loanword, cf. EES 2012: 464). In Lithuanian, on the other hand, there is a Slavic borrowing, *grįbas* m. ‘mushroom’ (Smoczyński 2018: 384), see also Latv. *grība* f. ‘cep, penny bun, porcino, porcini, *Boletus edulis* L.’, *grības* f. pl. ‘inedible mushrooms’. The Old Prussian term for ‘mushroom’ is not mentioned in the sources (Zinkevičius 1985: 79; 1992: 119).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Attested exclusively in Latvian and Yatvingian. The discussed Baltic words for ‘mushroom’ have no Indo-European cognates.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *sieni*, dial. *siena* ‘mushroom’, *sieni-eläin* ‘sponge’; Est. *seen* ‘mushroom’, Liv. *sēņ* ‘mushroom’, Ingr. *seeni*, Vot. *siini*, Ol. *sieni*, Lud. *šień*, Vp. *seń* ‘id.’ (< BFi. **sēne*); Saa.N *čadna* ‘bracket fungus growing on a birch’, Saa.L *tjatnā* ‘id.’; Cher. *šin*, *šen* ‘wood mushroom, bracket fungus’; Udm.S *senki*, *šeńki*, Udm.K *senka*, *senkâ*, *šenkâ*, Udm.G *šeńki* ‘tinder; bracket fungus; callus’; Kh.Vas *sāṇəγ*: *sāṇəγ nōŋis* ‘bracket fungus growing on a tree’, Kh.D *sānə*, Kh.Obd *sān* ‘wood mushroom’; Vog.S *šinə-w*, Vog.E *šenəj*, Vog.W *šenəγ*, Vog.N *šēniy* ‘tree-growing fun-

gus' < FU. **čänä* 'bracket fungus, tree fungus / Zunder, Baumschwamm' (Collinder 1977: 127; Rédei 1986–88: 494–495, s.v. **šöne*; EES 2012: 464; Aikio 2020: 113–114, s.v. **čänä*).

COMMENTARY: A certain Finno-Ugric loanword, which is universally accepted (Zinkevičius 1985: 79, 1992: 119; Bednarczuk 1992: 106, 1999: 68; EES 2012: 464; Schmalstieg 2015: 351).

2.21. Yatv. *sjałe* 'elder, elderberry, *Sambucus* L. (tree species)'

ATTESTATION: PDN 48 *bez* ('elder, *Sambucus* L.') – *sjale*. The context of the record shows that the Polish term *bez* represents a dendronym, cf. PDN 49 *sosna - puŝe* ('pine, *Pinus* L.'), PDN 50 *jodłowiça – egłe* ('fir, *Abies* L.'). Theoretically, the Polish lexeme *bez* may refer to several different plants, e.g. (1) 'black elder, *Sambucus nigra* L.', (2) 'danewort, *Sambucus ebulus* L.', (3) 'red elderberry, *Sambucus racemosa* L. '; (4) 'lilac, *Syringa vulgaris* L. '.

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *šeivā-medis*, *šeiv-medis* m. 'elder-tree, *Sambucus nigra* L. ' (also 'lilac, *Syringa vulgaris* L. ') is a complex formation containing the Lithuanian noun *mēdis* m. 'tree' (Witczak 1992: 201).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The Baltic plant names (Yatvingian and Lithuanian) have been compared with the following dendronyms: Dac. *σέβα* f. 'black elder, *Sambucus nigra* L. ', Gr. *ἀκτέα*, Att. *ἀκτῆ* f. 'black elder, *Sambucus nigra* L. ' and on this basis the Indo-European archetype was reconstructed: **ǵk̑péuā* < PIE. **h₂k̑péueh₂* f. 'black elder' (Witczak 1992: 201–211). It has also been admitted that the names of other plants should be derived from the same Indo-European proto-form, e.g. Arm. *hac'i* 'ash', Bessan *ἄσᾱ* f. 'coltsfoot, *Tussilago farfara* L. ', Alb. *ashë* f. 'holly, *Ilex aquifolium* L. ; coltsfoot, *Tussilago farfara* L. '. Anikin (1994: 155) questions the Indo-European origin of the Baltic lexemes.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Mdv.E *čevgeľ*, *čavdiľ*, Mdv.M *čevgä*, *čivgä* 'Maßholder-beere'; Udm.S *šu* 'guelder-rose berry', *šu-pu* 'red elderberry, *Sambucus racemosa* L. ; guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L. ', Udm.G *šu* 'guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L. ; guelder-rose berry', *šu-pu* 'guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L. '; Zyr.P *žu* 'guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L. ', Zyr.S *žo-pu* 'id. ', also *žol-pu*, *žov-pu* 'id. ' < FU. **šewä* or **šejwä*, also **še(j)wä-puwi* 'red elderberry; guelder-rose' (Rédei 1986–88: 784). The Finnish term *heisi*, *heisi-puu* 'guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L. ' (< BFi. **šejti* / **šejti-puwe*) is built a somewhat differently.

