

The Lexicon of Slavic

Sergueï Sakhno

▶ **To cite this version:**

Sergueï Sakhno. The Lexicon of Slavic. M. Fritz. Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, Vol. 3, W. de Gruyter, Mouton, 2017. halshs-01725973

HAL Id: halshs-01725973
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01725973

Submitted on 7 Mar 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Stieber, Zdzisław
1971 *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich. Fleksja imienna* [An outline of the comparative grammar of the Slavic languages. Nominal inflection]. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
Stjepanović, Sandra
1998 On the Placement of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: Evidence from VP Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 527–537.
Stjepanović, Sandra
1999 *What do Second Position Cliticization, Scrambling, and Multiple wh-fronting have in Common*? Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
Stone, Gerald
2002 Cassubian. In: Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages,* 759–794. London: Routledge.
Tomić, Olga
1996 The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 811–872.
Trugman, Helen
2007 Rudiments of Romance N-to-D movement in Russian. In: Peter Kosta, Gerda Hassler, Lilia Schürcks and Nadine Thielemann (eds.), *Linguistic Investigations into Formal Description of Slavic Languages. Potsdam Linguistic Investigations,* volume 1, 411–426. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
Wackernagel, Jakob
1892 Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333–436.

Krysztof Migdalski, Wrocław (Poland)

84. The Lexicon of Slavic

1. Inherited vocabulary
2. Loan-words
3. Specific vocabulary
4. Word formation
5. Abbreviations
6. References

Many Slavic words of widespread occurrence related to fundamental natural and human concepts have reliable PIE etymologies and may, therefore, be considered as PIE inheritance. Others are particular to Balto-Slavic or Proto-Slavic (PSl), representing local innovations or borrowings from the languages with which the Slavs came into contact. Slavic reconstructions are given below in their late Proto-Slavic (also called Common Slavic) form, mainly according to Trubačev (1974–2013). In the following discussion, Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian adjectives are quoted in their long (attributive) forms.

1. Inherited vocabulary

In relation to the common PIE lexical stock Slavic appears both conservative and innovative (Meillet 1934). On the one hand, many important PIE stems and roots are well preserved in their form and meaning. On the other hand, a PSl term of PIE origin may present significant modifications (e.g. enlargements by suffixation, cf. the word for 'sun', 1.2) and semantic peculiarities (cf. PSl *moldŭ, 1.2).

Moreover, while the lexicon of the modern Slavic languages is rightfully reputed to be remarkably homogeneous in denoting core concepts, Slavic languages and dialects use, in several instances, particular words of PIE origin which differ from the primary signifier of such concepts or are borrowed from non-IE languages.

Sometimes a word in a Slavic language may be quite different from the word having the corresponding sense in another Slavic language, cf. R *gorod* and Cz *město* 'city, town'; but these items are actually based on two common Slavic roots both existing in Russian and Czech, cf. R *mesto* 'place, position' and Cz *hrad* 'castle, citadel'. The semantic relations are generally clear in such cases: the latter is PSl *gordъ, from PIE *ghordhos 'hedge; enclosure' showing the semantic development 'enclosed place' > 'citadel' and 'town' (cf. G *Zaun* 'fence' cognate with E *town*); the former is PSl *mēsto 'place' < *mēt-t-o from the PIE root *mei- 'support, sustain' (Černyx 1993: 1. 526) showing the semantic change 'place' > 'town' (cf. E *place* in sense of 'village, settlement, town').

1.1. Kinship terms

Most Slavic kinship terms are clearly IE:

PSl *dŭkt'i, gen. -ere (feminine) 'daughter'; PIE *dhug(h_2)tēr, gen. *dhug(h_2)tros; cf. G *Tochter*, E *daughter*, etc. Slavic forms descended from this item include OCS *dŭšti* gen. *dŭštere*; OR *doči*, gen. *dočere*; R *doč'*, gen. *dočeri*; Ukr *doč*; Bulg *dăšterja*; Slovn *hči*, SCr *kći*; Cz *dcera*; Pol *cora*.

PSl. *žena 'woman, wife'; Balto-Slavic *genā < PIE *$g^{w}enh_2$, gen. $g^{w}neh_2s$ 'woman'. Cognates of this item are seen in Gr *gunḗ* 'woman, wife', E *queen*, etc. Cf. OCS *žena* 'woman, wife'; R *žena* 'wife', *ženščina* 'woman' (derived by suffixation); Bulg *žena* 'woman, wife', Sorb *žona*; Pol *żona* 'wife', but 'woman' is *niewiasta*, also (archaic) 'wife' (see below *nevesta, 4) or *kobieta*, from a different root: perhaps from a phrase such as *kobita žena 'ill-tempered, irritable, stubborn woman', from *kobĭ 'divination; fate; wickedness, evil; stubbornness' (Trubačev 1974–2013: 10. 88–91). For 'wife', Ukrainian uses *žinka* (derived by suffixation) and *družyna* 'spouse' – female or male (cf. *druh* 'friend'); Slovene, beside *žena*, uses *soproga* 'spouse', while Czech and Slovak use, beside *žena*, a derivative of *manžel* (see below): *manželka* + specific words for 'spouse': Cz *chot'* 'spouse, husband or wife', OCS *chotĭ* 'lover, beloved', *chotěti* 'wish'.

PSl. *mǫžĭ 'man, husband' from *man-g-i-os (Schenker 1993: 114), which seems to be closely related to PIE *mVnus 'man' (often derived from *men- 'think'), with the addition of a suffixal element *g. But *man-g-i-os is perhaps from a different root signifying virility, which is also seen in Alb *mëz* 'colt', PIE Transponat *men-d-ios 'horse' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 274) and may be the basis of Gr *amazṓn* (if from *n̥-mn̥-

$g^{(w)}$-iōn ‘man-less, without husbands’, Mallory and Adams 1997: 367). Cf. also Rom *mînz* ‘foal, colt’, L dial. *mannus* ‘small horse’ (borrowed from an unidentifiable source), perhaps Slovn *mánih* ‘gelding’ (Trubačev 1960: 56). Cf. Ukr *muž* ‘man’, Maced *maž*, SCr *muž*, Pol *mąż*, Cz and Slovk *muž* ‘man’, but ‘husband’ is usually *manžel* (< PSl *malǔžena ‘spouse, wife’, OCS *mal[ǔ]žena* dual ‘husband and wife’, R dial. *malžonki* ‘spouses’, probably partially calqued on OHG *mâlkona ‘spouse, wife’, cf. *mahal* ‘contract’, *gimahala* ‘bride, wife’, G *Gemahlin* ‘wife, spouse’, or from *malǔ* ‘little’, as a prefix of affection, or even from *mǫžĭžena ‘husband + wife’ with dissimilation (Vasmer 1987: 2. 562); but cf. also R *molodožëny* (plural) ‘couple just married’, from *moldŭ ‘young’ + *žena ‘wife’). Modern Russian uses *muž* mostly in the sense ‘husband’ (although the meaning ‘man’ is retained in high style), and *mužčina* ‘man’ was built later by suffixation. Some Slavic languages use other words for ‘husband’: Slovene has *mož* and *soprog* ‘spouse’ and Ukrainian *čolovik* (cf. R *čelovek* ‘man, human being’), Bulgarian uses *suprug* (and other Slavic languages use a similar word in the sense ‘spouse’, cf. R *suprug*).

