Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

Leiden University Repository

Author: Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia Elisabeth
Title: The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic : origin and accentuation
Issue Date: 2012-11-28

The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic
Origin and accentuation

Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff

The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic
Origin and accentuation

Promotores: Prof. dr. F.H.H. Kortlandt
                   Prof. dr. A.M. Lubotsky

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. R.H. Bremmer
                   Prof. dr. G. Holzer (Universität Wien)
                   Prof. dr. A. Quak
                   Prof. dr. J. Schaeken

Voor Thera, in herinnering

Table of contents

PREFACE

Vsaka beseda [postane] kulturnozgodovinski dokument šele takrat, ko je zadovoljivo in vsestransko preiskana [...]. (ESSlov. 1: vii)

France Bezlaj

The subject of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic has enjoyed great scholarly interest over the past two centuries, not only from Slavists, but also from Germanicists and scholars from adjoining fields. Apart from the monographs that were published on the area under discussion in the course of the 20th century (Mladenov 1908, Stender-Petersen 1927, Kiparsky 1934 and Martynov 1963), scholars have touched upon the subject in numerous handbooks and articles.

Research into the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic has been complicated by the fact that every scholar works with his own corpus of loanwords, and it is often not made clear how the corpus was compiled. The absence of a defined, indisputable corpus of loanwords makes it difficult to investigate phonological, morphological or accentological developments or the semantic layering of the loanwords. When I started my research on the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, I felt it therefore necessary to review all (or almost all) possible Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. The aim of this work had become twofold. On the one hand, this dissertation intends to provide an updated overview of the words that are to be regarded as Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic. On the other hand, it investigates the loanwords from the viewpoint of their accentuation in Proto-Slavic. In the field of Slavic accentology, much progress has been made since Christian Stang published *Slavonic accentuation* in 1957, but the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic has not thoroughly and conclusively been investigated since the late 1950's. The present work aims to fill this gap and investigates the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic within the framework set by the works of Leiden Slavists and Indo-Europeanists.

It is thanks to the inspiring classes of Willem Vermeer and Jos Schaeken of the Department of Slavic Languages and Cultures at Leiden University that my interest in Slavic historical linguistics was awakened. When I attended Willem Vermeer's fascinating, but extremely complicated lectures on Balto-Slavic historical accentology, I could not have imagined that I would ever write on an accentological subject myself.

The basis for this dissertation was laid in the master thesis that I wrote at the Department of Comparative Indo-European Linguistics at Leiden University,

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS OF LANGUAGES

Alb.	Albanian	Kash.	Kashubian
Arm.	Armenian	Lang.	Langobardic (Lombardic)
Av.	Avestan	Lat.	Latin
Bav.	Bavarian German	Latv.	Latvian
Bg.	Bulgarian	LS	Lower Sorbian
BSl.	Balto-Slavic	M-	Middle
Čak.	Čakavian	MBg.	Middle Bulgarian
Cr.	Croatian	MDu.	Middle Dutch
Cr.CS	Croatian Church Slavic	MHG	Middle High German
Crn.	Montenegrin	MLG	Middle Low German
CS	Church Slavic	MW	Middle Welsh
Cz.	Czech	N	Norse
Dan.	Danish	NFri.	(New) Frisian
Du.	Dutch	NWGmc.	Northwest Germanic
E	English	O-	Old
EGmc.	East Germanic	OCS	Old Church Slavic
Fin.	Finnish	OCr.	Old Croatian
Fr.	French	OCz.	Old Czech
G	German	ODu.	Old Dutch
Gaul.	Gaulish	OE	Old English
Goth.	Gothic	OFr.	Old French
Gr.	Ancient Greek	OFri.	Old Frisian
Hg.	Hungarian	OHG	Old High German
Hitt.	Hittite	OIr.	Old Irish
Hsch.	Hesychius	OLF	Old Low Franconian
Ic.	Icelandic	OLG	Old Low German
Ir.	Irish	ON	Old Norse
It.	Italian	OP	Old Polish
Kajk.	Kajkavian	OPr.	Old Prussian

OR	Old Russian	S/Cr.	Serbian/Croatian (cf. §1.2.2.4)
OS	Old Saxon	SCS	Serbian Church Slavic
OW	Old Welsh	Skt.	Sanskrit
P	Polish	Slk.	Slovak
P-	Proto-	Slnc.	Slovincian
PCelt.	Proto-Celtic	Slov.	Slovene
PGmc.	Proto-Germanic	Sp.	Spanish
Phryg.	Phrygian	Supr.	Codex Suprasliensis
PIE	Proto-Indo-European	Sw.	Swedish
Plb.	Polabian	Toch. A/B	Tocharian A/B
Prt.	Portugese	Ukr.	Ukrainian
PSl.	Proto-Slavic	US	Upper Sorbian
R	Russian	VLat.	Vulgar Latin
RCS	Russian Church Slavic	W	Welsh
Rom.	Romance	WGmc.	West Germanic
S	Serbian		

LINGUISTIC ABBREVIATIONS

1/2/3	1st /2nd /3rd person	L	locative
A	accusative	lit.	literally
adj.	adjective	m.	masculine
adv.	adverb	N	nominative
AP	accent paradigm	n.	neuter
arch.	archaic	obs.	obsolete
D	dative	pej.	pejorative
dial.	dialectal	pl.	plural
f.	feminine	sg.	singular
G	genitive	V	vocative
I	instrumental		

SYMBOLS

*	reconstructed form
<	developed from
>	developed into
C	consonant
H	laryngeal
N	nasal
R	resonant
V	vowel

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIM AND STRUCTURE

From the early period of their expansion from their homeland, the Proto-Slavs were in contact with Germanic tribes. In Slavic, these contacts have resulted in the presence of dozens of Germanic loanwords. The study of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic has received much scholarly interest over the past two centuries. The most important works dealing with the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic will be discussed in §1.3.

It was already stated in the Preface that the present work has a twofold aim. Firstly, it intends to provide an updated overview of the words that are to be regarded as Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic. Secondly, this dissertation aims to clarify the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the three Proto-Slavic accent paradigms (a), (b) and (c), a problem that has never conclusively been solved. The earlier research on the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, from Meillet's observation that the Germanic loanwords regularly received acute intonation in Slavic (1909) to Matasović's recent treatment of the problem (2000), will be discussed in chapter 3. It has long been thought that the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic regularly joined AP (a) or, in other words, received acute intonation. Meillet states that "les noms empruntés au germanique ont en général l'intonation rude" (1909: 69). This idea has been followed mainly during the first part of the 20ᵗʰ century, but the large number of Germanic loanwords not having AP (a) shows that this theory cannot be correct. Kuryłowicz put forward an ingenious theory, which posits that the loanwords with AP (a) were borrowed at an earlier stage than the loanwords with AP (b) (1951). The accentological reasoning behind this theory cannot be upheld today, and when we look at the material, there turns out to be no reason whatsoever to assume that the words with AP (b) were borrowed at a later date than the ones with AP (a).

In their respective monographs, Stender-Petersen and Kiparsky devote a chapter to the accent and intonation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and assume that no conclusions can be drawn on the basis of accentological evidence. Stender-Petersen takes the view that definite conclusions about the accentuation of the loanwords in Proto-Slavic cannot be reached because many secondary developments could have taken place (1927: 533). This view is advocated by Kiparsky as well (1934: 298). However, this idea now seems to be unnecessarily pessimistic.

In the second half of the 20ᵗʰ century, starting with the publication of *Slavonic accentuation* by Christian Stang in 1957, huge progress in the field of

Slavic historical accentology has been made. Stang classified the prosodic features of Proto-Slavic into three accent paradigms: AP (a), (b) and (c). Since the accent paradigms are very different from one another, words do not randomly join an accent paradigm, nor do they easily change it. It has been shown that the stress patterns of AP (a) and AP (b) separated only by the end of Proto-Slavic: the latter type underwent Dybo's law and Stang's law, making AP (b) a mobile paradigm. For the larger part of Proto-Slavic, however, the stress patterns of AP (a) and AP (b) were the same because both had fixed stress on the stem (Kortlandt 2008a: 2). The only difference between the two accent paradigms was the intonation of the stressed vowel: words that followed AP (a) had a glottalized stem vowel and words that followed AP (b) had a rising, non-glottalized stem vowel. A more detailed description of the Proto-Slavic prosodic system will be given in chapter 2. The main question when trying to solve the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the accent paradigms (a) and (b) is: under what circumstances did loanwords adopt the glottal intonation of AP (a) and when did they adopt the rising intonation of AP (b)? I will present my analysis of the distribution of the loanwords over the three Proto-Slavic accent paradigms (a), (b) and (c) in chapter 8.

In chapter 4, the location of the original homeland of the Slavs and their (subsequent) earliest contacts with speakers of Germanic languages will be investigated. The location of the Proto-Slavic homeland is of direct influence on the nature and dating of the Slavic contacts with Germanic peoples. Martynov, for example, supposes that the homeland of the Slavs is to be located in contemporary western Poland, which enables him to date the earliest contacts between the Proto-Slavs and speakers of Germanic around 500 BC and to suppose a layer of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Proto-Germanic, which is otherwise not generally accepted among scholars. Mainly on the basis of the onomastic evidence adduced by Udolph (1979), I locate the homeland of the Slavs to the area north and northeast of the Carpathian Mountains and on the forest steppes around the river Dniester. I think the Proto-Slavs first came into contact with the Goths and that these contacts probably lasted from the third to the fifth centuries AD. Contacts with speakers of West Germanic languages started when the Slavs moved into central Europe and lasted until after the disintegration of Proto-Slavic at the beginning of the ninth century, or – to be more precise – the contacts between Slavs and Germans along the western borders of the Slavic language area have never ceased to exist.

Chapter 5 gives an overview of the words that can be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and these words are arranged according to their accentuation in Proto-Slavic (§5.2-§5.6). Although I would not dare to state that the overview is exhaustive, it does come close to being a complete overview of

all Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. I departed from the corpus put together by Kiparsky (1934) because I regard his monograph to be the best and most complete on the subject to date, but his corpus has been critically evaluated and revised. Almost 80 years have passed since Kiparsky's attempt to determine the corpus of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (1934) and a lot of new insights and literature has seen the light since then. The corpus presented in this dissertation therefore substantially differs from Kiparsky's corpus: I do not consider *avorъ, *bordy, *bugъ, *bъči, *Dunovъ, *glazъ, *klějь, *mur(in)ъ, *op-, *remy, *smoky, *tjudjь, *želsti to be certain Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic. Church Slavic bugъ 'bracelet' (cf. OHG bauc 'ring') (Kiparsky 1934: 170) has not been included in the material because of its scanty attestation that is limited to Church Slavic. PSl. *bordy '(battle) axe, bearded axe' is not included in the corpus because it is only attested in South Slavic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 216).[1] I omitted the name of the river Danube (PSl. *Dunovъ) because it is a toponym (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 195). The other words mentioned above will be discussed in chapter 6. In contrast to Kiparsky, I regard PSl. *dъlgъ, *gorazdъ, *lъvъ, *koldędźь, *redьky/*rьdьky, *užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti, *vъrtogordъ, *xula, *xuliti as Germanic loanwords.

   I have tried to avoid including words of disputed origin in my corpus, so as not to confuse the actual distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the three Slavic accentual paradigms. Toponyms are not included in the corpus, nor are they generally mentioned in the overview of forms in the different Slavic languages. The only exception to this practice is made when a toponym is the sole evidence that the etymon is reflected in a particular branch of Slavic. I consider a word to be "Proto-Slavic", when it is attested in at least two branches of Slavic. This criterion does not include words that are limited to West Slavic and Slovene because words that are attested only in these languages may result

---

[1] PSl. *bordy is likely to be a Germanic loanword from a reflex of PGmc. *bardō 'battle-axe' and the borrowing can be dated before the metathesis of liquids ceased to operate. PSl. *bordy has been connected to West Slavic forms as OCz. brodatice, US brodaćica and Plb. bordåįńə. Kiparsky, however, explains OCz. brodatice (and US brodaćica, which was supposedly borrowed from Czech) as a later loan translations from G Bartaxt 'bearded axe' (1934: 216). Plb. bordåįńə is thought to go back to earlier *bordyńa (Polański/Sehnert 1967: 39, cf. SEJDP 1: 44), which points to an ū-stem declension just as the South Slavic forms. Polańsky and Lehr-Spławiński, however, allow for the possibility that the form *bordyńa is secondary and that the original form is *borda (SEJDP 1: 44), in which case it is less straightforward to derive the Polabian form from the same (Proto-Slavic) form as the South Slavic forms. Kiparsky explains Plb. bordåįńə as a borrowing from Low German (1934: 216). On the basis of its limited attestation, it cannot be excluded that PSl. *bordy was a late and/or regional borrowing into South Slavic.

from later (post-Proto-Slavic) borrowings from German (I nevertheless included PSl. *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ 'wood drill' in the corpus because this word is phonologically archaic).

All entries basically have the same structure: the Proto-Slavic and Germanic reconstructed forms are followed by a reconstruction of the original meaning of the word and grammatical information. Forms in the individual languages have not been glossed, except in cases where there is a difference with respect to the reconstructed form or substantial differentiation within Slavic. In those cases where the accent paradigm is clear from the attested Slavic forms, I will only write AP (a), AP (b) or AP (c). Only when the Slavic forms do not provide a coherent picture concerning the accentuation of a word or in case of disagreement in the scholarly literature, will I give an explanation for the reconstructed accent paradigm. Derivations are not generally given, except when the root word is absent in a language. Where a form in one of the Slavic languages can be regarded as a borrowing from another Slavic language, I write the form between square brackets.

After listing the attestations in the Slavic and the (old) Germanic languages, the entries begin with an investigation of the origin of the Germanic word. It will become clear that very few of the Germanic donor words are inherited themselves. The majority of the Germanic words were borrowed from Latin, Celtic or unknown substratum languages. This is not surprising: the Germanic peoples transferred mainly new objects and ideas which they had acquired from peoples they had come into contact with to the Proto-Slavs, who had not come into contact with Romans, Celts and other peoples as early as the Germanic peoples did. This given also explains why the number of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic is so much lower than the reverse (cf. §4.4). The entries continue with a discussion of the possible Germanic donor language. The best way to ascertain the origin of a loanword is when an innovation of a specific Germanic language or branch is reflected in the Proto-Slavic loanword. On the basis of this criterion, the Germanic donor language of a number of words can, in varying degree of certainty, be established. This aspect of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic has remained underexposed in earlier works on the subject because most scholars mainly looked at the Slavic material, paying less attention to the linguistic side of the Germanic donor languages.

Then follows a description of phonological, morphological and semantic particulars in the connection of the Slavic and Germanic forms and in the individual Slavic languages. I have made extensive use of (etymological) dictionaries (cf. §1.2), but do not reproduce all bibliographical information and old etymologies.

In chapter 6, those words whose origin remains undecided are listed (§6.1 and §6.2) and §6.3 gives an overview of the words that have either repeatedly or in recent literature been regarded as Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic, but which I, on the other hand, do not regard to belong to this category.

Chapter 7 consists of a linguistic analysis of the material presented in chaper 5. In this chapter, the phonological, morphological and semantic peculiarities of the loanwords will be analysed. It will in more detail be investigated and summarised what formal clues we have for establishing the donor language of the Germanic forms. The most important morphological questions that will be discussed in this chapter are the circumstance that Germanic neuter forms regularly changed gender when they were borrowed into Proto-Slavic and the frequent occurrence of the feminine *ū*-stem declension among the loanwords. Chapter 8, finally, investigates the distribution of the loanwords over the accent paradigms (a), (b) and (c) in Proto-Slavic.

1.2   LINGUISTIC SOURCES AND TERMINOLOGY

1.2.1   GERMANIC: INTRODUCTION AND LINGUISTIC SOURCES

1.2.1.1   GENERAL
For Proto-Germanic and general Germanic etymologies, I have mainly used A. Fick, H. Falk and A. Torp, *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen, dritter Teil: Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit* (1909). I sporadically consulted V.E. Orel's *A handbook of Germanic etymology* (2003).

1.2.1.2   EAST GERMANIC
The only East Germanic language that has come down to us is Gothic, the language of the Visigoths and the Ostrogoths. The Goths are a Germanic tribe that was first recorded when it raided the Roman Empire in 238. From that time, the Goths conquered and occupied large areas to the north of the Black Sea and south of the Carpathian Mountains. The main part of the remaining Gothic textual material is formed by parts of a translation of the Bible (chiefly from the New Testament, but also parts of the Old Testament). The most important preserved Gothic manuscript is the *Codex Argenteus*, a sixth-century copy of (a part of) the Bible translation that was originally made by the Gothic bishop Wulfila around 369. Apart from the translations of the Bible, some smaller pieces of text have come down to us, among which are two runic inscriptions,

the *Skeireins* (an eight-page commentary on the Gospel of Mark), a fragment of a Gothic church calendar, as well as glosses and Gothic personal names in Latin and Greek texts (Jellinek 1926: 14-19, Robinson 1992: 47-48). After the Goths had migrated to Spain and Italy in the fifth century, the Gothic language started to lose its importance in the Pontic region. By the eighth century, the Goths seem to have largely assimilated both ethnically and linguistically to other groups (Robinson 1992: 47).

However, small contingents of Goths remained in the Balkans. In the ninth century, the Frankish monk Walafrid Strabo reported that the Gothic language was used in the church in the Dobrudja area in present-day eastern Bulgaria and Romania. In the middle of the 16th century, Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, the Flemish ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire to Constantinople, came into contact with two men who spoke a Germanic language on the Crimea. De Busbecq recorded approximately 80 words and a song from their language, which became known as Crimean Gothic. There is some doubt about the reliability of De Busbecq's rendering of the material, but the language he recorded can be regarded as an East Germanic language (Jellinek 1926: 17-18, Robinson 1992: 50-51). Crimean Gothic is thought to have become extinct by the end of the 18th century.

When Wulfila developed the Gothic alphabet for the purpose of his translation of the Bible, he did this on the basis of the Greek alphabet. The Gothic graphemes by and large correspond to the Greek letters from which they are derived and the phonetic value of the Greek letters influenced the orthography of Gothic. By the fourth century, Greek <ει> was pronounced as [i]. The Gothic digraph <ei> similarly denotes a long monophthong *ī*. The Gothic letter <i> represents a short vowel *i*. Gothic <e> and <o> denote the long vowels *ē* and *ō*, respectively. The graphemes <a> and <u> can represent long as well as short vowels; the alphabet does not provide means to distinguish between the two (Jellinek 1926: 30-32, 40-42).

There is no consensus about the phonetic value of the Gothic graphs <ai> and <au>. Etymologically, Gothic *ai* and *au* (basically) continue the Proto-Germanic diphthongs **ai* and **au*. The grapheme *ai* also reflects PGmc. **e* and **i* in the position before *h*, *ƕ* and *r* as well as **e* in reduplicated syllables, and the grapheme *au* reflects PGmc. **o* before *h*, *ƕ* and *r*. Before a vowel, the reflexes of PGmc. **ē$_i$* and **ō* are written as <ai>, <au>, e.g., Goth. *saian* 'to sow', *staua* 'judgement, charge'. It has therefore been thought that <ai> and <au> represent three phonemes: *ai* would phonetically correspond to [ai], but to [ɛ] or

[ɛ] before the *h*, *hv*, *r*, and to [æ] before vowels. Similarly, the graph *au* would phonetically correspond to [au], but to [ɔ] before the *h*, *hv*, *r* and to [ɔ̄] before vowels (cf. Wright 1892: 7-8, 1910: 8-9).[2]

    Wright concludes, however, that it is "almost incredible that a man like Ulfilas, who showed such great skill in other respects" would choose one grapheme to denote three different phonemes, in view of the fact that he especially designed the Gothic alphabet to write Gothic. He therefore supposes that the Proto-Germanic diphthongs **ai* and **au* had monophthongized in Wulfila's Gothic and that Wulfila used the graphs <ai> and <au> to denote [ɛ], [æ] and [ɔ], [ɔ̄], respectively (1910: 362, cf. Bennett 1949: 19). The monophthongal value of <ai> and <au> is supported by the fact that Greek *αι* was pronounced [e] in Wulfila's time (Jellinek 1926: 31). The monophthongization in Greek is first attested in spellings from about 100 AD (Allen 1974: 75). In the Gothic texts, <ai> is also used to transcribe Greek *ε* and *αι* (*Paitrus* 'Petrus') and Latin *e* (*laiktjo* 'reading', Lat. *lēktiō*). In loanwords from Latin, Gothic <au> reflects Latin *o* (*naubaimbair* 'November').

For Gothic etymologies, I have based myself primarily on *A Gothic etymological dictionary* by W.P. Lehmann (1986), although I have made occasional use of S. Feist's *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache: mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen* (1939).

1.2.1.3   *WEST GERMANIC*

The West Germanic languages that play the most important role in this dissertation are Old High German and Old Saxon because the Proto-Slavs are likely to have been primarily in contact with ancestor languages/dialects of High and Low German when they arrived in central Europe. The written tradition of Old High German starts by the end of the eighth century (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 1). The name Old High German does not refer to one uniform language, but rather comprises a number of substantially different dialects, which are united by the distinguishing feature that they underwent (at least to some extent) the High German consonant shift. These dialects include Old Bavarian, Alemannic, (Upper) Franconian dialects (High, Central and Rhine Franconian) and probably Langobardic. The Bavarians settled in present-day Bavaria and parts of Austria, probably between 488 and 520, and came under Frankish rule

---

[2] In the scholarly literature, the three alleged phonemes are distinguished by diacritics: *ái*, *áu* represent [ai] and [au]; *aí*, *aú* represent [e] and [o] and *ai*, *au* represent [æ] and [ɔ̄]. These diacritics do not occur in the original Gothic texts.

shortly afterwards (Robinson 1992: 224). The Alemanni settled in the Alsace and became part of the Frankish Empire in the sixth century. In the first centuries AD, the Franks formed a loose alliance of different tribes between the rivers Rhine and Weser, who were joined in their desire to cross the border of the Roman Empire along the river Rhine. From the mid-fourth century, they achieved more and more military success. The Franconian dialects that underwent the High German sound shift belong to the High German dialects. The Franconian dialects that did not undergo the sound shift form a separate Low Franconian dialect group within West Germanic (ibid.: 199-201). [3] Langobardic is the scarcely attested language of the Langobards, who established a kingdom in northern Italy in 568 and soon afterwards assimilated linguistically to the local Romance population. The language is sometimes regarded as an East Germanic language. In all probability, however, it must rather be regarded as a West Germanic language because PGmc. *e is retained as e in Langobardic (although it became umlauted to i under certain circumstances as in the other Germanic languages (Bruckner 1895: 63)); Langobardic thus does not share the Gothic raising of *e > i in all positions, which is an argument for regarding the language as West Germanic. The language, furthermore, shows traces of the High German consonant shift. Braune/Reiffenstein do not, on the other hand, include Langobardic in the Old High German dialects, but mainly, it seems, for political and cultural reasons (2004: 3).

The so-called Benrath line (G *Benrather Linie*) marks the border between the High German dialects and the dialects in the West Germanic dialect continuum that did not undergo the High German consonant shift. To the north of the Benrath line, Low German dialects are spoken. The oldest attested form of Low German is Old Saxon, which is first attested in the ninth century and developed into Middle Low German after the 12th century (Gallée 1910: 1). Ptolemy mentions the Saxons in the middle of the second century as a tribe inhabiting the North Sea coast along the lower reaches of the river Elbe. Since their later spread is very extensive, it has been assumed that the Saxons in fact occupied a larger territory in the Early Middle Ages already (Robinson 1992: 100). The territory of the Saxons spread in the east along the river Elbe, up to the river Saale (Gallée 1910: 2, Robinson 1992: 103). Here, they must have bordered onto (West) Slavic tribes. In 531, the Saxons had become allies of the Franks in the Frankish campaign against the Thuringians, after which the Saxons settled in

---

[3] The Low Franconian dialects are nowadays mainly spoken in The Netherlands and Belgium. Old Low Franconian developed into Old Dutch around 600.

the Thuringia area as well (Robinson 1992: 101-102). In the early seventh century, the Saxons are known to have fought together with the Franks against West Slavic tribes (cf. §4.3). After the Saxon Wars conducted by Charlemagne in the last decades of the eighth century, the Saxons became fully subjected to Frankish rule.

The largest and most important Old Saxon text is the *Heliand* ('Saviour', G *Heiland*), an epic poem about the life of Jesus. The text has come down to us in four, significantly differing, manuscripts. It has been assumed that the text was composed slightly after 830. Another important Old Saxon text is a fragment of a translation of the book of Genesis, also dating from the ninth century (ibid.: 110).

For (High) German forms and etymologies, I made extensive use of the *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch. 6. Auflage, um die Glossen erweitert* (R. Schützeichel, 2006), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* by F. Kluge and E. Seebold (24th edition, 2002), the new *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*, edited by A.L. Lloyd, O. Springer and R. Lühr (1988-), J. and W. Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1854-1961, digital edition on www.dwb.uni-trier.de) and E. Seebold's *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)* (2001) and *idem: der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts* (2008). Some dialect forms have been taken from other, older, dictionaries: J.A. Schmeller, *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* (1872-1877), K.J. Schröer *Wörterbuch der Mundart von Gottschee* (1870), K.L. and J.C. Heyse *Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (1849) and M. Höfer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der in Oberdeutschland, vorzüglich aber der in Österreich üblichen Mundart* (1815).

For Low German material, I have used H. Tiefenbach, *Altsächsisches Wörterbuch/A Concise Old Saxon Dictionary* (2010), F. Holthausen, *Altsächsisches Wörterbuch* (1956) and J.C. Dähnert, *Platt-deutsches Wörter-Buch: Nach der alten und neuen Pommerschen und Rügischen Mundart* (1781).

Apart from the German material, I also include Old English, Old Frisian and Dutch forms in the entries. Modern English forms have been added in those cases where the modern language has a different form or meaning than the other attested Germanic forms.

For Old English, I made use of J. Bosworth and T. Northcote Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary* (1898, 1921). The Old Frisian forms stem from the *Altfriesisches Handwörterbuch* (D. Hofmann and A.T. Popkema, 2008). I also used the *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch* (Holthausen/Hofmann, 1985). I used a number of Dutch etymological dictionaries, mainly the new *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands* edited by M. Philippa, F. Debrabandere, A. Quak, T. Schoonheim and N. van der Sijs (2003-2009), but also J. Franck and N. van Wijk's *Franck's Etymologisch woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal* (1912), J.

De Vries and F. De Tollenaere *Nederlands etymologisch woordenboek* (1997) and P.A.F. van Veen's *Etymologisch woordenboek: de herkomst van onze woorden* (1994).[4] I have occasionally used A.A. Weijnen's *Etymologisch dialectwoordenboek* (1996).

1.2.1.4   NORTH GERMANIC

North Germanic plays a less important role in the discussion of the loanwords than Gothic and High and Low German because there is no reason to assume the existence of North Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Old Norse (Old Icelandic) is the only North Germanic language regularly featuring in the entries. Modern Scandinavian forms have only occasionally been added. For Old Norse etymologies, I based myself on J. De Vries's *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1977).

1.2.2   SLAVIC: INTRODUCTION AND LINGUISTIC SOURCES

1.2.2.1   PROTO-SLAVIC

In the literature, the language that was spoken by the Proto-Slavs has often indiscriminately been referred to as Proto-Slavic or Common Slavic. A tendency seems to have developed among Slavists to distinguish between Proto-Slavic (G *Urslavisch*, Cr. *praslavenski*) and Common Slavic (G *Gemeinslavisch*, Cr. *općeslavenski*) (e.g., Holzer 2005, 2009, Matasović 2008): "Proto-Slavic" in this respect refers to the reconstructed language of the Proto-Slavs around 600, during and immediately after their great expansion (e.g., Holzer 2009: 151), whereas "Common Slavic" refers to the language after around 600, but during the time when "es noch ein zusammenhängendes, kompaktes slavisches Sprachgebiet gab und es daher noch gesamtslavischen Sprachwandel geben konnte" (Holzer 2005: 31). I do not follow this practice and refer to the entire period when the language of the Slavs can be regarded as a common language (up until the ninth century) as "Proto-Slavic". The term Proto-Slavic does therefore not refer to one specific system at one specific point of time, but rather to a language that gradually diverged when the Proto-Slavs expanded from their homeland and started to spread over the territory the Slavs inhabit today. As long as the language shared common innovations, it can be called "Proto-Slavic".

---

[4] All these dictionaries are accessible in database-form on the website www.etymologiebank.nl.

Kortlandt dates "late Proto-Slavic" as late as 750-900 because in this period the last shared innovations, such as the rise of the neo-acute tone, are supposed to have taken place (2002a: 3, 2003b: 3-4).[5]

I made use of the following etymological dictionaries of Proto-Slavic: O.N. Trubačev's *Etimologiceskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov* (1974-), F. Sławski's *Słownik prasłowiański* (1974-) and R.H. Derksen's *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon* (2008).

1.2.2.2   *EAST SLAVIC*

From the East Slavic languages, Russian and Ukrainian forms are regularly given in the entries, whereas Belorussian forms are left out of consideration. Occasionally, Old Russian and Russian Church Slavic forms are cited.

For Russian, I made use of M. Vasmer's *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1953-1958). I used I.I. Sreznevskij, *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskago jazyka* (1893-1912) and A.A. Zaliznjak, *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt* (2004) for checking and supplementing Old Russian forms. The Ukrainian forms have been checked and supplemented from the *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy* edited by I.K. Bilodid (1970-1980) and O.S. Meľnyčuk's *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy* (1982–2006).

1.2.2.3   *WEST SLAVIC*

The West Slavic languages Polish, Czech, Slovak, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian and Polabian are regularly represented in the entries. Kashubian and Slovincian are only included when there is particular reason to do so.

For the West Slavic languages, I used the following sources. For Polish, I made use of A. Brückner's *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* (1927) and the *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* (2003, ed. S. Dubisz). For Czech and Slovak, I used V. Machek's *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého* (1957), which also includes many Slovak forms, as well as the *Slovník slovenského jazyka* (1959-1968, ed. Š. Peciar).

Upper and Lower Sorbian forms mainly derive from H. Schuster-Šewc's *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache* (1983-1996). Polabian forms derive from K. Polański and T. Lehr-Spławiński's

---

[5] When exactly we can date (the end of) "Proto-Slavic" remains a matter of terminological debate. Kiparsky, for example, dates Proto-Slavic at the beginning of the Slavic expansion, around the year 400 (1934: 12).

Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich (1962-1994) and K. Polański and J.A. Sehnert's *Polabian-English dictionary* (1967); I have applied the transcription used by Polański/Lehr-Spławiński.

1.2.2.4   SOUTH SLAVIC

Apart from Old Church Slavic, the South Slavic branch of Slavic consists of Slovene, Bulgarian and Macedonian (Macedonian is left out of consideration in this dissertation), as well as Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian and Montenegrin. The latter four languages were formerly generally called Serbo-Croatian and the standards of these languages are based on the same dialect, viz., the east Herzegovinian dialect codified by Vuk Karadžić in the mid-19th century. Although I am fully aware of the sensitivities regarding these languages and of the fact that from a political and sociological point of view we are now dealing with four different - standardized (or incipiently standardized in the case of Montenegrin) and acknowledged - languages, I have decided to stay close to the prevailing linguistic tradition and refer to all standard varieties in the dialect continuum as Serbian/Croatian (abbreviated S/Cr.).[6]

For South Slavic, I used the following sources: for Old Church Slavic, I consulted *Staroslavjanskij slovar'* (*po rukopisjam X-XI vekov*) edited by R.M. Cejtlin (et al.) (1999). For Slovene, I used the *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika* (1976-2007) edited by F. Bezlaj, M. Snoj, M. Furlan and S. Klemenčič (1976-2007) and M. Snoj's *Slovenski etimološki slovar* (2003). Slovene forms are mainly taken from M. Pleteršnik's *Slovensko-nemški slovar* (1894-1895) and rendered in Pleteršnik's orthography. Some dialect forms derive from T. Pronk, *The Slovene Dialect of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria* (2009).

For Serbian/Croatian etymologies, I used P. Skok's *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (1971-1973) and R. Matasović's etymological notes in the *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik* (ed. by V. Anić et al., 2002). I also consulted *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (JAZU, 1881-1976), *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika* (Beograd, 1959-). The cited Čakavian dialect forms from the Croatian island of Vrgada stem from B. Jurišić's *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II: Rječnik* (1973).

Bulgarian forms have been taken from the *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik* (1962-2002, ed. V. Georgiev, et al.) and the *Rečnik na bălgarskija ezik* (1977–, ed. K. Čolakova).

---

[6] In referring to dialects, I will nevertheless speak of, e.g., the 'Kajkavian dialect of Croatian', rather than the 'Kajkavian dialect of Serbian/Croatian'.

1.2.3   Slavic accentuation

The accentological framework in which this dissertation is written is based on the theories of Leiden Slavists and Indo-Europeanists, mainly of Frederik Kortlandt. Many publications by Kortlandt have been used in this dissertation, as well as a number of the accentological articles by Willem Vermeer.

I have used a number of the standard works on Slavic accentology: C.S. Stang, *Slavonic accentuation* (1957), V.M. Illič-Svityč, *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom* (1963) and its translation into English (1979), V.A. Dybo, *Slavjanskaja akcentologija* (1981) and A.A. Zaliznjak, *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj* (1985). T. Olander's *Common Slavic accentological word list* (2001) proved to be a valuable reference tool, especially for Dybo (1981), which lacks an index.

1.3   Monographs on Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic

The following section discusses the most important works that have been published on the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Three major monographs published on the subject will be reviewed, namely those by Stender-Petersen (1927), Kiparsky (1934) and Martynov (1963). Mladenov's *Staritě germanski elementi vă slavjanskitě ezici* (1908) is yet another monograph on Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. This work was unavailable to me, so I have not been able to discuss it here or make direct use of it, but all Mladenov's etymologies are treated by Kiparsky (1934). Gołąb's *The origins of the Slavs: a linguist's view* (1991) is strictly speaking not a monograph on the subject, but it will be discussed in this section because it extensively deals with the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and is one of the most recent publications on the subject.

1.3.1   Stender-Petersen (1927)

Adolf Stender-Petersen extensively discusses about 90 Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic that result from the earliest contacts between Slavic and Germanic tribes. He discusses the loanwords that he considers to be borrowed from Germanic before approximately the year 400. Stender-Petersen divides the loanwords into two periods of borrowing: words of "urostgermanische" origin and words of Gothic origin (thus excluding any West Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic). He dates beginning of the contacts after the operation of Grimm's law in Germanic, but in any case very early: "vielleicht schon einige Jahrhunderte vor unsrer Zeitrechnung, spätestens aber um Chr. Geb." (1927: 178).

According to Stender-Petersen, the Proto-Slavs did not, in the last centuries before the turn of the millennium, reach across the western Bug river into present-day Poland and to the Carpathian Mountains (1927: 111-112). He connects the earliest contacts to the migration of the Goths through the Proto-Slavic homeland (1927: 178), which he locates in the area comprising the Pripet Marshes in the west, the end of the steppe area in the south and in the northeast, the area up until the rivers Dvina, Oka and Don. This region comprises eastern Belarus, north-eastern Ukraine and a part of south-western Russia. Stender-Petersen thus locates the Proto-Slavic homeland much more eastwards than most other researchers tend to do (cf. §4.1.4).

Stender-Petersen states that his aim is to investigate the loanwords as an "organischer Teil einer allgemeinen Sprach- und Kulturerscheinung" (1927: v); a loanword is not only a "sprachliches Erzeugnis" but also a "Träger oder das Symbol eines geistigen Gehaltes" (1927: 71). To the oldest period of loanwords, Stender-Petersen assigns the words that are "Begriffe einer urgerm. Kultur" and, to the second period, words that reflect Germanic contacts with the Greek and Roman civilisation. Stender-Petersen thus treats the problem in the first place from the cultural-historical point of view. He even holds the opinion that "die Beweisfähigheit der sprachlichen Methode in allzu hohem Grade überschätzt worden ist" (1927: 70). Stender-Petersen concludes that in many cases it is impossible to decide on linguistic grounds whether a word is a loanword or not, but that it is possible to make the decision on cultural (i.e., semantic) grounds. Whereas this approach makes Stender-Petersen's book an interesting read, its main drawback is the lack of linguistic solidity on which some of the etymologies are based.

1.3.2   KIPARSKY (1934)

The most complete work on the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic is Valentin Kiparsky's *Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen* (1934). Kiparsky, a Finnish Slavist/Baltist, wrote his book as an answer to all earlier works on Slavic-Germanic linguistic relations, which are, in his view, either outdated (referring to Miklošič's *Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen* (1867)) or overreaching themselves (referring to Uhlenbeck's *Die germanischen Wörter im Altslavischen* (1893) and Hirt's "Zu den germanischen Lehnwörtern im Slawischen und Baltischen" in *Grammatisches und Etymologisches* (1898)). *Staritě germanski elementi vă slavjanskitě ezici* (1908) by Mladenov suffers, according to Kiparsky, from "tendenziöser Auffassung" (1934: 17). Kiparsky considers Stender-Petersen's *Slavisch-germanische Lehnwortkunde* (1927) to be incomplete because Stender-Petersen only treats the words that were borrowed

before ca. 400 and because he does not accept the existence of West Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic (1934: 17, 12-13).

Kiparsky aims to treat "jedes Wort, das wann und von wem auch immer als gemein- bzw. urslavisches Lehnwort aus dem Germanischen betrachtet worden ist." (1934: 17-18). While all loanwords that supposedly stem from Proto-Germanic or Gothic are treated, Kiparsky included the words that had been claimed to derive either from Balkan Gothic or from West or North Germanic languages/dialects only if the words had by earlier authors explicitly been considered to be borrowings into Proto-Slavic. Kiparsky's corpus is supplemented by the words that he himself regards to belong to one of the aforementioned groups. In case of doubt, he claims to have always decided to include the concerning word in his book (1934: 17-18). This modus operandi has made the book a very complete and useful overview of possible Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

Kiparsky reviews the supposed Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and groups them into several different categories according to their origin. Apart from the section *Gemeinslavische Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen* (1934: 168-270), which forms the core of his work, Kiparsky distinguishes the words that, in his view, do not belong to the corpus of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic because they are:
  1. inherited (1934: 22-108)
  2. borrowed from a language family other than Germanic (1934: 109-140)
  3. borrowed from Germanic into Slavic, but after the disintegration of Proto-Slavic (1934: 141-164).

Kiparsky distinguishes four periods in which loanwords from Germanic entered Proto-Slavic. In his interpretation, the loanwords stem from 1. Proto-Germanic, 2. Gothic, 3. Balkan Gothic and 4. West Germanic dialects.

The first contacts between Slavic and Germanic peoples are dated and located "in den ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderten (also bereits in einer wesentlich urgermanischen Zeit) in Ostpreussen", when the ancestors of the Goths had moved from Scandinavia to the continent (1934: 183). Kiparsky regards these supposed contacts to be with speakers of Proto-Germanic (occasionally also called "vorgotisch"), and attributes to Stender-Petersen the proof that this layer of loanwords in Proto-Slavic did exist. In §4.1, it will be nevertheless argued that there are no indications to assume a layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

The second period that Kiparsky distinguishes consists of Gothic loanwords that the Slavs borrowed when they came in contact with the Visigothic empire (1934:

192-193). Kiparsky adopts the dating provided by Stender-Petersen, who limits the Visigothic borrowings into Slavic to the period between 213 and 376, ending with the arrival of the Huns and the consequent outbreak of the Gothic War (cf. Stender-Petersen 1927: 171). This period was supposedly dominated by the transfer of Roman culture through Gothic to Slavic. The transfer of Greek cultural heritage went through Slavic contacts with the Ostrogoths and is dated to the period between the end of the third century and the end of the fourth century (Stender-Petersen 1927: 173-174, also Kiparsky 1934: 193).

The third period that Kiparsky distinguishes consists of words that were borrowed from the Germanic languages on the Balkan peninsula, after the bulk of Goths had moved from the Balkans to Spain and Italy. These loanwords are supposed to stem from contacts with Germanic peoples who remained in the Balkans in the fifth century. Kiparsky calls these loanwords "Balkan Germanic" or "Balkan Gothic" loanwords. The suggestion that these Balkan Gothic loanwords were indeed Proto-Slavic is, however, in conflict with Kiparsky's remark that "nur das Vorhandensein eines Wortes in lautgesetzlicher Form im Poln., Sorbischen und Polabischen zugleich […] ein sicheres Kriterium für nichtbalkangerm. Ursprung desselben [ist]." (1934: 215-216): if a word cannot be of Balkan Gothic origin if it is attested in Polish, Sorbian or Polabian, it follows that Balkan Gothic loanwords cannot be regarded as Proto-Slavic. It seems to me that if a word was borrowed in the fifth century in the Balkans or elsewhere, it still could easily have spread through the entire Slavic territory. Nevertheless, I think there are no grounds for assuming a layer of Balkan Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. On phonological grounds, Kiparsky does not distinguish between Balkan Gothic and 'classic' Gothic loanwords. He regards a word to be Balkan Gothic if it can formally best be explained from Gothic and is attested in South Slavic (from where it might have entered the other Slavic languages through Church Slavic), but when the actual Gothic form is unattested. Kiparsky thus mainly postulates a layer of Balkan Gothic loanwords because the corpus of Gothic texts is very limited. Moreover, it is from a cultural point of view unlikely that many words were borrowed by the Proto-Slavs from Goths that stayed behind after the large migrations of Visigoths and Ostrogoths towards Italy and Spain because the prestige and supremacy of the Goths in the area had disappeared. It turns out that many of the supposed Balkan Gothic loanwords can be explained from either Gothic or West Germanic (cf. §7.2).

The fourth and last period that is distinguished by Kiparsky consists of words derived from West Germanic dialects. He dates these contacts after the year 600, mainly on the basis of the fact that the Slavs are first mentioned to inhabit areas in present-day Germany in the early seventh century (viz., in the Chronicles of Fredegar, cf. §4.3). Kiparsky does not doubt that words borrowed from West

Germanic after 600 could have spread through the entire Slavic territory because there was "eine ostwärts gerichtete Kulturströmung" in Europe between the seventh and the ninth centuries that did not stop at the borders of Slavic territory. The words could spread over Slavic territory because it was a linguistically and culturally homogeneous area. This idea seems to be in conflict with Kiparsky's views on the Balkan Gothic loanwords, which would have been borrowed in the fifth century but did not necessarily spread though the entire Slavic area. Kiparsky dates the period of West Germanic borrowings until at least 800, but he does not rule out the possibility of even later West Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic (1934: 229).

When deciding whether or not a word is a loanword, Kiparsky bases himself in the first place on formal criteria ("sichere Lautgesetze"), whereas "semasiologische und kulturhistorische Momente" are taken into account in those cases where the sound laws are inconclusive (1934: 18). This is thus the opposite of Stender-Petersen's approach, who regards semantic and historical arguments to have priority when deciding about the origin of a word.

It is often difficult, as Kiparsky also notes, to decide about the origin of a word and sometimes, it is not even clear whether the word is inherited or borrowed. In those cases, Kiparsky on principle explains the word as inherited (1934: 18, 47, cf. §1.2.3 for Stender-Petersen's and Holzer's criticism of this approach). Kiparsky does not let the accentuation of the words in Proto-Slavic play any role in favour of or against deciding about Germanic origin. He includes statistic proof to show that the accentuation of the loanwords plays no role at all (1934: 18, 298). It will be shown in chapter 8 that this proof cannot be upheld and that the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic is not arbitrary at all and indeed provides valuable information about the loanwords (cf. §3.2 and chapter 8).

1.3.3   Reception of Kiparsky (1934)

1.3.3.1   *Review by Stender-Petersen (1936)*
Stender-Petersen starts his review of Kiparsky's work with a warning note: "Man muß von vornherein darauf gefasst sein, von anders denkenden zu einem elenden Stümper degradiert zu werden, wenn man es einmal versucht, von einem einheitlichen Standpunkt aus etwas Licht und Klarheit ins Chaos der slawisch-germanischen Lehnbeziehungen zu bringen." (1936: 247). The highly critical review continues in the same heated tone. Part of Stender-Petersen's criticism is certainly justified, but part of it seems to have been infused by spite:

the young Kiparsky had published on the same subject on which Stender-Petersen himself had just a few years earlier published a voluminous monograph.

Stender-Petersen is right in criticising the distinction Kiparsky applies between Gothic and Balkan Gothic. Stender-Petersen notes that the historical proof for close Germanic-Slavic contacts in the Balkans is poor and Kiparsky himself admits that he does not assume a radical difference between the language of Wulfila and the Balkan Gothic language (Stender-Petersen 1936: 248, cf. Kiparsky 1934: 216).

Stender-Petersen disapproves of the existence of a supposed layer of West Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and rather derives the Proto-Slavic Christian terminology from Gothic (1936: 250). Furthermore, Stender-Petersen criticizes the fact that Kiparsky treats the Slavic loanwords from West Germanic in two separate categories (1936: 249): a category of Proto-Slavic loanwords from West Germanic and a category of later West Germanic loanwords that cannot be regarded as Proto-Slavic. According to Stender-Petersen, the religious words that are attested in all branches of Slavic (and therefore give the appearance to be Proto-Slavic) are also "einzelsprachlich entlehnt" (1936: 249) and it is therefore wrong to put, e.g., PSl. * *popъ* 'clergyman, priest' and *postъ* 'fast, Lent' into one category and *almužno* 'alms' and *papežь* 'pope' into another, simply because the latter words are attested in a limited number of Slavic languages.

However, when Kiparsky distinguished between the (religious) words that were borrowed into Proto-Slavic and those that were borrowed at a later stage, he based himself not only on the number of languages in which these words are attested, but also on linguistic criteria. Kiparsky, for example, correctly regards *almužno* to be a late (post-Proto-Slavic) borrowing from Old High German because of the correspondence OHG *ă* ~ Slavic *a* (instead of expected *o* if the word were a Proto-Slavic loanword) and because the metathesis of liquid diphthongs is not reflected in the Slavic form (1934: 141).

Stender-Petersen in principle supports Kiparsky's division between Proto-Germanic and Gothic loanwords. As we have seen, Stender-Petersen himself distinguishes two periods of borrowings: a period of "urostgermanische" loanwords and one of Gothic loanwords into Proto-Slavic. He argues, however, against the way in which Kiparsky distinguishes between Proto-Germanic and Gothic loanwords into Proto-Slavic; the choice for attributing a word to one of these categories seems to be mainly based upon the question as to whether the word is attested in Gothic, whereas Stender-Petersen thinks the choice should be based on semantic criteria as well, not just on the question whether or not a word is attested in Gothic (1936: 251-252).

1.3.3.2   HOLZER (1990)

In his article "Germanische Lehnwörter im Urslavischen: Methodologisches zu ihrer Identifizierung" (1990), Holzer argues against Kiparsky's methodological choice "ceteris paribus stets eine einheimische Etymologie vorzuziehen": in dubious cases, Kiparsky principally decides to regard a word as inherited (1934: 47), which is a starting point that Stender-Petersen also calls "zweifelhaft" (1936: 253).

Holzer is right in arguing that when - at a certain time and place - words were borrowed from one language into another, the actual number of borrowed words does not play a role. Kiparsky's suggestion that it is more economical to assume that a word is inherited is therefore misleading (Holzer 1990: 60-61); in principle, any word in the recipient language can be a loanword. It can only be more economical to suggest native origin of a word if it enables us to spare a layer of loanwords in a language (for example a layer of Proto-Slavic loanwords into Germanic, which is controversial) or if it allows us to limit the borrowings to certain semantic fields (ibid.: 60-62).

Holzer argues for a number of the words about which Kiparsky decides in favour of native origin, that it is on probabilistic grounds ("von […] wahrscheinlichkeitstheoretischen Gesichtspunkten aus" (1990: 59)) preferable to regard the word as a Germanic loanword. In place of Kiparsky's methodology, Holzer uses two criteria to determine whether native or Germanic origin is more likely: the number of predictable corresponding phonemes and the semantic range of the possible donor word and the word in the receiving language (1990: 62). In order to illustrate his criteria, Holzer re-examines several words that Kiparsky sees as indigenous words. Holzer, for example, regards PSl. *molto* 'remains of the barley after processing' rather as a borrowing from Germanic *malta* 'barley' than a derivative of PSl. *melti* 'to grind' because it explains the vocalism of the Proto-Slavic form on the one hand, and does not presuppose a narrowing in meaning from 'grinded' to 'grinded barley' on the other hand (Holzer 1990: 62-64, cf. Kiparsky 1934: 46 and §6.1.2). The words discussed by Holzer will be treated in §6.2 and §6.3.

1.3.4   MARTYNOV (1963)

Just as Stender-Petersen, Viktor Vladimirovič Martynov only treats the oldest Slavic-Germanic contacts. Martynov does not discuss possible Proto-Slavic loanwords from West Germanic dialects. Other than his predecessors, Martynov does not only assume the existence of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, but also a substantial layer of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Proto-Germanic.

Martynov investigates the supposed Slavic-Germanic contacts between the fifth century BC and the first century AD within the framework of the so-called "Weichsel/Oder hypothesis" about the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland (1963: 3, cf. §4.1.4). He locates the Proto-Slavic homeland in the Vistula (Weichsel) and Oder basins in the western part of present-day Poland in the fifth to third centuries BC (note that this location is about 1200 kilometres more to the west than the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland as supposed by Stender-Petersen!). In this area, the Proto-Slavs supposedly bordered on the Proto-Germanic people. Martynov connects the Slavs to the Lusatian culture, an archaeological Bronze and early Iron Age culture that had its centre in present-day Poland and also comprised parts of surrounding areas. Martynov thinks that other ethnic groups must have belonged to the same archaeological culture as well because the Slavs were at that point probably too small a people to cover the entire Lusatian culture (1963: 6).

Martynov supposes that around the beginning of the first millennium, the Proto-Slavs comprised three archaeological cultures: the Oksywie (Oxhöft) culture, the Przeworsk culture and the Zarubintsy culture (1963: 7). The Oksywie culture is located around the Vistula estuary and has more generally been regarded as Germanic. The Przeworsk culture in south and central Poland and western Ukraine is of disputed nature: it has been connected to the Slavic homeland by those that place the Proto-Slavic homeland in Poland (as Martynov does), but the Przeworsk culture has also been thought to be either of Germanic or of mixed Slavic and Germanic nature (Mallory/Adams 1997: 470). The Zarubintsy culture has often been connected to the Proto-Slavs (ibid.: 657, cf. §4.1.4). The fact that Martynov connects these cultures to the living area of the Proto-Slavs around the beginning of the first millennium seems to imply that he thinks the Proto-Slavs moved eastwards again from their earlier homeland in western Poland.

Martynov criticises the earlier research into the problem of Slavic and Germanic linguistic relations: he considers other scholars to have been biased in viewing the problem from the viewpoint of supposed cultural hegemony of the Germanic peoples and that these researchers consequently did not allow the possibility of (a substantial number of) Proto-Slavic loanwords into Germanic (1963: 24-25). Martynov divides his corpus into two parts: a.) loanwords from Proto-Germanic into Proto-Slavic and b.) loanwords from Proto-Slavic into Proto-Germanic. The corpus of Proto-Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic consists of 32 words and the corpus of supposed Proto-Slavic loanwords into Proto-Germanic is slightly larger and consists of 40 words. Both parts are subdivided into borrowings with maximal, medial or minimal probability of actually being a loanword.

Martynov also distinguishes between two different types of loanwords: *proniknovenija* 'penetrations' and *zaimstvovanija* 'borrowings' (1963: 23). *Proniknovenija* supposedly take place when linguistic groups live in close vicinity to one another and are to a certain extent bilingual, whereas *zaimstvovanija* enter a language as result of trade and cultural influence, and thus require less cultural interaction. A *proniknovenie* is recognised by the presence of an existing absolute synonym in the receiving language. Martynov claims that it can be proven that a word is a *proniknovenie* if the word in the receiving language had a complete synonym, but a *zaimstvovanie* if the word did not have a complete synonym. When a *proniknovenie* enters the language which already has a word for the specific concept, this leads to a semantic shift within the lexical pair. According to this idea, information about the social and cultural relations between the two linguistic groups concerned can be obtained by the way in which the meaning within a lexical pair shifts (1963: 31-33, cf. Gołąb 1991: 356).

As we have seen, Martynov maintains a very early date for the beginning of the contacts between speakers of Germanic and Proto-Slavic. This theory hinges on the "Weichsel/Oder hypothesis" about the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland: Martynov considers the earliest contact zone to be in western Poland, and he dates a number of borrowings to the period before the fifth century BC (and before the operation of Grimm's law in Germanic). Martynov dates the Proto-Germanic borrowings into Proto-Slavic between the fifth century BC and the second century AD and includes in this group also the Gothic loanwords (on the grounds that the difference between Gothic or East Germanic and Proto-Germanic loanwords would often be hard to tell). The layer of Proto-Slavic loanwords into Proto-Germanic supposedly came about in a shorter period of time and has been dated before the collapse of Proto-Germanic (which Martynov dates to the third century BC) (1963: 24).

It will be shown in §4.1.4 that the "Weichsel/Oder hypothesis" is unlikely and that the homeland of the Slavs must probably be located more eastwards on the northern and north-eastern foothills of the Carpathian Mountains, where the Slavs remained out of reach of the Germanic peoples until the third century, when they came into contact with the Goths. Since the first contacts between speakers of Slavic and Germanic languages date from after the break-up of Proto-Germanic (cf. §4.1), there can be no question of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Proto-Germanic. Although it certainly cannot be ruled out that the Germanic languages took over loanwords from Slavic, these must be either borrowings into Gothic or borrowings into West Germanic languages/dialects (cf. §4.4).

Martynov strives to adduce an equal number of loanwords in either direction and criticises the scholars who suppose that the Germanic languages left more loanwords in Slavic than vice versa. Not only Martynov, but also Gołąb

(1991: 355), argues against the idea of cultural hegemony of the Germanic peoples over the Slavs in early Medieval times. However, the level of technological development of the Germanic peoples had increased significantly through their longstanding contacts with the Roman Empire and this can explain the larger number of Germanic loanwords in Slavic than vice versa (cf. §4.4).

1.3.5   GOŁĄB (1991)

In his work on *The Origins of the Slavs*, Zbigniew Gołąb deals quite extensively with the problem of Germanic and Proto-Slavic linguistic relations (1991: 337-392). He relates the earliest Slavic-Germanic contacts to the migration of East Germanic tribes through the Proto-Slavic homeland, when the Goths and possibly other East Germanic tribes took the route towards the south along the eastern ridges of the Carpathian Mountains. He considers, however, "the number of pre-Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic […] much smaller than that of Gothic words" (1991: 72).

Gołąb bases himself mainly on Kiparsky, Martynov and, for the accentuation of the loanwords, on Kuryłowicz (cf. §3.3). Gołąb, just as Martynov, supports the idea of the existence of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic because he considers it "*a priori* improbable that such a prolonged period of close Slavic-Germanic contacts left loanwords only in Slavic, leaving the other side, Germanic, untouched by any Slavic influences" (1991: 355).

Gołąb assumes that the contacts between the Goths and the Proto-Slavs lasted for about 500 years: the relations started about 5 AD when the Goths allegedly arrived from Scandinavia in the lower Vistula basin and ended in the fifth century when the Goths lost their power in the Pontic area (1991: 349ff.). He distinguishes two main periods of borrowing, which he connects to the "two main periods of prehistorical Slavic-Germanic contacts": an older period of contacts between the "Proto-Slavs (or rather their western tribes, the Veneti) and the Proto-Teutons (specifically, their eastern tribes, including the Burgundians, the Vandals, and the early Goths)" and a second period of contacts between the "Proto-Slavs (in this case the Antes and Sclaveni = Slověne) and the later Goths" (1991: 361). The contacts during the first period are located near the Vistula estuary before the migration of the Goths to the Pontic region and are dated until approximately the second half of the second century AD. The contacts with the so-called "later Goths" mainly refer to contacts with the Ostrogoths in the Pontic area, although Gołąb also mentions that the Goths who stayed for some time in Pannonia in the fifth century remained in touch with the Slavs as well. The end of the Proto-Slavic relations with East Germanic

tribes has been dated to the sixth century (1991: 362). Gołąb limits the borrowings from Germanic into Proto-Slavic to around the year 600, because after around 600, the Slavs covered a large area and Proto-Slavic started to show increasing dialectal differentiation (1991: 378), implying that words borrowed after around 600 cannot have a pan-Slavic distribution.

Gołąb essentially distinguishes four periods of borrowings into Proto-Slavic: borrowings from Eastern Proto-Germanic taken over before the second century AD; from Gothic taken over between the second and fourth centuries; from Balkan-Gothic taken over in the fifth and sixth centuries; from Old High German (1991: 361, 378). Although he mainly credits Kuryłowicz for making this classification, the classification originally stems from Kiparsky (1934, cf. §3.4.1, §3.4.3). Gołąb regards the West Germanic loanwords as a problem because of the extensive spread of and dialectal variation in Slavic from the seventh century onwards. He therefore thinks that the Old High German loanwords were initially borrowed into "the dialects of the westernmost Slavic peoples", Slovenian, Czech, Sorbian and possibly Polabian and "eventually spread throughout the Slavic world penetrating from one Slavic dialect to another" (1991: 378).

In the monographs discussed in this chapter, scholars have expressed different views on the date and nature of the earliest contacts between the Proto-Slavs and Germanic tribes. All scholars depart from a layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords and a layer of Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, and Kiparsky and Gołąb also take West Germanic loanwords into account. In chapter 4, I will discuss modern research into the homelands of the Slavs and the Germanic peoples and the indications this gives for the date and location of the earliest contacts between Slavic and Germanic tribes. It will turn out that there are no grounds to assume the existence of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic because the Germanic and Slavic homelands were located too far away from one another. Because Proto-Slavic remained a linguistic unity until the early ninth century, Kiparsky and Gołąb are correct in including West Germanic into the corpus of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

2 THE PROTO-SLAVIC PROSODIC SYSTEM

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In his book *Slavonic accentuation*, Christian Stang (1957) has classified the prosodic features of Proto-Slavic, viz., vowel length, place of the stress and tone, into three accent paradigms (AP), which he called (a), (b) and (c). At the end of the book, he summarises the general characteristics of the three accent paradigms as follows:

> "a. Acute, which can occur on any syllable, and which keeps its stress constantly throughout the paradigm.
>
> b. Neo-acute, which can occur on any syllable, provided that other forms of the paradigm or the etymological group concerned have stress on the subsequent syllable, and provided also that no skipping of syllables ever takes place in the process concerned.
>
> c. Circumflex, which occurs on the first syllable when other forms of the paradigm have the stress on the last syllable." (1957: 179).

The description given by Stang reflects the stage that can be reconstructed as the final stage of Proto-Slavic. It was later discovered that the three Proto-Slavic accent paradigms go back to an earlier system that had two accentuation patterns: a pattern with fixed stress on the stem, to which belong AP (a) and AP (b), and a pattern with mobile stress, which corresponds to AP (c). In AP (a), the stress remained on the stem, whereas in AP (b), a new mobile paradigm was created by a series of accent shifts. In the following sections, the properties and the historical development of the three accent paradigms will be discussed in more detail.

2.2 AP (A)

AP (a) has fixed stress and acute intonation on a stem syllable. The stressed syllable always reflects a heavy syllabic nucleus, which means that the stressed vowel is either a long vowel $*\bar{e}$, $*\bar{o}$ or a short vowel or syllabic resonant followed by a laryngeal or tautosyllabic resonant (Vermeer 1992: 120). It was shown by Werner Winter that the reflexes of the PIE voiced unaspirated stops caused preceding vowels to become long and acute in Balto-Slavic. Kortlandt explains this phenomenon in terms of the glottalic theory: he sees the fact that the PIE voiced unaspirated stops yielded an acute in Balto-Slavic (whereas the PIE lengthened grade, conversely, is never reflected by an old acute) as comparative

evidence for Gamkrelidze and Ivanov's theory that the PIE stops *b, *d, *g were in fact (pre-)glottalized (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1973). This development has been called Winter's law and has been reformulated by Kortlandt as the transfer of the laryngeal feature from a glottalic consonant to a preceding vowel (Kortlandt 1977: 2, 1978a, cf. Vermeer 1984: 335). Kortlandt supposed that in Balto-Slavic, the laryngeal part of these preglottalized stops merged with the reflex of the PIE laryngeals and yielded an acute intonation. Kortlandt, thus, states that the acute intonation of AP (a) was caused by the PIE laryngeals and glottalized stops only, rather than being a reflex of all types of PIE length: long vowels that resulted from a PIE lengthened grade and from contractions did not become acute (e.g., 1975: 22, 1978a: 110).

The view that AP (a) reflects the glottalization of the PIE voiced unaspirated stops *b, *d, *g and of the laryngeals forms one of the most important theories of the Dutch accentological school. This view has not, however, been universally accepted. According to the traditional view, the Balto-Slavic acute intonation resulted from any long vowel: a sequence of a vowel and laryngeal yielded a plain long vowel which merged with the reflex of the PIE lengthened grade. The acute intonation developed at a later stage. Vermeer, however, concludes to "know of no good example of a lengthened grade that is continued as an acute. It is rather the case that in both Baltic and Slavic such instances of lengthened grade as can be found persistently refuse to have an acute." (1992: 125-126).

This work is written within the theoretical framework devised by Leiden accentologists and therefore, I regard the acute intonation of AP (a) to result from the laryngeals and glottalized stops of PIE. When the glottal stop developed from a separate phoneme into a feature of the preceding vowel, it yielded a contour that is comparable to the broken tone that is found in Latvian and dialects of Lithuanian (Kortlandt, e.g., 1985b: 122). The broken tone was lost by the end of Proto-Slavic at some point after the operation of Dybo's law (see below) and yielded a short rising tone.

In the modern Slavic languages, the words that belong to AP (a) are generally characterised by fixed stress on the stem. The stressed vowel is reflected as short. AP (a) can synchronically, by and large, be recognised by:
- in general, the reflex of fixed stress on the stem, e.g., R *plug*, Gsg. *plúga* 'plough'.
- in (all case forms of) Serbian/Croatian, this is reflected as a short falling accent: *plȕg*, Gsg. *plȕga*.
- in Slovene, short stem stress in monosyllabic forms and long rising stem stress in polysyllabic forms: *plȕg*, Gsg. *plúga*.

2.3   AP (в)

At the last reconstructible stage of Proto-Slavic, the stress in AP (b) alternated between the final stem syllable and the first syllable of the ending. Stem-stressed forms in late Proto-Slavic have so-called neo-acute intonation. This neo-acute intonation is reflected as a short rising tone on light syllabic nuclei (i.e., syllables in which the vowel is the reflex of a PIE short vowel: PSl. *o, *e, *ъ, *ь) and as a long rising tone on heavy syllabic nuclei.

2.3.1   DYBO'S LAW

The mobility of AP (b) was created only towards the very end of the Slavic linguistic unity. For the larger part of Proto-Slavic, AP (b) was characterized by stem stress, just as AP (a). The difference between the two paradigms was that, while AP (a) was characterised by acute intonation, AP (b) had a rising tone. As a result of an accent shift that was discovered by V.A. Dybo and V.M. Illič-Svityč and has become known as Dybo's law, rising vowels lost the stress (if possible) to the following syllable. When the newly stressed vowel was long, it received a falling tone. At this point, jers in word-final position had already lost their stressability and therefore could not receive the stress (Kortlandt 2002a: 15). The circumstance that only rising vowels underwent this change excludes AP (a) and AP (c) from Dybo's law.

2.3.2   STANG'S LAW

Stang's law is an accent retraction that took place in a part of the word forms affected by Dybo's law, and therefore applied to words belonging to AP (b) only. According to Stang's law, a long falling tone in a final syllable (not counting final jers) lost the stress to the preceding syllable. The vowels that lost the stress according to Stang's law were the vowels that became stressed after Dybo's law and received a falling tone in those cases in which the vowel was long. The vowel that received the stress after Stang's retraction received a rising tone (Kortlandt 2002a: 17). This new rising tone is traditionally called neo-acute because it does not reflect an old acute nor a traditional circumflex (falling tone). The new rising tone merged with the short rising tone that developed after the acute tone of AP (a) was lost.[7] Stang's law has alternatively been called

---

[7] The terms acute and neo-acute refer to "etymologically defined vowels carrying certain prosodic properties" (Vermeer 1992: 120). They are not synchronically identifiable in late

Ivšić's law, most notably by Georg Holzer, Mate Kapović and Ranko Matasović.[8] It has been regarded as the very last common Slavic accentual development (Kortlandt 2002a: 17).

