



HAL
open science

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.

Krzysztof Migdalski, Wrocław (Poland)

84. The Lexicon of Slavic

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Inherited vocabulary | 4. Word formation |
| 2. Loan-words | 5. Abbreviations |
| 3. Specific vocabulary | 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 (PSI), 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 PSI term of PIE origin may present significant modifications (e.g. enlargements by suffixation, cf. the word for ‘sun’, 1.2) and semantic peculiarities (cf. PSI *moldū, 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 PSI *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 PSI *město ‘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:

PSI *dūkt’i, gen. -ere (feminine) ‘daughter’; PIE *dhug(h₂)tēr, gen. *dhug(h₂)tros; cf. G *Tochter*, E *daughter*, etc. Slavic forms descended from this item include OCS *dūšti* gen. *dūštere*; OR *doči*, gen. *dočere*; R *doč’*, gen. *dočeri*; Ukr *doč’*; Bulg *dāšterja*; Slov *hči*, SCR *kći*; Cz *dčera*; Pol *cora*.

PSI. *žena ‘woman, wife’; Balto-Slavic *genā < PIE *g^wenh₂, gen. g^wneh₂s ‘woman’. Cognates of this item are seen in Gr *gunē* ‘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 *kobi ‘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 *choť* ‘spouse, husband or wife’, OCS *choťi* ‘lover, beloved’, *choťeti* ‘wish’.

PSI. *možī ‘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 *mēz* ‘colt’, PIE Transponat *men-d-ios ‘horse’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 274) and may be the basis of Gr *amazōn* (if from *ḡ-mḡ-

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 Slov *muž* ‘man’, but ‘husband’ is usually *manžel* (< PSI *malūžena ‘spouse, wife’, OCS *mal[ŭ]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 *malū* ‘little’, as a prefix of affection, or even from *mōžīžena ‘husband + wife’ with dissimilation (Vasmer 1987: 2. 562); but cf. also R *molodožěny* (plural) ‘couple just married’, from *moldū ‘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-* (*h₂et-) ‘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, PSI *otičī (< *ot-īk-os) was built with a suffix -īk- probably having a diminutive sense (‘little father, daddy’); or -īk- is rather an adjectivizing suffix (‘one of the father, paternal’, cf. French colloquial *mon paternel* ‘my father’). According to Trubačev (1974–2013: 39), PSI *otičī may be compared with the Gr ethnic name *Attikos*. Cf. R *otec*, Pol *ojciec*, Cz *otec*, Slov *otec*, SCr *otac*, Slovn *oče*, Upper Sorb *wótc* ‘father (rare); ancestor’.

The other PSI 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 Slov *táta*; Bulg *tato*, *tatko*, *tate*; Maced *tatko*.

Besides, ‘father, daddy’ can be denoted by a different lexical item, PSI *bata / *bat’a / *batja (perhaps from *brat[r]ŭ ‘brother’, which is semantically somewhat symmetrical to *strŭjī ‘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), PSI *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’; Slov *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 **ph₂tēr*, gen. **ph₂tros* ‘father’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 195), seems to be represented only in PSI **strŭjĭ*, **stryjĭ* ‘paternal uncle’. Cf. OLith *strŭjus* ‘old man, grandfather’, Lith *strujus* ‘father’s brother, mother’s sister’s husband’, L *patruus* ‘paternal uncle’. PIE **ph₂trōs* ‘male paternal relative; father’s brother’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 609). Cf. OR *stryj*, R dial. *stroj*, Pol *stryj*, Cz *strýc*, Slov *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:

PSI **bratrŭ* ‘brother’, PIE **bhreh₂tēr*; cf. OCS *bratrŭ*, R Ukr BelR Bulg Slov *Pol* *brat*, Cz Upper Sorb *bratr*, Lower Sorb *bratš*, etc.

PSI **mati*, gen. **matere* ‘mother’, PIE **meh₂tēr*. 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.

PSI **sestra* ‘sister’, PIE **s₁esōr*; cf. R Ukr Bulg *sestra*, BelR *sjastra*, OCS Cz Slov *Polab* *sestra*, SCr *sěstra*, Slovn *sěstra*, Pol *siostra*, Upper Sorb *sotra*, Lower Sorb *sošša*.

PSI **synŭ* ‘son’, PIE **suh_xnus*; cf. OCS *synŭ*, R Ukr BelR Cz Slov *Pol* *Sorb* *syn*, Bulg Slovn *sin*, SCr *šin*, etc.