COMMENTARY: If we reject the Indo-European origin of the Baltic dendronyms, then an alternative option may be the provenance from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate. The Yatvingian plant name *sjałe* ‘elderberry, *Sambucus*’ can be successfully combined with the FU archetype **še(j)wä* ‘red elderberry, *Sambucus racemosa* L.; guelder-rose, *Viburnum opulus* L.’, from where Mdv. *čev-* ‘red elderberry’; Udm. *šu* ‘red elderberry’; guelder-rose (tree and fruit); Zyr. *žu* ‘guelder-rose’, *Viburnum opulus* L.’ The Lithuanian dendronim *šeivā-medis*, *šeiv-medis* m. ‘black elder, *Sambucus nigra* L.’ can be a partial calque of FU. **še(j)wä-puwi* ‘red elderberry’; guelder-rose’ (cf. Udm. *šu-pu*, Zyr. *žov-pu*, *žol-pu*, *žo-pu*), based on full equivalence between Lith. *mēdis* m. ‘tree’ and FU. **puwi* ‘id.’, see Fi. *puu* ‘tree, wood’, Est. *puu* ‘id.’; Cher. *pu* ‘firewood, wood, tree’; Udm. *pu* ‘tree, wood’; Zyr. *pu* ‘id.’, Hung. *fa* ‘id.’; En. *fe* ‘tree’; Slk. *pô* ‘tree, wood’; Kam. *pa* ‘tree, forest’; Koib. *pa* ‘tree’ (Collinder 1977: 71; Rédei 1986–88: 410; EES 2012: 396–397). It is worth noting that the Baltic dendronyms cannot be derived from the Western Finnic form **šejti* ‘guelder-rose’, so the borrowing must come from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate.

2.22. Yatv. *sula* ‘hole’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 149 *dziura* – *fuła*.

BALTIC EQUIVALENTS: No words with similar semantics. Terms appearing in other Baltic languages have completely different meanings: Lith. *sulà* f. ‘sap, sweet wood juice secreting in the spring after cutting the bark’, Latv. *sula* f. ‘tree juice, esp. birch sap’, OPrus. (EV 693) *Sulo* gl. *Matte* ‘sour milk’ (Zinkevičius 1985: 79, 1992: 119; Derksen 2015: 434–435; Smoczyński 2018: 1325). Reference to Lith. *šulė* f. ‘beer or wine barrel’ or OLith. *šulinis* f. ‘well’, Lith. *šulinys* m. ‘id.’ (in the sense of ‘hole in the ground’), proposed as a possible alternative by Zinkevičius (1985: 79, 1992: 119), is impossible to accept in terms of semantics. These words are obvious derivatives from Lith. *šulas* m. ‘wooden pole, wooden stave’, see *šulnio šulaĩ* ‘well casing’ (Derksen 2015: 454–455; Smoczyński 2018: 1423, 1424).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Provenance of Yatv. *sula* f. ‘hole’ from the Indo-European root **seu-* ‘press, squeeze (juice)’ seems unbelievable. Karulis (1987: 138) attempts to explain the Yatvingian semantics by referring to the Latvian phrase *urbt bērza sulas* ‘to make a hole in the birch for juice’.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *sula* ‘a hole in the ice (on the frozen part of the lake), natural blowhole, полынья’ derives from the verbal root **sula* ‘thaw’, cf. Fi. *sulaa-* ‘thaw, melt’; Saa.N *šql’gi-* ‘to melt’; Mdv. *sola* ‘thaw’, Cher. *šule-* ‘thaw’; Zyr. *syl-* ‘thaw’; Vog. *tol-* ‘thaw’; Kh.Vas *jöl-*, Kh.V *löl-*, Kh.D *tät-* ‘id.’; Hung. *olvad-* ‘to melt; thaw’ < FU. **sula* ‘thaw’ (Collinder 1977: 129; Rédei 1986–88: 450–451; EES 2012: 487). The Proto-Uralic origin of the discussed item seems to be confirmed by Yuk. *alaa-* ‘to melt’ (Blažek, Piispanen 2024: 43–44).

COMMENTARY: Uncertain Finno-Ugric borrowing. Khelimskij admits that his Finnish-Yatvingian comparison seems unlikely in semantic terms (Khelimskij 1985: 235, 2000: 403). His semantic change: ‘blowhole’ > ‘hole in ice’ > ‘every hole’ > ‘hole’, however, is acceptable.

2.23. OPrus. *sylecke* ‘Baltic herring, *Clupea harengus membras* L.’

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 575) *Sylecke* gl. *Hering* (Trautmann 1910: 426).

BALTIC COGNATES: Lith. *siĺkė* f. ‘herring, sea fish *Clupea harengus*, esp. Baltic herring’, Žem. *sėlkė* f. ‘id.’; Latv. *siļķe* f., *silkis* m. ‘Baltic herring; salted fish’, Kur. *šilēke* f. ‘Baltic herring’ (Blažek, Čeladín, Běťáková 2004: 120).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: It is generally assumed that the Baltic terms are borrowed from a North Germanic (Nordic) source, cf. ON. *sild*, *sild* ‘herring’, OSwed. *sildi*, Swed. *sill* ‘id.’ (Smoczyński 2018: 1168). This reasoning does not explain the occurrence of the consonant group **lk* in the Baltic languages. Borrowing from the Swedish appellative of *sil-laka* ‘Baltic herring’ is assumed by Czech researchers (Blažek, Čeladín, Běťáková 2004: 120), which Schmalstieg notes carefully (2015: 277).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *silakka*, dial. *sillahka*, *silhakka* ‘Baltic herring, *Clupea harengus membras* L.; any salted fish’, Ingr. *silakka* ‘salted fish; salty mushroom dish’, Lud. *silak* ‘salted fish’, Ol. *silakka* ‘salted fish, salted meat, salted mushrooms’, Est. *silk* (gen. *silgu*) and (obsolete) *silakas* ‘herring’, Liv. *siļk* (pl. *siļkōd*) ‘herring’ (< BFi. **silakka* ‘Baltic herring’, originally ‘fat fish’); Saa.N *salled*, Saa.L *sallēt* ‘herring’ (< PSaa. **sēlēte* < **silā-tā* ← Ur. **silā* ‘fat, especially fish fat’). The original meaning is perfectly preserved in the following languages: Fi. *silava*, dial. *silevā* ‘bacon, fat’; Vog. *šilt* ‘bear fat / Fett des Bären’; Ngan. *séla* ‘molten fish fat’; Slk. *siil3*, *siileng* adj. ‘fat, obese’; Kam. *śəl*, *śil* ‘fat, tallow, suet’, Koib. *syl* ‘fat’ < Ur. **silā* ‘fat [adj.]; (fish) fat’ (Collinder 1977: 74; Rédei 1986–88: 478–479).