Not only Stang's law, but also Dybo's law has been dated relatively late in Proto-Slavic. Kortlandt assigns Dybo's law to the 'young Proto-Slavic' period, which he dates from 600 to 750. Stang's law has been dated to the subsequent period 'late Proto-Slavic' between 750 and 900 (2003b: 4). The view that Dybo's law took place relatively late in Proto-Slavic is not shared by all scholars. Holzer, for example, dates Dybo's law quite early in the relative chronology of the development of Proto-Slavic (2005: 44-46, cf. Kortlandt 2007a: 15). However, as absolute dating for Dybo's law, Holzer suggests "um die Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts" (2005: 46), which more or less corresponds to the dating suggested by Kortlandt. Ranko Matasović dates Dybo's law at the earliest around the transition of the eighth to the ninth centuries ("najranije prijelazom 8. u 9. stoljeće") (2000: 135) because of the fact that Dybo's law also operated on the late Germanic loanwords as PSl. *korljь 'king' from Germanic *Karl*, which probably refers to the name of Charlemagne (or Charles Martel, cf. §5.3) and must therefore have been borrowed in the (second half of the) eighth century (cf. §5.3). In a more recent article, Matasović dates Dybo's law considerably earlier, namely "sometime during the sixth century", after the borrowing of the large majority of early loanwords from Germanic in the fourth and fifth centuries (2007: 117). The accentuation of PSl. *korljь is, however, best explained if the borrowing of the word preceded the operation (or rather phonemicization) of Dybo's law because it would be hard to explain how the word would otherwise have joined AP (b).

Proto-Slavic: a short rising stressed vowel is called acute when it reflects a heavy syllabic nucleus, but as neo-acute when it reflects a light syllabic nucleus (ibid.).

[8] It is, however, confusing to refer to Stang's law as Ivšić's law because the term Ivšić's law comprises in fact several different stress retractions: the retraction otherwise known as Stang's law as well as the retractions from final and non-final jers to the previous syllable (Ivšić 1911: 169-177, 182-194). Kapović first suggested to use the term Ivšić's law for Stang's law (2005: 84 fn. 36), and he distinguishes between Ivšić's law (for Stang's law) and Ivšić's rule (for the retraction from weak jers) (2005: 82 fn. 30). Holzer distinguishes between the first Ivšić's law and the second Ivšić's law, the first Ivšić's law being "Stang's law" and the second Ivšić's law the retraction from (final and non-final) jers (Holzer 2005: 52-55, cf. Matasović 2008: 168). Kortlandt justifiably argues that these retractions are in fact three different developments, and that they should therefore also terminologically be separated (2007: 12-14, cf. 2002a: 15, 17).

2.3.3 THE *VOLJA*-TYPE

There is a group of disyllabic feminine *jā*-stems in Slavic, which have fixed stem stress throughout the paradigm, but "behave in other respects as if they go with type (b)" (Vermeer 1992: 122). The fixed stress of these feminine *jā*-stems can be explained by assuming that Stang's law applied in all case forms. The final syllable of the disyllabic feminine *jā*-stems regularly received the stress as a result of Dybo's law. The newly stressed final vowel was long in all case forms and thus received a falling tone. This resulted in the operation of Stang's law in the entire paradigm and, as a consequence, in fixed stem stress. The vowel in the final syllable in this group of disyllabic feminine *jā*-stems had become long because of Van Wijk's law: when the phoneme /j/ as the final element of a consonant cluster disappeared, the following vowel was lengthened, e.g., PSl. **vòlja* > **vòḷā* (Vermeer 1992: 129, cf. also Kortlandt 2002a: 14). This is the reason why these words had a long falling vowel in the second syllable, and why Stang's law applied in all case forms. From a synchronic late Proto-Slavic point of view, one can therefore also include these words under AP (a) (Kortlandt 2008a: 4), but historically, words of this type belong to AP (b). These words will be classified under AP (b) in this work because their borrowing into Proto-Slavic can be dated before the above-mentioned stress shifts.

Accent paradigm (b) can by and large be recognised by:
- in general: accentual mobility, without the traces of the falling tone that belong to AP (c).
- in West Slavic, reflexes of long vowels and diphthongs are retained as long: P *trąba*, Cz. *trouba*, Slk. *trúba* 'trumpet'.
- in the feminine *ā*-stems, stem-stressed forms are absent: all case forms have end stress (except for the *volja*-type *jā*-stems) (Vermeer 2001b: 22-23).

2.4 AP (C)

AP (c) has mobile accent. The stress alternates between the initial and the final syllable of the word. Forms with initial stress have a falling tone. As opposed to the mobility of AP (b), the mobility of AP (c) can be traced to Balto-Slavic times (Stang 1957: 179).

In the modern Slavic languages, AP (c) can, on the whole, be recognised as follows:
- The stem vowel is always reflected as short in West Slavic: P *ręka*, Cz. *ruka*, in contrast to AP (b) where the reflexes of long vowels are retained in West Slavic.

- In Serbian/Croatian, the stressed vowel is always long in monosyllabic case forms (*vôz* 'train', *grâd* 'town'). In disyllabic case forms, the stressed vowel is short on light syllabic nuclei but long on heavy syllabic nuclei (*vòza* vs. *grâda*) and in polysyllabic case forms, it is always short (*vòzovi*, *gràdovi*).
- In Slovene, the stem vowel in monosyllabic forms is always long and has a falling tone. In di- and polysyllabic forms, length can no longer be established because of the progressive shift from falling vowels: falling vowels in Slovene lost the stress to the following syllable and received a long falling tone, e.g., **grâdu > *gradû* (Vermeer 2001b: 23-24).

2.5   AP (D)?

Some scholars, for example those of the Moscow Accentological School, distinguish yet another accent paradigm, which has been labelled AP (d). This supposed accent paradigm only contains (originally barytone) masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root.[9] Evidence for AP (d) has mainly been found in dialects of Croatian because the words that supposedly belong to AP (d) are stressed according to AP (c) in most other Slavic systems. Croatian dialectal evidence seems to indicate that the AP (d) nouns were accented according to AP (c) in the NAsg. only (viz. with a long falling tone on the root), but in the oblique cases according to AP (b) (viz. with the stress on the ending). It has therefore been argued by Illič-Svityč that the merger of the barytone masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root with AP (c) was only partial and included the NAsg. case forms only (1963: 119 = 1979: 103-104). This would have resulted in a separate accent paradigm in Proto-Slavic. It is, however, questionable whether the existence of a fourth accent paradigm in Proto-Slavic can be substantiated (Vermeer 2001a: 131-161, Langston 2007). Kortlandt explains the spread of the final stress in the oblique case forms from the stress pattern of the *u*-stems, which had final stress in the genitive singular (2007b: 231-232).

---

[9] According to Holzer also neuter *s*-stems (2005: 40).

3 RESEARCH HISTORY ON THE ACCENTUATION OF GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

3.1 MEILLET (1909), LEHR-SPŁAWIŃSKI (1929)

Meillet was to my knowledge the first to write about the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. He states that "les noms empruntés au germanique ont en général l'intonation rude" (1909: 69). The loanwords from Germanic kept their original initial stress and secondarily received acute intonation in Slavic.[10]

This idea has long been followed and, in consequence, scholars have tried to give different explanations for words that differed from this rule: when a word belonged to a different accent paradigm, the reason for this was sought in secondary developments or the word was explained as being borrowed from a different language. Meillet considers the words PSl. *osьlъ 'donkey', *kotьlъ 'kettle' and *kъbьlъ 'tub; quantity of grain' borrowings from Latin *aséllum*, *catéllum* and *cupélleum* respectively because they supposedly reflect the Latin place of the stress, rather than the Germanic initial stress (1902: 186). Although Lehr-Spławiński rejects the Latin etymology of *kъbьlъ, he agrees with Meillet about the Latin origin of *osьlъ, *kotьlъ (1929: 706, but cf. also §8.3.2).[11]

Regarding the accentuation of the loanwords from Germanic, Lehr-Spławiński, just as Meillet, "constate aisément qu'ils ont conservé généralement l'accent sur leur syllabe radicale - laquelle était accentuée en germanique - et que cette syllabe accentuée apparaît toujours intonée rude" (1929: 707).[12] He demonstrates this by enumerating a number of well-known examples of Germanic loanwords with acute intonation, e.g., PSl. *bljudo 'plate, dish', *bordy '(battle) axe, bearded

---

[10] In the discussion of the theories advocated by Meillet, Lehr-Spławiński, Stender-Petersen, Kiparsky and Kuryłowicz, I avoid using the Stang-terms AP (a), (b) and (c). As the mentioned scholars themselves mainly do, I will refer to the words that in modern terms belong to AP (a) as 'acute', to those belonging to AP (b) as 'oxytone' and to those belonging to AP (c) as 'mobile'.

[11] PSl. *vino 'wine' would also be a loanword from Latin, corresponding to the stem-stressed form Lat. *vīnum*. The end stress in *vino is explained by Lehr-Spławiński as resulting from analogy to other end stressed words with the suffix -no (1929: 708). We can now easily explain the final stress in PSl. *vino by Dybo's law, regardless of the Latin or Germanic origin of the word.

[12] Although this article bears the title "Les emprunts latins en slave commun", it deals quite extensively with Germanic loanwords and their accentuation in Proto-Slavic.

axe' (cf. §1.1, fn. 1), *vitędźь 'hero, knight', *volxъ 'Romance-speaking person/people', *tynъ 'fence', *xyzъ/-a, 'small house, cottage', *bukъ/*buky 'beech(nut); book', *šelmъ 'helmet', *lixva 'interest, usury', *avorъ 'maple, plane tree' (cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. *avorъ), *xlěbъ 'loaf, bread', *skrin(j)a 'chest', *cьrky 'church' (cf. §5.3, s.v. PSl. *cьrky; reconstructed with AP (b) in this dissertation), *koldędźь 'well, spring' (1929: 708).[13] Although in his overview of loanwords, Lehr-Spławiński mentions a small number of words that do not have acute intonation "dont l'origine germanique n'est pas douteuse", e.g., PSl. *gorazdъ 'experienced, able', *cěsarь '(Roman) emperor', *myto 'toll, payment', the number of certain loanwords without acute intonation is in fact much larger (cf. §5.3 and §5.4). Lehr-Spławiński correctly places the words with a jer in the root apart and mentions that in these words the stress regularly shifts to the next syllable (1929: 708 fn.).

In his very short article regarding the accentuation of the Proto-Slavic feminine ū-stems that were borrowed from Germanic, Illič-Svityč proposes that these words joined the ū-stem declension in Proto-Slavic because here, AP (a) was predominant, whereas the feminine ā-stems included many mobile words as well (1961: 29-31).

3.2 STENDER-PETERSEN (1927), KIPARSKY (1934)

Although both Stender-Petersen and Kiparsky devote a chapter to the accent and intonation of the loanwords in Slavic in their respective monographs, they essentially disregard and reject accentological evidence. Stender-Petersen takes the view that:

> "eine solche Untersuchung nicht zu irgendwie feststehenden oder sonst entscheidenden Resultaten wird führen können. Gerade innerhalb dieses Gebietes können die mannigfachsten An- und Ausgleichungen gewirkt haben, deren Tragweite jetzt nicht mehr voll zu ermessen ist" (1927: 533).

While Stender-Petersen notes that the loanwords often have initial accent and that this initial accent supposedly continues the initial accent of Germanic, he concludes that the Germanic initial accent had no influence at all on the accentuation type in Slavic. He, furthermore, supposes that the words with oxytone stress might have been borrowed from Proto-Germanic before the

---

[13] For the sake of uniformity, I render the words in their Proto-Slavic reconstruction; Lehr-Spławiński cites the S/Cr. form.

Germanic fixation of the stress on the initial syllable (1927: 533-537), but this can hardly be correct.

Kiparsky acknowledges that the view that Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic as a rule became acute (as was, for example, held by Meillet) cannot be maintained because of the considerable number of words that do not have acute intonation. On the basis of this observation, however, Kiparsky concludes that the accent is no criterion at all in determining whether the word is a loanword (1934: 298-299).

3.3   KURYŁOWICZ (1951, 1952)

Kuryłowicz treated the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic in his book *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes* (1952) and in a separate article that was published one year earlier.[14] Kuryłowicz holds the view that the differences in accentological treatment of the loanwords from Germanic are caused by the fact that the words were borrowed in different periods. His explanation of the distribution of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic over the accentual paradigms has warmly been embraced and was followed, for example, by Kiparsky (1958), Martynov (1963: 27ff.), more recently also by Gołąb (1991) and, to a certain extent, Matasović (2000).

3.3.1   "PÉRIODE 1"

In Kuryłowicz's "période 1", when the earliest Germanic words were borrowed into Proto-Slavic, the accent in Germanic was already fixed on the initial syllable. According to him (but also to, e.g., Meillet, see above), the Germanic initial accent could only be retained in Proto-Slavic in the accentual type with acute intonation. The loanwords from Germanic received acute intonation secondarily because this feature came together with the fixed initial stress: "Le slave de l'époque antérieure à l'affaiblissement des yers n'a pu conserver cette barytonèse constante du thème qu'en lui conférant l'intonation rude. Les thèmes à tranche radicale intonable reçoivent par conséquent l'intonation rude" (1952: 275, 1958: 234-235). This happened in loanwords where the Germanic stem vowel was long or contained a diphthong, e.g., PSl. **bljudo* 'plate, dish', **bukъ*

---

[14] This article, with the title "Związki językowe słowiańsko-germańskie", was published in 1951 and reprinted in *Studia językoznawcze* (1987).

'beech(nut)', *xlěbъ 'loaf, bread', *lixva 'interest, usury', *lukъ 'onion', *stǫpa 'pestle, mortar', *šelmъ 'helmet', *volxъ 'Romance-speaking person/people'.

Kuryłowicz saw that the acute accentuation type did not allow words with fixed initial stress on traditional short vowels. The loanwords that were borrowed in the first period and contained a short stem vowel therefore became oxytones: "L'immobilité des thèmes à tranche brève ne peut être effectuée que par l'imposition de l'oxytonèse puisqu'il n'y avait pas, en slave, de barytons immobiles à vocalisme bref" (1952: 276, 1958: 234-235). This happened in, for example, in PSl. *kotьlъ 'kettle', *osьlъ 'donkey', *popъ 'clergyman, priest', *postъ 'fast, Lent', *skotъ 'cattle'.

3.3.2   "PÉRIODE 2"

Kuryłowicz dates the second period in which words were borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic after the weakening of the jers and the establishment of the neo-acute intonation. Words that were borrowed during this period would regularly have become oxytones (AP (b) in post-Stang terminology), viz., PSl. *korljь 'king', *lěkъ 'medicine', *lugъ 'lye, caustic soda', *pila 'saw, file', *skutъ 'hem; clothing covering the legs', *trǫba 'trumpet', *vino 'wine'. As the reason for this, Kuryłowicz assumes the shortening of the long acute, after which words with fixed stress on a long initial vowel did not exist in Proto-Slavic anymore: "Les substantifs germaniques à vocalisme long empruntés après l'affaiblissement des yers et après la constitution de l'intonation néorude, sont devenus oxytons en slave parce qu'entretemps, à cause de l'abrègement des longues rudes, les barytons immobiles à vocalisme long ont disparu de la langue." (Kuryłowicz 1952: 276, 1958: 234-235).

3.3.3   "PÉRIODE 3"

The youngest layer of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic supposedly retained the Germanic place of the stress on the initial syllable of the word, even on a short stem vowel, e.g., PSl. *petьlja 'noose, snare', *smoky 'fig (tree)': "La couche d'emprunts la plus récente semble constituée par les thèmes accentués sur une voyelle radicale brève […]. Ces emprunts ont été traités comme les formes slaves à accentuation néorude (accentuation de la more prédésinentielle)" (1952: 276, 1958: 234-235).

3.3.4   Discussion of Kuryłowicz's theory

Kuryłowicz's analysis of the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the accentuation patterns of Proto-Slavic has been superseded in several respects by huge progress that has been made in the field of Slavic historical accentology in the second half of the 20th century. As a result, a large part of his interpretation of the material has now become invalid. Especially the character and development of AP (b) and Dybo's law are important in this respect. In the following section, I will discuss the major points of Kuryłowicz's classification of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. It will be shown that Kuryłowicz's division cannot be upheld from a modern accentological point of view.

1. "Le slave n'a pu conserver cette barytonèse constante du thème qu'en lui conférant l'intonation rude."
It has now been established that AP (a) and AP (b) had the same stress pattern up until the operation of Dybo's law (cf. §2.3.1). The only difference between the two paradigms was the intonation of the vowel: the vowel in AP (a) was acute (which probably means glottalized), whereas the vowel in AP (b) was (non-glottalized and) rising (Kortlandt 2008a: 6). Since Dybo's law has been dated rather late in Proto-Slavic, it is reasonable to assume that the majority of loanwords were borrowed before this time, i.e., at the time when two accent paradigms with fixed initial stress existed. The loanwords from Germanic could, therefore, retain their original initial accent (up to almost the end of the Proto-Slavic period) in AP (b) as well.

2. "Il n'y avait pas, en slave, de barytons immobiles à vocalisme bref."
This point has also been superseded by the discovery of Dybo's law. Certainly, only words with stressed long vowels and diphthongs could follow the barytone accentuation type that has now been labelled as AP (a). However, in AP (b), both long and short stressed vowels as well as diphthongs could occur. This is indeed well attested in the many Germanic loanwords with a short stem vowel that follow AP (b) and these words are mentioned by Kuryłowicz as well (see above under "Période 1"). We must now reject Kuryłowicz's suggestion that the stress in these words had shifted to the final syllable at the moment the words were borrowed into Proto-Slavic in order to adapt the words to the existing stress patterns. The words were rather borrowed into Proto-Slavic with their Germanic fixed initial stress, which they retained until the words underwent Dybo's law at a later stage.

3. "Les substantifs germaniques […] empruntés après l'affaiblissement des yers et après la constitution de l'intonation néorude."
Kuryłowicz assigns a large number of Germanic loanwords in Slavic to the period after the weakening of the jers and the development of the neo-acute

intonation. However, these developments are now considered to have occurred very late in late Proto-Slavic: the neo-acute arose as a result of Stang's law, which can be regarded as the last accentual development in Proto-Slavic and has been dated to the ninth century (Kortlandt 1976: 2, cf. §2.3.2). After Stang's law, there were hardly any innovations in Proto-Slavic that were shared by all three branches of Slavic (Kortlandt 2002a: 16-17). Since the words Kuryłowicz attributes to his "période 2" clearly date from Proto-Slavic (they regularly underwent Proto-Slavic sound changes, e.g., the monophthongization of diphthongs, the development of nasal vowels), these words must have been borrowed when Proto-Slavic was still a linguistic unity and thus earlier than the weakening of the jers and Stang's law, from which the neo-acute intonation in these examples originated.

4. "l'abrègement des longues rudes"
This statement is based upon the traditional idea that the acute vowels were originally long. In accordance with this theory, Kuryłowicz supposes that the younger loanwords became oxytones (i.e., joined AP (b)) because acute vowels were shortened in an earlier period, as a result of which a fixed initial accent on words with a long stem vowel had become impossible. However, acute vowels are now considered to be indifferent with respect to length (Kortlandt 1976: 5).

5. "La couche d'emprunts la plus récente semble constituée par les thèmes accentués sur une voyelle radicale brève".
PSl. *petьlja and PSl. *smoky, Gsg. *smokъve regularly joined AP (b) (cf. §8.3.2). The words were originally stressed on the initial syllable and the stress moved to the next syllable with Dybo's law. The stress was then retracted to the initial syllable again when the jers lost their stressability, which resulted in fixed initial stress throughout the paradigm. In the NAsg. of PSl. *smoky, the stress moved back in analogy to the oblique case forms. Kuryłowicz also mentions the reflexes of PSl. *sǫbota, *sobota 'Saturday' in this category, but these forms are rather borrowed from Latin (Snoj 2003: 678).

3.4   RECEPTION OF KURYŁOWICZ (1951, 1952)

3.4.1   KIPARSKY (1958)
Kiparsky's article "Zur Datierung der gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen" (1958) is a reaction on Kuryłowicz's theory on the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Kiparsky accepts Kuryłowicz's theory and abandons his earlier accentological nihilism. He furnishes Kuryłowicz's

material with information about the accentuation of some of the words in Russian on the basis of material in old(er) Russian texts (chiefly based upon his book *O kolebanijax udarenija v russkom literaturnom jazyke* (1950)).

By giving an absolute dating for the three periods defined by Kuryłowicz, Kiparsky concludes that Kuryłowicz's first period, containing the oldest loanwords, ranges from the beginning of the first millennium until around 700, when the oldest Christian terms came into Slavic from Old High German. The second period of borrowings would contain (Balkan) Gothic as well as West Germanic (German) words and is dated to the eighth and ninth centuries and Kuryłowicz's third period dates from after the ninth century (Kiparsky 1958: 24). This dating can be considered problematic because the first period is very long (lasting more than six centuries!) and apparently comprises words from a number of donor languages, namely Proto-(East-)Germanic, Gothic and Old High German. Kiparsky maintains that loanwords from the eighth and ninth centuries can be of (Balkan) Gothic as well as West Germanic origin, even though the Goths had ceased to play a role of importance in the Balkans several centuries earlier. The dating of the third period after the ninth century is too late to have been Proto-Slavic. This chronology is thus not very convincing (and has for that reason been criticised in later works, e.g., Martynov 1963: 28, Gołąb 1991: 359), but doubtlessly results from a major problem that initially concerns Kuryłowicz's classification: as we have seen, Kuryłowicz considers the words that have (in post-Stangian terms) AP (b) on a light syllabic nucleus or AP (a) to belong to an early period of borrowings, whereas the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus belong to a later period. I assume that Kiparsky dated the second period to the eighth and ninth centuries because of the date of borrowing of PSl. *korljь* 'king' (from *Karl*, probably referring to Charlemagne). The hypothesis that the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus were borrowed any later than the words with AP (a) or AP (b) on a light syllabic nucleus is, nonetheless, not supported by any other evidence. All of these accentual categories contain words of Gothic origin and words of West Germanic origin. On formal grounds it is impossible to say that words in one of these categories were borrowed earlier than the words in the other categories. This is, apart from the accentological considerations elaborated upon above, the main reason to reject Kuryłowicz's theory.

3.4.2   Martynov (1963)

Martynov considers the earliest loanwords in Proto-Slavic to stem from the period when the Indo-European place of the accent was still retained in Germanic. He investigates whether the division made by Kuryłowicz still applies when one keeps this circumstance in mind. According to him, it does, but with

the following adaptation: an oxytone word with a long vowel or diphthong does not necessarily point to later borrowing because the end stress may also reflect Proto-Germanic oxytonesis (1963: 29-30).

Up until a certain stage of Proto-Germanic, the free Indo-European place of the stress was retained. Germanic must still have had the free place of the stress when Verner's law operated. According to Kluge, the stress became fixed (mainly) on the initial syllable around the beginning of the first millennium (1913: 34-35, 86).[15] In Martynov's own theoretical framework, in which the contacts between Proto-Slavic and (Proto-)Germanic are dated between the fifth century BC and the first century AD, it is possible that loanwords were borrowed before the stress in Germanic became fixed on the initial syllable of the word. However, it will be shown in chapter 4 that the earliest contacts between the Slavic and Germanic people could hardly start before the mid-third century, at which point the Proto-Germanic free stress had got lost.

3.4.3   GOŁĄB (1991)

Gołąb adopted Kuryłowicz's theory about the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic as well and does not add new insights to Kuryłowicz's classification. He criticises the chronology provided by Kiparsky (1958, see above) and refers to a "more detailed" chronology of the loanwords that was published by Kuryłowicz in an article titled ""Germanic-Slavic linguistic relations," (1964: 99-100)" (1991: 360):

> "[Kuryłowicz] gave a more detailed chronology of these loanwords in Slavic, without however quoting the linguistic (?) [question mark in the original] criteria upon which his chronology is based. Undoubtedly, the starting point was accentology, as previously proposed, but it became supplemented by additional information. In any case, he distinguished the following periods of borrowing or chronological layers of Germanic:
>
> I. - Borrowings from Eastern Proto-Germanic taken before the second century AD.
>
> II. - Borrowings from Gothic taken between the second and fourth centuries AD

---

[15] Kortlandt dates the fixation of the stress before Grimm's law in Gothic and after Grimm's law in the Northwest Germanic languages (1988: 9).

III. - Borrowings from Balkan-Gothic taken in the fifth and sixth centuries AD

Of course, there are loanwords whose chronological classification is controversial because of the lack of sufficient linguistic criteria. But the above chronology, which I will follow in the list of Germanic loanwords below, has greater value for a historian than the purely linguistic and rather too general chronology proposed by V. Kiparsky." (Gołąb 1991: 360-361)

Surprisingly, no article by Kuryłowicz from 1964 and with this title figures in Gołąb's bibliography, nor have I been able to find it elsewhere. I suppose that Gołąb has Kuryłowicz's 1951 article "Związki językowe słowiańsko-germańskie" in mind. In this article, a chronological layering is provided that is very similar to the one reproduced in the citation above (1951 = 1987: 401). This chronology is however not devised by Kuryłowicz himself; it is a summary of the chronologies postulated by Stender-Petersen (1927) and Kiparsky (1934), as Kuryłowicz himself faithfully notes (1951 = 1987: 401).[16] Gołąb is, thus, mistaken in supposing that the chronology cited above is Kuryłowicz's answer to Kiparsky's chronology in his article from 1958. Gołąb, furthermore, seems to imply that the three categories labelled as I, II and III are intended by Kuryłowicz to be identified with his "périodes" 1, 2, 3, but this can, obviously, not be the case because the chronologies postulated by Stender-Petersen and Kiparsky date from before the accentological classification devised by Kuryłowicz.

3.4.4 MATASOVIĆ (2000)

Ranko Matasović has examined the material that Kuryłowicz brought together in "période 2", i.e., the words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus. Matasović observed that this material is "vrlo […] raznorodna i dopušta i drukčije tumačenje [very diverse, and also allows a different interpretation]" (2000: 132). In his article, he therefore seeks different explanations for a number of these words, either as inherited words or as loanwords from another language. Kuryłowicz gives seven loanwords as examples for his theory (viz., *korljь 'king', *lěkъ 'medicine', *lugъ 'lye, caustic soda', *pila 'saw, file', *skutъ 'hem; clothing

---

[16] Gołąb does not reproduce the fourth category: West Germanic loanwords dating from 600-800 AD.

covering the legs', *trǫba 'trumpet', *vino 'wine').[17] Matasović provides a different explanation for four of these words:

- PSl. *pila might be an inherited word related to Lith. peĩlis 'knife'.
- PSl. *vino could be explained as a borrowing from vulgar Latin, rather than from Germanic, based on the fact that Germanic masculine words on the whole retain their gender in Slavic.[18]
- R trubá, Cr. trúba, Bg. trǎbá might have been borrowed twice, from vulgar Latin trumba 'trumpet' as well as from OHG trumba 'trumpet'.
- For the word *lěkъ 'medicine', Matasović allows the possibility that the word is not a loanword from Germanic at all, but instead a native word built on the PIE root *leikʷ- 'to leave' (2000: 132).

Matasović concludes that the regular accentological reflex of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic was AP (a): "germanske posuđenice s dugim prvim slogom zadržavaju mjesto naglaska na tom slogu, koji u praslavenskom dobiva akutsku intonaciju [Germanic loanwords with a long initial syllable keep the place of the accent on this syllable, which received acute intonation in Proto-Slavic]" and that this is "[…] u skladu s našim spoznajama o praslavenskim intonacijama [consistent with our understanding of Proto-Slavic intonation.]" (2000: 132). This implies that all loanwords with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic

---

[17] In his 1951 article, Kuryłowicz also mentions PSl. *stъlpъ (*stъlbъ) 'post, pillar' (1951 = 1987: 409), but this word is not to be regarded as a Germanic loanword. The word is probably related to Germanic forms as ON stolpi 'pillar', MDu. stolpe 'beam' and Baltic forms as Lith. stul̃bas 'pillar, column' (REW 3: 18, De Vries 1977: 551); Kuryłowicz did not include the word in the list of examples of borrowings in "période 2" in the overview in L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes (1958: 234-235).

[18] Cf. however §7.3.3, where it is shown that the word was likely to be originally neuter in Germanic as well.

nucleus must be explained otherwise. However, not all words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus can be explained away. In his article, Matasović leaves Kuryłowicz's other three examples PSl. *korljь, *lugъ, *skutъ aside. PSl. *korljь, above all, is evidently a loanword from Germanic, but the same probably goes for PSl. *lugъ and *skutъ. In §5.3, more words with AP (b) on a heavy syllabic nucleus are listed.

4 LANGUAGE CONTACT BETWEEN PROTO-SLAVIC AND GERMANIC TRIBES

4.1 THE GERMANIC AND SLAVIC HOMELANDS

In this chapter, it will be investigated when and where the contacts between speakers of Germanic and Proto-Slavic arose. In order to do this, the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland and the time and direction of the movements of Proto-Slavs out of their homeland into the areas where they came into contact with Germanic tribes will be examined.

4.1.1 THE PROTO-GERMANIC HOMELAND

The handbooks often mention that the Germanic languages originated in the first millennium BC in the north of present-day Germany and in southern Scandinavia (cf., e.g., König/Van der Auwera 1994: 1, Mallory/Adams 1997: 218-219, Ringe 2006: 213). Bennett regards the waters in between not to have been a major obstacle: "the Skaggerak and the Kattegat were then scarcely more than small bays or fjords, and the Baltic was a fresh-water lake that covered a much smaller area than it does today" (1950: 234).

Udolph assumes that the Germanic homeland was originally located more to the south. On the basis of onomastic and hydronymic evidence, he places the original Germanic homeland in "ein relativ enges Gebiet in Deutschland" corresponding to the south-western part of the former GDR. The area bordered on the river Elbe in the east. The Erzgebirge and the Thuringian Forest formed natural barriers in the south. A clear border in the west is absent, whereas the river Aller, north of the Harz, formed the northern barrier of the supposed Germanic homeland (1994: 925-926). Udolph supposes that the area in northern Germany and southern Scandinavia was only inhabited by speakers of Proto-Germanic after population growth compelled them to spread from their homeland in the last centuries BC (1994: 927). This theory of an expansion of Proto-Germanic people to the north and west is consistent with the onomastic evidence that Udolph adduces in his monograph, whereas a spread from a supposed northern (Scandinavian) homeland to the south and west is, in view of the onomastic evidence, much harder to picture (1994: 932).

Proto-Germanic has been dated to the last centuries BC, but not earlier than 500 BC (e.g., Ringe 2006: 213). Proto-Germanic as such would have come to an end as a result of the migration of the Goths, which can probably be dated to the second century AD (cf. Nielsen 2000: 238, Jellinek 1926: 4). Northwest

Germanic has been regarded as a gradually dissolving dialect continuum "during the first four or five centuries AD", which came to an end as a result of separate North Sea Germanic, early Norse and (Old) High German innovations (Nielsen 2000: 295).

There seems to be more or less general consensus in linking the Germanic homeland in northern Germany and in southern Scandinavia to the archaeological Jastorf culture. The Jastorf culture existed from around 600 BC until the turn of the millennium. The core area lies in northern Germany, in present-day north-eastern Lower Saxony, Holstein and western Mecklenburg. The southern part of the Jastorf territory shows archaeological influence of the La Tène culture, which is generally thought to be Celtic. The interaction between the Jastorf and La Tène cultures has been connected to the Celtic loanwords in Proto-Germanic (Mallory/Adams 1997: 218-219, 321-322). According to Dahl, the Germanic speaking tribes arrived in the area in northern Germany and Denmark shortly before the beginning of the first millennium AD. When Denmark became the major political power in the following centuries, the language spread to other areas of Scandinavia, which led to a homogeneous linguistic situation in Scandinavia in the first centuries AD (2001: 231).

The first mention of the Germanic people by the Romans stems from Julius Caesar in his *Commentarii de bello Gallico* (*Commentaries on the Gaulish War*). Caesar crossed the river Rhine during his conquests in Gaul in the middle of the first century BC. He describes the Germanic people he encountered along the Rhine (particularly the Suebi) as primitive and savage people, who had set their minds to invading the Gaulish territories across the Rhine. Roman knowledge of the interior of the Germanic lands remained scarce, although the advancement of the Roman army led to increasing contact with Germanic people from around the turn of the millennium (not only in the west, but also in other areas, for example, along the river Elbe and in Bohemia). From these contacts date the majority of Latin loanwords in Germanic. Almost all Latin loanwords are, however, supposed to have reached Old Norse only later or through mediation of other languages (Green 1998: 201).

4.1.2   THE GOTHIC HOMELAND

The Goths are probably the first Germanic tribe the Slavs came into contact with. The date and location of these contacts, however, remain subject to considerable debate, which is closely related to the question of the homeland of the Goths. The location of the homeland of the Goths and the way they travelled

from the Proto-Germanic homeland to the Black Sea coast, where they emerged in the early decades of the third century, is disputed among scholars.

The most important Roman work describing the early Germanic people is Tacitus' *De origine et situ Germanorum* (*On the origin and location of the Germani*, alternatively called *Germania*), that appeared in 98 AD. The work was probably partly based on material collected by the geographer Ptolemy. By the time Tacitus compiled his work, a sizable amount of information about the Germanic people had become available, mainly through writings of Roman commanders, emissaries and traders (Todd 2004: 2-5). Tacitus locates the *Got(h)ones*, who have of course been identified with the Goths because of the formal correspondence between the names, along the lower reaches of the river Vistula, but not directly bordering on the Baltic Sea coast:

> [240] […] Beyond the Lygii are the Gothones, [241] who live under a monarchy, somewhat more strict than that of the other German nations, yet not to a degree incompatible with liberty. Adjoining to these are the Rugii [242] and Lemovii, [243] situated on the sea-coast […] (Tacitus 1854: 336).

It has often been suggested that the Goths originated in a homeland along the Baltic coast from where they moved east of the Carpathian Mountains towards the Black Sea (cf., e.g., Nielsen 2000: 326-330). Historical descriptions are the main reason that the Gothic homeland has commonly been placed in northern Poland (after the Goths had allegedly crossed the Baltic Sea from Scandinavia). Nielsen, for example, on the basis of the historical sources, "safely conclude[s] that the Goths were settled in the lower Vistula area at the beginning of our era" (2000: 326).

This traditional view is based upon the description by Tacitus as cited above, as well as a description by Ptolemy, and on claims made by the Gothic historian Jordanes in his *De origine actibusque Getarum* (*On the origin and deeds of the Goths*, also *Getica*). The *Getica* dates from around 550, and was probably intended as a summary of the now-lost *Gothic history* that was written by the Roman statesman Cassiodorus. Jordanes almost certainly made use of earlier works by classical writers like Strabo, Tacitus and Ptolemy (Barford 2001: 35). According to Jordanes' saga, the Goths originally came from Scandinavia. From there, they moved southwards through a marshy area, which presumably refers to the Pripet marshes (Jellinek 1926: 4). Jordanes writes:

> IV (25) Now from this island of Scandza, as from a hive of races or a womb of nations, the Goths are said to have come forth long ago under their king, Berig by name. As soon as they disembarked from their ships

and set foot on the land, they straightway gave their name to the place. And even to-day it is said to be called Gothiscandza (Mierow 1915: 57).

Corroboration for the placing of the homeland of the Goths in Scandinavia has been found in Scandinavian toponyms as *Göt(a)land* (an area in southern Sweden) and *Gotland* (a Swedish island) (Nielsen 2000: 329).

Nevertheless, we have to be very careful with the use of the written sources. As Barford warns, "we tend to place too much faith in the truth of the written word": people are inclined to hold on to the things written down in chronicles and histories (2001: 5). The written texts that have come down to us survived largely by chance: the existing texts were often saved because they were copied in later times (with the possibility of later editing, shortening or misinterpreting the contents by later scribes). The surviving texts might not be a sample selection of the original body of writings. Barford reminds us that the writers of texts often acquired their information by a variety of indirect means, which can significantly decrease the reliability of the text. Tacitus, for example, wrote *Germania* without probably ever having been to Germania and based his description on earlier accounts, for example by Pliny and Ptolemy. Furthermore, the information the writer provides is often the result of his own interpretation and it is not always clear what message the writer wanted to convey in the text (ibid.: 5-6). Jordanes wrote *Getica* to glorify the history of the Goths, and might have chosen an appealing story out of the several existing legends of the origin of his people. The Scandinavian toponyms *Göt(a)land* and *Gotland* do not necessarily prove that the Goths originated there because names denoting tribes and peoples spread easily from one people to another, cf. §4.2 on the Veneti and §5.2, s.v. PSl. **volxъ*.

An entirely different theory about the origins of the Goths has been proposed by Mańczak (1987). He locates the Gothic homeland in the very southern part of the continental Germanic area. Mańczak departs from the premise that the closer languages are in a geographical sense, the more lexical stock they have in common. He illustrates this by comparing parallel texts in a number of Germanic languages. In accordance to this idea, it follows that if the Gothic homeland were indeed in Scandinavia, Gothic should have most lexical similarities with Swedish. However, Mańczak demonstrates that Gothic surprisingly shares the least lexical correspondences with Swedish, out of all modern Germanic languages included in the research. The degree of lexical similarity between Gothic and the investigated languages increases towards the south of the continental Germanic language area: Mańczak observed the most lexical similarities between Gothic and the Upper German dialects of High German. Gothic is thus lexically closer to the southern West Germanic dialects

than to the languages of Scandinavia.[19] On the basis of this, he concludes that the "homeland of the Goths was not in Scandinavia, but in the southernmost part of ancient Germania" (1987: 5). Much can be said about this method and the results that can be achieved by comparing the vocabulary in parallel texts are dubious. This is shown by the fact that Mancźak places the Proto-Slavic homeland in the Oder and Vistula basins, as a result of an investigation into the lexical convergences between the Slavic languages on the basis of fragments of the gospels in the modern Slavic languages (2009, cf. §4.1.4 about the "Weichsel/Oder theory").

The idea of the southern location of the Gothic homeland is, however, supported by Kortlandt, who regards a "large-scale migration of Goths from the Baltic to the Black Sea […] highly unlikely" (2002b: 2). The reasons he adduces for this are that there is firstly a "clear discontinuity between the Przeworsk culture in Poland and the Černjahov culture in the Ukraine which are identified with the Goths before and after the migration", secondly that there is no evidence for a large-scale migration of Goths through the Slavic homeland before they were stirred by the arrival of the Huns in the fourth century. And as a further argument, he reasons that people tend to migrate towards areas of "more stable climatic conditions" and better living conditions. Bearing these factors in mind, it would be highly unexpected that the Goths moved "from the richer upland forest into the poorer lowland steppe" (ibid.).

The Roman Empire posed great attraction to the 'barbarians' living north of the Roman Empire and many groups moved towards the limes along the Danube in search of wealth (Barford 2001: 23ff.). Attacks of 'barbarians' led to considerable depopulation in the northern Roman provinces that bordered on the river Danube. We would therefore rather expect the Goths, like other Germanic peoples before them, to move southwards towards the Roman Empire. For these reasons, Kortlandt agrees with Mańczak in locating the homeland of the Goths in Lower Austria, where different East and West Germanic tribes may have met on their way towards the Roman Empire. From Lower Austria, they would have followed the river Danube until reaching the Black Sea (2002b: 3).

Gothic has a number of loanwords from Celtic that are attested only in Gothic and not in the other Germanic languages: Goth. *siponeis* 'disciple', *kelikn* 'tower',

---

[19] It must, however, be noted that Gothic shares a number of phonological and morphological correspondences with North Germanic, which are not shared by West Germanic (cf. Jellinek 1926: 11-13).

alew 'oil' and *lukarn* 'lamp' (Green 1998: 156-158, cf. Kortlandt 2002b: 3).[20] It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that these words were borrowed after the Goths had split off from the Proto-Germanic dialect continuum. Green explores the possible areas where this contact between Goths and Celts may have come about and suggests Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia or the Balkans (1998: 156-158). The most obvious place of contact seems to be Moravia (cf. Kortlandt 2002b: 3), but this is difficult to connect with the idea of a Gothic migration from the Baltic east of the Carpathian Mountains to the Pontic area. The existence of Celtic loanwords in Gothic thus seems to corroborate the idea of a southern Gothic homeland.

Whichever way the Goths went, they are first recorded by the middle of the third century, when they started raiding the Roman Empire. In 238, the Goths raided the town of Histria on the coast of the Black Sea in the Roman province of Moesia inferior. In 271, after numerous other attacks on the Roman Empire, the Romans yielded the province of Dacia (that bordered the Danube in the south and the foothills of the Carpathian Mountains in the north) to the Goths. Hereafter, the Roman frontier was established along the Danube. In the course of the fourth century, most Goths became (Aryan) Christians, partly due to the works of Wulfila, who was the first Gothic bishop and translator of the Bible. However, already before Wulfila made his translation of the Bible around 369, the Goths had come into contact with Christianity (Jellinek 1926: 7ff.). When Christian Goths were persecuted in their home-province of Dacia, they were allowed to settle as *foederati* in the Roman province of Moesia, where they received protection in exchange for which they had to provide soldiers to serve in the Roman army.

From the fourth century onwards, a division can be made between Visigoths and Ostrogoths. The Ostrogoths had a large empire east along the river Dniestr, which became subjected to the Huns when they arrived in Europe. In the early fifth century, the Visigoths and Ostrogoths began moving westwards and established empires in present-day Spain and Italy, respectively. After the migration of the Goths to the west, smaller contingents of Goths remained in the Balkans, but they had lost their position of power. After the sixth century, no mention of presence of the Goths in south-eastern Europe is made, until the ninth century, when the Frankish monk Walafrid Strabo writes that in the

---

[20] Green mentions the possibility that the latter two words, and possibly Goth. *siponeis* as well, were transmitted from Celtic to Gothic through the Cimbri, probably a Germanic people (1998: 157-158).

Dobrudja area (a region in present-day eastern Bulgaria and Romania), the Gothic language was used in church (cf. §1.2.1.2). Up to the 16th century, a dialect of Gothic remained as a spoken language in the Crimea.

4.1.3   THE HUNS AND THE AVARS

Large-scale wanderings of people over Europe started during the Migration Period, which, in particular, consisted of raids of various Germanic tribes into the Roman Empire. The Migration Period was evoked by the emergence of the Huns in Europe and took place approximately from the fourth to sixth centuries. The Huns were a configuration of Central Asian tribes that roamed Europe and caused massive upheaval in the late fourth century and the first half of the fifth century. They first appeared around 370 north of the Black Sea, where they subjugated first the (Iranian) Alans and a couple of years later also the Ostrogoths. Soon, the Huns built a huge empire that, at its peak, stretched far into modern-day Germany. Almost immediately after the death of the Hunnic leader Attila in 453, the Hunnic empire collapsed.

The Huns were in all likelihood a relatively small group of horsemen, who were joined by other ethnic groups along their way into central Europe (Barford 2001: 33ff.). It is not entirely clear what language the Huns spoke, but they are often regarded as a Turkic tribe. Three words are recorded in the Hunnic empire. The Byzantine historian Priscus of Pannia, who travelled through the Hunnic lands, described two drinks: *medos* (a substitute for wine) and *kamon* (a drink made of barley that was offered to the servants). Jordanes uses the word *strava* to describe the wake at the funeral of Attila. These words give few clues about the language(s) spoken in the Hunnic empire: *medos* is very likely to be mead and might be a Slavic word, but could also be Germanic or another Indo-European language. The word *kamon* cannot be linked to any language. *Strava* exists in the modern West and East Slavic languages and means 'food', although it is unclear whether the Slavic word *strava* can be connected to the *strava* at Attila's funeral wake (Schenker 1995: 6).

About a century after the disappearance of the Huns, another nomadic tribe entered Europe over the lowland plains in the east. These were the Avars. From the second half of the sixth century onwards, the Avars had their centre of power in the Carpathian Basin, but they held supremacy over the inhabitants of a large part of central Europe until they were ultimately defeated by Charlemagne around 800. After capturing the Avar fortress that was situated somewhere between Carinthia and the Danube in 795/796, Charlemagne established the so-called Avar March in the east of his empire in order to protect his empire from raids of the Avars. This made the (mainly Slavic) inhabitants of

the Avar March, which comprised present-day Lower Austria, Burgenland and northwest Hungary, tributary to the Frankish Empire. Hereafter, the Avars disappeared as rapidly as the Huns had done a couple of centuries earlier. As with the Huns, the ethnic origin of the Avars is not entirely clear. Many scholars regard the Avars to be a Turkic tribe from Central Asia. Nichols put forward the theory that the Avars were in fact an Iranian tribe (probably Alans, an East Iranian tribe deriving from the Sarmatians). She bases this on the fact that there is hardly any linguistic evidence that the Proto-Slavs had been in close contact with speakers of a Turkic language (1993: 387-388). Lunt suggested that Proto-Slavic functioned as a *lingua franca* within the Avar khaganate because this would explain how the language was able to spread over a large area in a relative short period of time and remained relatively stable until the beginning of the ninth century (1984-1985: 421-422).

The violent raids of the Huns caused Germanic tribes to start moving around in search of safety. They sought their refuge in the safer and economically more developed territory of the Roman Empire. The movements of the Germanic tribes are part of the first stage of the Migration Period and lasted from the last few decades of the fourth century until the first half of the fifth century.

The second half of the fifth century and the early sixth century are characterised by the arrival of the Proto-Slavs in the areas vacated by Germanic peoples. The areas newly populated by the Slavs were, however, not completely devoid of inhabitants. Although archaeological finds show a decrease of population density after the Migration Period, there are no archaeological signs that large areas were completely depopulated (Brather 2008: 61). Neither is there any evidence that the areas where the Proto-Slavs are supposed to have lived originally significantly depopulated when they made their appearance in central Europe. One must for that reason assume that the enormous spread of the Slavs in a short period of time is largely due to assimilation by other linguistic groups, probably mainly speakers of Germanic (Barford 2001: 46, cf. Brather 2008: 61). After their expansion, the Slavs inhabited the larger part of present-day central and eastern Europe.

4.1.4   THE PROTO-SLAVIC HOMELAND

No consensus exists about the location of the homeland of the Proto-Slavs before they had moved into central Europe. The following section gives an overview of the indications we have for establishing the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland.

The Slavs are not mentioned at all in writings by classical authors before the sixth century. This is significant, for the classical writers did show a lively interest in the Celtic and Germanic peoples inhabiting their neighbouring lands in central and northern Europe. This disparity can only be explained by the fact that the Proto-Slavs were unknown to the Romans until after the Migration Period and lived outside the sphere of influence of the Roman Empire.

In Roman times, the amber route formed a well-travelled trade route from the Baltic coast through contemporary western Poland, Silesia and the eastern part of the Alps to the Roman port of Aquileia. Through the trading of amber, the Romans had long been in touch with the peoples along this route. These were probably Germanic peoples, given the fact that the Romans borrowed the word for amber from Germanic (cf. §4.6.2). Had the Proto-Slavs lived along this trading route and occupied themselves directly or indirectly with amber trade with the Romans, then the Romans would certainly have mentioned the Slavs in their accounts. It follows that the Proto-Slavs did not originally live within the reach of the amber trading route between the Baltic Sea through present-day western Poland to the Mediterranean Sea. This negative evidence is corroborated by the absence of a word for amber in Proto-Slavic. Russian borrowed *jantar'* from Lith. *gintāras* 'amber', and the word was borrowed from Russian into a number of other Slavic languages, e.g., Ukrainian, Czech, Serbian/Croatian and Slovene (cf. Schenker 1995: 4, Gołąb 1991: 338, REW 3: 491). P *bursztyn* stems from Germanic (cf. G *Bernstein*), and S *ćilibar*, Bg. *kexlibar* stem from Turkic (cf. Turkish *kehribar*).

Evidence on the basis of tree names seems to place the Proto-Slavs even farther eastwards. Proto-Slavic lacks inherited words for beech, European larch, noble fir or yew tree. The occurrence of these trees has been placed west of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa. This might indicate that the Proto-Slavs lived to the east of the above-mentioned line (Juškova 2006: 148). However, pollen analysis has shown that the spread of, for example, the beech in the past was much more restricted than today. In prehistory, the eastern range of the beech reached only as far as the river Elbe, instead of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa (Birnbaum 1973: 407-408). If this is correct, it would place the Proto-Slavs only east of the river Elbe, but since there is no evidence that the Proto-Slavs originally lived across the Elbe anyway, this would add nothing new to our knowledge.

Proto-Slavic lacks nautical terminology: there are no words relating to seafaring, boatbuilding, sea fishing and sea trade that can be reconstructed for Proto-Slavic (Schenker 1995: 4). PSl. *morje* 'sea' probably originally meant 'marsh'; in Russian dialects, the word is attested in the meaning 'lake' (REW 2: 157-158). PSl. *ostrovъ* 'island' is a compound of the preposition **ob-* and **strov-* that derives

from the verbal root meaning 'to flow, stream' (Derksen 2008: 379). PSl. *ostrovъ* 'island' thus literally means 'circum-flow', which suggests that it originally referred to islets in rivers, rather than in the sea. According to Meillet, this "détail de vocabulaire confirme que les Slaves étaient essentiellement des terriens et que la mer est entrée tardivement dans leur vie, bien qu'ils en aient toujours eu quelque notion." (1927: 8). The absence of a maritime vocabulary in Proto-Slavic indeed strongly indicates that the Proto-Slavs did not live along the coast.

So far, only negative linguistic evidence concerning the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland has been adduced. This evidence places the homeland: 1. out of the range of influence of the Roman Empire, 2. to the east of the amber trade route and possibly of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa and 3. away from the Baltic Sea.

This evidence combined makes the so-called "autochthonous theory" or "Weichsel/Oder theory" about the location of the Proto-Slavic homeland highly improbable. According to this theory, which has mostly been adhered to by Polish scholars, the Proto-Slavs originally lived in present-day western Poland, in the territory between the rivers Vistula and Oder from the second millennium BC onwards (a current adherent is, e.g., Mancźak 2009). The theory connects the Proto-Slavs to the archaeological Lusatian culture (Schenker 1995: 1-2). Martynov is also one of the advocates of the "autochthonous theory" (1963: 5) and he connects the earliest contacts between the Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic peoples to this western location of the Proto-Slavic homeland (cf. §1.3.4). Historical and linguistic evidence, however, makes the presence of Proto-Slavs anywhere west of the river Vistula before the second century AD highly improbable.

The most extensive study of the Proto-Slavic homeland on the basis of hydronyms is made by Udolph (1979). He investigated the names for rivers, streams, marshes, etc., in the entire area that is today inhabited by Slavs. On the basis of this, he places the Proto-Slavic homeland on the northern and north-eastern foothills of the Carpathians "etwa zwischen Zakopane [near Kraków] im Westen und der Bukowina im Osten [approximately to the town of Chernivtsi in southwest Ukraine]" (1979: 619). Although the exact borders of the Proto-Slavic homeland cannot be determined, Udolph supposes an area of about 300 kilometres from east to west and about 50 to 150 kilometres from north to south (1979: 623). This location places the Proto-Slavs to the west of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa, which defies the already questionable evidence from the spread of trees and tree names. In the area on the north-eastern foothills of the Carpathians, Udolph has found: 1. the largest number of appellatives that are reflected in all branches of Slavic, 2. the largest concentration of hydronyms

derived from appellatives that are otherwise only attested in South Slavic, as well as 3. hydronyms that preserve old ablaut forms (1979: 619-620). This location is, I think, is the most likely site of the Proto-Slavic homeland. Udolph dates the residence of the Proto-Slavs in this homeland to the period before 500 because they shortly afterwards first appeared in the Balkans. He supposes that the Proto-Slavs occupied only a small area until the beginning of the first millennium (1979: 623).

Gołąb regards the location of the Proto-Slavs on the foothills of the northern Carpathians around the beginning of our era "demographically impossible" because he considers these areas (with its dense forests and poor soil) to be chiefly refuge areas. Rather than being a permanent habitat, the foothills of the mountains would have attracted Proto-Slavs in times of demographic upheaval (1991: 262). The concentration of Slavic hydronyms in the sub-Carpathian zone is explained by Gołąb by the general density of streams and brooks in this area because of the hilly territory, on the one hand, and by the general late colonization of the Carpathian foothills, on the other hand, as a result of which the Slavs would have been the first ones to name the waters instead of taking over pre-existing names as they might have done in the more exposed forest steppes.

The location of the Proto-Slavic homeland as supposed by Udolph places it south of the Pripet (Pinsk) Marshes. The Pripet Marshes form an immense territory of wetlands on both sides of the river Pripet and its tributaries. It is the largest swampland in Europe and consists of impenetrable woods that are interspersed with swamps and streams. The natural conditions and frequent floods in spring and autumn make the area unattractive for human population and make agriculture difficult (even today, the Pripet Marshes are not densely populated, which is one of the reasons why it was decided to build the ill-fated nuclear power plant in the town of Chernobyl). Being rather impenetrable, on the one hand, and unhealthy, on the other hand, the Pripet Marshes themselves form a very unlikely location for the Proto-Slavic homeland. It can rather be supposed that the Proto-Slavs originally lived in an area bordering the Pripet Marshes. Hydronymic evidence places the early Balts to the north of these marshes (Gołąb 1991: 248).

It has often been tried to connect the Proto-Slavs to one or more archaeological cultures. This is a hazardous undertaking and not one that has proven to be very

successful (Brather 2004: 214).[21] According to Brather, all attempts to locate the Proto-Slavs before approximately 500 have remained unsuccessful or unconvincing. Archaeological traces are difficult to follow because of the rapid demographic changes during the Migration Period. The Proto-Slavs are especially difficult to trace because their material culture appears to have lacked many distinguishing features (ibid.: 216). Scholars have connected a number of archaeological cultures to the Proto-Slavs: the Przeworsk culture (second century BC to fourth century AD, upper and middle reaches of the Oder and Vistula), the (late-)Zarubintsy culture (first and second century, Pripet and middle Dniepr), the Černjaxov culture (third and fourth century, lower Danube and Dniepr) and the Kiev culture (third to fifth century, Middle Dniepr and Desna) (ibid.: 213-214). The Przeworsk culture has mainly been considered to be either of Germanic or of mixed Slavic and Germanic nature (Mallory/Adams 1997: 470). The Zarubintsy culture has often been connected to the Proto-Slavs (ibid.: 657). This was one of the archaeological cultures that influenced the Černjaxov culture, which shows influence from ethnically different tribes, of Slavic, (East) Germanic and Iranian (Scythian and Sarmatian) origin. Mallory/Adams consider the Černjaxov culture "a convenient contact zone to explain lexical borrowings between Germans and Slavs, and Iranians and Slavs" (1997: 106).

4.2   SLAVIC EXPANSION TOWARDS THE ROMAN EMPIRE

The Gothic historian Jordanes mentions the Slavs in his *Getica* and by doing so, he is the first to make note of the Proto-Slavs in writing. Jordanes mentions three tribes that have by later scholars been regarded as Proto-Slavic: the Veneti, the Antes and the Sclaveni. Although the Sclaveni (and the Antes, who, according to contemporary sources, spoke the same language as the Sclaveni) have generally been regarded as Slavs, there is, as Curta remarks, no concluding evidence of the language they spoke in the sixth century (2004: 140). One must, furthermore, be careful in connecting ethnonyms to ethnic groups, for

---

[21] Nielsen calls the mixing of archaeological or prehistoric facts with linguistic ones a "trap" because there is not necessarily a connection between the two. Archaeological information cannot be indiscriminately connected to linguistic groups because those aspects of prehistoric life that can be discovered on the basis of archaeology (e.g., types of pottery or burial rites) can be transferred from one group to the other, without the necessity of a genetic relation between the two (2000: 31).

ethnonyms are easily transferred from one group to the other.[22] Compare, for example, the name Veneti (Venedi or Venethi) that is known from historical sources to denote at least three different tribes: firstly, a people along the Adriatic coast, whose language Venetic is attested in ca. 300 inscriptions between 600 BC and 100 AD; secondly, a Celtic, seafaring tribe by the name of Veneti that lived in the southern part of the peninsula of Brittany. They were vanquished and sent into slavery by Caesar around 56 BC. The third group of Late Iron Age Veneti was a tribe along the river Vistula. Pliny the Elder, Ptolemy and Tacitus wrote about this people, which has not left any written records. Today, the name of the Veneti is retained as the German designation for those Slavs with whom they live in close contact, viz. G *Wenden* 'Sorbs', Austrian G *Winden* 'Carinthian Slovenes'.

Jordanes writes about the Veneti, the Antes and the Sclaveni:

> (34) Within these rivers [Tisia, Danube, Flutausis, Ister] lies Dacia, encircled by the lofty Alps [Carpathian Mountains] as by a crown. Near their left ridge, which inclines toward the north, and beginning at the source of the Vistula, the populous race of the Venethi dwell, occupying a great expanse of land. Though their names are now dispersed amid various clans and places, yet they are chiefly called Sclaveni and Antes. (35) The abode of the Sclaveni extends from the city of Noviodunum [present-day Isaccea (Rumania) on the banks of the river Danube] and the [unknown] lake called Mursianus to the Danaster [Dniestr], and northward as far as the Vistula. They have swamps and forests for their cities. The Antes, who are the bravest of these peoples dwelling in the curve of the sea of Pontus [Black Sea], spread from the Danaster to the Danaper [Dniepr], rivers that are many days' journey apart (Mierow 1915: 59-60).

This description is likely to reflect the historical situation in the sixth century, when Cassiodorus and Jordanes wrote their respective works.

The Byzantine historian Procopius, a contemporary of Jordanes, described the Slavic tribes in his work *Historia Arcana* (*Secret history*):

---

[22] Gołąb, for example, readily connects ethnonyms given by classical writers to various peoples. In his discussion of Ptolemy's *Geography*, for example, he remarks that "the Goths "(*Γύθωνες*)" did not border the Baltic coast because they were separated from the coast by the "*Οὐενέδαι* (i.e. the Slavs!)" (1991: 351).

"(VII. 14. 22-30). And both the two peoples [the Sclaveni and the Antae] have also the same language, an utterly barbarous tongue. […] In fact, the Sclaveni and the Antae actually had a single name in the remote past; for they were both called Spori in olden times because, I suppose, living apart one man from another, they inhabit their country in a sporadic fashion. And in consequence of this very fact they hold a great amount of land; for they alone inhabit the greatest part of the northern bank of the Ister [Danube]. So much then may be said regarding these peoples." (Dewing 1962: 273-275).

Procopius mentions raids of the Antes and the Sclaveni in the Danube frontier region and connects these raids to the beginning of the reign of the Byzantine emperor Justin I (reign 518-527) (Barford 2001: 35, Curta 2001: 75ff.). Procopius writes that the attack of the Slavs was averted by a man called Germanus, who was the *magister militum per Thraciam* (the "master of the soldiers" in the Roman diocese of Thrace, which comprised the Roman provinces on the eastern part of the Balkans, between Dacia and the Black Sea). The next mention of the Slavs in Procopius' works is in relation to the reign of Justin's successor Justinian, under whose rule the Romans started to invade the non-Roman lands across the Danube. These campaigns did not prove to be very successful, for soon afterwards the next *magister militum* got killed on a campaign into the barbaric lands, after which, as Procopius remarks, "the river became free for the barbarians to cross [and enter the Roman Empire] all times just as they wished" (Curta 2001: 76).

The descriptions by Jordanes and Procopius are the oldest remaining testimonies of contacts of the Proto-Slavs with the Goths and with the Roman Empire.

4.3 Slavic expansion towards the west and the later Frankish Empire

On their way westwards and after their arrival in central Europe, the Proto-Slavs came into contact with speakers of Germanic too. The geographical situation suggests that these Germanic peoples spoke pre-stages of High and Low German dialects, the oldest attested forms of which are Old High German and Old Saxon, respectively. The extent of the initial spread of the Slavs into present-day Germany is evidenced by a large amount of Slavic place names in Germany. These show that the Slavs once occupied the entire territory east of the river Elbe (and in some regions also stretching across the Elbe on its left banks) in an area that by and large corresponds to the former GDR. Slavic place-names can be found almost as far west as Hamburg and the Lüneburger Heide, where, for

example, the name Wendland testifies that the area was inhabited by Slavs (viz., the Polabians).

The move of Proto-Slavs into central Europe is difficult to date archaeologically. Brather supposes that the Slavs arrived in Poland in the first half of the sixth century, while Moravia and Bohemia would have been settled by Slavs in the second half of the sixth century (Brather 2008: 58-61). Both Herrmann (1985) and Brather (2008) date the beginning of the slavicisation of central and eastern Germany chiefly to the seventh century. On the basis of archaeological evidence, Herrmann assumes that the Elbe-Saale area was populated from Bohemia in the second half of the sixth or early seventh century: the Slavs would have followed the Elbe northwards from Bohemia and Moravia (areas inhabited by Langobards in the sixth century) into the Saale area (1985: 21-26). Brather supposes that from there, they gradually spread northwards, reaching Mecklenburg and Pomerania in the second half of the seventh century and finally arriving in Ostholstein, the most north-western part of their territory, at the beginning of the eighth century (2008: 60-61, cf. Herrmann 1985: 9-10). This idea is, however, contradicted by linguistic evidence: the similarities between the Lechitic languages (i.e., Polish, Pomeranian (Kashubian and Slovincian) and Polabian), on the one hand, and Czech and Slovak, on the other hand, indicate that the later West Slavic branch of languages divided into at least two subgroups soon after the migration from the Proto-Slavic homeland. It has been argued that Sorbian should be regarded as a separate subgroup within West Slavic. Sorbian has a number of features in common with Lechitic that are not shared by Czech/Slovak and it shares a number of features with Czech/Slovak that are not shared by Lechitic (Stone 1972: 91-97, Schaarschmidt 1997: 7, 155-156). According to Schaarschmidt, Upper and Lower Sorbian are, however, more closely related to Lechitic than to Czech and Slovak (1997: 155-156).

The early split of the West Slavic tribes was caused by the ranges of hills and mountains that the Slavs had to cross on their way to the west (Udolph 1979: 626-627). The Lechitic group passed the Świętokrzyskie Mountains in central Poland both to the north and the south and the strong concentration of Slavic toponyms in the region of Posen (Poznań) points to early Slavic settlement in this area. According to Udolph, the further spread of the Lechitic group, including the way the Polabians reached their territory in northern Germany, remains unclear (1979: 626). The Slavs that later became speakers of Czech/Slovak moved into their present living area through passes in the Carpathian Mountains, the main trails probably being the route along the river Orava and the route through the Moravian Gate (ibid.: 627).

The landscape in central Europe was characterised by dense forests, which separated the tribes inhabiting the area. These woods served as natural barriers

of the areas settled by the Proto-Slavs. In the lowland plains of eastern Thuringia (in the Saale basin), no natural barrier separated Slavic and Germanic tribes, so there they lived in close proximity. The close proximity of Slavs and Germans is reflected in toponyms and family names consisting of a mixture of a Slavic and a German part (e.g., the family name *Arnoltitz* < **Arnoltici*, a German name with a Slavic suffix, or the place-name *Bogumilsdorf*, now *Bommelsdorf*, a compound of a Slavic and a Germanic element). The forms *-winden*/*-wenden* or *Windisch-*/*Wendisch-* also occur in toponyms in areas where Slavs and Germanic people lived in close proximity (Herrmann 1985: 43), cf., for example, the neighbouring villages *Deutsch Evern* and *Wendisch Evern* south of Lüneburg.[23] When the Germans advanced to the east again (which started under the Merovingian dynasty in the sixth century), they mainly took over the existing Slavic toponyms and hydronyms.

