

Václav Blažek: *The Indo-European “Smith”*. “Journal of Indo-European Studies. Monograph Series” 58. Washington 2010, pp. 119

The reviewed monograph is an excellently prepared and edited publication, where both Indo-European and non-Indo-European traditions of smithery are carefully discussed. Václav Blažek reviews and suggests numerous etymologies, combining qualitative standards with scientific rigour. The Indo-European part of Blažek’s book explains appellatives for ‘smith’ found in Indo-Aryan, Kafir or Nuristani, Iranian, Armenian, Anatolian, Greek, Albanian, Italic, Celtic, Germanic, Baltic and Slavic (pp. 1–80). The Tocharian subgroup is omitted, as no term for ‘smith’ is attested in the preserved Tocharian texts.

In the external (non-Indo-European) part of the monograph (pp. 80–97) a number of terms designating the craft of ‘smith’ are discussed. This part includes isolated languages (like Basque, Hattic, Sumerian) and various languages belonging to language families of the Old World, which – according to the traditional point of view – form the Nostratic phylum, namely Kartvelian, Uralic (Fenno-Ugric, Samoyedic), Altaic (Turkic, Mongolian, Tungusic, Korean, Japanese), Afro-Asiatic (Semitic, Egyptian, Cushitic, Berber) and Dravidian. West Caucasian, East Caucasian and Hurrian designations for ‘smith’ are presented as well. Further parts of the book are Conclusions (pp. 97–100) and Bibliography (pp. 101–118).

Blažek’s aim “is to map the terms designating the craft of ‘smith’ in Indo-European languages, including the divine smiths, to analyze their etymologies and finally to try to classify them according to semantic typology” (p. 1). In fact, his work is prepared very well. There are terms of unclear origin, for which Blažek gives new explanations. For example, having discussed etymologies suggested earlier (by Oleg N. Trubačev, Janis Endzelins, Ernst Fraenkel, Vladimir N. Toporov and others) the author connects the Balto-Slavic term for ‘smith’, *\*utrjas*, attested in Old Prussian *wutris* ‘smith’ (see OPruss. *autre* ‘smithery’) and Old Church Slavic *vǫtrь*, Middle Bulgarian *vǫtrь* ‘smith’, with the Baltic designation of ‘copper’, *\*warjan* (n.), attested in Lithuanian *vāriās*, Latvian *varš* and Old Prussian *vargien* ‘id.’<sup>1</sup>. He proposes the following development: IE. *\*u<sub>r</sub>-trijos* > BSl. *\*utrjas*. Thus, he claims a regressive dissimilation of the rhotics (*r – r* > *ø – r*) occurred.

In my opinion, the Balto-Slavic *\*utrjas* should be connected with the Latin word *uter* (m. *i*-stem) ‘a bag or bottle made of an animal’s hide’.

<sup>1</sup> The same etymology is repeated in Blažek’s article, written in Czech (Blažek 2010: 9–14).