COMMENTARY: Junttila (2015: 21) rejects the thesis on substrate (Finno-Ugric) or Balto-Finnic borrowing, based on another, highly uncertain hypothesis that the Finnish term for ‘Baltic herring’ was taken from a Scandinavian source. In other words, borrowings cannot be returned to the pre-Baltic era. The author refers to Smoczyński’s (2018: 1168) approach, which derives the Baltic fish names in question from a Nordic source, adopting a native (allegedly Baltic-wide) phonetic change **-lt- > -lk-*, which is extremely difficult to prove (cf. Jakob 2024: 96). In this situation, an argument from a Balto-Finnic source seems highly likely. It should be emphasized that the native character of the Scandinavian herring name is by no means certain. Many Germanists derived this lexeme from some unknown substrate source. In my opinion, the Nordic noun **sild-* ‘herring’ comes from a Saami source, specifically from the archetype **silä-tä* ‘herring’, originally ‘fat fish’ (Witczak 2020a: 12).

2.24. Yatv. *tuolis* ‘devil’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 128 *diabał* (‘devil’) - *tuolif*.

BALTIC COGNATES: Other Baltic languages have introduced different terms for the ‘devil’: OLith. *velinas*, Lith. *vėlnias*, Latv. *vēl̃ns* vs. OPrus. *cawx*, *pickuls*. Zinkevičius (1985: 80, 1992: 120) suggests a juxtaposition of the Yatvingian word denoting ‘devil’ with the Old Prussian theonym *Patollus*, meaning the lord of the underworld. The name of the Old Prussian god of the underworld consists of the prefix *pa-* and the appellative (EV 207) *talus* (gl. Böne) ‘floor in a room’, cf. OLith. *patalas* m. ‘sleeping bed’, Lith. *pātalas* m. ‘bed covering, bedding, bed’, Latv. *pataļs* m. ‘pillow’ (Běřaková, Blažek 2012: 148; Schmalstieg 2015: 353).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: OPrus. *talus* ‘floor in the room’ and the Lithuanian composite form *pātalas* m. ‘bedding’ comes from PIE. **telh₂-* ‘spread, lie in bed’, cf. OInd. *talam* n. ‘plane, level, sole’, OCS. *tbla* n. pl. ‘ground, floor’, Rus. *tlo* n. ‘ground’ (Smoczyński 2018: 923). It should be emphasized, however, that the above juxtapositions do not explain the Yatvingian word *tuolis* ‘devil’, for which a different etymology should be sought. One of peer reviewers suggests that Yatv. *tuolis* represents a borrowing from an East Slavic source, cf. Russ. *дьявол* m. ‘devil’ (← OChSl. *дѣволѣ* ‘id.’ ← Gk. *διάβολος* m. ‘slanderer, enemy, devil’; cf. Orel 2011: 332). In fact, this hypothesis is ingenious, al-

though the adaptation of the voiced consonant [d] as the voiceless stop [t] in Yatvingian is hardly explainable, as well as the syncope of the initial and stressed syllable.

FINNO-UGRIC AND URALIC DATA: Fi. *tuli* (gen. *tulen*) ‘fire’; Est. *tuli* ‘id.’, Liv. *tu’l* ‘fire, flamme, firelight’; Saa.N *dollâ* ‘id.’; Mdv. *tol* ‘fire, spark’; Cher. *tōl*, *tul*; Udm. *tyl* ‘id.’; Zyr. *tyl-kōrt* ‘poker’ (literally ‘iron for fire’, cf. Zyr. *kōrt* ‘iron’) < Ur. **tuli* ‘fire’, cf. Nen. *tū* ‘fire’, Ngan. *tui* ‘id.’, En. *tū*, *tu* ‘id.’, Slk. *tüü* ‘id.’; Kam. *šü* ‘fire’; Koib. *siu* ‘id.’; Mat. *tuek* ‘id.’, Karag. *dui* ‘id.’; Tg. *tui* ‘fire’ (Collinder 1977: 80; Rédei 1986–88: 535; EES 2012: 553).

COMMENTARY: Bednarczuk (1992: 106; 1999: 68) juxtaposes the Yatvingian name of the devil with the Finnish and Estonian word *tuli* ‘fire’. If we assume that the Yatv. *tuolis* originally meant ‘fiery’, hence later in Christian terms ‘devil’, its comparison with Uralic appellative **tuli* ‘fire’ would be perfectly justified. It should be noted, however, that the Yatvingian language also preserved the native formation *ugne* in the secondary sense of the ‘bonfire’ (PDN 69 *ognisko* – *ugne*), cf. Lith. *ugnīs* f. ‘fire’, Latv. *uguns* f. ‘fire’. The semantic change of ‘fire’ > ‘bonfire’ in the Yatvingian word *ugne* could have been triggered by the alleged competition of the native form with the Finno-Ugric borrowing.

2.25. Yatv. *wa* ‘it’s necessary to, one must’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 204 *trzeba* - *wa* ... (*wa*?) (Zinkevičius 1985: 80, 1992: 104).

BALTIC COGNATES: Latv. *wajaga* ‘it’s necessary to, to need’ (a West Finnish loanword).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: Without any certain cognate and explanation in Indo-European.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Est. *vaja* ‘necessary’, Liv. *vajāg* ‘id.’, Vot. *vajaa* ‘necessary; lacking, missing, required’, Fi. *vajaa* ‘wanting, in need of; not full; partial; incomplete’, Ingr. *vaijaa* ‘necessary; lacking’, Ol. *vajai* ‘incomplete, partial; in need of’; Lud. *vajag* ‘incomplete, lacking’, Vp. *vajag* ‘incomplete, insufficient’ (EES 2012: 586–587) < BFi. **wajaka* (adv.) ‘necessary, needed’, also (adj.) ‘incomplete, partial’.