The Slavic word for ‘father’ goes back to PIE *at- ‘father’, an informal and probably affective word derived from the language of children (cf. L *atta*, Gr *átta*, Goth *atta*), which may have signified ‘foster-father’, the meaning found in Old Irish (Mallory and Adams 1997: 195). It may explain L *atavus* ‘great-great-great-grandfather’ if one supposes a compound *atta* ‘father’+ *avus* ‘grandfather’. Alternatively, *at-avus* would represent *avus* together with a prefix *at-* (*$h_2$et-) ‘beyond, further’, almost certainly related to the *at-* of *atque*, which no doubt means literally ‘and further’ (cf. Mallory and Adams 1997: 156). Turkic languages have a similar term *ata* ‘father’. Moreover, PSl *otĭcĭ (< *ot-ĭk-os) was built with a suffix -ĭk- probably having a diminutive sense (‘little father, daddy’); or -ĭk- is rather an adjectivizing suffix (‘one of the father, paternal’, cf. French colloquial *mon paternel* ‘my father’). According to Trubačev (1974–2013: 39), PSl *otĭcĭ may be compared with the Gr ethnic name *Attikos*. Cf. R *otec*, Pol *ojciec*, Cz *otec*, Slovk *otec*, SCr *otac*, Slovn *oče*, Upper Sorb *wótc* ‘father (rare); ancestor’.

The other PSl word for ‘father’ is *tata, from a PIE Transponat *t-at-, with sound repetition seen in other nursery terms. Cf. R (old and rural) *tjatja*, (dial. only) *tata* ‘daddy’; Ukr *tato, tatko*; Pol *tata, tatko*; Cz and Slovk *táta*; Bulg *tato, tatko, tate*; Maced *tatko*.

Besides, ‘father, daddy’ can be denoted by a different lexical item, PSl *bata / *bat’a / *batja (perhaps from *brat[r]ŭ ‘brother’, which is semantically somewhat symmetrical to *strŭjĭ ‘paternal uncle’ = ‘father’s brother’): R (colloquial and affective) *batja, bat’ko*, dial. also ‘(eldest) brother, uncle, father-in-law, wife’s father’; Ukr *bat’ko*; Bulg *bašta* ‘father’. But Cz *bát’a* means ‘brother, relative, friend’, Bulg *bate*, SCr *bata* ‘(eldest) brother’, R. dial. *bat* ‘brother’. According to Trubačev (1974–2013: 39. 163–164), PSl *bata ‘father, daddy, uncle, elder man’ is a very archaic form similar to reduplicated formations such as *baba, *mama (cf. It *babbo* ‘daddy’ related to *padre* ‘father’, with voicing of p to b), and the association with *brat[r]ŭ ‘brother’ is only secondary. Cf. semantically Bengali *stri* ‘wife’ from PIE *swesōr ‘sister’.

In Upper Sorbian the usual word for ‘father’ is *nan*, also a nursery term, cf. SCr *nana* ‘mother’; Slovk *ňaňo, ňaňa* ‘aunt’; R *njanja* ‘nurse’ (cf. Gr *nénnos* [variant *nónnos* beside *nánnas* (Hesych.)] ‘uncle’; L *nonnus* ‘father > monk’; It *nonna* ‘grandmother’; E *nan* ‘grandmother’, *nanny* ‘nurse who cares for a baby’, etc.).

Apart from the Slavic divine name **Stribogŭ* = *Stri-bogŭ*, taken to be 'father-god', PIE *$ph_2tēr$, gen. *ph_2tros 'father' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 195), seems to be represented only in PSl *strŭjĭ, *stryjĭ 'paternal uncle'. Cf. OLith *strūjus* 'old man, grandfather', Lith *strujus* 'father's brother, mother's sister's husband', L *patruus* 'paternal uncle'. PIE *$ph_2trōus$ 'male paternal relative; father's brother' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 609). Cf. OR *stryj*, R dial. *stroj*, Pol *stryj*, Cz *strýc*, Slovk *strýc*, SCr *stric*, Slovn *stric* 'paternal uncle'. However, according to Gippert (2002), this form is derived from a different etymon having the original meaning 'old man' and not related to R *staryj* 'old' (see 3).

Other kinship terms of wide occurrence are the following:

PSl *bratrъ 'brother', PIE *$bhreh_2tēr$; cf. OCS *bratrŭ*, R Ukr BelR Bulg Slovk Pol *brat*, Cz Upper Sorb *bratr*, Lower Sorb *bratš*, etc.

PSl *mati, gen. *matere 'mother', PIE *$meh_2tēr$. Cf. OCS *mati*, gen. *matere*; R *mat'*, gen. *materi*; Ukr *mati*, gen. *materi*; BelR *maci, matka*; Bulg *majka*; Slovn *mati*, gen. *matere*; Pol *matka*; Cz *máti*; etc.

PSl *sestra 'sister', PIE *$sụ̯esōr$; cf. R Ukr Bulg *sestra*, BelR *sjastra*, OCS Cz Slovk Polab *sestra*, SCr *sèstra*, Slovn *séstra*, Pol *siostra*, Upper Sorb *sotra*, Lower Sorb *sotša.*

PSl *synŭ 'son', PIE *suh_xnus; cf. OCS *synŭ*, R Ukr BelR Cz Slovk Pol Sorb *syn*, Bulg Slovn *sin*, SCr *sîn*, etc.

PSl *svekry 'husband's mother', gen. *svekrŭve, PIE *$sụ̯e\acute{k}ruh_2s$. Cf. OCS *svekry*, gen. *svekrŭve*; R *svekrov'*, gen. *svekrovi*; Ukr *svekruxa*; BelR *svjakrou*; Bulg *svekărva*; Pol *świekra*; etc.

1.2. Terms denoting fundamental natural and human concepts

'Sun' is PSl *sŭlnĭce (neut.), from *sulnĭko- / *sulniko-, a stem based on PIE *$seh_2u̯̥l$, gen. *$sh_2ŭ̯$-en-s (Mallory and Adams 1997: 556) 'sun', extended by diminutive suffix -ĭk- / -ik- (hypocoristic sense: 'little sun'), which is analogous to the origin of Fr *soleil* 'sun'. As is well known, the latter is derived not from L *sōl* 'sun' but from a Vulgar Latin diminutive form of the latter: *soliculus*. Cf. OCS *slŭnĭce*, R *solnce*, Ukr *sonce*, Pol *słońce*, Cz *slunce*, Bulg *slănce*, SCr *sûnce*, Slovn *sonce*, Slovk *slnce*, Sorb *słyńco*, etc. Among its IE cognates, cf. Lith *sáulė* 'sun', Goth *sauil* (beside *sunno*) 'id.', etc.

'Moon' is PSl *luna (Trubačev 1974–2013: 16. 173), from *louksnā, PIE *louksneh$_2$- 'moon' (cf. L *lūna* etc.), from the root *leuk- 'light', and PSl *mēsęcĭ (masc.) 'moon; month', from *mēs-n̥̆-ko- (with extension by a suffix *k), PIE *meh_1-nōt- / *meh_1-n(e)s- 'moon' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 385) (cf. L *mēnsis* 'month', E *moon, month*, etc.), from the root *meh_1- 'measure'. Attested Slavic forms for 'moon' include OCS R Bulg Slovn Cz (poet.) Slovk (poet.) *łuna* 'moon', while forms meaning both 'moon' and 'month include OCS *měsęcĭ*, R *mesjac*, Ukr *misac*, Bulg *mesec*, SCr *mjesec*, Cz *měsíc*, Slovk *mesiac*, Pol *miesiąc*, Sorb *mjasec*. But OCS *luna* 'moon' may be a Lat loan, whereas Slavic *louksnā could mean 'any light (in the sky)' (Černyx 1993: 1. 495), cf. Pol *łuna* 'glint, light', Cz *luna* 'light, glow', R dial. 'light (in the sky), glow', Ukr *luna* 'echo' (< 'light reflection').