Thus this term denotes a smith (or rather smith's assistant), who works with a pair of bellows. Similar semantics was earlier suggested by Oleg Trubačev (Трубачев 1966: 337–339), who proposed a completely different etymology of Balto-Slavic *\*utrjas* 'smith', deriving it from IE. *\*wē-* 'to blow' < PIE. *\*h<sub>2</sub>weh<sub>1</sub>-* (Pokorny 1959: 81–84; Rix, Kümmel 2001: 287). The Latin noun seems to be a continuation of an appellative of Indo-European origin, e.g. IE. *\*utris* (m. *i*-stem) 'bellows (or bag) made of an animal's hide'. It is obvious that a craftsman who works with a pair of bellows (i.e. smith's assistant or even the smith) might have been called *\*utr(i)jos* in Indo-European. Thus, the Balto-Slavic term *\*utrjas* 'smith' seems to represent an Indo-European heritage. What is more, the Ossetic term for 'blacksmith', attested as *kurd* in Digoron and *k<sup>w</sup>yrđ* in Iron, may represent not only Iranian *\*kurta-* or *\*kurtar-* (as suggested by Vasilij I. Abaev and V. Blažek), but also *\*kutra-* (with a regular metathesis of *-tr-* to *-rt-* in Ossetic, e.g. Digoron *furt*, Iron *fyrđ* 'son', cf. Avestan *puθra-* 'son', OInd. *putrá-* m. 'son, child'). If my line of thought is correct, the Ossetic term for 'blacksmith' can be explained morphologically as a compound containing the Indo-Iranian (augmentative and pejorative) prefix *\*ku-* (< IE. *\*k<sup>w</sup>u-* 'what') and the term *\*utra-* (< IE. *\*utr[i]o-*) denoting originally 'smith's assistant working with a pair of bellows'. Such a derivation is very common to all the Indo-Iranian languages, e.g. Avestan *kuruya-* f. 'a kind of disease / Name einer Krankheit' < Iran. *\*ku-ruga-* 'bad illness' (orig. 'what an illness') vs. OInd. *ruj-* m. 'pain, illness, disease', *róga-* m. 'disease, infirmity, sickness'. It should be emphasized that the Indo-Iranian pejorative prefix *\*ku-* appears frequently in the designations of people (including craftsmen), e.g. Av. *kūnāirī-* f. 'whore / Hurenweib, Hure' (orig. 'what a wife / was für ein Weib') vs. Av. *nāirī-* f. 'woman, wife'; OInd. *nārī-* f. 'woman, wife', Lusitanian *nurim* (f., acc. sg.) 'wife' (< PIE. *\*h<sub>2</sub>nōrī* f.). The long vowel *-ū-* in the above Avestan word results from a laryngeal effect (thus Av. *kūnāirī-* < PIE. *\*ku-h<sub>2</sub>nōrī*). See also OInd. *ku-vādika-* m. 'charlatan, quack' vs. *vādika-* m. 'magician'. It is not impossible that the Iranian word *\*ku-utra-* 'blacksmith', attested in Ossetic (Digoron) *kurd*, (Iron) *k<sup>w</sup>yrđ* 'id.', derives from IE. *\*utrijos* with a secondary introduction of *o*-stem against the primitive *yo*-stem. The same development is seen in the following example: OInd. *ku-rasa-* 'having a bad taste' < OInd. *rasya-* adj. 'juicy, tasty, savoury, palatable'. Of course, the pejorative aspect of the Ossetic smithery could be connected to the introduction of the opposition of good (divine) and evil among the Iranian tribes.

Blažek gives his own explanations for numerous Indo-European (and non-Indo-European) terms denoting 'smith'. For example, he discusses

three different explanations of Armenian *darbin* ‘smith, blacksmith’. First, he rejects the traditional connection with the Latin appellative *faber* ‘craftsman; artisan; worker on hard materials; smith’ (as if from IE. *\*dhabh-ró-s*) on the phonological basis (the original *a*-vocalism is hardly possible in Indo-European). Second, Blažek prefers to compare the Armenian term with the Lithuanian verb *dirbti* ‘to work, make, produce’, OE. *deorfan* ‘arbeiten; umkommen’ (< IE. *\*dherbh-*). Third, he does not exclude a foreign origin for Arm. *darbin*, as it resembles two oriental (substratal) terms attested in Hurrian *tabira* ‘metal-worker’ and Sumerian *tabira*, *tibira* ‘metal-worker’, esp. ‘copper-worker’, respectively.

According to Blažek, the Latin term in question is related to Old Lithuanian *gabija* f. ‘fire’ (also *Gabija*, *Gabie* f. ‘a pagan goddess of fire’) and the Celtic terms for ‘smith’: Old Irish *gobae* m. ‘id.’, Welsh *gof*, Old Cornish *gof* gl. ‘faber vel cudo’, Breton *gov*, Vannetais *gô*, Gaulish *gobedbi* (instr. pl.) ‘by smiths’ or ‘with smiths’. Although the Latin *a*-vocalism may be explained as a reflex of the nominal root *\*gh<sup>w</sup>obh-* ‘fire’ with a non-apophonic vowel *\*o*<sup>2</sup>, I believe that the Latin and Armenian terms for ‘smith’ are related to each other. Agreeing with Blažek’s opinion that the Germanic, Baltic and Slavic forms, quoted as possible equivalents in the standard dictionaries and monographs (cf. Gothic *ga-daban* ‘to happen, be suitable’, Old Nordic *dafna* ‘to become strong’; Lith. *dabà* f. ‘nature, character’; Old Church Slavic *dobrǎ* adi. ‘good’), “are rather vague in semantics” (p. 22, 38), I accept the opinion that the North Indo-European forms belong to a different group of words.