PSI **svekry* ‘husband’s mother’, gen. **svekrŭve*, PIE **s₁ek₁ruh₂s*. Cf. OCS *svekry*, gen. *svekrŭve*; R *svekvov’*, gen. *svekvovi*; Ukr *svekruxa*; BelR *svjakrou*; Bulg *svekārva*; Pol *świekra*; etc.

1.2. Terms denoting fundamental natural and human concepts

‘Sun’ is PSI **sŭlnice* (neut.), from **sulnĭko-* / **sulniko-*, a stem based on PIE **seh₂ul*, gen. **sh₂u-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 *slŭnice*, R *solnce*, Ukr *sonce*, Pol *śłońce*, Cz *slunce*, Bulg *slānce*, SCr *sŭnce*, Slovn *sonce*, Slov *slnce*, Sorb *stŭńico*, etc. Among its IE cognates, cf. Lith *saulė* ‘sun’, Goth *sauil* (beside *sunno*) ‘id.’, etc.

‘Moon’ is PSI **luna* (Trubačev 1974–2013: 16. 173), from **louksnā*, PIE **louksneh₂-* ‘moon’ (cf. L *lūna* etc.), from the root **leuk-* ‘light’, and PSI **mēsēcĭ* (masc.) ‘moon; month’, from **mēs-ŋ-ko-* (with extension by a suffix **k*), PIE **meh₁-nōt-* / **meh₁-n(e)s-* ‘moon’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 385) (cf. L *mēnsis* ‘month’, E *moon*, *month*, etc.), from the root **meh₁-* ‘measure’. Attested Slavic forms for ‘moon’ include OCS R Bulg Slovn Cz (poet.) Slov *luna* ‘moon’, while forms meaning both ‘moon’ and ‘month’ include OCS *mēsēcĭ*, R *mesjac*, Ukr *misac*, Bulg *mesec*, SCr *mjesec*, Cz *měsíc*, Slov *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 *luna* ‘glint, light’, Cz *luna* ‘light, glow’, R dial. ‘light (in the sky), glow’, Ukr *luna* ‘echo’ (< ‘light reflection’).

The term for ‘house; household’ is PSI **domŭ*, PIE **dóm(h₂)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 *dŭm*, Bulg *dom* 'house; household, family'. But Bulg 'house' is usually *kāšta*, cf. OCS *kōšta*, probably related to Bulg *kātam*, R *kutat* 'to hide', or to OCS *kōtŭ*, Bulg *kāt*, 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').

PSI **molǵu* 'soft' and 'young', from PIE **melh₁-* '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 *mal dai* '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 nogtŭi* '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 **h₂ǵeu-* 'young' is well preserved: PSI *(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:

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

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

PSI **voda* 'water': OCS *voda*, R Ukr BR Bulg *voda*, SCr *vōda*, Slovn *vōda*, Cz Slovk *voda*, Pol Sorb *woda*;

PSI **vętrŭ* 'wind': OCS *vętrŭ*, R *veter*, Ukr *viter*, Bulg *vetār*, SCr *vjetar*, Slovn *vęter*, Cz *vĭtr*, Slovk *vietor*, Pol *wiatr*, Sorb *wjetš*;

PSI **sędęti* 'sit': OCS *sędęti*, R *sidet*, Ukr *sydaty*, BelR *sidzec*, Bulg *sedja*, SCr dial. *sĵęditi*, Slovn *sedęti*, Cz *sedęti*, Slovk *sediet*, Pol *siedzicę*, Sorb *sejżęš*;

PSI **stojati* 'stay': OCS *stojati*, R *stojat*, Ukr *stojaty*, Bulg *stajati*, Slovn Cz *stāti*, Slovk *stāt*, Pol *stać*, Sorb *stojas*;

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

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

PSI **novŭ* 'new': OCS *novŭ*, R Ukr *novyj*, Bulg *nov*, SCr *nōv*, Slovn *nōv*, 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. PSI **rōka* 'hand', OCS *rōka* and Lith *rankà* 'hand', Latv *rūoka*, OPr *rancko*. This term is probably a deverbative from a Balto-Slavic verb similar to Lith

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

1.3.1. Slavic-Germanic lexical isoglosses

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

PSI **tyseŕtja* / **tysotja* ‘thousand’. Cf. OCS *tysęšta*; R *tysjača*; Pol *tysjác*, *tysjác*; Cz *tisíc*; SCr *tisuća*; Slov *tisoč*; etc.; Lith *tūkstantis*, Olcel *þúsund*, OHG *thūsund*, Goth *þusundi* (*þū-*) < Gmc **thūs-hundī* ← < PIE **tuh₂s-km̥to-* ‘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 **teuh₂-* ‘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 *tmaŋ*, B *tumane* ‘ten thousand’.