COMMENTARY: The provenance from the Finno-Ugric source is highly probable, even if the Yatvingian record contains only two initial sounds (Zinkevičius 1985: 80, 1992: 121; Bednarczuk 1992: 106, 1999: 68; Schmalstieg 2015: 353).

2.26. Yatv. *wał* ‘was’.

ATTESTATION: PDN 155 *było* - *wał*.

BALTIC COGNATES: None.

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: No cognates.

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Fi. *ol-i* ‘there was’; Est. *oli* ‘id.’; Liv. *vol* ‘id.’; Zyr. *vel-i* ‘id.’; Udm. *val*, dial. *vau* ‘was’; Hung. (former) *val-a* ‘was’ (< FU. **wol-*, a stem of historical tense with the meaning ‘to be’). The present tense form is based on the suppletive form of the Finno-Ugric root **won-* ‘to be’, cf. Fi. *on*, Hung. *van*, Udm. *vañ* (Khelinskij 1985: 234, 2000: 402).

COMMENTARY: The Yatvingian verbal form is quite commonly derived from the Finno-Ugric source (Khelinskij 1985: 234, 2000: 402; Orel, Khelinskij 1987: 127; Zinkevičius 1992: 121; Bednarczuk 1992: 106; 1999: 68). The hypothesis about borrowing the Yatvingian word from the Germ. *war* ‘was’ seems less likely, cf. Karulis (1987: 138), who requires the adoption of an unusual phonetic change *r* > *ł*. In this situation, the hypothesis about the borrowing of the Yatvingian verbal form *wał* ‘was’ from some unknown Finno-Ugric substrate should be taken into account. The borrowing of the verb with the meaning of ‘to be’ testifies to very intensive linguistic contacts between Yatvingian and an unknown people of Finno-Ugric origin.

2.27. OPrus. *wargien* n. ‘copper’.

ATTESTATION: OPrus. (EV 525) *Wargien* [= *warjen*] – *Kupper* [= *Kupfer*].

BALTIC COGNATES: OLith. *vārias* m. ‘copper, *Cuprum*’, Lith. *vāris* m. ‘id.’, Latv. *varš* m. ‘id.’ (< PB. **warjan* n. ‘copper’).

INDO-EUROPEAN ETYMOLOGY: The word has no obvious cognates in other Indo-European languages. In addition, it remains etymologically unclear (Smoczyński 2018: 1607: “No etymology”).

FINNO-UGRIC DATA: Cher. *wūryeñe*, *wəryeñə* ‘copper’; Udm.K *ârgon*, Udm.S *îrgon*, Udm.G *îrgon* ‘copper’; Zyr.S *îrgen* ‘id.’; Vog.E *äryən*, Vog.N *aryin* ‘copper’. Rédei (1986–88: 628) derives the above words from the Finno-Permian protoform **iry3n3* (or **üry3n3*) ‘copper’, but at the same time recognizes the Cheremissian word as a possible Permian loanword. He strongly rejects the hypothesis about the Iranian or Caucasian borrowing.

COMMENTARY: The Baltic words can be derived from the uniform Baltic archetype **varjan* n. ‘copper’. Bednarczuk (1976: 54, 1977: 103, 1993: 110, 2016: 87) explains their origin as from some Finno-Ugric substrate (or source), at the same time emphasizing the alleged Iranian genesis of the above-mentioned words. Junttila (2015: 22) rejects the hypothesis about Finno-Ugric substrate borrowing and, in opposition to Rédei (1986–88: 628), is of the opinion that the above Uralic expressions cannot be reduced to a uniform Finno-Ugric archetype. He also emphasizes that none of the Baltic forms certifies the consonant [ɣ], but only [j]. It should be noted, however, that the phonetic change [ɣ] > [j] is documented in some Finno-Ugric languages, including the Mordvinian language. It can therefore be assumed that a similar phonetic process also took place in an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate on which the Baltic peoples had once accumulated. It seems that the analyzed Finno-Ugric loanword was acquired in the Proto-Baltic era. The reverse direction of borrowing is completely ruled out both for phonological reasons (the change [j] > [ɣ] is unlikely) and for geographical reasons.

3. Conclusions

This paper reviews possible Finno-Ugric borrowings in West Baltic languages. In total, twenty-seven lexical items have been discussed. Five previously postulated juxtapositions have been rejected, including No. 3, 4, 5, 13, 16.

The following entities documented in Old Prussian have been recognized as early Finno-Ugric borrowings of substrate origin: (No. 8) OPrus. *jūri* ‘sea’ ← FV. **järwä* ‘lake’, see also Ur. **jurma* ‘deep water’; (No. 10) OPrus. *kadegis* ‘juniper’ ← BFi. **katana* < FU. **kačana* ‘id.’ ← Ur. **kača* ‘resin; resin tree’; (No. 11) OPrus. *kaywe* ‘mare’ ← BFi. **kēwe* ‘female horse or reindeer’ < Ur. **käōwä* ‘female animal’; (No. 12) OPrus. *kērdan* ‘time’ ← FV. **kertä* ‘succession, order, time’ ← FU. **kentä* ‘time’; (No. 15) OPrus. *malko* ‘wood’ ← FU. **malka* ‘willow species’, secondarily ‘willow rod’; (No. 17) OPrus. **palwe*, whence Germ. dial. *palwe* ‘wasteland; the empty, swampy area overgrown with juniper’ ← FU. **palyz* ‘village’; (No. 18) OPrus. *pusne* ‘(knee-high) boot’ ← FU. **pučni* ‘shoe upper’ < Ur. **ponči* ‘reindeer leg skin used as a leg warmer or a bootleg’; (No. 19) OPrus. **salavō* ‘island’, whence Germ. dial. *sulava* ‘id.’ ← FU. **salaw* ‘island; dry place in the swamp’ < Ur. **sala* ‘island; peninsula, cape’; (No. 23) OPrus. *sylecke* ‘Baltic herring’ ←

**siläkkä* ‘id.’ (originally ‘fat fish’) ← Ur. *šilä* ‘fat, especially from fish’; (No. 27) OPrus. *wargien* [warjen] ‘copper’ ← FU. **würγznz* ‘copper’.