The term for 'house; household' is PSl. *domŭ, PIE *dóm(h_2)os (Mallory and Adams 1997: 281). External comparanda are L *domus* 'house; family' and Gr *dómos* 'house,

household, family'. Within Slavic cf. OCS *domŭ*, R *dom* 'house, household', Pol *dom*, Cz *dům*, Bulg *dom* 'house; household, family'. But Bulg 'house' is usually *kăšta*, cf. OCS *kǫšta*, probably related to Bulg *kătam*, R *kutat'* 'to hide', or to OCS *kǫtŭ*, Bulg *kăt*, R *kut* 'angle, corner'; the latter is in turn related to Gr *kanthós* '(corner of the) eye'. Also SCr *kuća*, Slovn *koča,* but Slovn *hiša* 'house' (an old Germanic loan < *hūs, cf. R *xižina* 'hut').

PSl *moldŭ 'soft' and 'young', from PIE *melh$_1$- 'soft', with extension by a suffix *-d(h)-, is seen in OCS *mladŭ* 'soft, new, fresh; young, babyish, childish, juvenile', R *molodoj* 'young', Ukr *molodyj*, BelR *malady*, Bulg *mlad*, Cz *mladý*, etc.; cf. OPr *maldai* 'young', L *mollis* 'soft', E *melt*, G E *mild*, etc. The semantic shift to 'young' is peculiar to Balto-Slavic. The meaning 'soft' is still partly maintained in phrases such as OCS *iz mladŭ nogtii* 'new, freshly made' and 'since earliest age, since childhood', R *ot / s molodyx nogtej* 'since soft nails' > 'since early youth'. Cf. R *mladenec* 'baby', OPr *maldenikis* 'child'.

Nevertheless, the older etymon in this value, PIE *h$_2$ieu- 'young' is well preserved: PSl *(j)unŭ 'young', OR *unŭ / unyi*, R *junyj*, Ukr *junyj*, BelR *juny* 'young'; but in Southern Slavic this item appears mostly with derivative suffixes, cf. Slovn *junec* 'young calf'; also in Western Slavic, Pol *junak* 'young brave man'.

Some additional terms of wide currency within Slavic are the following:

PSl *dŭva 'two': OCS *dŭva*, R Ukr Bulg Cz Slovk *dva*, SCr Slovn *dvâ*, Pol Sorb *dwa*;

PSl *jĭmę 'name': OCS *imę*, R *imja*, Ukr *im'ja*, BelR *imja*, Bulg *ime*, SCr *imē*, Slovn *imê*, Cz *jméno*, Slovk *meno*, Pol *imię* , Sorb *mě*, Polab *jeima*;

PSl *voda 'water': OCS *voda*, R Ukr BR Bulg *voda*, SCr *vòda*, Slovn *vóda*, Cz Slovk *voda*, Pol Sorb *woda*;

PSl *vētrŭ 'wind': OCS *větrŭ*, R *veter*, Ukr *viter*, Bulg *vetăr*, SCr *vjetar*, Slovn *vêter*, Cz *vítr*, Slovk *vietor*, Pol *wiatr*, Sorb *wjetš*;

PSl *sēdēti 'sit': OCS *sěděti*, R *sidet'*, Ukr *sydaty*, BelR *sidzec'*, Bulg *sedja*, SCr dial. *sjèditi*, Slovn *sedéti*, Cz *seděti*, Slovk *sediet'*, Pol *siedzieć*, Sorb *sejźeś*;

PSl *stojati 'stay': OCS *stojati*, R *stojat'*, Ukr *stojaty*, Bulg *stajati*, Slovn Cz *státi*, Slovk *stát'*, Pol *stać*, Sorb *stojaś*;

PSl *šiti 'sew': R *šit'*, Ukr *šyty*, BelR *šyc'*, Bulg *šija*, SCr *šiti*, Slovn Cz Slovk *šit'*, Pol *szyć*, Sorb *šyś*, Polab. *sait*;

PSl *živŭ 'alive': OCS *živŭ*, R *živoj*, Ukr *žyvyj*, Bulg Cz Slovk *živ*, SCr Slov. *žîv*, Pol *żywy*, Sorb *žywy*;

PSl *novŭ 'new': OCS *novŭ*, R Ukr *novyj*, Bulg *nov*, SCr *nôv*, Slovn *nòv*, Cz *nový*, Pol Sorb *nowy.*

1.3. Lexical isoglosses with other IE subgroups

A huge number of terms are common to Slavic and Baltic, some of which have no direct matches or only remote etymological links with the assumed cognates in other IE languages. Cf. PSl *rǫka 'hand', OCS *rǫka* and Lith *rankà* 'hand', Latv *rùoka*, OPr *rancko*. This term is probably a deverbative from a Balto-Slavic verb similar to Lith

riñkti ‘to gather, pick, collect’. R *ruka*, Bulg *răka*, Pol *ręka*, Cz *ruka*, etc. For more see Dini, this handbook.

1.3.1. Slavic-Germanic lexical isoglosses

PSl *voldēti ‘to rule, possess’. Cf. OR *voloděti* ‘id.’, R *vladet’* ‘to possess’, Lith *valdýti* ‘to rule, possess’, Goth *waldan*, OE *wealdan* ‘to rule’ > E *wield*, from a PIE root *u̯al- ‘rule, be strong’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 490) related to L *valēre* ‘be healthy’, Toch A *wäl*, B *walo* ‘king’. Slavic (+ Balt) and German present the same extension in *-d(h)-.

PSl *tysętja / *tysǫtja ‘thousand’. Cf. OCS *tysęšta*; R *tysjača*; Pol *tysjąc*, *tysiąc*; Cz *tisíc*; SCr *tisuća*; Slovn *tisoč*; etc.; Lith *tū́kstantis*, OIcel *þúsund*, OHG *thūsund*, Goth *þusundi* (*þū-*) < Gmc *thūs-hundī ← < PIE *tuh$_2$s-ḱm̥to- ‘fat hundred, strong hundred’, cf. G *Tausend*, E *thousand*. This term is generally considered to be a Germanic loan in Balto-Slavic. The first part of the compound is from PIE *teuh$_2$- ‘swell, grow fat’, cf. R *tučnyj* ‘fat, obese’. But Bulg and SCr employ usually *xiljada* (*tisešta* is archaic or dialectal). Tocharian has a similar term: A *tmaṃ*, B *tumane* ‘ten thousand’.

PSl *čĭmeljĭ / *čĭmela ‘bumble-bee’. Cf. OHG *humbal*, MHG *hummen*, Swed *humla*, E *hum* etc.; R *šmel’* ‘bumble-bee’, Lith *kimstu* ‘become hoarse’, Latv *kamines* ‘bee, bumble-bee’, OPr *camus*, Slovn *čmelj*, Pol *czmiel* ‘bumble-bee’ < PIE *kem/*kom ‘hum’ (possibly of onomatopoeic origin). Cognate with R *komar* ‘mosquito’(cf. **komonĭ* below, 3).

