



UDC 39+811.113+811.511.12

Andrzej Piotr Kowalski

University of Gdańsk, Poland

Mikołaj Rychło

University of Gdańsk, Poland

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

University of Lodz, Poland

IS OLD NORSE *GAMMI* AN INHERITED OR A BORROWED WORD?

For citation: Kowalski A. P., Rychło M., Witczak K. T. Is Old Norse *gammi* an inherited or a borrowed word? *Scandinavian Philology*, 2020, vol. 18, issue 1, pp. 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2020.105>

The article discusses the uncertainty around the etymology and origin of the Old Norse *gammi* m. ‘Saami hut; earthen hut’, as well as its modern Scandinavian cognates, e. g. Icel. *gammi* m. ‘earthen hut’, Norw. *gamme* m. ‘id.’; Swed. dial. (Elfld.) *gamme* m. ‘porch; manger, cow manger’, Da. *gamme* c. ‘animal stall, sheepfold, fence, fencing’. The Northern Germanic terms are traditionally explained as an Indo-European heritage. There are three different competing etymologies for the Scandinavian words in question. The first explanation, proposed by two Norwegian linguists Hjalmar Seierstedt Falk (1859–1928) and Alf Torp (1853–1916), connects the Old Norse term for ‘earthen hut’ with the Indo-European term for ‘earth’ (PIE. **dʰǵʰom-*). The second etymology, given by the Swedish researcher Evald Lidén (1862–1939), relates it to Arm. *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’. He suggested a new Indo-European nominal root **gʰom-* ‘animal stall’ on the basis of the alleged comparison of the Germanic and Armenian forms. Twenty years ago, the Danish linguist Birgit Anette Olsen (born 1952) reinterpreted Lidén’s proposal, deriving the Germano-Armenian lexemes from the Indo-European root **gʰos-* ‘to eat’ (cf. Old Indic *ghas-* ‘to eat’) and finally explaining the protoform **gʰos-mo(n)-* as a *nomen loci* denoting ‘eating place’. In our opinion, neither a derivation from PIE. **dʰǵʰom-* ‘earth’, nor a comparison with Arm. *gom* ‘stable, stall, pigsty’ can be accepted for phonological, semantic, and cultural reasons. It is suggested that all the Scandinavian words should be treated as having been borrowed from North Saami *gammi* ‘earthen hut’. In fact, the aforementioned Nordic appellatives are completely isolated in the Germanic and Indo-European language world, whereas the

Saami word in question has numerous cognates in the Finno-Ugric languages and derives from a Finno-Permic archetype **kθm̄s* 'granary, pantry', e. g. Fi. *kumo* 'grain barn', Ost. *kōm* 'granary, pantry'.

Keywords: borrowings, Danish, Elfdalian dialect of Swedish, etymology, Finno-Ugric languages, Germanic-Saami relations, Icelandic, Indo-European languages, language contacts, Norway, Old Norse, Saami material culture, Scandinavian peoples, Uralic influence.

1. INTRODUCTION

In our article we would like to discuss the origin and etymology of one group of words attested in the Nordic languages. The lexical material includes not only Old Norse *gammi* m. 'Saami hut; dugout / Lappenhütte, Erdhütte', but also a number of modern Scandinavian cognates, e. g. Icel. *gammi* m. 'earthen hut', Norw. *gamme* m. 'dugout', Swed. dial. (Elfd.) *gamme* m. 'porch; manger, cow manger', Da. *gamme* c. 'sheepfold, fence, fencing' [de Vries, 1977, p. 155]. They seem to derive from the Proto-Germanic (or Nordic) archetype **gamman-* m. 'dugout, earthen hut'.