In central Europe, the Slavs came under the influence of the increasingly eastwards expanding Frankish Empire. In the year 531, the Frankish Empire conquered Thuringia, whereas Swabia had already been incorporated in the Empire a couple of decennia earlier. Hereafter, the eastward expansion came to a halt until a second period of wars of conquest was initiated by Charlemagne in the second half of the eighth century. During his reign (that lasted from 768 until his death in 814), he undertook about 50 campaigns, and many of them were directed towards the lands across the eastern borders of the Empire. In 774, Charlemagne subjugated the lands north of Regensburg and in 778, Bavaria. In the last three decades of the eighth century, the Saxon Wars in the lower Elbe area led to the incorporation of Saxony into the Frankish Empire. Frankish annals testify that Slavic tribes took part in Frankish campaigns in the late eighth and early ninth century; the Obotrites and Sorbs are, for example, mentioned to have taken part in the campaign against the Slavic Veleti. Charlemagne's expansionism in the areas on the eastern side of the rivers Elbe and Saale came to a halt in the beginning of the ninth century (Herrmann 1985: 327-329). In the ninth century, the eastern frontier of the Frankish Empire was formed by the *limes Sorabicus*. The exact location of the *limes Sorabicus* is not clear but it is supposed to have mainly followed the course of the river Saale. This river is described by Charlemagne's chronicler as the border between the German Thuringians and the Slavic Sorbs (ibid.: 10). Slavic tribes across the

---

[23] The forms *-winden*/*-wenden* point to the settling of Slavs in a Germanic environment, the latter forms to later settling of Germans in close proximity of Slavic settlements (Herrmann 1985: 43).

borders of the Frankish Empire remained in a semi-independent position, but they were placed under tribute by the Franks (Hooper/Bennett 1996: 30).

The earliest written account that testifies of Slavic presence in central Europe stems from the Frankish chronicles of Fredegar (Brather 2008: 60). This chronicle was written in the middle of the seventh century and relates to the years 584-642. Fredegar describes a rebellion of Slavs living east of the Frankish Empire against the Avar rule in the year 623/624. The revolt was led by a man called Samo, a Frankish merchant who had become a warlord over Slavic troops. A group of Slavs had managed to free themselves from the Avar superiority and had chosen Samo to be their king (ibid.: 62). Samo and his Slavic men could apparently hold out in a number of subsequent battles against the Avars. Samo established a kind of independent princedom or empire and booked his greatest success in 631/632 when he triumphed over the Frankish army under king Dagobert I in the so-called Battle of Wogastisburg. After this battle, the Sorbian prince Dervanus, described by Fredegar as "dux gente Surbiorum que ex genere Sclavinorum", declared his independence from the Franks and joined the empire of Samo (Brather 2008: 62, Curta 2001: 330-331). Samo died in 658, after which his empire vanished without a trace. Despite many attempts, it has been impossible to locate the mysterious Slavic empire or Wogastisburg where the Frankish army was beaten. All other sources relating to these events are of later date and based upon Fredegar's chronicles.

For the remainder of the seventh century and the first half of the eighth century, Frankish chronicles do not mention the Slavs. After the eastward expansion of the Frankish Empire and the submission of the Slavic tribes by Charlemagne in the second half of the eighth century, they are again mentioned in Frankish chronicles of the ninth and tenth centuries (Brather 2008: 63-64). The Slavic tribes had been placed under tribute of the Frankish Empire, and Slavic monarchs tended to be present on the assemblies of the Frankish Empire in the early ninth century. It is mentioned, for example, that there was *In quo conventu* [a gathering in Frankfurt in 822] *omnium orientalium Sclavorum, id est Abodritorum, Soraborum, Wilzorum, Beheimorum, Marvanorum, Praedenecetorum, et in Pannonia residentium Abarum legationes* (ibid.: 65).

4.4   PROTO-SLAVIC LOANWORDS IN GERMANIC

It is well known that the contacts between Proto-Slavs and various Germanic tribes have resulted in dozens of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. The occurrence of Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic, on the other hand, is not universally accepted. Holzer writes: "die Existenz einer urslavischen Lehnwortschicht im Germanischen […] ist umstritten" (1990: 61). Birnbaum

states that "eine Übername aus dem Slawischen ins Germanische [sich] so gut wie nirgends nachweisen oder auch nur wahrscheinlich machen lässt" (1984: 9). In principle, it cannot, however, be excluded that the Germanic peoples borrowed words from Proto-Slavic as well. But although there might be several loanwords from Proto-Slavic in Germanic, their number is unquestionably lower than the reverse (pace Martynov 1963).

In view of the probable location of the Proto-Slavic and the Proto-Germanic homelands, it is highly unlikely that the contacts between the Slavic and Germanic tribes started before the time the Proto-Slavs began to spread into central Europe and onto the Balkans, and before the time the Goths had moved into the Pontic area. It can therefore be excluded that any Slavic loanwords were borrowed into Proto-Germanic, for when the first contacts came about, Proto-Germanic as a linguistic unity had ceased to exist. If it is possible to prove or put a convincing case for Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic, these must therefore be words that were either borrowed into Gothic or into West Germanic (or possibly even into Northwest Germanic); if an alleged loanword is attested in all branches of Germanic, the word is hardly likely to stem from Slavic.

Kiparsky adduces five possible Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic (1934: 96-101):

   The only possible Gothic loanword from Proto-Slavic is Goth. *plinsjan* 'to dance' (unattested in the North and West Germanic languages) (Kiparsky 1934: 98-99). The semantic motivation for the borrowing of PSl. **plęsati* 'to dance' into Gothic is unclear. Lehmann suggests that the verb *plinsjan* might have represented an "older shamanistic ritual dance" for the Goths (1986: 273).

   PSl. **drop-* 'great bustard' (*Otis tarda*, G. *Trappe*) is a bird that is found predominantly in present-day Poland, Galicia and Russia, which corresponds to the area of the supposed Proto-Slavic homeland (Kiparsky 1934: 97). The word is attested as Middle High German and Middle Low German *trappe* or *trap* from the early 13th century onwards.

   A number of words related to fur trade are borrowed from Slavic into (West) Germanic. This is not surprising because the Slavs are known to have dealt with fur trade from their early history:

   PSl. **kъrzьno* 'fur'. The word is attested from the 13th century onwards in West Germanic and occurs in OHG *chursina* 'fur coat' (G *Kürsch* 'fur'), MDu. *corsene* 'fur', OFri. *kersne* 'fur coat' and OE *crusne*, *crusene* 'robe made of skins' (Kiparsky 1934: 97-98).

PSl. *sorka 'shirt' or 'bag for fur' has also been thought to be a Slavic loanword in Germanic (Kiparsky 1934: 99-101). The word might be a late loanword, because it is primarily attested in Scandinavian, ON *serkr* 'shirt', tunic, Sw. (dial.) *sark*.[24] If the word is to be regarded as a loanword from Slavic, the borrowing must nevertheless date from before the Proto-Slavic metathesis of liquids.

PSl. *pьlxъ '(edible) dormouse' was probably the source of G *Bilche* 'idem' (Kiparsky 1934: 99). The dormouse lives in forests in large parts of Europe and was hunted for its meat, grease and fur. Dormouse was a popular delicacy for the Romans. In Slovenia, dormouse hunting is still commonly practised and dormouse figures on the menu to this day (Peršič 1998).

A possible Slavic loanword in Germanic that is not noted by Kiparsky, is PSl. *šuba*, which is probably the source of MHG *schûbe, schoube*, G *Schaube* 'wide coat, often trimmed with fur'. The German word has often been derived from It. *giubba, giuppa* 'coat, jerkin' (cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Schaube*), but the phonological correspondence between the High German forms and the supposed Romance donor is difficult. Brückner supposed that the Germanic word was of Slavic origin (1927: 556, cf. also HEW 19: 1479). Both in Slavic and Germanic, the word refers to coats made of or trimmed with fur, which speaks for Slavic origin of the Germanic forms.

Another Slavic, though perhaps not Proto-Slavic, loanword in German is MHG *twarc* 'curd cheese' (G *Quark* 'idem' with High German *qu-* for *tw-*; Du. *kwark* 'idem' was borrowed from German). The word is first attested in the 14th century and has been thought to derive from LS *twarog* < PSl. *tvarogъ* 'curd cheese' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Quark,* EWN: s.v. *kwark,* cf. HEW 20: 1563, REW 3: 85), but the word might equally well derive from another West Slavic language or dialect.[25, 26]

---

[24] E (dial. Scottish and northern English) *sark* 'chemise', (late) OE *serc* 'shirt' are considered to be borrowed from Old Norse (De Vries 1979: 471).

[25] That is to say, the word could have been borrowed from a West Slavic language/dialect that had not (yet) undergone the spirantization of PSl. *g* to *h*. This spirantization went through an intermediate stage [ɣ] which is - on the basis of toponymic and textual evidence - supposed to have existed in Upper Sorbian in the 12th century. Upper Sorbian toponymic evidence of the 14th century shows that the development of PSl. *g* to *h* was completed (Schaarschmidt 1997: 95-97). On the evidence of (Latin) textual evidence, the development of PSl. *g* to *h* has often been dated to the 13th century in Czech and between the first half of the 12th century to the first half of the 13th century in Slovak (Andersen 1969: 557).

[26] For OHG *karmala* 'revolt', see §6.3.

Martynov (1963) and Gołąb (1991) dismiss the view that Germanic remained by and large untouched by Slavic lexical influence. Gołąb considers it, in view of the long period of contact between Slavs and speakers of Germanic languages, unlikely that the Proto-Slavs have not or hardly left traces in the Germanic languages especially because, according to him, their cultural level before their contacts with the classical world was likely to be very similar (1991: 355). Yet this reasoning takes no notice of the fact that the Germanic peoples came into contact with the Roman Empire much earlier than the Proto-Slavs did. Through the influence of the Roman Empire, the level of technological development of the Germanic peoples increased and this gave them prestige among their non-Latin neighbours. About the long-standing influence of the Roman Empire in the Germanic tribes, Wild writes that "the vocabulary of an advanced [Roman] society made an impact on the languages of less advanced [Germanic] peoples." (1976: 57). This is shown by the direction of the borrowings (Green 1998: 183): there are many more loanwords from Latin into Germanic than the reverse and there are, similarly, more loanwords from Germanic not only into Proto-Slavic, but also into Baltic and Finnic than from these languages into Germanic. The reason that there are fewer Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic than vice versa is likely to be due to the higher level of technological development of the Germanic peoples.

4.5 Conclusion

The Slavs are first mentioned in writings by classical and Gothic authors in the mid-sixth century. Before that time, they had probably not spread very extensively beyond their homeland. As we have seen in the preceding sections, the homeland of the Slavs can most likely be located to the area north and northeast of the Carpathian Mountains on the foothills of the Carpathians and on the vast forest steppes around the river Dniester.

Speakers of Proto-Germanic were far removed from this area. The Germanic homeland has most commonly been placed in northern Germany and southern Scandinavia, but Udolph, for example, places the Germanic homeland more to the south in central Germany. Germanic must have been a linguistic unity in the last centuries BC probably until the second century AD, which dissolved when the Goths moved away from the homeland. When Germanic was still a linguistic unity, the speakers of the proto-language could not encounter any Proto-Slavs, for the two homelands were at best about 900 kilometres removed from each other. The first contacts could only have emerged when Germanic tribes had migrated southwards and eastwards and/or when the Proto-Slavs had spread beyond their homeland. If one adheres to the traditional view that the Goths migrated east of the Carpathian Mountains to the south,

they first encountered the Proto-Slavs in the area of the Proto-Slavic homeland and probably maintained contacts with the Slavs afterwards, when the Goths had established an empire in the Pontic area. Were one to accept Mańczak's and Kortlandt's view that the ethnogenesis of the Goths must be placed in Lower Austria, then the first contacts between Goths and Slavs came about after the Goths had assumed their position of power in the Pontic area.

The first contacts between Slavic and Germanic peoples probably came about either during the Gothic migration (if the migration took them through the Proto-Slavic homeland) or else shortly after the arrival of the Goths in the Pontic area in the middle of the third century. The contacts with the Goths are likely to have ended in the fifth century, when the latter lost their power in the Black Sea area. It is therefore less likely that the Slavs borrowed words from the Goths after the fifth century.

When the Slavs moved into central Europe, the first loanwords from West Germanic languages entered Proto-Slavic, but the contacts with speakers of West Germanic have remained until this very day. Loanwords from West Germanic languages could therefore enter Proto-Slavic until its disintegration at the beginning of the ninth century.

4.6 Excursus I: Loanwords from and into Latin and early Romance

Chapter 5 of this dissertation consists of a description of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. For a significant part, these words represent objects and concepts that were unknown to the Slavs before they came into contact with speakers of Germanic. Many of these words were relatively new to the Germanic people as well because they were borrowed from, e.g., Latin or Celtic. In this section, I will give a short description of the Latin loanwords in Germanic, the Germanic loanwords in Latin and the Latin loanwords in Proto-Slavic in terms of approximate number and semantic range. In §4.7, I will concisely describe a much earlier layer of loanwords in Proto-Slavic: the so-called 'Tememic' substrate supposed by Holzer (1989).

4.6.1 Latin loanwords in Germanic

Long before their first contacts with the Proto-Slavs, the Germanic peoples had been under the influence of the Roman Empire and had taken over many objects and loanwords from the Romans. The contacts between the Roman Empire and the Germanic peoples reached its peak in the third and fourth centuries. In the Germanic dialects, there are about 400 loanwords from Latin

(mainly Vulgar Latin) that can be dated before the Anglo-Saxon migration to Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries (Wild 1976: 60). Green differentiates this number into "about 350 early Latin loanwords [...] for Germanic at large and about 50 for Gothic (with some degree of overlap)" (1998: 201). The semantics of these Latin loanwords in Germanic comprise technical terms, foodstuffs, viticultural terminology and trade-related terms such as weights, measures and names for coins (Wild 1976). According to Green, the most important group of Latin loanwords in Germanic is perhaps formed by army-related terms (1998: 202-204), whereas Wild thinks the Germans borrowed "surprisingly few Roman military expressions" (1976: 60). The loanwords indicate that the Germanic peoples received glass, pottery, metal vessels and coins from the Romans. The objects that the Germanic peoples got to know through contacts with the Roman Empire were mainly unknown to the Proto-Slavs as well, and the Proto-Slavs got acquainted with these objects primarily through their contacts with the Germanic peoples. The Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic that ultimately derive from Latin therefore form a large part of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

4.6.2   GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN LATIN

The Romans took over loanwords from Germanic, but much less so than the other way around. Wild mentions three Germanic loanwords in Latin, all of them resulting from trade relations between the Romans and Germanic peoples (1976: 61). These words are recorded by Pliny in *Naturalis historia* (*Natural History*): Lat. *ganta* 'wild goose', borrowed from Germanic **ganta* 'goose'. According to Pliny, geese were imported from the Germanic provinces because they were used in making stuffing for cushions (Green 1998: 186, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. **gǫsь*). Lat. *glaesum/glesum* 'amber' from Germanic **glēsa-/*glēza-* was borrowed in relation to the trade of amber from the Baltic Sea coast into the Roman Empire (cf. §4.1.4). According to Pliny, Lat. *sāpo* 'soap' (OHG *saiffa*, MLG *sēpe*) was used to dye the hair red, a practice that was apparently widespread amongst Germanic men (ibid.: 188).

4.6.3   LATIN LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

In her recent dissertation, Maja Matasović discussed approximately 300 loanwords from Latin and early Romance that were borrowed into Slavic before

the ninth century (2011). She discusses about 55 Latin and early Romance loanwords that are attested in all three branches of Slavic, whereas the majority of the loanwords that Matasović discusses are limited to South Slavic.[27] One of the reasons for this is that many of the Latin and early Romance loanwords refer to Mediterranean plants, animals and fish and were therefore in use only in the areas bordering on the Mediterranean Sea. Other prominent semantic groups are religious terms, building terminology (including terms for parts of the house or village) and words relating to trade (including words for various containers) (2011: 254-277).

4.7   EXCURSUS II: 'TEMEMATIC' SUBSTRATE IN PROTO-SLAVIC

A theory about a much earlier layer of loanwords into Proto-Slavic (or Balto-Slavic) has been put forward by Georg Holzer (1989). He supposes a layer of substrate loanwords into Baltic and Slavic from an unknown Indo-European language, which he calls "Temematisch".[28] Holzer tentatively connects the Temematic loanwords to the unknown language of the Cimmerians, an Indo-European people that lived north of the Black Sea until the eighth century BC (1989: 177ff.). He distinguishes 45 loanwords, which have been divided into the following semantic fields: 1. agriculture; 2. cattle breeding; 3. bee-keeping; 4. provisioning; 5. society; 6. carpentry and 7. remaining words (1989: 5-7). As can be seen from the fields in which these loanwords can be divided, the words mainly relate to arable farming and stockbreeding, as well as domestic skills like bee-keeping and carpentry. As the Temematic loanwords have most cognates in Germanic and Greek, Holzer supposes that Temematic or a preliminary stage bordered preliminary stages of Germanic and Greek. For this reason, Kortlandt places the speakers of Temematic in the western part of Ukraine between "Germanic in the north and Greek in the south", also because similar consonant changes to the ones reconstructed for Temematic are found in Germanic and

---

[27] A number of the words that Matasović lists as Latin loanwords in Proto-Slavic are regarded as Germanic loanwords in this dissertation. This goes for a number of words that ultimately derive from Latin and occur in Germanic as well as in Slavic. Matasović considers these words to be direct borrowings from Latin, whereas I see a Germanic language as the donor. These words are: PSl. *cěsarь/*cesarь, *cьrky, *kotьlъ, *kъbьlъ, *ǫborъ(kъ), *orky, *osьlъ, *popъ, *skrinja, *vino and *xrьstъ/*krьstъ.

[28] Holzer calls this language "Temematisch" after two of the distinctive sound changes it is supposed to have undergone after it split off from Proto-Indo-European: the Indo-European voiceless stops (tenues) *p, *t, *k became voiced (mediae) *b, *d, *g and the voiced aspirates (mediae aspiratae) *bʰ, *dʰ, *gʰ became voiceless.

Greek: voicing of the voiceless stops (*tenues*) occurs in Germanic by means of Verner's law and devoicing of the aspirates (*mediae aspiratae*) is found in Greek (2003a: 258-260).

5 GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of an etymological description of 75 words that can be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. The words included in this chapter form the basis of chapter 7 *The origin of the loanwords* and chapter 8 *Accentological analysis of the material.* The entries are arranged according to their accentuation in Proto-Slavic (AP (a), (b) and (c), cf. chapter 2). The loanwords with AP (a) form §5.2. The loanwords with (b) are discussed in two separate sections: those with AP (b) and a heavy syllabic nucleus in §5.3 and those with AP (b) and a light syllabic nucleus in §5.4, because the distinction between heavy and light syllabic nuclei is accentologically important (cf. §8.3). §5.5 lists the (few) Germanic loanwords with AP (c) and §5.6 lists those with unknown or indeterminable accentuation.

I have tried to give all entries the same structure: after an overview of the attested Slavic and Germanic forms, the entries start with a discussion of the provenance of the Germanic word, followed by a discussion of the Proto-Slavic form and of the indications we have for establishing the exact Germanic donor language or dialect. The entries conclude with a discussion of irregularities in the individual Slavic languages.

5.2 LOANWORDS WITH AP (A)

PSl. **bljudo* 'plate, dish' (n. *o*-stem)
OCS *bljudo* n.; *bljudъ* (Supr.) m. 'pan, dish'; **CS** *bljudъ* m., *bljudo* n., *bljuda* f.; **RCS** *bljudo* n. 'dish'; *bljudy*, Gsg. *bljudve* f.; *bljudva* f. 'basket'; **R** *bljúdo* n. 'plate, dish'; **Ukr.** *bljúdo* n. 'wooden barrel used in making cheese'; **US** *blido* n. 'table'; **LS** *blido* n. 'table'; **S/Cr.** *bljȕdo* n.; *bljȕda* f. 'dish'; **Bg.** *bljúdo* n. 'plate, table'[29]
Accentuation: AP (a)

---

[29] OP *bluda* f. 'wooden plate' has repeatedly been cited in the literature, but the form is not included in the *Słownik Staropolski* (1953-2002).

PGmc. *beuda- 'plate, table' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *biuþs*, Gsg. *biudis* m. 'table'; **OHG** *biet* m. 'table, plate'; **OE** *bēod, bēad* m. 'table; (pl.) dishes'; **OS** *biod* m. 'table'; **ON** *bjóđ* n. 'table, dish'

Etymology: PGmc. *beuda- 'plate, table' is probably a derivative of the verb *beudan 'to offer', which has been explained from PIE *b*ʰeudʰ*- 'to be aware' (cf. Skt. *bódhati* 'to observe', Gr. πεύθομαι 'to examine') (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *bieten*, Lehmann 1986: 74). In Germanic, the meaning of the derivation shifted from 'to serve' to 'object on which something is served' which caused the word to mean 'table' in Germanic next to 'plate, dish'. Similar semantic shifts are found in the Proto-Slavic loanwords *dъska 'plank, plate' (borrowed from Lat. *discus* 'disc, dish' or a reflex of NWGmc. *diska-, cf. §6.1) and *misa 'table, plate' (borrowed from VLat. *mēsa* 'table' < Lat. *mensa*). The primary meaning of PSl. *bljudo is 'plate, dish', which is the original meaning of the Germanic word as well (Lehmann 1986: 74). Only in Sorbian, *blido* means 'table' and in Bulgarian, 'table' occurs as a secondary meaning of the word *bljúdo*. In Old Church Slavic, *bljudъ* 'dish' translates Gr. πίναξ 'dish', whereas Gr. τράπεζα 'table' remains untranslated in the Slavic text (Stender-Petersen 1927: 403).

The donor language of the borrowing into Slavic is likely to be Gothic because the attested forms in West Germanic could not phonologically have yielded the Slavic form *bljudo (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 193 for literature). The Germanic diphthong *eu was affected by the *a*-umlaut before *a in a following syllable very early in Northwest Germanic, and it is unlikely that the umlauted reflex *eo would have yielded PSl. *ju.

Already the earliest attestations of the word in Slavic show variation in gender. In every Slavic language where the word is retained, except for Old Polish, it occurs as a neuter *o*-stem. Besides, the word occurs as a feminine *ā*-stem in Church Slavic and Serbian/Croatian, as a feminine *ū*-stem in Russian Church Slavic and as a masculine *o*-stem in Old Church Slavic. Because the word goes back to a masculine word in Germanic, it is possible that the word was initially masculine in Slavic (cf. OCS *bljudъ*) and became neuter in Proto-Slavic, as a result of a secondary development. The change of gender might be explained if the word was interpreted as a collective noun ending in -*a* with the meaning 'plates, dishes', after which a new singulative neuter was formed in -*o* to denote the single 'plate, dish'. Skok suggests that the feminine forms developed in analogy to S/Cr. *zdjěla* 'plate, dish' (ERHSJ 1: 174-175), but this is questionable because it cannot be proven that the borrowing of S/Cr. *zdjěla*, Slov. *zdêla* 'plate, dish' < Lat. *scutella* 'small bowl, dish' can be dated to Proto-Slavic (the word occurs in South Slavic only).
Origin: Gothic.

PSl. *bukъ 'beech' (m. *o*-stem)
OR *bukъ*; **R** *buk*, Gsg. *búka*; **Ukr.** *buk*; **P** *buk*; **Cz.** *buk*; **Slk.** *buk*; **US** *buk*; **LS** *buk*; **Plb.** *bau̯k, boi̯k*; **S/Cr.** *bȕk* (arch.);[30] **Bg.** *buk*

PSl. *buky 'beech(nut)' (f. *ū*-stem)
RCS *buky*, Gsg. *bukъve* 'beech'; **P** *bukiew*, Gsg. *bukwi* 'beechnut'; **Cz.** *bukvice* 'beechnut; beech mast; *Stachys officinalis*'; **Slk.** *bukvica* 'beechnut'; **US** *bukwica* 'beechnut'; **Plb.** [*bükvoi̯* f. pl. 'beechnuts' ?];[31] **S/Cr.** *bùkva* 'beech'; **Slov.** *búkev*, Gsg. *bûkve* 'beech'; *búkəvca* 'beechnut'
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *bōkō 'beech' (f. *ō*-stem)
OHG *buohha* (f. *n*-stem (and *ō*-stem?) EWA 1: 437) 'beech', also 'oak; birch'; **MHG** *buoche*; **G** *Buche*; **OE** *bōc* f. (next to *bēce* < *bōkiōn) f.; **OS** *bōka* f.; **Du.** *beuk*; **ON** *bók* f.
Cognates: Lat. *fāgus* 'beech', Gr. *φηγός* 'oak', Gaul. *bāgos 'beech' (in French place-names) < PIE *bʰeh₂g (or *ǵ)-o- 'oak, beech' (Pokorny 1959: 107, cf. De Vaan 2008: 199).[32]

Etymology: Germanic *bōkō 'beech' is related to Lat. *fāgus* 'beech', Gr. *φηγός* 'oak' < PIE *bʰeh₂g-o 'oak, beech' (cf. De Vaan 2008: 199).

PSl. *bukъ 'beech' has straightforward reflexes and a stable meaning in all Slavic languages. Next to PSl. *bukъ, we also find the feminine *ū*-stem *buky. In Russian Church Slavic, Slovene, Old Czech and Polish, the reflex of this form means 'beech', whereas it means 'beechnut' or 'letter' (see below) in the other Slavic languages. The word could have been borrowed by the Slavs in connection to the writing on slabs of beech wood (see below). Alternatively, the borrowing might be connected to the spread of the Slavs from their original homeland to the west. The reach of the common beech (*Fagus sylvatica*) has been limited to central and western Europe, approximately to the west of the line Kaliningrad-Odessa, but possibly only as far as the river Elbe (Juškova 2006: 148, Birnbaum 1973: 407, cf. §4.1.4). The beech is supposed to be (almost) nonexistent in the area in which the Goths lived (EWA 1: 447), and for this reason, PSl. *bukъ and *buky are more likely to derive from West Germanic.

---

[30] In Serbian/Croatian, the word for 'beech' is nowadays *bukva*, whereas *buk* has gone out of use.
[31] SEJDP regards Plb. *bükvoi̯* 'book; beechnuts' as independent borrowings from MLG *bōk* n. 'beechnut; (pl. also) book', with the Slavic suffix *-ъvy because Plb. *ü* is the reflex of *o, whereas *u is reflected as Plb. *ai* or *au* (SEJDP 1: 61, Polański/Sehnert 1967: 24, 43).
[32] De Vaan considers Alb. *bung* 'kind of oak' and PSl. *buzъ/*bъzъ 'elder' unrelated (2008: 199).

Whereas the word in the donor language is feminine, it is masculine in Slavic. The masculine gender of *bukъ might be secondary to other monosyllabic Proto-Slavic words for trees, e.g., PSl. *grabъ 'hornbeam', *dǫbъ 'oak' and *klenъ 'field maple' (REW 1: 139). On the etymology of the word, see below.

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the beech does not seem to have existed in the area in which the Goths lived.

PSl. *buky 'letter (sg.); book, document (pl.)' (f. ū-stem)
OCS buky (Gsg. bukъve).**; RCS** bukvamъ (Dpl.)**; R** búkva**; Ukr.** búkva**; Plb.** [bükvoi̯ f. pl. 'book' ? (cf. fn. 32)]**; S/Cr.** bȕkva**; Slov.** bȗkbi (dial. Gailtal (Pronk 2009: 204)) f. pl. 'book'**; Bg.** búkva
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *bōk- (root noun) 'book, document, letter'
Goth. boka 'letter' f.; bokos 'document, book'**; OHG** buoh f./n./m. 'letter (sg.), book (sg./pl.)**; MHG** buoch n.**; G** Buch**; OE** bōc f. (also n., originally a root noun) 'book'**; OFri.** bōk f./n. 'book; missal; Bible'**; OS** bōk f./n. 'writing slate, book'**; Du.** boek**; ON** bók f. (originally a root noun) 'embroidered cushion, book'.

Etymology: Fick/Falk/Torp reconstruct the Proto-Germanic form as a feminine ō-stem *bōkō (1909: 271), but Kluge and Bammesberger reconstruct a root noun *bōk-. The word is attested as a root noun in Gothic, and Old High German shows traces of a root noun as well (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Buch, Bammesberger 1990: 197-198). The singular of the word meant 'letter' originally, and the plural 'book, piece of writing' (as is attested in Gothic, Old High German); this pattern corresponds to the use of Gr. γράμμα and Lat. littera, the singular of which denoted 'letter' and the plural 'book, document'. West Germanic and Old Norse created a new singular form 'book', after which the element *staba- 'staff, stick' was added if the meaning 'letter' was meant (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Buch).

According to Fick/Falk/Torp, the original meaning of the word was '(tablet of) beech wood with inscribed runes' (1909: 271), which enables a connection with NWGmc. *bōkō 'beech'. The Germanic words *bōkō 'beech' and *bōk-s 'letter' have often been connected. Beech bark is known to have been used by Indo-European peoples for writing, especially for the writing of religious texts (Mallory/Adams 1997: 58). Friedrich claims that "another source has it that the ancient [Germanic] runic tablets were made from slabs of beech wood" (1970: 110), but his source of information remains unfortunately unspecified. Kluge, on the other hand, rejects the connection between the two words because he finds no evidence for ancient Germanic writing (of runes) on beech wood (2002: s.v.

Buch). If, however, the tablets on which runes were written were indeed made of beech wood, the motive for the borrowing of the word by the Proto-Slavs would become clear: the specific use of beech wood tablets for writing would provide a motive for the borrowing of the word. Lloyd et al. reject the connection of the Germanic words for 'beech' and 'book' to the writing of runes and rather connect it to the writing of Latin, which was in use by the ruling classes of the Germanic peoples from very early onwards. Initially, people wrote on wooden slates, possibly made of beech wood because this wood splits easily and could therefore well be made into writing tablets. When writing was done on parchment rather than on wood, the covering plates were almost always made of beech wood until the 16th century. A similar example in which the word 'book' derives from the name of the material is Lat. *liber* 'bark of a tree' > 'book' (EWA 1: 447-448).

The Proto-Slavic loanwords *bukъ* and *buky* have been etymologised in many different ways. Kiparsky attributes the absence of a satisfying etymology to the fact that scholars tried to explain the forms from one or two borrowings, whereas Kiparsky proposes that apart from PSl. *bukъ*, the form *buky* was borrowed into Slavic on as many as three separate occasions (in different periods and from different Germanic dialects) in order to account for the diversity in form and meaning. He explains *bukъ* 'beech' as a West Germanic borrowing dating from the fifth century; *buky* 'letter, book', which is only attested in South Slavic and Russian Church Slavic, would be a loanword from Balkan Gothic and *buky* 'beechnut' an early borrowing "von den noch ziemlich unkultivierten Germanen Norddeutschlands". He completely separates the borrowing of *buky* 'beechnut' from the borrowing of *bukъ* 'beech' and regards *buky* 'beech' as a very late borrowing from Old Saxon (1934: 218-219). This seems to be a rather uneconomical solution. It is more likely that the Germanic word for 'beech', with secondary meaning 'letter, document' was borrowed on only one occasion. It is impossible to decide on formal grounds from which Germanic dialect the words were borrowed, but if the word was borrowed together with PSl. *bukъ*, the origin is probably West Germanic.

Origin: Probably West Germanic if the word was borrowed together with PSl. *bukъ*; the beech does not seem to have existed in the area in which the Goths lived.

PSl. *duma* 'advice, thought, opinion' (f. *ā*-stem)

OR *duma* 'advice, thought'**; R** *dúma* 'thought, council'**; Ukr.** *dúma* 'thought; folksong (originally 'story')'**; P** *duma* 'pride, self-esteem; epic or elegiac song'**; Cz.** [*dumat* 'to brood, ponder' < P (Machek 1957: 134)]**; Slk.** [*duma* (dial.) 'thoughtfulness, arrogance', *dumať* 'to think' < P (Machek 1957: 134)]**; S/Cr.**

dȕma 'thought';[33] **Slov.** *dumati* 'to think' (verb only); **Bg.** *dúma* 'word, thought, conversation'
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. **dōma-* 'judgement' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *doms** m. 'judgement, sense'; **OHG** *t(h)uom* m./n. 'state, judgement, power'; **G** *-tum* (suffix to form abstract nouns); **OE** *dōm* m. 'power, judgement, interpretation' ; **E** *doom, to deem*; **OFri.** *dōm* m. 'court of justice, judgement, decision'; **OS** *dōm* m. 'court of justice, judgement, fame, honour'; **Du.** *-dom* (suffix to form abstract nouns); **ON** *dómr* m. 'court of justice, judgement'
Cognates: Gr. θωμός 'heap'; Lith. *domẽ, domesỹs* 'attention, directing of the thought and will on something' < PIE **dʰoh₁-mo-* (Pokorny 1959: 235-239).

Etymology: The Germanic forms derive from the PIE root **dʰeh₁-* 'to put' with the suffix *-mo-*. In modern German and Dutch, the word has only been retained as suffix *-tum*, *-dom* that is used in the formation of abstract nouns. The word was probably used in legal contexts in Proto-Germanic times and might have referred to the actions of a Germanic legal assembly (Green 1998: 44-45).

On the basis of the attested Germanic forms it is impossible to establish the origin of the Slavic word. The semantic correspondence between Germanic and Slavic is not very straightforward; the word means 'judgement' in most of Germanic, but 'advice, thought' in Proto-Slavic. For this reason, Trubačev rejects the often advanced theory that the word was borrowed from Germanic, but rather follows Mladenov, who connects it to the roots **dux-*, **dyx-*, with a semantic shift 'breathing' > 'word' > 'thought' (cf. ÈSSJa 5: 155-156). Since the word was borrowed from Germanic in Finnish as well, as Fin. *tuomio* 'judgement', the Germanic word is likely to have represented an institution or a concept that was unknown to their neighbouring peoples (possibly a legal assembly as Green supposed), and was for that reason borrowed into Proto-Slavic and Finnish. The semantic shift would then have originated in Slavic.

The word is a feminine *ā*-stem in Slavic, whereas the word in Germanic is a masculine *a*-stem.
Origin: Cannot be specified.

---

[33] Skok cites only the verb *dȕmati*, *dȕmâm* 'to think', which occurs dialectally in Serbian/Croatian. It is listed with this accent in RJA as well. Anić has *dȕmati*, *dȕmām* (2002: s.v. *dȕmati*), whereas the RSA cites *dúmati*. Even though Skok claims that the corresponding noun is unattested, RSA lists the noun *dȕma*. In Croatian, the noun only occurs in the idiom *nemati blage dume* 'to have no idea'.

PSl. *koldędźь 'well, spring' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)
OCS *kladędźь*; **CS** *kladędźь*, *klad'azъ*, *kladezъ*; **RCS** *kladenьcь*, *kladecь*; **OR** *kolódjazʼ*; **R** *kolódec*, *kolódjazʼ*; **Ukr.** *kolódjazʼ*; **S/Cr.** *klȁdenac*, *kladezъ* (arch.);[34]
Slov. [*klādez* < CS *kladęzъ* (Pleteršnik 1894-1895, s.v. *klādez*, Kiparsky 1934: 38)], [*kladę̑nǝc* < S/Cr. (ESSJ 2: 35)]; **Bg.** *kládenec*
Accentuation: AP (a) in Old Russian (Zaliznjak 1985: 132), and this is confirmed by the accentuation of S/Cr. *klȁdenac*. Because of early analogical adaptation to *koldenьcь*, there are no other sources than the East Slavic forms to determine the original AP.

OE [*celde* 'spring' (?) (< ON ?)]; **ON** *kelda* 'well, brook'; **Dan.** *Kolding* (place-name); **Sw.** *Käldinge* (place-name)

Etymology: PSl. *koldędźь* had often been regarded as a borrowing from Germanic because of the suffix *-ędźь* (e.g., by Meillet 1905: 355, Stender-Petersen 1927: 277ff., Kluge 1913: 41). It has been observed that this suffix in Slavic occurs only in loanwords from Germanic (e.g., Meillet 1905: 355, cf. §7.3.2). The supposed Germanic donor would be a derivative from PGmc. *kalda-* 'cold', going back to the PIE root *gel-* 'to be cold, freeze' (Pokorny 1959: 365-366). A semantic parallel in which a Slavic word for 'well, spring' derives from 'cold' is found in, e.g., S/Cr. *studénac*, P *studnia* 'well' from PSl. *studenъ* 'cold'.

A Germanic derivative *kalda-* 'cold' with the suffix *-inga-* is unattested in Germanic, which causes Kiparsky to reject the etymology (1934: 38). Trubačev, however, mentions toponyms in Scandinavia that go back to *kaldinga-*, namely *Kolding* in Denmark and *Käldinge* in Sweden (ÈSSJa 10: 124). It is therefore attractive to regard the word as a loanword from Germanic after all, mainly because of the 'Germanic' suffix *-ędźь* (cf. §7.3.2).

The suffix *-ьcь-* in Russian Church Slavic, Russian, Serbian/Croatian, Slovene and Bulgarian is probably analogous to PSl. *studenьcь* 'well'.
Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *lixva* 'interest, usury' (f. *ā*-stem)
OCS *lixva*; **R** *líxvá*; **Ukr.** *lýxvá*; **P** *lichwa*; **Cz.** *lichva*; **Slk.** *lichva* 'cattle'; **US** *lichwa*; **S/Cr.** *lȉhva*; **Slov.** *lȋhva*; **Bg.** *lȋhva*

---

[34] S/Cr. *kladezъ* stems, probably just as Slov. *klādez,* from Church Slavic.

Accentuation: AP (a); in modern Russian, the form has end stress. This stress pattern developed only in the 19th century. In the *Slovar' cerkovnoslavjanskogo i russkogo jazyka* (1847), the word has fixed initial stress (Kiparsky 1958: 20). This is consistent with the accentological evidence from other Slavic languages, e.g., the short falling accent of Serbian/Croatian and the neocircumflex of Slovene, which also point to AP (a).

PGmc. *leiƕa- 'to lend (out)' (strong verb)
Goth. *leiƕan* 'to borrow'; **OHG** *līhan*; **MHG** *līhen*; **G** *leihen*; **OE** *lēon*; **OS** *far-līhan*; **ON** *ljá, léa* (also substantive *leiga* f. 'rent')
Cognates: Skt. *riṇákti* 'to leave, give up, release', Gk. λείπω 'to leave', Lat. *linquere*, OIr. *ar-léici* 'to release' also 'to borrow, lend', Lith. *lìkti* 'to remain' < PIE *leikʷ-* 'to leave' (Pokorny 1959: 669-670).

Etymology: The verbal stem PGmc. *leiƕa-* 'to lend (out)' is attested in all branches of Germanic and derives from PIE *leikʷ-* 'to leave'. The corresponding noun does not occur in West Germanic or Gothic (but Old Norse has *leiga* 'rent').

The Slavic forms show that the word was borrowed from a Germanic dialect that had retained the original Proto-Germanic labiovelar fricative *xʷ < PIE *kʷ. In West Germanic, PGmc. *xʷ was medially simplified to -h-. This development took place prior to the earliest attestations of West Germanic, for all attested West Germanic forms show the reflex -h- < *xʷ (Wright 1906: 44).

Gothic is often regarded as the donor (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 206 for references). This is likely because of the formal correspondences between the Gothic word and the Slavic reflexes but Gothic origin cannot be absolutely proven because the noun corresponding to the verb PGmc. *leiƕa-* 'to lend (out)' is largely unattested and because the development of PGmc. *xʷ in medial position to -h- in West Germanic is difficult to date.

The word has a constant meaning in all Slavic languages; the semantic shift from Germanic 'loan' to Proto-Slavic 'interest' is not difficult if one envisages the Germanic peoples as the lending party and Slavs as the borrowing party.
Origin: Possibly Gothic.

PSl. *lukъ 'chive, onion' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *lukъ*; **R** *luk*, Gsg. *lúka*; **OP** *łuk*; **Cz.** *česnek luční* (arch.) 'field garlic', *luček* (dial.) 'leek'; **Plb.** *lau̯k* 'garlic'; **S/Cr.** *lȕk*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *lȕk*, Gsg. *lȕka*; **Slov.** *lȕk*, Gsg. *lúka*; **Bg.** *luk*
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *lauka- 'Allium, onion' (m. a-stem)
OHG louh m.; **MHG** louch; **G** Lauch m.; **OE** lēac n. 'garden herb, alliaceous plant, leek'; **OS** -lôk m.; **Du.** look; **ON** laukr m.
Cognates: Possibly OIr. lus 'leek, herb, vegetable' (cf. Hehn 1883: 168).

Etymology: The word is attested in North and West Germanic and has a possible cognate in OIr. lus 'leek, herb, vegetable' (Hehn 1883: 168). The further etymology of NWGmc. *lauka- is unclear; Kluge derives the word from the PIE root *h₂el- 'to grow' (2002: s.v. Lauch). Pokorny connects NWGmc. *lauka- to the root PIE leug- 'to bend' (1959: 685-686). The word has alternatively been explained as a regional substratum word (e.g., ERHSJ 2: 328, EWN: s.v. look).

According to Skok, cultivated plants are easily borrowed and he, therefore, does not consider the borrowing of the word from Germanic into Slavic unlikely (ERHSJ 2: 328). The phonological, morphological and semantic correspondence between the Slavic and Germanic forms does not pose any problems. In the etymological dictionaries, the word has most often been labelled as a loanword from 'Germanic', without speculation about the exact donor language (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 249 for references, ÈSSJa 16: 172).

Kiparsky considers the word to be of Old Saxon origin because Slavic does not show traces of the High German consonant shift and because the word is unattested in Gothic (1934: 249). Both arguments cannot be upheld: the absence of a word in the limited corpus of Gothic texts cannot prove that a word did not exist in Gothic and the word might also have been borrowed from a High German dialect because the High German consonant shift is usually not reflected in the Proto-Slavic borrowings (cf. §7.2.1.8). From a semantic viewpoint, the word is likely to stem from West Germanic because the words relating to fruit, garden vegetables and domestic products are mainly borrowed from West Germanic dialects (cf. §7.4.2.6).
Origin: Possibly West Germanic.

PSl. *nuta 'cow, cattle' (f. ā-stem)
CS nuta; **OR** nuta 'cattle'; **R** núta (arch. and dial.) 'cattle', nútnik 'butcher'; **US** nuknica (arch.) 'stockyard, tenant farm' (< nutnica 'estate'); **LS** nuta (arch.) 'herd'; **Plb.** nǫtǫ (Asg.) 'herd of cattle'; **Slov.** núta 'herd of cattle', nûtnjak 'bull'
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *nauta- 'cattle' (n. a-stem)
OHG nōz n. 'cattle'; **MHG** nōz n. 'cattle'; **OE** nēat n. 'cattle, cow, animal'; **E** neat 'cow, cattle'; **OFri.** nāt m. 'animal, partner'; **OS** nôtil n. 'draught animal, cattle'; **ON** naut n. 'cattle, cow'; nautr m. 'valuable possession, partner, cattle', nauti m. 'partner'

Cognates: Lith. *naudà* 'belongings', Latv. *naûda* 'money' < PIE *neud-* "Erstrebtes ergreifen, in Nutzung nehmen" (Pokorny 1959: 768).

Etymology: The word is only attested in North and West Germanic. NWGmc. *nauta-* has been connected to PGmc. *neut-a* 'to enjoy, use' (DG 2: 20, Palander 1899: 16) and is thus related to, e.g., G *Nutzen* 'use' and *genießen* 'to enjoy'. The original meaning of the word *nauta-* 'cattle' was then 'useful animal', cf. G *Nutztier* 'useful animal' as a covering name for livestock, dairy animals and draft animals.

In modern German and Dutch, the word is not attested, but the root has been retained in OS *ginôt,* OHG *g(i)nōz* (also G *Genosse* and Du. *genoot*) 'partner, companion', which thus originally meant 'he with whom one shares his cattle' (cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Genosse*). Comparable compounds with the prefix *ga-* and the meaning 'companion' exist in Gothic, e.g., *ga-hlaiba-* literally 'with whom one shares bread', *ga-juk-* literally 'with whom one shares a yoke' (Lehmann 1986: 139, 141).

The meaning of the Proto-Slavic form corresponds to that of the attested Germanic forms. The origin of the word has been thought to be 'Germanic' without further specification, Proto-Germanic or West Germanic; Trubačev derives the word from Proto-Germanic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 183 for literature, ÈSSJa 26: 48-49). The word is not likely to stem from Gothic because it is expected that the word or the compound *ganauta-* is attested if the word existed in Gothic.

Germanic *nauta-* is a collective neuter noun, which was borrowed as a collective neuter plural form into Proto-Slavic. The word was then reinterpreted as a feminine *ā*-stem, which frequently happens with words with a collective meaning, cf., e.g., S/Cr. *jêtra* 'liver' < PSl. *ętro* n. sg. 'liver', which is female in the standard languages, but dialectally occurs as a neuter plural.
Origin: Probably West Germanic; a cognate in Gothic is expected to be attested if it had existed.

PSl. *orky* 'box' (f. *ū*-stem)

Ukr. *rákva* 'butter dish'**; Cz.** *rakev* f. 'coffin, grave'**; Slk**. *rakva* 'coffin'**; Plb.** *råťåi̯* 'box' (< *orky* (SEJDP 4: 632)), *råkvai̯ćə* 'box'**; Slov.** *rákəv,* Gsg. *rákve* 'grave, tomb'**;**
[**OR** *rákovina* 'mother-of-pearl'**; R** *rákovina* 'mussel; shell, clam'**; Cz.** *rakvice* 'mussel; shell, clam'**; Bg.** *rakovína* 'shell, clam' (cf. ÈSSJa 32: 167-168) ?]
Accentuation: AP (a)

PSl. *orka 'tomb, reliquary' (f. ā-stem)

OCS *raka* 'tomb'; **OR** [*raka* 'tomb' < CS]; **R** [*ráka* 'reliquary' < CS], **Ukr.** [*ráka* 'reliquary' < CS]; **S/Cr.** *rȁka* 'tomb'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *rȁka*, Gsg. *rȁkē*; **Slov.** *ráka* 'crypt, tomb'; **Bg.** *ráka* 'reliquary'

PGmc. *arkō 'box, chest; ark' (f. ō-stem)

Goth. *arka* 'ark; bag, money box'; **OHG** *arc(h)a* 'box, chest'; **MHG** *arche*; **G** *Arche* 'ark'; **MLG** *arke* 'boxlike channel in mills' **OE** *earc(e)* f., *arc* m. 'ark, chest'; **OFri.** *erke* 'chest'; **Du.** *ark* 'ark; chest'; **ON** *ǫrk* 'box, chest'[35]

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from Lat. *arca* 'chest, container', which probably derives from the root of Lat. *arceō* 'to contain' (De Vaan 2008: 51). The word means 'box, chest' throughout the Germanic languages. In standard German, the word is only retained as referring to Noah's ark, but different secular meanings are attested in German dialects: in hydraulic engineering, an *Arche* denotes a wooden drainage canal in, e.g., mills and ponds (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Arche*, DWb: s.v. *Arche*). In (Old) English, an *ark* was a measure of capacity, derived from the name of a chest to keep fruit or grain in (Zupko 1985: 10). Since the word is attested in all of Germanic, the borrowing from Latin is thought to have been early (cf. EWN: s.v. *ark*). Lloyd et al. also suppose that the word was a very early borrowing from Latin not only because of the extensive spread throughout Germanic but also because of the early borrowing of the word into Fin. *arkku* (EWA 1: 330). Jellinek, on the other hand, assumes a late borrowing into Gothic because the original Latin ending was retained (1926: 185).

Two forms of the same root can be reconstructed for Proto-Slavic: the feminine ā-stem *orka* 'tomb, reliquary' is only attested in South Slavic and in Old Russian, Russian and Ukrainian. According to Kiparsky, the East Slavic forms might well be Church Slavicisms (1934: 252). The feminine ū-stem refers to box-like objects in Ukrainian and Polabian, but mean 'coffin, grave' in Czech, Slovak and Slovene.

In (Old) Russian, (Old) Czech and Bulgarian, possible reflexes of PSl. *orky are attested that refer to shellfish. Trubačev separates these forms from PSl. *orky and connects PSl. *orkovina to PSl. *orkovъ 'of a crayfish' (ÈSSJa 32: 168-169). PSl. *orkovъ is semantically quite remote from the meanings of the attested forms, which primarily refer to mussels and shells. A parallel that perfectly matches the Slavic forms is the name of the ark clams (*Arcidae,* G

---

[35] According to Franck/Van Wijk, ON *ǫrk* means 'coffin', next to 'box, chest' (1912: 21), but this meaning is not mentioned by De Vries (1977: 688).

Archenmuscheln), a family of saltwater clams. A number of mussels in this family is native to the North Sea, Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea (one type of mussel being the *Arca noae*, G *Arche Noah-Muschel*).

The geographically limited attestation of *orka* might suggest a late and local borrowing, although the word clearly underwent the metathesis of liquid diphthongs in Slavic. Kiparsky might be right in supposing a double origin of the Slavic forms: PSl. *orky* 'box' is borrowed from Germanic, whereas *orka* 'tomb' is not (1934: 253). Kiparsky derives *orka* from Gr. ἄρκα 'chest', but I rather agree with those who regard the word a borrowing from Romance (e.g., Skok 1915 and recently M. Matasović 2011: 131-132): Skok observed that the meaning of the Latin word *arca* had narrowed from 'chest, container' to 'tomb, grave' in Vulgar Latin inscriptions in Dalmatia (1915: 83). This dialect of Romance could then be regarded as the source of the South Slavic form *orka*.[36] Whether PSl. *orky* stems from Gothic or West Germanic cannot be established on formal grounds.

Origin: PSl. *orky* 'box' stems from Germanic, but the donor language remains unclear. PSl. *orka* 'tomb, reliquary' is more likely to be a loanword from Latin.

PSl. *pěnędźь 'penny, coin' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)
CS *pěnęzь*, *pěnęgъ*; **RCS** *pěnjazь* 'money, (foreign) coin'; **R** *pénjaz'*, Gsg. *pénjazja* 'small coin'; **Ukr.** *pínjaz'* '0,5 Kreuzer';[37] **P** *pieniądz*; **Cz.** *peníz* 'coin, amount'; **Slk.** *peniaz* 'coin, money'; **US** *pjenjez*; **LS** *pjenjez*; **Plb.** *pǫʒ* 'pfennig' (< *pędźь); **S/Cr.** *pjȅnēz*, Npl. *pjȅnēzi* 'money, coin'; **Slov.** *pẹ̑nez*; **Bg.** *pénez, pénjaz* (arch.)
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. **pandinga-/*pantinga-* (?) 'penny' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *pfending*; **MHG** *pfenni(n)c*; **G** *Pfennig*; **OE** *pening, penning, pending, penig, pennig* 'penny (other than English coinage)'; **OFri.** *penning, panning*; **OS** *penning*; **Du.** *penning*; **ON** [*pengr, penningr* < OE or OLG (De Vries 1977: 424)]

Etymology: The origin of the Germanic word is not entirely clear, but it might derive from Lat. *pondus* n. 'weight, mass'. The word has also been connected

---

[36] Kiparsky claims that the fact that the word is an *ū*-stem in Slavic, indicates that it is a relatively young loanword from Germanic into Proto-Slavic (1934: 252), but this need not to be correct because the *ū*-stems seem to have become productive for Germanic as well as Romance loanwords in Proto-Slavic (cf. §7.3.4).

[37] The Kreuzer was a denomination for a coin and currency in the southern states of the Holy Roman Empire.

with PGmc. *pandan 'pledge' (OFri. pand, pond, OS pand, OHG pfant 'pledge', also from Lat. pondus), but this etymology has been rejected because the forms without a medial stop seem to occur earlier. De Vries regards the Germanic forms without medial -t- or -d- as the older ones, on the basis of the fact that the borrowed forms in Slavic and Lithuanian do not show the reflex of a medial obstruent (De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 514, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 496). This leaves two rather unsatisfying etymologies of the Germanic forms, either from PGmc. *panna 'pan' (De Vries/De Tollenaere semantically explain the 'penny' as a 'coin with a concave form') or from PGmc. *pannus 'piece of cloth' (because cloth was used as means of payment) (1997: 514). It seems better to assume that the word originally was *pandinga- or *pantinga, derived from Lat. pondus, and that the Slavic form was borrowed from a dialect that had lost the medial obstruent.

The word does not occur in Gothic, which has skatts for Gr. δηνάριον. In Old High German, the word panding, pending (in various forms) started to replace OHG scaz during the eighth century. The first occurrence of the word in Old Saxon dates from the tenth century (Von Schrötter 1930: 506).

PSl. *pěnędźь was probably borrowed from West Germanic because the suffix -(l)inga-/-(l)unga- was productive in forming coin names in West (and North) Germanic, and much less so in Gothic (cf. Kluge 1926: 53-54 and §7.3.2). If the original Germanic form can indeed be reconstructed as *pandinga- or *pantinga with *a in the initial syllable, then the majority of the attested Germanic forms, as well as PSl. *pěnędźь, reflect the Germanic i-umlaut, which is another indication for a West Germanic donor of PSl. *pěnędźь (cf. §7.2.1.3).

The *ě in Slavic does not directly reflect the Germanic short e, because Gmc. e is reflected as PSl. *e rather than *ě. Meillet explains *ě in this word as a result of lengthening of *e before the double resonant -nn-; a similar case is the loanword S/Cr. zdjèla, Slov. zdêla 'plate, dish' < Lat. scutella 'small bowl, dish' (via *skъděla < *skъdella), which also has the reflex of *ě from a short *e before a double resonant (1902: 184).[38]

---

[38] A parallel for the compensatory lengthening of *e before -nn- in the first syllable is adduced by Kortlandt, who explains North Slavic *-ęn- and South Slavic *-ěn- in the Proto-Slavic suffix that is comparable to Lith. -ìngas from compensatory lengthening of *-inn- < *-ingn- after the loss of *g. The different reflexes in North Slavic and South Slavic can be explained from the fact that the loss of *g has been dated earlier in South Slavic than in North Slavic (Kortlandt 2008b: 80). Note that this parallel has a bearing on the first syllable of PSl. *pěnędźь; the similarity between the Proto-Slavic suffix *-ędźь from Germanic *-inga- and the Balto-Slavic suffix mentioned in this example is coincidental.

Origin: West Germanic; PSl. **pěnędźь* probably reflects the Northwest Germanic *i*-umlaut and it reflects the suffix *-(l)inga-/-(l)unga-* that was very productive in (North and) West Germanic.

PSl. **plugъ* 'plough' (m. *o*-stem)
CS *plugъ*; **OR** *plugъ*; **R** *plug*; **Ukr.** *pluh*; **P** *pług*; **Cz.** *pluh, plouh* (dial.); **Slk.** *pluh*; **US** *płuh*; **LS** *pług*; **Plb.** *plaug̓*; **S/Cr.** *plȕg*; **Slov.** *plȕg*, Gsg. *plúga*; **Bg.** *plug*
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. **plōga-* 'plough' (m. *u* or *a*-stem (Orel 2003: 292))
OHG *phluog*; **MHG** *pfluoc*; **G** *Pflug*; **OE** *plōg* 'plough, (plough of) land'; **OFri.** *plōch*; **Du.** *ploeg*; **Lang**. *plovum*; **ON** [*plógr* (later borrowing from another Germanic language (De Vries 1977: 426)]; **Pliny** *plaumorati*, 'a new two-wheeled ploughing instrument in Gaul'[39]

Etymology: The etymology of Germanic **plōga-* is unclear, but the word might be connected to the verb **plegan* 'to do one's best' (De Vries 1977: 426). It is not certain whether Lang. *plovum* and the form *plaumorati* recorded by Pliny can be connected to NWGmc. **plōga-*. Baist suggested that the word *plaumorati* should be read as *ploum Raeti* 'Rhaetic *ploum*', which would enable a smooth connection to Lang. *plovum* (1886: 285-286).

In Gothic, the word is not attested; Wulfila's Bible has *hoha* 'plough' (cf. also OHG *huohili* 'small plough'). The absence of a reflex of PGmc. **plōga-* in Gothic cannot be used as a decisive argument against the existence of the word in Gothic because different types of ploughs might have existed next to each other. For Proto-Slavic, several words for (different types of) ploughs can be reconstructed as well. The Proto-Slavs used the ploughing instrument **ordlo* (and perhaps **soxa,* although Derksen reconstructs the Proto-Slavic meaning of **soxa* as 'forked stick' (2008: 458)).[40] Whereas the Proto-Slavic instrument **ordlo* was used for the ploughing of soft terrain, it has been assumed that the

---

[39] Pliny writes "non pridem inventum in Raetia Galliae duas addere tali rotulas, quod genus vocant plaumorati" (Not long ago, an invention was made in Gaulish Raetia by fitting a plough of this sort with two small wheels, which the people call a *plaumorati*) (*Naturalis Historia*: 18,48).

[40] Both words have an Indo-European origin: PSl. **ordlo* < PIE **h₂(e)rh₃-dʰlom* is related to Goth. *arjan*, Lat. *arare*, Gr. *ἀρόω* 'to plough'. PSl. **soxa* is a cognate of Goth. *hoha* 'plough' and Skt. *śā́khā-* 'branch'; Derksen reconstructs 'forked stick' < PIE **ḱok-(e)h₂-* as the original Proto-Slavic meaning of **soxa* (2008: 458).

loanword *plugъ was a sturdier instrument for ploughing rougher terrain (ERHSJ 2: 690; also Gołąb 1991: 366).

The Germanic *plōga- was thus a type of plough that was previously unknown to the Slavs. The phonological, morphological and semantic correspondence between the Slavic and Germanic forms does not pose any problems. The word has quite generally been regarded to stem from 'Germanic' or West Germanic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 258, ESSlov. 3: 61-62 for literature). Schuster-Šewc supposes that the Germanic word originates in the Gaulish Roman area south of the Alps, from where it was taken over by the Langobards in the sixth or seventh century, after which the word spread from Langobardic to the other West Germanic languages. Schuster-Šewc dates the borrowing into Proto-Slavic shortly after the supposed borrowing from Langobardic into the other West Germanic languages (HEW 15: 1092). This is not a likely scenario, for if in Pliny's time in the first century AD the Raeti or Gauls indeed invented a revolutionary new type of plough, the invention is likely to have spread to neighbouring people in a short period of time. According to De Vries, the word was introduced in England and Scandinavia at a later stage and he supposes that the word originated in the area west of the river Elbe (1977: 426). The word in any case seems to have originated in Raetia or in present-day central Germany, which makes West Germanic origin of the Proto-Slavic loanword attractive (but not imperative if the homeland of the Goths is to be located in southern Germany, cf. §4.1.2).

Origin: Probably West Germanic in view of the fact that the word is supposed to have originated in Raetia or in present-day central Germany.

PSl. *šelmъ 'helmet' (m. *o*-stem)

CS šlěmъ; **OR** šelomъ, šolomъ 'pointed helmet, in use in Rus' in the Middle ages'; **R** [šlem 'helmet' < CS]; šelóm, Gsg. šelóma (dial.) 'covering, roofing'; **Ukr.** šolóm; **OP** szłom; **Cz.** šlem (dial.) 'headdress for women'; **S/Cr.** šljèm; **Slov.** šlẹ̀m, Gsg. šlẹ́ma; **Bg.** šlem

Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *helma- 'helmet' (m. *a*-stem)

Goth. hilms; **OHG** helm; **MHG** helm; **G** Helm; **OE** helm; **OFri.** helm; **OS** helm; **Du.** helm; **ON** hjalmr

Cognates: Skt. śárman- 'protection, shelter', Lat. cilium 'eye-lid', OIr. celim 'to hide' < PIE *ḱel- (Pokorny 1959: 553).

Etymology: The Germanic word *helma- is a derivation with the suffix -ma- from the verb *hela- 'to conceal', which continues PIE *ḱel- 'to

conceal'. The suffix *-ma- < PIE *-mo- forms substantives to verbs (EWN: s.v. *helm*).

   PSl. *šelmъ* cannot have been borrowed from Gothic because of the vocalism: PGmc. *e* became *i* in Gothic and this does not correspond to the *e* in Proto-Slavic *šelmъ*. The word must, therefore, have been borrowed from West Germanic. The borrowing can be dated before the second palatalization of velar consonants in Slavic because South and East Slavic show the reflex of the first rather than the second palatalization of velar consonants (West Slavic is inconclusive because it has /š/ as a result of the first as well as of the second palatalization of *x*). Separate loans of the same Germanic form are found in SCS *xilemъ* from Goth. *hilms* and in P and Cz. *helm* 'helmet' from MHG *hëlm* (Kiparsky 1934: 188). The word was also borrowed from Germanic into Lat. *helmus* 'helmet' (EWA 4: 945).

Origin: West Germanic because of the *e*-vocalism of PSl. *šelmъ*.

   PSl. *skrin(j)a* 'chest' (f. *a*- or *jā*-stem)

OCS *skrinja* 'ark, reliquary', *skrinica* 'small box'; **CS** *skrina*, *skrinja*; **OR** *skrina*, *skrinja*; **R** *skrin*, Gsg. *skrína*; *skrínja*, *skrínka* 'chest, shrine'; **Ukr.** *skrýnja* 'chest for clothing and valuables'; **P** *skrzynia* 'box, (linen-)cupboard'; **Cz.** *skříň* 'cupboard, wardrobe', *skříňka* 'box, chest' ; **Slk.** *skriňa* 'cupboard'; **US** *křinja* '(painted) blanket chest'; **LS** *kśinja*; **S/Cr.** *skrȉnja*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *skrȉnja*, Gsg. *skrȉnjē* 'coffin, chest'; **Slov.** *skrínja* '(blanket) chest', *škrínja* 'shrine, cabinet, (blanket) chest', *krínja* 'flour bin'; **Bg.** *skrin* '(linen-)cupboard'[41]

Accentuation: AP (a)

   WGmc.   *skrīn(i)a* 'shrine, chest, small box (especially for precious/religious objects)'

OHG *scrīni* m./n.; **MHG** *schrīn* m./n.; **G** *Schrein* m.; **OE** *scrīn*; **OFri.** *skrēn*, *skrīn*, *skrein*; **Du.** *schrijn*; **ON** [*skrín* < OE (De Vries 1977: 504)]

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from Lat. *scrīnium* n. 'round chest, receptacle for letters or papers' and is only attested in West Germanic. The West Germanic forms might have been taken over from the Latin plural form *scrīnia*. De Vries distinguishes between two borrowings from Latin in Germanic: most Germanic forms derive from WGmc. *skrīnia*, but OE *scrīn*

---

[41] R *skrínka* and P *skrzynka* are derivations with a different suffix. Some languages show forms with initial š-: Cz. *škříně* 'chest, box', S/Cr. *škrȉnja* 'coffin, (painted) blanket chest'. These might be later borrowings from (High) German.

goes back to WGmc. *skrīna, which De Vries/De Tollenaere consider to be the form taken over by the clergy (1997: 631). The Latin and Germanic words primarily refer to a small box used for the storage of precious and/or religious objects, although the words G *Schreiner*, Du. *schrijnwerker* 'cabinetmaker' suggest that the WGmc. *skrīn-* also referred to larger secular objects that were used as piece of furniture.[42] PSl. *skrin(j)a* continues the latter Germanic meaning, being a relatively large object, albeit also for the storage of valuables as is suggested by the fact that it refers to a decorated blanket chest in several Slavic languages, e.g., Sorbian, Ukrainian and Serbian/Croatian. Skok rejects the etymology of the word as a Germanic loanword and derives the word directly from Lat. *scrīnium* (ERHSJ 3: 269-270), but on the basis of semantic evidence the word is more likely to derive from Germanic: the meaning of the Slavic forms corresponds better to that of the Germanic forms than to that of Lat. *scrīnium*. PSl. *skrin(j)a* must be a loanword from West Germanic because the word seems to be a late borrowing from Latin into West Germanic only.

The genders of PSl. *skrin(j)a* and the Germanic forms do not agree: the Germanic forms appear to go back to a neuter proto-from (which corresponds to the gender of the Latin donor form), but the Slavic forms go back to a feminine *a-* or *jā-*stem. The word is masculine and/or neuter in the earliest (High) German attestations.

Origin: West Germanic (High German); the word seems to be a late borrowing from Latin into West Germanic only. Because of the absence of early attestations in Low German, the word is likely to have been borrowed from High German.

PSl. *stǫpa* 'pestle, mortar' (f. *ā-*stem)
CS *stupa*; **R** *stúpa*; **Ukr.** *stúpa*; **P** *stępa*; **Cz.** *stoupa* 'pestle; stamp-mill'; **Slk.** *stupa* (arch.) 'pestle; (pl.) stamp-mill'; **US** *stupa* 'pestle; stamp-mill'; **LS** *stupa* 'pestle; stamp-mill'; **Plb.** *stǫ̇po*; **S/Cr.** *stȕpa*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *stȕpa* Gsg. *stȕpē*; **Slov.** *stǫ̑pa*; **Bg.** *stǎpa*
Accentuation: AP (a)

WGmc. *stampa-* 'pestle, mortar' (m. *a-*stem)
OHG *stampf, stamph* m. 'pestle; barrel for grinding corn'; **MHG** *stampf* m.; **G** *Stampfe* f., *Stampf, Stampfer* m.; **OE** *stampe* f.; **OS** *stamp* m.; **MLG** *stampe* f.