PSl *gre(s)ti < *grebti ‘dig’, PIE *ghrebh- ‘dig’. Cf. R *pogrebat’* ‘bury’, *grob* ‘coffin’ (< ‘grave’); OHG, Goth *graban*, OE *grafan* (> E *grave*), G *graben* ‘dig’, *Grab* ‘grave’; Latv *grebt*, OCS *pogresti* ‘bury’, SCr *grèpsti*, Pol *grzebać* ‘dig, excavate’. Although R *gresti, grebu* ‘paddle, rake; row’ is sometimes said to be linked to a different, homophonous PIE root *ghrebh- ‘seize forcibly, grasp, take, enclose’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 159), both can be related via a chain of semantic shifts such as ‘rake together’ > ‘plunder, seize’. Cf. OCS *grabiti* ‘snatch up’, R *grabit’* ‘plunder’, MHG *grabben* ‘seize’, E (borrowed) *grab.*

1.3.2. Slavic-Italic lexical isoglosses

PSl *gospodĭ / *gospodinŭ ‘master, lord’, from *gostĭpodĭ. Cf. R *gospod’* ‘Lord’, *gospodin* ‘master’; Bulg *gospod, gospodin*; Cz *hospodín*; and L *hospes, hospitis* < PIE *ghost-pot- (Trubačev 1974−2013: 7. 60−63). However, this term may be an Iranian loanword, cf. OIran **wispati* ‘master of the clan’ < PIE *u̯iḱpotis ‘master of the clan’, cf. Avest *vīspaitiš* ‘master of the clan’, OInd *viśpáti-* ‘head of the household’, Lith *viẽšpatis* ‘master’, with a change of **wis-* to **gus-*, then to **gas-* pronounced **γas-*. Russian has a variant without initial [γ] : *Ospodi* ! ‘My Lord!’ (perhaps from **wispati* > **spati* > **aspati* > **aspadi*). A closely related term is R *(g)ospodar’*, Pol *gospodarz* ‘prince’, etc., perhaps from OIran **wispuθra-* ‘son of the clan or of the king’s family, prince’ > MIran **guspuθra*, later **gaspadar* in Middle Western Scytho-Sacian (Cornillot 1994: 85). Otherwise, a Germanic (Scandinavian) influence is not excluded, according to Le

Feuvre (2002–2003): ORus (Novgorodian dialect) *ospodinŭ* ‘master’ may be explained by OSwed *husponde* < *husbonde* ‘master of the house’, cf. E *husband*.

PSl **pola voda* ‘flood (of a river)’. Cf. R *polovod’e* or (inverted, rarely) *vodopol’e* ‘flood’ and L *palūs, palūdis* ‘marsh, swamp’; (Trubačev 1985: 216). PSl *polŭ ‘open (space)’ related to *polje ‘field’, PIE *pleth$_2$- ‘broad and flat, wide, open, plane’. Cf. L *palam* ‘openly’, Gr *pélagos* ‘sea’.

Many parallels can be observed between Slavic and Latin in the meanings of prepositions such as L *ob, prō* / PSl *ob, *pro and in derivational models involving corresponding prefixes L *ob-, pro-* / PSl *ob-, *pro-, cf. L *ob-sidēre* ‘sit near, haunt, frequent, besiege’/*ob-sīdere* ‘blockade, besiege’ (> E *obsess*, Fr *obséder*) and R *осаждàть-sadit’* ‘besiege’ from < PSl *ob-saditi ‘set about’, L *prō-movēre* ‘move forward, promote’, R *pro-dvigat’* (from *dvigat’* ‘move’) in the same sense. Cf. also the L prefix *po-* (in *po-situs* ‘placed, put’) and Slavic *po-* (cf. R *po-stavit’* ‘put, set’ [more in Toporov 1974; Sakhno 2002]). Another matching pair is L *com-edere*, a “perfective” of *edere* ‘eat’ (> Sp *comer* ‘eat’, E *comestible*) and R *sŭ-est’*, perfective of *est’* ‘eat’ (< PSl *jēdti), the prefixes L *com-* and R *s(ŭ)-* (< PSl *sŭn-) having the same basic sense (‘with’). See *obvlako below, 4.

1.3.3. Slavic-Indo-Iranian lexical isoglosses

Among many examples two may be cited here:

PSl *griva ‘mane (of animals)’. Cf. OInd, Avest *grīvā* ‘neck’, Latv *grīva* ‘river mouth’, PIE g^{w}rih$_{x}$u̯-eh$_2$ ‘neck’.

PSl *čĭrnŭ ‘black’. Cf. OCS *črŭrnŭ*, R *čërnyj*, OPr *kirsnan* ‘black’, OInd *kṛṣṇá-* ‘black’. PIE k^{w}ṛsnos ‘black’.

2. Loan-words

2.1. Iranian loans

The earliest borrowings were from the North Iranian languages of the Scythian, Sarmatian, and Alanic tribes. It has also been suggested that the Slavs derived their Iranian vocabulary from the Avars whose ruling family is identified as Turkic but, it has been speculated, was primarily composed of Iranian-speakers (Mallory and Adams 1997: 525). Many of the Iranian loans are linked to religious and social concepts.

PSl *bogŭ ‘god’. Cf. Avest *baga-* ‘god’ and *bag-* ‘apportion; lot, luck, fortune’, OCS *bogŭ*, R *bog* (Trubačev 1974–2013: 2. 161), PIE *bhag- ‘divide, distribute; receive, enjoy’, Gr *phágein* ‘eat’ < *‘enjoy, share’. An important derivative is PSl *bogatŭ ‘rich’ (< ‘well imparted’). The often assumed Slavic descendant from PIE *deiu̯os ‘god’ is *divŭ ‘demon’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 230), but according to Trubačev (1974–2013: 5. 29, 35) the etymology of *divŭ / *divo ‘miracle’ (hence ‘demon’), related to PSl *divŭ(jĭ) / *dikŭ(jĭ) ‘wild’, is different, and is to be compared with OInd *dhī-* ‘observe, contemplate’. Cf. R *divo* ‘miracle’, *divnyj* ‘astonishing, wonderful, splendid’, *udivljat’sja* ‘be surprised, to wonder’, etc.

PSl *rajĭ ‘paradise’. Cf. Avest *rāy-* ‘wealth’. The Slavic borrowing here is analogous to the borrowing of Gr ‘paradise’ from OIran *pairidaēza-* ‘enclosure, garden’.

PSl *svętŭ ‘holy, sacred’. Cf. Avest *spənta* ‘holy’ < PIE *ḱwen(to)- ‘holy’, originally *‘swollen (with force)’, from *ḱeu(h_1)- ‘swell’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 493); but a PIE origin without Iranian mediation is possible if one brings into the picture Goth *hunsl* ‘sacrifice’, Toch B *känts* ‘right, correct, firm’. Attested Slavic forms of this lexical item include OCS *svętŭ, svętyi*, R *svjatoj*, Bulg *sveti, svet*, Cz *svatý*, and Pol *święty* ‘holy’, etc.

PSl *gospodĭ ‘master, lord’ (unless properly Slavic, see 1.3.2).