PSI **čimeljī* / **čimela* ‘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*, Slov *čmelj*, Pol *czmiel* ‘bumble-bee’ < PIE **kem/*kom* ‘hum’ (possibly of onomatopoeic origin). Cognate with R *komar* ‘mosquito’ (cf. **komonī* below, 3).

PSI **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

PSI **gospodī* / **gospodinū* ‘master, lord’, from **gostīpodī*. Cf. R *gospod’* ‘Lord’, *gospodin* ‘master’; Bulg *gospod*, *gospodin*; Cz *hospodin*; 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 **uik̑potis* ‘master of the clan’, cf. Avest *vīspaitiš* ‘master of the clan’, OInd *viśpāti-* ‘head of the household’, Lith *viėšpatis* ‘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*.

PSI **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). PSI **polŭ* ‘open (space)’ related to **polje* ‘field’, PIE **pleth₂-* ‘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* / PSI **ob, *pro* and in derivational models involving corresponding prefixes L *ob-, pro-* / PSI **ob-, *pro-*, cf. L *ob-sidēre* ‘sit near, haunt, frequent, besiege’/*ob-sidere* ‘blockade, besiege’ (> E *obsess*, Fr *obséder*) and R *оцаждатъосадит’* ‘besiege’ from < PSI **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’ (< PSI **jēditi*), the prefixes L *com-* and R *s(ŭ)-* (< PSI **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:

PSI **griva* ‘mane (of animals)’. Cf. OInd, Avest *grīvā* ‘neck’, Latv *grīva* ‘river mouth’, PIE *g^wrih_xu-eh₂* ‘neck’.

PSI **čirnŭ* ‘black’. Cf. OCS *čŭrnŭ*, R *čěrnyj*, OPr *kirsnan* ‘black’, OInd *kṛṣṇā-* ‘black’. PIE *k^wṛsnos* ‘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.

PSI **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 PSI **bogatŭ* ‘rich’ (< ‘well imparted’). The often assumed Slavic descendant from PIE **deiwos* ‘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 PSI **divŭ(ji)* / **dikŭ(ji)* ‘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.

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

PSI *svētŭ ‘holy, sacred’. Cf. Avest *spənta* ‘holy’ < PIE **k̑wen*(to)- ‘holy’, originally *‘swollen (with force)’, from **k̑eu*(h₁)- ‘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 *kānts* ‘right, correct, firm’. Attested Slavic forms of this lexical item include OCS *světŭ*, *světyi*, R *svjatoj*, Bulg *sveti*, *svet*, Cz *svatý*, and Pol *święty* ‘holy’, etc.

PSI **gospodǐ* ‘master, lord’ (unless properly Slavic, see 1.3.2).

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

PSI **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 PSI **suka* ‘bitch’ (less likely **sōka*) may go back to PIE **k̑(u)won-* ‘dog’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 168) without Iranian mediation. Note that Slavic developed a specific term for ‘dog’: PSI **pīsŭ* < *‘spotted’, probably related to **pīstrŭ* ‘variegated’, from **pīsati* ‘paint’ and (later) ‘write’ < PIE **peik-* ‘paint, mark’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 414), cf. L *pingere* ‘paint, color’, etc., R *pēs*, Pol *pies* ‘dog’, etc.

2.2. Celtic loans

A few words may have originated in Celtic:

PSI **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.

PSI **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, hand-craft, power, etc.:

PSI **bukŭ* ‘writing’, gen. **bukŭve* < Goth *bōka* ‘written document’, cf. R *bukva* ‘letter’. Gmc **bōks* is related to **bōkō* ‘beech’ (< PIE *bheh₂gos* ‘beech’, cf. R *buzina*,

buz ‘elder, *Sambucus*’), cf. G. *Buch, Buche*, E *book, beech*. The PSI name of the beech tree, **bukū*, 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 **bogū* above in 2.2.