The term in question is generally absent in the West Germanic languages, though some linguists indicate some possible cognates in German, e. g. G. dial. *Gamm* 'heap of drying bricks' [Orel, 2003, p. 125]; Sw. *gämmeli* 'small barn or hut on the pastures, cowshed / kleine Scheune oder Hütte auf den Weiden, Viehhütte' [de Vries, 1977, p. 155]. It is worth emphasizing that the history of the German words in question is completely unclear. There are no traces of either of these appellatives in the earlier phases of the German language. Hence, the foreign (evidently Scandinavian) origin of two German terms cannot be ruled out.

2. OLD NORSE GAMMI AS AN INDO-EUROPEAN HERITAGE

There are three different ways of explaining the Old Norse word *gammi* m. 'Saami hut; earthen hut' in terms of a native element of Indo-European origin. It is worth emphasizing that none of these existing etymologies is thoroughly convincing. Let us review all the hypotheses hitherto suggested by researchers.

A. FALK AND TORP'S ETYMOLOGY

Hjalmar S. Falk and Alf Torp [1910, p. 298] were confident that the original meaning 'dugout; earthen hut' should be reconstructed based

on the Scandinavian words, as well as the Northern Saami form. The above-mentioned semantics ('dugout, earthen hut') can suggest a primitive derivation from the Proto-Indo-European term for 'earth, ground, land'. The Proto-Indo-European term **d^hǵ^hom-* f. (nom. sg. **d^heǵ^hōm* or **d^hǵ^hōm*) is securely attested in most Indo-European languages, cf.

2.1. Hitt. *tekan-* (gen. sg. *taknaš*) c. 'earth'; Toch. A *tkam*, B *kem* 'earth'; AGk. *χθών* f. (gen. sg. *χθονός*) 'earth'; OInd. *kṣám-* f. 'earth'; Av. *zam-* f. 'id.'; Alb. *dhe* f. 'earth'; Lat. *humus* f. 'earth' and so on.

It should be noted that the original term for 'earth' was lost completely from the languages of the Germanic tribes. However, they preserved an archaic derived noun belonging to the *n*-stems:

2.2. PG. **guman-* m. 'man': Go. *guma* m. 'man', ON. *gumi* m. 'man', Swed. *brud-gum* 'groom'; OE. *guma* m. 'man'; OFris. *breid-gomo* m. 'groom'; OSax. *gumo* m. 'man'; OHG. *gomo* m. 'hero, a famous man', MHG. *gome* m. 'human being, man' [Lehmann, 1986, p. 182; Orel, 2003, p. 146; Levitskiy, 2010, p. 130; Kroonen, 2013, p. 195].

The Germanic word for 'man, human being' has numerous cognates attested in other Indo-European languages, cf.

2.3. OLat. *hemō* m. (*n*-stem) 'man', Lat. *homō* m. 'id.'; OPruss. *smoy* m. 'man'; OLith. *žmuō* m. 'man', Lith. *žmónės* m. pl. 'human beings' (sg. *žmogùs* 'man'); Toch. B *šaumō* m. 'young man' (< PIE. **d^hǵ^hm-Hon-* m. 'man'), cf. also OIr. *duine* m. 'man', W. *dyn* m. 'human being'.

The aforementioned lexical data (2.3) clearly demonstrate that the Proto-Germanic word for 'man, human being' (2.2) derives from the Proto-Indo-European term for 'earth, ground, land' (2.1) and describes man as 'an earthly being' [Bammesberger, 1990, p. 184; Orel, 2003, p. 146; Levitskiy, 2010, p. 130].

Theoretically, the etymology suggested by Falk and Torp [1910, p. 298] seems to be well-founded from the semantic point of view (PG. dial. **gamman-* 'dugout; earthen hut' is convincingly connected with 'earth') and correct from the phonological angle (Germanic root **gam-* may represent an expected trace of PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-*). However, the suggested etymology does not explain the morphological aspects (e. g. the geminate *-mm-* remains unclear) and is doubtful within the Proto-Germanic word formation (it is completely unclear whether the final element **(m)an-* represents a suffix or perhaps the second member of a primitive compound). This is why Falk and Torp's explanation has often been rejected by most etymologists.