From a Finno-Ugric source the following Yatvingian words should also be derived: (No. 1) Yatv. *aiga* ‘end’ ← BFi. **akja* ‘the end’; (No. 2) Yatv. *ajki* ‘time’ ← BFi. **ajka* ‘time’ ← FU. **jikä* ‘age, year’; (No. 6) Yatv. *fala* ‘meat’ ← FU. **pala* ‘a bite; to eat’; (No. 14) Yatv. *ławe* ‘boat’ ← FU. **lajwa* ‘boat, canoe’; (No. 20) Yatv. *sini* ‘mushrooms’ ← BFi. **sēne* ‘mushroom’ < FU. **čänä* ‘bracket fungus’; (No. 24) Yatv. *tuolis* ‘devil’ ← FU. **tuli* ‘fire’ < Ur. **tuli* ‘id.’; (No. 25) Yatv. *wa* ‘it’s necessary to’ ← BFi. **wajag* ‘id.’; (No. 26) Yatv. *wał* ‘was’ ← FU. **wol-* ‘id.’.

Some West Baltic appellatives have uncertain or controversial origins. The Old Prussian noun *gentars* ‘amber’ (No. 7). may be regarded as a standard example. Other words of uncertain origin include OPrus. *juwis* ‘yew’ (No. 9), Yatv. *sjale* ‘elderberry, lilac’ (No. 21), Yatv. *suła* ‘hole’ (No. 22). In the case of West Baltic words, their Finno-Ugric origin or Finno-Ugric intermediary in their adaptation cannot be ruled out.

It seems that the greater part of Finno-Ugricisms in the West Baltic languages was borrowed in the prehistoric era through an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate, e.g. OPrus. *jūrī* ‘sea’, OPrus. *pusne* ‘shoe upper’. It is very likely that West Baltic languages have absorbed a Finno-Ugric substratum of a similar nature to Balto-Finnic languages, cf. Yatv. *ajga* ‘end’, *ajki* ‘time’, *sini* ‘mushrooms’; OPrus. *kadegis* ‘juniper’, *sylecke* ‘herring’.

Acknowledgements

The present article is part of the research project entitled *Prehistoric contacts between Indo-European and Uralic*, financed by the scholarly development fund of the Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz. I am very grateful to thank Loviisa Mänd, Katarzyna Wojan, Elwira Kaczyńska, Sampsa Holopainen, Ante Aikio and Mikołaj Rychło and two peer reviewers for their help, valuable comments and useful suggestions. As regards the final conclusions, I remain solely responsible.

Abbreviations

Sources

C – Catechism; E – Enchiridion; EV – Elbing Vocabulary; GrA, GrC, GrF, GrG – Simon Grunau's vocabulary (copies A, C, F, G); PDN – Pagan Dialects of Narew (i.e. Polish-Yatvingian Glossary).

Languages

Alb. – Albanian; Arm. – Armenian; Av. – Avestan; BFi. – Balto-Finnic (West Finnic); Bel. – Belorussian; Bret. – Breton; CEst. – Coastal Estonian (north-eastern dialect of Estonian); Cher. – Cheremis or Mari; Chuv. – Chuvash; Cur. – Curonian; Cz. – Czech; Dac. – Dacian; Dig. – Digoron (dialect of Ossetian); E. – English; En. – Enets or Yenisei Samoyed; Est. – Estonian; Far. – Faroese; Fi. – Finnish; FP. – Finno-Permic; FU. – Finno-Ugric; FV. – Finno-Volgaic; Germ. – German; Gr. – Greek (dialects: Att. – Attic; Hom. – Homeric; Ion. – Ionian); Hung. – Hungarian; IE. – Indo-European; Ingr. – Ingrian or Izhorian; Iran. – Iranian; Kam. – Kamassian Samoyed; Kar. – Karelian; Karag. – Karagassian; Kash. – Kashubian; Kh. – Khanty or Ostyak (dialects: Kh.D – Demianka Khanty, Kh.Kaz – Kazym Khanty; Kh.Obd – Obdorian Khanty, Kh.V – Vach Khanty; Kh.Vas – Vasyugan Khanty); Koib. – Koibal Samoyed; Kur. – Kuronian; Lat. – Latin; Latg. – Latgalian; Latv. – Latvian; Lith. – Lithuanian; Liv. – Livonian; Lud. – Ludic; Mat. – Mator Samoyed; MBret. – Middle Breton; MDu. – Middle Dutch; Mdv. – Mordvin (dialects: Mdv.E – Erzya Mordvin; Mdv.M – Moksha Mordvin); MHG. – Middle High German; MLG. – Middle Low German; Morav. – Moravian; MWel. – Middle Welsh; Nen. – Nenets or Yurak Samoyed; Ngan. – Nganasan or Tavgi Samoyed; Norw. – Norwegian; OChSl. – Old Church Slavic; OCorn. – Old Cornish; OCz. – Old Czech; OE. – Old English; OFr. – Old French; OFris. – Old Frisian; OHG. – Old High German; OHung. – Old Hungarian; OInd. – Old Indian; OIr. – Old Irish; Ol. – Olonets; OLith. – Old Lithuanian; ON. – Old Norse; OPol. – Old Polish; OPrus. – Old Prussian; ORu. – Old Russian; OSax. – Old Saxon; Oss. – Ossetian; OSwed. – Old Swedish; Ott. – Ottoman Turkish; PB. – Proto-Baltic; PC. – Proto-Celtic; Pers. – Persian or Farsi; PGmc. – Proto-Germanic; PIE. – Proto-Indo-European; Pol. – Polish; PSaa. – Proto-Saami; PSl. – Proto-Slavic; Ru. – Russian; Saa. – Saami or Laponian (dialects: Saa.I – Inari; Saa.Kd – Kildin; Saa.Ko – Kola; Saa.L – Lule Saami; Saa.N – North Saami; Saa.Nz – Notozersko Saami; Saa.S – South Saami; Saa.Sko – Skolt Saami; Saa.T – Ter Saami); SCR. –