Blažek’s judgement is that “Latin *faber* agrees only with Armenian *darbin*, if it is derivable from *\*d<sup>h</sup>ə<sub>2</sub>b<sup>h</sup>-r-ino-*“ (p. 22, 38). It is necessary to comment on his words. If the Paelignian noun *faber* ‘smith’ (p. 37) is not a borrowing from Latin and represents an Oscan heritage, then there is no justification for the Italic protoform *\*pafros* and IE. *\*dhə<sub>2</sub>bhros*. It is necessary to posit Italic *\*pabros* ‘smith’ (hence Latin and Paelignian *faber*) or even *\*pamros* (with the regular change of *\*mr* to *\*br*<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> K. T. Witczak (2000: 37–43), demonstrated that Latin *\*a* and Celtic *\*o* reflect a non-apophonic vowel *\*o* in Indo-European. The correctness of his statement may be confirmed by a number of comparisons: Latin *mare* = Celtic *\*mori* n. ‘sea’ (< IE. *\*mori* n. ‘id.’); Latin *lacus* = Celtic *\*loku-* ‘lake, pool’ (< IE. *\*loku-*), Latin *badius* ‘brown’ = Celtic *\*bodio-* adj. ‘yellow, tawny, sunburnt’ (< IE. *\*bodhyos*), Latin *agnus* = Celtic *\*ognos* m. ‘lamb’ and so on. All the Latin-Celtic equivalents create regular correspondences and they remain with no verbal motivation. It is highly probable that the afore-mentioned words demonstrate a non-apophonic Indo-European vowel *\*o*.

<sup>3</sup> Evidence for this development in Latin is plentiful, e.g. Lat. *brevis* adj. ‘short’, Gk. βραχύς adj. ‘id.’ < IE. *\*mr̥ǵhú-* adj. ‘short’; Lat. *hibernus* adj. ‘of winter’ < *\*heibrinos* < *\*xeim-*

To the best of my knowledge, the Latin, Oscan (Paelignian) and Armenian appellatives in question can be alternatively derived from the Proto-Indo-European archetype *\*dh̥mH-rós* ('smith; smelter or melter of metals', orig. 'blower'). The verbal root *\*dhemH-* (zero-grade *\*dh̥mH-*) 'blow, breathe; kindle a fire by blowing; melt or manufacture metal by blowing' is perfectly attested in the Indo-European languages, see OInd. *dhámati* 'he blows; kindles a fire by blowing; melts or manufactures metal by blowing', Khotanese *dam-* 'to blow, breathe', Ossetic (Iron) *dymyn*, (Digoron) *dumun* 'to blow', Shughni *dām-* 'to blow; to fan fire by blowing with smith's bellows'<sup>4</sup>, Yazgulami *dām-* 'to blow with the bellows; to forge' (Расторгуева, Эдельман 2003: 316–321), Old Church Slavic *doti* 'to blow', Polish *dąć* 'to blow' and *dymać* 'to blow with a pair of smith's bellows', Lith. *dùmti* 'to blow' (p. 7). The *a*-vocalism in Latin *faber*, Paelignian *faber* and Armenian *darbin* seems easily explainable as a reflex of the long nasal sonant *ṃ̄* (< PIE. *\*ṃ̄H*). The nasal sonant *\*ṃ̄*, if it is attested before the primitive stress, gives *-am-* in Latin and Armenian. What is more, the change of *\*-mr-* to *-br-* appears to be regular in Latin, as well as in Armenian (also the Armenian metathesis of *-br-* to *-rb-* is a well known phenomenon). The development from Indo-European to Latin should be reconstructed as follows: PIE. *\*dh̥mH-rós* 'blower; smelter; smith' > IE. *\*dh̥m̄rós* > (West IE.) *\*dhamrós* > Italic *\*pabros* > Latin and Paelignian *faber* 'smith'. Close equivalents of the Latin-Armenian terms for 'smith' are attested in Vedic *dhmātar-* m. 'blower, smelter or melter (of metals)', Sanskrit *dhamaka-* m. 'blower, blacksmith (as blowing the forge)' and *dhmā-kāra-* m. 'blacksmith' (lex.), see also Sanskrit *dhamana-* adj. 'blowing with the bellows'. Also the Balto-Slavic lexical material, derived from the root *\*dh̥mH-*, indicates smith's work with the bellows, cf. Lith. *dùmplės* f. pl. 'bellows used in the forge', Old Lithuanian *dùmtuvės* f. pl. 'leather bellows to blowing (in the forge)', Russ. dial. *дмуть* 'to blow; kindle fire by blowing', Polish *dymać* 'to blow with a pair of bellows', metaphorically 'futuere' (Smoczyński 2007: 133).