---

[42] In Dutch and English, the word nowadays has a religious meaning only, but G *Schrein* can refer to non-religious containers as well.

Etymology: The word is attested in West Germanic only and is explained as an instrument noun derived from the verb PGmc. *stampōn 'to stamp' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *stampfen*, EWN: s.v. *stampen*).

PSl. *stǫpa has quite generally been regarded as a borrowing from Germanic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 266 for literature). The donor of PSl. *stǫpa is likely to be a High or Low German dialect, because the occurrence of the word is limited to West Germanic. The meaning of the Germanic and Slavic forms corresponds exactly.

The Slavic word is feminine, whereas it is masculine in most of the older Germanic languages, although Old English, Middle Low German and modern High German have feminine forms as well.

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the occurrence of the word is limited to West Germanic.

PSl. *tynъ 'fence' (m. *o*-stem)
CS *tynъ* 'wall'; **OR** *tynъ*; **R** *tyn*, Gsg. *týna* 'fence'; **Ukr.** *tyn* 'wicker fence'; **P** *tyn* (dial.), *tynina* (dial.), *tyniec* (dial.) 'fence made of pine branches'; **OCz.** *týn* 'fence, fortification'; **Cz.** *týn* 'fence, hedge'; **Slk.** *týň* 'rod in a fence'; **Plb.** *våtåi̯n*, *våtěn* 'fence'; **S/Cr.** *tȉn* 'partition wall'; **Slov.** *tȉn*, Gsg. *tína* 'wall, partition'
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *tūna- 'hedge(row), fence' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *zūn* m.;[43] **MHG** *zūn*, *zoun* m.; **G** *Zaun*; **OE** *tūn* m. 'yard, manor, farm'; **E** *town*; **OFri.** *tūn* m. 'fence, fenced area'; **MLG** *tūn* 'fence'; **Du.** *tuin* m. 'garden'; **ON** *tún* n. 'fenced green, yard; town'
Cognates: NWGmc. *tūna- can be connected to OIr. *dún* 'fort, rampart', OW *din* 'castle', Gaul. *dunum* (in Latin authors), *-dūnum* (in place names), but the origin of the word is unclear (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Zaun*).

Etymology: The Germanic word *tūna- has been connected to the Celtic word *dūno- 'fort, rampart', which derives from PIE *dʰuHno- 'enclosure' (Matasović 2009: 108). It is unclear whether the words are cognates or that Germanic *tūna- has been borrowed from Celtic (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Zaun*), but the Germanic form has often been thought to be a loanword from Celtic (Pokorny 1959: 263, Orel 2003: 413).

---

[43] In Old High German, the word was a masculine *i*-stem originally, which had a plural in *-a*, next to a plural in *-i* (Braune/Reiffenstein: 2004: 202).

The original meaning of NWGmc. *tūna- is 'hedge(row), fence'; it developed into 'enclosure, fenced area' in Dutch, Old Norse, Old English and further into 'town' in English. The meaning 'hedge(row), fence' was retained in the southern dialects of Dutch (De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 753) and probably also in the dialect spoken on the island of Texel (in the Dutch province of North Holland), where a *tuunwol* refers to an (approximately one metre high) site-fencing made of turf. The Slavic loanword retained the primary Germanic meaning.

The Germanic reflexes of PGmc. *tūna- are rather uniform. As a result of this, the exact donor of the Slavic word remains unclear. Because the word is not attested in Gothic, and Gothic has the word *faþa* for 'hedge, fence', PSl. *tynъ* 'fence' might be considered to be a loanword from West Germanic. The Proto-Slavic vocalism -*y*- shows that the word was borrowed before the Slavic sound change *ū* > *y* took place.

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the word is not attested in Gothic, and Gothic has an alternative word for 'hedge, fence'.

PSl. *vitędźь* 'hero, knight' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)
CS *vitezъ*, *vitʼazъ* 'hero'; **R** *vítjaz'* 'hero, knight'; **Ukr.** *výtjaz'* 'hero, knight'; **OP** *wycięski* (adj.) 'victorious'; **P** *zwycięski* (adj.) 'victorious'; **Cz.** *vítěz* 'winner, champion'; **Slk.** *víťaz* 'winner, champion'; **US** *wićaz* 'vassal, liegeman'; **S/Cr.** *vȉtēz* 'hero, knight'; **Slov.** *vȋtez* 'knight, soldier'; **Bg.** *vítec*, *víteg*, *vítek* 'hero'
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *wīkinga* '(?)' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG ?*wīhhing*, ?*wihhing* '(?)'; **G** *Wiking(er)* 'Viking'; **OE** *wīcing* 'pirate'; **OS** *wīking* 'pirate', *Wīking* (personal name); **Du.** [*viking* 'Viking'< probably E]; **ON** *víkingr* 'pirate'

Etymology: The origin of NWGmc. *wīkinga* is unclear. The earliest attestation of the word is OE *wīcing* 'pirate', which dates perhaps from the seventh century, i.e., before the presence of the Vikings in England (Hofstra 2003: 149, 156). Hofstra evaluates the most important etymologies that have been proposed for the word for Viking and regards the problem of the etymology of the name "probably insolvable" (2003: 148). The most convincing etymologies are the ones that derive the word from NWGmc. *wīk-*, a loanword from Latin *vīcus* 'district of a town; minor settlement, village' (OE *wīc* 'dwelling place, village, lane', Du. *wijk* 'district in a town'), from NWGmc. *wīk-* 'inlet, bay' (ON *vík* 'bay', OE *wīc* 'bay, creek') or alternatively from the name of the bay *Vík* 'Oslo Fjord' (ibid.: 152-153).

Hofstra and De Vries (1977: 662) both mention the Old High German forms *wīhhing* and *wihhing*. About these Old High German forms, Hofstra remarks that they occur "in different spellings, already in the eighth century" (2003: 150); I have not been able to find these forms in any of the dictionaries available to me (Schützeichel's *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch,* Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch,* the *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: Der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)* or *Idem: Der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Seebold 2001 and 2008) and Köbler's dictionary of Old High German (1993)). Holthausen lists OS *Wīking* in his dictionary of Old Saxon, and derives the name from OS *wīk* 'dwelling place, village' (1956: 87).

The suffix *-inga-* (or *-unga-*) is used to form masculine names of denominative origin. In this function, the suffix is only attested in Northwest Germanic, not in Gothic. The suffix denotes mainly persons with characteristics expressed by the preceding element, as well as belonging to a family or community, and patronymics (Kluge 1926: 11-16). As we see in other examples, to West Germanic *-ing* corresponds the Proto-Slavic suffix *-ędźь* (cf. §7.3.2). Because of the reflex of the Germanic suffix *-ing* in the Proto-Slavic borrowing, and because of the late and limited occurrence of the word in West Germanic, PSl. *vitędźь* must be regarded as a loanword from West Germanic.

The semantic connection between the Germanic and the Slavic forms is not as straightforward as it might seem at first glance. In the old sources from the Carolingian period, the Vikings from Scandinavia are not described in a particular sympathetic way (Hofstra 2003: 160). This differs significantly from the meaning that is attested in the Slavic languages that can be reconstructed as 'hero, knight'. It is therefore not clear in what context the word was borrowed.

PSl. *vitędźь* can be reconstructed with *t'* in the root, whereas the Germanic forms have *k* in this position. The same correspondence is found in PSl. *retędźь* 'chain(s)' and in the forms *stьlędźь, *štьlędźь* 'coin' next to *skьlędźь*. As with these other forms, the reflex *t'* might be the result of dissimilation from **vicędźь* > *vitędźь*, with *c* resulting from the (second) palatalization of the velar *k* (REW 1: 206-207). Professor Kortlandt suggested to me that the Proto-Slavs might have heard Germanic *víki-* as *viti-*, which may alternatively explain *t* in PSl. *vitędźь* (and similarly in PSl. *retędźь* and *stьlędźь, *štьlędźь*).

In Bulgarian, the variants *viteg, vitek* are attested, the form *viteg* being a new Nsg. after the Npl. *vitezi*.

Origin: West Germanic; the suffix *-inga-* (or *-unga-*) to form masculine names of denominative origin is only attested in Northwest Germanic.

PSl. *volxъ* 'Romance-speaking person/people' (m. *o*-stem)
CS *vlaxъ*; **OR** *voloxъ*, pl. *volosi*; **R** *volóx* 'Romanian, Moldavian'; **Ukr.** *volóx* 'Rumanian'; **P** *włoch* 'Italian'; **Cz.** *vlach* (arch.) 'Italian'; **Slk.** *vlach* (arch.) 'Italian'; **US** *włóski* (adj.) 'Romance (Italian)'; **LS** *włoski* (adj.) 'Romance (Italian)', *włoch* (arch.) 'Italian'; **S/Cr.** *vlăh* 'Romanian; (pej.) member of the Orthodox Church'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *vlăh*, Gsg. *vlăha*; **Slov.** *làh*, *vlàh* 'Italian'; **Bg.** *vlax* 'Romanian, Aromanian'
Accentuation: AP (a)

NWGmc. *walha-* 'Celt, Roman, foreigner' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *wal(a)h*; **MHG** *Walch, Walhe*; **G** *welsch* (adj.); **OE** *wealh* 'foreigner (Celt, Roman); slave'; **MLG** *wale* (adj.) 'Welsh'; **Du.** *Waal(s)* 'Wallonian'; **ON** *valir* '(Celtic) inhabitant of Northern France'; **Caesar** *Volcae Tectosages, Volcae Arecomigi* 'Celtic tribes'

Etymology: In Germanic, reflexes of NWGmc. *walha-* denote foreign (Celtic or Roman) neighbouring tribes. Caesar mentions a Celtic tribe *Volcae Tectosages*, living in western Germania (*De bello gallico* 6.24). The name of this tribe might have been the origin of the word in the North and West Germanic languages. It has been supposed that the Celtic Volcae originally lived in southern Germany, despite of their later habitat in present-day France. The word was then possibly borrowed into Proto-Germanic around the fourth century BC, before Grimm's law operated (Bandle 2002: 578-579).

In Slavic, *volxъ* almost exclusively refers to Romance-speaking people. This suggests that the word was borrowed from Germanic in a linguistic situation in which speakers of Germanic, Slavic and Romance interacted. The speakers of Germanic gave their appellation of the Romance neighbours to the Slavs. Skok suggests that the borrowing can be dated to the fourth or fifth century, when the Slavs first came into contact with Romans at the *limes* along the lower Danube (ERHSJ 3: 608).
Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *xlěbъ* 'loaf, bread' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *xlěbъ*; **R** *xleb*, Gsg. *xléba*; **Ukr.** *xlib*; **P** *chleb*; **Cz.** *chléb*; **Slk.** *chlieb*; **US** *chlěb*; **LS** *klěb*; **S/Cr.** *hlèb*, *hljèb*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *hlȉb*, Gsg. *hlȉba*; **Slov.** *hlẹ̑b*, Gsg. *hlẹ́ba*; **Bg.** *hljab*
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *hlaiba-* 'loaf, bread' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *hlaifs*; **OHG** *leib* m.; **MHG** *leip*; **G** *Laib*; **OE** *hlāf*; **OFri.** *hlēf, lēf*; **ON** *hleifr*

Etymology: The origin of PGmc. *hlaiba- is unclear; the word was either borrowed from an unknown language or constructed from native material in late Proto-Germanic. According to Kluge, the word probably referred to unleavened (non-sour) bread, whereas *brauda- was the (more modern) soured bread (2002: s.v. *Laib*). PGmc. *hlaiba- has been connected to Gr. κλῑβανος 'baker's oven; pan with a lid for baking bread', Gr. κλῑβανίτης 'bread baked in a *klibanos*', which probably is a borrowing from an unknown substratum language (2002: s.v. *Laib*). The Germanic word might well have been borrowed from the same source.

The Proto-Slavic form *xlěbъ corresponds phonologically, morphologically and semantically with the attested forms in the early Germanic languages. The time and place of the borrowing of the word into Proto-Slavic cannot be determined with absolute certainty, but Gothic *hlaifs* is generally regarded as the donor of this word (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 199 for references). Gothic has root final -*f*- in the NAsg. and -*b*- (phonetically probably [ƀ]) in the oblique cases. The fricative was replaced by the labial stop -*b*- because Proto-Slavic did not have labial fricatives (cf. §7.2.1.7).
Origin: Probably Gothic.

PSl. *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a 'small house, cottage'
OCS *xyzъ* 'house'; **CS** *xyzъ, xyza, xyža* 'house'; **SCS and Cr.CS** *xiša, xisъ*; **RCS** *xyža*; **OR** *xyzъ*; **R** *xíža, xíza* (arch.) 'hut'; **Ukr.** *xýža* 'store room, hut, stable'; **P** *chyża, chyż, hyż, chyz, hyza* (dial.) 'house, hut, stable'; **OCz.** *chyšě* 'room (sg.), hut, house (pl.)'; **Cz.** *chýše* 'hut, primitive house'; **Slk.** *chyža* 'living room; hut'; **US** *chěža* 'house'; **LS** *chyz* 'house; storehouse/-room', *chyža* 'house, hut'; **Plb.** *x̓ai̯zně* (adj.) 'of/near a hut'; **S/Cr.** *hȉža* (dial.) 'house, (living) room', *hisa, hiš* 'house'; **Slov.** *hȉz* 'small wooden cellar or granary', *híža* 'house, (living) room', *his*; *híša* 'house'; **Bg.** *híža* '(mountain) hut'
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *hūsa- '(one room?) house' (n. *a*-stem)
Goth. -*hūs* (only in *gudhūs* n. 'temple'); **Crim. Goth.** *hus*; **OHG** (*h*)*ūs* n. 'house, family'; **MHG** *hūs* n.; **G** *Haus*; **OE** *hūs* n.; **OFri.** *hūs* n.; **OS** *hūs* n.; **Du.** *huis*; **ON** *hús* n.

Etymology: Many attempts have been made to etymologise PGmc. *hūsa-, but no etymology has been commonly accepted. Orel explains PGmc. *hūsa- as a borrowing from "a phonetically advanced East Iranian: *xuz ~ *xud < Iranian *kata-, cf. Av. *kata-* 'room, cellar'" (2003: 196). Kluge relates the word to modern G *Hütte* < PGmc. *hud- and thus derives PGmc. *hūsa- 'house' from earlier *hud-s-a-, with compensatory lengthening of the stem vowel after the drop of

the -*d*- (2002: s.v. *Haus*). With this etymology, the word would be related to Gr. *κεῦθος* n. 'hole, hiding place' < PIE **(s)keudh*- 'cover'. In Germanic, the word is quite uniform in form and meaning. In Gothic, the word occurs only in the compound *gudhūs* 'temple', whereas the normal word for 'house' is *gards*. In view of this, the Proto-Slavic word must have been borrowed from West Germanic.

The attested Slavic forms go back to a number of different forms: PSl. **xyzъ/-a*, **xysъ/-a*, **xyžъ/-a*, **xyšъ/-a* (HEW 6: 378-379). PGmc. **hūsa-* was not affected by Verner's law. The Proto-Slavic forms with a root-final -*z*- probably go back to an innovation in Slavic.

The word occurs in the Slavic languages in masculine as well as in feminine forms, whereas the Germanic donor word was neuter. This divergence is consistent with the change of gender that is common to Germanic neuter nouns that were borrowed in Proto Slavic (cf. §7.3.3). Vasmer explains the feminine forms in Slavic as derivations that developed from PSl. **xyzъ/*xysъ* 'house' to which the suffix **-ja* was attached in analogy to PSl. **kǫtja* 'house, cottage' (REW 3: 240).
Origin: West Germanic; Gothic has *gards* for 'house'.

5.3   LOANWORDS WITH AP (B) AND A HEAVY SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

PSl. **cěsarь*, **cesarь* '(Roman) emperor' (m. *jo*-stem)
OCS *cěsarь*; **CS** *cěsarь, cesarь* [*k̓esar'ъ, k̓esarъ* < Byzantinian Greek (ERHSJ 1: 258)]; **OR** *cěsarь, cesarъ*; **R** *císar'*; **Ukr.** *císar, césar*; **P** *cesarz*; **OCz.** *ciesař*; **Cz.** *císař*; **Slk.** [*cisár* < Cz]; **Plb.** [*ťai̯zår* < MLG *keiser* (SEJDP 5: 865)]; **S/Cr.** *cȅsar* 'absolute sovereign', (Čak. dial. Vodice) *cesàr*; **Slov.** *césar*, Gsg. *cesárja*

PSl. **cьsarь* '(Roman) emperor, (Russian) tsar' (m. *jo*-stem)
CS *cьsarь, carь*; **OR** *cьsarъ* 'Byzantine emperor (11ᵗʰ century)', *carь* 'sovereign, monarch; Tatar khan (13ᵗʰ century)'; **R** *car'*, Gsg. *carjá* 'tsar'; **Ukr.** *car* 'tsar'; **P** [*car* 'Russian tsar, Turkish emperor' < R]; **Cz.** [*car* < R]; **US** [*car* < G < R (HEW 2: 93)]; **S/Cr.** *cȁr*; **Slov.** [*câr*, Gsg. *cârja* 'tsar' < R]; **Bg.** *car*
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. **kaisar* 'emperor, Caesar' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *kaisar**; **OHG** *k(h)eisur*; **MHG** *keiser*; **G** *Kaiser*; **OE** *Cāsere*; **OS** *kêsur*; **Du.** *keizer*;

Etymology: The word derives from Caesar, the name of G. Julius Caesar (ca. 100 BC - 44 BC) that (together with *Augustus*) became part of the Roman

emperor's title from the reign of Claudius I. The meaning of the word had broadened in Germanic from 'Roman emperor' to 'emperor' in general. Kluge regards *kaisar* as one of the earliest borrowings from Latin in Germanic. The diphthong [ai] and the retention of *k-* before a front vowel indicate that the word was borrowed from classical Latin (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Kaiser*, also Lehmann 1986: 214). The articulation of Latin /ae/ as a diphthong was considered to be the urban Roman articulation, whereas the monophthongised reflex, which is attested in Latin texts and inscriptions from the last centuries BC onwards, was perceived as rural (Adams 2007: 78-88). The title was introduced in the German lands by Louis the German (Ludwig II, der Deutsche) in 843 as a title for the emperors of the Frankish empire (EWN: s.v. *keizer*).

The Slavic form and its relation to the donor form is highly complicated. The word was probably borrowed from a Germanic language and Goth. *kaisar* has frequently been regarded as the donor (e.g., by REW 3: 283, ESSlov. 1: 62, Lehmann 1986: 214).

The Proto-Slavic form has most often been reconstructed as *cěsarъ, but in fact, the vocalism in the initial syllable of the Slavic form is uncertain. The attested forms appear to reflect original *cěsarъ, *cesarъ and *cьsarъ. In Old Church Slavic, the forms *cěsarъ* and *cesarъ* are attested. The same forms are found in Church Slavic, but there, *cьsarъ* and *carъ* are also attested. The long *-í-* in Czech reflects a long PSl. *ě, and the *i*-vocalism of Ukr. *císar* also derives from PSl. *cěsarъ.

S/Cr. *cèsar*, on the other hand, does not derive from *cěsarъ because the form does not show the expected reflex *-je-* or *-ije* from a (short or long) PSl. *ě. In addition to this, there is no form **cisar* attested in the Ikavian dialects of Serbian/Croatian (ERHSJ 1: 258); S/Cr. *cèsar* must thus go back to *cesarъ. This form might also be the basis of Slov. *césar* because the Slovene form does not have the closed *ę*-vowel from PSl. *ě. P *cesarz* does not derive from PSl. *cěsarъ either.

From the 11ᵗʰ century, *cьsarъ* is attested in Russian, Serbian and Bulgarian. The form *cьsarъ consequently yielded *carъ, which was borrowed from Russian into a number of other Slavic languages (Kiparsky 1934: 194, ESSlov. 1: 62, HEW 2: 93). In Bulgarian, *car* seems to be the original form (ERHSJ 1: 259). S/Cr. *càr* has been considered the direct reflex of PSl. *cьsarъ* rather than a loanword from Russian (Gluhak 1993: 159, ERHSJ 1: 258). If PSl. *cьsarъ with a jer in the initial syllable indeed originated in the South Slavic area, perhaps R *carъ* 'tsar' must be considered to be a Church Slavonicism. The form *cьsarъ has been explained by the circumstance that forms of address of (high placed) persons are often shortened, cf. E *king*, Sw. *kung* < *kuninga-*, E *miss* < *mistress* (REW 3: 283, Gluhak 1993: 159).

The suffix that is attested in the Germanic forms does not formally correspond to the Slavic suffix. The forms in Old High German and Old Saxon

seem to occur primarily with the suffix *-ur* (cf. Seebold 2008: 461), which fits less well to the Proto-Slavic forms than the suffix of Goth. *kaisar*. The Gothic suffix does, nevertheless, not formally match the Proto-Slavic suffix either because Germanic **ă* regularly yields **o* in Slavic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 194). In Proto-Slavic, the suffix could, however, have been analogically adapted to other *nomina agentis* ending in the suffix **-ārъ*, which had become a productive suffix. PSl. **-ārъ*, that itself was borrowed from Goth. *-āreis* or Latin *-ārius*, has a long vowel (e.g., S/Cr. *rȉbār* 'fisherman', *vràtār* 'doorkeeper', Cz. *rybář*). The Proto-Slavic suffix **-ārъ* is attested in OCS already and denotes people practicing a profession, e.g., OCS *rybarjь* 'fisherman', *vratarjь* 'doorkeeper' (Meillet 1905: 211, cf. REW 3: 283). In the case of PSl. **cěsarъ/*cesarъ/*cьsarъ*, however, the vowel in the suffix is reflected as short. This short suffix is directly attested in Cz. *císař* (as opposed to Cz. *rybář*). The suffix in Slk. *cisár*, which must be a loanword from Czech because of the *-i-* (< long **ě*) in the initial syllable, is reflected as long, but this might well be analogical to the other *nomina agentis* ending in **-ārъ*. The initial stress of the Slovene Nsg. *césar* (Gsg. *cesárja*) indicates that the vowel in the suffix was short because in Slovene, the stress retracted from final short vowels. The short *-a-* in the suffix can alternatively be the regular reflex if we were to assume that the word was a late borrowing dating from after the rise of the new timbre distinctions, which has been dated after the seventh century (cf. Kortlandt 2002a: 13, 2003b: 4, cf. §7.2.2.2). A late date of borrowing of the word would exclude Gothic as the donor language because the Goths lost their dominance in the Pontic region around the fifth century (cf. §4.1.2).

The forms deriving from original PSl. **cěsarъ* are predominantly attested in the northern part of the Slavic territory. PSl. **cesarъ* seems to be the basis of the Serbian/Croatian and Slovene forms, whereas the Bulgarian form is thought to derive from PSl. **cьsarъ*. Whether the variety in the vocalism of the initial syllable of PSl. **cěsarъ/*cesarъ/*cьsarъ* results from a late borrowing into a stage of Proto-Slavic that had already begun to develop into different dialects or whether the diversity in forms can be attributed to multiple borrowings cannot be established with certainty.

The forms **cěsarъ/*cesarъ/*cьsarъ* are in any case most likely to have been borrowed prior to the rise of the new timbre distinctions, and analogically received the suffix **-ārъ* in Proto-Slavic (instead of **-or*). According to Dybo's law, the suffix received the stress in all case forms, yielding a long falling tone on the suffix throughout the paradigm. Consequently, Stang's law operated only in the Nsg., whereas the other case forms retained the accent on the suffix because Dybo's law operated only on final syllables (not counting final jers). The long stressed falling vowel in the oblique case forms was subsequently shortened (cf. Kortlandt 2002a: 17). This chain of events explains the short reflex of the suffix that is reflected in most Slavic languages, as well as the initial accent of S/Cr.

cěsar and the dialectal form *cesăr* (the suffix stress in the latter form is then analogical to the oblique case forms).

Origin: Unknown; often thought to be Gothic, but this idea cannot be substantiated.

PSl. **cьrky* 'church' (f. *ū*-stem)

OCS *crъky*; **RCS** *crъky* (also *krъky**);[44] **OR** *cьrky*; **R** *cérkov'*, Gsg. *cérkvi*; **Ukr.** *cérkva*; **OP** *cyrkiew, cerkiew, cerki*; **P** *cerkiew* 'Greek Orthodox church'; **OCz.** *cierkiev*; **Cz.** *církev* 'congregation'; **Slk.** *cirkev* 'congregation', *cerkev* 'Orthodox church'; **US** *cyrkej*; **LS** *cerkwja*; **Plb.** *carťai̯, carťëv* 'church, cemetery'; **S/Cr.** *cȓkva*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *crȋkva*, Gsg. *crȋkvē*; **Slov.** *cę́rkəv*, Gsg. *cę́rkve* (*Freisinger Denkmäler circuvah* Lpl. f.); **Bg.** *cắrkva, čérkva*

Accentuation: AP (b), as is suggested by the long vocalic reflexes in a number of the attested Slavic forms, as well as by the neo-acute in South Slavic. The attested forms point to fixed initial stress in late Proto-Slavic. For this reason, AP (a) has repeatedly been suggested (Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 707, Zaliznjak 1985: 133), but this cannot be correct. The original paradigm of the *ū*-stems was, e.g., PSl. **svekry* 'mother-in-law' (< **uH-s*), Gsg. **svekrъve* (< **uH-es*), Asg. *svekrovь* (< **-euH-m*) (cf. Kortlandt 1997: 160). The fixed initial stress of PSl. **cьrky* results from retraction of the stress from the weak jer in the second syllable of the oblique case forms. The word was likely to be originally borrowed as **círky* (see below), which underwent Dybo's law in all case forms. In the oblique case forms, the stress subsequently retracted from the medial jer to the initial syllable again, and the stress then analogically retracted in the nominative and accusative singular as well.

Illič-Svityč reconstructs PSl. **cьrъkỳ*, Gsg. **cьrъkъ̀ve* with fixed stress on the suffix and *ъ*-vocalism in the first and second syllables (1961: 30). This reconstruction is attractive in view of the attested Germanic forms, which are also trisyllabic with **i* in the first and second syllables (deriving from WGmc. **kirikō*). The attested Slavic forms point, however, to the absence of a jer between the *r* and *k* and do thus not corroborate the reconstruction of PSl. **cьrъky*.

---

[44] Two RCS attestations show the forms *krъkъvь* (Asg.) and *kъrъkvi* (Vsg.). These forms are attested in two different menologies from the 13th and 15th centuries and go back to **krъky*. This shows that the RCS texts in which the forms are recorded must have originated in North Russia, where the second palatalization of velar consonants did not operate. One of the menologies was indeed kept in the library of the *Sofijskij sobor* in Novgorod (MSDJ 1: 1341).

According to Snoj, part of the material (e.g., MBg. NAsg. *crъkо́vъ,* Gpl. *crkо́vъ,* Belarusian *carkvá*) point to the "progresivno-premični NV tipa **l'ȗby* [progressive-mobile accentuation type **l'ȗby*]", which implies AP (c), whereas Serbian and Croatian material points to a neo-acute on the root syllable (1994: 512-513).[45]

WGmc. **kirikō* 'church' (f. *ō*-stem)
OHG *kirihha, ckĭlihha,* (dial. Bav.) *chirhha;* **MHG** *kirche;* **G** *Kirche;* **OE** *cirice;* **OFri.** *tzerke, tzereke;* **OS** *kirika;* **Du.** *kerk*

Etymology: The Germanic word is attested in West Germanic only. De Vries regards it an early borrowing from Latin into Germanic from a Greek model *κυρικόν,* which derives from the Vulgar Greek adjective *κύριακός* 'belonging to the lord'. The form **kirikō* would have spread from the imperial Roman residence of Trier to the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons, together with the spread of Christianity around the fourth century (De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 312, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Kirche*). In Gothic, the word is not attested. In view of the fact that Gothic has *aikklesjo* 'house of God, congregation' from Gr. *ἐκκλησία* as well as *gudhūs* 'house of God, Jewish temple', it is unclear whether the word **kirikō* or **kyrikō* ever existed in Gothic (cf., e.g., Snoj 1994: 511).[46] The word can, furthermore, be expected to be attested in Gothic if it had existed in the language.

The older West Germanic languages point to an original form **kirik-* with *i*-vocalism in the second syllable as well. The second *-i-* is not reflected in Slavic, which is shown among other things by the fact that the Polish and Czech forms do not have a soft *-r-* (Kiparsky 1934: 245).

The forms in the different Slavic languages cannot be derived from a single proto-form. The vocalism of the attested forms points to four different vowels in the initial syllable: **cъr-, *cir- *cer-* and **cěr-.* Forms pointing to *-ъ-* in the initial syllable are, for example, attested in (Old) Church Slavic, Old Russian *cъrky,* S/Cr. *cȓkva,* Bg. *cărkva.* The East Slavic forms can also be derived from PSl. **cъrky.* The Polabian forms are indecisive and might reflect **ъ* or **i* (cf. Polański/Sehnert 1967: 24-26). Forms with original *-i-* in the initial syllable are attested, for example, in Old Church Slavic (Gsg. *cirъkъve* and Nsg. f. (adj.) *cirkъnaě* in the *Kiever Blätter* and forms in the *Psalterium Sinaiticum*), in

---

[45] PSl. **ljuby* has alternatively been regarded as a AP (b)-noun (cf. Dybo 1981: 187). Derksen notes PSl. **ljuby* without an accent paradigm (2008: 281).
[46] Gothic *aikklesjo,* however, did not mean 'church building' (as did the Latin word *ecclesia* after the third century) but 'congregation' (Lehmann 1986: 15).

dialects of Croatian (e.g., Kajkavian, Prigorje, *církva*) (Snoj 1994: 509-510, Schaeken 1987: 123-124). Dialectal forms in Slovene, as well as Bg. *čérkva*, point to a full vowel **i* or **e* in the initial syllable (Snoj 1994: 509-510), as well as US *cyrkej*. Dialectal East Lower Sorbian (e.g., Megiser *cyrkwja*) and the Old Polish forms with initial *cyr-* must go back to **cir-* (HEW 2: 105). Čakavian Croatian dialect forms, e.g., Vrgada *crîkva*, Orbanići *crʲěkva*, point to initial *-er-* (cf. Jurišić 1973: 34, Kalsbeek 1998: 426). OCz. *cierkiev* and Cz. *církev* derive from initial **cěr-*.

All in all, the forms deriving from an initial syllable with **ь* and **i* are more frequent than the forms with **e* or **ě* and there seems to be a certain geographical distribution of the forms over the Slavic languages. The forms that seem to go back to original **ь* are centred in East Slavic and the southern parts of South Slavic, whereas the forms deriving from **i* occur mainly in West Slavic and in the northern areas of South Slavic.

All attested forms likely to go back to forms with an original initial syllable **cьr-* or **cir-*: Snoj supposes that the forms pointing to **ě* in the initial syllable analogically replaced the *i*-vowel in the initial syllable because the anlaut **cě-* was much more common in Proto-Slavic than **ci-* (1994: 512-513), but it can alternatively be assumed that the forms with *e*-vocalism result from lowering of PSl. **i* before *r*, a development that is not infrequent in Slavic (cf. Vondrák 1906: 31-32). In this case, the forms with **cer-* (in dialectal forms in Čakavian and perhaps Slovenian and Bulgarian) go back to earlier **cьr-* and forms with **cěr-* (in Czech) go back to earlier **cir-*.

Nahtigal supposed that the word was borrowed twice into Proto-Slavic. He assumed that PSl. **cirky* (which became PSl. **cirъky* in accordance with the Proto-Slavic syllabic structure) was borrowed from Bavarian German, possibly in Slavic Carantania. The form **cьrky* would have entered Slavic along with the mission of Cyril and Method and has been thought to derive from Crimean Gothic originally (1936: 18). The division between PSl. **cirky* from the north and **cьrky* from the south would seem to be corroborated by the distribution of the reflexes over the Slavic languages.

Brückner assumes that the word was borrowed in the seventh century in Bavaria or around Salzburg, and spread throughout the Slavic language area along with the mission of Cyril and Method (1927: 59). Snoj also departs from one borrowing and derives all Slavic forms from (unattested) Old Middle German **kīrka,* with supposed compensatory lengthening in the initial syllable due to the loss of the vowel in the original second syllable. He dates the borrowing to the eighth century and supposes that the word was initially borrowed into the western part of the Slavic language area. The borrowing of the word might well be located to Slavic Carantania, as Nahtigal suggested, because the Slavs in Carantania are known to have conversed to Christianity at an early stage (cf. §7.4.2.5). Snoj thinks the word was originally borrowed as PSl. **cirky*

and that the problem of the closed syllable in the NAsg. was solved in two different ways, by inserting a jer (*cirъky) and by metathesis (*criky) after which different forms of analogical levelling took place in the individual Slavic languages (1994: 512-513).

The word is in any case likely to be a late borrowing; the occurrence of *c suggests that the word was borrowed before the second palatalization of velar consonants had ceased to be active, but after the first palatalization had finished.[47]

Origin: West Germanic; the word is unattested in Gothic.

PSl. *grędelъ 'plough-beam, axis' (m. *jo*-stem)
R [*grjadíl', gredíl', gradíl'* 'plough-beam' < Ukr.]; **Ukr.** *hrjadíl', hradíl'* 'plough-beam'; **P** *grządziel* 'pole on a plough'; **OCz.** *hřiedel* 'axis, pivot'; **Cz.** *hřídel* 'axis, pivot'; **Slk.** *hriadeľ* 'pivot, cylinder'; **S/Cr.** *grédelj* 'plough-beam'; **Slov.** *grẹ́dəl*, Gsg. *grédlja* 'pole, plough-beam'; **Bg.** *gredá* 'beam', *gredél* 'pole, plough-beam'

Accentuation: AP (b)

NWGmc. *grindila-, *grandila-* 'bar, bolt' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *grintil* 'bar, bolt, plough-beam'; **MHG** *grintel, grindel* 'bolt, beam'; **G** *Grindel* m. 'plough-beam'; (dial. Carinth.) *grintl*, (dial. Hess.) *grindel*; **OE** *grindel* m. 'bar, bolt'; **OS** *grindil* 'bolt, bar', *grendil* 'plough tail';[48] **MLG** *grindel, grendel* 'bar, bolt, plough-beam'; **MDu.** *grendel* 'crossbeam, bolt', *grindel* 'beam, axis'; **Du.** *grendel* 'bolt'; **ON** *grind* f. 'fence, frame';
Cognates: Lat. *grunda* 'roof (trusses)', Lith. *grindìs* 'floor plank', OPr. *grandis* 'ring on a plough-beam to connect the plough-beam with the front part of the plough', R *grjadá* 'bed (of flowers), row', S/Cr. *gréda* 'balk, beam', Cz. *hřada* 'shaft, pole' < European IE *gʰrendʰ-* 'beam' (Pokorny 1959: 459).

Etymology: For Proto-Germanic, the forms *grandila-* (Swiss German *grendel*, MDu. *grendel* 'crossbeam, bolt', OS *grendil* 'plough tail') and PGmc.

---

[47] Skok rejects the Germanic origin of the Slavic word and thinks both Slavic and Germanic are borrowed directly from Greek because he can better explain the forms with a vowel pointing to *ě from Vulgar Gr. κυρικόν than from Germanic (ERHSJ 1: 275), but this etymology is equally difficult and it is easier to derive the Czech forms with a reflex of *ě from earlier *i.

[48] According to the EWN, OS *grendil* 'plough tail; bolt, bar' is an isolated attestation, whereas the normal form in Old Saxon is *grindil* (EWN: s.v. *grendel*). Tiefenbach lists both forms, and according to him, the forms differ in meaning (2010: 137-138).

*grindila- (MDu. *grindel*, OS *grindil* 'bolt, bar', OHG *grintil*, OE *grindel* 'beam, axis') can be distinguished (e.g., De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 219). In some Germanic languages or dialects in which the two forms occur next to each other, a difference in meaning can be observed, e.g., in Swiss *grendel* 'fencing' against *grindel* 'plough-beam', although Grimm/Grimm consider it on the basis of modern German impossible to distinguish different meanings for PGmc. *grandila- and *grindila- (DWb: s.v. *Grindel*). Forms going back to initial *grin-* or *gren-* are attested with the meaning 'plough-beam' or 'plough-tail' throughout the High and Low German language area (EWA 4: 628). The vowel in the first syllable of PGmc. *grandila- was fronted to -*e*- as a result of the *i*-umlaut. In Old High German, the forms with -*i*- in the initial syllable were initially the most frequent, whereas forms with -*e*- (< *a*) occurred only occasionally; the forms with -*e*- seem to have their origin in the western dialects of the German language area (DWb: s.v. *Grindel*).

PSl. *grędelъ is a technical borrowing from a West Germanic dialect. It might have been borrowed from a reflex of either PGmc. *grandila- (after the *i*-umlaut) or from PGmc. *grindila-. The word was borrowed into Proto-Slavic as *grędelъ, where the nasal vowel in the first syllable can continue both Germanic *-*en*- and *-*in*-. The Germanic *i*-umlaut probably reached the High and Low German language area in the seventh or eighth century (cf. §7.2.1.3), so if the word was borrowed from the umlauted reflex of PGmc. *grandila- it must be a relatively late borrowing.

The word ends in a soft *-*ljъ* in Proto-Slavic, and this might well be the Slavic interpretation of the German auslaut. A similar case would then be PSl. *korljъ (see below).
Origin: West Germanic.

PSl. *korljъ 'king' (m. *jo*-stem)
CS *kralъ*; **R** *koról'*, Gsg. *koroljá*; **Ukr.** *koról'*; **P** *król*, Gsg. *króla*; **OCz.** *král*; **Cz.** *král* 'king. prince'; **Slk.** *kráľ*; **US** [*kral* < Cz. (HEW 9: 663)]; **LS** [*kral* < Cz. (HEW 9: 663)], *krol* (arch., dial., Mucke 1891: 35); **Plb.** [*ťarl, ťarål* < MLG *kerl* (SEJDP 5: 866)]; **S/Cr.** *krâlj*, Gsg. *králja*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *krⁿāḷ*, Gsg. *krⁿāḷà*; **Slov.** *králj*; **Bg.** *kral*
Accentuation: AP (b)

Etymology: PSl. *korljъ is without any doubt the most famous Germanic loanword in Slavic. The word seems to be borrowed from *Karl*, the name of Charlemagne (742-814). He was of great importance to the Slavs living in the western part of their expansion area, for they were subjected to the Frankish rule (cf. §4.3).

If PSl. *korljь indeed derives from *Karl* 'Charlemagne', it is the only loanword in Proto-Slavic that can actually be dated, thus giving important indications about the absolute dating of phonological developments in Proto-Slavic. The circumstance that *korljь clearly belongs to the Proto-Slavic period (it is represented in all three branches of Slavic and it underwent regular Proto-Slavic sound laws) is one of the reasons to date the end of Proto-Slavic to the ninth century (cf. §1.2.2.1). This may be perceived as counter-intuitive because it implies that the Proto-Slavic period ended only about a century before the first Old Church Slavic manuscripts were written. For this reason, scholars have tried to find other etymologies for the word. Holzer suggested that the word was borrowed as the name of Charles Martel (688-741) rather than that of Charlemagne (2005: 46). Charles Martel was ruler of the Franks. He fought the Saxons and subjugated Bavaria and Alemannia, but acquired his greatest fame by defeating the Moorish army at the Battle of Poitiers in 732. This etymology of the word is attractive because it would place the borrowing of the word earlier (albeit half a century), but Charles Martel was less directly important to the western Proto-Slavs than Charlemagne was. Stender-Petersen derives the word from Germanic *karla- 'free man' (e.g., in OHG *karl* 'man') (1927: 206ff.). Although Stender-Petersen regards the semantic shift of this etymology as a "sehr einfache Verschiebung", it obviously fits less well than the derivation of PSl. *korljь 'king' from *Karl* 'Charlemagne', who was after all 'king' of (among others) the Slavs, and, although perhaps to a lesser degree, the derivation from *Karl* 'Charles Martel'.

Contrary to the Germanic donor word, PSl. *korljь is a masculine *jo*-stem and not an *o*-stem, as one might expect. This has been explained as the result of analogical replacement after the example of either the *nomina agentis* ending in *-telь or other words denoting leaders as PSl. *cěsarь and *kъnędźь (Schenker 1995: 161). According to Holzer, the word has a *j*-suffix resulting from a substantivized possessive adjective (2007: 107). The word might alternatively have final *-ljь because the Proto-Slavs perceived the German final consonant as soft, as possibly also happened in PSl. *grędelь (see above).

Origin: West Germanic (High German); the word was borrowed from the name of the Frankish king Charlemagne (or alternatively from the name of Charles Martel).

PSl. *kupiti: *kupľǫ 'to buy'
OCS *kupiti, kupľǫ*; **R** *kupít', kupljú, kúpiš'*; **Ukr.** *kupýty*; **P** *kupić, kupię*; **Cz.** *koupit*; **Slk.** *kúpiť*; **US** *kupić*; **LS** *kupiś*; **Plb.** *ťaip̃ě* (3sg.); **S/Cr.** *kúpiti, kûpīm* (1sg.); (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *kūpȉti, kūpīš* (2sg.); **Slov.** *kúpiti*; **Bg.** *kúpja*
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. *kaupjan, *kaupōn 'to buy, trade' (weak verb)
Goth. *kaupon*; **OHG** *koufen*; **MHG** *koufon, koufen, keufen*; **G** *kaufen*; **OE** *cýpan, cípan* 'to sell'; *cēapjan* 'to bargain, trade'; **OFri.** *kāpia, kēpia* 'to buy'; **OS** *kôpian* 'to purchase, buy', *kōpon* 'to buy, trade; to suffer for'; **Du.** *kopen*; **ON** *kaupa* 'to buy, trade, change'
Cognates: A cognate of the Latin forms *caupōnāri* 'to haggle', *caupo* 'innkeeper, small tradesman' is Gr. κάπηλος 'huckster, innkeeper'. The Latin and Greek forms have been regarded as loanwords from an unknown, possibly Mediterranean, language (De Vaan 2008: 100).

Etymology: Kluge derives the verb *kaupjan, *kaupōn* 'to trade, buy' from the Latin verb *caupōnāri* 'to haggle' (2002: s.v. *kaufen*). Green objects to this derivation because the verb *caupōnāri* apparently did not occur in Gaul, but mainly in the southern provinces of the Roman Empire (1998: 225). He rather considers the Proto-Germanic verb a new formation after the noun *kaupo* 'trader' that was borrowed from Lat. *caupo* 'innkeeper, small tradesman'. The Slavic word is generally regarded as a borrowing from Goth. *kaupon* 'to trade' (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 204 for literature).
Origin: Generally regarded as Gothic.

PSl. *kusiti: *kusjǫ 'to try, taste'
OCS *vъkusiti* 'to taste', *o-, po-, izvъkusiti* 'to try'; **OR** *kusiti*; **Ukr.** *kusýty*; **P** *kusić, kuszę* (arch.); **Cz.** *okusit* 'to try'; **Slk.** *okúsiť* 'to try, taste'; **US** *skušować* (arch.) 'to elicit, worm'; **LS** (dial. East Lower Sorbian) *skušyć* 'to try, taste; to keep'; **Plb.** *ťau̯sot, ťai̯sot* 'to taste'; **S/Cr.** *kȕsiti* (arch.);[49] **Slov.** *iskúsiti, kúšati*; **Bg.** *kúsam, kúsvam*
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. *keus-a- 'to sample, choose' (weak verb)
Goth. *kiusan* (causative *kausjan*); **OHG** *kiosan*; **MHG** *kiesen*; **G** *kiesen*; **OE** *cēosan*; **OFri.** *kiāsa, tziāsa*; **OS** *kiosan*; **Du.** *kiezen*; **ON** *kjósa*
Cognates: Goth. *kausjan* is structurally identical with Skt. *joṣáyate* 'to caress, take delight in' (Orel 2003: 211); further cognates are, e.g., Gr. γεύομαι 'to taste, enjoy', Lat. *gustus* 'taste', OIr. *do-goa* 'he chooses' < PIE *ǵeus- 'to taste, enjoy' (Pokorny 1959: 399-400).

---

[49] The word is attested from the 16th to 18th century (RJA 5: 827).

Etymology: The Germanic forms ultimately derive from PIE *ǵeus- 'to taste, enjoy' (Pokorny 1959: 399-400, Lehmann 1986: 219). In Germanic, as well as in Celtic, the root acquired the meaning 'to sample, choose'.

The Slavic word is generally regarded as a borrowing from Goth. *kausjan* 'to experience, taste', which is a causative-iterative derivation from PGmc. *keusanan* 'to test, choose' (Orel 2003: 211, 213).[50] The Slavic word cannot have been borrowed from (a reflex of) PGmc. *keusa- because the diphthong *eu is reflected as a *iu in Gothic or *io in the West Germanic languages (e.g., Goth. *kiusan*, OHG *kiosan*, OS *kiosan*). The diphthong was affected by the *a*-umlaut in Northwest Germanic and its reflexes are not expected to give PSl. *u. Goth. *iu* gives *ju in Proto-Slavic, as it did in PSl. *bljudo.

In a number of Slavic languages, PSl. *kusiti merged phonologically with the reflex of PSl. *kǫsiti 'to bite', which consequently led to a semantic merger as well (Kiparsky 1934: 204).

Origin: Gothic; Goth. *kausjan* 'to experience, taste' is the only attested Germanic form that formally corresponds to PSl. *kusiti.

PSl. *lagy 'bottle, cask' (f. *ū*-stem)

RCS *lagva*, *lagvica* 'cup'; **R** *lagóvka* (dial. Kazan) 'milk jug'; *lagvica* (arch.) 'cup'; **P** *łagiew*, Gsg. *łagwi* 'cup'; *łagwica* 'small barrel'; **Cz.** *láhev*, Gsg. *lahve* 'bottle, jar'; **US** *łahej* 'bottle'; **LS** *łagwja* 'bottle'; **S/Cr.** *làgav* m.; *lagva* f. 'barrel', *làgvić* 'small barrel'; **Slov.** *lágəv*, Gsg. *lágve* f. 'bottle'; *lágəv*, Gsg *lágva* m. 'barrel'

Accentuation: AP (b)?; secondary developments make it difficult to establish the original accentuation type. Cz. *láhev* can be AP (a) or (b). The South Slavic forms are most easily explained from AP (b), while they can hardly be explained from AP (a) and (c).

WGmc. *lāgel(l)a 'bottle, cask' (f. *ō*-stem)

OHG *lāgel(l)a* 'cask for liquid', *lāgel(la)* f. 'bottle', *lagen* (dial.); **MHG** *lāgel(e)*, *lægel(e)* f.; **G** *Lägel* (also *Legel*) 'small barrel'; **MDu.** *lagel(e)*, *legel(e)*

Etymology: The Germanic word is a borrowing from Lat. *lagoena*, *lagōna* f. 'bottle with narrow neck and broad body'. The Latin word itself is a borrowing from Gr. λάγυνος m. (later also f.) 'flask', which is of unknown origin (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Lägel*). In different dialects of German, the word

---

[50] In West Germanic, the root has forms that underwent rhotacism, e.g., OHG *korōn* 'to try, examine'.

denotes different kinds of containers: it often refers to a wine jar, but also designates a broad, round wooden barrel used for transporting fluids and ironwork (DWb: s.v. *Lägel*, Heyse/Heyse 1849: 5).

Kiparsky explains PSl. **lagy* as a borrowing from OHG *lāge* (1934: 247), which would be attractive had this form indeed been attested in Old High German. The Old High German documents however always show *lāgela* or *lāgella*. Germanic *-l-* instead of Latin *-n-* is according to the "übliche Suffixersatz" (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Lägel*), by which Latin loanwords in Germanic receive an *l*-suffix (as in, e.g., PGmc. **asil-* from Lat. *asinus* 'donkey', cf. §7.3.2). In High German dialects, the form *lagen* with the original final *-n* from Latin is also attested. Neither the Germanic suffix nor the original Latin suffix are attested in the Proto-Slavic borrowing.

Because the occurrence of the word is limited to West Germanic, the borrowing from Latin was probably relatively late, West Germanic only. PSl. **lagy* therefore is likely to stem from a West Germanic dialect.

For semantic reasons, the word must be regarded as a borrowing through a Germanic intermediary, rather than as a loanword directly from Latin: the Slavic meaning of the word corresponds better to that of the Germanic form than of the Latin form, for in Germanic as well as in Slavic the word refers to a larger vessel of glass, wood or earthenware, and includes barrels, whereas Lat. *lagoena* primarily seems to refer to a (smaller) glass vessel.

Origin: West Germanic (High German); the word is a late Latin loanword in West Germanic. The word must derive from High German because it is not attested in Low German.

   PSl. **lěkъ* 'medicine' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *lěčъba* 'cure'; **CS** *lěčъba, lěkъ*; **R** *leká*; **Ukr.** *lik*; **P** *lek*; **Cz.** *lék*; **Slk.** *liek*; **US** *lěk*; **Plb.** *lekər* 'doctor'; **S/Cr.** *lȉjek*, Gsg. *lijèka*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *lîk*, Gsg. *lîka*; **Slov.** *lẹ́k*; **Bg.** *lek*

   PSl. **lěčiti* 'to cure'
CS *lěčiti*; **R** *lečítь*; **Ukr.** *ličíti*; **P** *leczyć*; **Cz.** *léčiti*; **Plb.** *lecě* (3sg.); **S/Cr.** *lijèčiti, lijèčīm* (1sg.); (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *lĩčȉti, lĩčĩš* (2sg.)
Accentuation: AP (b)

   PGmc. **lēkja-* 'doctor' (m. *ja*-stem)
Goth. ?*lekeis** m.; **OHG** *lāhhi*; **OE** *lǣce, lǣca*; **E** *leech* (arch.) 'doctor; bloodsucker'; **OFri.** *lētza, leitza*; **MDu.** *lāke* 'leech' ; **ON** *læknir*

   PGmc. **lēkinōn-* 'to cure'
Goth. *lekinon*; **OHG** *lāhhenōn*; **OE** *lǣcnian*; **OS** *lāknon*; **ON** *lækna*

Etymology: The Germanic word has often been explained as a borrowing from Celtic **lēgi* 'physician' (cf. OIr. *liaig*, Gsg. *lego* 'doctor'). The Celtic word possibly derives from **lēpagi-* 'charmer' (Lehmann 1986: 232, Pokorny 1959: 658, 677).

The Proto-Slavic reflex **ě* in the initial syllable shows that the word was borrowed from a Germanic form with **ē* rather than **ā*. For this reason, it is very probable that the Slavic form is a borrowing from Gothic, since PGmc. **ē₁* is reflected as *ē* in Gothic and as **ā* or **æ* in North and West Germanic (cf. §7.2.1.1).

The Germanic origin of PSl. **lěkъ*, **lěčiti* has been doubted, however, by Gołąb and Matasović, primarily because no form in Germanic exactly corresponds to PSl. **lěkъ* 'medicine'. They regard PSl. **lěk-* as an inherited root going back to PIE **leikʷ-* 'to leave' (Gołąb 1991: 372, Matasović 2000: 132).[51] Gołąb considers the correspondence of Gothic **ē* to Slavic **ě* to be "exceptional" (ibid.), but **ě* (< earlier PSl. **ē*) is in fact the expected reflex of Germanic **ē* in Proto-Slavic.

Because of the semantic agreement between the Germanic and the Slavic forms, a borrowing from Germanic is more likely than a derivation from the root PIE **leikʷ-*, with a semantic shift from 'to leave' to 'to cure' in Proto-Slavic. Kiparsky suggests that the Slavs borrowed only the root **lēk-* from Gothic, after which the derivations **lěčьba* 'medicine', **lěkārъ* 'doctor', **lěčiti* 'to cure' were made in Slavic (1934: 205).

Origin: Gothic; the Proto-Slavic reflex **ě* indicates that the vowel in the donor language was **ē* rather than **ā*.

PSl. **lugъ* 'lye, caustic soda' (m. *o*-stem)
R *lúga*; *lug* (dial.) 'lye'; **Ukr.** *luh*; **P** *ług*; **OCz.** *lúh*; **Cz.** *louh*; **Slk.** *lúh*; **US** *łuh*; **LS** *ług*; **Plb.** *la͝ug*; **S/Cr.** *lûg*, Gsg. *lúga*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *lũg*, Gsg. *lūgà*, Lsg. *u lūgù*; **Bg.** *lugá*
Accentuation: AP (b)?; the long reflex of **u* in Cz. *louh* suggests AP (b) and the long falling accent of S/Cr. *lûg* excludes AP (a).

NWGmc. **laugō* 'bath, lye' (f. *ō*-stem)
OHG *louga*; **MHG** *lauge*; **G** *Lauge*; **OE** *lēah*; **MLG** *lōge*; **Du.** *loog*; **ON** *laug* '(warm) bath'

---

[51] With this etymology, the word is thought to derive from PIE **loikʷó*, a *nomen agentis* from the root PIE **leikʷ-* 'to leave'. The meaning of this word would be 'decoction remaining in the vessel from brewing medicinal herbs" (Gołąb 1991: 372).

Cognates: OE *lauþr*, ON *lauðr* 'lather, foam, washing soda'; Gaul. *lautro* 'bath', Breton *ludu* 'ashes', Lat. *lavāre* 'to wash', Gr. λούω 'to take a bath', Arm. *loganam* (1sg.) 'to wash' < European IE *leuh₃-/*louh₃-* 'to wash, bathe' (Pokorny 1959: 692, De Vaan 2008: 330-331).

Etymology: The Germanic form, which is attested in West and North Germanic, is derived from European IE **leuh₃-/*louh₃-* 'to wash, bathe'. The word is a technical term; lye is a caustic solution that one gets by extracting substances like ash or ore. In the Middle Ages, lye soap was a cheap, harsh soap that was produced at home from lye made of wood ashes and lard (rendered animal fat); it was also used as a laundry detergent (Newman 2001: 151-152).

   Apart from the difference in gender, the formal and semantic correspondence between the Germanic and Slavic forms is flawless. The word is a masculine *o*-stem in Slavic, whereas the Germanic forms are generally feminine. Only in Russian and Bulgarian is the word feminine, but in Russian, the word occurs next to a dialectal form *lug*. The distribution of the masculine forms over the entire Slavic language area suggests that the word was masculine in Proto-Slavic already.

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the occurrence of the word is limited to West and North Germanic.

   PSl. **myto* 'toll, payment' (n. *o*-stem)

OCS *myto* 'reward, profit'; **OR** *myto* 'toll, tribute'; **R** *myto* (arch.) 'toll', *myt* (dial.) 'lease'; **Ukr.** *mýto* 'toll'; **P** *myto* 'payment, toll, reward'; **Cz.** *mýto* 'toll, tollhouse'; **Slk.** *mýto* 'toll, tollhouse'; **US** *myto* 'pay; prize, reward'; **LS** *myto* 'pay; prize, reward'; **Plb.** *moi̯tĕ* 'reward'; **S/Cr.** *mît*, Gsg. *míta*, *míto* 'bribe'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *mītȍ*, Gsg. *mītã*; **Slov.** *mítǫ* n. 'bribe, gift (for bribery)', *mîta* f. 'toll, bribe';[52] **Bg.** *míto* 'toll, bribe'

Accentuation: AP (b) (cf. Zaliznjak 1985: 135); although this word has fixed initial stress in Russian, older forms of Russian point to end stress, which is attested in, e.g., *Domostroj* (16th century) and *Uloženije* (1649) (Kiparsky 1958: 22). The end stress corresponds to the end stress in Serbian/Croatian, which points to AP (b).

---

[52] Slovene *múta* f. 'toll, miller's pay' is a later borrowing from High German.

PGmc. (?) *mōta* or *mūta* 'toll' (f. *ō*-stem)
Goth. *mota* 'toll'**; OHG** (dial. Bav.) *mūta* 'toll, toll post'**; MHG** (dial. Bav.) *maut*; (late MHG, dial. Bav.) *muoze* 'miller's pay'**; G** *Maut* 'toll, toll post'**; MDu.** (dial. Flanders) *mute* 'toll'**; OE** (dial. Northumberland) *mōt* 'tax'**; ON** *múta* 'charge, bribe'

Etymology: The Germanic word has been connected to (reconstructed?) Medieval Latin **mūta* 'toll, tax', that would derive from the verb Lat. *mūtāre* 'to (ex)change, replace', cf. Lat. *mūtātūra* 'the exchange of money' (LEW 2: 137). Lehmann regards the Germanic word as a borrowing from Latin (1986: 259). De Vries, on the other hand, rejects the connection of Lat. **mūta* with *mūtāre* and considers Lat. **mūta* to be a borrowing from East Germanic (1977: 397).

The word is attested in the eastern (Bavarian) dialects of High German from the ninth century onwards. The Bavarian form has often been explained as a borrowing from Gothic, which has been dated to the end of the fifth century or the early sixth century, when the Ostrogothic king Theodoric the Great is said to have imposed taxes upon West Germanic peoples (Lehmann 1986: 259). In Old High German, the word is reflected as *mūta* with /ū/ rather than /ō/ as in Gothic. It has been concluded on the basis of *mūta* in Old High German that in late Ostrogothic (which was presumed to be the donor language of the Old High German form), the phoneme /ō/ was phonetically closer to [ū] than to [ō] (Jellinek 1926: 46).

ON *múta* 'charge, bribe' has been explained as a loanword from Gothic (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Maut*) or directly from Latin (De Vries 1977: 397; the latter explanation is, however, difficult because there do not seem to be many loanwords directly from Latin into Old Norse). In view of the occurrence of the word in Middle Dutch and Old English, it is nevertheless difficult to see the word as a regional loanword from Gothic in eastern Old High German at the beginning of the sixth century. The distribution of the word over the Germanic languages would rather suggest that we are dealing with a Proto-Germanic word, possibly an early borrowing from Latin. The vocalism of the original form of the word is unclear: Old English and Gothic point to original *ō, whereas the High German, Middle Dutch and Old Norse forms go back to *ū.

In the Proto-Slavic form *myto*, *y goes back to earlier Proto-Slavic *ū, and corresponds to *ū in Germanic (cf. §7.2.1, §7.2.2.2). On the basis of this, the Slavic word has often been regarded as a loanword from OHG *mūta*. A borrowing from the attested Gothic form *mota* would have given PSl. **muta*. There are two possible scenario's: if the word was pan-Germanic (albeit with unexplained variation of *ō next to *ū), then PSl. *myto* was probably borrowed from a Germanic donor form with *ū*-vocalism, e.g., High German. If *ō in late Ostrogothic had indeed narrowed to *ū* and had been borrowed as *mūta* into Old High German, there is, nevertheless, no objection to derive PSl. *myto* directly

from Gothic and to date the borrowing to the same time as the presumed borrowing of the word into Old High German. If the Ostrogoths under Theodoric the Great controlled the trade routes near Bavaria and imposed taxes on traders, the Slavs certainly were affected by these measures as well, and if the Gothic word could have been borrowed with *ū* into Old High German, the same could have happened in Proto-Slavic. The Germanic origin of the word thus remains unclear.

The borrowing into Slavic can in either case be dated to the time before the unrounding of Proto-Slavic *ū* to *y* or while the development was still operative; this development has been dated to approximately 300 to 600 (Kortlandt 2002a: 12; 2003b: 4).

The word means 'toll' or 'payment' throughout the Slavic languages. In South Slavic, the meaning of *myto* has broadened to include 'bribe' as well. The word is neuter in Slavic, whereas it derives from a feminine Germanic form. This might be due to the fact that the Germanic word was interpreted as a collective neuter plural form in Proto-Slavic, which later became a feminine singular form.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ)* 'bucket, quantity of grain' (m. *o*-stem)
OR *uborokъ* 'measure of capacity'; **P** *węborek*, (dial. Poznań) *wębor* 'bucket'; **Cz.** *úborek* (arch.) 'basket'; **Slk.** *úborka* (arch.) 'basket'; **LS** [*zbórk/zbork, bórk/bork* '(well) bucket' ?];[53] **Plb.** *vǫbörək* '(milk) bucket'; **S/Cr.** *ùborak*, Gsg. *ùbōrka* 'quantity of grain'; **Slov.** *obǫ̂rək*, Gsg. *obǫ̂rka* 'quantity of grain'
Accentuation: AP (b)

NWGmc. *aimbara-* 'bucket' (n. (or m.?) *a*-stem)
OHG *eimbar* m./n., *eimberi* n., (?) *ambar**; **MHG** *eimer, eimber, einber*; **G** *Eimer* m.; **OS** *êmbar, emmar*; **OE** *āmber, ōmber, ōmbor* m./n.(?) 'dry measure (of four bushels)'; *amber* m./f./n. 'vessel; measure'; **MDu.** *eemer, emmer, eimer*; **Du.** *emmer*; **N** *ambar, ember*; **Sw.** *ämbar*, **Dan**. *ember*

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from Lat. *amphora* f. 'vessel with two handles', which itself stems from Gr. ἀμφορεύς (< earlier ἀμφιφορεύς 'two-handled jug', a compound of ἀμφι 'both' and φέρειν 'to carry'). It has been

---

[53] LS *bórk* is usually included in the list of reflexes of PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ)* 'bucket, quantity of grain', but Schuster-Šewc derives LS *zbórk/zbork* and *bórk* from PSl. *čьbьrъ* 'tub' (HEW 23: 1741).

assumed that the Proto-Germanic form was reinterpreted by folk etymology as *ein-bar*, a compound of *eins* 'one' and *beran* 'to carry' because the function of the container was taken over by a bucket with one handle (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Eimer*). A formation similar to NWGmc. *ein-bar* and Gr. ἀμφι-φορεύς is found in OHG *zubar*, *zwibar* 'tub' (G *Zuber*), which is a compound of the numeral 'two' and the verb *beran* (cf. §6.3, s.v. PSl. *čьbьrъ*). The Scandinavian forms are borrowed from Middle Low German, obviously before the assimilation of *-mb-* to *-m-* (RGA 6: 582). The forms without *-b-* are attested from the 12th century (EWA 2: 986).

The Old High German form *ambar* appears not infrequently in dictionaries (e.g., Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 155, Köbler 1993: 47, REW 3: 169, De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 157). Kiparsky adds that *ambar* is the form that occurs in the oldest Old High German sources of the eighth century, whereas *eimbar* is found in younger texts (1934: 255). Yet I am unsure as to whether OHG *ambar* is really attested because the form is not listed in Schützeichel's *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch* (2006), the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (DWb), the *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* (EWA 2) nor in the *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: Der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)* or *Idem: Der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Seebold 2001 and 2008).

In all probability, the form *ambar* did exist in Germanic: the form *ampar* or *ambar* (with voicing of Lat. *p*) is the expected Germanic reflex of a borrowing of Lat. *amp(h)ora* and corresponds from a phonological viewpoint exactly to PSl. *ǫborъ*. Furthermore, *amper* 'bucket' occurs in modern Austrian German and *emper* is attested in the Bavarian dialect of Gottschee in Slovenia (Schröer 1870: 78). The Austrian German *amper* is a tall wooden vessel with one handle on the side that was used to carry water, wine or beer, whereas the *emer* (< *eim(b)er*), which occurs next to *amper* in Austrian, is a round vessel with a handle that is used to draw and carry water (Höfer 1815: 27). The Old High German derivation *ampri*, attested in a ninth-century gloss, also indicates that OHG *ambar* existed (EWA 2: 987).

PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ)* must be regarded as a loanword from Germanic, rather than as a loanword directly from Latin because the meaning of the Slavic word corresponds exactly to that of the Germanic forms. The meaning of the Germanic forms differs from that of the Latin donor word: in Germanic, the word came to denote a vessel with one handle (viz., a bucket), whereas the Roman *amphora* was an (earthen) vessel with its well known form with two handles, small neck and round body. The Roman *amphora* was also used to carry and store, for example, water or grain.

Already in Proto-Slavic, a variant existed with the suffix *-ъkъ*, which is attested in almost all of Slavic.

Origin: West Germanic (High German); the word is a late Latin loanword in West Germanic.