Serbo-Croatian; SEst. – South Estonian; SLiv. – Salaca Livonian; Slk. – Selkup Samoyed (dialects: Slk.Ke – Ket Selkup; Slk.Nar – Narym Selkup; Slk.MOb – Middle Ob Selkup; Slk.T – Taz Selkup, Slk.Tur – Turukhan Selkup; Slk.Ty – Tym Selkup); Swed. – Swedish; Tat. – Tatar; Tg. – Taigan Samoyed; Udm. – Udmurt or Votyak (dialects: Udm.G – Glazov Udmurt; Udm.K – Kazan Udmurt; Udm.S – Sarapul Udmurt); Ukr. – Ukrainian; Ur. – Uralic; Wa. – Wakhi; Vp. – Veps; Vog. – Vogul or Mansi (dialects: Vog.E – Eastern Vogul or Konda; Vog.N – Northern or Sosva Vogul; Vog.S – Southern Vogul or Tavdin, Vog.W – Western or Pelym-Vagilsk Vogul); Vot. – Votic; Yagn. – Yagnobi; Yatv. – Yatvingian; Yazg. – Yazghulami; Yuk. – Yukaghir; Zyr. – Zyrian (dialects: Zyr.P – Permic Zyrian or Komi-Permic; Zyr.S – Sysola Zyrian); Žem. – Žemaitian or Samogitian.

References

- Aikio, Ante (2004) “An essay on substrate studies and the origins of Saami”, in Hyvärinen, Irma, Kallio, Petri and Korhonen, Jarmo (eds.) *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen: Festschrift für Jorma Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag*, Helsinki: Société Néophilologique, 5–34.
- Aikio, Ante (2020) *Uralic Etymological Dictionary* (draft version of entries A-Ĉ, opened for comments and discussion on <academia.edu>, 1/17/2020).
- Anikin, Alexandr E. (1994) “Review of *Linguistica Baltica. International Journal of Baltic Linguistics*, Vol. 1, Warszawa: Omnitech Press, 1992”, *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 6: 152–156.
- Bańkowski, Andrzej (2000) *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*, Vol. 2, Warszawa: PWN.
- Bartholomae, Christian (1904) *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Baskakow, Nikoła A., Szapszał, Seraja M. and Zajączkowski, Ananiasz (eds.) (1974) *Słownik karaimsko-rosyjsko-polski*, Moskwa: Wydawnictwo “Russkij Jazyk”.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (1976) “Zapożyczenia ugrofińskie w językach bałto-słowiańskich”, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 9: 39–64.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (1977) “Finno-Ugric Loans in Baltic”, *Journal of Baltic Studies* 8(2): 99–104.

- Bednarczuk, Leszek (1992) “Konwergencje między językami bałtosłowiańskimi a ugrofińskimi w aspekcie strukturalnym i arealnym”, in Smoczyński, Wojciech and Holvoet, Axel (eds.) *Colloquium Pruthenicum Primum. Papers from the First International Conference on Old Prussian held in Warsaw, September 30th – October 1st, 1991*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 99–119.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (1993) *Języki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego na tle porównawczym*, Wilno: Uniwersytet Polski w Wilnie.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (1999) *Stosunki językowe na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Edukacja.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (2013) “Languages in Contact and Conflict on the Territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL)”, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 37: 19–39.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (2016) *Celtic and Other Indo-European Languages*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Lexis.
- Bednarczuk, Leszek (2017) “Kontakty językowe w przedhistorycznej Europie środkowo-wschodniej”, *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 93: 175–193.
- Běťáková, Marta Eva and Blažek, Václav (2012) *Encyklopedie baltské mytologie*, Praha: Nakladatelství Libri.
- Blažek, Václav (2001) “Old Prussian Arboreal Terminology”, *Linguistica Baltica* 9: 29–61.
- Blažek, Václav, Čeladín, Jindřich and Běťáková, Marta Eva (2004) “Old Prussian fish-names”, *Baltistica* 39(1): 107–126.
- Blažek, Václav and Piispanen, Peter (2024) *Yukaghir and Uralic*, Piscataway: Gorgias Press.
- Boryś, Wiesław (2005) *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Bouda, Charles (1950) “L’Euscaro-caucasique”, in Larronde, Jean-Claude (ed.) *VIIème Congrès d’Etudes Basques, Biarritz, [12-19 septembre] 1948*, Donostia: Eusko Ikaskuntza, 663–672.
- Campbell, Lyle (1990) “Indo-European and Uralic Tree Names”, *Diachronica* 7/2: 149–180.
- Collinder, Björn (1977) *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Languages*, Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