Here I have discussed only two highly controversial problems in trying to explain two possible Indo-European terms, *\*utriōs* and *\*dh̥mHrós*, denoting 'smith', originally 'blower'. Generally, Blažek's etymologies

*rinos* < IE. *\*ǵheimerinos*, cf. Gk. χειμερινός adj. 'id.', Lat. *hiems* f. 'winter, storm'. The same change is also attested in Greek and other Indo-European languages.

<sup>4</sup>The Pamir languages demonstrate also some appellatives connecting with the smith's profession, e.g. Shughni *dām* 'smith's bellows', Sarikoli *dom* 'bellows for kindling fire'.

and conclusions are acceptable and unquestionable. In my opinion, his monograph is both a valuable and interesting contribution to studies of the Indo-European lexicon and culture.

(Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak,  
Uniwersytet Łódzki, Łódź)

### References

- Blažek V. (2010): *Staroslověnské \*vǔtrь 'kovář'* [Old Church Slavic \*vǔtrь 'smith']. „Slavia” LXXIX(1), pp. 9–14.
- Pokorny J. (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern–München.
- Расторгуева В.С., Эдельман Д.И. (2003): *Этимологический словарь иранских языков* [*Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages*]. Vol. 2. Moscow 2003, pp. 316–321.
- Rix H., Kümmel M. (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Smoczyński W. (2007): *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [Etymological Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language]. Wilno.
- Трубачев О.Н. (1966): *Ремесленная терминология в славянских языках (этимология и опыт групповой реконструкции)* [Craftman's Terminology in the Slavonic Languages (Etymology and Trial of a Collective Reconstruction)]. Москва.
- Witczak K.T. (2000): *Non-apophonic \*o in Common Celtic and Latin*. „Studia Indogermanica Lodziensia” III, pp. 37–43.

### Sprawozdanie z konferencji

W dniach 17–18 listopada 2016 r. odbyła się w Centrum Nauk Humanistycznych UWM w Olsztynie międzynarodowa konferencja naukowa poświęcona szeroko pojętym zagadnieniom aksjologicznym, pt. „Wartości i wartościowanie we współczesnej humanistyce: perspektywa filozoficzna, lingwistyczna, komunikacyjna”. Było to kolejne z cyklicznych spotkań naukowców prowadzonych przez prof. dr. hab. Aleksandra Kiklewicza i Centrum Badań Europy Wschodniej, tym razem współorganizowane przez Instytut Dziennikarstwa i Komunikacji Społecznej, Instytut Filozofii, Instytut Polonistyki i Logopedii. Komitet organizacyjny konferencji tworzył mocny zespół kadry naukowej Wydziału Humanistycznego UWM, w składzie: prof. dr. hab. A. Kiklewicz, dr. hab. A. Dudziak, dr. hab. E. Starzyńska-Kościuszkó, prof. UWM, dr. hab. A. Naruszewicz-Duchlińska, prof. UWM, dr I. Matusiak-Kempa, dr J. Piwowar i mgr P. Buczek, sekretarz Komitetu.

Zaproponowana przez organizatorów tematyka spotkała się z zainteresowaniem szerokiego grona badaczy, wśród ponad 90 wygłoszonych referatów znaleźć można było analizy bardzo różnorodne tematycznie i metodologicznie.