PSl. **pъlkъ* 'regiment, crowd' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *plъkъ* 'battle array, wedge'; **CS** *plъkъ* 'crowd, people'; **OR** *pъlkъ, pъlъkъ, plъkъ, polkъ* 'regiment, battle, campaign, people, crowd'; **R** *polk*, Gsg. *polká* 'regiment, crowd'; *polók*, Gsg. *polká* (dial.) 'flock (of girls)'; **Ukr.** *polk* 'regiment'; **P** *pułk* 'regiment', *pełk* (arch.); **OCz.** *plk*; **Cz.** *pluk* 'group; regiment'; **Slk.** *pluk* 'regiment'; **US** *połk* 'regiment'; **S/Cr.** *pûk* 'people, crowd'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *pûk*, Gsg. *pûka*; **Slov.** [*pôłk* < R or another Slavic language (ESSlov. 3: 82, Pleteršnik 1894-1895: s.v. *pôłk*)]; **Bg.** *plăk, pălk* [*polk* < R]; **Late PSl. personal name** **Svętopъlkъ* 'Svatopluk', ruler of Great Moravia in the second half of the ninth century (in contemporary documents also *Zwentibald, Zuendibolch*)

Accentuation: AP (b); on the basis of material from the 16th century *Sinodal'nyj sbornik*, in which the word has stem stress, Kiparsky thinks that the word originally had fixed initial stress and that the end-stressed forms are the result of a more recent analogical development (1958: 20-21). This cannot be the case, for the long falling stem vowel of Serbian/Croatian excludes AP (a). The (dialectal) Russian forms Nsg. *polók*, Gsg. *polká* point to AP (b) as well.

PGmc. **fulka-* 'people, multitude, army' (n. *a*-stem)

EGmc. **fulk-* (in personal names, e.g. West Gothic *Fulgaredus*, Herulic *Φούλκαρις*); **OHG** *folk* n./m.; **MHG** *volc* n./m. 'multitude, people, infantry'; **G** *Volk* 'people'; **OE** *folc* n. 'crowd, people'; **OFri.** *folk, fulk* n.; **OS** *folk* n.; **Du.** *volk* 'people'; **Lang.** *fulc-* (*fulcfree* 'free (highest degree of freedom a former slave could obtain)'); **ON** *folk* n. 'army, crowd, people'

Etymology: In Germanic as well as in Slavic, the word means 'multitude, large amount (of people)' as well as 'regiment, army'; in many languages these concepts go hand in hand, cf. the English words *legion*, *army* and *battalion*, which all have a connotation 'multitude, large amount' besides their military meaning. The meaning 'host, army' that is attested in a number of older Germanic languages, and is the main meaning of not only the Proto-Slavic loanword, but also of borrowings of the Germanic word in northern dialects of French, is probably original. This meaning is retained in Du. *voetvolk* 'infantry' (EWN: s.v. *volk*).

The attestation *fulcus** in the late eighth-century *Reichenauer Glossen* (which were written in north-western France) have been regarded as Gothic (e.g., Kluge 1913: 17). Lloyd et al. consider the form rather to be a borrowing from OLF **fulk* because of the limited geographic distribution of the word in Romance (it only occurs in OFr. *folc, fouc*, Provençal *folc* and Piemontic *folc*)

(EWA 3: 451-452). The form with retained -*u*- is, nevertheless, not attested in Franconian. Due to the *a in the second syllable of the word, *u in the stressed syllable of PGmc. *fulka- was lowered to *o. The *a*-umlaut took place very early in Northwest Germanic (cf. §7.2.1.3). The *u*-vocalism is, nevertheless, attested in the Langobardic form *fulcfree* 'free (highest degree of freedom a former slave could obtain)' because Langobardic has *u* instead of expected *o* before an *l* in closed syllables (Bruckner 1895: 80-85). The vocalism of PSl. *pъlkъ suggests that the word was borrowed from a Germanic form with *u in the root rather than with *o and therefore, East Germanic *fulk- and Langobardic are attractive candidates as the donor form of the Slavic word.

The Latinised attestation in the *Reichenauer Glossen* seems to imply a masculine form, but the other Germanic languages show that the original gender was neuter (cf. §7.3.3). PGmc. *fulka- is a collective neuter noun, which became masculine in Proto-Slavic. Given the fact that this word occurs in the ninth-century late-Proto-Slavic personal name *Svętopъlkъ 'Svatopluk I', the word must have been borrowed relatively early.

Origin: Gothic or Langobardic due to the absence of the reflex of the *a*-umlaut.

PSl. *skutъ 'hem; clothing covering the legs' (m. *o*-stem)
CS *skutъ* 'hem'; **OR** *skutъ, skutь, skudь* 'cloth, outerwear'; **R** *skut* (dial.) 'leg covering (the strips of cloth wrapped round the foot when wearing bast shoes)' [*skut* 'hem, seam' < CS? (Kiparsky 1934: 221)]; **LS** *skut* (arch., only found by Chojnan) 'piece of cloth, hem'; **S/Cr.** *skût*, Gsg. *skúta* 'hem, skirt, coat-tail'; **MBg.** *skutъ* 'coat'; **Bg.** *skut* 'part of the body between the arms and the knees of a sitting person; front part of a shirt or trousers', *skúta* 'apron, lower front part of a skirt or dress'

Accentuation: AP (b)?; S/Cr. *skût*, Gsg. *skúta* points to AP (b), and there are few other indications for the accentuation of the word.

PGmc. *skauta- '(hem of a) skirt, coat-tail' (m. or n. *a*-stem)
Goth. *skauts** m. or *skaut** n. (attested Dsg. *skauta*, masculine according to Lehmann 1986: 311) 'hem'; **OHG** *scōz* m., *scōzo* m. 'lap, skirt, coat-tail'; **MHG** *schōz* m./n., *schōz(e)* f.; **G** *Schoß* 'lap, skirt, coat-tail'; **OE** *scēat* 'corner, lap, bosom, garment'; **E** *sheet*; **OFri.** m. *skāt* 'lap, part of a skirt'; **MLG** *schōt* 'coat-tail; bay; back part of a church'; **Du.** *schoot* 'lap, skirt'; **ON** *skaut* n. 'corner, headscarf, lap, skirt', *skauti* m. 'cloth, scarf'

Etymology: The origin of PGmc. *skauta- is unclear, but the word has been connected to PIE *(*s*)*keud*- 'to throw, shoot' (Lehmann 1986: 311), although Franck/Van Wijk call this connection improbable (1912: 592). It has been suggested that PGmc. *skauta- originally meant 'angle, corner' (as in OE *scēat*)

or '(something) triangular' and related to the triangular area between the thighs and the lower part of the body (Riecke 2004: 231). In North and West Germanic the word refers to different kinds of clothing and to the extremities of parts of clothing, as, for example, in the meaning 'coat-tail'. Goth. *skauts* is attested with the meaning 'hem, seam of garments' only.

The Proto-Slavic form has usually been regarded as a loanword from Gothic (e.g., ERHSJ 3: 275), but there is no compelling formal reason not to derive the word form West Germanic: the monophthongization of PGmc. **au* before alveolars has been dated to the eighth century in Old High German and the reflexes of the High German consonant shift are not generally attested in the loanwords (§7.2.1.8). Although the word means 'hem' in several Slavic languages, as it does in Gothic, the word also refers to different kinds of clothing covering the legs (viz., coat(-tail), skirt, puttee) and this rather corresponds to the West Germanic meaning of the word. For this reason, the Proto-Slavic form might go back to back to a double borrowing from West Germanic and from Gothic, or, more probably, that the meaning of Goth. *skaut*(*s*)* included 'clothing covering the legs' as well.

The word has been supposed to be limited to South Slavic (e.g., by Kiparsky 1934: 221, ERHSJ 3: 275), but the attestation of the word in Old Russian proves that the word existed in East Slavic as well. Kiparsky explains R *skut* 'hem' as a Church Slavonicism (1934: 221, which is questioned by Vasmer (REW 2: 655)), but the meaning of the word in Old and dialectal Russian proves that this cannot be correct: dialectal R *skut* 'leg covering for bast shoes' can hardly be attributed to Church Slavic influence. The borrowing can thus be dated to Proto-Slavic.

The attestation in Lower Sorbian is the only indication that the word existed in West Slavic. Yet LS *skut* occurs only in the works of the Jan Chojnan. In his discussion of the etymology of US/LS *smokwa*, Schuster-Šewc remarks that Chojnan spent some time in the Balkans and may have taken over the word *smokwa* there (HEW 17: 1321-1322, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. **smoky*). The same might be true for LS *skut*.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. **trǫba* 'trumpet' (f. *ā*-stem)

OCS *trǫba* 'trumpet'**; R** *trubá* 'tube, chimney'**; Ukr.** *trubá* 'trumpet, trombone; tube'**; P** *trąba* 'trumpet, tube'**; Cz.** *trouba* 'old wind instrument; oven'**; Slk.** *trúba* 'old wind instrument; oven'**; US** *truba* 'stovepipe; trumpet, trombone'**; LS** *tšuba* 'tube; French horn, trombone'**; Plb.** *trǫbə* 'hank of tow'**; S/Cr.** *trúba* 'trumpet, role'**; Slov.** *trǫ́ba* 'trumpet, tube'**; Bg.** *trăbá* 'trumpet, tube'
Accentuation: AP (b)

NWGmc. *trumba* 'trumpet' (f. ō-stem)
OHG *trumba*; **MHG** *trum(m)e, trumbe*; **G** *Trommel*; **MDu.** *trumme*; **Du.** *trommel*; **ON** *trumba*

Etymology: The Germanic word is attested in West and North Germanic only and does not have an etymology (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Trommel*).[54] The same word is attested in the Romance languages (It. *tromba*, Fr. *trompe*, Sp. *trompa*, Prt. *trompa*) and Franck/Van Wijk explain these forms as borrowings from Germanic (1912: 710). A reflex of the word might not have existed in Gothic, for Gothic has *þuthaurn** for 'trumpet'.

The sequence *-mb-* became *-mm-* or *-m-* by assimilation in most Germanic languages (as in MHG *eimber > eimer*), but in older attested forms of Germanic, the medial sequence *-mb-* is retained. The Slavic word *trǫba* was borrowed from a (West Germanic) form that still had *-b-*, but the exact donor cannot be established.

Origin: West Germanic; the occurrence of the word is limited to Northwest Germanic and Gothic has an alternative word for 'trumpet'.

PSl. *vino* 'wine' (n. *o*-stem)
OCS *vino*; **R** *vinó*; **Ukr.** *vynó*; **P** *wino*; **Cz.** *víno*; **Slk.** *víno*; **US** *wino*; **LS** *wino*; **Plb.** *vaii̯nə* (Gsg.); **S/Cr.** *víno*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *vīnö*, Gsg. *vīnằ*, Npl. *vĩnᵒā*; **Slov.** *víno̧*; **Bg.** *víno*
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. *wīnan* 'wine' (n. *a*-stem)
Goth. *wein* n.; **OHG** *wĭn* m.; **MHG** *wīn*; **G** *Wein*; **OE** *wīn* n.; **OFri.** *wīn* m.; **OS** *wīn* m./n.; **Du.** *wijn*; **ON** [*vín* n. < OE or MLG (De Vries 1977: 664)]

PSl. *vinogordъ* 'vineyard' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *vinogradъ*; **R** [*vinográd* 'grapes' < CS]; **Ukr.** [*vynohrad* < CS?]; **P** *winogród* (dial.), [*winohrad, winograd* < Cz.]; **Cz.** *vinohrad* (arch.); **Slk.** *vinohrad*; **S/Cr.** *vìnogrād*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *vinȍgrad*; **Slov.** *vinǫ́grad*; **Bg.** *vinográd*
Accentuation: AP (b)

---

[54] NWGmc. *trumba* did not participate in the Northwest Germanic *a*-umlaut because the umlaut did not operate before a nasal cluster (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 35).

PGmc. *wīnan* 'wine' and PGmc. *gardōn* m. 'garden, yard'
Goth. *weinagards**; [55] **Crimean Gothic** *wingart*; **OHG** *wĭngarto*; **MHG** *wīngart(e)*; **G** *Weingarten, Wingert* (dial.) 'vineyard'; **OE** *wīngeard* 'vineyard; vine'; **OS** *wīngardo*; **Du.** *wijngaard* 'vineyard', *wingerd* 'vine'
Cognates: Gr. οἶνος, Arm. *gini*, Alb. *verë*, Hitt. *wiyan-* 'wine' < PIE *ueih₁-*. This form might derive from PIE *ueih₁-* 'to weave, wrap' (the 'vine' was then referred to as 'the weaving one') (Beekes 1987: 24-25, cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 1012, De Vaan 2008: 680).

Etymology: The Germanic oenological terminology stems from Latin and PGmc. *wīnan* is an early borrowing from Latin *vīnum* (Lehmann 1986: 399, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Wein*). The Romans first introduced viticulture in the Alsace in the first century AD and about a century later in the Rheinpfalz and the Mosel valley (Green 1998: 211). Philippa et al. connect the borrowing of Germanic *wīnan* to the time when the Romans introduced viticulture in Northwest Europe (EWN: s.v. *wijn*), but the Germanic people probably became acquainted with wine through trade with the Romans even earlier, so we might suppose that the borrowing of the word goes back to Proto-Germanic.

There has been some debate about the question whether PSl. *vino* stems directly from Romance or was borrowed through a Germanic language. Matasović regards PSl. *vino* as a borrowing directly from Vulgar Latin. He thinks it is improbable that the word stems from Gothic "because the genders do not agree (the Slavic words belong to the neuter gender, while the Germanic words are masculine as a rule)" (2007: 109, cf. also 2000: 132). Since the change of gender from masculine in Germanic to neuter in Proto-Slavic does not occur in other loanwords, this could be considered a very strong argument for the Romance origin of PSl. *vino*. It is, however, by no means certain that the gender of the Germanic etymon was originally masculine. The word is masculine in most modern Germanic languages, but neuter in Gothic, Old English and possibly Old Saxon (the form in Old Norse was probably borrowed from Old English or a Low German dialect and should therefore be left out of consideration.). According to Kluge, the attested forms go back to an original neuter proto-form and he reconstructs PGmc. *wīnan* (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Wein*). Since the word is attested as neuter in early Germanic languages and derives from a Latin neuter donor form, the reconstruction of the Proto-Germanic form as a neuter seems to be justified. The masculine gender can be

---

[55] The word does not occur in the Nsg. in Gothic, but it is amply attested in the Gsg., Dsg. and Asg.

regarded as an innovation in a part of West Germanic. PSl. *vino* can therefore be derived from a neuter Germanic donor form without formal obstacles.

The Proto-Slavic loanwords that are borrowed from Germanic neuters regularly seem to change gender in Proto-Slavic (cf. §7.3.3). It is therefore unexpected that PSl. *vino* remained neuter. The neuter gender of PSl. *vino* might have been retained in Slavic under influence of the Proto-Slavic compound *vinogordъ* 'vineyard' in which the medial *o* is a regular reflex of the Gothic medial *a* (see below, and cf. §7.3.3).

The existence of PSl. *vinogordъ* 'vineyard' speaks for Germanic rather than Romance origin of PSl. *vino.* The neuter gender of PSl. *vino* cannot be regarded as an argument in favour of Romance origin instead of Germanic origin because Latin loanwords into Proto-Slavic mainly change their gender into masculine (or occasionally feminine) as well (M. Matasović 2011: 277). The formation PSl. *vino-gordъ* corresponds exactly to Goth. *weinagards** (Kiparsky 1934: 224). Bezlaj explains PSl. *vinogordъ* as a native compound with PSl. *gordъ* 'fortification, town' or *gorditi* 'to fence off' (ESSlov. 4: 319-320, also ERHSJ 3: 595), but in view of the exact formal and semantic correspondence with Gothic and the meaning 'fortification, town' that has been reconstructed for PSl. *gordъ* (cf. Derksen 2008: 178), this is a less likely scenario.[56]

Origin: Gothic; PSl. *vino* and *vinogordъ* are likely to be borrowings from Gothic, because of the exact phonological correspondence between Goth. *weinagards* and PSl. *vinogordъ.*

PSl. *xlěvъ* 'cattle shed, stable' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *xlěvъ* 'cattle shed, lodgings, house, cellar'; **R** *xlev*, Gsg. *xléva*; **Ukr.** *xliv*; **P** *chlew* 'pigsty'; **Cz.** *chlév* 'cattle shed, stable'; **Slk.** *chliev* 'pigsty (sometimes also

---

[56] According to Mallory/Adams, the occurrence of OCS *vinjaga*, S/Cr. *vìnjaga* and Slov. *vinjága* 'grape, wild vine', "would strengthen the case for inheritance rather than borrowing" (1997: 644). PSl. *vinjaga* has been regarded as a compound of *vino* and *(j)agoda* 'berry' (ESSJ 4: 319), but the form must be a late formation because the second element of the compound has a prothetic glide *j* (cf. Kortlandt 2002: 11). The exact same formation is found in Lith. *vȳnuogė* 'grape, wild vine', which is a compound of *vȳnas* and *úoga* 'berry' (LitEW 2: 1165, 1255-1256). Because the word for wine is not Balto-Slavic, this cannot go back to an old Balto-Slavic formation (ESSJ 4: 319). Derksen considers South Slavic *vinjaga* a "derivation[s] of *vino* rather than a compound containing *jaga*" (2008: 27), but with what kind of suffix the word was derived remains unexplained. The compound of 'wine' and 'berry' for 'vine' might well be independent formations in Baltic and Slavic, cf. also Du. (dial) *wijnbes*, G *Weinbeere* 'grape'.

shed for other small animals, as rabbits or geese)'; **US** *chlěw* 'stable, pigsty'; **LS** *klěw* 'stable, sheep house'; **Plb.** *xlev*; **S/Cr.** *hlȉjev*; **Slov.** *hlẹ́v*; **Bg.** *hljav*
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. **hlew(j)a-* 'cover (against the weather)' (n. *wa*-stem)
Goth. *hlija* m./n. 'cabin, shack' (attested as Apl. *hlijans*);[57] **MHG** *lie, liewe* f. 'bower'; **G** *Lee* 'lee side'; **OS** *hleo, hleu* m./n. 'shelter, screen (against the weather)', *hlea* f. 'idem'; **OE** *hlēo(w)* n. 'cover, screen'; **OFri.** *hlī* m. or n. 'shelter, screen'; **Du.** *lij* 'lee side'; **ON** *hlé* n. 'shelter, lee side'

PGmc. **hlaiwa-* 'burial mound, grave' (n. or m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *hlaiw* n. 'grave'; **OHG** *(h)lēo* m. 'grave, burial mound'; **OE** *hlǣw, hlāw* m. 'rising ground, burial mound, tomb stone'; **OS** *hlêu* m. 'grave, burial mound'; **MDu.** *lē* 'hill' (cf. *Heiligerlee* 'holy hill' (MNW: s.v. *lee 1*)); **Old Runic** *hlaiwa* 'grave'
Cognates: Skt. *śráyati* 'to lean', Lat. *clīvus* 'hill', Gr. κλισία 'cottage, tent', Arm. *leaṙn* 'mountain' < *PIE *ḱlei-* 'to lean' (Pokorny 1959: 601, Lehmann 1986: 186).

Etymology: The origin of PSl. **xlěvъ* has most often been sought in Goth. *hlaiw* 'grave'. This is the etymology adhered to, for example, by Kiparsky, Vondrák and Stender-Petersen (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 176 for an overview and literature, also REW 3: 245-246, Stender-Petersen 1927: 237). The semantic correspondence between the Gothic and Proto-Slavic forms is difficult to say the least. PGmc. **hlaiwa-* was the original Proto-Germanic designation for a burial mound. The original meaning of **hlaiwa-* might have been 'house, chamber that was partly built undergrounds' and thus included underground burial chambers in burial mounds (Lehmann 1986: 186). The root often occurs in toponyms; because of the relative large number of toponyms built on **hlaiwa-* in southern Germany, Udolph concludes that the word had become "besonders produktiv" in that area (1994: 863-866).

Goth. *hlija* has been mentioned as a possible alternative donor of PSl. **xlěvъ* (e.g., ESSlov. 1: 197, Machek 1957: 199). This idea was proposed in the 19th century by J. Schmidt and Miklošič (see Kiparsky 1934: 176 for references). PSl. **xlěvъ* can, of course, not formally be derived from Goth. *hlija* (or Goth. **hliwa*, if *hlija* is indeed a scribal error, cf. fn. 60). However, Goth. *hlija* is a reflex of PGmc. **hlew(j)a* 'cover'. West Germanic reflexes of this Proto-Germanic form would fit quite well as donor forms of PSl. **xlěvъ*, and this etymology fits much

---

[57] It has been thought that the Gothic form is a scribal error for *hliwa* (cf. Lehmann 1986: 188 for references).

better semantically than a derivation of the word from Goth. *hlaiw* 'grave'. With this etymology, the *ě* in Slavic requires an explanation because a short Germanic *e* is not expected to result in PSl. *ě*. There are, however, West Germanic forms attested with a long vowel. A reflex of PGmc. *hlew(j)a-* in High German is attested from Middle High German onwards, which might exclude (Old) High German as the donor. Apart from that, the meaning of OS *hleo, hleu* 'shelter, screen (against the weather)' fits better semantically to PSl. *xlěvъ* than the meaning of the attested High German forms. For this reason, Old Saxon or another Low German dialect could be supposed to be the donor language.

Origin: West Germanic (Low German), borrowed from a reflex of *hlew(j)a* 'cover'. Goth. *hlija* can be excluded as the donor because it reflects the Gothic raising of PGmc. *e*. OS *hleo, hleu* 'shelter, screen (against the weather)' fits well semantically.

PSl. *xǫsa* 'robbery, trap' (f. *ā*-stem)

SCS *xusarъ, xusьnikъ* 'robber'; **RCS** *xusiti* 'to rob', *xusovati* 'to take hostage', *xusa* 'trap'; **OP** *chąsa, chąza* 'band of robbers'; *chąśba, chąźba, chądźba* 'robbery, theft'; **S/Cr.** *husa* (arch.) 'trap, invasion, plundering'; **Bg.** *Χουσά 'παρὰ Βουλγάροις οἱ κλεπταί* (with the Bulgarians the thieves)' (attested in the Suda)[58]

Accentuation: AP (b)?; the reflex of length in Polish might point to AP (b). Dybo also suggests AP (b) on the basis of OR *xúlnici* (1981: 187).

PGmc. *hansō* 'band of warriors, cohort' (f. *ō*-stem)

Goth. *hansa* 'troop, cohort, retinue'; **OHG** *hansa* 'cohort'; **MHG** *hans(e)* 'merchant's guild'; **G** *Hanse* 'Hanseatic League', *Hans(e)* (dial. Carinth.) 'chatter'; **OE** *hōs* 'band, troop'; **MLG** *hanse* 'merchant's guild'

Etymology: The attested Germanic forms go back to PGmc. *hansō,* which is supposed to have originally meant 'band of warriors'. The meaning 'economic organisation' (as in the famous Low German *Hanse* 'Hanseatic League') developed later in West Germanic. The further etymology of PGmc. *hansō* is unclear (Lehmann 1986: 177).

The word was borrowed from Germanic into Finnish as *kansa* 'people, society' (Lehmann 1986: 177). The Germanic *hansō* apparently made a less

---

[58] The *Suda* (*Σοῦδα, Lexicon Suidae*) is a large Byzantine encyclopaedic lexicon dating from the tenth century.

favourable impression on the Proto-Slavs, for the word has a predominantly negative connotation in Slavic. The word was borrowed into Proto-Slavic as *xǫsa 'robbery, trap'. The phonological correspondence between the Slavic and Germanic forms is flawless. Semantically, the connection is clear if we envisage the Germanic *hansō as a band of warriors who went on marauding expeditions among the Proto-Slavs. There is no phonological indication as to the exact donor of PSl. *xǫsa.[59]

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *xъlmъ 'hill' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS xlъmъ 'hill, mountain, forest'; **OR** xъlъmъ, xъlmъ 'hill, dam'; **R** xolm, Gsg. xolmá 'hill'; xolóm, Gsg. xolmá (dial.); **Ukr.** xolm; **OCz.** chlm, chlum; **Cz.** chlum 'hurst'; **Slk.** chlm 'hill'; **US** chołm; **S/Cr.** hûm, Gsg. húma; **Slov.** hòlm, Gsg. hólma 'hill, mountain top'; **Bg.** hălm

Accentuation: AP (b); most Old Russian forms point to AP (c), but there are also forms that point to AP (b) (Zaliznjak 1985: 137).

PGmc. *hulma- 'hill, elevation in the water' (m. *a*-stem)
G Holm 'islet';[60] **OE** holm m. 'wave, water, sea' (the secondary meaning 'land rising from the water, island' is thought to derive from Old Norse (Bosworth/Toller 1898: 551)); **OS** holm m. (n.?) 'hill';[61] **ON** holmi m. 'island', holmr m. 'island'

Cognates: Lat. columen 'point, top, pillar', Lat. collis 'hill', Gr. κολωνός 'hill', Lith. kálnas 'mountain', kalvà 'small hill', Latv. kaĨns 'mountain', kalva 'hill, islet in a river' < European IE *kel- 'elevation, hill, island (Pokorny 1959: 544).

---

[59] One of the derivations of PSl. *xǫsa is *xǫsarъ (SCS xusarъ). This word was borrowed into Hungarian, huszár 'hussar', and subsequently borrowed back into Slavic through German Husar (R gusár, P husarz, Cz. husar, Slk. husár, S/Cr. hùsār, Slov. huzár 'hussar, light cavalry') (Snoj 2003: 215). S/Cr. gùsār, Slov. gûsar 'privateer, pirate' are not related but rather borrowed from dialectal Italian gorsar (It. corsaro) 'privateer' (ibid.: 196).
[60] Although G holm means 'islet' in modern German, Grimm's dictionary lists 'hill' as primary meaning of G Holm, and adds that this word was taken over in High German from Low German dialects. In view of the absence of the word in Old and Middle High German, a late borrowing from Low German into High German is quite possible (DWb: s.v. Holm).
[61] Neuter according to Kluge (2002: s.v. Holm), masculine according to Holthausen (1954: 35) and Tiefenbach (2010: 175).

Etymology: The Germanic forms appear to go back to PGmc. *hulma-* 'hill, elevation in the water'. From the original meaning derived the connotation 'island, islet' in different Germanic languages.

In West and North Germanic, the stressed vowel was affected by the *a*-umlaut, which caused a lowering from PGmc. *hulma-* to *holm-*. PSl. *xъlmъ* might be a borrowing from Gothic (even though the word is not attested in Gothic) because the *a*-umlaut took place very early in West Germanic. Bruckner connects the first member of the Langobardic personal names *Ulmarîcus, Ulmarîs* to the same root (1895: 269). If this connection is correct, then the Slavic word could also have been borrowed from a form of Langobardic before the loss of initial PGmc. *h-* (cf. §7.2.1.3). Old Saxon is closest to the Slavic word from a semantic viewpoint.

Because of the wide spread of the word in Slavic, e.g., in place-names near Archangelsk, Kiparsky suggests that the word was borrowed very early. According to his dating, the word was borrowed from late PGmc. *hulma-* (1934: 179). The view that the word was borrowed extremely early is not necessarily correct because a borrowing into Proto-Slavic does not exclude the occurrence of toponyms in northern Russia. The word cannot have been borrowed from Proto-Germanic because Slavic and Germanic tribes were not likely to be in contact with one another before the fourth century (cf. §4.1).

Origin: Cannot be specified. The word was borrowed from a form of Germanic that had not undergone the *a*-umlaut. Possibly Gothic, even though a reflex of the word is unattested in Gothic, or Langobardic.

5.4 LOANWORDS WITH AP (B) AND A LIGHT SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

PSl. *brъnja* 'harness, suit of armour' (f. *jā*-stem)
OCS *brъnję* f. pl. 'coat of mail'; **OR** *brъně* pl. 'breastplate'; **R** *brónjá, bron'* f. 'coat of mail, harness'; **Ukr.** *brónjá* 'suit of armour'; **OP** *broń, bronia*; **OCz.** *brně* (pl.) 'plate armour'; **S/Cr.** *br̀njica* 'muzzle (device); (ear)ring, buckle', *br̀nja* 'patch of colour on a goat's or sheep's snout'; **Bg.** *brǎnka* '(iron) ring'
Accentuation: AP (b); this is a feminine *jā*-stem of the so-called '*volja*-type' and has fixed root stress on the (non-acute) root (cf. §2.3.3). In Russian, the word can have fixed stem stress as well as end stress. Evidence from the other Slavic languages shows that the end stress must be secondary.

PGmc. *brunjō-* 'harness, breastplate' (f. *jō*-stem)
Goth. *brunjo* f.**;** **OHG** *brunna, brunia*; **MHG** *brünne, brünje* 'harness, coat of mail'; **G** *Brünne*; **OE** *byrne* f.**;** **OS** *brunnia* f.**;** **ON** *brynja* f.

Etymology: The word was originally borrowed from Celtic into Proto-Germanic in the last centuries before Christ, when Celtic craftsmen were known to have worked with iron in northern and western Europe. Lehmann supposes that PGmc. *brunjō- was borrowed from Gaul (where the form is not attested) and connects the word to Celtic forms like OIr. *bruinne*, OW *bronn*, Breton *bronn* 'chest, breast' (1986: 81-82). Kluge rejects this etymology because Celtic has a geminate -nn-, which is not expected to have shortened in Germanic, and because the attested Celtic words deriving from PCelt. *bruson- mean 'abdomen, breast' rather than 'harness'. He therefore derives the word directly from PIE *b^hren-$d(^h)$- 'breast' (2002: s.v. *Brünne*, cf. Matasović 2009: 81). From a cultural-historical viewpoint, Celtic origin is more attractive.

The word did not participate in the Northwest Germanic *a*-umlaut because the umlaut did not operate before a nasal cluster (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 35). In West Germanic, the medial -n- has been geminated to -nn- under the influence of the following -j-. This development has been dated to the period between 150 and 450 (Nielsen 1985: 176). The absence of the geminate consonant itself in the Proto-Slavic reflex of the word does not give clues about the origin of the borrowing because Germanic geminate consonants yielded the corresponding single consonants in Proto-Slavic (as in, for example, PSl. *skotъ deriving from a reflex of PGmc. *skatta-). The fact that the word is a *jā*-stem in Proto-Slavic might nevertheless indicate that the word was borrowed from a dialect of Germanic that had not (or not yet) undergone gemination of -n- because the -j- often disappeared by assimilation from the geminated High German forms (although OHG *brunia* is also attested, but OHG *brunna* seems to be the most frequent form) (cf. Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 99). The early dating of the gemination of consonants before -j- in West Germanic seems to rule out Old High German as the donor language. The word might have been borrowed from Gothic, where the gemination did not take place, or from Low German dialects, which retained the -i- after the gemination, as in OS *brunnia* (cf. Gallée 1910: 205).

In his description of the Sclaveni and the Antae in his work *Wars* (Ὑπέρ τῶν πολέμων λόγοι, book VII. 14. 25-26), Procopius mentions that these tribes did not have breastplates when fighting.[62] But even if the Slavs did not have breastplates in the sixth century, when Procopius wrote his work, the Slavs could

---

[62] "When they enter battle, the majority of them go against their enemy on foot carrying little shields and javelins in their hands, but they never wear corselets. Indeed, some of them do not wear even a shirt or a cloak, but gathering their trews up as far as to their private parts they enter into battle with their opponents." (Dewing 1962: 271).

well have become acquainted with them in this period. Brückner dates the borrowing of the word to as late as the eighth century, when Charlemagne is reported to have forbidden the trade of cuirasses into the Slavic lands (1929: 138).

In Old Church Slavic, Old Russian and Old Czech the word occurs as a *plurale tantum*. In South Slavic, the meaning of the word narrowed from 'coat of mail' through 'ring on a coat of mail' to 'ring' (ERHSJ 1: 215).
Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *gonoziti 'to save'
OCS *gonoziti* 'to save, salvage'; **CS** *gonoziti* 'to keep, cure'; **Cr.CS** *goneziti* 'to save oneself'; **RCS** *gonesti*, *gonъsti* 'to be saved'; **OCz.** /Honezovice/ (place-name)

PGmc. **(ga)nazjan-* 'to save, guard'
Goth. *ganasjan*, *nasjan* 'to save, heal'; **OHG** *ginerien*, *nerren* 'to heal, save, keep'; **G** *nähren* 'to feed, keep'; **OE** *generian*, *nerian* 'to save, liberate, protect'; **OFri.** *nera* 'to keep, feed'; **OS** *ginerian* 'to save, cure'; **MDu.** *ghenēren* 'to save, keep, feed, cure'

PSl. *goneznǫti 'to recover'
OCS *goneznǫti* 'to recover, save oneself'; **Cr.CS** *goneznuti, gonesti* 'to save oneself'; **RCS** *gonъznuti, gonznuti, goneznuti* 'to recover'
Accentuation: AP (b)? (Zaliznjak 1985: 137).

PGmc. **ganesa-* 'to cure, recover'
Goth. *ganisan*; **OHG** *ginesan*; **MHG** *genesen*; **G** *genesen*; **OE** *genesan* 'to be saved, to escape from'; **OS** *ginesan* 'to cure, recover; to be saved'; **Du.** *genezen*
Cognates: Skt. *násate* 'to reunite, join', Gr. *νέομαι* 'to return home' and possibly Toch. A *nas-*, Toch. B *nes-* 'to be' < PIE **nes-* 'to join, return' (Pokorny 1959: 766-767, Kluge/Seebold 2002, Lehmann 1986: 146).

Etymology: The Germanic verb **ganesa-* 'to cure, recover' derives from PIE **nes-* 'to join, return' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *genesen*, EWN: s.v. *genezen*). The corresponding causative is PGmc. **(ga)nazján-* 'to save, guard', with *z from *s resulting from Verner's law.

The form and meaning of the Slavic forms indicates that we are probably dealing with two borrowings: one from a reflex of the Germanic causative **(ga)nazján-* and one from a reflex of PGmc. **ganesa-*. It is likely that the Proto-Slavic forms *gonoziti and *goneznǫti stem from the same donor language. PSl. *gonoziti and *goneznǫti seem to derive from the Germanic stems **ganaz-* and **ganez-*, respectively. The *e*-vocalism in the second syllable of PSl. *goneznǫti is

confirmed by OCS *goneznǫti*, which is attested ten times in the Codex Suprasliensis, both in the first part and in the second part of the manuscript. The first part of the Codex Suprasliensis sometimes has <e> for /ь/ in closed syllables in all positions of the word, but in the second part of the manuscript this only occurs in final syllables (Leskien 1962: 31-32). Since the form is written with <e> throughout the manuscript, /e/ must be the original vocalism of OCS *goneznǫti*. This excludes Gothic as a donor language (pace, e.g., REW 1: 292, Vaillant 1974: 631, Kiparsky 1934: 175-176) because the Slavic form does not reflect the general raising of PGmc. *e to *i* in Gothic. It follows that the donor PSl. *gonoziti and *goneznǫti must probably be sought in West Germanic.

Trubačev thinks that the word was borrowed from a West Germanic reflex of PGmc. **ganesa-* in which the intervocalic *s* had become voiced. He therefore dates the borrowing to after the seventh or eighth centuries (ÈSSJa 7: 21). This leaves rather a narrow gap because the Proto-Slavic forms must have been borrowed before the rhotacism, before the change of the prefix **ga-* to *gi-* (which has been dated to the eighth or ninth century) and before the *i*-umlaut that raised *a in the second syllable to *e* (in the eighth century, cf. §7.2.1.3). The forms might alternatively be earlier borrowings from West Germanic, with *z in PSl. *gonoziti regularly reflecting Verner's law in Germanic. In PSl. *goneznǫti, *z might be secondary to PSl. *gonoziti.

The form is attested in Old Church Slavic and through Old Church Slavic in Russian Church Slavic. The Old Czech toponym /Honezovice/ (attested *Honezowiz*, *Honezouici*, *Gonezouicih* (locative) 12th and 13th centuries) has been connected to this word (Kiparsky 1934: 174, cf. Erben 1855: 733), which is the only evidence that the word existed in West Slavic as well.

Origin: West Germanic; the *e*-vocalism of PSl. *goneznǫti excludes Gothic as a donor language.

   PSl. *kotьlъ 'kettle' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *kotьlъ*; **OR** *kotьlъ*; *kotьlъ*; **R** *kotël*, Gsg. *kotlá*; **Ukr.** *kotél*, Gsg. *kotlá*; **P** *kocioł*, Gsg. *kotła*; **Cz.** *kotel*, Gsg. *kotla*; **Slk.** *kotol*; **US** *kotoł*, Gsg. *kótła*, *kotoła*; **LS** *kośeł*; **Plb.** *t́üt́ål* 'large kettle'; **S/Cr.** *kòtao*, Gsg. *kòtla*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *kotᵛã*, Gsg. *kotlã̀*; **Slov.** *kótǝl*, Gsg. *kótla*; **Bg.** *kotél*

Accentuation: AP (b); for the question as to whether the accentuation of PSl. *kotьlъ, *kъbьlъ and *osьlъ indicates that the words were borrowed directly from Latin, as, for example, Meillet suggested (1902: 186), cf. §8.3.2.

PGmc. *katila- 'kettle' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *katil-** (attested Gpl. *katile*);[63] **OHG** *chezzil, kezzīn*;[64] **MHG** *kezzel*; **G** *Kessel*; **OE** *cytel, citel, cetel*; **OFri.** *tzetel, tzitel*; **OS** *ketil*; **Du.** *ketel*; **ON** *ketill*

Etymology: Germanic *katila- has generally been regarded as a loanword from Latin. Lat. *catīnus* 'bowl, dish' has been connected with Gr. κοτύλη 'bowl; measure of capacity' and the Latin word might be a borrowing from Greek (De Vaan 2008: 98). Already before the Roman period, kettles were imported from southern Europe into the Germanic speaking areas in northern Europe (Lehmann 1986: 215). Kluge regards the borrowing into Germanic from Latin to have taken place early (2002: s.v. *Kessel*). This can be concluded on the basis of the spread of the word throughout the Germanic language area and because the medial voiceless stop in Latin was not reflected as voiced. The exact Latin donor form of the Germanic word is disputed: PGmc. *katila- might be a loanword from Lat. *catīnus* 'deep vessel, bowl, dish' which received a different suffix in Germanic, or alternatively from the diminutive form Lat. *catillus* 'bowl, dish' (Stender-Petersen 1927: 400, Lehmann 1986: 216, De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 314, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 302). In view of the absence of any other ground for the assumption of the borrowing of PGmc. *katila- from a Latin diminutive form and in view of the correspondence with other Proto-Germanic loanwords from Latin that also have a suffix built on *-l-* rather than *-n-* (cf. §7.3.2), Lat. *catīnus* is to be preferred as the donor of the Germanic forms. However, if kettles were imported into northern Europe already long before the Roman period, we might alternatively suppose a more direct link with Gr. κοτύλη.

PSl. *kotьlъ is generally regarded as a borrowing from Gothic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 203 for references), probably on the basis of the fact that the North Germanic and West Germanic forms are affected by the *i*-umlaut. The *i*-umlaut is thought to have reached Old Saxon and Old High German only in the eighth century (Nielsen 1985: 89ff., cf. §7.2.1.3). There are, therefore, no formal reasons to reject the idea of PSl. *kotьlъ as an early borrowing from West Germanic.

For semantic reasons, PSl. *kotьlъ must be regarded as a loanword from Germanic rather than directly from Latin: whereas Lat. *catīnus* and *catillus* mean 'bowl, dish', the word denotes the same type of iron vessel, viz., a kettle, in Germanic as well as in Slavic. Furthermore, Lat. *catīnus* has *ī*, which does not yield PSl. *ь*.

---

[63] This form might point to an *a*-stem, but also to an *u*-stem, which is the declination that is often followed by Germanic loanwords from Latin or Greek (Stender-Petersen 1927: 399-400).
[64] OHG *kezzīn* seems to be borrowed from Lat. *catīnus* and shows the original Latin suffix.

Origin: Generally thought to be Gothic.

PSl. *kъbьlъ 'tub; quantity of grain' (m. *o*-stem)
CS kъbьlь, koblъ, kobelъ 'bin, bucket; a certain quantity'; **R** kóbél, kobl (arch.) 'quantity of grain'; **OP** gbeł 'tub'; **Cz.** kbel 'container; liquid measure', kbelík 'tub, bucket', dbel (dial.), gbel (dial.) 'well bucket'; **Slk.** gbel 'water bucket; measure of capacity'; **S/Cr.** kàbao, Gsg. kàbla 'water bucket'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) kabᵒā, Gsg. kablä; **Slov.** kəbəl, Gsg. kəblà; kábəl, Gsg. kábla 'tub, quantity of grain'; **Bg.** kóbel 'bucket, trough'
Accentuation: AP (b)?, cf. §8.3.2.

WGmc. *kubil- 'tub; unit of measure (of, e.g., grain, coal)' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG -kubil(i) (attested as miluh-chubili, milich-chubili 'milk pail');[65] **MHG** kubbel, kübbel, kübel 'tub; unit of measure'; **G** Kübel 'large wooden vessel'; **OE** cyfel or cȳfel (?) 'tub';[66] **Du.** (dial. Limburg) kiebel 'tub; cage used in a mine shaft'

Etymology: The form *kubil- was borrowed from (Medieval) Lat. cūpella or cūpellus 'small vat, cask', also 'quantity of grain' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Kübel). The Latin forms are diminutives of Lat. cūpa 'vat, cask', which was also borrowed in Germanic, e.g., OE cȳf(e), Du. kuip, OS kōpa 'idem' and Scandinavian forms as Sw. kopp and Ic. koppur 'idem'. Lat. cūpa probably is a loanword from a non-Indo-European language, and was also borrowed into Greek, cf. Gr. κύπελλον 'beaker', Gr. κύπρος 'corn measure' (De Vaan 2008: 155). The voiced reflex of the medial stop in Germanic shows that the Latin word was a late borrowing into Germanic, and therefore limited to West Germanic. Unlike in other examples (cf. §5.4, s.v. PSl. *kotьlъ, osьlъ), WGmc. *kubil- is likely to be borrowed from the diminutive form of the Latin donor word: the Lat. cūpella or cūpellus had a different function than the Lat. cūpa and the use of these two containers in Latin and Germanic corresponds to one another.

Dialectal Dutch kiebel denotes a container that was used in mining (Weijnen 1996: 92-93) and this practice is also mentioned by Grimm/Grimm, who note that the G Kübel served "zum fördern der gesteine aus dem schachte" (DWb: s.v. Kübel). This is probably part of the original meaning of the word because the

---

[65] The word is attested as milichchubili n., which is a diminutive form of unattested OHG *-chubil. Kluge also lists OHG kubilo (2002: s.v. Kübel), but I have been unable to find this form elsewhere.
[66] It is unclear whether the initial vowel in Old English is long: Bosworth/Toller note cyfel or cȳfel? (1921: 140).

Latin *cūpella* was used in the processing of metal too: in a *cūpella*, noble metals such as gold and silver were separated from base metals in a process called 'cupellation' (Mantello/Rigg 1996: 493).

PSl. **kъbьlъ* formally corresponds to the form that can be reconstructed for Old High German before the operation of the High German sound shift. The metallurgical connotation of the Latin and Germanic forms is not reflected in Slavic, but the two other semantic aspects of the Germanic donor word, viz., 'tub' and 'quantity of grain', are.

Origin: West Germanic (High German); the Latin word was a late borrowing into West Germanic.

PSl. **kъnędźь* 'prince, ruler' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)

OCS *kъnędźь* 'prince, ruler'; **CS** *kъnęgъ* 'prince, ruler'; **OR** *knjazь* 'prince, bridegroom'; **R** *knjaz'* 'prince, bridegroom'; **Ukr.** *knjaz'* 'prince, bridegroom'; **P** *ksiądz*, Gsg. *księdza* 'ruler (arch.); priest'; **Cz.** *kněz* 'prince (arch.); priest'; **Slk.** *kňaz* 'priest'; **US** *knjez* 'sir, priest'; **LS** *kněz*; **Plb.** *t'ėnǫʒ* 'nobleman, king; moon';[67] **S/Cr.** *knêz* 'prince'; **Slov.** *knẹ̑z* 'count, ruler'; **Bg.** *knez* 'ruler, elder, bailiff'

Accentuation: Probably AP (b) (cf. §8.3.1), although the word is often thought to have AP (c) (Zaliznjak 1985: 137, Dybo 1981: 171).

NWGmc. **kuninga-* 'king, ruler' (m. *a*-stem)

OHG *kuni(n)g*; **MHG** *künic, künec* (Gsg. *küneges*); **G** *König*; **OE** *cyni(n)g, cyng*; **OFri.** *kining, kening*; **OS** *kuning*; **Du.** *koning*; **ON** *konungr*

Cognates: Lat. *genus* 'race, sort', Gr. *γένος* 'clan, sort', Skt. *jánas* 'race, class of beings' < PIE **ǵenh₁-* 'to give birth, bring forth' (Pokorny 1959: 373-375, EWN: s.v. *koning*).

Etymology: NWGmc. **kuninga-* derives from PGmc. **kunja-* 'family, lineage' which goes back to PIE **ǵenh₁-* 'to give birth, bring forth' (EWN: s.v. *koning*). NWGmc. **kuninga-* thus originally denoted a 'man of (noble) lineage'. The word is reflected as an early borrowing into Finnish and Estonian as *kuningas* 'king'. There is no cognate in Gothic; in Wulfila's Bible, the noun *þiudans* 'monarch' is used.

The Germanic suffix *-inga-/-unga-* denotes family names and objects and persons belonging to the etymon and this use is limited to West Germanic (cf. §7.3.2). PSl. **kъnędźь* must therefore be a loanword from West Germanic.

---

[67] The meaning 'moon' for this word is also found in P *księżyc* 'moon'.

In (Middle) High German, the suffix -*ing* dissimilated to -*ig* because of the -*n*- in the stem (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *König*). The Slavic form was obviously borrowed from a form of Germanic that preserved the original shape of the word.

Origin: West Germanic; the use of the Germanic suffix -*inga-/-unga-* to denote family names etc. is limited to West Germanic, and Gothic has another word for 'monarch'.

PSl. **lьvъ* 'lion' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *lьvъ, levъ*; **R** *lev*, Gsg. *l'va*; **Ukr.** *lev*, Gsg. *léva*; **P** *lew*, Gsg. *lwa*; **Cz.** *lev*; **Slk.** *lev*, Gsg. *leva*; **US** *law*; **LS** *law*; **Plb.** *lăv*; **S/Cr.** *lȁv*; **Slov.** *lèv*, Gsg. *léva*; **Bg.** *lăv, lev* (arch.)
Accentuation: AP (b) (Zaliznjak 1985: 134)

(N)WGmc. **le(w)o* 'lion'
OHG *le(w)o*, Gsg. *leuuen, lewo, louwo*; **MHG** *lewe*, Gsg. *lewen, leu, louwe*; **G** *Löwe*; **OE** *lēo*; **MLG** *lēwe*; **MDu.** *leeuwe, lewe, le(e)u*; **Du.** *leeuw*; **ON** [*leó(n)* < OE (De Vries 1977: 353)]

Etymology: (N)WGmc. **le(w)o* is borrowed from Lat. *leō*, Gsg. *leōnis* 'lion', which itself is a borrowing from Gr. *λέων* 'lion'. The Greek word might stem from Semitic languages, cf. Assyrian *labbu*, Egyptian *labu*, Hebrew *layiš* 'lion', but Philippa et al. regard these forms too deviant to have yielded the Greek form (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Löwe*, EWN: s.v. *leeuw*, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 376).

Mallory/Adams do not consider PSl. **lьvъ* to be a Germanic loanword, but rather suppose an opposite borrowing by assuming that the Germanic word originally stems from Slavic (1997: 356). The word would have spread from Proto-Slavic to Gothic, where it remained unattested, and through Gothic to Old High German. The reason for this assumption is that lions are known to have lived in the Balkans and western Ukraine until the bronze age (Herodotus, for example, makes note of lions in Thrace). Mallory/Adams connect the Slavic form with Gr. *λίς* and tentatively reconstruct (dialectal) Indo-European **li(u)-* (1997: 356).[68] The idea of a Gothic borrowing into West Germanic is unlikely to be correct because a supposed Gothic form would have had *i*-vocalism, whereas the West Germanic forms have **e*.

---

[68] The connection between Gr. *λέων* 'lion' and *λίς* 'lion' is unclear (cf. Beekes 2009: 854).

The majority of scholars believe PSl. *lьvъ to be a Proto-Slavic loanword from Germanic (see below for references), although Kiparsky remains uncertain about the origin of the word to such an extent that he does not include the word in his main corpus of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (1934: 275). The Germanic donor language is disputed (cf. ÈSSJa 17: 105-107). PSl. *lьvъ has been explained as a borrowing from OHG *lewo* (e.g., by REW 2: 23, HEW 11: 804-805), but other scholars suppose unattested Goth. *liwa* to be the donor (e.g., Brückner 1927: 297, Stender-Petersen 1927: 361). Gothic origin of the word is attractive because this would explain the jer in the first syllable of PSl. *lьvъ, which remains unexplained if the word was borrowed from West Germanic.

R *lev* might be a Church Slavonicism because the expected reflex is R **lëv* (which is, nevertheless, attested in Russian dialects) (ÈSSJa 17: 105-107, REW 2: 23). Since the reflex of PSl. *ь in Upper Sorbian is /e/ and in Lower Sorbian /'a/, US and LS *law* do not derive from PSl. *lьvъ (Mucke 1891: 64). Schuster-Šewc considers the words to be later loanwords from Middle German dialects (with supposed *au* instead of *eu*) (HEW 11: 804-805, also Schaarschmidt 1997: 61). Mucke, on the other hand, thinks US and LS *law* are secondary under influence of the German adjective *lauen-* 'of a lion' (cf. *Lauengasse/Lawska hasa,* a street name in Bautzen) (1891: 64).

Origin: Probably (unattested) Gothic; PSl. *lьvъ indicates that the donor language had *i*-vocalism.

PSl. *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ 'wood drill' (m. *o*-stem)
P *niebozas* (dial.); **Kash.** *ńebᵘòzwǒř*; **Slnc.** *ńebᵾθzọ̌ř*; **OCz.** *nebozěz, neboziez*; **Cz.** *nebozez*, (dial.) *nábosez*; **Slk.** *nebožiec*; **US** *njeboz*; **LS** *njabozac*; **Plb.** *nebüʒ̇år*; **Slov.** *nabộzəc, nabộžəc*
Accentuation: AP (b)

NWGmc. *nabagaiza- 'auger, drill' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *nabagēr, nabagēr(o)*; **MHG** *nabegēr*; **G** *Naber, Näber*; **OE** *nafugār*; **OS** *navugēr*; **MLG** (*n*)*evegēr, never*; **Du.** *avegaar, agger*; **ON** *nafarr*

Etymology: NWGmc. *nabagaiza- is composed of PGmc. *nabō 'wheel hub' and *gaiza- 'spear'.[69] The drill served primarily to bore hubs (G *Nabe* 'hub') in wheels etc., and relates to the craft of the cartwright.

---

[69] PGmc. *nabō- derives from PIE *h₃nebʰ- and is related to, e.g., Gr. ὀμφαλός 'navel', Lat. *umbō* 'shield boss', *umbilīcus* 'navel'. PIE *ǵʰaisó- 'javelin, (throwing-)spear' has been reconstructed on the basis of PGmc. *gaiza-, Proto-Celtic *gaiso- and Lat. *gaesum,* but the Celtic word was

The word falls in the range of technical terms that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic. Kiparsky reconstructs PSl. *nobozězъ, but this reconstruction is influenced by the form that has been reconstructed for Northwest Germanic: the attested Slavic forms point to an initial syllable *ne- (West Slavic) or *na- (Slovene). Trubačev, therefore, departs from an original *nebozězъ and *nabozězъ (ÈSSJa 21: 216, 24: 106). The original form was probably early adapted analogically to the existing Proto-Slavic prefixes *ne- and *na-.

Because of the occurrence of final -z in Slavic, it has been thought that the word was an early borrowing before the rhotacism in Germanic took place (ÈSSJa 21: 216, 24: 106, Kiparsky 1934: 182, cf. §7.2.1.4). The Czech forms (and perhaps the dialectal Polish form as well) supposedly reflect original NWGmc. *nabagaiza- before the rhotacism operated. In US njeboz, the ending of the Germanic donor has dropped. In Proto-Slavic, the word received the suffix *-ьcь which replaced the original ending (ÈSSJa 21: 216, 24: 106). This suffix is attested in Slovak, Lower Sorbian and Slovene. The word is attested with stem-final -r in Polabian, Kashubian and Slovincian. Because of this stem-final -r, which seems to reflect the Germanic rhotacism, Trubačev supposes that the borrowing in these languages took place later than in the other Slavic languages (ÈSSJa 21: 216). This cannot be excluded, especially in view of the geographic location of these languages in the immediate vicinity of the German language area. Because of the diversity in the attested forms, it is difficult to reconstruct the original final consonant and to substantiate the claim that the word was borrowed before the Germanic rhotacism. The same Germanic word was also borrowed into Finnish: napakaira 'large drill', which might be an argument in favour of original stem-final -r in Proto-Slavic as well.

PSl. *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ underwent the second palatalization of velar consonants in Proto-Slavic: *-bozě- < *-bogai-. The fact that the word underwent the second palatalization in Proto-Slavic (and not the first palatalization) indicates either that the word was borrowed at the time when the diphthong *ai in the Germanic donor form was still retained, or that the word was a relatively late borrowing. The attested Germanic forms already show the monophthongized reflex ē of PGmc. *ai. In Old High German, the monophthongization (only before r, h, and w) has been dated to the seventh century. PGmc. *ai had monophthongized in Old Saxon in all positions before the earliest texts were written and is therefore difficult to date (cf. §7.2.2.1).

---

probably borrowed from Germanic and the Latin word from Celtic (EWN: s.v. geer 1, Pokorny 1959: 410).

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the word is unattested in Gothic and some of the Slavic forms might reflect the West Germanic rhotacism. The technical terminology that was borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic seems mainly to stem from West Germanic dialects (cf. §7.4.2.3).

PSl. *osьlъ* 'donkey' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *osъlъ, osьlъ*; **R** *osël*, Gsg. *oslá*; **Ukr.** *osél*, Gsg. *oslá*; **P** *osioł*, Gsg. *osła* ; **Cz.** *osel*; **Slk.** *osol*; **US** *wosoł*; **LS** *wosol*; **S/Cr.** *òsao*; **Slov.** *ósəł*, Gsg. *ósla*; **Bg.** *osél*[70]

Accentuation: AP (b), cf. §8.3.2.

PGmc. *asil-* 'donkey' (m. *a*-stem or *u*-stem)

Goth. *asilus* m. *u*-stem; **OHG** *esil*; **MHG** *esel*; **G** *Esel*; **OE** *e(o)sol*; **OS** *esil*; **Du.** *ezel*; **ON** [*asni* < OFr. *asne* (De Vries 1977: 16)]

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from Lat. *asinus* 'donkey' or a late Latin diminutive form *asellus* (Lehmann 1986: 45). Lat. *asinus*, as well as Gr. *ὄνος* 'donkey', are possibly independent borrowings from an unknown substrate language (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Esel*). The derivation of PGmc. *asil-* from Lat. *asinus* is more generally adhered to, and seems to be more plausible as well: when Lat. *asinus* was borrowed into Germanic, the suffix was replaced by the Germanic suffix *-il-* or *-l-* (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Esel*, Green 1998: 204, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 161). Among the words discussed in the present work, there are quite a few where the Germanic form has *-l-*, whereas the Latin donor word has *-n-* in the stem. Since there is in most cases hardly a reason why the words should have been borrowed in the diminutive form, we are likely to deal with a general change of suffix (cf. §7.3.2).

The donkey, as well as its name, originally stems from Asia Minor (Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 161). The word for donkey was borrowed from Latin into Germanic in relation to trade because the Romans used donkeys (as well as mules) to transport their wares overland and in that way they introduced the donkey into northern Europe (Green 1998: 204).

The Proto-Germanic form *asil-* has been affected by the *i*-umlaut in West Germanic, which raised the initial *a-* to *e-*; afterwards, the *-i-* in the second stem syllable became *-e-* because it stood in unaccented position (cf. Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 67). The Slavic word must have been borrowed from

[70] The Bulgarian form occurs in the literary language only and might have been taken over from Old Church Slavic or be a borrowing from Russian (BER 4: 937).

a Germanic donor form *asil-. The word was probably borrowed from Gothic, as is generally assumed (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 208 for references). It might, nevertheless, alternatively derive from West Germanic before the above-mentioned sound changes took place (cf. §7.2.1.3).

Origin: Generally thought to be Gothic.

PSl. *ovotjь, *ovotje 'fruit' (m. *jo*-stem; n. *jo*-stem)
OCS *ovošte* n.**; CS** *ovoštъ*; **R** [*óvošč'* 'vegetable' < CS]; **Ukr.** *óvoč*, [*óvošč* (arch.) < CS]; **P** *owoc* m. 'fruit, berries'; **Cz.** *ovoce* n. 'fruit; result'; **Slk.** *ovocie* n. 'fruit; result'; **S/Cr.** *vȍće* n.; **Slov.** *ovȏčje* n.; **Bg.** *ovóšte, ovóštie* n.

Accentuation: AP (b); PSl. *ovotjь, *ovotje* belongs to AP (b), but has fixed stem stress on the second syllable because Dybo's law applied in all case forms. The initial stress of Ukr. *óvoč* is incompatible with AP (b).

WGmc. *uba-ēta-* 'side dish, fruit' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *obaz*; **MHG** *obez*, *obz*; **NHG** (dial. Bav.) *owes*, *obs*, (dial. Carinthian) *oubas*, *oubes*; **G** *Obst*;[71] **OE** *ofet*, *ofæt*,; **NFri.** *oefte* 'something nice to eat'; **MLG** *ovet*, *avet*, *aves*, *oves*, *ovest*; **NLG** *owest*, *ovst*, *awet*, *aawt*; **ODu.** *ovit*; **MDu.** *oeft*, *oft*, *ooft*, *ovet*; **Du.** *ooft* (arch.) 'fruit, especially from fruit trees'[72]

Etymology: The Germanic forms might derive from a Proto-Germanic compound *uba-ēta-* 'something that is eaten on the side, side dish' from PGmc. *uba-* 'at, over' and *eta-* 'to eat' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Obst*). The Proto-Germanic noun *ēta-* 'dish, course' has a lengthened grade, which can be explained if the word derives from an original root noun (Bammesberger 1990: 62). The meaning of the compound narrowed from 'side dish' to 'fruit' in most Germanic languages.

   The final *-z/-s* in the High German forms developed from *-t* in the (first stage of the) High German consonant shift; the beginning of the High German consonant shift cannot be dated with certainty but can probably be placed in the first half of the first millennium AD (cf. §7.2.1.8). The Old High German form can be reconstructed as *obat-*, which has initial *ob-* from PGmc. *ub-* as a result of the *a*-umlaut. The connection between this form and the reconstructed Proto-Slavic form is very difficult because Germanic *o-* is expected to yield *a-* in Proto-Slavic and Germanic *-b-* is expected to be retained as such.

---

[71] The final *-t* in G *Obst* developed in the 16th century (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Obst*).
[72] Some of the German forms are taken from Pritzel/Jessen (1882: 282), the DWb and Dähnert (1781).

Vasmer, therefore, thinks the word is not to be regarded as a loanword from Germanic at all (REW 2: 250). It is, however, easier to derive PSl. *ovotjъ from the forms attested in the Low German dialects. In Low German, the word is generally attested with a medial fricative and has forms with initial *a-* next to forms with initial *o-*.

Origin: West Germanic (Low German); the Slavic form reflects initial *ob-* from PGmc. *ub-* as a result of the *a*-umlaut. The medial fricative *-v-* corresponds to that in Low German dialects.

PSl. *petъlja 'noose, snare' (f. *jā*-stem)

RCS *petlja* 'noose, snare'; **OR** *petlja*; **R** *pétljá* 'loop, noose', *pétel'ka* 'eyelet'; **Ukr.** *petljá* 'loop, noose'; **P** *pętla* '(poacher's) trap, snare', *pętlica* (earlier also *petlica*) '(poacher's) trap, snare; loop-shaped clasp or embroidery on the traditional costume'; **Cz.** *petlice* 'bolt, latch'; **S/Cr.** *pètlja* 'bow, snare'; **Slov.** *pétlja* 'noose'; **Bg.** *pétlja* 'buttonhole, noose'

Accentuation: AP (b); Kiparsky thinks that this word originally had acute intonation, which he bases on the stem stressed forms in *Učenije i xitrosť ratnago stroenija pěxotnyxъ ljudej* (1647) (1958: 22). This is impossible given the fact that the syllabic nucleus of PSl. *petъlja is light, whereas words with acute intonation always have heavy syllabic nuclei. The word belongs to AP (b). As a result of Dybo's law, the stress shifted to the medial jer. When the jer lost its stressability, the stress retracted to the previous syllable. This is reflected by the stem stress in the Russian and Serbian/Croatian forms. Slov. *pétlja* is difficult because the vowel *é* instead of *ę́* indicates that the form goes back to earlier end stress, which rather points to AP (c).

NWGmc. *fatila- 'fetter, band' (m. *a*-stem)

OHG *fezzil* m. 'fetter', *fezzeros* m. pl., *fezzara* f., *fazza* f.; **MHG** *vezzel* m.; **G** *Fessel* m./f./n. 'fetter, chain'; **OE** *fetel* m. 'girdle, belt'; **MLG** *vetel* 'band, lace, chain'; **MDu.** *vetel* 'fetter, chain'; **ON** *fetill* m. 'chain, sling'

Cognates: From PIE *ped-/pod- 'foot' also derive, e.g., Lat. *pedica* 'fetter, shackle', Lat. *compēs* 'fetter', Lat. *impedīre* 'to hinder', Gr. πέδη 'fetter', Gr. πηδάω 'to chain', Av. *bi-bda* 'double fetter' (Pokorny 1959: 790-792, De Vaan 2008: 462).

Etymology: Germanic *fatila- 'fetter, band' has been connected to PGmc. *fetura- m. 'chains', which derives from PIE *ped-/pod- 'foot' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Fessel*).

PSl. *petъlja must be a late borrowing from West Germanic. A reflex of PGmc. *fatila- is not attested in Gothic, but even if the word existed in Gothic, it could not have been the source of the Slavic form because PSl. *petъlja reflects the Germanic *i*-umlaut, which raised *a* in the initial syllable to *e*. The borrowing

must, therefore, be dated after the operation of the *i*-umlaut, which is supposed to have taken place in the eighth century in Old Saxon and Old High German (Nielsen 1985: 89ff., and cf. §7.2.1.3). PSl. **petьlja* was, on the other hand, obviously borrowed from a dialect of Germanic that had not undergone or phonemicised the High German consonant shift, which yielded medial *-zz-* < **-t-*. Since this stage of the High German consonant shift has been dated earlier than the occurrence of the *i*-umlaut in High German, PSl. **petьlja* is likely to have been borrowed from a Low German dialect.

The Polish forms *pętla*, *pętlica* with a nasal vowel in the initial syllable are secondary to **pęti* 'to stretch'; the older attested form of the word is *petlica* (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 256).

Origin: West Germanic (Low German); PSl. **petьlja* reflects the Germanic *i*-umlaut, but not the High German consonant shift.

PSl. **popъ* 'clergyman, (Orthodox) priest' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *popъ*; **R** *pop*, Gsg. *popá*; **Ukr.** *pip*, Gsg. *popá* 'Orthodox priest'; **P** *pop* 'pope, Orthodox priest'; **Cz.** *pop* 'pope, (Orthodox) priest'; **Slk.** *pop* 'Orthodox priest'; **US** *pop* 'priest, protestant clergyman'; **LS** *pop* 'priest, clergyman'; **Plb.** *püp* 'priest, schoolteacher'; **S/Cr.** *pȍp*, Gsg. *pòpa*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *pȍp*, Gsg. *popä̀*; **Slov.** *pòp*, Gsg. *pópa* 'pope'; **Bg.** *pop* 'priest, schoolteacher'

Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. **papa-* 'clergyman, priest' (m. *a*-stem)

Goth. *papa**; **OHG** *phaffo*; **MHG** *phaffe*, *pfaffe*; **G** *Pfaffe*; **MLG** *pape*; **MDu.** *pape* **Du.** *paap*

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from Gr. *παπᾶς* 'clergyman, priest' rather than from Gr. *πάπας*, Lat. *papa* 'pope'. The latter words denoted higher clergy such as bishops, and from the fifth century onwards mainly the bishop of Rome, viz., the pope. Gr. *παπᾶς*, on the other hand, referred to the lower clergy, just as the Germanic (and Slavic) forms (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Pfaffe*).