- Derksen, Rick (2015) *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- De Smit, Merlijn (2018) “Insular Etymologies: Indo-European and substrate coastal terminology on Finnic and Saami“, *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 41: 103–129.
- Diefenbach, Lorenz (1880) *Völkerkunde Osteuropas insbesondere der Haemoshalbinsel und der unteren Donauegebiete*, vol. 2, Darmstadt: L. Brill.
- Dini, Pietro U. (2014) *Foundations of Baltic Languages*, Vilnius: Eugrimas.
- Donner, Otto (1874) “Über den Einfluss des Litauischen auf die finnischen Sprachen“, *Techmers Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemaine Sprachwissenschaft* 1: 257–271.
- Edel'man, Džoj I. (2011) *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' iranskikh jazykov*, vol. 4, Moscow: Izdatel'skaja Firm “Vostočnaja Literatura”.
- EES (2012) = Metsmägi, Iris, Sedrik, Meeli and Soosaur, Sven-Erik (2012) *Eesti etümoloogiasõnaraamat*, Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.
- Euler, Wolfram (1985) “Tiernamen im Altpreußischen“, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 98/1: 84–98.
- Fraenkel, Ernst (1962) *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Gerullis, Georg (1922) *Die altpreußischen Ortsnamen*, Berlin-Leipzig: Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger.
- Häkkinen, Jaakko (2009) “Kantauralin ajoitus ja paikannus: perustelut puntarissa“, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne / Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 92: 9–56.
- Holopainen, Sampsa (2019) *Indo-Iranian Borrowings in Uralic. Critical Overview of the Sound Substitutions and Distribution Criterion*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Holst, Jan Henrik (2015) “On the theory of a Uralic substratum in Baltic“, in Junttila, Santeri (ed.) *Contacts between the Baltic and Finnic languages*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 151–173.
- Horn, Paul (1893) *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*, Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Jakob, Anthony (2024) *A History of East Baltic through Language Contact*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

- Junttila, Santeri (2012) “The prehistoric context of the oldest contacts between Baltic and Finnic languages”, in Grünthal, Riho and Kallio, Petri (eds.) *A Linguistic Map of Prehistoric Northern Europe*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 261–294.
- Junttila, Santeri (2015) “Proto-Finnic loanwords in the Baltic languages?”, in Junttila, Santeri (ed.) *Contacts between the Baltic and Finnic languages*, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 12–37.
- Kalima, Jalo (1936) *Itämerensuomalaisten kielten balttilaiset lainasanat*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Karulis, Konstantins (1987) “K jatvjažskomu slovariku”, in Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. (ed.) *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija 1985*, Moscow: “Nauka”, 134–140.
- Khelimskij, Evgenij A. (1985) “*Fenno-Ugrica* v «jativjažskom» slovarike?”, in *Tarptautini baltistų konferencija. Pranešimų tezės*, Vilnius: University of Vilnius, 234–235. (reprinted in: Khelimskij 2000: 402–403).
- Khelimskij, Evgenij A. (2000) *Komparativistika. Uralistika. Lektsii i stat'i*, Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kultury.
- Kolbuszewski, Stanisław Franciszek (1973) “Nowe prace w badaniach nad pożyczkami fińskimi w językach bałtyckich”, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 8: 145–150.
- Kowalski, Andrzej Piotr, Rychło Mikołaj and Witczak Krzysztof Tomasz (2020) “Is Old Norse *gammi* an inherited or a borrowed word?”, *Scandinavian Philology* 18 (1): 72–84.
- Kroonen, Guus (2013) *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Kruopas, Jonas (ed.) (1966) *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, vol. 7, Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų akademija.
- Kurschat, Alexander (1970) *Litauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Thesaurus Linguae Lituanicae*, vol. 2, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Liaučute, Jurate A. (1982) *Slovar' baltizmov v slavjanskich jazykakh*, Leningrad: “Nauka”.
- Mańczak, Witold (1990) “La communauté balto-slave a-t-elle existé?”, *Baltistica* 36: 29–38.
- Mańczak, Witold (2008) *Linguistique générale et linguistique indo-européenne*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

- Matasović, Ranko (2009) *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas (1988) *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, vol. 1, Vilnius: “Mokslas”.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas (1993) *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, vol. 2, Vilnius: “Mokslas”.
- Mažiulis, Vytautas (1996) *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, vol. 3, Vilnius: “Mokslas”.
- Mikkola, Jooseppi Julius (1932) “Paikannimien alalta III”, *Virittäjä* 36: 442–443.
- Montanari, Franco (2018) *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- Orel, Vladimir E. (1986) “Marginalia to the Polish-«Jatvingian» Glossary”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 91: 269–272.
- Orel, Vladimir E. (2011) *Russian Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1, Calgary: Theophania Publishing.
- Orel, Vladimir E. and Khelimskij, Evgenij A. (1987) “Nabljudenija nad baltijskim jazykom pol’sko-«jatvyazhskogo» slovarika”, in Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. (ed.) *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija 1985*, Moskva: “Nauka”, 121–134.
- Pokorny, Julius (1959) *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern–München: Francke Verlag.
- Raun, Alo (1958) “Über die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Ostseefinnischen”, *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher* 30: 30–34.
- Raun, Alo (2000) *Eesti keele etümoloogiline teatmik*, Tartu: Maarjamaa.
- Rédei, Karoly (1986–88) *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Budapest: Akademiai Kiadó.
- Regan, Brian (1974) *Dictionary of the Biblical Gothic Language*, Phoenix: Wellspring Books.
- Rychło, Mikołaj (2013) “English *herd* and Polish *trzoda*: How the two words developed from one Proto-Indo-European root”, *Acta Neophilologica* 15(1): 155–166.
- Saarikivi, Janne (2004) “Is there Palaeo-European substratum interference in the western branches of Uralic?”, *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90: 187–214.