However, some Iranian terms do not belong to the religious sphere:

PSl *sobaka ‘dog’ < MIran *sabāka-*, cf. Avest *spā* ‘dog’, *spaka-* ‘of a dog, doggish’; only R, Ukr *sobaka*, BelR *sabaka* (probably an Eastern Slavic loan from Iranian, not known in other Slavic languages, except for Pol dial and Kashub *sobaka*). According to Trubačev (1960: 29), this term may be a loan from Turkic *köbäk* ‘dog’. But PSl *suka ‘bitch’ (less likely *sǫka) may go back to PIE *ḱ(u)won- ‘dog’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 168) without Iranian mediation. Note that Slavic developed a specific term for ‘dog’: PSl *pĭsŭ < *‘spotted’, probably related to *pĭstrŭ ‘variegated’, from *pĭsati ‘paint’ and (later) ‘write’ < PIE *peiḱ- ‘paint, mark’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 414), cf. L *pingere* ‘paint, color’, etc., R *pës*, Pol *pies* ‘dog’, etc.

2.2. Celtic loans

A few words may have originated in Celtic:

PSl *sluga ‘servant’. Cf. OIr *slōg, slūag* ‘army, host; crowd, company’ < PIE *slougos ‘servant, one performing service’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 506). The Proto-Slavic form is manifested in R *sluga* ‘servant’, but Lith *slaugà* ‘service’ indicates that the borrowing most likely reaches back into the period of Proto-Balto-Slavic, with a semantic shift from a military context to one of service. Mallory and Adams (1997: 285) suggest that Balto-Slavic may have derived the term independently of Celtic, from PIE *sel- ‘move quickly’, cf. OE *sellan* ‘deliver, sell’ (> E *sell*), OCS *sŭlŭ* ‘messenger’, R *posol* ‘messenger, ambassador’ (for a semantic analogy cf. E. *ambassador* < Fr < L < Celtic *ambaktos, see *jabeda* below, 2.3), *slat’* ‘send’; however, the morphological complexities required by this assumption make it a far less attractive scenario.

PSl *jama / *ama ‘cave’. Cf. OIr *huam* ‘cavern, specus’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 1. 70–71); but one may also compare this form to Gr *ámē* ‘shovel, spade’ (< PIE *sem- ‘gather’).

2.3. Germanic loans

Slavic possesses numerous loans from Germanic, mostly related to everyday life, handcraft, power, etc.:

PSl *buky ‘writing’, gen. *bukŭve < Goth *bōka* ‘written document’, cf. R *bukva* ‘letter’. Gmc *bōks is related to *bōkō ‘beech’ (< PIE bheh$_2$ǵos ‘beech’, cf. R *buzina,*

buz ‘elder, *Sambucus*’), cf. G. *Buch, Buche*, E *book, beech*. The PSl name of the beech tree, *bukŭ, is also Gmc, cf. R *buk* ‘beech’. But it has been suggested that Gmc *bōks may be linked to the family of PIE *bhag- ‘allot, deal, distribute’ (Pfeifer 2004: 179), see *bogŭ above in 2.2.

PSl *bl’udo ‘dish’ < Goth *biuþs, biud-* ‘table’, cf. R *bljudo* ‘dish’.

PSl *korl’ĭ ‘king’ < OHG *Kar(a)l*, name of Charlemagne, R *korol’*, etc. Surprisingly, this explains the Polish name for ‘rabbit’: *królik* (whence R *krolik*, Ukr *krilyk*), which is a recent folk-etymological calque (‘little king’) after G dial. *Küningl* and *Königshase* ‘king-hare’ < MHG *küniklīn* / *künglīn*, from L *cunīculus* ‘rabbit’, due to confusion between *küniklīn* and MHG *künig*, MLG *Könink* ‘king’.

PSl *myto ‘tax’ < OHG *mûte* ‘tax’, OR *myto* ‘tax’. But G *Miete* < OHG *mieta* ‘loan, gift’ is different, related to Gmc *mizdō, Goth *mizdō*, cf. OCS *mĭzda* R *mzda* ‘recompense, reward’.

PSl *kusiti ‘try’ < Goth *kausjan*, E *choose*, Fr *choisir*, akin to L *gustus* ‘taste’. Cf. Ukr *kusyty* ‘tempt’ Bulg. *kusja* ‘try (a food)’, Pol *kusić* ‘tempt’; in modern Slavic languages this form is usually prefixed: R *iskušat’* ‘tempt’, *iskusstvo* ‘art’, *vkus* ‘taste’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 13. 135).

PSl *kŭnędzĭ < *kŭnęg’ĭ ‘prince’ < Goth *kuningaz*, cf. R *knjaz’* ‘prince’, etc.

PSl *pŭlkŭ ‘host’ < Gmc *fulkaz, OHG *folk* ‘host’, G *Volk* ‘people, nation’, R *polk* ‘troop, regiment’, akin to L *plēbēs* ‘the common people’, Gr *plēthús* ’throng, crowd, (common) people’, PIE root *pleh$_1$- ‘fill’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 417).

PSl *t’ud’ĭ / *tjudjĭ ‘foreign’; cf. OCS *tuždĭ, štuždĭ*; OR *čudĭ, čužĭ* ‘foreign’; R *čužoj, čuždyj* < Goth *þiuda* ‘folk’, OHG *diot* ‘people, heathen’ (> G *deutsch*, E *Dutch*). PIE *teuteh$_2$ ‘the people’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 417). This term bears no relationship to OCS OR R *čudo* ‘miracle’.

PSl *xǫdogŭ ‘wise, skillful’ < Goth *handugs* ‘handy, dexterous’ (E *handy*), cf. OCS *xǫdožĭnikŭ* ‘creator, maker’, *xǫdožĭstvo* ‘wiseness, sagacity; ruse, perfidy’, R *xudožnik* ‘artist, painter’.

PSl *xlēbŭ ‘bread’ < Goth *hlaifs*, cf. G *Laib*, E *loaf* . Attested Slavic forms include OCS *xlěbŭ*, R *xleb*, Ukr *xlib*, Bulg *xljab*, etc. But a properly Slavic origin (akin to Germanic) is possible, if PIE *kloibo- ‘a mold of pottery used to bake bread’ > ‘bread baked in a pottery mold’, cf. Gr *klíbanos* / *kríbanos* ‘baker’s oven’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 8. 27–29).

There are debatable cases: PSl *čędo / *čęda / *čędŭ ‘child’, cf. R *čado*, etc., may be an early Germanic loan (k > č, 1st palatalization), from OHG *kind*. But a Slavic origin may be admitted (Trubačev 1974–2013: 4. 102–104), from PSl *čęti ‘begin’ < PIE *ken- ‘beginning; end’, cf. R načalo < PSl *na-čęlo < *na-ken-lo, L *recēns* ‘recent, young’, etc.

Germanic also served as an intermediary: some loans from Germanic are actually of Latin, occasionally Greek, origin.

PSl *dŭska ‘board’ < OHG *tisc* (cf. G *Tisch* ‘table’, E *dish*) < L *discus* < Gr *dískos*, cf. R *doska* ‘board’. This may explain R *stakan* ‘(drinking) glass’, from **dŭstŭkanŭ* ‘wooden holder (of drink)’.

PSl *kupiti ‘buy’ < Goth *kaupōn* (the Germanic word was itself borrowed from L *caupō, caupōnis* ‘petty tradesman, huckster, innkeeper’). This word is not to be confounded with its PSl homonym *kupiti ‘gather’, from PSl *kupa ‘mound, heap’, cf. R *sovokupnyj* ‘gathered, summarized’ < PIE *koupo- ‘heap’, cf. OHG *houf* ‘heap’, E *heap*.

PSl *kotĭlŭ ‘kettle’ < Goth *katils / *katilus, from L *catillus* ‘kettle’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 11. 217–218), R *kotël* ‘kettle’, etc.