Archeological findings confirm that underground pits or dugouts were known to the ancient Germanic tribes. These constructions, dug in the ground, were frequently used as grain storages [Much, 1937, p. 180–181]. Moreover, Cornelius Tacitus (*Germ.* 16.3) indicates similar objects among the Germanic tribes, using the Latin noun *suffugium* n. ‘shelter; underground pit’ [Rives, 1999, p. 195]. The Nordic people called them *jarðhūs* (literally ‘earthen hut’). These objects are named *Erdstadel* in Germany and *Erdställe* in the folk culture of Austria. It may be noted that the Germanic terms for ‘underground huts’ are commonly derived from the Proto-Germanic noun **erþō* f. ‘earth, land, soil’, and not from PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-* f. ‘earth’. It seems highly probable that the Proto-Germanic people introduced a kind of taboo referring to the sacred name for ‘earth’ (PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-*). It is suggested that initially the Proto-Indo-European term for ‘earth’ was a lexical element strongly associated with rituals [cf. Blažek, 2019, p. 9–16]. It was replaced by the new (profane) appellative **erþō* f. ‘earth, land, soil’ [Lehmann, 1968, p. 8]. This is why the Germanic terms for earthen objects such as embankments, excavations, lockers dug in the earth were created on the basis of the innovational Proto-Germanic name for ‘earth’. In other words, the derivation of ON. *gammi* from the sacred name for ‘earth’ is questionable due to a prehistoric taboo.

B. LIDÉN’S ETYMOLOGY

The Swedish linguist Evald Lidén also favoured the native origin of the Old Norse appellative *gammi* m. ‘Saami hut, dugout/Lappenhütte, Erdhütte’ and cognate Scandinavian words [Lidén, 1906, p. 13–16], but the etymology which he provided was different to that of Falk and Torp. He compared the Germanic nouns with the Old Armenian lexeme *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’, as well as EArm. *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, pigsty’ and WArm. *kum* ‘cowshed’. Based on this alleged correspondence, Lidén proposed the Indo-European archetype **g^hom-*. Numerous diachronists have accepted both the Germanic-Armenian set [e. g. Ačařjan, 1971, p. 574–575; de Vries, 1977, p. 155; Levitskiy, 2010, p. 203], and the alleged Indo-European reconstruction **g^hom-* ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty / Stall’ [Walde, Pokorny, 1930, p. 637; Pokorny, 1959, p. 452; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, 1995, p. 38; Levitskiy, 2010, p. 203]. Mann [1984–87], however, does not include this word.

Unfortunately, the Germanic-Armenian set contains at least a few weaknesses. Firstly, the set is isolated and has never been supported by lexical material attested in a third Indo-European group (the so-called *tertium comparationis* is missing). Contemporary Indo-Europeanists believe that an Indo-European reconstruction is possible only when cognates from at least three language groups can be identified. Without the third comparison, the set does not have the necessary binding force (validity) and the reconstruction is not certain. Secondly, the Armenian word *gom* has rich counterparts in Caucasian languages (e. g. Georgian, Svan, Kabardian, Adyghe, Shapsug, Chechen, Ingush and Ossetic), which strongly supports the hypothesis regarding its local (Caucasian or sub-Caucasian) origin¹. Thirdly, the Armenian form of *gom* retains the vowel [ɔ] in the position before a nasal, which is completely inconsistent with the development of the Armenian language. The expected form should be **gum* [Olsen, 1999, p. 198; Martirosyan, 2009, p. 225]. Fourthly, the Germanic words can be borrowings from some pre-Indo-European, Scandinavian substrate, cf. a Northern Saami term *gammi* ‘Saami hut, dugout, hut made of peat’ [de Vries, 1977, p. 155]. Fifthly, the Germanic words contain an inconclusively explained “expressive” geminate *-mm-*. Sixthly, the meaning convergent with the Armenian term (e. g. ‘sheepfold, cowshed’) is demonstrated by Germanic forms of relatively late origin. It seems that the initial semantics (in the sense of ‘dugout’) is better motivated in the preserved Germanic lexical material. Seventhly, based on the Northern Saami form and numerous Nordic words (attested e. g. in Old Norse, Icelandic, Norwegian), the original meaning of ‘dugout’ can theoretically be postulated, which allows for an alternative reference of the Germanic appellatives to Proto-Indo-European word for ‘earth’ (PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-* f. ‘earth, soil’), as previously suggested by some researchers [cf. Falk, Torp, 1910, p. 298]. Eighthly, the suggested Indo-European archetype **ǵ^hom-* (‘stable, cowshed, pigsty / Stall’) has nei-

