

ERIC P. HAMP
 University of Chicago
 Department of Linguistics
 Chicago

UDC 807.5—541.2

YET AGAIN βάτραχος

I have proposed, ŽA 29, 1979, 209—12, tracing βάτραχος and its Greek congeners, as well as some other Southeast European forms attested in modern times, to pre-Greek **burtVkko-*. Such a „Pelasgian“ form could be derived from an IE **bhṛd-V-ko-*. However, the common Greek form **b(ω)rtVkko-* which I assume could equally well be reconstructed **g^wṛVkko-*. This would then yield an IE reconstruction **g^whṛd-V-ko-*.

As a comparandum for the base we are now reminded of Armenian *gort* gen. *gortoy*, but. instr. *gortiw* ‘frog’. The most direct IE reconstruction for this Armenian noun is **g^(w)hord-o-*, *-i-*, if these two nouns are to be related.

However, Meillet (*Esquisse* 76) compares Arm. *gort* to Latvian *varde*, no doubt drawing this comparison from Hübschmann (*Armen. Gr.* 437, #102), where Latv. *warde* and Lith. *varlė* are compared. This knowledge was summarized by Trautmann *Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch* 342 s.v. *uardiā* adducing Latv. *varde*, ELatv. *vargle* > Lith. *varlė*, OPruss. *Worlyne*.

This leaves us with two possibilities for the Armenian noun: **ṽord-* and **g^(w)hord-*. It will be seen that the supposed Baltic cognates are by no means free of complexities. Yet a conjecture based on „Pelasgian“ can be no more than a suggestion to be kept in mind in future work.

Addendum: I meantime see that if κέδνος is to be derived from **g^whedh-* as has been claimed, then **burtVkko-* can be only from **bhṛd-V-ko-*. This means that Arm. *gort* is still best equated with Baltic **ṽord-*.

Oct. 28, 1980.