From a phonological point of view, PSl. **popъ* can be borrowed either from Gothic or from West Germanic. Kiparsky rejects direct Greek origin of the word because in that case the expected reflex would be PSl. ***papá* (1934: 259).

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *postъ 'fast, Lent' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *postъ*; **R** *post*, Gsg. *postá*; **Ukr.** *pist*, Gsg. *póstu*; **P** *post*; **Cz.** *půst*; **Slk.** *pôst*; **US** *póst*; **LS** *spot*, Gsg. *spotu*; **S/Cr.** *pôst*, Gsg. *pȍsta*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *pôst*, Gsg. *pȍsta*; **Slov.** *pòst*, Gsg. *pósta*; **Bg.** *post*

PGmc. *fast- 'fast, Lent'
Goth. *fastubni* n.; **OHG** *fasta* f., *fasto* m.; **MHG** *vaste*; **G** *Fasten* pl.; **OE** *fæsten* n.; **OFri.** *feste, -faste*; **OS** *fasta* f., *fastunn* f.; **MDu.** *vastene* f. ; **Du.** *vasten* pl.; **ON** *fasta* f.

PSl. *postiti sę 'to fast'
OCS *postiti sę*; **R** *postítьsja*; **Ukr.** *postýtysja*; **P** *pościć* (*się*); **Cz.** *postit se*; **Slk.** *postiť sa*; **US** *posćić* (*so*); **S/Cr.** *pòstiti pòstīm* (1sg.); (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *pȍstiti*, *pȍstīš* (2sg.); **Slov.** *póstiti*; **Bg.** *póstja* (*se*)
Accentuation: AP (b). The Serbian/Croatian forms follow AP (c).

PGmc. *fastē- 'to fast' (weak verb)
Goth. (*sik*)*fastan* 'to fast; to hold on to'; **OHG** *fastē(n)*; **MHG** *vasten*; **G** *fasten*; **OE** *fæstan* 'to fast; to hold on to'; **OFri.** *festia*; **Du.** *vasten*; **ON** *fasta*

Etymology: The root *fasta- 'fast, Lent' probably derives from PIE *ph₂s-tó-, which is a verbal adjective to PIE *peh₂(s)- 'to guard' (EWN: s.v. *vast*). The original and literal meaning of the word is 'to hold on to'. This developed into the metaphorical use 'to observe, comply (with rules etc.)'. Because the literal meaning of the word is retained only in Gothic and Old English, it has been supposed that the word in its religious sense was borrowed from Gothic into the other Germanic languages (EWA 3: 84-85, EWN: s.v. *vast*).

The Proto-Slavic forms *postъ and *postiti sę can from a phonological point of view be borrowed either from West Germanic or from Gothic. Kiparsky suggests that, if one assumes that PSl. *postiti sę was a separate borrowing rather than being a Slavic derivative from the noun, the fact that the verb is reflexive both in Gothic and in Slavic speaks for Gothic origin of the forms (1934: 261). This idea has been rejected by Lloyd et al., who state that the Gothic expression *fastan sik silban* means 'to keep oneself' rather than 'to fast (religiously)' (EWA 3: 84). The Proto-Slavic noun cannot have been borrowed from Goth. *fastubni* or OS *fastunn* (attested *fastunnea, fastonnea*), which are both formed with the productive suffix *-umnija- (with PGmc. *-um- from a zero grade of the suffix *-men-) (Bammesberger 1990: 90). OHG *fasto* corresponds best to the Proto-Slavic noun because the genders agree (Kiparsky 1934: 261).

Both the verb and the noun occur equally early in Slavic and it is unclear whether the verb and the noun were borrowed into Proto-Slavic together or if one of the forms was borrowed and the other form is a Proto-Slavic derivation.

The exact Germanic origin of PSl. *postъ and *postiti sę remains therefore undecided.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *redъky/*rъdъky 'radish, Raphanus sativus' (f. ū-stem)
CS redъky, rъdъky; **SCS** redъky, rъdъky, rъdъkva; **OR** redъkovъ, retъka; **R** réd'ka; **Ukr.** réd'ka; **P** rzodkiew; **Cz.** ředkev 'wild radish (Raphanus raphanistrum)', ředkvička 'radish'; **Slk.** reďkev 'Raphanus'; **US** rjetkej; **LS** rjatkej; **S/Cr.** [rȍtkva, rȍkva < ?]; **Slov.** rédkəv f., rédkva f.

Accentuation: AP (b); the word has fixed initial stress in Russian, Serbian/Croatian and Slovene. The fixed initial stress results from retraction of the stress from the medial jer (which had received the stress by Dybo's law), when the latter lost its stressability.

WGmc. *radik- 'radish, Raphanus sativus' (m. a-stem)
OHG ratih, retih m.; **MHG** rætich, retich m.; **G** Rettich m.; **OE** rǣdic (or rædic (?) (Bosworth/Toller 1898: 783)) m.; **MLG** redik, redich; **MDu.** radic, redic

Etymology: The Germanic word derives from Lat. rādīx, Gsg. -īcis f. 'root'. The word is neither attested in Gothic nor in Old Norse, which might suggest that the word is a borrowing from Latin that was restricted to West Germanic. The Romans had taken over the radish from Syria (Lat. radix Syria) around the turn of the millennium and subsequently introduced it in northern Europe (Hehn 1883: 405). The long root vowel of the Latin donor was shortened in High and Low German (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Rettich).

Kiparsky remains undecided about the origin of the Slavic word and therefore does not list the word in his corpus of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (1934: 276). The word is nevertheless more likely to be a borrowing from Germanic than from Latin because the Slavic forms are phonologically hard to explain from the ultimate Latin donor and because PSl. *redъky reflects the West Germanic i-umlaut. The attested Slavic forms go back to PSl. *redъky or *rъdъky. Vasmer and Kiparsky assume that the divergence in forms may be due to popular etymology (REW 2: 504, Kiparsky 1934: 276). Vasmer traces the Polish and Sorbian forms back to *redъky, but Ukrainian to *rъdъky (REW 2: 504). Skok thinks S/Cr. rȍtkva, rȍkva are borrowed directly from Latin; the vocalism of S/Cr. rȍtkva, rȍkva points to original *ra- in the initial syllable (1910: 474). Maja Matasović, on the other hand, rather derives the Serbian/Croatian forms from Germanic as well (from a form not affected by the i-umlaut) because the Lat. ī in the second syllable of Lat. rādīx is not expected to develop into *ъ in Proto-Slavic. She alternatively cites the reconstructed Romance form *rádica with initial stress and shortening of the i in the second syllable (which yielded It.

radica), which might formally be the donor of the Serbian/Croatian forms as well (2011: 242-243).

PSl. **redъky/*rъdъky* must have been borrowed from a Germanic dialect that had retained the medial voiced *d* of the Latin donor and thus excludes post-sound shift Old High German. Since the Slavic forms point to a front vowel in the initial syllable, the word is likely to be a late borrowing from a Germanic dialect that underwent the *i*-umlaut (§7.2.1.3). This combined makes Low German origin of PSl. **redъky/*rъdъky* attractive.

Origin: West Germanic (Low German); the word is a late Latin loanword into West Germanic.

PSl. **skotъ* 'cattle' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *skotъ*; **OR** *skotъ* 'cattle, property', (dial. Novgorod) *skotъ* 'money' (Zaliznjak 2004: 798); **R** *skot*, Gsg. *skotá*; **Ukr.** *skot*, Gsg. *skotá, skótu*; **P** *skot* (arch.) 'cattle; Polish coin (12th-14th century)'; **OCz.** *skuot*; **Cz.** *skot*; **US** *skót*; **LS** *skot*; **Plb.** *stöt*; **S/Cr.** *skȍt*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *skȏt*, Gsg. *skȍti* f.; **Slov.** *skòt*, Gsg. *skǫ́ta* 'young of an animal'; **Bg.** *skot*

Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. **skatta-* 'money, property' (m. *a*-stem)

Goth. *skatts* 'coin, money'; **OHG** *scaz*, Gsg. *scazzes* 'denarius, money, wealth'; **MHG** *schaz*, Gsg. *schatzes* 'coin, property, treasure, value'; **G** *Schatz* 'treasure'; **OE** *sceatt* 'property, treasure, tax, bribe, unit of money'; **OFri.** *sket* 'money, treasure, cattle'; **OS** *skatt* 'coin, property, cattle (?)'; **Du.** *schat* 'treasure'; **ON** *skattr* 'tax, money, wealth'

Etymology: The origin of the Germanic word is entirely unclear. It is an isolated formation and might be a borrowing from a non-Indo-European language (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Schatz*, EWN: s.v. *schat*).

The semantic relation between the Germanic and Slavic forms is difficult: the primary meaning of the attested Germanic forms is 'property, money', which is in Slavic only reflected in OR *skotъ* 'cattle, property, money' and P *skot* 'medieval Polish coin'. In Slavic, the word has a rather uniform meaning 'cattle', which is in Germanic only found as one of the meanings of OFri. *sket*. Tiefenbach adds this meaning for OS *skett* with a question mark (2010: 340). Cattle and property are semantically connected because of the fact that in many communities one's property (mainly) consisted of one's cattle. Similar examples

are found in other languages, the most famous being Lat. *pecūnia* 'money, wealth', literally 'property in cattle', which derived from Lat. *pecū* 'cattle, herd'.[73] Germanic etymologists suggested on the basis of PSl. *skotъ* that the original meaning of the Proto-Germanic word was 'cattle' as well (e.g., EWN: *schat*, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 575). It is attractive to assume that the Slavs borrowed PSl. *skotъ* from Germanic when the Germanic word retained the supposed original meaning 'cattle'. On the other hand, both the West Germanic forms and Goth. *skatts* uniformly refer to 'money, property', which indicates that this was at least part of the original Proto-Germanic meaning of the word. It can therefore be supposed that PGmc. *skatta-* meant 'money, property' as well as 'cattle' originally and the latter meaning then disappeared in all of Germanic except for Old Frisian.

   It has been suggested that the word was borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic (e.g., Radić 1898: 17-23, Martynov 1963: 183ff.). Stankiewicz also explains PSl. *skotъ* as a native formation. He derives the word from PSl. *skopiti* 'to castrate', a variant with *s*-mobile of PSl. *kopiti* 'to castrate' (Stankiewicz 1986: 443-446, cf. ESSlov. 3: 245). Comparative evidence shows that languages often derive their designations for castrated animals from verbs and that these words are often late formations (Stankiewicz 1986: 445). PSl. *skotъ* would then go back to *skop-tъ*, in which the cluster *-pt-* simplified to *-t-*, as in, e.g., PSl. *potъ* 'sweat' < PIE *pok^w-to*. The word would have originally referred to an ox (a castrated bovine animal) and presupposes a broadening of meaning from 'ox' to 'cattle' (ibid.: 446). Stankiewicz explains Goth. *skatts* (leaving aside the reflexes in the other Germanic languages) as a borrowing from Proto-Slavic and explains the geminate *-tt-* in Gothic as a reflex of a supposed geminate *-tt-* in Proto-Slavic, which would have been a medial stage in the simplification of *-pt-* to *-t-* (1986: 446). The supposed borrowing of the word from Proto-Slavic into Gothic does not explain the occurrence of the word in West and North Germanic, and with this etymology, the origin of the geminate in Germanic remains highly speculative. It is therefore more attractive to assume that PSl. *skotъ* was borrowed from a reflex of PGmc. *skatta-* 'money, property', and that the original meaning of the Germanic etymon included 'cattle' as well.
Origin: Cannot be specified.

---

[73] From the same Proto-Indo-European root *peḱ-u-* 'cattle' derives PGmc. *fehu* 'cattle, property' which is reflected by E *fee*.

PSl. *stъklo 'glass(ware)' (n. *o*-stem)

OCS *stъklěnica, stъklьnica* 'cup'; **CS** *stъklo* 'glass'; **R** *stekló*; *sklo* (dial., poet.) 'glass(ware)'; **Ukr.** *sklo* 'glass(ware)'; **P** *szkło* 'glass(ware)'; **OCz.** *stklo*; **Cz.** *sklo* 'glass(ware)'; **Slk.** *sklo* 'glass(ware)'; **US** *škla* 'bowl', *škleńca* 'glass(ware); window pane'; **LS** *škla* 'bowl', *šklanica* 'window pane'; **S/Cr.** *stàklo* 'glass(ware)'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *staklȍ*, Gsg. *staklä̀*; **Slov.** *stəklȍ̦* 'glass(ware)'; **Bg.** *stăkló* 'glass'
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. *stikla-* '(object with) pointed end' (m. *a*-stem)

Goth. *stikls* 'beaker, goblet'; **OHG** *stehhal* 'goblet'

Etymology: The Germanic forms are derivatives from PGmc. *stikila-* 'prickle', which derive from PIE *(s)teig-* 'prick' (cf., e.g., OHG *stichil*, OE *sticel* 'prickle' and ON *stikill* 'pointed end of the horn'). The semantic shift went from '(something) pointed' to 'pointed end of a drinking horn' (as is attested in Old Norse) to 'drinking horn, goblet' in general (Kiparsky 1934: 210).

The direction of the borrowing is not uniformly agreed upon. It has been supposed that the word was borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Gothic because the Slavic word refers to the material glass, whereas the Germanic word denotes a concrete glass object. The semantic shift from a 'concrete object' to a 'material' occurs less frequently than a change the other way round (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 210 for references). This objection against the borrowing of PSl. *stъklo* from Goth. *stikls* is quite unnecessary because if the Slavs became acquainted with glass and glassware through contacts with the Goths, they might well have adopted the Gothic designation for the glass goblet for the material 'glass' in general.

If this is indeed so, this would make PSl. *stъklo* one of the technological loanwords from Germanic. Unlike the other technological loanwords from Germanic in Proto-Slavic, PSl. *stъklo* clearly derives from Gothic: the West Germanic forms were very early affected by the *a*-umlaut, which lowered *i* in the initial syllable to *e* and yielded OHG *stehhal* (cf. §7.2.1.3).

In Germanic, the word is a masculine *a*-stem, whereas it became a neuter *o*-stem in Slavic. According to Stender-Petersen, this might have been caused by the change in meaning in Slavic from 'the name of the glass vessel' to 'the name of the material' in analogy to other names for materials as PSl. *želězo* 'iron', *zolto* 'gold', *sъrebro* 'silver' (1927: 397).
Origin: Gothic because of the absence of the *a*-umlaut.

PSl. *velьblǫdъ* 'camel' (m. *o*-stem)

CS *velьbǫdъ, velьblǫdъ*; **OR** *velbludъ, velbudъ, velьbludъ, verьbludъ*; **R** *verbljúd*; **Ukr.** *verbljúd*; **P** *wielbłąd, wielbrąd*; **Cz.** *velbloud*; **US** [*wjelbłud* < Cz. (HEW 21: 1611)] ; **Slov.** *velblòd*, Gsg. *velblǫ́da*

Accentuation: AP (b), but with columnal stress on the second root syllable after Dybo's law. Dybo's law must have operated when the original form of the word was retained, before the popular etymology from *vъlb(l)ǫdъ to *velьblǫdъ: PSl. vь̏lbǫdъ > vъlbǫ̀dъ, otherwise the stress would have moved to the jer in the second syllable of PSl. *velьblǫdъ.

Gmc. *ulband- 'camel' (m. *a* or *u*-stem)
Goth. *ulbandus** m. *u*-stem (attested Dsg. *ulbandau*, Gsg. *ulbandaus*)**; OHG** *olbenta* f.**; MHG** *olbende*; **OE** *olfend* m.**; OS** *olvundio* m.**; ON** *ulfaldi* m.**; OSw.** *ulvande*

Etymology: The Germanic word was borrowed from a (Vulgar) Latin form that derives from Lat. *elephas* (Asg. *elephantes*) 'elephant'. Lat. *elephas* itself is a borrowing from Gr. ἐλέφᾱς (Gsg. ἐλέφαντος) 'ivory, elephant'. The word is likely to originally come from Asia Minor and has been connected to Old Egyptian *āb(u)* 'ivory, elephant' und Hamitic *eḷu* 'elephant' (De Vries 1977: 632, Lehmann 1986: 375, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Elefant*).

The Slavic word has commonly been regarded as a loanword from Goth. *ulbandus* 'camel' (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 213 for literature). The Goths became acquainted with tame camels in the Lower Danube region in the fourth century and subsequently introduced them in neighbouring areas. The reflexes of the word in Slavic as well in West and North Germanic would thus stem from Gothic (RGA 7: 141-142). In the West Germanic forms, the *a*-umlaut lowered the initial *u to *o*.[74]

Phonologically, Goth. *ul-* cannot yield *velь-* in Proto-Slavic. The regular reflex of the word is expected to be PSl. **vъlbǫdъ*. The vocalism of the initial syllable has been explained as the result of change from original *vъlb(l)ǫdъ to *velьblǫdъ, due to popular etymology to *velijь 'great' (REW 1: 184). Since all Slavic languages seem to go back to *velьblǫdъ, this popular etymology must have operated in Proto-Slavic already, but only after the operation of Dybo's law (see above). In Russian and Ukrainian, the first *-l-* dissimilated to *-r-* and the same happened to the second *-l-* in P *wielbrąd*.

Origin: Probably Gothic; Proto-Slavic initial *velь-* (resulting from popular etymology from earlier **vъl-*) can better be explained from Goth. *ul-* than from West Germanic *ol-*.

---

[74] ON has *ulfaldi*, and De Vries supposed that the word came "auf östlichem wege" to Scandinavia (1977: 632).

PSl. *xrъstъ 'cross, Christ, baptism' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *xrist(os)ъ, xrъst(os)ъ* 'Christ'; **CS** *xrъstъ* 'cross'; **OR** *xrъstъ* 'cross'; **R** *xrëst*
(dial.) 'cross'; **Ukr.** *xrest*, Gsg. *xrestá* 'cross'; **S/Cr.** *hrst* (14th century) 'Christ'
Accentuation: AP (b)

PSl. *krъstъ 'cross, Christ, baptism' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *krъstъ* 'cross(, Christ)'; **OR** *krъstъ* 'cross'; **R** [*krest* 'cross' < CS (REW 1:
661)]; **OP** *chrzest, krzest* 'baptism'; **Cz.** *křest*, Gsg. *křestu* 'baptism'; **Slk.** *krst*;
S/Cr. *kȑst*, Gsg. *kȑsta* 'Christ', (Gr. cath.) cross, baptism'; [**US** *křest* 'baptism'];[75]
Slov. *kȑst*, Gsg. *kŕsta* 'baptism'; **Bg.** *krăst* 'cross'

Goth. *Xristus*; **OHG** *Christ*; **OE** *Crist, Krist*; **OS** *Krist* 'Christ'

Etymology: The name of Christ was borrowed into Germanic from Lat.
Chrīstus, which itself stems from Gr. *Χρῑστός*. Gr. *Χρῑστός* means 'the anointed'
and is derived from the verb Gr. *χρίειν* 'to anoint', which is a loan translation
from Hebrew *Mashiah* 'Messiah' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Christ*). The
declination of (*Iesus*) *Xristus* as an *u*-stem in Gothic points to Latin origin, as
well as the oblique case forms of Goth. *Iesus* (Gsg. *Iesuis*, Dsg. *Iesua*, next to
Iesu) and the accentuation pattern *Iesús Xrístus* (Jellinek 1926: 189-190, Kortlandt
2002b: 3-4).

Kiparsky and Stender-Petersen derive PSl. *xrъstъ from Old High German,
in which the reflex of the High German consonant shift is attested.
Stender-Petersen regards PSl. *krъstъ as a loanword from Gothic, whereas
Kiparsky considers the form to be an older borrowing from Old High German
(Stender-Petersen 1927: 420, Kiparsky 1934: 234-236). Vasmer supposes that the
forms were borrowed from OHG *krist, christ* in the original meaning 'Christ',
after which the word became to mean 'cross' in Slavic as well (REW 1: 661-662).
Origin: PSl. *xrъstъ stems from West Germanic (High German). PSl. *krъstъ
could be West Germanic or Gothic.

---

[75] US *křest* 'baptism' is a later formation, dating from the 19th century, after Cz. *křest* (HEW 10:
696).

5.5   LOANWORDS WITH AP (C)

PSl. *dъlgъ* 'debt' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *dlъgъ*; **OR** *dolgъ, dъlgъ, dъlъgъ*; **R** *dolg*, Gsg. *dólga*; **Ukr.** *dovh*; **P** *dług*; **Cz.**
dluh; **Slk.** *dlh*; **US** *dołh*; **LS** *dług*; **Plb.** *då̯ug*; **S/Cr.** *dûg*, Gsg. *dûga*; **Slov.** *dôłg*, Gsg.
dołgâ; **Bg.** *dǎlǎg*
Accentuation: AP (c)

Goth. *dulgs** m. 'debt' (attested Gsg. *dulgis*)

Etymology: Gothic is the only Germanic language in which the word is attested.
Goth. *dulgs* has been explained as a borrowing from Celtic and this borrowing
falls in a row of legal terms that were borrowed from Celtic into Germanic
(Lehmann 1986: 97).

The connection between Goth. *dulgs* and PSl. *dъlgъ* 'debt' fits
phonologically and semantically very well, but Gothic origin of the word has
nevertheless frequently been doubted or rejected (e.g., by Kiparsky 1934: 25, Snoj
2003: 117, REW 1: 359).

From the attested Slavic forms it is not clear that the word must be
reconstructed as PSl. *dъlgъ* with a *ъ*-vowel in the root. Vasmer reconstructs PSl.
dьlgъ (REW 1: 359), which enables the connection of the word to PSl. *dьlgъ*
'long'. Trubačev also regards this connection to be attractive (ÈSSJa 5: 179ff.).
The semantic connection between PSl. *dьlgъ* 'long' and 'debt' is explained by
describing debt as something that a creditor is being kept waiting for (ibid.).
From a semantic viewpoint, it is much more attractive to regard the word as a
loanword from Gothic because the meanings of the Slavic and Germanic words
are identical and there are a large number of Germanic loanwords in
Proto-Slavic relating to money, trade, etc. Stender-Petersen therefore regards the
word to be a likely loanword (1927: 319ff.). In the Old Church Slavic
manuscripts, *dlъgъ* and its derivative *dlъžьnikъ* 'debtor' are consistently written
with the vowel *ъ*, which strongly indicates that this was the original vowel.

The main ground for Vasmer to reject the etymology of PSl. *dьlgъ* (*dъlgъ*)
as a loanword from Gothic is the mobile accentuation of the word in Slavic: AP
(c) is not an accentuation type that regularly occurs with Germanic loanwords in
Proto-Slavic (REW 1: 359, cf. §8.3.1). The idea that the word is inherited and
related to PSl. *dьlgъ* 'long' is, on the other hand, difficult from an
accentological point of view as well because PSl. *dьlgъ* 'long' has AP (a).
Because of the exact formal and semantic correspondence between the
Germanic and Slavic forms, PSl. *dъlgъ* is likely to be a Germanic loanword. The
accentuation of the word can be explained if we were to assume that the word
became a masculine *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic (cf. §8.3.1).

Origin: Gothic; this is the only Germanic language in which the word is attested.

PSl. *jьstъba '(heated) room' (f. ā-stem)
CS istъba 'tent'; **OR** istobka 'house, bathroom', istъba, izba 'house, building'; **R** izbá 'peasant's log hut'; **P** izba, jizdba (dial.), zdba (dial.), źba (dial.) 'room'; **OCz.** jistba, jizdba, jizba 'room; pillar, flying buttress (architecture)'; **Cz.** jizba 'living room'; **Slk.** izba 'living room'; **US** (j)stwa 'room'; **LS** śpa 'room'; **Plb.** åzbə 'living room; public building in a village where the youth gathers'; **S/Cr.** ìzba 'small room, cellar'; **Slov.** îzba, îspa (dial.), jêzba (dial.), jispa (dial.) 'room'; **Bg.** ízba 'cellar, mud hut'
Accentuation: AP (c)

(N)WGmc. *stubō 'heated room' (f. ō-stem)
OHG stuba 'bathroom, heated room'; **MHG** stube; **G** Stube 'room'; **OE** stofa m. 'bathroom'; **MLG** stove(n) m. 'heated room'; **MDu.** stove 'room with fireplace, bathroom'; **Du.** stoof 'foot stove'; **ON** [stofa 'sitting-room, house' < MLG (?) (De Vries 1977: 550)]

Etymology: The origin of the Germanic word is not entirely clear, but is has often been connected to VLat. *extūfāre 'to emanate, evaporate'. The word is not attested in Latin, but can be reconstructed on the basis of, e.g., Sp. estufar, It. stufare, OFr. estuver and has been derived from reconstructed VLat. *tūfus 'vapour' < Gr. τῦφος m. 'vapour'. The corresponding reconstructed Vulgar Latin noun *extūfa is attested in Sp. estufa 'stove, warm room', It. stufa, Fr. étuve 'steam bath'. The original meaning of the word seems to be 'steam bath', from which developed the meaning '(heated) room' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Stube, EWN: s.v. stoof). Franck/Van Wijk derives the Germanic forms from PGmc. *stūban-, *steuban- 'to vaporise, steam' (1912: 670-671).

Lith. stubà 'room in a farmhouse', OPr. stubo 'room' stem from Old High German (LitEW 2: 928). According to Bezlaj, Latv. istaba '(bath)room, apartment' would also be a loanword from Germanic (ESSlov. 1: 215), but Karulis derives the word from Slavic (1992: 346).

The phonological relation between the Romance, Germanic and Slavic forms remains very difficult and it is probably impossible to decide in which direction the borrowings in the different languages took place. The Germanic forms have most often been explained to stem from Romance. This would also fit well from a cultural point of view because the Romans introduced steam baths and heated bathhouses to the Germanic tribes (EWN: s.v. stoof).

Although the predominant meaning in the living Slavic languages is 'room', the original meaning was (also) 'bathroom', as we know from the *Primary*

Chronicle and from the chronicles of Ibrahim ibn Yaqub. This goes back to the original meaning of the word, which can be reconstructed as '(heated) room'.[76]

PSl. *jьstъba* has been thought to be of Romance origin, because of the anlaut of the word which is hard to explain from Germanic (Gołąb 1991: 387, Machek 1957: 230).[77] Yet the Vulgar Latin word that has been reconstructed as *extūfa* 'heated room, steam bath' does not formally correspond to the Slavic word either because the Proto-Slavic initial *i-* cannot be explained from Vulgar Latin *e-*, and Vulgar Latin *-ū-* is not expected to yield *-ъ-* in Proto-Slavic.

Martynov suggests that the word was borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic (1963: 120). This etymology does not explain the absence of the initial vowel in Germanic.

Nevertheless, most scholars regard the word a loanword from Germanic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 237-239 for references, M. Matasović 2011: 238). Bezlaj regards the Germanic origin of the Slavic word to be impossible (ESSlov. 1: 215). Although both the Romance and the Germanic etymologies of PSl. *jьstъba* have their advantages, neither of them can fully explain the shape of the Proto-Slavic form. The reflexes from WGmc. *stubō* correspond to PSl. *jьstъba* with respect to phonological shape and meaning of the word, except for the initial *jь-*, which remains unexplained if the word was borrowed from Germanic. Stender-Petersen notes that sometimes loanwords starting with a sibilant *s* or *z* receive an initial *i-* in Slavic (1927: 247). A small number of examples for Slavic, as well as for Baltic, can be found, e.g., R *izumrúd* 'emerald' from Turkic *zümrüt*; R *iz'jan* 'damage, loss' from Turkic/Tatar *zyjan* and R *ispolín* 'giant', which has been connected with a tribe mentioned by Pliny called *Spalaei* (ibid.). The initial *i-* in Slavic also reminds of Hungarian, where initial consonant clusters were resolved by the placement of a prothetic vowel, cf. Hg. *István* < *Stephanus*. PSl. *jьstъba* is however not likely to be a Hungarian loanword, firstly because the Magyars first arrived in central Europe in the early tenth century which is too late for loanwords to have a Proto-Slavic distribution and secondly because there does not seem to be a modern Hungarian cognate of PSl. *jьstъba* '(heated) room'.

Origin: West Germanic; the word seems to be a late Latin loanword into West Germanic.

---

[76] Ibrahim ibn Yaqub was a traveller and merchant, who traveled through central and eastern Europe in the 960's and 970's and later published memoirs of these travels. Although Stender-Petersen writes that he was an Arab (1929: 248), he actually was a Sephardic Jew called Abraham ben Jacob, who became known under his Arabic name.

[77] Machek derives the Slavic word from Lat. *aestuāre* 'to heat' (1957: 230).

PSl. *lъstъ 'cunning (trick)' (f. *i*-stem)

OCS *lъstъ, lьstъ* 'fraud, deceit'; **OR** *lъstъ* 'deceit, trick, flattery, evil'; **R** *lest'*, Gsg. *lesti* 'flattery, cajolery'; **Ukr.** *léstošči* f. pl. 'flattery'; **P** *leść* (arch.) 'treachery, hypocrisy'; **Cz.** *lest*, Gsg. *lsti* 'trick'; **Slk.** *lesť*, Gsg. *lesti/ľsti* 'trick'; **US** *lesć* 'trick'; **LS** *lasć* trick; **S/Cr.** *lâst*, Gsg. *lȁsti* 'deceit'; **Slov.** *làst*, Gsg. *ləstî*; **Bg.** *lăst* f. 'flattery, seduction'; *lest* 'deceit, cajolery'

Accentuation: AP (c), as is reflected by the long falling vowel in the Nsg. *lâst* in Serbian/Croatian and the reflex of the progressive accent shift in the Slov. Gsg. *ləstî*. In this specific case, the fact that the word follows AP (c) need not surprise us because *i*-stems are almost always mobile and the word might therefore analogically have joined AP (c) (cf. Zaliznjak 1985: 132-140, Kapović 2009: 236-243 and cf. §8.3.1).

PGmc. *listi-* 'cunning (trick), clever(ness)' (f. *i*-stem)

Goth. *list** f. 'trick, cunning' (attested as Apl. *listins*); **OHG** *list* m./f. 'wisdom, clever(ness)'; **MHG** *list* m. 'trick, skill, wisdom'; **G** *List* f. 'cunning (trick)'; **OE** *list* f.; **OFri.** *list* f. 'reason, cunning'; **OS** *list* m./f. 'wisdom, clever(ness)'; **Du.** *list* 'cunning (trick)'; **ON** *list* f. 'art, craft'

Etymology: PGmc. *listi-* is a verbal abstract from the zero grade of the Proto-Germanic root *lais-* 'to know, learn' with the suffix *-ti-*. There are no semantically related forms outside Germanic. The root has been connected to the homophonic root PIE *leis-* 'furrow', attested in Germanic in, e.g., OHG *leist* 'track, trace; (cobbler's) last', Goth. *laists* 'track, trace' (cf. EWN: s.v. *list*, Pokorny 1959: 671-672), but this connection is semantically difficult.

The word can be reconstructed as a Proto-Germanic feminine *i*-stem, but appears in High German and Old English in masculine forms as well. PSl. *lъstъ* was probably borrowed from a Germanic feminine *i*-stem because the word follows the *i*-stem declension in Slavic as well.

Many etymologists explain PSl. *lъstъ* as a borrowing from Gothic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 207 for references). There is no formal reason why the word cannot have been borrowed from West Germanic, but on semantic grounds, a borrowing from Gothic is more likely: both Gothic and Slavic share the meaning 'trick, cunning', whereas the Old High German and Old Saxon forms mean 'wisdom, clever(ness)'.

Origin: Gothic because this fits better semantically.

5.6 Loanwords with an unknown AP

PSl. *bъdьnja* 'tub' (f. *jā*-stem); *bъdьnjь* 'idem' (m. *jo*-stem)
R [*bódnja* (dial.) 'small lockable drum' < Ukr.]; **Ukr.** *bódnja* 'lockable basket or bee hive'; **P** *bednia* (dial.) 'tub'; [*bodnia* < Ukr]; **Cz.** *bedna* 'tub'; **Slk.** *debna* '(usually wooden) tub; measure of capacity'; **Plb.** [*badån* 'cask, tub' < MLG *boden/bodden* (SEJDP 1: 24)]; **S/Cr.** *bàdanj*; Gsg. *bádnja* 'tub, barrel'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *badᵒãń*, Gsg. *badńã̀*; **Slov.** *bâdənj*, Gsg. *bâdnja*; *bədə̀nj*, Gsg. *bədnjà* 'tub'; **Bg.** *bădắn* (dial.), *bădné* (dial.)
Accentuation: AP (b) or (c): on the basis of the attested forms, it is difficult to reconstruct the AP.

NWGmc. *budina* 'tub' (f. *ō*-stem)
OHG *butin, butin(n)a* f.; **MHG** *büt(t)e, büten* f. 'tub'; **G** *Bütte*; **OE** *byden* f. 'bushel, barrel', *bytt* f. 'leather bag'; **E** *butt* 'beer, water, wine butt'; **Du.** *but* (arch.) 'large beer mug, ration of beer on a ship'; **OS** *budin* f.; **MLG** *bodene, budde, butte* f. 'cask'; **ON** [*bytta* f., *bytti* n. 'tub, barrel' < OE or OLG (De Vries 1977: 68)]

Etymology: NWGmc. *budina* is regarded as a borrowing from (Middle) Lat. *butina* 'bottle, vessel', which itself is a loanword from Gr. βυτίνη, πυτίνη 'wicker wine jug'. The intervocalic voiceless stops became voiced in (Middle) Latin, which caused to word to be borrowed as *budin-* in Germanic. In Old English and Low German, the Latin voicing of intervocalic stops is directly reflected and the Old High German forms also go back to a pre-sound shift form *budin-*. The Latin word, which is only retained in southern Italian dialects and possibly in Romanian, is first attested in the fifth or sixth century. Wollmann dates the borrowing of the word into Old English to the fifth century because the form reflects the Northwest Germanic *i*-umlaut and because the attestation of the Latin word is dated rather late (1993: 23). The word probably entered the other Germanic languages at the same time as in Old English. The spread of the word to northern Europe has been connected to the spread of viniculture (Wollmann 1993: 23).

Just as the Germanic forms, PSl. *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь* reflects the voicing of the Latin intervocalic stops. For this reason, the word must be borrowed from a Germanic dialect that retained the voiced reflex of the medial consonant.

Because the earliest attestation of the root refers to the 'cooper' rather than the 'tub' itself (i.e., OCz. *bednář*, attested from the 14th century onwards),

Kiparsky supposes that the word 'cooper' was the original loanword (cf. MHG *bütenaere* 'cooper') and that the words reflecting **bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь* were later derivatives (1934: 232).[78] This would imply that the attested forms for 'tub' do not go back to PSl. **bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь*, but are new formations in the individual Slavic languages. The late attestation of the etymon in Slavic is no argument against an early, Proto-Slavic borrowing of **bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь* 'tub' or **bъdьnārъ* 'cooper' because both forms are attested in all branches of Slavic. In view of the fact that the Slavs borrowed a large number of designations for different types of vessels (§7.4.2.4), but, on the other hand, no other occupational names, the borrowing of PSl. **bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь* 'tub' from Germanic is most likely. It is, furthermore, likelier that the Slavs derived the name of the cooper from the name of the vessel than the other way round.

Origin: West Germanic; the word is a late Latin loanword in West Germanic.

PSl. **gobina/*gobino* 'wealth, abundance' (n. *o*-stem)
OCS *gobino*, *gobina* (Supr.)**; CS** *gobina*, *gobino***; RCS** *gobino*, *gobъ***; OR** *gobino*, *gobina*, *gobъ***; S/Cr.** *gobino* (arch.) 'spelt, *Triticum spelta*'

PSl. **gobъdźъ* 'wealthy, abundant (adj.); wealth, abundance' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *gobъdzije***; RCS** *gobъzъ*, *gobъzyi***; OR** *gobъzъ*, *gobъzyi***; R** *gobzá* (dial.) 'abundance'; **OCz.** *obih* (< **gobigъ* 'abundance' (ÈSSJa VI 185)), *hobezný*;
Accentuation: AP unknown; because the word almost does not occur in living Slavic languages, the accentuation cannot be established.

PGmc. **gabī-* 'wealth', **gabīga-/*gabiga-* 'wealthy'
Goth. *gabei* 'wealth, abundance'; *gabeigs*, *gabigs* (adj.) 'wealthy'**; OE** *gifig* (adj.) 'possessing as the result of a gift/grant'**; ON** *gǫfugr* (adj.) 'noble'

Etymology: The Germanic forms have been explained as derivatives from the verbal root PGmc. **geba-* 'to give' (Lehmann 1986: 134, De Vries 1977: 160, 198). Philippa et al. call the connection of Goth. *gabei* to PGmc. **geba-* 'to give' unclear (EWN: s.v. *geven*).[79]

---

[78] Also, e.g., R *bondar'*, Ukr. *bondar*; P *bednarz*; Cz. *bednář*; US *bětnar*; LS *bjatkaŕ*; S/Cr. *bȁčvār* 'cooper'. The medial voiceless *-t-* in the Sorbian forms indicate that the word was a later borrowing from High German (HEW 1: 29).

[79] Kortlandt rejects the usual connection of PGmc. **geba-* 'to give' to, e.g., Lat. *habeō* 'to have, hold' and Ir. *gaibid* 3sg. 'takes' because the vocalism is incompatible: the Latin and Celtic forms derive from PIE **gʰeh₁b^(h)-* 'to have, take' (cf. De Vaan 2008: 277), but the Germanic form cannot derive from a root with a laryngeal. In addition, Goth. *grob* from *graban* 'to dig' < PIE

Gothic is often cited as the donor of the Slavic forms (ĖSSJa 6: 185-186, Derksen 2008: 171-172). This is indeed very attractive because of the exact formal correspondence between the Gothic and the Proto-Slavic forms, although an early borrowing from West Germanic cannot be ruled out either. The Slavic forms probably go back to several parallel borrowings: one from a reflex of the noun PGmc. *gabī-, another from a reflex of the adjective PGmc. *gabīga-/*gabiga-. It has been supposed that PSl. *gobina/*gobino was borrowed from Goth. *gabein- 'wealth' (Kiparsky 1934: 198-199, ĖSSJa 6: 185), but this formation is unattested in Gothic. PSl. *gobina/*gobino is more likely to be a Slavic derivative with the suffix *-ina-, which formed abstract nouns from adjectives, cf. PSl. *brъzina 'speed', *čistina 'purity', *širina 'width' (cf. Vaillant 1974: 355-356), with *gobino as a secondary neuter.

Both in Germanic and in Slavic, the word generally means 'wealth, abundance' (or 'wealthy, abundant'). Stender-Petersen remarks that in a number of languages the Slavic form has a connotation 'good crop, rich harvest' (for example, OR *damъ gobi na zemli na umnoženie plodovъ zemnyxъ* 'I give wealth on the earth for the increase of the fruits of the earth' (cf. ĖSSJa 6: 185)). Stender-Petersen, therefore, relates the borrowing of the word to the cult of mother goddesses practiced by Celtic and Germanic tribes. A number of statues of *Matrona Gabiae* or *Alagabiae* ('the giving one') have been found in Germany, and Stender-Petersen supposes that this mother goddess was the one that was called upon for rich harvests (1927: 315ff.).[80] This may very well be true, since in statues, *Matrona Gabiae* is equipped with a plough (Hoffmann-Krayer/Bächtold-Stäubli 1935: 1719).

OCz. *obih* from PSl. *gobigъ* is a remarkable form, not only because it seems to reflect Germanic *ī rather than *i in the second stem syllable, but mainly because the expected reflex of the progressive palatalization is absent. Trubačev does not provide an explanation for this form (ĖSSJa 6: 185).

Origin: Probably Gothic.

---

*gʰrobʰ- is written with final -b, whereas the preterite of Goth. *giban* 'to give' has the form *gaf*. Kortlandt therefore analyses PGmc. *geba- as the Proto-Germanic prefix *ga- with a root *ep- 'to reach' that is also found in, e.g., Hitt. *epzi* 'seizes' (1992a: 104-105).

[80] This mother goddess is also known in Celtic, as *Ollagabiae*, and in Lithuanian *Matergabia* (Hoffmann-Krayer/Bächtold-Stäubli 1935: 1719).

PSl. *gorazdъ 'experienced, able' (adj.)

OCS *Saint Gorazd* (personal name), a disciple of Cyril and Method in Great Moravia (ninth century)**; RCS** *gorazdъ* 'experienced, agile'**; OR** *gorazdo* 'perfectly, well, quite', *gorazdyj* 'well done'**; R,** *goŕázd, goŕázdyj* 'experienced, agile', *goŕázdo, goŕázno* 'much, (by) far'**; Ukr.** *haŕázd* 'good, happy'**; OP** *gorazdy* 'successful, happy, agile'**; Cz.** *horazd* 'big' (arch.), [*horazdit* 'to rage, scold' < Hg. (Machek 1957: 149, 176)]**; Slk.** [*garazda* 'shouting, disturbance, noise' < Hg. (Machek 1957: 149)];[81] **Late PSl. personal name** *Gorazd* (also *Carast, Karastus* in contemporary documents), a duke of Carantania (died ca. 751)

Accentuation: AP unknown; the absence of the word in South Slavic makes it difficult to establish the accent paradigm. In R *goŕázdyj*, the stress is fixed on the second root syllable. This might point to AP (b); the word underwent Dybo's law in all case forms and received fixed stress on the second syllable in Slavic.

PGmc. *ga-* and *razdō* 'sound, speech, tongue'
Goth. *razda* 'speech, dialect'**; OHG** *rarta*; **OE** *reord*; **ON** *rǫdd*

Etymology: The compound of the Proto-Germanic noun *razdō* 'sound, speech, tongue' with the prefix *ga-* is unattested in the Germanic languages. The origin of PGmc. *razdō* is unclear (Lehmann 1986: 283, De Vries 1977: 457).

The etymology of PSl. *gorazdъ* as a loanword from Germanic has not been universally accepted. Kiparsky rejects the idea of the borrowing from Germanic because the correspondence between Germanic *a* and PSl. *a* is difficult and because the compound is not attested in Germanic (1934: 28). The reflex *a* in the second stem syllable of PSl. *gorazdъ* is indeed difficult to explain and is not treated by Trubačev (ÈSSJa 7: 31-33), Vasmer (REW 1: 293-294) and Mel'nyčuk (ESUM 1: 470), who on the other hand all regard the word to be a borrowing from Germanic.[82]

The absence of the compound in the attested Germanic languages is no prohibitive objection: the prefix *ga-* is widely used in Germanic and was especially productive in Gothic (Lehmann 1986: 132). The semantic shift from '(being) with speech' to 'able, agile' is not hard to picture. Furthermore, the verbs *rartjan* and *garertjan*, which derive from PGmc. *razdō*, are attested in Old High German (cf. Graff 1836: 534-535). Forms of the verb *garertjan* compare to Latin meanings as *collatus* 'brought together', *consonus* 'sounding together', *institutus*

---

[81] Hg. *goŕázda* 'quarrelsome, peevish, shrewish' was probably itself a borrowing from Slavic (Machek 1957: 149).

[82] Brückner does not regard the word as a borrowing from Germanic but rather connects it to PSl. *golsъ* 'voice' (1927: 151).

'instituted, built' and *modulatus* 'measured' (cf. Köbler 2003: s.v. *rerten*) and these meanings are quite close to some of the Slavic meanings. The word is therefore likely to be a loanword from Germanic, but the correspondence between Germanic *a* and PSl. *a* remains an unsolved problem.

The origin of the borrowing is unclear and the donor language cannot be established with certainty. The compound in Proto-Slavic does not reflect the (North and) West Germanic rhotacism and therefore might be regarded as a borrowing from Gothic or as an early borrowing from West Germanic. The word is reflected in the name of the Carantanian duke Gorazd. This means that either the word was a relatively early borrowing into Proto-Slavic, or that the name of the duke triggered the spread of the word in the meaning 'experienced, able' throughout Slavic.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *likъ* 'choir (?)' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *likъ* 'choir', *likovati* 'to dance, clap'; **RCS** *lěkъ* 'kind of game (?)';[83] **OR** *likъ* 'number, choral dance, chorus'; *likovati* 'to dance, sing; **R** *lik*, Gsg. *líka* (arch.) 'choir'; [*likovátъ* 'to cheer, rejoice' < CS]; **Ukr.** *lyk* 'gathering, crowd of angels, saints, etc., on religious paintings';[84] **S/Cr.** [*lȉk* 'chorus' < CS] *líka* (obs.) 'pleasure, delight';[85] **Bg.** [*lik* 'choir' < CS]

Accentuation: Unclear; in few languages we find indications for reconstructing the AP. S/Cr. *lȉk* indicates AP (a), but this is inconclusive because the word seems to have been borrowed from Church Slavic (according to Kiparsky 1934: 219). S/Cr. *líka*, on the other hand, excludes AP (a).

PGmc. *laika-* (or *laiki-*) 'dance, game' (m. *a*-stem (or *i*-stem))

Goth. *laiks** (Apl. *laikins*) m. 'frolic, dance'; **OHG** *leih* 'melody, tune'; **MHG** *leich* m./n. 'game, melody, song' ; **G** *Leich* m. 'lai, lay';[86] **OE** *lāc* n. (also m./f.) 'struggle; offering, gift'; **ON** *leikr* m. 'game, satire'

---

[83] Miklosich suggests a kind of dance, but this interpretation seems to have been influenced by the meaning of Gothic *laiks**; Sreznevskij suggests a game of dice. A dice game seems more probable on the basis of the attested passages (cf. MSDJ 2: 71).

[84] The semantic shift went from '(religious) choir' to 'gathering of people in a religious painting'.

[85] S/Cr. *líka* is a hapax attested in a Montenegrin folk song.

[86] The *lai* (G. *leich*) was a song form that was in use in Northern Europe (mainly France and Germany) from the 12th to the late 14th century.

Cognates: Skt. *réjati* 'to cause to hop, tremble', Kurdish *līzim* 'to play', Lith. *láigyti* 'to frolic, frisk about', Gr. *ἐλελίζω* 'to cause to shake' < PIE *$h_1$leiǵ-* 'to hop, jump' (Beekes 2009: 406, Pokorny 1959: 668).

Etymology: PGmc. **laika-* is a derivative of the strong verb PGmc. **laika-* 'to play' < PIE **leig-* 'to hop, jump'.

The word is not very well attested in Slavic. RCS *lěkъ* has a jat', but the other forms in Slavic point to an original *-i-*. The word has been explained as a borrowing from Gothic, but this is formally difficult because Goth. *ai* is expected to yield PSl. **ě* (as in PSl. **xlěbъ* < Goth. *hlaifs*), which fits in well with the Russian Church Slavic form, but not with the cognates in the other Slavic languages.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. **pergynja* 'impenetrable covert (?)' (f. *ja*-stem)

OCS *prěgynji, prěgynja* 'impenetrable covert (?)'; **OR** *peregynja, pereginja* 'thicket, covert'; **Ukr.** *Perehynško* (place-name) ; **P** *Przeginia* (place-name, Małopolska province).

Accentuation: AP unknown

PGmc. **fergunjō* 'mountain range'

Goth. *fairguni* 'mountain, mountain range' (n. *ja*-stem); **OHG** *Fergunna, Firgunnea* 'Erzgebirge, Fichtelgebirge', *Virgundia/Virgunnia waldus* 'range of hills in southern Bavaria'; **MHG** *Virgunt* f. 'Schwarzwald'; **OE** *firgen, fyrgen* n. 'mountain, mountain-woodland'

Etymology: PGmc. **fergunjō* is supposed to be a loanword from PCelt. **perkuniā* (< PIE **perkʷ-unjo-*) before the loss of initial **p-* in Celtic (Lehmann 1986: 104-105). Celtic *erkuniā* is attested, for example, by Caesar in *Hercynia silva*, denoting the dense forests that ranged from the Black Forest to the Ardennes (Matasović 2009: 178). In Old High German, derivations of PGmc. **fergunjō* only denote existing ranges of mountains, whereas Goth. *fairguni* is a general name for a mountain or mountain range. The same general meaning is attested in Old English.

Although PSl. **pergynja* has often been regarded as a loanword from Germanic (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 185), Vasmer considers the word to be native and reconstructs PSl. **per-gybni* 'hilly area', which he derives from PSl. **gъnǫti* 'to bend, bow' (REW 2: 338). This etymology is less convincing (thus also Stender-Petersen 1927: 268ff.).

The Proto-Slavic reflex **y* in the second stem syllable might indicate that the Germanic donor form had a **ū*, even though the attested Germanic forms seem

to have a *u in this position. The word might alternatively have been adapted to the productive Proto-Slavic suffix *-ynja. Vaillant supposes that PSl. *pergynja is a regular reflex of a Gothic donor form, and that the Proto-Slavs borrowed the suffix *-ynja from Germanic (cf. also RCS opynja 'ape', §6.2) (1974: 385-388). The word might alternatively have been borrowed from West Germanic because West Germanic forms are feminine, whereas the word is neuter in Gothic.
Origin: Cannot be specified, possibly West Germanic.

PSl. *pila 'saw, file' (f. ā-stem)

OCS pila 'saw'; **R** pilá 'saw', pílka (dim.) 'file'; **Ukr.** pylá 'saw'; **P** piła 'saw, file'; **Cz.** pila 'saw; (arch.) 'file'; **Slk.** píla 'saw'; **US** piła 'saw; sawmill', pila 'file'; **LS** piła 'saw', pilka 'file'; **S/Cr.** píla, Asg. pîlu 'saw, file'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) pīlȁ, Asg. pîlu; **Slov.** píla 'saw, file'; **Bg.** pilá 'saw, file'

Accentuation: Unclear; Serbian/Croatian (including Čakavian) points to AP (c). In Russian, the singular has end stress whereas the entire plural has initial stress. This type continues AP (b) (Vermeer 2001b: 23). Old Russian points to AP (b) or (c) (Zaliznjak 1985: 135).

PGmc. *finh(a)lō or *finhilō '(iron) file' (f. ō-stem)

OHG fīhala, fīhila; **MHG** vīle; **G** Feile; **OE** fēol; **OS** fīla; **MLG** vīle; **Du.** vijl; **ON** þél; **OSw.** fǽl;[87]

Cognates: Gr. πικρός 'sharp, pointed', Skt. piṃśati 'hews out, carves', PSl. *pisati 'to write' < PIE *peiḱ- 'to cut' (Pokorny 1959: 794-795, EWN: s.v. vijl).

Etymology: The attested Germanic forms derive from PGmc. *finh(a)lō (Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 241) or PGmc. *finhilō '(iron) file'. Philippa et al. reconstruct PGmc. *finhilō, with the suffix *-ilō- because this suffix denotes instruments (EWN: s.v. vijl, cf. Kluge 1926: 48). The root *finh- might derive from a nasalised zero grade of PIE *peiḱ- 'to cut' (EWN: s.v. vijl, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Feile).

PSl. *pila is not likely to have been borrowed from Old High German because the word is attested only as fīhala in Old High German in the eighth and ninth centuries (cf. Seebold 2001: 126, 2008: 295). OS fīla fits phonologically

---

[87] If the Old Norse form is to be connected with the other Germanic forms, we have to assume a change from *f to þ. A similar alternation is found in ON þél 'buttermilk' next to N file, Sw. (dial.) fil 'cream'. De Vries regards this etymology of the word as one out of three possible explanations of the origin of ON þél (1977: 608).

very well as donor of the Proto-Slavic form. The initial fricative was replaced by *p* in Slavic because Proto-Slavic did not have the phoneme /f/ (cf. §7.2.1.7).

Matasović questions this etymology and suggests that *pila* might be an inherited word in Slavic, related to Lith. *peilis* 'knife' (2000: 132). Given the fact that we are dealing with a technical term, with exactly corresponding meanings in Slavic and Germanic, the word seems more likely to be a borrowing.

Schuster-Šewc explains the alveolar *l* in US *pila* 'file', next to *piła* 'saw; sawmill' as secondary to the younger German loanword *fila* 'file' or the derivation *pilnik* 'file' (HEW 14: 1063).

Origin: West Germanic (Low German). The attested Low German form exactly corresponds to PSl. *pila*.

PSl. *retędźь* 'chain(s)' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)
RCS *retezъ*; **R** *rétjaz*'; **Ukr.** *rétjaz* 'chain, string'; **P** *wrzeciądz, rzeciądz* (arch.), *rzejcuz* (dial.), *rzecoz* (dial.), *recuz* (dial.) '(door) chain, bolt'; **Kash.** *řecoz*; **Cz.** *řetěz*; **Slk.** *reťaz*; **US** *rjećaz*; **LS** *rjeśaz*
Accentuation: Unclear; Russian has fixed stem stress, which in this case does not point to AP (a) because the syllabic nucleus is light.

NWGmc. *rakend-, *rekend-* '(neck) chain(s), fetter'
OHG *rahhinza* f.; **OE** *racente* f. (*n*-stem); **ON** *rekendi* n.; *rekendr* f. pl. 'chains'

Etymology: The origin of the Germanic forms is not entirely clear. De Vries and Franck/Van Wijk connect these forms to the nautical term ON *rakki* m., OE *racca* m., Du. *rak* n. 'truss', which might derive from PGmc. *rek-* 'to stretch, straighten' < PIE *$h_3$reǵ-* 'to stretch' (De Vries 1977: 432, 440, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 532).

It is unclear which Germanic dialect was the donor of PSl. *retędźь*. A number of attempts have been made to etymologise the word, but none very convincing (cf. Kiparsky 1934 262-264 for an overview). Kiparsky holds Knutsson's etymology the most plausible; Knutsson derives PSl. *retędźь* from Germanic **reking*, which would derive from the root PGmc. *rek-* 'to stretch, straighten' (Knutsson 1926: 134, cited by Kiparsky 1934: 262-264). This etymology presupposes the change of Germanic *k* to PSl. *t'*. As with PSl. *vitędźь*, this reflex has been explained through dissimilation from ***recędźь* > *retędźь*, with *c* resulting from the (second) palatalization of the velar *k* (REW 2: 516, cf. §5.2, s.v. PSl. *vitędźь*). PSl. *t* for Gmc. *k* is also found in PSl. *stъlędźь, *štъlędźь* (s.v. PSl. *skъlędźь, *stъlędźь, *štъlędźь* below). The fact that no reflex of **reking* 'chains' is attested in Germanic is more problematic (but compare a similar case in PSl. *koldędźь* 'well, spring' which is supposed to stem from Germanic, although no formally corresponding form in Germanic exists).

The word might have been borrowed from West Germanic because the suffix *-inga-* was especially productive in Northwest Germanic.

Origin: Probably West Germanic; the Slavic form reflects the West Germanic productive suffix *-inga-*.

PSl. **skъlędźь, *stъlędźь, *štъlędźь* 'coin' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)

OCS *skъlędźь*; **SCS** *sklezъ*; **RCS** *skľazъ, stъgľazъ, stъľazъ*; **OR** *ščъlěgъ, štľagъ, štľazъ, stľazъ*; **OCr.** (Brač, Vrbnik, Senj) *clez*

Accentuation: AP unknown. It is impossible to reconstruct the accent paradigm because the word is only attested in Church Slavic, Old Russian and Old Croatian.

Germanic **skillinga-* '(golden) coin' (m. *a*-stem)[88]

Goth. *skilliggs**; **OHG** *scilling*; **MHG** *schillinc*; **G** *Schilling*; **OE** *scilling*; **E** *shilling*; **OS** *skilling* 'shilling; dozen'; **Du.** *schelling*; **ON** *skillingr*

Etymology: Germanic *skillinga was the name for the Byzantine *solidus*, a gold coin that was introduced by emperor Constantine I in the beginning of the fourth century to replace the earlier *aureus*. The Gothic form is attested in the Naples Deed of 551. The coin was in use in the Germanic empires of the Middle Ages: the Vandali in Africa, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Langobards, the Burgundi and the Franks each minted their own gold *solidi* (called *skilling*), but these Germanic currencies were subordinate to the Byzantine *solidus*. The coin remained in use until the 13th or 14th century (Von Schrötter 1930: 599ff.). The etymology of Germanic **skillinga-* is disputed and many different etymologies have been proposed: **skillinga-* has, for example, been supposed to go back to *skild-lings 'small shield' or be a derivative from PIE **(s)kel-* 'to cut' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Schilling*, Lehmann 1986: 312).[89]

The attested Slavic forms seem to go back to three Proto-Slavic forms: **skъlędźь, *stъlędźь, *štъlędźь*. For this reason, it has been supposed that the word was borrowed three times (Stender-Petersen 1927: 380ff., Kiparsky 1934: 265). Meillet supposes that PSl. *štъlędźь was borrowed before the first palatalization (more strictly speaking, before the first palatalization ceased to operate): PSl. **štъ-* < **ščъ-* < **skъ-*, whereas PSl. *skъlędźь is a late borrowing after the palatalizations (1902: 110). Kiparsky, on the other hand, regards PSl.

---

[88] Even though the word exists in all branches of Germanic, it obviously cannot go back to Proto-Germanic because the coin was only introduced in the fourth century.

[89] In a similar way, Gr. κέρμα 'coin' derives from κείρω 'to shear, cut'.

*štьlędźь as the youngest form because OR ščьlěgъ, štľagъ does not show the reflex of the progressive palatalization (1934: 265), but these forms might alternatively stem from North Russian dialects (e.g., Novgorod), which did not participate in the progressive palatalization of velar consonants. PSl. *skьlędźь is not likely to be a late borrowing dating from after the palatalizations because the suffix does show palatalization. The *k* in this form might alternatively have been restored under the influence of lasting contact with the donor language. Whether the variation in forms can be attributed to several borrowings or to a late borrowing into a form of Proto-Slavic that had begun to develop into different dialects cannot be established with certainty.

Origin: Cannot be specified.

PSl. *userędźь* 'earring' (m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem)

CS *useręzъ, useręgъ, usiręzъ, usirezъ, usorezъ, userizъ, userugъ, useręga, vьseręzъ, vseręzъ*; **RCS** *serjazъ, serazъ*; **OR** *userjazъ* (11th century, 12th century), [*serʹga* (14th century) < Turkic? (REW 2: 617)]; **R** [*serʹgá, ísergá* (dial.) < Turkic? (REW 2: 617)]; **Ukr.** [*sérha* < Turkic? (REW 2: 617)]; **OCr.** *userez* (arch., attested Ipl. *userezmi*)

Accentuation: AP unknown

PGmc. *auzō* 'ear' and *hringa* 'ring'

MHG *ōrrinc, ōrinc*; **G** *Ohrring*; **OE** *ēarhring*; **Du.** *oorring*;[90]

Etymology: PSl. *userędźь* 'earring' is a borrowing from a Germanic compound of PGmc. *auzō-* 'ear' and *hringa-* 'ring' (Kiparsky 1934: 223). Because Proto-Slavic has a voiceless sibilant -*s*- in the root, the word might be a borrowing from Gothic because this is the only Germanic languages in which PGmc. *auzō* 'ear' is reflected with a voiceless fricative. The other Germanic languages are reconstructed with *z* resulting from Verner's law, which developed into *r* in the attested North and West Germanic languages. PGmc. *hringa* 'ring' is not attested in Biblical Gothic. Gothic has *figgragulþ* (lit. 'finger gold') for '(finger) ring'. The existence of the word in East Germanic can

---

[90] Goth. *ausō*; OHG *ōra*; G *Ohr*; OE *ēare*; OFri. *āre*; OS *ôra*; Du. *oor*; ON *eyra* < PGmc. *auzō* 'ear', which goes back to PIE *h₂eus-* and is related to, e.g., Lat. *auris,* Lith. *ausìs,* PSl. *uxo* 'ear'; Crimean Gothic *rinck, ringo* (Pokorny 1959: 785, Lehmann 1986: 285); OHG (*h*)*ring*; G *Ring*; OE *hring, hrincg*; OFri. *hring*; OS *hring*; ON *hringr* < PGmc. *hringa* 'ring'. PGmc. *hringa* (from earlier *hrenga-*) is related to PSl. *krǫgъ* 'circle', but has no other Indo-European cognates (EWN: s.v. *ring*, Derksen 2008: 251, 507).

nevertheless be ascertained on the basis of the existence of the word in Crimean Gothic, where it is attested as *rinck, ringo*.

It is uncertain whether (O)R *ser'ga* and Ukr. *serha* belong to the same group. They might alternatively have been borrowed from a Turkic language, e.g., Proto-Chuvash **śürüγ* 'ring' (REW 2: 617).

Origin: Gothic; PSl. **userędźъ* indicates that the donor language had a voiceless sibilant in the first member of the compound, which excludes the attested West Germanic languages.

PSl. **užasъ* (m. *o*-stem) 'horror, amazement'

OCS *užasъ*; **OR** *užasъ*; **R** *úžas*; **Cz.** *úžas* 'amazement, surprise'; **Slk.** *úžas* 'amazement, surprise'; **S/Cr.** [*ȕžās* < R];[91] **Bg.** *úžas*

PSl. **(u-)žasnǫti* 'to terrify, frighten'

OCS *užasnǫti, užasati* 'to be astonished'; **CS** *žasiti* 'to frighten'; **R** *užasnút'*, *užasát'* 'to terrify, frighten'; **P** *przeżasnąć się* (obs.) 'to be astonished'; **Cz.** *užasnout* 'to be astonished', *žasnout* to frighten'; **Slk.** *užasnút'* 'to be astonished', *žasnút'* to frighten'; **S/Cr.** [*užàsnuti* 'to terrify, frighten' < R]

Accentuation: unknown

Goth. *usgaisjan* 'to terrify, frighten'

Etymology: Goth. *usgaisjan* (also Goth. *usgeisnan* 'astonished') has been connected to, e.g., ON *geiskafullr* (adj.) 'full of fear', OHG *geis(t)* 'ghost, spirit' from PGmc. **gais-* 'supernatural being' < PIE **ǵʰeis-/*ǵʰois-* 'to be frightened, shocked' (Lehmann 1986: 382, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Geist*, EWN: s.v. *geest*).

The etymology of PSl. **užasъ* and **(u-)žasnǫti* has not been agreed upon. The forms have tentatively been connected to PSl. **gasiti* 'to extinguish', but this connection is semantically difficult (Derksen 2008: 554, REW 3: 175). A number of etymological dictionaries mention Goth. *usgaisjan*, which corresponds very well to the Slavic forms from a semantic viewpoint, but the dictionaries add that the vocalism of the Slavic and Gothic forms does not match (Derksen 2008: 554, REW 3: 175, Lehmann 1986: 382). This objection is, in fact, incorrect and PSl. **užasъ* and **(u-)žasnǫti* can well be explained as loanwords from Germanic: the Gothic writing <ai> does probably not denote a diphthong, but rather a long or short monophthong [æ] (cf. §1.2.1.2). PSl. **xlěbъ* 'loaf, bread', which was

---

[91] S/Cr. *ȕžās* is a later loanword from another Slavic language, probably Russian, and is attested from the 19th century onwards (cf. RJA 20: 462).

borrowed from Goth. *hlaifs* 'loaf, bread', shows that Goth. <ai> was borrowed into early Proto-Slavic as *$\bar{e}$ > late Proto-Slavic *$\check{e}$. Goth. -*gais*- would thus in early Proto-Slavic be reflected as *-*g$\bar{e}$s*-, regularly yielding PSl. *-*žas*- after the first palatalization. This would make the etymology of PSl. *$u\check{z}as\check{b}$ and *(*u-*)*žasnǫti* as a loanword from Goth. *usgaisjan* very attractive because it fits well both formally and semantically (Pronk 2012 forthc.). It can be supposed that the Slavs identified the Gothic prefix *-*us*- 'out' with the Proto-Slavic prefix *-*u*-, which explains the absence of *s* in the initial syllable, as well as the occurrence of Slavic forms prefix-less forms like CS *žasiti* 'to frighten', and, e.g., P *przeżasnąć* in which the Proto-Slavic prefix *-*u*- was replaced by another prefix (Pronk 2012 forthc.).

Origin: Gothic; Gothic is the only Germanic language in which the verb is attested.

PSl. *-*vaga* 'weight; scales' (f. $\bar{a}$-stem)
OR *vaga* 'weight'; **R** *vága* (dial.); **Ukr.** *vahá*; **P** *waga*; **Cz.** *váha*; **Slk.** *váha*; **US** *waha*; **LS** *waga*; **S/Cr.** *vâga* 'scales'; **Slov.** *vâga*

Accentuation: Unclear; the original situation must have been blurred by secondary developments. Russian has fixed initial stress. The long falling accent of Serbian/Croatian *vâga*, in contrast, precludes AP (a) and (b). Czech shows length, which precludes AP (c). The accentuation of Slov. *vâga* either points to AP (c) or a recent borrowing from Germanic. The long vowel of Czech and Slovak may also be secondary under the influence of Germanic. The best way to establish the accentuation pattern is thus the accentuation of the adjective. Here, the long vowel in Cz. *vážný*, Slk. *vážny* points to AP (b).