¹ Cf. Geo. *gomi* ‘pigsty’, *gomuri* ‘country house; pigsty’, Sv. *gwem* ‘pantry’; Kab. *gwän* ‘grain box, grain storage’, Ad. *kon* ‘upward widening woven granary, pasted on the outside with clay and covered with straw’, Shaps. ‘storehouse, granary’ [Shagirov, 1977, p. 112]; Ing. *ke* (obl. *keno*) ‘granary’, Che. *čö* (obl. *čöna-*) ‘grain storage, granary’; Osset. term *gom*, *gon*, *gondan* ‘grain box, granary’ [Abaev, 1959, p. 523–524]. Similar terms are also attested in some extra-Caucasian languages, e. g. Kurd. *göm*, *göv* f. ‘sheepfold, pigsty’ [Tsabolov, 2001, p. 393], Yaghn. *köy* ‘pigsty’ [Novák, 2010, p. 87].

ther an obvious verbal motivation, nor is it a component of complex words, which makes it completely isolated (at least from the perspective of Indo-European word formation).

All these difficulties make the Germanic-Armenian correspondence a hypothesis that is insufficiently justified and relatively poorly supported on the grounds of phonology, semantics and word formation.

C. OLSEN'S ETYMOLOGY

Birgit Anette Olsen [1999, p.198] tries to explain why the vowel lengthening of *o* [ɔ] failed when positioned in front of the nasal consonant *m* [m], as can be observed in the Armenian appellative *gom* 'cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty'. Olsen puts forward an interesting hypothesis by referring to the disappearance of the IE. *s [s] in the position before [m], which is a fully regular process in the Armenian language. As a result, the Danish linguist reduces the Armenian word to two related archetypes of **g^hos-mo-* (m.) and **g^hos-meh₂-* (f.), referring to the Proto-Indo-European root **g^hos-* 'to eat' (cf. OInd. *ghas-* 'to eat') finally explaining Arm. *gom* as a *nomen loci* denoting 'eating place'. Development from such a proto-form could explain the Proto-Germanic geminate *-*mm-* as a result of a regressive assimilation in the consonant group -*zm-* (< PIE. *-*sm-*). In other words, PG. **gamman-* (from previous **gazman-*) would represent an alleged *n*-stem **g^hos-món-* m. [Kroonen, 2013, p.166].

The main obstacle in recognising the nativity of Germanic words is the fact that the Nordic name *gammi* does not describe the native North Germanic reality, but a typical Saami hut in the form of a dugout ('Lapenhütte, Erdhütte'), which argues strongly in favour of a borrowing from a Finno-Ugric source.

3. ARE THE SCANDINAVIAN TERMS FOR 'DUGOUT' OF SAAMI ORIGIN?

The Northern Saami appellative *gammi* 'Saami dugout, provision-
al hut built of peat' can be successfully reduced to the Finno-Permic
archetype **k8mз* 'granary, pantry / Speicher, Vorratskammer' [Rédei,
1988, p. 680]. Although the Saami form *gammi* does not appear in Ré-
dei's *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, its omission seems to stem
from a misconception by researchers believing it to be an Old Norse

or Proto-Germanic borrowing² [Wiklund, 1917, p.102; Kylstra, 1996, p.32–33, 107]. However, it is enough to mention other Saami forms of Finno-Ugric (or Uralic) origin, to find out that the Saami cognate closely matches the root of *k8mз in both semantic and phonological aspects:

3.1. SaaN. *gammi*, dial. *kammi* ‘dugout, hut made of peat / Erdhütte, Torfhütte’ [de Vries, 1977, p. XXXVIII, 155] = Fi. *kumo* ‘grain barn’, dial. *kommio* ‘tent, forest hut’; Kar. *kommo*, *komo* ‘cave / Höhle’, *kommi* ‘(cattle) shed / (Vieh)Schuppen’; Vot. *kommi* ‘room, cabin, place / Zimmer; Kajüte; Platz, Raum’; Est. *komm* (gen. *kommi*) ‘hut, vault / Hütte; Gewölbe, Wölbung’; Md. (Erz.) *kav* ‘granary’, (Mksh.) *kav* ‘hay box’; Zr. *kum* ‘hunter’s pantry in the forest, clothing box’; Ost. *kõm* ‘granary, pantry’; Vty. *kūm* ‘attic’ < FP. *k8mз ‘granary, pantry / Speicher, Vorratskammer’ [Rédei, 1988, p. 680].

For comparison, other Finno-Ugric (sets of) comparanda, can be adduced. They exhibit a similar structure.

3.2. SaaN. *gāmā* ‘Saami leather shoe’ = Fi. *ken-kä* ‘shoe’; Md. (Erz.) *keme*, (Mksh.) *kämä* ‘shoe’; Cher. *kem* ‘id.’; Zr. *keṃ* ‘shoe made of bast or birch bark’ < FU. *kämä ‘shoe, leather footwear’ [Rédei, 1988, p. 650].

3.3. SaaN. *gālmās* ‘frozen’ = Fi. *kylmä* ‘cold’, adj. ‘cold, cool’; Est. *külm* ‘id.’; Md. (Erz.) *kelme*, (Mksh) *kelmä* ‘id.’; Cher. *kəlmə* ‘frozen’; Vty. *kin* ‘frost, cold; freezing, cold, frozen’ < FU. *külmä ‘cold, frost’, adj. ‘cold’ [Rédei, 1988, p. 203–204].

3.4. SaaN. *goabmā* ‘overhanging, arched edge (of earth, rock, earth, snow)’ = Fi. *komi*, *komo* ‘hollow’, adj. ‘empty, hollow’; Ost. *kõm*, dial. *χõm* ‘hollow’; Hu. *homorú* ‘concave, hollow’ < FU. *komз ‘hollow; concave’ [Rédei, 1988, p. 227].

3.5. SaaN. *goabmer* ‘two bent open hands folded together to receive something’ = Fi. *kamahlo*, *kahmalo* ‘double handful’; Md. (Erz.) *komoro*, (Mksh.) *komor* ‘handful’; Zr. *kamiṛ* ‘handful’ < FU. *komзэз ‘id.’ < Ur. *komзэз ‘empty hand’, cf. also Yen. *hammara* ‘hand’, Km. *kāməru?* ‘arms’ [Collinder, 1977, p. 42; Rédei, 1988, p. 175].

3.6. SaaN. *goaw'de* ‘opening; a protruding roof; roof on stilts, without walls’ = Fi. *kansi* ‘lid, cover’, Est. *kaas* ‘id.’, Liv. *kõñts̄* ‘id.’; Md. *kunda* ‘lid’;

² Note that Kylstra [1996, p.32–33] also quotes Swed. dial. *kammi* ‘hole, crate / Loch, Verschlag’ (with the initial *k-* as opposed to *g-*) as a back-borrowing from a Saami or Balto-Finnic source. See Fi. dial. *kamano*, *kamanto* ‘cave, depression, hole / Höhle, Vertiefung, Loch’, also ‘hut / Hütte’.

Cher. *komδāš* ‘id.’; Zr. *kud* ‘eyelid; lid’ < FU. **komta* ‘lid, cover’ [Collinder, 1977, p. 158; Rédei, 1988, p. 671].