PSl *cĭrky / *cĭrĭky ‘church’ < Gmc *kiriko < Gr (*dõma*) *kūriakón* ‘(house) of the Lord’. OCS *crĭky*, R *cerkov’* ‘church’, etc. A different but very unconvincing etymology (Gunnarsson 1937): from Romanian *beserică*, *biserică* < L *basilica* < Gr. *basileús*. According to Le Feuvre (2002–2003), in ORus (Novgorodian dialect) *kĭrku*, the initial (unpalatalized) *k* is due to OSwed *kirkio* / *kirko*.

Some loans are limited to a particular Slavic subgroup. These include especially some North Germanic (Scandinavian) terms borrowed only by Eastern Slavic: OR *jabednikŭ* ‘official, administrator, judge’ < *ębeda < ON *embætti* ‘office’, cf. OHG *ambahti* ‘id.’, G *Amt*, from Celt *ambaktos ‘highly ranked servant’ (with a different suffix) < *$h_2$entbhi ‘around’ + the participle of the verbal root *h_2eǵ- ‘be active’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 506). With semantic pejoration cf. R Ukr *jabeda, jabednik* ‘libeller, slanderer; sneak, telltale’ (for a similar debasement, cf. R *fiskal* ‘sneak’, from Pol *fiscał* ‘lawyer, procurator’ < L *fiscālis* ‘fiscal’, cf. Scots E *Procurator Fiscal*).

Many Germanic loans are more recent, as Pol *rynek* ‘market’, Cz *rynk* ‘ring, town square’ (whence R *rynok* ‘market’), from MHG *rinc* ‘ring, circle, town square’, cf. G *Ring,* E *ring*. Inversely (and much earlier), PSl *tŭrgŭ ‘market’ (of unclear etymology), seen in R *torg* ‘market, bargaining’, Cz *trh*, etc., was borrowed by Scandinavian, cf. Swed Norw Icel *torg*, Dan *torv* ‘market’.

2.4. Loans from non-PIE languages

Most of these are from Asian languages (Altaic, Chinese, etc.)

PSl *kapĭ ‘appearance, figure, idol’, OCS *kapĭ* ‘id.’, *kapište* ‘pagan temple’ < Proto-Bulgarian (Turkic) *käp, cf. Uigur *kep* ‘shape, form, figure, picture’.

PSl *kŭniga ‘written document, book’ < OTurkic *küinig < Chinese *küen* ‘roll, volume’, the same source as for Hung *könyv* ‘book’. Cf. R kniga ‘book’, etc. Other etymologies have also been suggested for this term, e.g., from Akkadian *kunukkum* ‘(cylindrical) seal, stamp, document’.

Some Slavic terms for ‘horse’ are of Altaic (Turkic, Mongol) origin: cf. OR *loša, R *lošad’* (fem.), now the usual word for ‘horse’ (cf. *kon’* : ‘charger, steed’, 3), Ukr *loša* ‘colt’, Pol *łoszę* ‘id.’, a loan from Turkic *(a)laša* ‘horse, gelding’. More recent is R Ukr *merin* (attested since 1500) ‘gelding’, borrowed from Mong *mörin, morin* (Trubačev 1960: 58) and therefore having no direct link with ON *merr* ‘mare’. But the Mongol term is probably related to PIE *markos ‘horse’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 274) seen in Ir *marc*, Bret *marc’h*, ON *marr* ‘horse’, *merr* ‘mare’, OHG *meriha* ‘mare’, E *mare*, etc.; Chinese *mă*, Korean *mal* (opinion is divided on whether the PIE word is a borrowing from pre-Mongol, which would also be the source of the Chinese word and that in turn the source of the Korean, or the Mongol, Chinese, etc., words are ultimately borrowed from PIE). See other terms for ‘horse’ below, 3.

3. Specific vocabulary

Many Slavic word can be related to PIE terms having a different meaning, although the link is semantically justifiable.

PSl *dobrŭ ‘good, kind’ is related to PIE **dhabros* ‘craftsman’, L *faber*, etc., from PIE *dhabh- ‘put together’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 139). Cf. OCS *dobrŭ* ‘good, kind, well-famed, beautiful’, R *dobryj* ‘good, kind’, etc. The meaning in Slavic may be explained as coming from ‘fitting, becoming’, cf. G *tapfer* ‘bold, solid, brave’, OE *gedæfte* ‘mild, gentle’ > E *daft*, from the same PIE root, which also explains PSl *doba ‘time period, season’, cf. Ukr *doba* ‘time’, Cz ‘time, period, epoch’, Pol ‘period of 24 hours’. For the meaning ‘fitting’ cf. R *udobnyj* ‘fitting, convenient’, from the same root. Semantically, the latter PSl term is analogous to PSl *godŭ (see next item).

PSl *godŭ ‘fitting / convenient / favorable time’, from PIE *ghedh- ‘join, fit together’ (whence E *together*) (Mallory and Adams 1997: 64). Cf. OCS *godŭ* ‘appointed time, period; year’, *godina* ‘hour’, R *god* ‘year’, *pogoda* ‘weather’ (< ‘fine, favourable weather’), from which is derived R *godnyj* ‘fitting’, Pol *gody* ‘feast’, *godzina* ‘hour’, Cz *hod* ‘time; feast’, *hodina* ‘hour’, Slovk *god* ‘fitting / favourable time / moment’, related to Lith *guõdas* ‘honour, respect’, OHG *gi-gat* ‘fitting’, G *gättlich* ‘fitting’, *Gatte* ‘spouse, husband’, *gut* ‘good’, E *good*, etc.

PSl *starŭ ‘old’ (Slavic has no word derived from PIE *senos, unlike Lith *sẽnas* ‘old’), hypothetically from PIE *(s)terh$_1$- ‘stiff’ ON *starr* ‘stiff’, OE *starian* ‘look at, stare’ > E *stare* or, more plausibly, from PIE *sth$_2$ei- ‘become hard, fixed’ (an extension of *steh$_2$- ‘stand’) (Černyx 1993: 2. 199; Vasmer 1987: 3. 747), cf. Lith. *stóras* ‘thick, wide, large’, L *stīria* ‘icicle’ ON *stórr* ‘big, strong, important’.

Other Slavic words have more questionable Indo-European etymologies.

The PSl term for ‘oak’ is *dǫbŭ / *dǫbrŭ, R *dub*, etc., of unclear etymology, hypothetically from *dheubh- (with inclusion of a nasal infix *n, cf. E *dump* ‘deep hole in a pond’) ‘deep, hole’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 154). The sense would originally have been ‘tree growing in a valley, a low / deep place’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 5. 95–97), cf. OCS *dŭno*, R *dno* ‘ground, floor’ < PIE *dubno as well as OCS *dŭbrŭ* ‘ravine, valley’ and R *dubrava* ‘oak wood’, R *duplo* ‘tree hole’, Pol *dub, dziub* ‘tree hole’. However, other etymologies have been suggested, including *dem-bh-os / *dom-bh-os ‘timber, building wood used to build houses’ or *dheubh- / *dhoubh- ‘dark’ (oak timber / wood becomes dark if it remains in water). If one supposes *dhan-bh-os (Černyx 1993: 1. 272), then a link would be possible between PSl *dǫbŭ and Gmc *danwō, cf. G *Tanne* ‘pine’ (if so derived). In any event, the Slavic word differs from such Germanic words as ON *fura* ‘pine’, OHG *for(a)ha* ‘pine’, E *fir*, which seem to derive from a dialectal PIE *pr̥k^{w}eh$_2$ cognate with *perk^{w}us ‘oak’. The latter word was not preserved in Slavic, except for the divinity name *Perunŭ ‘thunder god’, from *perk^{w}u-h$_x$n- ‘the oaken one’ (cf. the mythological link between oak and thunder).