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

PSI **korl’i* ‘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 / küniglīn*, from L *cuniculus* ‘rabbit’, due to confusion between *küniklīn* and MHG *künig*, MLG *Könink* ‘king’.

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

PSI **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).

PSI **kūnēdži* < **kūnēg’i* ‘prince’ < Goth *kuningaz*, cf. R *knjaz’* ‘prince’, etc.

PSI **pūlkū* ‘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 **pleh₁-* ‘fill’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 417).

PSI **t’ud’i* / **tjudji* ‘foreign’; cf. OCS *tuždi, štuždi*; OR *čudī, čuži* ‘foreign’; R *čužoj, čuždyj* < Goth *þiuda* ‘folk’, OHG *diot* ‘people, heathen’ (> G *deutsch*, E *Dutch*). PIE **teuteh₂* ‘the people’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 417). This term bears no relationship to OCS OR R *čudo* ‘miracle’.

PSI **xōdogū* ‘wise, skillful’ < Goth *handugs* ‘handy, dexterous’ (E *handy*), cf. OCS *xōdožnikū* ‘creator, maker’, *xōdožstvo* ‘wiseness, sagacity; ruse, perfidy’, R *xudožnik* ‘artist, painter’.

PSI **xlēbū* ‘bread’ < Goth *hlaifs*, cf. G *Laib*, E *loaf*. Attested Slavic forms include OCS *xlēbū*, 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 *klībanos / kribanos* ‘baker’s oven’ (Trubačev 1974–2013: 8. 27–29).

There are debatable cases: PSI **čędo / *čęda / *čędū* ‘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 PSI **čęti* ‘begin’ < PIE **ken-* ‘beginning; end’, cf. R *načalo* < PSI **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.

PSI **dūska* ‘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 **dústúkanū* ‘wooden holder (of drink)’.

PSI **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 PSI homonym **kupiti* ‘gather’, from PSI **kupa* ‘mound, heap’, cf. R *sovokupnyj* ‘gathered, summarized’ < PIE **koupo-* ‘heap’, cf. OHG *houf* ‘heap’, E *heap*.

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

PSl *cīrky / *cīrky ‘church’ < Gmc *kiriko < Gr (*dōma*) *kūriakón* ‘(house) of the Lord’. OCS *crīky*, 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) *kīrku*, 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) < *h₂entbhi ‘around’ + the participle of the verbal root *h₂eǵ- ‘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 *fiscal* ‘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 *tǔrgŭ ‘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 *kapī ‘appearance, figure, idol’, OCS *kapī* ‘id.’, *kapište* ‘pagan temple’ < Proto-Bulgarian (Turkic) *kāp, cf. Uigur *kep* ‘shape, form, figure, picture’.

PSl *kūniga ‘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 *loszę* ‘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 *mǎ*, 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.

PSI *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 PSI *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 PSI term is analogous to PSI *godŭ (see next item).

PSI *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’, Slov *god* ‘fitting / favourable time / moment’, related to Lith *guōdas* ‘honour, respect’, OHG *gi-gat* ‘fitting’, G *gütlich* ‘fitting’, *Gatte* ‘spouse, husband’, *gut* ‘good’, E *good*, etc.

PSI *starŭ ‘old’ (Slavic has no word derived from PIE *senos, unlike Lith *sėnas* ‘old’), hypothetically from PIE *(s)terh₁- ‘stiff’ ON *starr* ‘stiff’, OE *starian* ‘look at, stare’ > E *stare* or, more plausibly, from PIE *sth₂ei- ‘become hard, fixed’ (an extension of *steh₂- ‘stand’) (Černyx 1993: 2. 199; Vasmer 1987: 3. 747), cf. Lith *stōras* ‘thick, wide, large’, L *stīria* ‘icicle’ ON *stōrr* ‘big, strong, important’.

Other Slavic words have more questionable Indo-European etymologies.

The PSI term for ‘oak’ is *dōbŭ / *dōbrŭ, 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 *dŭino*, 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 PSI *dōbŭ 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 *prk^weh₂ cognate with *perk^wus ‘oak’. The latter word was not preserved in Slavic, except for the divinity name *Perunŭ ‘thunder god’, from *perk^wu-h_xn- ‘the oaken one’ (cf. the mythological link between oak and thunder).