3.7. SaaN. *gōw’dâg* ‘wide’ = Cher. *kumda*, *kumda* ‘id.’, Ost. *komæt* ‘id.’ < FU. **kumte* adj. ‘wide’ [Collinder, 1977, p. 96; Rédei, 1988, p. 203–204].

An overview of the etymological sets shown above leaves no doubt that the Saami word *gammi* is soundly anchored in the Finno-Ugric lexicon while the Germanic words are isolated in the Indo-European context. Let us emphasize once again that the Old Norse appellative *gammi* refers to a Saami hut, a dugout built of peat (“Lappehütte, Erdhütte, Torfhütte”), which definitely argues in favour of a borrowing from a Saami (or Lappish) source. Borrowing in the opposite direction is not justified by the available lexical data.

Cornelius Tacitus (*Germ.* 46) uses the Lat. *suffugium* ‘shelter’, when referring to structures built by Fenni, an ethnic people frequently identified with the Saamis (or the Balto-Finnic peoples). The Roman writer does not add the adjective *subterraneum*, as he is probably describing huts of the hunting people of northern Eurasia. Underground lockers were also known to exist in the culture of these people. By this time, the Finno-Ugric communities including the Saami tribes, had partly adopted the goods and vocabulary of the Neolithic epoch. They knew the elements of solid structures and constructions, as evidenced by words for ‘a beam’, ‘a pole’ or ‘a granary on stilts’ [Häkkinen, 2007, p. 182]. Secondary contacts between the Germanic and Finno-Ugric peoples could have been as early as in the Bronze Age, beginning from 1700 BC [Carpelan, Parpola, 2007, p. 90]. Importantly, these language contacts took place in areas where a hunting and gathering culture still dominated. Both ethnic groups began to lose their existing or previously associated elements with agricultural culture. This is why the Saami (Mesolithic people) borrowed some names for nets from the Scandinavian Germanic tribes (Aikio 2006: 10). It should be no surprise that the Northern Proto-Germanic tribes borrowed the term for ‘Saami hut, dugout’ directly from the Saami people

4. CONCLUSIONS

A thorough analysis of the linguistic facts has led to the following conclusions:

4.1. ON. *gammi* ‘Saami hut, dugout’ can clearly not be derived from PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-* f. ‘earth’.

4.2. The correlation of the Old Norse word in question with Arm. *gom* ‘sheepfold, stable, cowshed, pigsty’ is questionable both for semantic and phonological reasons.

4.3. The Scandinavian words, including Norw. *gamme* m. ‘dugout’, Elfd. *gamme* m. ‘porch; manger, cow manger’, Swed. dial. *kammi* ‘hole, crate’, Da. *gamme* c. ‘sheepfold, fence, fencing’, are probably borrowings from a Saami source.

4.4. The Northern Saami word *gammi* ‘dugout, hut made of peat’ represents a native lexical element and demonstrates numerous cognates in Finno-Ugric languages, cf. Fi. *kumo* ‘grain barn’, dial. *kommio* ‘tent, forest hut’; Md. (Erz.) *kav* ‘granary’, (Mksh.) *kav* ‘hay box’; Zr. *kum* ‘hunter’s pantry in the forest, clothing box’; Ost. *kõm* ‘granary, pantry’; Vty. *kūm* ‘attic’ (< FP. **k8m3* ‘granary, pantry’)

Acknowledgements: The present article is part of a research project entitled *Prehistoric contacts between Indo-European and Uralic*, financed by the scholarly development fund of the Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz. Our sincere thanks go to Penny Shefton for proofreading the whole text and making several stylistic improvements. For all the errors that still remain we alone are responsible.