PSl *konĭ, *komonĭ ‘horse’, R *kon’*, Ukr *kin’* < *komn̥o-, OR *komonĭ* < *komon- ‘hornless one’ (as opposed to cattle); cf. R *komolyj* ‘hornless’, from PIE *ḱem- / *kem- ‘hornless’; cf. OInd *śáma-* ‘id.’, Lith *šmùlas* ‘id.’, ON *hind* ‘hind’, OE *hind* ‘id.’ > E *hind*, OPr *camstian* ‘sheep’, *camnet* ‘horse, hornless’, Lith *kumẽlė* ‘mare’, *kumelỹs*, Latv *kumeļš* ‘colt’, Gr *kemás* ’young deer’(Mallory and Adams, 273). Cf. SCr *konj* ‘horse; castrated horse’, Cz *kůň*, Pol *koń* ‘horse’. Trubačev (1960: 51) suggests for *konĭ a derivation from *kopn̥o- ‘male animal’, from *kap-n- < PIE *kapro- ‘male’, cf. L *caper*; but later (1974–2013: 10. 197) he claims that *komonĭ may have a different, onomatopoetic etymology: ‘the neighing one’, cf. ON *humre* ‘neigh’ < *kom- / *kim-, and PSl *čĭmelĭ ‘hum’ (see above, 1.3.1.). He proposes (1974–2013: 10. 197) that *konĭ is from *konikŭ / *konĭkŭ borrowed from Celt *konko / *kanko ‘horse’ (akin to G *Hengst*

'stallion', etc.). Note that PSl *kobyla 'mare', probably related to L (< Celt) *caballus*, perhaps originated in an Asian language, cf. Turkish *käväl(at)* 'swift (horse)', Persian *kaval*, or from "Pelasgian" *kabullēs < PIE *ghabheli- < *ghabh(o)lo- 'fork', 'Gabelpferd', cf. G *Gabel* 'fork' (Trubačev 1960: 52, 1974–2013: 10. 93).

PSl *skotŭ 'livestock' is specific to Slavic, unlike such Baltic forms as Lith *pekus*, (PIE pe$\acute{k}$u- 'livestock') borrowed from some western IE group (Mallory and Adams 1997: 23), and *gyvulỹs* 'beast' < PIE *$g^{w}ih_3$-w- 'live'. It is often considered to be a Germanic loan (Goth *skatts* 'wealth, treasure', G *Schatz*; ON *skatts* 'tribute, treasure' is a loan from West Germanic), see discussion in Trubačev (1960: 99–105). However, Martynov (*apud* Trubačev 1960: 101) has etymologized this word as PSl *sŭkotŭ 'young animals, brood, offspring, progeny' from **kotiti sę* 'procreate, give birth, drop'.

4. Word Formation

Slavic is rich in various compounds and derivatives by prefixation and suffixation.

PSl *nevēsta 'bride' < *neu̯-u̯edh-t-a, from PIE *neu̯- 'new' and *u̯edh- 'lead' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 369): 'the one who has been newly led', i. e. the newcomer in the husband's family, R *nevesta* 'bride', etc. Cf. L *dūcere uxōrem* 'lead a wife', E *wed, wedding* (< *u̯edh-). Different, because of its *d, is PIE *u̯edmo- 'bride-price', whence PSl *vēdnom, OCS *věno* 'bride-price' (Mallory and Adams 1997: 82), although the PIE term has often been taken as derived from *u̯edh- 'lead', a root frequently used in connection with marriage. But a common PIE form *h_xu̯ed- has been suggested by Szemerényi (*apud* Mallory and Adams 1997: 82). PSl *nevēsta has also been explained as *ne-vēst-a 'the unknown' to *věstŭ* 'known'.

PSl *medvēdĭ 'bear' is a bahuvrīhi 'whose food is honey' from *medv- 'honey' (cf. *medŭ 'honey', adj. *medvĭnŭ) and *ēdĭ 'food' (from the root *ēd- 'eat'), hence 'honey-eater' (Černyx 1993: 1. 519). OCS *medvědĭ*, R *medved'*, Ukr *medvid', vedmid'* (with inversion of members), Cz *medvěd*, etc. This form, together with its Germanic counterpart G *Bär*, E *bear*, originally 'brown one', is a tabu substitution for PIE *h_2ŗ$\acute{t}$kos 'bear' in an area (Northern Europe) where bears have been hunted since antiquity.

This source is not listed in the reference section !!

PSl *obvolko / *obvolka / *obvolkŭ 'cloud' (R *oblako* [< OCS], BelR *voblak* Bulg Maced *oblak,* SCr Slovn *voblak*; cf. Trubačev 2005: 84–87) is from *obvelkt'i 'envelop' < *ob- 'about, around' + *velkt'i 'pull, draw' > 'veil, cover'. The same combination of root and prefix had the meaning 'garment, clothing' (the Slavic *k* precludes any connection to G *Wolke*, which is rather related to PSl *volga > OCS *vlaga* 'moisture'). The Slavic term is semantically analogous to ON Swed *sky* 'cloud' (borrowed as E *sky*), L *ob-scūrus*, both presumably from a root *skeu- 'cover'. For the semantics, cf. also Fr *nuage* < L *nūbes* 'cloud; veil, shroud, covering' and for the prefix (on which see also 1.3.2 above) cf. L *ob-nubilāre* 'cover with clouds'. Other Slavic languages form their word for 'cloud' from different etyma: Ukr *xmara*, Pol Cz Slovk *chmura* presuppose a *xmur- 'gloomy', while Cz Slovk *mrak* 'cloud' is from *morkŭ 'darkness', related to G *Morgen* 'dawn' < 'dusk'.

An identical notion can be denoted in Slavic languages by derivatives involving a common prefix but different roots. Thus, *otŭ- 'away' appears in the following Slavic verbs meaning 'to answer' (cf. also E *reply, respond, rejoin*, all of Latinate origin):

OCS *otŭvěštati*, R *otvečat'*, root *vět- 'tell, say (solemnly)'; cf. PIE *u̯ōt- 'seer, poet';
OCS *otŭrěšti*, root *rěk- 'say' < *'lead, arrange, indicate'; cf. PIE *rek- 'speak';
Bulg *otgovorjam*, Maced *odgovori*, SC Slovn *odgovoriti*, root *govor- 'speak';
BelR *adkazvac'*, root *kaz- 'say' < 'show, indicate';
Ukr *vidpovidati*, Pol *odpowiedać*, Cz *odpověděti*, from **pověd-* 'tell', prefix *po- + *věd- 'know'; cf. PIE *u̯eid- 'see, know as a fact'.