PSI *konī, *komonī ‘horse’, R *kon’*, Ukr *kin’* < *komnjo-, OR *komonī* < *komon- ‘hornless one’ (as opposed to cattle); cf. R *komolyj* ‘hornless’, from PIE *kem- / *kem- ‘hornless’; cf. OInd *śama-* ‘id.’, Lith *šmūlas* ‘id.’, ON *hind* ‘hind’, OE *hind* ‘id.’ > E *hind*, OPr *camstian* ‘sheep’, *camnet* ‘horse, hornless’, Lith *kumėlė* ‘mare’, *kumelys*, Latv *kumelš* ‘colt’, Gr *kemās* ‘young deer’ (Mallory and Adams, 273). Cf. SCr *konj* ‘horse; castrated horse’, Cz *kůň*, Pol *koń* ‘horse’. Trubačev (1960: 51) suggests for *konī a derivation from *kopnjo- ‘male animal’, from *kap-n- < PIE *kapro- ‘male’, cf. L *capere*; but later (1974–2013: 10. 197) he claims that *komonī may have a different, onomatopoeic etymology: ‘the neighing one’, cf. ON *humre* ‘neigh’ < *kom- / *kim-, and PSI *čimelī ‘hum’ (see above, 1.3.1.). He proposes (1974–2013: 10. 197) that *konī is from *konikŭ / *konikŭ borrowed from Celt *konko / *kanko ‘horse’ (akin to G *Hengst*

‘stallion’, etc.). Note that PSI *kobyła ‘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).

PSI *skotŭ ‘livestock’ is specific to Slavic, unlike such Baltic forms as Lith *pekus*, (PIE *peku-* ‘livestock’) borrowed from some western IE group (Mallory and Adams 1997: 23), and *gyvulys* ‘beast’ < PIE *gʷih₃-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 PSI *sŭkotŭ ‘young animals, brood, offspring, progeny’ from *kotiti *se* ‘procreate, give birth, drop’.

4. Word Formation

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

PSI *nevēsta ‘bride’ < *neŭ-ŭedh-t-a, from PIE *neŭ- ‘new’ and *ŭedh- ‘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* (< *ŭedh-). Different, because of its *d, is PIE *ŭedmo- ‘bride-price’, whence PSI *vēdnom, OCS *věno* ‘bride-price’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 82), although the PIE term has often been taken as derived from *ŭedh- ‘lead’, a root frequently used in connection with marriage. But a common PIE form *h₂ŭed- has been suggested by Szemerényi (*apud* Mallory and Adams 1997: 82). PSI *nevēsta has also been explained as *ne-vēst-a ‘the unknown’ to *věstŭ* ‘known’.

PSI *medvĕdī ‘bear’ is a bahuvrīhi ‘whose food is honey’ from *medv- ‘honey’ (cf. *medŭ ‘honey’, adj. *medvĭnŭ) and *ĕdī ‘food’ (from the root *ĕd- ‘eat’), hence ‘honey-eater’ (Černyx 1993: 1. 519). OCS *medvĕdī*, 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 *h₂r̥tkos ‘bear’ in an area (Northern Europe) where bears have been hunted since antiquity.

PSI *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 PSI *volga > OCS *vлага* ‘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):

This source is not listed in the reference section !!

OCS *otŭvēštati*, R *otvečat'*, root *vēt- 'tell, say (solemnly)'; cf. PIE *uōt- '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 *ueid- '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, Raĭa 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 Jakovlevič
 1993 *Istoriko-etimologičeskij 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 *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i Indoeuropejcy*. 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: Almqvist & 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 paralelej [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 *Ėtimologičeskij 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 *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language]. Vol. 1–4. Moscow: Progress.

Serguei Sakhno, Rueil-Malmaison (France)

Is this the correct name ?

85. The Dialectology of Slavic

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| 1. Introduction | 6. West Slavic |
| 2. Early Proto-Slavic | 7. East Slavic |
| 3. Late Proto-Slavic | 8. Morphology |
| 4. The dialectal disintegration of Proto-Slavic | 9. Lexical differences |
| 5. South Slavic | 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. *klausyti* ‘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. *šėšuras*, Skt. *çváçuras*, Av. *xʷasura-* ‘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. *vãkars* ‘id.’; OCS *redŭkŭ* ‘seldom’ : Lith. *rėtas* ‘id.’; OCS *devęti*, Lith. *devyni*, 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. *dãmas*, Gk. *dómos*, Lat. *domus* ‘house’; OCS *dlŭgŭ* ‘long’ : Lith. *ĩlgas*, Latv *ĩlgs* ‘id.’