LANGUAGE ABBREVIATIONS

Ad. — Adyghе	G. — German
AGk. — Ancient Greek	Geo. — Georgian
Alb. — Albanian	Go. — Gothic
Anat. — Anatolian	Hitt. — Hittite
Arm. — Armenian	Hu. — Hungarian
Av. — Avestan	Icel. — Icelandic
Che. — Chechen	IE. — Indo-European
Cher. — Cheremis	Ing. — Ingush
Da. — Danish	Kab. — Kabardian
EArm. — Eastern Armenian	Km. — Kamassian
Elfd. — Elfdalian (Övdalian)	Kurd. — Kurdish
Erz. — Erza (dialect of Mordvin)	Lat. — Latin
Est. — Estonian	Lith. — Lithuanian
Fi. — Finnish	MHG. — Middle High German
FP. — Finno-Permic	Mksh. — Moksha (dialect of
FU. — Finno-Ugric	Mordvin)

Norw. — Norwegian	Shaps. — Shapsug (dialect of Adyghe)
OE. — Old English	Sv. — Svan
OFris. — Old Frisian	Sw. — Swiss dialect of the German language
OHG. — Old High German	Swed. — Swedish
OInd. — Old Indic	Toch. A — Tocharian A or East Tocharian
OIr. — Old Irish	Toch. B — Tocharian B or West Tocharian
OLat. — Old Latin	Ur. — Uralic
OLith. — Old Lithuanian	Vty. — Votyak
ON. — Old Norse	W. — Welsh
OPruss. — Old Prussian	WArm. — West Armenian
OSax. — Old Saxonian	Yaghn. — Yaghnobi
Osset. — Ossetic	Yen. — Yenisey Samoyed
Ost. — Ostyak	Zr. — Zyrian
PG. — Proto-Germanic	
PIE. — Proto-Indo-European	
SaaN. — Saami (northern dialect)	

REFERENCES

- Abaev V.I. *Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Ossetic Language*. Vol. 1. Moscow; Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR Publ., 1959. 655 p. (In Russian)
- Ačařjan H. H. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Language*. Vol. 1. Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hrat. Publ., 1971. 698 p. (In Armenian)
- Aikio A. On Germanic-Saami contacts and Saami Prehistory. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 2006. Vol. 91. P. 9–55.
- Bammesberger A. *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1990. 290 p.
- Blažek V. Old Icelandic gná. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, 2019. Vol. 80. P. 9–16.
- Carpelan Ch., Parpola A. Emergence, contacts and dispersal of Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Uralic and Proto-Aryan in archaeological perspective. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Eds Ch. Carpelan, A. Parpola, P. Koskikallio. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 2007. P. 55–150.
- Collinder B. *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Language*. Hamburg: Buske, 1977. 217 p.
- Falk H. S., Torp A. *Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1910. 808 s.

- Gamkrelidze T. V., Ivanov V. V. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*. Part 2. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995. P. 379–936.
- Häkkinen K. Prehistoric Finno-Ugric culture in the light of historical lexicology. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Eds Ch. Carpelan, A. Parpola, P. Koskikallio. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 2007. P. 169–186.
- Kroonen G. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013. 794 p.
- Kylstra A. D. *Lexikon der älteren germanischen Lehnwörter in den Ostseefinnischen Sprachen*. B. 2. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996. 313 p.
- Lehmann W. P. The Proto-Germanic Words Inherited from Proto-Indo-European which Reflect the Social and Economic Status of the Speakers. *Zeitschrift für Mundartforschung*, 1968. Vol. 35. No. 1. P. 1–25.
- Lehmann W. P. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986. 712 p.
- Levitskiy V. V. *An Etymological Dictionary of Germanic Languages*. Vol. 1. Vinnitsa: Nova Knyga Publ., 2010. 614 p. (In Russian)
- Lidén E. *Armenische Studien*. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1906. 149 p.
- Mann S. E. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1984–87. 1683 p.
- Martirosyan H. K. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009. 951 p.
- Much R. *Die Germania des Tacitus*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1937. XIII+459 p.
- Novák L. *Jahňóbsko-český slovník*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta, 2010. 265 p.
- Olsen B. *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation with Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1999. 1143 p.
- Orel V. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003. 683 p.
- Pokorny J. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern; München: Francke Verlag, 1959. 1183 p.
- Rédei K. *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Budapest: Akademia Kiado, 1988. 593 p.
- Rives J. B. *Tacitus, Germania*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. X+346 p.
- Shagirov A. K. *Etymological Dictionary of the Adyghe (Circassian) Languages*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1977. 290 p. (In Russian)
- Tsabolov R. L. *Etymological Dictionary of the Kurdish Language*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Vostochnaia Literatura Publ., 2001. 686 p. (In Russian)
- Vries de J. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill, 1977. 689 p.
- Walde A., Pokorny J. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1. Berlin; Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1930. 717 p.