5. Abbreviations

Alb − Albanian, Avest − Avestan, BelR − Belorussian, Bret − Breton, Bulg − Bulgarian, Celt − Celtic. Cz − Czech, Dan − Danish, E − (New) English, Fr − French. G − German, Gmc − Germanic, Goth − Gothic, Gr − Greek, Hung − Hungarian, Ir − Irish, Iran − Iranian, It − Italian, Kashub − Kashubian, L − Latin, Latv − Latvian, Lith − Lithuanian, Maced − Macedonian, MHG − Middle High German, Mong − Mongol, Norw − Norwegian, OCS − Old Church Slavonic, OHG − Old High German, OIcel − Old Icelandic, OInd − Old Indic, ON − Old Norse, OPr − Old Prussian, PIE − Proto-Indo-European, Pol − Polish, Polab − Polabian, PSl − Proto-Slavic, R − Russian, Rom − Romanian, SCr − Serbian-Croatian, Slovk − Slovakian, Slovn − Slovene, Sorb − Sorbian, Sp − Spanish, Swed − Swedish, Toch − Tocharian, Ukr − Ukrainian. In general, O before any of the above designates 'Old' and M denotes 'Middle'. Also, it should be noted that the rubric SCr is employed in its "traditional" value. The items in question are, at least diachronically, inherent to both Serbian and Croatian, as well as to Bosnian and Montenegrin (BCMS).

6. References

Avanesov, Ruben Ivanovič (ed.)
1988−1991 *Slovar' drevne-russkogo jazyka XI−XIV vekov* [Dictionary of the Old Russian language of the XI−XIV centuries]. Vol. 1−4. Moscow: Nauka.

Birnbaum, Henrik
1975 *Common Slavic: Progress and problems in its reconstruction*. Cambridge, MA: Slavica.

Cejtlin, Ralâ Mihajlovna, Radoslav Večerka and Emilie Bláhová
1994 *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X−XI vekov)* [Old Slavic dictionary (based on manuscripts of the X−XI centuries)]. Moscow: Russkij Jazyk.

Černyx, Pavel Jakovlevic
1993 *Istoriko-etymologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka* [Historical and etymological dictionary of the modern Russian language]. Vol. 1−2. Moscow: Russkij Jazyk.

Cornillot, François
1994 L'aube scythique du monde slave, *Slovo* 14: 77−259.

Derksen, Rick
2008 *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill. Web database *Dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*: Please insert a date of last access to this reference (if possible). http://www.indoeuropean.nl/cgi-bin/startq.cgi?flags=endnnnl&root=leiden&basename=%5Cdata%5Cie%5Cslav.

Feuillet, Jack
1999 *Grammaire historique du bulgare* (ch. 12: Formation du lexique). Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
Gamkrelidze, Tamaz V. and Vyacheslav V. Ivanov
1984 *Indoevropejskij jazyk i Indoevropejcy.* Vol. 1, 2. Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta. Translated as *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture.* 2 vols. 1995. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Gippert, Jost
2002 Neues zu 'Slavisch *st* aus älterem *pt*'? In: Peter Anreiter, Peter Ernst and Isolde Hausner (eds.), *Namen, Sprachen und Kulturen*, 239–256. Vienna: Praesens.
Gunnarsson, Gunnar
1937 *Das slavische Wort für Kirche*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell.
Herman, Louis J.
1975 *A Dictionary of Slavic word families*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Le Feuvre, Claire
2002–2003 Deux exemples d'interférences linguistiques dans les textes novgorodiens anciens: l'église et le maître. *Revue des études slaves* 74: 431–440.
Le Feuvre, Claire
2009 *Le vieux slave*. Leuven: Peeters.
Lehmann, Volkmar
1995 Die Rekonstruktion von Bedeutungsentwicklung und -motiviertheit mit funktionalen Operationen. *Slavistische Linguistik* 21: 255–289.
Mallory, James P. and Douglas Q. Adams
1997 *Encyclopaedia of Indo-European culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
Meillet, Antoine
1934 *Le slave commun.* Paris: Champion.
Schenker, Alexander
1993 Proto-Slavonic. In: Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic languages*, 60–124. London: Routledge.
Patrick, George Z.
1989 *Roots of the Russian language: An Elementary Guide to Wordbuilding.* Lincolnwood (Chicago): Passport Books.
Pfeifer, Wolfgang
2004 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. 7th ed. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
Sakhno, Serguei
2001 *Dictionnaire russe-français d'étymologie comparée: Correspondances lexicales historiques.* Paris: L'Harmattan.
Sakhno, Serguei
2002 Autour des prépositions russes O(B) et PRO: Problème des parallèles lexico-sémantiques slavo − latins. *Slavica Occitania* 15: 157–178.
Toporov, Vladimir N.
1974 Neskol'ko drevnix latinsko-slavjanskix parallelej [Several ancient Latin-Slavic parallels]. In: Oleg N. Trubačev (ed.), *Etimologija 1972*, 3–19. Moscow: Nauka.
Trubačev, Oleg N.
1960 *Proisxoždenie nazvanij domašnix životnyx v slavjanskix jazykax* [The origin of the names of domestic animals in the Slavic languages]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Trubačev, Oleg N. (ed.)
1974–2013 *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond* [Etymological dictionary of the slavic languages. The Proto-Slavic lexical stock]. Vol. 1–39. since 2002 ed. by Trubač and A. Žuravlev. Moscow: Nauka.
Trubačev, Oleg N.
1985 Linguistics and Ethnogenesis of the Slavs: The Ancient Slavs as Evidenced by Etymology and Onomastics. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 13: 203–256.
Vaillant André
1974 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Vol. 4: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Vasmer, Max
1987 *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language]. Vol. 1–4. Moscow: Progress.

Is this the correct name ?

Serguei Sakhno, Rueil-Malmaison (France)

85. The Dialectology of Slavic

1. Introduction
2. Early Proto-Slavic
3. Late Proto-Slavic
4. The dialectal disintegration of Proto-Slavic
5. South Slavic
6. West Slavic
7. East Slavic
8. Morphology
9. Lexical differences
10. References

1. Introduction

All Slavic languages have been derived from their common ancestor, Proto-Slavic. The majority of scholars consider Proto-Slavic to have developed from yet an earlier intermediate proto-language, Proto-Balto-Slavic. This larger entity belonged in turn to the *satem* group of Indo-European languages. Both Slavic and Baltic harbor some irregular traces of features found in *centum* dialects, e.g. OCS *kamy*, Russ. *kamenĭ* 'stone', Lith. *akmuõ* 'id.' : *ašmuõ* 'blade', cf. Gk. *ákmōn* 'anvil', ON *hamarr* 'hammer, crag, precipice' : Skt. *áśman-* 'stone'; OCS *slušati* 'hear', Skt. (Vedic) *śroṣantu* 'let them hear' : Lith. *klausýti* 'hear', OIr. *-cloathar* (subj.) 'would hear', Toch. A *klyoṣ-* 'heard (3sg.)', OHG *hlosên* 'hear'; OCS *svekrŭ* 'father-in-law', Gk. *hékuros*, Lat. *socer*, OHG *swêhur* : Lith. *šẽšuras*, Skt. *çváçuras*, Av. *xᵛasura-* 'id.', etc. Some irregular correspondences reflect probably dialectal differences within Proto-Balto-Slavic. These are usually neglected in comparative grammars but are presented in etymological dictionaries, e.g. OCS *večerŭ* 'evening' : Lith. *vãkaras*, Latv. *vakars* 'id.'; OCS *redŭkŭ* 'seldom' : Lith. *rẽtas* 'id.'; OCS *devętĭ*, Lith. *devynì,* Latv. *deviņi* '9' : Pr *newīnts* '9th', cf. Gk. *ennéa*, Lat *novem*, Skt. *náva*, Goth *niun* '9'; OCS *domŭ* 'house' : Lith. *nãmas* 'id.' but *dimstis* 'yard, domain', cf. Skt. *dámas*, Gk. *dómos*, Lat. *domus* 'house'; OCS *dlŭgŭ* 'long' : Lith. *ìlgas*, Latv *ĩlgs* 'id.'