NWGmc. *-*w$\bar{e}$g$\bar{o}$ 'scales' (f. $\bar{o}$-stem)
OHG *w$\bar{a}$ga*; **MHG** *w$\bar{a}$ge*; **G** *Waage*; **OE** *w$\bar{æ}$g(e)* 'weight'; **OFri.** *w$\bar{a}$ch*; **OS** *w$\bar{a}$ga*; **Du.** *waag* 'scales, weigh house'; **ON** *vág*

Etymology: Germanic *-*w$\bar{e}$g$\bar{o}$ is derived from the verb *-*weg-a*- 'to move, weigh' < PIE *-*ueǵʰ*-, *-*uoǵʰ*- 'to transport' (EWN: s.v. *wegen*, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Waage*, *wägen*).

The origin of the Slavic word must be sought in a dialect in which PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ developed into *$\bar{a}$ (cf. §7.2.1.1). The word stems, therefore, in all probability from High or Low German, with the oldest attested forms of which PSl. *-*vaga* literally corresponds. The word has been regarded as a late borrowing into Slavic (Kiparsky 1934: 267-268).

From PSl. *-*vaga* also derives the adjective R *vážnyj*, P *ważny*, Cz. *vážný*, Slk. *vážny*, S/Cr. *vážan*, Slov. *vážən* 'weighty, important', Bg. *váža* 'be worth, important'. The Russian form has been explained as a borrowing from Polish

(REW 1: 162), the Serbian/Croatian form as a borrowing from Russian or Czech (ERHSJ 3: 559). The Slovene etymologists, on the other hand, do not regard Slov. *vážən* as a borrowing, but rather as a native derivative from Slov. *vâga* (ESSlov. 4: 274, Snoj 2003: 808).

Origin: West Germanic; PSl. *vaga* reflects the West Germanic development of PGmc. *ē₁* into *ā*.

PSl. *vъrtogordъ* 'garden' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *vrъtogradъ*, *vrьtogradъ*; **OR** *vьrtogradъ*, *vrьtogradъ*, *vertogradъ*; **R** [*vertográd* < CS]; **Slov.** *vrtọ́grad* (dial.) 'fenced garden'

Accentuation: Unclear, but might be AP (b); Kortlandt assumes an acute root and thus AP (a) (1975: 70). The accent of Slov. *vrtọ́grad*, however, points to AP (b), where *ọ́* received the stress as a result of Dybo's law. After Dybo's law, the stress became fixed on this syllable throughout the paradigm. Synchronically speaking, the word can, therefore, be categorised as AP (a), but historically it belongs to AP (b) (cf. §2.3). The accentuation of Slov. *vrtọ́grad* is the only indication that the word might belong to AP (b), but it cannot be excluded that this accentuation is secondary after Slov. *vinọ́grad* 'vineyard'.

PGmc. *wurti-* f. 'herb, root' and *gardōn* m. 'garden, yard'[92]

Goth. *aurtigards* 'garden'; **MHG** *wurzegarte*, *wurzgarte* 'herb garden'; **OE** *ortgeard* 'orchard (earlier also 'vegetable garden'), garden', *wyrtgeard* 'kitchen garden'; **MLG** *wortegarde*; **Sw.** *örtagård*

Etymology: Lehmann explains the first element of Goth. *aurtigards* as a borrowing from VLat. *orto* 'garden', after which the native element *gards* 'house, family' was added. He supposes that the English and Swedish forms were borrowed independently from Gothic (from a Vulgar Latin donor?) (1986: 51, cf. also Feist 1939: 68). This cannot be correct, for Sw. *ört* regularly derives from PGmc. *wurti-* (ON *urt*) (De Vries 1977: 636), which means that Sw. *örtagård* must be etymologically connected to High German *wurzegarte*, *wurzgarte* and Low German *wortegarde* 'herb garden'. These forms go back to a compound of

---

[92] Goth. *waurts*; OHG *wurz*; G *Wurz*; OE *wyrt*; E *wort*; OS *wurt*; ON *urt* < PGmc. *wurti-* from PIE *urh₂d-i*, related to, e.g., Lat. *rādīx* 'root', W *gwraidd* 'roots' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Wurz*, De Vaan 2008: 512). Goth. *gards*; OHG *gart*; G *Garten*; OE *geard*; OS *gard*; Du. *gaard*; ON *garðr* < PGmc. *garda-* 'yard, enclosure' from PIE *gʰor-dʰ-* 'enclosure', related to, e.g., Lat. *hortus* 'garden', Skt. *gr̥há-* 'house', PSl. *gordъ*, Gr. χόρτος 'barn' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Garten*, EWN: s.v. *gaard*).

PGmc. *wurti- 'herb, root' and *gardōn 'garden, yard'. Lehmann does not mention the possibility of a connection between this Northwest Germanic compound and Goth. *aurtigards* (cf. 1986: 51). The formal correspondence between Goth. *aurtigards* 'garden', OE *ortgeard* (E *orchard*) and the other Northwest Germanic forms is admittedly somewhat problematic: PGmc. *wurti- is regularly reflected as Goth. *waurts* and OE *wyrt*. Both in the Gothic and in the Old English form, the initial *w-* has been retained and OE *wyrt* has a front vowel resulting from the *i*-umlaut. One might nevertheless wonder whether the Gothic and English forms are not in some way derived from the compound of PGmc. *wurti- and *gardōn as well. This etymology might also explain the medial *-i-* in the Gothic compound *aurtigards*, which Lehmann calls "noteworthy" (1986: 51).[93] In addition, it fits better semantically to assume that the compound was formed when the second element *-gards* retained the original Proto-Germanic meaning 'yard, enclosure', rather than being a compound of VLat. *orto and Goth. *gards* 'house, family'. The element *-gards* might alternatively have been added in analogy to the compound PGmc. *wīn(a)gard- 'vineyard'.

PSl. *vьrtogradъ seems to have been borrowed from the Germanic compound of PGmc. *wurti- and *gardōn and has often been regarded to be of Gothic origin (e.g., Stender-Petersen 1927: 370). From a phonological viewpoint, Gothic origin is unnecessary, or perhaps even more difficult than West Germanic origin: it is easier to derive PSl. *vьrtogordъ from a West Germanic donor form with initial *w-* than from initial Gothic /ɔr-/ (but cf. *velьblǫdъ 'camel', which has PSl. **vъl- from Goth. *ul-*) and the medial *-o- in the Proto-Slavic compound is hard to explain from Goth. *aurtigards*. It is thus easier to derive PSl. *vьrtogradъ from a pre-sound shift form of Old High German or from Low German.

Kiparsky rejects the idea that PSl. *vьrtogradъ 'garden' was borrowed from Germanic, but rather connects the word to *vьrtъ 'garden' (1934: 57-58). He considers PSl. *vьrtъ to be an inherited formation after PSl. *-verti (as in otъverti 'to open', zaverti 'to close'), the semantic connection being a 'garden' as an 'enclosed yard'. PSl. *vьrtъ is nevertheless more likely to stem from Latin (M. Matasović 2011: 108-109).
Origin: West Germanic fits better phonologically.

---

[93] Lehmann assumes analogy to PIE *ti*-stems or from the genitive *orti from VLat. *orto (1986: 51).

PSl. *xǫdogъ 'skill (?)' (m. o-stem)
OCS xǫdožьstvo 'wisdom; cunning craft', xǫdožьstvьje 'art, skill'; **CS** xudogъ 'experienced, wise, cunning'; **R** xudóga 'art'; **P** chędogi (arch.) 'elegant, decorated, clean', chędożycz 'to clean'

Accentuation: AP unknown; Russian has fixed stress on the medial o, which might result from Dybo's law after an earlier stage with fixed initial stress. This would then point to AP (b). This is, however, not consistent with the short stem vowel in P chędogi and chędożycz, which precludes AP (b).

PGmc. *handu/a/ĭga
Goth. handugs 'wise'; **OHG** hantego (adv.) 'sharply, vehemently', handeg 'sharp(ness), severe';

To be separated from derivatives of PGmc. *handu- 'hand' (f. u-stem)
MHG handec, hendec 'skilful'; **OE** (list)hendig 'having skilful hands'; **MLG** handich 'skilful'; **Du.** handig 'skilful'; **Dan.** hændig 'skilful'

Etymology: Goth. handugs, OHG hantego, handeg should probably be separated from MHG handec, hendec, MLG handich and the other Northwest Germanic cognates meaning 'skilful' which derive from PGmc. *handu- 'hand'. Lehmann, for example, thinks that the connection of the Gothic and Old High German forms to PGmc. *handu- is "less credibl[e]" than a derivation from PIE *ḱent- (cf. Gr. κεντέω 'to prick') (1986: 176, cf. EWA 4: 819). Lloyd et al. also reject the connection between Goth. handugs, OHG hantego, handeg and the forms attested in the other Northwest Germanic languages. It is supposed that the Gothic and Old High German forms are derived from PGmc. *handu/a/ĭga from PGmc. *hanþa- 'sharp' with a voiced obstruent resulting from Verner's law from PIE *ḱent- 'to pierce, prick' (EWA 4: 817-819). A semantic parallel for this derivation is E sharp 'clever' (1986: 176). Franck/Van Wijk, however, allows for the possibility that Goth. handugs is derived from PGmc. *handu- as well (1912: 229-230).

The origin of PSl. *xǫdogъ is not entirely clear, despite the fact that is has often been connected to Goth. handugs 'wise'. The attested Slavic forms encompass the meaning 'wise, sharp, clever' which is reflected in the Gothic and Old High German forms, on the one hand, but also the meaning 'skilful, elegant' that is attested in the other Northwest Germanic forms. The word is formally most easily derived from a pre-sound shift form of OHG hantego, but the meaning of this adverb does not correspond very well to that of the attested Slavic forms.

Brückner regards PSl. *xǫdogъ as a native word from a root *skond- and relates it to Lith. skanùs 'tasty' (1927: 178-179); this etymology is less credible and rejected by Kiparsky (1934: 200) and Vasmer (REW 3: 276).

Origin: Possibly West Germanic; PSl. *xǫdogъ* can formally well be derived from a reflex of PGmc. *handu/a/ĭga*. The vocalism of the second syllable matches that of Old High German.

PSl. *xula* 'abuse, revile'
OCS *xula* 'abuse'; **OR** *xula*; **R** *xulá*; **Ukr.** *hulá*; **S/Cr.** *hŭla* 'blasphemy'; **Slov.** *húla* 'abuse, ridicule'

PSl. *xuliti* 'to abuse, revile'
OCS *xuliti* 'to abuse, insult'; **R** *xulítʹ*; **Ukr.** *hulýty*; **S/Cr.** *hŭliti,* 1sg. *hŭlīm* 'to blaspheme';[94] **Slov.** *húlati, húliti* 'to abuse, ridicule'; **Bg.** *húlja*
Accentuation: AP unknown. OR *xula* belongs to AP (a), but has forms that point to AP (b) (Zaliznjak 1985: 132). Dybo considers PSl. *xula* to be a word of AP (b) (1981: 78, 187).

PGmc. *hōlōn, *hōlian*
Goth. *holon* 'to slander'; **OHG** *huolan, huolian* 'to deceive'; **OE** *hōlian, helan* 'to slander'; **ON** *hœla* 'to praise, boast'
Cognates: Lat. *calvor* 'to deceive', *calumnia* 'deceit, slander', Gr. *κηλέω* 'to bewitch, cast a spell' < PIE *keh₂l-* 'to deceive, bewitch' (Pokorny 1959: 551, Lehmann 1986: 189, De Vries 1977: 247, 278, De Vaan 2008: 85)

Etymology: The Germanic forms derive from PIE *keh₂l-* 'to deceive, bewitch' (Lehmann 1986: 189, De Vries 1977: 247, 278).

Meillet was the first to regard PSl. *xula* and *xuliti* as borrowings from Germanic. He derives the forms from Old High German (1905: 252). The etymology of PSl. *xula, *xuliti* has been complicated by the supposed cognates in Czech and Slovak: OCz. *chúlost* 'shame', Slk. *chúliť sa* 'to curl up', Slk. *chúlostivý* 'shy, sensible'. These forms give the impression to derive from the same root, but are different in meaning. For this reason, Vasmer rejects the etymology of PSl. *xula, *xuliti* as a Germanic loanword and connects the etyma to PSl. *xylъ, *xyliti* 'to bend' < PIE *(s)keuh₂* 'to bend' (REW 3: 277-278, cf. Snoj 2003: 214, ESSlov. 1: 193).[95]

The attested Slavic forms deriving from PSl. *xula* and *xuliti* correspond semantically much better to the Germanic forms than to the reflexes of PSl.

---

[94] Anić lists the word with different accentuation: Cr. *húliti,* 1sg. *húlīm* (2002: s.v. *húliti*).
[95] Attested forms are, e.g., R *xilyj* 'sickly, under grown', Slov. *hił* 'crooked, bent', *híliti* 'to bend', Cz. *chýliti*, P *chylić* 'to bend'.

*xylъ, *xyliti*. For this reason, Seldeslachts, probably correctly, separates the Czech and Slovak forms from the East and South Slavic forms and connects the former to PSl. *xylъ, *xyliti*, whereas he considers the latter to be loanwords from Germanic. Because the Slavic forms are most easily derived from a Germanic *jan*-verb, he, just as Meillet, derives PSl. *xula* and *xuliti* from an early stage of West Germanic, probably High German (1991: 256-258).
Origin: Possibly West Germanic because the Slavic forms would be most easily derived from a Germanic *jan*-verb.

6 WORDS THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CORPUS

Chapter 5 gave an overview of the words that I consider to be certain Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. In the following chapter, I will discuss the words that I do not think that can be positively identified as borrowings from Germanic, but which have either repeatedly or in recent literature, mainly Holzer (1990) and Matasović (2000, 2008), been regarded as such. I distinguish between the words that are loanwords of ultimate Latin origin, which entered Proto-Slavic either directly or through a Germanic intermediary (§6.1), the words whose origin remains indeterminable and which might be inherited, borrowed from Germanic or borrowed from another language (§6.2) and the words that, in my opinion, cannot be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic at all (§6.3).

6.1 LOANWORDS OF LATIN OR GERMANIC ORIGIN

PSl. *bъči 'vat, vessel' (f. ū-stem); *bъčьka 'idem' (f. ā-stem)
RCS bъčьvъ; bъčьka; **OR** bъčьka, bočьka; **R** bóčka; **Ukr.** bóčka; **OP** beczka, baczka; **OCz.** bečka; bečva; **Cz.** bečka 'tub, barrel'; **Slk.** bočka, bečka '(small) barrel'; **S/Cr.** bȁčva; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) bȁčva, Gsg. bȁčvē; **Slov.** bəčvà, bəčkà, bâčva 'cask', bâčəv, bâčva 'tub, barrel'; **Bg.** bǎčva, bǎčeva, [bočka < R]
Accentuation: AP (b); the fixed initial stress in Russian and the short falling tone of Serbian/Croatian points to fixed initial stress in the final stage of Proto-Slavic. This stress pattern results from retraction of the stress from the earlier stressed medial jer (which had received the stress with Dybo's law) when the jer lost its stressability.

G (dial. Bav.) *butschen, bütschen* 'small lockable container'

Etymology: PSl. *bъči has often been regarded as a loanword from Germanic. Miklošič, for example, derives the word from OHG *botahha*, but the correspondence between these forms is obviously difficult. Kiparsky also derives the word from Old High German and reconstructs the donor forms *butša, *butše on the basis of modern Bavarian dialectal forms *butschen, bütschen* 'small lockable container'. The Bavarian forms are borrowings from Vulgar Lat. *buttia* 'bottle, flask' (Kiparsky 1934: 231, cf. Schmeller 1872-1877: 312).

The word has more recently been explained as a loanword directly from VLat. *buttia* 'bottle'. PSl. *č is explained as a regular reflex from Romance *tj and

this reflex is also found in, e.g., S/Cr. *ràčūn* 'account, bill' from Lat. *rātiōnem* 'account, reason' (ESSlov. 1: 15).

The origin of the word cannot be established with certainty. For Germanic origin of PSl. *bъči* speaks that the meaning of the Bavarian word, 'small lockable container', is closer to that of PSl. *bъči* than the meaning of VLat. *buttia* 'bottle'. Romance origin of the word is, on the other hand, attractive because VLat. *buttia* and the substitution of Romance *tj* for PSl. *č* are actually attested, whereas the Germanic etymology of the word departs from a reconstructed dialectal donor form.

PSl. *dъska* 'plank, plate' (f. *ā*-stem)
OCS *dъska, dьska*; **OR** *dъska*; **R** *doská*, Asg. *dósku*; *cka* (dial.); **Ukr.** *došká*; **OP** *cka*, **P** *deska*; **OCz.** *dska*, **Cz.** *deska*; **Slk.** *doska*; **US** *deska*; **LS** *cka* (arch.) 'knead board'; **S/Cr.** *dàska*; *ska* (arch.), *ckä* (arch.); **Slov.** *dəskà, dáska*; **Bg.** *dăská*
Accentuation: AP (c) (Zaliznjak 1985: 138).

NWGmc. *diska-* 'table, dish' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *tisc* m. 'dish, table'; **G** *Tisch* 'table'; **OE** *disc* 'plate, dish'; **OS** *disk* 'table, dish; flat cake'; **MDu.** *disc*; **Du.** *dis* 'table'; **ON** *diskr* 'plate, dish'

Etymology: NWGmc. *diska-* was borrowed from Lat. *discus* 'disc, dish', which itself stems from Gr. δίσκος 'disc, discus'. Philippa et al. regard the Germanic word as a "very early" loanword from Latin, but why the borrowing has to be dated very early is not explained (EWN: s.v. *dis*). The semantics of NWGmc. *diska-* 'table, dish' are the same as for PSl. *bljudo* and range from 'plate' and 'dish' to 'table'. This divergence has been explained from the fact that people used to have their food each on a separate dish or plate on its own foot that at the same time served as a table (EWN: s.v. *dis*, Franck/Van Wijk 1912: 119).[96]

PSl. *dъska* might have been borrowed either directly from Latin or from Germanic. Brückner (1927: 88) and Stender-Petersen (1927: 406) consider the word to be a borrowing from Gothic. Vasmer seems to prefer West Germanic origin for the word (REW 1: 365). Bezlaj does not decide between Germanic or Romance origin of PSl. *dъska* (ESSlov. 1: 98). Others consider the word to be a direct borrowing from Latin (e.g., Kiparsky 1934: 112ff., M. Matasović 2011: 107-108), the reason for this being that the word is attested in Vulgar Latin in

---

[96] A similar example is Du. *tafel* 'table' that was borrowed (through VLat. *tavla, tavola*) from Lat. *tabula* 'board, plank'.

feminine forms, whereas if the word was borrowed from Germanic the gender would have changed from masculine to feminine. Skok supposes Latin origin because the Proto-Slavic meaning 'plank, plate' corresponds better to that of Latin *discus* 'disc, dish', than that of Germanic *diska-* 'table, dish' (ERHSJ 1: 408, s.v. *diskos*).

The form has been reconstructed as PSl. *dъska*, which is unexpected in view of the vocalism of the supposed donor forms. PSl. *dъska* with *ъ in the initial syllable must nevertheless be the original form and this is confirmed by the form *dъsky* in the Russian Church Slavic Ostromir Gospel. This gospel, dating from 1056, is "admirably correct in the etymological use of jers" (Lunt 1982: 225). The etymological dictionaries that mention the problem of the *ъ*-vowel in the initial syllable of PSl. *dъska* mainly consider it unexplainable (ÈSSJa 5: 184, HEW 3: 130). Vasmer assumes that the Proto-Slavic vocalism *ъ instead of expected *ь reflects the non-palatal pronunciation of the foreign sequence *di- (REW 1: 365), but this argument cannot hold because Proto-Slavic had no problem in admitting the sequence *dь- (e.g., PSl. *dьnь* 'day'). Professor Kortlandt suggested that the *ъ in PSl. *dъska* may be the result of jer umlaut. Irregular though this development is, it occurs occasionally in Slavic that a form with expected *ь shows the reflex of *ъ, e.g., R *tónkij,* next to Macedonian *ténok,* P *cienki* < PSl. *tьnъkъ* 'thin' (Vaillant 1950: 134-136, cf. Meillet 1902: 113).

PSl. *męta* (f. *ā*-stem)*; *męty (f. *ū*-stem) 'mint'
OCS *męta*; **SCS** and **Cr.CS** *meta*; **RCS** *mętva, mjata*; **R** *mjáta*; **Ukr.** *m'játa*; **P** *mięta, miętkiew* (arch.); **Cz.** *máta*; **Slk.** *mäta*; **US** *mjatej*; **LS** *mjetwej*; **S/Cr.** *mĕta, mĕtva, mĕtvica*; **Slov.** *mętva, mẹ̑ta*
Accentuation: AP (a) (Zaliznjak 1985: 132)

WGmc. *minta* 'mint'
OHG *minza*; **MHG** *minz(e)*; **G** *Minze*; **OE** *minte*; **OS** *minta*; **Du.** *munt*[97]

Etymology: WGmc. *minta* 'mint' was borrowed from Lat. *mentha* 'mint', which itself stems from Gr. μίνθη 'mint'. The ultimate origin of the word is unknown.

Bezlaj supposes Latin origin of PSl. *męta/*męty (ESSlov. 2: 180). The word has, on the other hand, frequently been supposed to have been borrowed from Germanic because of the *ū*-stem flexion in Slavic (HEW 12: 915-916, REW 2: 189,

---

[97] In Dutch, as well as in dialects of German, the word has forms with *u* or *ü*. These forms are irregular and might be influenced by Du. *munt*, G *Münze* 'coin' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Minze*, EWN: s.v. *munt*).

Brückner 1927: 336). Although this is an argument one often comes across, Latin loanwords in Proto-Slavic also frequently adopt the *ū*-stem declension. Feminine *ū*-stems are especially numerous among the plant names that were borrowed into Proto-Slavic from Latin or early Romance (M. Matasović 2011: 280, cf. §7.3.4). Kiparsky supposes possible Greek origin for the Slavic forms (1934: 109ff.), which Vasmer considers to be implausible in view of the existence of the forms in West Slavic (REW 2: 189). On phonological grounds, it is impossible to decide about the Romance or Germanic origin of PSl. *męta/*męty.

PSl. *mur(in)ъ 'moor, negro' (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *murinъ*; **OR** *mur(in)ъ*; **R** *múr(in)*; **Ukr.** *múrin*; **P** *murzyn*; **OCz.** *múřín;* **US** *mur*; **LS** [*mor* < G]; **Slov.** *mûr*, Gsg. *múra*

Accentuation: Unclear; the reflex of length in Czech may point to AP (b). Slovene points to AP (c).

WGmc. *mōr- 'moor, negro' (m. *a*-stem)

OHG *mōr*; **MHG** *mōr(e)*; **G** *Mohr, Maure*; **OS** *môr*; **OLF** *mōr*; **Du.** *moriaan*; **Ic.** *mór*

Etymology: Germanic *mōr-* was borrowed from Latin *maurus* '(black) Moor'. Kiparsky regards PSl. *mur(in)ъ* as a borrowing from Germanic (1934: 249), just as Bezlaj (ESSlov. 2: 206), Brückner (1927: 348) and Vasmer (REW 2: 175), but the word might equally well derive directly from Latin.

Already in Proto-Slavic, the word *murъ* received the suffix *-in-*, secondary to other nouns denoting persons (e.g., PSl. *poganinъ* 'heathen'), people names and inhabitants of towns or regions (e.g., PSl. *ruminъ* 'Roman') (Vaillant 1974: 336).

Because of the vocalism, Lower Sorbian *mor* must be a later borrowing form German.

PSl. *mъlinъ* 'mill'

SCS *mъlinъ*; **OR** *mlinъ*; **R** *mlin*; **P** *młyn*; **Cz.** *mlýn*; **Slk.** *mlyn*; **US** *młyn*; **LS** *młyn*; **S/Cr.** *mlȉn*; *màlin* (dial. Čak.), *mèlin* (dial. Kajk.); **Slov.** *mlîn*, *málin* (dial.), *mélin* (dial.)

Accentuation: AP (b); Kortlandt reconstructs a laryngealized vowel in the second syllable of PSl. *mъlinъ* (1975: 70), but the short stressed vowel in the second syllable of PSl. *mъlinъ* may also be the short rising vowel that resulted from Dybo's law. The South Slavic forms with a vocalised jer in the initial syllable result from Stang's law, which points to AP (b).

(N)WGmc. *mulīna (f. ō-stem) 'mill'
OHG *mulī, mulīn*; **MHG** *mül(e)*; **G** *Mühle* f.; **OE** *mylen*; **OFri.** *molene, molne*;
Du. *molen*; **ON** *mylna* 'water mill'

Etymology: (N)WGmc. *mulīna* was borrowed from Lat. *molīnae* (from Lat. *molere* 'to grind, mill') and originally denoted a hydro-powered mill (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Mühle*, EWN: s.v. *molen*). Water and wind operated mills were introduced in northern Europe by the Romans. Before that, grinding was done in hand mills or querns (Brückner 1927: 341, Snoj 2003: 408). The borrowing of the word from Latin into Germanic has been dated to the fourth century (EWN: s.v. *molen*).

The etymon is not treated by Kiparsky or Stender-Petersen, which indicates that they do not regard the word as a borrowing from Germanic, but rather as a loanword directly from Lat. *molīnae* (also, e.g., M. Matasović 2011: 172-173, ESSlov. 2: 189). PSl. *mъlinъ* is regarded as a borrowing from Germanic by Kortlandt (1975: 70), whereas Snoj (2003: 408) and Trubačev (ÈSSJa 19: 66-67) seem to prefer direct Latin origin (but leave the possibility open that the word was borrowed through Germanic). Vasmer leaves both options open (REW 2: 142).

Trubačev reconstructs PSl. *mlinъ* (ÈSSJa 19: 66-67), but the presence of an initial jer is attested in SCS *mъlinъ* as well as in Croatian dialectal forms *màlin, mȅlin* and Slovene dialectal *málin, mélin,* which show vocalisation of the weak jer.

PSl. *ocьtъ* 'vinegar' (m. o-stem)
OCS *ocьtъ*; **R** [*ócet*, Gsg. *ócta* (dial.) < CS (Kiparsky 1934: 117)]; **Ukr.** [*ócet* < P (?) (ESUM 4: 242)]; **P** *ocet*; **Cz.** *ocet*; **Slk.** *ocot*; **S/Cr.** *òcat*, Gsg. *òcta*; **Slov.** *ọ́cət*, Gsg. *ócta*;[98] **Bg.** *océt*
Accentuation: AP (b) (Zaliznjak 1985: 134)

Germanic *akēt-
Goth. *aket, akeit*; **G** *achiss* (dial. Swiss); **OE** *eced, æced, æcced*; **OS** *ekid*

Germanic *adik-/*atik-
OHG *ezzih*; **G** *Essig*; **OS** *edik* (EWN: s.v. *edik*); **MLG** *etik, ettik*; **MDu.** *edic*; **Du.** *edik* (arch.), *eek* (dial. Limburg);[99] **ON** [*edik* < MLG (De Vries 1977: 93)]

---

[98] Slov. *cìk,* Gsg. *cíka* and *jẹ́sih* 'vinegar' are later loanwords from High German.

Etymology: Lat. *acētum* 'vinegar' derives from Lat. *acidus* (adj.) 'sour, acid' < PIE *$h_2e\acute{k}$-eh$_1$- 'to be sharp' (cf. De Vaan 2008: 21). The word was borrowed into other languages along with the spread of viticulture in Europe. The attested Germanic forms cannot go back to one borrowing from Latin: some of the Germanic forms reflect a metathesis of consonants from Lat. *acētum* to *atecum/*adecum. The Gothic, Old English, Swiss German and Old Saxon forms are borrowed from Latin *acētum* 'vinegar'; the other forms stem from the metathesized form *atecum/*adecum. The Germanic forms that go back to *adecum reflect voicing of the Romance voiceless stops between vowels. Kluge supposes that the metathesis from *acētum* to *atēcum took place in Vulgar Latin already (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Essig*, cf. also EWN: s.v. *edik*). Lloyd et al. allow the possibility that the metathesis in these forms came about after the borrowing into Germanic under the influence of the numerous (loan)words with the Germanic suffix *-ik (OHG -ih) (EWA 2: 1190). Kortlandt considers Goth. *aket*, *akeit* to be a borrowing from Alemannic in the first century AD, before viticulture spread into central Germany (2002b: 3). Germanic *ĭ for Lat. ē has parallels in, e.g., OHG *buliz* 'fungus, boletus' < Lat. *bolētus*, OHG *muniz(a)* 'coin' < Lat. *monēta* (EWA 2: 1190).

Skok regards PSl. *ocьtъ to be of Latin origin (ERHSJ 2: 540). M. Matasović (2011: 88-89) and R. Matasović (2007: 109) keep the possibility open that the word was borrowed into Proto-Slavic through a Germanic intermediary and Vasmer does not decide between Latin or Germanic (Gothic) origin of the word either (REW 2: 295). According to Maja Matasović, Germanic origin of PSl. *ocьtъ is more plausible because if the word was borrowed from Latin, it is expected that the Proto-Slavs would interpret Lat. ẹ in the stressed (open) syllable (Lat. *acḗtum*) as a *ī, rather than as *ь (2011: 88-89). The reflex with /ī/ is found in Germanic in Goth. *akeit* (next to *aket*).

PSl. *ocьtъ was borrowed from a (Latin or Germanic) non-metathesized form. This means that if the word is a loanword from Germanic, only Gothic and Old Saxon qualify as donor languages. Gothic origin is formally difficult because the [ī] in the second syllable of Goth. *akeit* is not expected to have yielded PSl. *ь any more than the ē in the Romance form. The word could have been borrowed from Old Saxon (or another Low German dialect) before the *i*-umlaut. The problem with the vocalism can alternatively be solved by deriving PSl. *ocьtъ from the Latin adjective *acidus*, but this etymology is also

---

[99] Modern Dutch has *azijn* 'vinegar', a later loanword from Old French *aisil*, which itself is derived from Latijn *acētulum* of *acētillum*, a diminutive from of Lat. *acētum* (EWN: s.v. *azijn*).

problematic because the voiced medial stop of Lat. *acidus* is expected to remain voiced in a borrowing in Proto-Slavic (M. Matasović 2011: 88, REW 2: 295).

The word must in either scenario be a relatively late borrowing because the velar was palatalized in Proto-Slavic according to the second and not according to the first palatalization.

6.2 WORDS OF INDETERMINABLE ORIGIN: INHERITED, BORROWED FROM GERMANIC OR FROM ANOTHER LANGUAGE

PSl. *avorъ* 'maple, plane tree' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS avorovъ (adj.) 'of a plane tree'; **R** jávor, Gsg. jávora 'Acer pseudoplatanus; Platanus orientalis'; **Ukr.** jávir, Gsg. jávora 'Acer pseudoplatanus'; **P** jawor 'maple, plane tree'; **Cz.** javor 'maple'; **Slk.** javor; **US** jawor 'Acer platanoides'; **LS** jawor 'Acer platanoides'; **Plb.** jovårě (NApl.) 'maple'; **S/Cr.** jàvōr, Gsg. jàvora; (dial. Crn.) jahor 'laurel, plane tree, Acer pseudoplatanus, Acer platanoides'; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) jȁvor, Gsg. jȁvora; **Slov.** jávor 'maple'; **Bg.** jávor 'Platanus orientalis'
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *ēhur(n)a-* 'platan, plane tree' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG ăhorn; **MHG** ahorn; **G** Ahorn; **OS** ahorn; **ODan.** aer
Cognates: Lat. acer,-eris 'maple-tree'; perhaps also Gr. ἄκαστος 'maple' (Hsch.), ἄκαρνα 'laurel-tree' (Hsch.) (De Vaan 2008: 21-22)

Etymology: PSl. *avorъ* has often been regarded as a Germanic loanword (Kiparsky 1934: 229-230, REW 3: 478-479, Shevelov 1964: 240, ÈSSJa 1: 96-97). This etymology poses formal difficulties because the initial *a* of Germanic does not correspond to initial PSl. *a*. Similarly, PSl. *o* in the second syllable is not a regular reflex of either PGmc. *u* or West Germanic *o*. In the third place, there are no other loanwords in which Germanic *h* is replaced by *v* in Proto-Slavic (cf. also HEW 6: 436).

Fick/Falk/Torp reconstruct the Proto-Germanic form as *ēhura-(/*ēhira-)* (1909: 23), but in fact, it is not clear whether the initial vowel should be reconstructed as long.[100] In the literature, OHG ahorn is occasionally cited with long initial *ā* (e.g., Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 23). The vocalism of the initial vowel in

---

[100] ODan. ær, NHG *Acher* (dial.) 'maple-tree' derive from PGmc. *ēhira-* (Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 23).

Old High German is unclear and Lloyd et al. cite the form as OHG *ǎhorn* (EWA 1: 110). High German dialectal forms in Switzerland and Westfalen seem to point to initial *ā, but the length is supposed to be secondary (ibid.: 112). Kluge reconstructs the word as PGmc. *ahur-(na-)* with a short initial vowel (2002: s.v. *Ahorn*) and this reconstruction seems to be justified. We are likely to deal with two original Proto-Germanic forms: PGmc. *ahur-* next to *ahur-na-*. The form with *-n-* is thought to be an original adjectival derivation that later became substantivized. This is not uncommon, especially for tree names, cf., e.g., Lat. *fraxinus* (adj.) 'ash(en)' > Lat. *fraxinus* 'ash tree' (EWA 1: 111). To an original form without *-n-* point, e.g., ODan. *ær* (cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Ahorn*), and attestations in isolated dialects of High German: *ǫhr* (Pernegg, Carinthia), *ūvǝr* (the Gottschee dialect in Kočevje, Slovenia) and *ār* (Luzern), *Acher* (Lesachtal, Carinthia), *Ahre* (Burgsdorf, Saxony-Anhalt) (forms cited from Schwarz 1926: 284, Pritzel/Jessen 1882: 4-5). Van Loon connects Dutch toponyms with initial *Aar-* (e.g. *Arlo, Aarle*) to the same root (2011: 292-294).

PGmc. *ahur(-na)-* can in all probability be connected to Lat. *acer* 'maple-tree', and perhaps to the Greek forms ἄκαστος and ἄκαρνα recorded by Hesychius as well (De Vaan 2008: 21-22). The name of the tree has been thought to be an inherited word deriving from PIE *h_2eḱ-ro-* 'sharp' (e.g., Gr. ἄκρος 'highest, outermost', OCS *ostrъ* 'sharp', Lith. *aštrùs* 'sharp') after the pointed form of the leaves (Mallory/Adams 1997: 367), but the word is unlikely to go back to Proto-Indo-European. The Germanic and Latin forms are more often explained as deriving from a non-Indo-European substratum language (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Ahorn*, EWN: s.v. *ahorn*).

Schwarz supposes that PSl. *avorъ* was borrowed from a late West Germanic form *āorъ*, in which the medial Germanic *-h-* had supposedly developed into [h] and was therefore not perceived as velar fricative anymore (1926: 286, cf. Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 145ff.). The Slavs would thus have borrowed the word as *āorъ* after which *-v-* was inserted in Proto-Slavic to solve the hiatus. A very late borrowing might also explain the vocalism of PSl. *avorъ*. This idea would, however, presuppose that the word was borrowed into Proto-Slavic later than the other loanwords discussed in this dissertation, in which Germanic *o corresponds to PSl. *a, and Germanic *a to PSl. *o, and such a late borrowing is problematic in view of the extensive spread of the word in Slavic.

Machek supposes that the Slavic, Germanic and Latin forms all derive from an (unknown) substratum language (1950: 154).[101] This idea seems to be the most likely solution (also ERHSJ 1: 763).

PSl. *bergъ* 'bank, shore; slope' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *brěgъ*; **R** *béreg* 'bank, shore'; **Ukr.** *béreh* 'bank, shore'; **P** *brzeg* 'bank, shore'; **OCz.** *břěh* 'shore, coast'; **Cz.** *břeh* 'shore, coast'; **Slk.** *breh* 'shore; slope, hill'; **US** *brjóh* 'bank, shore, coast, edge of a wood, hill', Gsg. *brjoha*; **LS** *brjog* 'bank, shore, coast, edge of a wood, hill'; **Plb.** *brig* 'river bank'; **S/Cr.** *brȉjeg* 'small hill'; **Slov.** *brȇg* 'bank'; **Bg.** *brjag* 'bank, shore'
Accentuation: AP (c)

PGmc. *berga-* 'mountain, hill'
Goth. *bairgahei* 'mountains'; **OHG** *berg*; **G** *Berg*; **OE** *beorg, beorh, biorg, biorh* 'hill; heap'; **E** *barrow* (arch.) 'burial mound'; **OFri.** *berch, birch*; **OS** *berg*; **MLG** *berch, berech, barch* 'mountain, hill; wood; fortification'; **ON** *bjarg* n., *berg* n. 'rock, cliff face, mountain'
Cognates: Av. *bərəzah-* n. 'height, mountain', Arm. *berj* 'height', MIr. *brí* (Asg. *brig*) 'hill, mountain', Hitt. *parku-* 'high', Toch. A, B *pärk-* 'to rise, ascend' < PIE *bʰerǵʰ-* 'mountain; high, elevated' (Pokorny 1959: 140-141).

Etymology: PGmc. *berga-* 'mountain, hill' derives from PIE *bʰerǵʰ-* 'mountain'. On the basis of the cognates in Avestan and Armenian, the PIE form has been reconstructed with a palato-velar *ǵʰ*. This implies that an inherited Proto-Slavic reflex of PIE *bʰerǵʰ-o-* is expected to have stem-final *-z-*. Because PSl. *bergъ* has a stem-final velar *g*, the word has been regarded as a borrowing from Germanic or another centum-language (Kiparsky 1934: 101-108).[102] Venetic-Illyrian has been mentioned as a possible donor. According to Derksen, these etymologies "lack a solid basis but cannot be rejected out of hand" (2008: 37). Vasmer rejects Germanic as the donor of PSl. *bergъ* because of the difference in meaning and the mobile accentuation of the Slavic word (REW 1:

---

[101] Machek adds that the vocalism of the second syllable of Germanic (WGmc. *-or-* < PGmc. *-ur-*) is not compatible with Lat. *-er-*, which would make an etymological connection between Germanic and Latin difficult as well (1950: 154).
[102] Kiparsky assumes the same for PSl. *čerda, *kъrdъ, *gǫsь,*gordъ, *žъrdь, svekrъ/svekry* (1934: 101-108). For PSl. *gǫsь*, see below. The velar in the other forms can be explained from depalatalization of the Proto-Indo-European palatovelars before *r* (Kortlandt 1978b: 238-239, cf. 2012: 1).

76). He supposes that an unknown centum-language is the donor of PSl. *bergъ, or alternatively, that a variant form with a depalatalised stem-final velar existed in Proto-Indo-European next to PIE *bʰerǵʰ-o-, especially if Alb. burg 'mountain, mountain ridge' is to be connected to this etymon (REW 1: 76).

From a semantic viewpoint it is difficult to consider PSl. *bergъ a loanword from Germanic: the meaning of the Slavic and Germanic forms does not completely correspond (cf. ERHSJ 1: 210, also Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Berg) and mobile accentuation is indeed very uncommon for Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Were we to assume that the word is indeed a loanword from Germanic, then the problem of the accentuation could be solved by assuming that PSl. *bergъ originally became an u-stem in Proto-Slavic, for which the adjective formation beregovój and the "second locative" na beregú in Russian seem to be indications. Another example of a Germanic loanword that has supposedly become an u-stem is PSl. dъlgъ (cf. §8.3.1). The etymology of PSl. *bergъ as a loanword is in any case attractive because it would spare the assumption of a PIE root alternation *ǵʰ next to *gʰ.

PSl. *čędo, -a, -ъ 'child' (n. o-stem, f. ā-stem, m. o-stem)
OCS čędo n. 'child'; **R** [čádo 'child, offspring' < CS]; **Ukr.** [čádo 'child, offspring' < CS]; **OCz.** čad, čád m. 'little boy'; čada, čáda f. 'little girl'; **S/Cr.** čědo n. (arch.) 'child, offspring'; **Bg.** čédo 'child'
Accentuation: AP (a)

WGmc. *kinþa- 'child' (n. a-stem)
OHG kind; **MHG** kint; **G** Kind; **OFri.** [kind < HG (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Kind)]; **OS** [kind < HG (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Kind)]; **Du.** kind
Cognates: Gr. καινός, Lat. recēns 'new, fresh', MW bachgen m. 'boy', Skt. kanī́na- 'young' < PIE *ken- 'young, new' (Derksen 2008: 88, De Vaan 2008: 516).

Etymology: The Germanic forms go back to PGmc. *kinþa- 'child' < PIE *ǵenh₁-to-, which is a derivation from PIE *ǵenh₁- 'to create, give birth' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Kind, EWN: s.v. kind). PSl. *čędo (also PSl. *čędь 'people, servants') has often been regarded as a Germanic loanword because of the formal and semantic correspondences between the Slavic and Germanic forms (e.g., Meillet 1902: 110, Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 708, Matasović 2000: 133, 2008: 50, Holzer 1990: 65). Kiparsky rejects this etymology because an etymology of the word as a derivation from PSl. *-čęti < PIE *k(e)n- (cf. PSl. *načęti 'to begin') is "mindestens ebensogut" (1934: 22-23). In itself, this is not a very convincing argument, and the derivation of PSl. *čędo from PSl. *-čęti obviously fits less well semantically than the etymology that explains the word as

a loanword from a reflex of WGmc. *kinþa- 'child'. The word has nevertheless currently largely been regarded as a native formation going back to PIE *k(e)n-do- < PIE *ken- 'young, new' (ĖSSJa 4: 102-104, Derksen 2008: 88, 345).[103]

The supposed suffix PSl. *-do- would, however, require an explanation with this etymology because this suffix occurs only in a small number of Proto-Slavic forms and does not seem to have been very productive. The suffix is also found in, e.g., PSl. *stado 'herd, flock' < PIE *steh₂-dʰo-m, PSl. *govędo 'head of cattle' (Vaillant 1974: 489-490, cf. Derksen 2008: 464-465, 181).

PSl. *gotovъ 'ready, prepared'
OCS gotovъ; **R** gotóv(yj); **Ukr.** hotóvyj; **P** gotowy, gotów; **Cz.** hotový; **Slk.** hotový; **US** hotowy; **LS** gotowy; **S/Cr.** gòtov; **Slov.** gotòv; **Bg.** gotóv

PSl. *gotoviti 'to prepare'
OCS gotoviti; **RCS** gotoviti; **OR** gotoviti; **R** gotóvitʼ; **Ukr.** hotóvyty; **P** gotowić (arch.); **Cz.** hotoviti; **US** hotowić; **LS** gotowić; **S/Cr.** gòtoviti; **Slov.** gotóviti; **Bg.** gótvja 'to cook'
Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. *ga- and *tawjan 'to prepare, make'
Goth. gataujan 'to do, realize, accomplish'; **OHG** zawjan, zowjan 'to prepare, make'; **E** to taw 'to prepare skins'; **MDu.** touwen 'to prepare skins'
Cognates: Possibly Alb. gat 'ready, prepared', gatuaj, gatuej 'to prepare, cook'; Gr. νηγάτεος 'new-made'.

Etymology: PSl. *gotovъ and *gotoviti have mainly been derived from the PIE root *gʷeh₂- 'to go'. The meaning 'to prepare; prepared' would then be secondary. Parallels for the semantic shift from 'to go, ride' to 'prepared, ready' have been found in G bereit 'ready', E ready from reflexes of the Proto-Germanic verbal root *rīdan- 'to ride', G fertig 'ready' from G fahren 'to drive' (ĖSSJa 7: 71, cf. ESSlov. 1: 165). This etymology does, nevertheless, not explain the *o in the root of PSl. *gotovъ and *gotoviti. Kiparsky also considers the word to be inherited and departs from original PSl. *gotъ. He supposes that the Slavic forms in -ov- go back to a Proto-Slavic derivative with *-ovo- (1934: 29, cf. HEW 4: 241, 5: 333-334). He bases this idea on the Sorbian forms US hot 'preparation' and LS gotnica 'factory', which would derive from PSl. *gotъ without the suffix. The original

---

[103] This form has been connected to PSl. ščenę 'young animal' (which has s-mobile) (Derksen 2008: 486).

meaning of supposed PSl. *gotъ could then be reconstructed as 'to make' (cf. 1934: 29). The Slavic forms have been connected to Alb. *gat* 'ready, prepared', *gatuaj, gatuej* 'to prepare, cook' and Gr. *νηγάτεος* 'new-made' (ESSlov. 1: 165, also REW 1: 301). The forms in Albanian words are, nevertheless, likely to result from an early borrowing from PSl. *gotoviti* (Alb. *gat* would be secondary formation in Albanian) (Orel 1998: 111, cf. ÈSSJa 7: 70-71).

PSl. *gotovъ and *gotoviti have alternatively occasionally been regarded as loanwords from Germanic (e.g., Kluge 1913: 41). In this case, only Gothic *gataujan* comes into consideration because a compound of a reflex of PGmc. *tawjan* with the prefix *ga- is unattested in the other Germanic languages. Goth. *ga-taujan* 'to do, realize, accomplish' derives from PGmc. *tawjan* 'to prepare, make'. This verb has no accepted etymology (Lehmann 1986: 342).

From a phonological and morphological viewpoint, the Slavic forms might very well be borrowed from Gothic, but it cannot be excluded that the Slavic forms are inherited either.

PSl. *gǫsь 'goose' (f. *i*-stem, earlier consonant stem)
R *gus'*, Gsg. *gúsja* (m. *jo*-stem); **P** *gęś*; **OCz.** *hus*; **Cz.** *hus* (dial.); **Slk.** *hus*; **US** *husy* (pl.) 'geese';[104] **LS** *gus*; **Plb.** *gǫ́s*; **SCr.** *gùska*; **Slov.** *gôs*, Gsg. *gosî*; **Bg.** *gǎ́ska*
Accentuation: AP (c)

PGmc. *gans- 'goose' (f. *i*-stem, earlier consonant stem)
OHG *gans*; **MHG** *gans*; **G** *Gans*; **OE** *gōs*; **MLG** *gōs, gūs*; **Du.** *gans*; **ON** *gás*[105]
Cognates: Lith. *žąsìs*, Latv. *zùoss*, OPr. *sansy*, Skt. *haṁsá-* 'goose, swan', Gk. *χήν*, Lat. *ānser* < PIE *ǵʰeh₂ns- (Derksen 2008: 184).

Etymology: PSl. *gǫsь has occasionally been regarded as a loanword from Germanic (recently Matasović 2008: 50). The reason for this etymology is the initial *g- in Slavic, which cannot be explained if the word directly derives from PIE *ǵʰeh₂ns- 'goose'; if that were the case, one would expect the word to have initial *z- in Balto-Slavic (as is indeed attested in the Baltic forms).

---

[104] In US, the 'goose' is either denoted by the word *huso* from < PSl. *gǫsę 'young goose' or *husica* < PSl. *gǫsica 'female goose' (HEW 5: 366).
[105] The form in Gothic is unattested but can be reconstructed as *gansus on the basis of Sp./Prt. *ganso* 'gander', Sp./Prt. *gansa* 'goose' which must be Visigothic loanwords (EWN: s.v. *gans*, cf. EWA 4: 66).

Kiparsky also assumes that PSl. *gǫsь is a loanword, although he does not regard a Germanic language as the donor, but an unknown centum-language (1934: 103). There are no indications to assume that this is correct.

Vasmer reconstructs original PSl. *zǫsь and supposes that this form secondarily became PSl. *gǫsь with an initial stop under influence of the Germanic forms. He refers in this respect to Pliny, who remarks in *Naturalis Historia* that the quality of Germanic geese was very high (REW 1: 324, also EWA 4: 68); Germanic geese were apparently used for stuffing cushions (Green 1998: 186). The Germanic word was in any case borrowed into Latin as *ganta* 'wild goose' (cf. §4.6.2).

As an argument against borrowing from Germanic can be adduced that the formation and the accentuation of the Baltic and Slavic forms exactly correspond to one another: both in Baltic and in Slavic, the words are *i*-stems with mobile accentuation. In addition, PSl. *gǫserъ 'gander' has an exact formal correspondence in Lat. *ānser* 'gander', which is another argument against borrowing from Germanic (ÈSSJa 7: 88-89).[106]

In his 1985 article on "Long vowels in Balto-Slavic", Kortlandt explained the initial velar stop of PSl. *gǫsь from depalatalization of the original palato-velar. The PIE paradigm has been reconstructed as Nsg. *ǵʰehₐns, Asg. *ǵʰhₐensm, Gsg. *ǵʰhₐnsos. Kortlandt considered the depalatalization to have regularly operated before -*n*-, which means that it must have originated in the genitive and/or accusative singular and then spread over the rest of the paradigm (1985b: 119, cf. Lubotsky 1989: 60, Derksen 2008: 184). Kortlandt now considers the evidence for depalatalization before syllabic nasal resonants refutable, in view of counterexamples such as Lith. *dēšimt* 'ten', *žinóti* 'to know', Slavic *zъnatь 'to know' (2012: 1, cf. 1985c: 236-237). He rather assumes, if the word was indeed inherited rather than a loanword from Germanic, that the depalatalization occurred before the laryngeal, which is a rule that may go back to Indo-European (2012: 2, cf. 2010b: 2 = 2010a: 38). Kortlandt analyses PIE *ǵʰehₐns 'goose' as an -*nt*-participle of the verb *ǵʰehₐ- 'to yawn' because the ablaut pattern that has been reconstructed for 'goose' corresponds to the ablaut pattern of the *nt*-participles (2012: 2).

---

[106] Reflexes of PSl. *gǫserъ 'gander' in the attested Slavic languages are, e.g., P *gąsior, gęsior*; Cz. *houser*; US *husor*; LS *gusor*; Slov. *gosér*; Bg. *gǎser*.

PSl. *klějъ/*klьjъ 'glue' (m. *jo*-stem)
CS *klějъ* 'glue'; **RCS** *klej, klěj, klij*; **R** *klej*, Gsg. *kléja*; **P** *klej*; **Cz.** *klí*, Gsg. *klé* 'glue, resin'; **US** *klij* 'wood glue'; **LS** *klij*; **S/Cr.** *klîj, klȉja*; **Slov.** *klȇj*, Gsg. *klȇja/klęjâ* 'glue, resin'; **Bg.** *klej* 'glue, resin'
Accentuation: AP (c)?; the forward shift of the falling tone in Slovene points to AP (c), SCr. *klȉja* points to AP (a).

WGmc. *klaija-* 'clay, loam' (m. *ja*-stem)
G [*klei* 'heavy clay' < LG (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Klei*)]; **OE** *clǣg*; **OFri.** *klai*; **MLG** *klei*; **Du.** *klei*
Cognates: If PSl. *klějъ/*klьjъ* is to be regarded as an inherited word, it might perhaps be connected to Gr. κόλλα 'glue', but Derksen calls this connection "doubtful" (2008: 224).

Etymology: Kiparsky regards the Proto-Slavic forms as a borrowing from a reflex of WGmc. *klaija-* 'clay, loam' and assumes a semantic shift from 'sticky soil' to 'glue' (1934: 239-240). This shift is not unnatural: WGmc. *klaija-* 'clay, loam' derives from PGmc. *klei-*, from which also derive, e.g., E *clammy* (adj.) 'damp, sticky', G *kleiben, kleben* 'to stick, glue' (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Klei). WGmc. *klaija-* 'clay, loam' derives from PIE *gleiH-, gloiH-* 'to stick' (EWN: s.v. *klei*, cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Klei*). The occurrence of the Germanic forms seems to be limited to Low German, Anglo-Frisian and Dutch; G *klei* is a loanword from Low German (DWb: s.v. *Klei*).

The connection between the Germanic forms and PSl. *klějъ/*klьjъ* is unclear: the word has been thought to be a loanword from Germanic (e.g., Kiparsky 1934: 239-240), although it has in recent etymological dictionaries rather been regarded as a native formation (Derksen 2008: 224, ĖSSJa 10: 19-20, Snoj 2003: 277, REW 1: 566-567).[107] The connection of PSl. *klějъ/*klьjъ* to Gr. κόλλα 'glue' is unclear, and this leaves the Proto-Slavic forms to be the only ones pointing to initial *k rather than *g. This is an argument to regard the word as a loanword. Derksen remarks that the word is reminiscent of PSl. *glěva, *glěvъ, *glěvь* 'slime' < PIE *gloh₁i-uo-* (cf. Gr. γλοιός 'any glutinous substance') and PSl. *glьjъ* 'clay, loam' < *glh₁i-o-*, but the connection between the forms remains unclear (2008: 224, cf. 2008: 163, 168). The vocalism of PSl. *klьjъ* could be secondary to PSl. *glьjъ*.

---

[107] Vasmer reconstructs PSl. *kъlějъ/*kъlьjъ* on the basis of Slov. *kəljè* 'carpenter's glue' (REW 1: 566-567), but the Slovene form cannot prove the existence of an original *ъ because jers are often secondarily inserted, especially in the clusters *tl and *kl (Kiparsky 1934: 239).

PSl. *krěpъ(kъ) 'strong'
OCS *krěpъ, krěpъkъ* 'strong, powerful'; **R** *krépkij, krépok* 'strong, firm'; **P** *krzepki* 'strong, alive, quick'; **Cz.** *křepý* 'strong' *křepký* 'fresh, strong'; **Slk.** *krepý* 'slow-witted, simple-minded', *krepký* 'adroit, smart'; **S/Cr.** *krȉjep* (arch.), *krȅpak* 'strong, lively'; **Slov.** *krẹpâk* 'hard, stiff, tough'; **Bg.** *krépăk* 'tough, hard, strong'
Accentuation: PSl. *krěpъkъ* has AP (a). Derksen lists PSl. *krěpъ* without an accent paradigm (2008: 246), but Dybo and Zaliznjak reconstruct PSl. *krěpъ* with AP (c) (Dybo 1981: 105-106, Zaliznjak 1985: 138).

PGmc. *krēpja-* 'power'
G (dial. Visperterminen Swiss) *xreepfe* 'strong'

PGmc. *krafti-* (f. *i*-stem), *kraftu-* (m. *u*-stem) 'strength, power'
OHG *chraft, kraft*; **MHG** *kraft*; **G** *Kraft*; **OE** *cræft*; **OFri.** *kreft, kraft*; **OS** *kraft* m./f.; **Du.** *kracht* ; **ON** *kraptr, krǫptr*

Etymology: PSl. *krěpъ(kъ)* 'strong' has usually been connected to ON *hræfa* 'to tolerate'. The forms would derive from PIE *kreh₁p-o-* (Derksen 2008: 246, cf. REW 1: 660). Guus Kroonen has proposed that PSl. *krěpъ* is rather to be regarded as a loanword from a reflex of PGmc. *krēpja-* 'power', which fits better semantically than the connection to ON *hræfa* 'to tolerate' (2010: 405-406). Kroonen bases this idea on the High German form *xreepfe*, attested in the Visperterminen dialect of Swiss German. This form derives from OHG *chrāpfi*, which can be reconstructed as WGmc. *krāppja-* (and PGmc. *krēpja-*).[108] He supposes to connect the form to OHG *chraft* (G *Kraft* 'strength'). OHG *chraft* and its cognates have usually been derived from PGmc. *krafti-/*kraftu-*, but the origin of these forms is unclear (Kroonen 2010: 402-405, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Kraft*).

PSl. *krěpъ* has been reconstructed with AP (c). Kroonen considers the accentuation of PSl. *krěpъ* not to be sufficient counterevidence against the idea that the word was borrowed from Germanic (2010: 406). As we have seen, the number of Germanic loanwords with AP (c) is exceedingly low (cf. §5.5). Nevertheless, the suffix *-ъkъ* to PSl. *krěpъ* suggests that the word might have been an original Proto-Slavic *u*-stem and *u*-stems very often have AP (c), which might explain the unexpected mobile accentuation if the word is to be regarded as a Germanic loanword (Kroonen 2010: 406, cf. Orr 1996: 315, 329 and §8.3.1).

---

[108] Visperterminen Swiss *ee* derives from High German *ā* (< PGmc. *ē*) (Kroonen 2010: 405).

PSl. *melko 'milk' (n. *o*-stem)

OCS mlěko; **R** molokó; **Ukr.** molokó; **P** mleko; **Cz.** mléko; **Slk.** mlieko; **US** mloko;
LS mloko; **Plb.** mlåkə; **S/Cr.** mlijèko; **Slov.** mlękǫ; **Bg.** mljáko, mlekó
Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. *meluk- 'milk' (f., root noun)

Goth. miluks; **OHG** miluh, mil(i)h; **MHG** mil(i)ch; **G** Milch; **OE** meol(u)c, milc;
OFri. meloke, molke; **OS** miluk; **Du.** melk; **ON** mjolk
Cognates: Lat. mulgeō 'to milk', OIr. melg n. (in a gloss) 'milk', mlicht, W blith, R
molózivo n. 'colostrum, beestings', Toch. A malke 'milk', Toch. B malkwer m.
'milk' < PIE *h₂melǵ- 'to milk' (Pokorny 1959: 723, Mallory/Adams 1997: 381).

Etymology: The Germanic forms go back to PGmc. *meluk- f. 'milk' < PIE
*h₂melǵ- 'to milk'. The origin of *u in the second root syllable of Proto-Germanic
is unclear (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. Milch, EWN: s.v. melk).

Because the word has been reconstructed with a stem-final palato-velar, the
regular reflex in Proto-Slavic is with a stem-final sibilant (cf. also s.v. PSl.
*bergъ). PSl. *melzti 'to milk' is, for example, regularly derived from PIE
*h₂melǵ-.[109] Because of the root-final *k in PSl. *melko, the word has been
considered a Germanic loanword (Derksen 2008: 307, Mallory/Adams 1997:
381). This etymology is difficult because Slavic shows no trace of the *u in the
Germanic second syllable. This *u must go back to Proto-Germanic because it is
attested both in East Germanic and in West Germanic, but the origin of the
vowel in the second syllable is unexplained. In High German, forms without the
second root syllable are attested only from Middle High German onwards,
which is too late to be the donor of the Proto-Slavic form.

Kiparsky completely separates PSl. *melko 'milk' from the reflexes of PGmc.
*meluk- 'milk' and derives the Proto-Slavic form from PSl. *molka, attested, e.g.,
in S/Cr. mlȁka 'pool, puddle', OR molokita 'swamp' (1934: 45), but this etymology
is rather far-fetched. Snoj presupposes a depalatalised variant of the PIE root
and reconstructs PIE *h₂melk- as the basis of PSl. *melko (2003: 407). Trubačev
regards PSl. *melko unlikely to be a borrowing, among other reasons, because of
the stress pattern (ÈSSJa 18: 85). The word belongs, however, to AP (b) and the
final stress goes back to earlier stem stress, which is not at all unlikely among the
Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

---

[109] RCS melьziti 'to milk', R molózivo 'colostrums, beestings', RCS mlěsti 'to bring down, dislodge',
Slk. mlʼzť 'to suck', S/Cr. mȕsti, Slov. mlésti < PSl. *melzti 'to milk'. Dybo seems to regard the
present tense forms of PSl. *melzti to belong to AP (c), but Derksen lists the word without an
accent paradigm (2008: 307).

PSl. *molto/*moltъ/*molta 'draff, grain residual in the beer-making process'

Ukr. *mólot* 'sediment, lees'; **P** *młóto, młóta* (arch.) 'grain residual in the beer making process'; **Cz.** *mláto* 'sediment, (spent) grains'; **S/Cr.** *mlata* (arch.) 'grain residual in the beer making process'; **Slov.** *mlátǫ* n., *mláta* f. 'spent grains'

Accentuation: AP unknown; Ukrainian points to AP (c), whereas Old Czech and Slovene point to AP (a) or (b).

NWGmc. *malta- 'malt' (n. *a-stem*)

OHG *malz*; **MHG** *malz*; **G** *Malz*; **OE** *mealt, malt* (adj.) 'cooked, boiled (?)'; **NFri.** [*mout* < MDu. (EWN: s.v. *mout*)]; **OS** *malt*; **Du.** *mout*; **ON** *malt*

Etymology: NWGmc. *malta- 'malt' has been connected to PGmc. *malta- 'soft'. Malt is made of cereal grains (often barley) and forms a main ingredient in the beer-making process. The grains are first soaked in water to make them germinate after which they are heated to stop the germination process. The name 'malt' in Germanic refers to the soft, soaked germinating seedlings (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Malz*, EWN: s.v. *mout*).

There is significant formal and semantic similarity between the Germanic forms and PSl. *molto/*moltъ/*molta 'draff, grain residual in the beer-making process': in both languages, the word refers to the grains used in the process of making beer. For this reason, PSl. *molto/*moltъ/*molta has sometimes been regarded as a loanword from Germanic (e.g., Holzer 1990: 62-63). The semantic connection between the Slavic and Germanic forms is slightly less attractive than it might seem at first glance: in those Slavic languages in which the word is attested, the word does not mean 'malt', but rather the residual of the grains in the beer making process, i.e., the waste product that was often used as animal feed.

The word has alternatively been analysed as *mol-to, a participle with *-to- from either PSl. *melti 'to grind, mill' or from PSl. *moltiti 'to beat, thresh'. These verbs primarily refer to the threshing of grains and this etymology is more frequently adhered to (Kiparsky 1934: 46, Brückner 1927: 341, ERHSJ 2: 441, ESUM 3: 504-505).

PSl. *mostъ '(corduroy) bridge' (m. *o-stem*)

OCS *mostъ* (Supr.); **R** *most*, Gsg. *mósta, mostá*; **Ukr.** *mist*; **P** *most*; **Cz.** *most*; **Slk.** *most*; **US** *móst*, Gsg. *mosta, mostu* 'bridge'; **LS** *most* 'bridge, footbridge through the Spreewald'; **Plb.** *möst* 'causeway, dam'; **S/Cr.** *môst*, Gsg. *mȍsta*; **Slov.** *mȏst*, Gsg. *mǫ̑sta, mostȃ, mostȗ*; **Bg.** *most*

Accentuation: AP (c)

PGmc. *masta- '(ship's) mast' (m. *a*-stem)
OHG *mast*; **MHG** *mast*; **G** *Mast*; **OE** *mæst*; **MLG** *mast*(*bōm*); **Du.** *mast*; **ON** *mastr*
Cognates: Lat. *mālus* 'mast, pole',[110] OIr. *mátán* 'club' < PIE *masd- (Pokorny 1959: 701-702, Derksen 2008: 326-327, De Vaan 2008: 361).

Etymology: PSl. *mostъ 'bridge' has often thought to be a loanword from a reflex of PGmc. *masta- 'mast' (e.g., Stender-Petersen 1927: 281, more recently Holzer 1990: 64, Matasović 2008: 50). Although the phonological correspondence between PSl. *mostъ and reflexes of PGmc. *masta- 'mast' does not pose any problems, the word is less likely to be a loanword from a semantic viewpoint: in Germanic, the word always refers to vertically placed beams (masts). The original meaning in Slavic seems to be 'beam' and the word relates to several kinds of horizontally placed beams in the individual Slavic languages (cf. also Russian derivatives as *mostovája* 'roadway', *pomóst* 'scaffold'). The meaning 'bridge' in Slavic thus developed from a series of beams that were placed over a stream of river. Because of the difference in meaning of the word in Germanic and in Slavic, it is doubtful whether the etymology of PSl. *mostъ as a Germanic loanword is correct (cf. REW 2: 163).

Trubačev does not consider PSl. *mostъ to be a loanword and mentions the two prevailing etymologies. The first etymology derives the word from *mot-tos < PSl. *mesti 'to throw', which means that PSl. *mostъ originally referred to something that is 'thrown' over a stream (ÈSSJa 20: 30-33, cf. Brückner 1927: 344, Machek 1957: 374). The other etymology derives PSl. *mostъ from PIE *masd-to-s 'pole, mast (?)'. This etymology would make PSl. *mostъ a cognate of the Germanic, Latin and Celtic forms (ÈSSJa 20: 30-33, Derksen 2008: 326-327, cf. Kiparsky 1934: 47).