Wiklund K. B. Die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Finnischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1917. Vol. 38. P. 48–115.

Анджей Петр Ковальский

Гданьский университет

Миколай Рыхло

Гданьский университет

Кшиштоф Томаш Витчак

Лодзинский университет

ЯВЛЯЕТСЯ ЛИ ДРЕВНЕСКАНДИНАВСКОЕ GAMMI УНАСЛЕДОВАННЫМ ИЛИ ЗАИМСТВОВАННЫМ СЛОВОМ?

Для цитирования: Kowalski A. P., Rychło M., Witczak K. T. Is Old Norse *gammi* an inherited or a borrowed word? // Скандинавская филология. 2020. Т. 18. Вып. 1. С. 72–84. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2020.105>

В статье рассматриваются этимология и генезис древнескандинавского слова *gammi* ‘саамская изба, землянка’, а также другие слова скандинавской группы языков, ср., напр., исл. *gammi* ‘землянка’, норв. *gamte* ‘землянка’, швед. диал. *gamte* ‘кормушка’, дат. *gamte* ‘овчарня, забор, ограда’. Принято считать, что данное древнескандинавское слово является индоевропейским наследием. По мнению авторов настоящей статьи, как существующий вывод о происхождении слова из праиндоевропейского языка (ср. пие. **dʰǵʰom-* ‘земля’), так и сопоставление с арм. *got* ‘коровник, конюшня, овчарня, хлев’ не может быть одобрено по фонологическим, семантическим или культурным основаниям. Все скандинавские слова должны быть, согласно нашему мнению, признаны заимствованиями из саамского (лапландского) источника. Нордические апеллятивы изолированы на германской и индоевропейской почве, тогда как саамское *gammi* ‘землянка, построенная из торфа’ имеет многочисленные соответствия в финно-угорских языках и выводится из финно-пермской графемы **kvmz* ‘амбар, зернохранилище’, сравн. финск. *kuto* ‘рига, овин’, диал. *kottio* ‘шалаш, лесная изба’; мордв. (эрз.) *kav* ‘амбар, зернохранилище’, мокш. *kav* ‘ящик для сена’; зыр. *kut* ‘кладовая охотника в лесу, потайное место для одежды’; хант. *kõt* ‘амбар, зернохранилище’; удм. *kõt* ‘чердак’.

Ключевые слова: заимствования, датский язык, эльвдальский диалект шведского языка, этимология, финно-угорские языки, германо-саамские отношения, исландский язык, индоевропейские языки, языковые контакты, норвежский язык, древнескандинавский язык, саамская материальная культура, скандинавы, шведский язык, уральское влияние.

Andrzej Piotr Kowalski

Dr. Hab., Professor,

University of Gdańsk,

8, ul. Bażyńskiego, Gdańsk, 80-309, Poland

E-mail: andrzej.kowalski@ug.edu.pl

Mikołaj Rychło

PhD,

University of Gdańsk,

8, ul. Bażyńskiego, Gdańsk, 80-309, Poland

E-mail: mikolaj.rychlo@ug.edu.pl

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

Dr. Hab., Professor,

University of Lodz,

171/173, ul. Pomorska, PL-90-236 Łódź, Poland

E-mail: krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl

Received: March 16, 2020

Accepted: June 2, 2020