

Supplementary Comment

I thank the reviewer for the careful attention and the useful and clarifying comments which have been brought to my brief notes. In some ways it is the question of etymological criteria and the nature of reasoning in historical linguistic problems more than the substance of the data that has attracted my interest in presenting these slender notes. Therefore it is all the more essential that my remarks should be clear, and it is obvious that in some aspects I have failed to express myself with sufficient clarity and that in the effort to avoid prolixity I have been inexplicit. I therefore thank the reviewer for the help in explication, and I take the liberty here of adding some remarks that should have been incorporated in the first place.

With regard to *krma I*, *II*, and *III*, I would like to urge as a matter of method that we want to know and state clearly why we adduce particular relations among Slavic forms and languages, especially when the forms do not furnish precise equations (equivalences). I insist on overt reconstructions because one of the most important contributions the Slavic evidence can offer is the relation its form bears to Indo-European word formation. I consider *krma I* a valuable increment to the dossier, as also *krma II* has been.

My remark on Alb. *karmë* seems to me an essential clarification, and it is offered in that spirit.

The suggestion for *krma II* is simply a proposal.

Regarding *kášelj*, I think of my remarks as being in the direction of what a dictionary should do for the public in order to emphasize the systematicity of our work. Morphophonemic status and reconstructive phonetics of course introduce technical problems, but must be faced. Native testimony should never be ignored or dismissed.

The value of these forms for Indo-European dialectology is to me a highly important aspect.

The illicit standing of appeal to linguistic tabu is a tenet that I strongly hold, but it can of course be debated.

I regard the etymon of *ógenj* as a notable Balto-Slavic question and topic, with much to teach us, and *vígenj* is an important, even crucial, part of that question.

On the other hand, *vatra* forms a very important part of our theory of Albanian prehistory.

I wish to make my position on *ôglje* clear, especially since Pisani has regrettably not aided clarity on this matter.

Eric P. Hamp
University of Chicago