- Sabaliauskas, Algirdas (1993) *We, the Balts*, Vilnius: Science and Encyclopedia Publishers.
- Schmalstieg, William R. (1986) “Armenian and Jatvingian *mard*: A Shared Lexical Item”, *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 7: 59–61.
- Schmalstieg, William R. (2015) *Studies in Old Prussian. A Critical Review of the Relevant Literature in the Field from 1975 until 2005*, ed. by Pietro U. Dini, Vilnius: Vaga Publishers.
- Setälä, Emil Nestor (1909) “Beiträge zur finnisch-ugrischen Wortkunde (9. Fi. *kataja* ‘Wacholder’)”, *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 9: 126–128.
- Sevortjan, Ėrvand V. (1974) *Ėtimologičeskij slovar’ tjurkskich jazykov*, vol. 1, Moscow: “Nauka”.
- Sławski, Franciszek (1952–56) *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, vol. 1, Kraków: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego.
- Sławski, Franciszek (ed.) (1976) *Słownik prastłowiański*, vol. 2, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN.
- Smit, Merlijn de (2017) “Insular Etymologies: Indo-European and substrate coastal terminology on Finnic and Saami”, *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 41: 103–129.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech (1989) “Ėlbingskij slovar’: ėmendatsii, čtenija i ėtimologii”, in Ivanov, Vjačeslav V. (ed.) *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija* 1987, Moscow: “Nauka”, 13–42.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech (2000) *Untersuchungen zum deutschen Lehngut im Altpreussischen*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech (2018) *Lithuanian Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1–5, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Szcześniak, Krystyna (2014) “Kadyk, czym jest i na jakich obszarach jest?”, *Studia Rossica Gedanensia* 1: 89–99.
- Thomsen, Vilhelm (1890) *Beröringer mellem de finske og de baltiske (litauisk-lettiske) sprog: en sproghistorisk undersøgelse*, København: Lunos (reprinted in 2011 in Charleston: Nabu Press).
- Toivonen, Yrjö Henrik (1929) “Wortgeschichtliche Streifziige”, *Finnisch-ugrische Forschungen* 20(1): 136–144.
- Trautmann, Reinhold (1910) *Die altpreussische Sprachdenkmäler*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (1992) "Indo-European *ǵ₂képēwā 'elder, *Sambucus nigra* L.' and its Baltic descendants", *Linguistica Baltica* 1: 201–211.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (1999) "Gaulish *pados* 'pitch-pine' and Lithuanian *kadagys* 'juniper'", *Studia Indogermanica Lodziensia* 2: 171.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2004) "Linguistic calques in the Old Prussian and Yatvingian toponymy", *Baltistica* 39(2): 309–313.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2015) "Węgra – dawny hydronim jaćwieski", *Onomastica* 59: 271–280.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2019) "Hipoteza Witolda Mańczaka o ugrofińskim substracie w językach bałtyckich", *LingVaria* 14(2): 43–53.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2019a) *Słowniczek polsko-jaćwieski w świetle onomastyki*, in Rutkowski, Krzysztof and Rygorowicz-Kuźma, Anna (eds.) *Nazwy własne w języku, literaturze i kulturze. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesor Zofii Abramowicz*, Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 633–661.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2020) "Ugrofinizmy w języku jaćwieskim", *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 44: 142–167.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz (2020a) "Dwie germańskie nazwy śledzia", *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Germanica* 15: 9–18.
- Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz and Rychło, Mikołaj (2022) "Soot in the Saami and Germanic Languages", *Scandinavian Philology* 20 (2): 269–287.
- Wojan, Katarzyna (2014) "Jałowiec/kadyk w świetle etymologii globalnej", *Studia Rossica Gedanensia* 1: 100–141.
- Zeps, Valdis (1962) *Latvian and Finnic Linguistic Convergence*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas (1985) "Lenkų-jotvingių žodynėlis?", *Baltistica* 21(1): 61–82 and 21(2): 184–194.
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas (1992) "A Polish-Yatvingian Vocabulary?", *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań* 1: 99–133.

SAŽETAK

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

UGROFINSKE POSUĐENICE U ZAPADNOBALTIČKIM JEZICIMA

U ovome se radu raspravlja o 27 zapadnobaltičkih posuđenica za koje se vjeruje da su posuđene iz ugrofinskog izvora. Za pet leksičkih jedinica utvrđeno je da ne pripadaju ovoj kategoriji, dok se status još nekoliko njih smatra nesigurnim. Za brojne je riječi potvrđeno da su ugrofinske posuđenice. Među njima se nalaze fiziografski termini, npr. st. prus. *jūri* 'more' (← f.-v. **jārwā* 'jezero, more'); st. prus. **salavō* 'otok' (← u.-f. **salaw* 'otok; suho mjesto u močvari' < ur. **sala*), kao i nazivi korisnih vrsta drveća i biljaka, npr. st. prus. *kadegis* 'borovica' (← balto-fi. **kataja* 'id.' ← ur. **kača* 'smola'); st. prus. *malko* 'suma' (← u.-f. **malka* 'vrsta vrbe', sekundarno 'vrbov štap'); jatv. *sini* pl. 'gljive' (← balto-fi. **sēne* 'gljiva' < u.-f. **čänā* 'Polypore'). Tu su i leksičke jedinice koje označavaju životinje, meso i kožu koje se dobivaju od njih, npr. st. prus. *sylecke* 'baltička haringa' (← **silākkā* 'id.' ← ur. **šilā* 'salo'); st. prus. *kaywe* 'kobila' (← balto-fi. **kēwe* 'ženka konja ili soba' < ur. **kādōwā* 'ženka'); jatv. *fała* 'meso' (← u.-f. **pala* 'gristi; jesti'); st. prus. *pusne* 'čizma (do koljena)' (← u.-f. **pučni* 'gornjište' < ur. **ponči* 'koža na sobovoj nozi'). Intenzivni jezični kontakti zapadnih Balta i nepoznatoga naroda ugrofinskoga podrijetla potvrđeni su i u glagolskim oblicima, npr. jatv. *wał* 'bio' (← u.-f. **wol-* 'bio'); jatv. *wa* 'potrebno je' (← balto-fi. **wajagz* 'id.').

Ključne riječi: *Baltik; posuđenice; ugrofinski; jezični kontakt; staropruski; substrat; jatviški*