PSl. *opica 'ape' (f. *ā*-stem)
RCS *opica*, *opynja*; **OP** [*opica* (15th century) < Cz]; **P** *opica* (dial.); **OCz.** (*h*)*opicě*; **Cz.** *opice*; **Slk.** *opica*; **US** *wopica*; **Plb.** *opo*; **S/Cr.** *ȍpica*, (dial. Kajk.) *jȍpica*; **Slov.** *ộpica*
Accentuation: AP (a)?, on the basis of Serbian/Croatian and Slovene.

---

[110] Lat. *mālus* 'mast, pole' derives from *mādos (with *d > l), if the word is to be connected with the other Indo-European forms (Pokorny 1959: 701-702, De Vaan 2008: 361).

NWGmc. *apōn- (m. *n*-stem)
OHG *affo*; **MHG** *affe*; **G** *Affe*; **OE** *apa*; **NFri.** *aap*; **OS** *apo*; **Du.** *aap*; **ON** *api*

Etymology: Monkeys are not native to western Europe, although remains of Barbary apes have been discovered in (Celtic) La Tène settlements in Ireland and Luxemburg dating from the last three centuries BC. The presence of monkey-remains in these settlements has been explained as the result of prestige gift-exchange from long-distance contacts with North Africa (Mallory/Adams 1997: 384-385). NWGmc. *apōn- has no clear etymology and is sometimes thought to have been borrowed from Celtic. Hesychius has recorded ἀβράνας (Apl.) in a gloss, which is supposed to have been a writing error for ἀββάνας (ESSlov. 2: 251, Mallory/Adams 1997: 384-385). NWGmc. *apōn- has alternatively been connected to Skt. *kapí-* 'monkey'. It has been thought that the word 'ape' is ultimately of Asian origin and wandered into Europe through the Semitic languages. In several Indo-European languages similar words for ape or monkey are attested, which are all likely to be borrowings from other, often unknown, languages (Mallory/Adams 1997: 384-385).

PSl. *opica has been regarded as a loanword from Germanic (e.g., Snoj 2003: 473, HEW 22: 1655). The word must have been borrowed as PSl. *opъ after which a suffix *-ica has been added in analogy to other animal names. This suffix, however, specifically denotes female animals in other words, e.g., PSl. *vъlčica 'she-wolf'.

In Russian Church Slavic, the word is attested with another female suffix *-ynja; this form might stem directly from ON *apynja* 'she-ape'.[111] Bezlaj is undecided about the origin of PSl. *opica and allows also the opposite possibility that the Germanic word was borrowed from Slavic (ESSlov. 2: 251).

PSl. *plakati 'to cry, weep'
OCS *plakati* (*sę*), 1sg. *plačǫ* (*sę*); **R** *plákatʼ*, 1sg. *pláču*; **Ukr.** *plákaty*; **P** *płakać*, 1sg. *płaczę*; **Cz.** *plakat*; **Slk.** *plakatʼ*; **US** *płakać*; **LS** *płakaś*; **Plb.** *plokət*; **S/Cr.** *plàkati*, 1sg. *plȁčēm*; **Slov.** *plákati*, 1sg. *plákam*, 1sg. *pláčem*; **Bg.** *pláča*
Accentuation: AP (a)

---

[111] ON *apynja* 'she-ape' is a feminine form built with the suffix PGmc. *-unjō-, whereas the West Germanic languages have feminine forms with the suffix PGmc. *-injō-, WGmc. *-inna- (EWA 1: 59).

PGmc. *flōk-a- 'to curse, bewail'

Goth. *flokan 'to bewail' (attested 3pl. pret. *faiflokun*); **OHG** *fluohhōn, fluohhan*; **MHG** *vluochen*; **G** *fluchen* 'to curse'; **OE** *flocan* 'to clap, strike, beat together'; **OFri.** *urflōka* 'to curse'; **OS** *flōkan* 'to curse'; **Du.** *vloeken*

Cognates: Lat. *plangere* 'to beat, mourn (by beating the chest)', Gr. πλήσσω 'to beat', πληγή 'blow' < PIE *pleh₂k-/*pleh₂g- (Pokorny 1959: 832, Derksen 2008: 402). Often connected to Lith. *plàkti* 'to knock, beat', Latv. *plakt* 'to be flattened, diminish' but this may not be correct (see below).

Etymology: The Baltic and Slavic forms are difficult to etymologically connect both with each other and with the cognates in other Indo-European languages. The Baltic and Slavic forms seem to go back to a root ending in a voiceless stop -*k*-, whereas Germanic, Greek and Latin forms point to PIE *pleh₂g-.

The Baltic forms like Lith. *plàkti* 'to knock, beat', Latv. *plakt* 'to be flattened, diminish' have often been connected to PSl. *plakati (LitEW 1: 602-603). This connection remains difficult to explain. The vocalism of Lith. *plàkti* 'to beat, hit' points to a short vowel in the proto-language and to the absence of a laryngeal, whereas the accentuation of PSl. *plakati according to AP (a) suggests that the word derives from an original form with a laryngeal. The primary meaning of the Baltic forms seems to be 'to flatten', rather than 'to beat' (cf. also Lith. *plókščias*, Latv. *plākans* 'flat') and are more likely to be cognates of, e.g., OHG *flah* 'flat', ON *flaga* 'thin layer, flatness' Gr. πλάξ 'plain; flat stone, board' < PIE *plok-eh₂ (Beekes 2009: 1202, cf. LitEW 1: 602-603, De Vries 1977: 1287). For these reasons, the Baltic forms must perhaps be separated from PSl. *plakati and the other cognates altogether.

PSl. *plakati has mainly been etymologically connected to the other Indo-European forms and derived from PIE *pleh₂k-/*pleh₂g- with supposed alternation in the root final consonant (Derksen 2008: 402, cf. also Snoj 2003: 520, LitEW 1: 602-603). The original Indo-European meaning can be reconstructed as 'to bump, hit'. Slavic and Germanic are supposed to have shifted this meaning into 'to cry, curse, bewail' through the hitting oneself on the chest as an act of grief or despair (but cf. also Lat. *plangere* 'to beat, mourn (by beating one's chest)').

PSl. *plakati has alternatively been regarded as a Germanic loanword from a reflex of PGmc. *flōk-a- (recently Holzer 1990: 65, Matasović 2008: 50). This is attractive in several respects: from a semantic viewpoint is it attractive because Slavic and Germanic share the meaning 'to cry, bewail', which is largely unattested in the cognate forms and from a formal point of view because it would spare the assumption of a PIE root alternation. If the Baltic forms are to be separated from this etymon, and PSl. *plakati derives from Germanic, then not only the assumption of a PIE root alternation would be spared, but the PIE form from which the Germanic, Greek and Latin forms derive could be

reconstructed as PIE *pleh₂ǵ-. The reconstruction with a root-final palatovelar fits in better with Kortlandt's reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European phonological system with originally alternation between palatovelars and labiovelars only, and thus without a series of plain velars (cf. 2010b: 2 = 2010a: 38). Strongly against the idea of PSl. *plakati as a loanword from Germanic, however, speaks the fact that the regular reflex of PGmc. *ō in Proto-Slavic loanwords is *u rather than *a (cf. §7.2.2.2).

      PSl. *ščirъ 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'
R ščir 'Amarantus'; **Ukr.** ščir 'Amarantus'; **P** szczyr 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **US** ščěr 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **LS** ščěŕ 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **S/Cr.** štȉr 'Amarantus'; **Slov.** ščȋr, ščȇr 'Amarantus'; **Bg.** štir 'Amarantus, Atriplex'
Accentuation: AP (a)

      OHG stur, stūr, stor, stier, stir, steyr 'endive; Amaranthus blitum' (in glosses); **G** Stuhr 'Amaranthus blitum, weed, vegetable'; **MLG** stur, sture 'Amaranthus blitum' (in vocabularies 13ᵗʰ-15ᵗʰ centuries)

Etymology: PSl. *ščirъ is sometimes supposed to be a loanword from Germanic, but the Germanic origin of the word cannot be proven nor disproven. The Germanic cognates are only attested in High and Low German dialects. Brückner assumes that the word was borrowed from OHG stiuro (1927: 546), but this form does not seem to exist in the meaning of a plant-name (OHG stiuro means 'captain, steers man'). Vasmer rightly notes that a derivation from the attested Germanic forms is phonetically difficult (REW 3: 452). Schuster-Šewc rejects the idea of a borrowing from Germanic because the word is a popular plant name ("eine alte volkstümliche Pflanzenbezeichnung") and therefore not likely to be a loanword. He rather derives it from an onomatopoeic root PSl. *ščer- (from which he also derives US ščerčeć 'to rattle, flap') because the plant has seeds in capsules which make a rattling noise in the wind (HEW 19: 1419).

      PSl. *smoky 'fig (tree)' (f. ū-stem)
OCS smoky, smokъva; **R** [smókva < CS]; **P** [smokiew]; **Cz.** [smokva]; **Slk.** [smokva]; **US** [smokwa]; **LS** [smokwa]; **S/Cr.** smȍkva; **Slov.** smǫ́kəv; **Bg.** smokínja
Accentuation: AP (b); Matasović follows Kuryłowicz in considering this word to be a very late borrowing from Balkan Gothic, that entered Slavic after the operation of Dybo's law as a result of which the word had fixed initial stress throughout the paradigm (Matasović 2008: 52, Kuryłowicz 1952: 276). This is impossible (there can be no question of Gothic loanwords after Dybo's law and the vocalic reflexes also imply earlier borrowing, if the word was indeed

borrowed from Germanic) and not necessary either: the fixed initial stress results from retraction from the medial jer when it lost its stressability, as in, e.g., PSl. *petьlja 'noose, snare' and *redьky 'radish, *Raphanus sativus*' (§8.3.2).

Goth. *smakka* 'fig' (m. *n*-stem)

Etymology: The Germanic word is attested in Gothic only and the etymology is not entirely clear. The word has been related to PGmc. **smakka*- m. 'taste': Goth. *smakka* 'fig' then literally means 'tasty fruit' (Lehmann 1986: 315).

PSl. *smoky has often been thought to be a Gothic loanword (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 222 for references). Illič-Svityč, on the other hand, regards PSl. *smoky as a native formation (and thence a borrowing into Gothic). He derives the word from PSl. *mok- 'wet', which would make the original meaning of the fruit 'watery fruit' (cf. ÈSRJ 3: 689-690). The geminate in Goth. *smakka* remains, however, unexplained if the word was borrowed from Slavic and might rather be connected to the *n*-stem inflection of the word (Kroonen 2011: 111, cf. also s.v. *skotъ).

The West Slavic forms are neologisms. The fruit is called *figa* or *fig* in Old Polish and *figa* in old and dialectal Sorbian (HEW 17: 1321-1322).[112] This means that the word originally only existed in the South Slavic languages. Skok does not think it necessary to derive the South Slavic form from Gothic because both the Gothic and Slavic forms might have been both independently borrowed from another language in the Balkans, such as Thraco-Illyrian (ERHSJ 3: 294).

PSl. *tjudjь 'foreign' (adj.)
OCS *štuždь, stuždь, tuždь*; **CS** *čuždь*; **OR** *čužij*; **R** *čužój* 'foreign, strange, someone else's'; **Ukr.** *čužýj* 'foreign, strange, someone else's'; **P** *cudzy* 'foreign, someone else's'; **OCz.** *cuzí*; **Cz.** *cizí* 'foreign, unfamiliar'; **Slk.** *cudzí* 'unfamiliar, someone else's'; **US** *cuzy*; **LS** *cuzy*; **Plb.** *cau̯ǯě*; **S/Cr.** *tûđ*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *tūjī*; **Slov.** *tûj*, Gsg, *túja*; **Bg.** *čužd* 'foreign, someone else's'
Accentuation: AP (c)

---

[112] Jan Chojnan, one of the founders of the (Lower) Sorbian standard language in the first decennia of the 17th century, spent some time in the Balkans and could have learned the word there from a South Slavic language. The Polish and Sorbian forms *fig(a)* are also loanwords from Germanic, probably from Old High German *figa* 'fig', which is in turn a borrowing from Lat. *ficus* (HEW 17: 1321-1322, 4, 211-212). A similar borrowing from Germanic is P *pigwa* 'fig', OCz. *pihva* 'fig' and, through West Slavic, R *pígva* 'quince' from OHG *figa* (REW 2: 354).

PGmc. *þeudō 'people' (f. ō-stem)

Goth. þiuda f. ō-stem 'people, nation'**; OHG** thiot (m. i-stem, n. a-stem)*; diutisg* (adj.) 'German'**; MHG** tiutsch, diut(i)sch; **G** deutsch (adj.) 'German'**; OE** þēod 'people, nation; country; language'**; E** Dutch**; OFri.** thiāde, thiēde 'people'**; OS** thiod, thioda f. 'people'**; Du.** duits 'German'**; ON** þjóð f. 'people, heathen'

Cognates: Lith. (arch.) tautà 'people, nation', Latv. tàuta 'people, nation', OPr. tauto 'land', OIr. túath 'tribe, people', W tud 'country', Oscan touto 'citizenry, state', Umbrian tuta (Asg.) < European IE *teut-ā (De Vaan 2008: 618-619). Hitt. tuzzi- should not be regarded as a cognate (Kloekhorst 2008: 908).

Etymology: PGmc. *þeudō 'people' stems from European IE *teut-ā. PSl. *tjudjь cannot without formal difficulties be connected to the same root because of the stem-final *d. For this reason, PSl. *tjudjь has often been thought to be a Germanic loanword, either from Goth. *þiuda- 'people, nation' or from a reflex of WGmc. *Þeudō 'people, tribe' (Kiparsky 1934: 211, Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 708, Snoj 2003: 790-791). A semantic parallel for the development 'people' to 'foreign' has been found in Slov. ljûdski 'human, popular; foreign' (cf. REW 3: 352-353).

PSl. *tjudjь has alternatively been explained as an inherited word from PIE *teu-t- after all, with the supposition that the final *-t had dissimilated to *-d. PSl. *tvьrdъ 'hard, firm, solid' has been adduced as a similar case, for the Baltic cognates have -t, cf. Lat. tvìrtas (ESSlov. 4: 245).[113] Vasmer remains indecisive about the origin of PSl. *tjudjь and mentions both etymologies of the word (REW 3: 352-353).

South Slavic shows a difference with respect to the treatment of initial *tj, compared to East Slavic and West Slavic. In South Slavic, *tjudjь dissimilated to *tudjь, yielding S/Cr. tûđ instead of **ćûđ, Slov. tûj instead of **čûj. Kortlandt, who considers the word to be inherited, thinks this development "undoubtedly belongs to the Late Middle Slavic period" (from ca 300 to 600) (2002a: 12; 2003b: 4).

PSl. (?) *želsti 'to repay, pay for'

OCS žlěsti, 1sg. žlědǫ (Supr.); žlasti, 1sg. žladǫ (Supr.)**; OR** [želěsti, 1sg. želědu; žlěsti, 1sg. žlědu 'to pay off'; žlasti, 1sg. žladu 'to pay off' < CS]

Accentuation: AP unknown

---

[113] Holzer explains PSl. *tvьrdъ as a Tememematic loanword from *tu̯ír-do- 'enclosed, fixed' < PIE *dhwer-to- (1989: 150-152, cf. §4.7).

PGmc. *geldan- 'to pay, repay'

Goth. *-gildan* (e.g., *fragildan* 'repay'); **OHG** *geltan* 'to pay, repay; sacrifice'; **MHG** *gelten*; **G** *gelten* 'to count'; **OE** *gieldan, geldan, gyldan* 'to pay, repay; sacrifice'; **E** *to yield*; **OFri.** *jelda* 'to pay; be worth; concern'; **OS** *geldan* 'to pay, repay; be worth'; **Du.** *gelden* 'to count'; **ON** *gjalda* 'to pay, repay'[114]

Etymology: PSl. **želsti* has often been considered to be a loanword from Germanic, from a reflex of PGmc. **geldan-* 'to pay, repay' (Stender-Petersen 1927: 326, Kiparsky 1934: 190, Derksen 2008: 556-557). Vasmer rather thinks the words are related because of the "slav. Vokalverhältnisse" (REW 1: 415). OCS *žlěsti* goes back to earlier **gel-*, whereas OCS *žlasti* would seem to derive from ***gēl-*.

In Slavic, the word is only attested in Old Church Slavic (and, through Old Church Slavic, in Old Russian). OCS *žlěsti* can without phonological difficulties be derived from the Germanic forms, in which case the word must derive from West Germanic because of the Gothic raising of PGmc. **e* to *i* (§7.2.1.2). If the word is a loanword, the borrowing must be dated before the metathesis of liquid diphthongs, but because of the limited attestation of the word it cannot be excluded that the word is a late and/or regional loanword.[115] Its limited attestation is another reason not to include the word into the main corpus of certain Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

If the word is to be regarded as a native word, it can perhaps alternatively be connected to OR *željanie* 'fine', *želja* 'lamentation', *žla* 'lamentation' < PSl. **žalъ* 'grief, regret, pity', **želěti* 'to regret, grieve' (the latter form is homonymous with PSl. **želěti* 'to wish, want') (cf. Derksen 2008: 553, 555, REW 1: 410).

---

[114] The origin of PGmc. **geldan-* 'to pay for, compensate' is unclear. It has no cognates in other Indo-European languages, except for the Slavic and perhaps Baltic forms (Kluge-Seebold 2002: s.v. *gelten*, EWN: s.v. *gelden*). The word has a religious connotation in Germanic, which seems to be absent in the Slavic forms (DWb: s.v. *gelten*). Lith. *gelóju* 'to count, be worth' can rather be explained as a borrowing from Low German (Kiparsky 1934: 191).

[115] Sreznevskij cites the Old Russian forms *želěsti*, 1sg. *želědu* 'to pay for', *žlěsti*, 1sg. *žlědu* 'to pay off' and *žlasti*, 1sg. *žladu* 'to pay off'; the latter two forms are Church Slavonicisms (MSDJ 2: 853, 881). OR *želěsti* cannot be a regular reflex from PSl. **želsti* because we would expect ***želosti* with *polnoglasie* of PSl. **el* to *olo* and fronting of **o* after a palatal consonant (as in dialectal Russian *šelóm* 'covering, roofing' < PSl. **šelmъ* 'helmet').

6.3 WORDS THAT CANNOT BE REGARDED AS GERMANIC LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

PSl. *borda* 'beard; chin, throat' (f. *ā*-stem)
R *borodá* 'beard, (dial.) chin', Asg. *bórodu*; **Ukr.** *borodá* 'beard'; **P** *broda* 'beard, chin'; **Cz.** *brada* 'chin, beard'; **Slk.** *brada* 'chin, beard'; **US** *broda* 'beard, chin'; **LS** *broda* 'beard, moustache, chin'; **Plb.** *brödə* 'chin, throat'; **S/Cr.** *bráda* 'beard, chin', Asg. *brâdu*; **Slov.** *bráda* 'beard, (beardless) chin'; **Bg.** *bradá* 'chin, beard'
Accentuation: AP (c)

(N)WGmc. *barda-* 'beard' (m. or n. *a*-stem)
OHG *bart* m.; **MHG** *bart*; **G** *Bart*; **OE** *beard*; **OFri.** *berd*; **Du.** *baard*; **ON** [*barđ* < MLG *bard* (De Vries 1977: 26)]
Cognates: Lat. *barba*,[116] Lith. *barzdà*, Latv. *bằrda*, *bārzda* (dial.), OPr. *bordus* 'beard, chin' < European Indo-European *$b^h ard^h$-eh₂* (De Vaan 2008: 69, Derksen 2008: 55).

Etymology: The (European) Indo-European proto-form has been reconstructed as *$b^h arzd^h$-* in order to connect the Germanic forms deriving from (N)WGmc. *barda-* 'beard' to the Baltic forms (as well as to PSl. *borzda* 'furrow, fissure', but this connection is semantically difficult) (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 60, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Bart*). PSl. *borda* cannot derive from IE *$b^h arzd^h$-* and for this reason, the word has occasionally been regarded as a loanword, e.g., by Pedersen (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 60 for references).

This idea has now mainly been rejected and Slavic and Germanic forms are rather to be regarded as cognates (cf. ÈSSJa 2: 197-198, ESSlov. 1: 36). They are thought to be a North Indo-European substratum word, going back to *$b^h ard^h$-eh₂*. The *a* that has been reconstructed in the root which is difficult to explain via ablaut and rather points to substratum influence (De Vaan 2008: 69, Derksen 2008: 55). The forms with *-zd-* in Baltic have now been explained as secondary (Smoczyński 2007: 48, cf. LitEW 1: 36).

---

[116] The anlaut of the Latin form *barba* is irregular; the expected form would be Latin *farba* (De Vaan 2008: 69).

PSl. *čьbьrъ 'wooden tub' (m. *o*-stem)
SCS čьbьrъ**; OP** dzber**; P** czeber (dial.)**; OCz.** čber, džber, žber**; Cz.** džber**; Slk.** džber**; US** čwor**; Plb.** cabår**; S/Cr.** čàbar**; Slov.** čəbə̀r**; Bg.** čébăr
Accentuation: AP (b) (Illič-Svityč 1979: 122, Dybo 1981: 21).

OHG zubar, zwibar**; MHG** zuber, zūber**; G** *Zuber* 'tub'
Cognates: Lith. kibìras 'bucket'

Etymology: Mainly on the basis of the semantic correspondence between PSl. *čьbьrъ 'wooden tub' and the Germanic forms has the Slavic word been regarded as a Germanic loanword (by, e.g., Berneker 1: 165, cf. ESSlov. 1: 75). The supposed Germanic donor of PSl. *čьbьrъ 'wooden tub' is OHG zubar, zwibar 'tub', which is a compound of PGmc. *twai 'two' and *beran 'to carry'. The original meaning of the compound was 'container with two handles' (cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Zuber*). This etymology meets with difficulties because PSl. *čьbьrъ does not formally correspond to the attested Germanic forms. For this reason, the etymology of PSl. *čьbьrъ as a Germanic loanword has now by and large been rejected (ÈSSJa 4: 139, cf. Snoj 2003: 81, HEW 3: 131).

PSl. *čьbьrъ is rather to be regarded as an inherited word. The word is related to PSl. *čьbanъ 'jug' and has been connected to Lith. kibìras 'barrel', cf. Lith. kìbti 'to hang' (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 23-24, ÈSSJa 4: 139, Sławski 1976: 306-308). This suggests that PSl. *čьbьrъ originally denoted a vessel with a handle that could be hung from the wall (Snoj 2003: 81).[117]

PSl. *dělъ 'part' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS dělъ**; RCS** dělъ**; R** del 'share (of booty, production)'**; Ukr.** dil 'valley; lower part, bottom'**; P** dział**; Cz.** díl**; Slk.** diel**; US** dźěł**; LS** źěł**; S/Cr.** dȉo, Gsg. dijèla 'part'**; Slov.** dḗł 'part'**; Bg.** djal
Accentuation: AP (b); Derksen notes that the accentuation of PSl. *dělъ according to AP (b) conflicts with the reconstruction *deh₂i-l- (2008: 102-103).

PGmc. *daila- (m./n. *a*-stem), *daili-* (m./f. *i*-stem) 'part'
Goth. dails**; OHG** teil**; MHG** teil**; G** Teil**; OE** dǣl m.**; E** deal**; OFri.** dēl 'part, juridicial district'**; OS** dêl**; Du.** deel

---

[117] Fraenkel rejects the connection of Lith. kibìras 'bucket' with Lith. kìbti 'to hang' and Gr. κόφινος 'basket', and connects Lith. kibìras to Latv. ciba 'round wooden vessel' (LitEW 1: 250, 200).

PSl. *děliti 'to divide'
OCS *dělitъ* 3sg. (Supr.); **R** *delít'*; **P** *dzielicz*; **Cz.** *děliti*; **Slk.** *deliti*; **S/Cr.** *dijèliti*; **Slov.** *dẹlíti*; **Bg.** *delja*
Accentuation: AP (c) on the basis of Slovene, Old Russian (Zaliznjak 1985: 140). Kajkavian (Bednja) *delȉti* also points to AP (c) (Jedvaj 1956: 315).

PGmc. *dailjan- 'to divide, distribute'
Goth. *dailjan*; **OHG** *teilen*; **G** *teilen*; **OE** *dǣlan*; **OFri.** *dēla*; **OS** *dêlian*; **Du.** *delen*

Etymology: The connection of the Germanic forms with the cognates in other languages, such as Skt. *dáyate* 'divides' and Gr. δαίομαι 'divide', Lith. *dailýti* (obs.) 'to divide' < PIE *deh₂i- 'to divide' (Derksen 2008: 102, ÈSSJa 5: 8-9), is difficult because the initial PGmc. *d points to PIE *dʰ, whereas other supposed cognates point to initial PIE *d (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 64-65, Derksen 2008: 102, Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Teil*, EWN: s.v. *deel2*). The Germanic form has thus been explained from a PIE anlaut doublet *dʰ next to *d (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 64-65). The reconstruction of a PIE anlaut doublet might be avoided if the word could be explained as a borrowing from Proto-Slavic, but this is implausible in view of the extensive spread of the word throughout Germanic (cf. §4.4).

PGmc. *daila-/daili- has alternatively been separated from the supposed Indo-European cognates and has been explained as a borrowing from a substratum language (De Vries/De Tollenaere 1997: 108). Derksen adds that PIE *dʰoil- (*dʰail-) - from which the Germanic forms would derive if they were inherited from Indo-European - is an unusual root structure from a PIE point of view (2008: 102). The origin of the Germanic forms thus remains unclear.

PSl. *dělъ, *děliti are, in any case, not likely to have been borrowed from Germanic. The word has now mainly been thought to stem from PIE *deh₂i-l- < *deh₂i- 'to divide' (Snoj 2003: 100, Derksen 2008: 102, cf. ÈSSJa 5: 8-9).

PSl. *glazъ 'stone, ball' (m. *o*-stem)
OR *glazky stekljanyj* (Apl.) 'glass balls'; **R** *glaz* 'eye'; **Ukr.** *hlazký* 'iron balls to weight a (fishing) net'; **P** *głaz, głaza* 'boulder, rock'; **Cz.** *hlazec* 'type of stone'[118]
Accentuation: AP (c)?; since the word is not attested in South Slavic, and Czech and Polish give no clues about the accentuation of the word, the only basis for

---

[118] The word occurs in West and East Slavic only, but Pohl mentions the mountain name *Graslitzen* in the Carinthian Gailtal which supposedly goes back to PSl. *glazъ as well (the name *Graslitzen* occurs in early documents with initial *gl-*: *Glasitzen* (1524), *Clasitzen, Gläsitzen* (1713-17)) (2005: 140). There is no proof that this idea is correct.

reconstruction of the accentuation is Russian. R *glaz* has stem stress in the singular and end stress in the plural, which points to AP (c) (cf. Zaliznjak 1985: 137).

PGmc. **glasa-* 'glass' (n. *a*-stem)
OHG *clas*; **MHG** *glas*; **G** *Glas*; **OE** *glæs*; **OFri.** *gles*; **OS** *glas*; **Du.** *glas*

PGmc. **glaza-* 'amber, resin' (n. *a*-stem)
OE *glær* 'amber'; **MLG** *gler* 'resin'; **ON** *gler* 'glass'

Etymology: PSl. *glazъ has often been regarded as a Germanic loanword. The word is thought to have been borrowed in connection with the amber trade and the meaning of the word supposedly shifted from 'amber' to 'shining stone' in Proto-Slavic (Kiparsky 1934: 172-174). The same Germanic word was borrowed into Latin as *glēsum, glaesum* 'amber'.

For several reasons, the etymology of PSl. *glazъ as a Germanic loanword is difficult: the vocalism of the Slavic word is difficult to explain from Germanic **glaza-*, since the expected reflex of Germanic *a is PSl. *o (as in, e.g., PSl. **skotъ, *popъ, *osъlъ*). The semantic connection between the Germanic and Slavic forms is not straightforward either. The reflexes of the word in Slavic vary greatly in meaning and give the impression of being a relic rather than a relatively recent loanword: if the word was borrowed in Slavic denoting a concrete item like glass or amber, we would expect the meaning to have been retained at least in some of the Slavic languages.

The word has nowadays largely been regarded as an inherited word, although the etymology is not entirely clear. Trubačev derives the word from PIE **ǵʰel-* 'round pebble' (ĖSSJa 6: 117). PSl. *glazъ can be etymologically connected to the Germanic forms if we suppose that PSl. *z arose from *s as a result of Zupitza's law. According to Zupitza's law, PSl. *s in a stressed syllable became *z if it followed initial *m or *n or a voiced consonant plus *r or **l,* e.g., R *grozá* 'thunderstorm' compared to Lith. *grasùs* 'disgusting'. Zupitza's law is, however, based only on very few examples and cannot be proven to be correct (Shevelov 1964: 147-148, cf. Derksen 2008: 163). Vasmer connects the word to ON *klakkr* 'clod, lump' and CS *gleznъ, glezno* 'knuckle' from PIE **gloǵno-* (REW 1: 271, cf. ĖSSJa 6: 117-118).

PSl. **glumъ/*gluma* 'mockery' (m. *o*-stem, f. *ā*-stem)
OCS *glumъ* 'idle talk, mockery'; **RCS** *glumъ* 'noise, amusement'; **OR** *glumъ* 'noise, amusement'; **R** *glum* (dial.) 'stupidity, mockery, joke, noise'; **Ukr.** *hlum* 'mockery'; **P** *głum* f. (dial) 'mockery, torture, misfortune'; **OCz.** *hluma* 'actor, comedian'; **S/Cr.** *glúma* 'joke, gaiety (arch.); interpretation (theatre)'; **Slov.** *glúma* 'joke, foolishness'; **Bg.** *glúma* 'joke, mockery'

Accentuation: AP (c)? (Zaliznjak 1985: 271-276)

OE *glēam* m. 'splendour, radiance'; ON *glaumr* m. 'jubilation'
Cognates: Gr. χλεύη 'joke, mockery', χλενάζω 'to joke', Lith. *glaudas, glauda* (arch.) 'amusement', *gláudoti* 'to joke', Latv. *glaudât* 'to joke' < PIE *g^hleu-* (Pokorny 1959: 451).

Etymology: PSl. *glumъ/*gluma* has occasionally been thought to be a borrowing from Germanic (Holzer 1990: 66, cf. Kiparsky 1934: 66 for further references). This idea is, however, mainly rejected. The Slavic and Germanic forms can without any problems be derived from PIE *g^hlou-m-* and are thus rather to be regarded as inherited cognates (Derksen 2008: 167, cf. REW 1: 276, Kiparsky 1934: 66, ÈSSJa 6: 147-148).

PSl. *glupъ* (adj.) 'foolish, stupid'
CS *glupъ*; **R** *glúpyj*; **OP** *głupi*; **P** *głupi*; **Cz.** *hloupý*; **Slk.** *hlúpy*; **S/Cr.** [*glûp* < R (Kiparsky 1934: 26)]; **Slov.** *glûp*
Accentuation: AP (b) in Old Russian (Zaliznjak 1985: 136)

ON *glópr* m. 'fool'

Etymology: Because of the formal and semantic correspondences between the Germanic and Slavic forms, PSl. *glupъ* 'foolish, stupid' has been thought to derive from Germanic, most recently by Ranko Matasović (Anić 2002: 388, also Lehr-Spławiński 1929: 708, cf. Kiparsky 1934: 26-27 for further references). However, the Germanic word occurs in Scandinavian only and there is no evidence for Old Norse loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Derksen does not seem to regard PSl. *glupъ* as a Germanic loanword and calls the connection to ON *glópr* 'fool' "uncertain" (2008: 167). The word has often been connected to PSl. *glumъ* 'mockery' and *gluxъ* 'deaf' deriving from PIE *g^hleu-/*g^hlou-* (ÈSSJa 6: 151-152, REW 1: 277, ESSlov. 1: 150-151).

PSl. *gordъ* 'fortification, town' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS *gradъ*; **R** *górod*, Gsg. *góroda*; **Ukr.** *hórod* (arch.) 'city'; **P** *gród* 'fortress, castle, (arch.) city', Gsg. *grodu*; **Cz.** *hrad* 'fortress, castle'; **Slk.** *hrad* 'castle'; **US** *hród* 'castle', Gsg. *hrodu, hroda* 'castle, palace'; **LS** *grod* 'castle, palace'; **S/Cr.** *grâd*, Gsg. *grâda* 'city, fortress, castle'; **Slov.** *grâd,* Gsg. *grâda, gradû* 'city, fortress, castle'; **Bg.** *grad* 'city, fortress'
Accentuation: AP (c)

PGmc. *garda- 'fenced off area, yard' (m. *a*-stem)
Goth. *gards* m. 'house, family'**; OHG** *gart* 'circle, enclosed yard'**; OE** *geard* 'yard'**;
OS** *gard* 'field, earth; (pl.) house'**; Du.** *gaard*; **ON** *garðr* 'garden, yard, fence'
Cognates: Lith. *gar̃das* 'fence, enclosure, stall', Skt. *gr̥há-* 'house, residence', Alb.
garth 'hedge', Phryg. *-gordum* 'town', Hitt. *gurtas* 'fortress' < PIE
$\hat{g}^h$erd^h-o-/$\hat{g}^h$ord^h-o-* 'enclosure' (Pokorny 1959: 444, Derksen 2008: 178).

Etymology: This etymon is widely attested in the Indo-European languages.
PSl. *gordъ* has regularly been thought to be a loanword from Germanic
(recently, e.g., by Matasović 2008: 50, cf. ESSlov. 1: 168 for further references).
This etymology is, however, not straightforward nor generally accepted. There
are significant differences between the meaning that has been reconstructed of
PGmc. *garda-* and of PSl. *gordъ*: PSl. *gordъ* means 'fortification, (fortified)
town', whereas the Germanic forms mainly mean 'garden, yard'. Both the
Germanic and the Slavic forms can without formal difficulties be derived from
PIE *g^hord^h-* 'enclosure' < PIE *$\hat{g}^h$er-* 'to enclose, grab'. The plain velar results from
depalatalization of the Proto-Indo-European palatovelar *$\hat{g}^h$* before *r* (cf.
Kortlandt 1978b: 238-239, 2012: 1 and cf. fn. 105). This means that there is no
need to consider a borrowing (so also Derksen 2008: 178, Pokorny 1959:
442-444, Snoj 2003: 185, REW 1: 297, ÈSSJa 7: 37-38).

PSl. *kormola 'riot, rebellion'
OCS *kramola***; OR** *koromola***; R** [*kramóla* < CS]**; Ukr.** *koromóly* (arch.) 'intrigue,
plot', [*kramóla* < CS]**; Cz.** *kramola;* **Slk.** *kramola***; S/Cr.** *kramola* (arch.)*;* **Bg.**
kramolá (arch.) 'alarm, emotion, quarrel'[119]
Accentuation: AP (b), though AP (c) in Old Russian cannot be excluded
(Zaliznjak 1985: 135).

OHG *karmala* (dial. Bav.) 'revolt'

Etymology: OHG *karmala*, which is attested in the *Lex Baiuvariorum*, has been
connected to PGmc. *karma-* 'noise'.[120] The word was also borrowed from Old
High German into Middle Latin as *carmula* 'rebellion'. It says in the *Lex
Baiuvariorum* that *karmala* is a local (Bavarian) expression meaning 'revolt'
(Leeming 1974: 131). This word corresponds with regard to form and meaning

---

[119] The word also occurs in place-names in West Slavic areas, e.g., P *Kromołów,* Sorbian *Kromoła*.
[120] The *Lex Baiuvariorum* is a Bavarian law code dating from the sixth to eighth centuries. The
oldest copy dates from around 800.

exactly to PSl. *kormola. PSl. *kormola has therefore been regarded as a borrowing from High German (REW 1: 655, ĖSSJa 11: 89, M. Matasović 2011: 237), although Skok regards Middle Latin the donor language of the Proto-Slavic form (ERHSJ 2: 178).

Leeming, however, convincingly argues that PSl. *kormola must rather be regarded as a loanword from Turkic. He derives the word from Turkic *qarmala- 'to rob, plunder', which itself is a derivative of qarma 'robbery', with the verbal affix -la (1974: 130). Leeming dates the borrowing to "the period of conflicts between Slavs and Turkic people in Central Europe during the eighth and ninth centuries" and assumes that the word was subsequently taken over by the Germans in Bavaria from Proto-Slavic. The attestations of the word in Middle Latin, the earliest of which is in 818, are in texts probably originating in southern Germany as well. The occurrence of the word in one of these texts relates to the disturbances that arose as a result of German attempts to Christianize the Slavs in Carantania (cf. §7.4.2.5).[121] If OHG karmala is indeed a borrowing from Proto-Slavic, the borrowing must have occurred before the Proto-Slavic metathesis of liquids.

PSl. *ljudъ 'people' (m. *o*-stem)
OCS ljudьje; **CS** ljudъ; **R** ljud 'people, nation', ljudi pl. 'people'; **Ukr.** ljud 'people, nation', ljudy pl. 'people'; **P** lud 'people (the masses), nation', ludzie pl. 'people, community'; **OCz.** ľud; **Cz.** lid 'people, the masses', lidé pl. 'people, folk'; **Slk.** ľud 'people (the masses)'; **US** lud, ludźo; **LS** lud, luźe; **Plb.** ľau̯di, ľau̯dai̯; **S/Cr.** ljûdi 'people'; **Slov.** ljûd 'people, nation', ljudjȇ 'people'
Accentuation: AP (c)

PGmc. *leudi- 'people' (m. *i*-stem)
Burgundian leudis 'free man'; **OHG** liut(i) m./n./f.; **MHG** liute; **G** leute; **OE** lēod f.; **OFri.** liōde, liūde m. pl. 'people'; **OS** liud 'people'; **Du.** lieden pl. 'people'; **ON** ljóðr m. 'people, nation', lýðr m. 'people'[122]

---

[121] Leeming cites as sources for the Latin form the *Greater Regensburg annals*, the Gerhard of Augsburg's *Vita Sancti Oudalrici* (Udalric was bisshop of Augsburg; the word *karmala* is found in the description of the rebellion by Henry of Bavaria), and the chronicle in which the conversion of the Bavarians and the Carantanians is described (1974: 130-131).
[122] The singular form has disappeared from all modern Germanic languages (EWN: s.v. *lieden* (*mensen*)).

Cognates: Lith. *liáudis* 'people, the masses', Latv. *ļàudis* 'people', Skt. *ródhati* 'to grow', Gr. *ἐλεύθερος* 'free', Lat. *liberī* 'children' < PIE *$h_1$leud^h- 'to grow' (Pokorny 1959: 685, Derksen 2008: 282).

Etymology: Both PGmc. *leudi-* and PSl. *ljudъ* 'people' derive from PIE *$h_1$leud^h-o-* 'to grow'. Cognates are attested in Balto-Slavic, Germanic, Latin and Greek, but only the Balto-Slavic and Germanic forms mean 'people'. Because of this correspondence, the word has sometimes been regarded as a borrowing from Germanic into Proto-Slavic (Stender-Petersen 1927: 189ff., Vaillant 1950: 123). The Slavic and Germanic forms have, however, more generally been regarded as inherited cognates, which does not pose any formal or semantic problems (Kiparsky 1934: 73, Derksen 2008: 282, ÈSSJa 15: 194-200, Snoj 2003: 361, HEW 12: 865, cf. Derksen 2008: 437).

          PSl. *mečь/*mъčь* 'sword' (m. *jo*-stem)
OCS *mečь*; **R** *meč*, Gsg. *mečá*; **Ukr.** *meč*; **P** *miecz*; **Cz.** *meč*; **Slk.** *meč*; **US** *mječ*; **LS** *mjac*; **S/Cr.** *mȁč*, Gsg. *màča*; **Slov.** *mèč*; **Bg.** *meč*
Accentuation: AP (b)

          PGmc. *mē̱k-*
Goth. *mekeis* m. (attested Asg. *meki*); **Crimean Gothic** *mycha*; **OE** *mēce*; **OS** *māki* m; **ON** *mækir*

Etymology: Fick/Falk/Torp connect PGmc. *mē̱k-* to OIr. *machtaim* 'slaughter (1sg.)' (1909: 303). The ultimate origin of the word is unclear and has, perhaps apart from the Old Irish from, no cognates in the other Indo-European languages (De Vries 1977: 399, Lehmann 1986: 250). Green places the origin of the Northwest Germanic forms in Gothic and supposes that the word was borrowed into Gothic "from one of the Iranian peoples in southern Russia" (1998: 178). A cognate would then be Pahlavi *magēn* 'sword' (cf. REW 2: 158). As Green himself notes, this is a difficult scenario because the word is first attested in Old Norse already around 250, which would presuppose a very early borrowing from Gothic (directly?) into Old Norse. Green therefore assumes that the borrowing of the word might be located in the supposed homeland of the Goths in the Vistula area (1998: 178), but the homeland of the Goths cannot with certainty be located to the Baltic Sea coast (cf. §4.1.2).
          The origin of PSl. *mečь/*mъčь* has been disputed. The main problem is the twofold reflex of the root vowel: S/Cr. *ȁ* goes back to a jer, but Slovene and Russian point to a proto-form *mečь. In Old Church Slavic, both *mečь* and *mъčь* are attested. Neither the short *e nor the jer in the root in Slavic correspond to the long stem vowel in Gothic (unlike Finnic forms such as Fin. *miekkä,* which

were borrowed from Germanic *mēkia (De Vries 1977: 399)). For this reason, the word cannot be a loanword from Germanic (ĖSSJa 18: 38-42). Kortlandt attributes the alternation between *e* and *ь* to pretonic raising of *e* in a palatal environment and does not regard the word to be a Germanic loanword (1984-1985: 367-368). Derksen allows the possibility that the word was borrowed from Germanic because Kortlandt dates pretonic raising of *e* in a palatal environment prior to Dybo's law and Derksen sees no particular reason to regard *mečь* as an old oxytone noun (2008: 305). The word is in any case very unlikely to be an old oxytone noun if it was borrowed from Germanic because the stress in Germanic languages was fixed on the word-initial syllable.

Kiparsky considers PSl. *mečь/*mьčь to be a borrowing from a Caucasian language, rather than from Germanic (1934: 138-141). Vasmer supposed that both the Slavic and the Germanic forms are borrowings from an unknown language and he also mentions similar words in Caucasian languages: Georgian *maχva* 'sharp; sword', Udi *meχ* 'sickle', Lezgian *maχ* 'iron' (REW 2: 158).

PSl. *mъrky* 'carrot, carrots' (f. *ū*-stem)
OR. morkovь, morkva; **R** morkóv', mórkva (dial.), morkvá (dial.); **Ukr.** mórkva; **OP** marchew; **P** marchew; **OCz.** mrkev; **Cz.** mrkev; **Slk.** mrkva; **US** morchej;[123] **LS** marchej; **S/Cr.** mr̃kva; **Slov.** mŕkəv, Gsg. mŕkve; (dial.) mr̃kva
Accentuation: AP (b)

WGmc. *murhōn 'carrot' (f. *n.*-stem)
OHG moraha, more; **MHG** mor(c)he, more; **G** Möhre; **OE** more, moru '(edible) root, carrot'; **OS** morha
Cognates: Possibly Gr. (Hsch.) βράκανα 'wild vegetable' (< *mrak-) (Pokorny 1959; 750, Mallory/Adams 1997: 620).

Etymology: The word is attested in West Germanic only and goes back to WGmc. *murhōn. PSl. *mъrky has been thought to be a loanword from Germanic, mainly, it seems because the word belongs to *ū*-stem declination in Slavic, which contains many (Germanic) loanwords (Knutsson 1929: 31-36, ERHSJ 2: 469, but cf. §7.3.4). This etymology is however formally impossible because Germanic *h does not yield PSl. *k, but PSl. *x (cf. §7.2.1.7).

---

[123] Trubačev derives the Polish and Sorbian forms from *mъrxy, which he regards to be a later borrowing from Germanic (ĖSSJa 20: 247-249). According to Schuster-Šewc, the *ch* for *k in Sorbian is no proof for later borrowing and he derives these forms from PSl. *mъrky as well (HEW 13: 950).

Derksen derives PSl. *mъrky from PIE *mrk-uH and considers the Germanic forms to be inherited cognates (2008: 335). Mallory/Adams regard *mrk- to be a late (central and western) Indo-European term and date the spread of the carrot over Europe before the beginning of the first millennium (1997: 433-434, 620, cf. ÈSSJa 20: 247-249).

PSl. *remy 'bridle, belt' (m. *n*-stem)
OCS *remenь*; **OR** *remykъ*; **R** *reménь*, Gsg. *remnjá*; **Ukr.** *réminь*; **OP** *rzemień*; *rzemyszek*; **P** *rzemień*; **Cz.** *řemen*; **Slk.** *remeň*; **US** *rjemjeń*; **LS** *rjemjeń*; **S/Cr.** *rȅmēn*; *rèmik*; **Slov.** *rémen*, Gsg. *reménạ*; *jérmen*, Gsg. *jerménạ*;[124] **Bg.** *rémǎk*
Accentuation: AP (b)?

PGmc. *reumn- 'belt' (cf. Pronk 2010: 315) (m. *n*-stem)
OHG *riomo*; **MHG** *rieme*; **G** *Riemen*; **OE** *rēoma* 'membrane, ligament'; **OS** *riomo*; **Du.** *riem*
Cognates: The Germanic and Slavic forms are either borrowings from a substratum language or cognates with Gr. ἐρέφω 'to cover', ὄροφος 'cover, roof' (Matasović 2010: 304).[125]

Etymology: Kiparsky considers PSl. *remy to be a loanword from Germanic (1934: 262), but this etymology is formally impossible because PSl. *e cannot be a reflex from Germanic *eu. Derksen seems to regard this word as an inherited word, rather than as a borrowing from Germanic, and calls the relationship with Germanic "unclear" (2008: 433). PSl. *remy belongs to the archaic *n*-stem declension, which is reason for Vasmer to reject the etymology of PSl. *remy as a Germanic loanword (REW 2: 510).

Both the Slavic and Germanic forms are most likely to be inherited. Matasović derives the Proto-Slavic form, as well as the Germanic form from *reg-men < PIE *Hregʷʰ-men. PSl. *g was (regularly) lost before *m and in his article, Matasović gives a number of other examples of Proto-Slavic words in which this happened (2010: 304). The Germanic forms can also be derived from PIE *Hregʷʰ-mn-, but with a zero-grade in the suffix: in this position, *m was syllabic and *gʷʰ yielded *w in Germanic between vowels (Pronk 2010: 314-315).

---

[124] Pronk derives Slov. *jérmen*, Gsg. *jerménạ* from the same proto-form, but with a zero grade in the root: *jъrC- : *reC-, where the zero grade form *jъrC- was retained in Slovene next to Slov. *rémen*, which reflects a full grade (2010: 314).

[125] Pokorny derives the Greek forms from PIE *rebʰ- and connects them to the Slavic and Germanic words for 'rib' (1959: 853).

PSl. *strěla* 'arrow, lightning' (f. *ā*-stem)
OCS *strěla*; **R** *strelá* 'arrow, shaft'; **Ukr.** *strilá* 'arrow, bolt'; **P** *strzała*; **Cz.** *střela* 'bullet, shot'; **Slk.** *strela* 'missile, shot'; **US** *třěł* (arch.) 'arrow'; **LS** *stśěła* (arch.) 'arrow'; **S/Cr.** *strijèla*, Npl. *strȉjele*; **Slov.** *strẹ́la* 'arrow'*;* **Bg.** *strelá* 'arrow'
Accentuation: AP (c)

WGmc. *strǣlō* 'arrow' (f. *ō*-stem)
OHG *strāla*; **MHG** *strāl(e)*; **G** *Strahl* 'beam'; **OE** *strǣl* m./f.; **NFri.** *striel*; **OS** *strāla* f.; 'arrow, thunderbolt'; **Du.** *straal* 'beam'
Cognates: Lith. *strėlà* 'arrow, lightning', the further origin is unclear (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Strahl*).

Etymology: The origin of WGmc. *strǣlō*, and its supposed cognates in Balto-Slavic, is unclear. The forms are thought to have been borrowed from a substratum language (EWN: s.v. *straal*, cf. Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Strahl*). PSl. *strěla* and the Germanic forms have alternatively been thought to be inherited cognates deriving from PIE *streh₁-leh₂* (Snoj 2003: 704, cf. ERHSJ 2: 345, HEW 18: 1368), but the reconstruction with a laryngeal cannot be reconciled with the mobile accentuation of PSl. *strěla*.

PSl. *strěla* has occasionally been regarded as a Germanic loanword, recently by Holzer and Matasović (Holzer 1990: 67, Matasović 2008: 50). According to Holzer, the etymology of the word as a Germanic loanword has the advantage that one does not have to assume that both Germanic and Slavic received the suffix *-leh₂*, and that both underwent a shift of meaning to 'arrow', although these arguments become invalid if one assumes that these features resulted from a common donor form or from a shared innovation within Balto-Slavic and Germanic (1990: 67).

7 THE ORIGIN OF THE LOANWORDS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In the present chapter, the phonological, morphological and semantic characteristics of the loanwords will be discussed. On this basis, it will be summarized and further investigated which indications enable us to establish the Germanic donor language of the loanwords. In §5.2-§5.6, the certain loanwords from Germanic were discussed and these 78 words form the basis of this chapter. In the following overview, the loanwords are schematically listed:

	Proto-Slavic:	Meaning:	Stem class:
AP (a)	*bljudo	'plate, dish'	n. o-stem
	*bukъ	'beech'	m. o-stem
	*buky	'beech(nut); letter; book, document'	f. ū-stem
	*duma	'advice, thought, opinion'	f. ā-stem
	*koldędźь	'well, spring'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem
	*lixva	'interest, usury'	f. ā-stem
	*lukъ	'chive, onion'	m. o-stem
	*nuta	'cow, cattle'	f. ā-stem
	*orky	'box'	f. ū-stem
	*pěnędźь	'penny, coin'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem
	*plugъ	'plough'	m. o-stem
	*šelmъ	'helmet'	m. o-stem
	*skrin(j)a	'chest'	f. a- or jā-stem
	*stǫpa	'pestle, mortar'	f. ā-stem
	*tynъ	'fence'	m. o-stem
	*vitędźь	'hero, knight'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem
	*volxъ	'Romance-speaking person/people'	m. o-stem
	*xlěbъ	'loaf, bread'	m. o-stem

	*xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a	'small house, cottage'	
AP (b) heavy	*cěsarь, *cesarь, *cьsarь	'(Roman) emperor'	m. *jo*-stem
	*cьrky	'church'	f. *ū*-stem
	*grędelь	'plough-beam, axis'	m. *jo*-stem
	*korljь	'king'	m. *jo*-stem
	*kupiti	'to buy'	
	*kusiti	'to try, taste'	
	*lagy	'bottle, cask'	f. *ū*-stem
	*lěkъ	'medicine'	m. *o*-stem
	*lugъ	'lye, caustic soda'	m. *o*-stem
	*myto	'toll, payment'	n. *o*-stem
	*ǫborъ(kъ)	'bucket, quantity of grain'	m. *o*-stem
	*pъlkъ	'regiment, crowd'	m. *o*-stem
	*skutъ	'hem; clothing covering the legs'	m. *o*-stem
	*trǫba	'trumpet'	f. *ā*-stem
	*vino	'wine'	n. *o*-stem
	*vinogordъ	'vineyard'	m. *o*-stem
	*xlěvъ	'cattle shed, stable'	m. *o*-stem
	*xǫsa	'robbery, trap'	f. *ā*-stem
	*xъlmъ	'hill'	m. *o*-stem
AP (b) light	*brъnja	'harness, suit of armour'	f. *jā*-stem
	*gonoziti	'to save'	
	*goneznǫti	'to recover'	
	*kotьlъ	'kettle'	m. *o*-stem
	*kъbьlъ	'tub; quantity of grain'	m. *o*-stem

	*kъnędźь	'prince, ruler'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem
	*lьvъ	'lion'	m. o-stem
	*nebozězъ/*nabozězъ	'wood drill'	m. o-stem
	*osьlъ	'donkey'	m. o-stem
	*ovotjь,*ovotje	'fruit'	m. jo-stem; n. jo-stem
	*petьlja	'noose, snare'	f. jā-stem
	*popъ	'clergyman, (Orthodox) priest'	m. o-stem
	*postъ	'fast, Lent'	m. o-stem
	*postiti sę	'to fast'	
	*redьky, *rъdьky	'radish, *Raphanus sativus*'	f. ū-stem
	*skotъ	'cattle'	m. o-stem
	*stьklo	'glass(ware)'	n. o-stem
	*velьblǫdъ	'camel'	m. o-stem
	*xrьstъ	'cross, Christ, baptism'	m. o-stem
	*krьstъ	'cross, Christ, baptism'	m. o-stem
AP (c)	*dъlgъ	'debt'	m. o-stem
	*jьstъba	'(heated) room'	f. ā-stem
	*lьstь	'cunning (trick)'	f. i-stem
unkn. AP	*bъdьnja, *bъdьnjь	'tub'	f. jā-stem; m. jo-stem
	*gobina/*gobino	'wealth, abundance'	f. ā-stem; n. o-stem
	*gobьdźь	'wealth, abundance'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem
	*gorazdъ	'experienced, able' (adj.)	
	*likъ	'choir (?)'	m. o-stem
	*pergynja	'impenetrable covert (?)'	f. ja-stem
	*pila	'saw, file'	f. ā-stem
	*retędźь	'chain(s)'	m. jo-stem < m. o-stem

	*skъlędźь, *stъlędźь, *štъlędźь	'coin'	m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem
	*userędźь	'earring'	m. *jo*-stem < m. *o*-stem
	*užasъ	'horror, amazement'	m. *o*-stem
	*(u-)žasnǫti	'to terrify, frighten'	
	*vaga	'weight; scales'	f. *ā*-stem
	*vъrtogordъ	'garden'	m. *o*-stem
	*xǫdogъ	'skill (?)'	m. *o*-stem
	*xula	'abuse, revile'	f. *ā*-stem
	*xuliti	'to abuse, revile'	

The following words are probably of Gothic origin: PSl. *bljudo, *dъlgъ, *gobina/*gobino/*gobъdźь, *kotьlъ, *kupiti, *kusiti, *lěkъ, *lixva, *lьstь, *lьvъ, *osьlъ, *stъklo, *userędźь, *užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti, *velьblǫdъ, *vino, *vinogordъ, *xlěbъ.

The majority of the loanwords seem to stem from West Germanic dialects or, more specifically, from High and Low German dialects. As for the West Germanic loanwords, it is for most words impossible to decide between High and Low German origin: PSl. *bukъ, *buky, *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь, *cьrky, *gonoziti/*goneznǫti, *grędelь, *jьstъba, *kъnędźь, *lugъ, *lukъ, *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ, *nuta, *pěnędźь, *plugъ, *retędźь, *šelmъ, *stǫpa, *trǫba, *tynъ, *vaga, *vitędźь, *vъrtogordъ, *xǫdogъ, *xula/*xuliti, *xysъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a, *xyzъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a are probably of West Germanic origin, but the exact donor dialect cannot be established. The words PSl. *korljь, *kъbьlъ, *lagy, *ǫborъ(kъ), *skrin(j)a and *xrьstъ seem to stem from High German, whereas PSl. *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja, *pila, *redьky/*rьdьky and *xlěvъ might have been borrowed from Low German dialects.

The donor language of PSl. *brънja, *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *duma, *gorazdъ, *koldędźь, *krьstъ, *likъ, *myto, *orky, *pergynja, *popъ, *postъ/*postiti sę,

*pъlkъ, *skotъ, *skutъ, *skъlędźъ/*stъlędźъ/*štъlędźь, *volxъ, *xǫsa and *xъlmъ remains unclear.[126]

7.2 PHONOLOGICAL ADAPTATION OF THE LOANWORDS

7.2.1 INDICATIONS ABOUT THE DONOR LANGUAGE

In the following section, an overview will be given of the innovations in Gothic and in West Germanic that may provide information about the donor language of the loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

When the loanwords entered Proto-Slavic and became integrated in the language, they were adapted to the existing phonological system of Proto-Slavic. The phonological system of Proto-Slavic around the beginning of the first millennium, roughly 0-300 AD, has been reconstructed as follows: it consisted of the obstruents: *p, *b, *t, *d, *k, *g, *ʔ, *s, *z, *x; the resonants *m, *n, *r, *l; the approximants *j, *w and the vowels *i, *ī, *iN, *e, *ē, *eN, *a, *ā, *oN, *u, *ū, *uN. This inventory reflects a stage after the merger of *a, *ā with *o, *ō into *a, *ā, and after the rise of nasal vowels (*iN, *eN, *oN, *uN), but before the loss of the laryngeals as segmental phonemes (Kortlandt 2002a: 9, 2003b: 4). In the following centuries, up until the end of Proto-Slavic, the language changed radically. Not all changes can be listed and elaborated on here. For an overview and relative chronology of the development of Proto-Slavic, I refer to Kortlandt 2002a.

---

[126] Kiparsky in some cases assumes a different origin of the Slavic word than the donor language supposed here. He considers PSl. *kъnędźь, *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ, *nuta, *šelmъ, *xlěvъ, *xǫdogъ (which I regard as borrowings from West Germanic) to stem from Proto-Germanic. PSl. *buky/*bukъ would have been borrowed on four different occasions from different Germanic dialects. From the words for which it is in my view impossible to decide about the origin, Kiparsky regards PSl. *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *likъ, *lixva, *lъstъ, *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xǫsa as (Balkan) Gothic loanwords; *duma, *gonoziti/*goneznǫti, *pergynja, *skotъ, *tynъ, *volxъ, *xъlmъ as Proto-Germanic loanwords and *brъnja, *myto, *orky, *popъ, *postъ/*postiti sę, *skъlędźъ/*stъlędźъ/*štъlędźь as West Germanic loanwords (1934: 226-270). Kiparsky remains undecided about the origin of PSl. *lьvъ and does not include the word in his main corpus and neither does he regard PSl. *dъlgъ, *gorazdъ, *koldędźь, *redьky/*rъdьky, *užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti, *vъrtogordъ, *xula/*xuliti as Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic.

The following overview shows the basic correspondences between the vowel systems of the Germanic donor languages and of different stages that have been reconstructed for Proto-Slavic.

Germanic donor phoneme	Correspondence in early Proto-Slavic (0-300 AD)	Correspondence in late Proto-Slavic (750-900)
*ī	*ī	*i
*ē₁	*ē	*ě
*ū	*ū	*y
*ō	*au	*u
*ā (WGmc. only)	(*ā)	*a
*i	*i	*ь
*e	*e	*e
*u	*u	*ъ
*a	*a	*o
*ai	*ai	*ě
*au	*au	*u
*am, *an, *um, *un	*oN	*ǫ
*em, *en, *im, *in	*eN	*ę[127]
(*ei = [ī] (Goth.)	(*ī)	*i)[128]
(*iu (Goth.)	-	*ju)[129]

---

[127] Words with a tautosyllabic sequence of vowel and *m or *n developed into a nasal vowel *ǫ or *ę in Slavic, depending on the vowel: Germanic *am/n and *un yielded PSl. *ǫ, e.g., WGmc. *stampa-, *trumba- > PSl. *stǫpa, *trǫba. Germanic *in yielded PSl. *ę: PGmc. suffix -inga- > PSl. -ędžь, NWGmc. *grindila- (or *grendila-) > PSl. *grędelь.
[128] Only PSl. *lixva, see below.
[129] Only PSl. *bljudo, see below.

7.2.1.1 *THE DEVELOPMENT OF PGMC. *Ē₁*

PGmc. *$\bar{e}$ (< PIE *$\bar{e}$) is traditionally written as *$\bar{e}_1$ and phonetically reconstructed as [ē] or [æ].[130] The reflexes of PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ in Gothic are different from the reflexes in West Germanic: the Gothic reflex is /ē/ and the reflexes in Old High German, Old Saxon and Old Norse are /ā/, e.g., Goth. -*letan*, OHG *lāzan*, OS *lātan*, ON *láta* 'to leave, let' (in Anglo-Frisian, PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ is reflected as /æ/).

In the traditional view, PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ is supposed to have developed into *ā* in the entire Northwest Germanic dialect continuum, before it was fronted again to *æ* in Anglo-Frisian; the reflex *ē* in Gothic is regarded as an archaism (cf. Nielsen 1985: 232-235). According to another interpretation, put forward by Bennett, the change of PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ to *$\bar{a}$ took place in the central Germanic dialects only, but not in the peripheral languages Gothic, Old English and Old Frisian (1950: 232-235).[131]

As we have seen above, the reflex of PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ is *ā* in High and Low German and *ē* in Gothic. On the basis of this contrast, PSl. *$l\check{e}k\breve{u}$ must be regarded as a Gothic loanword and PSl. *vaga* as a West Germanic loanword.

7.2.1.2 *THE RAISING OF PGMC. *E IN GOTHIC*

In Gothic, PGmc. *i and *e merged into *i*, whereas these vowels remained distinct in North and West Germanic. On the basis of this development, PSl. *šelmъ cannot be a borrowing from Gothic. Because PSl. *goneznǫti does not reflect the raising of PGmc. *e, the word, as well as PSl. *gonoziti, is likely to derive from West Germanic. Although 'lion' is not attested in Gothic, it is attractive to derive PSl. *lьvъ from Gothic because of the *i*-vocalism in the

---

[130] PGmc. *$\bar{e}_1$ is distinguished from PGmc. *$\bar{e}_2$, which occurs in a limited number of (categories of) words only, for example in loanwords from Latin and certain verbal classes. In the Germanic languages, *$\bar{e}_2$ has usually more closed reflexes that PGmc. *$\bar{e}_2$, e.g., Goth. *her*, ON *hér*, OHG *hiar, hear, hier*, OS *hēr*, OFri. *hēr, hīr* < PGmc. *$h\bar{e}_2r$ 'here'. PGmc. *$\bar{e}_2$ is traditionally thought to represent [ē] phonetically (König/Van der Auwera 1994: 23). Kortlandt reconstructs a diphthongal realisation [ea] for *$\bar{e}_2$ (2010: 189). PGmc. *$\bar{e}_2$ (if it is indeed to be reconstructed as a diphthong [ea]) was monophthongized in Northwest Germanic, except in High German, where the symmetry in the vocalic system was restored by diphthongizing *$\bar{o}$ (Kortlandt 2010a: 191).

[131] The theory that the original reflex of *$\bar{e}_1$ in West Germanic is [ē] or [æ] rather than /ā/ is supported by the fact that the reflex of this vowel appears as *ē* in writings by classical authors in the first centuries AD, e.g., those by Caesar who writes *Suēbi* (not **Suābi*) for the Germanic tribe Suebi (Bennett 1950: 235; cf. Nielsen 1985: 232-235 for a detailed discussion of the problem). The reflex of PIE *$\bar{e}$ in the Dutch dialects of West Flanders, Zealand, South Holland, Utrecht, and the southern part of North Holland as *æ* is considered to be an archaism (Kortlandt 1986: 440).

Proto-Slavic borrowing. If we derive PSl. *xlěvъ from a reflex of PGmc. *hlew(j)a- 'cover (against the weather)' instead of from a reflex of PGmc. *hlaiwa- 'burial mound, grave', then the word must also have been borrowed from West Germanic because PGmc. *hlew(j)a- is reflected in Gothic as hlija*.

7.2.1.3 THE UMLAUT IN (NORTH AND) WEST GERMANIC

In North Germanic and West Germanic, several umlaut processes can be distinguished: these are the a-umlaut, i-umlaut and u-umlaut. No umlaut took place in Gothic. The umlaut processes started as allophonic variation in the accented vowel influenced by the vowel in the following syllable. The umlaut processes were phonemicised at different moments; the a-umlaut was phonemicised the earliest and the u-umlaut the latest (Nielsen 1985: 93). The reflexes of the u-umlaut are limited to North Germanic (Nielsen 2000: 264) and will not therefore be further discussed in this chapter.

As a result of the a-umlaut, the mid and low vowels PGmc. *a, *ē₁ or *ō in second syllables lowered short high vowels in the preceding stressed syllable: PGmc. *i > e and PGmc. *u > o (Hirt 1931: 45, Nielsen 1985: 218). The a-umlaut also affected *u in the Proto-Germanic diphthong *eu: in those positions where the umlaut operated, PGmc. *eu developed into eo in Old High German and into eo, io, ia or ie in Old Saxon (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 49-51, 57, Gallée 1910: 79).

The a-umlaut is shared by the earliest attested North and West Germanic languages. The Runic inscription on the golden horn of Gallehus, which has been dated to the early fifth century (probably around 400) already shows the reflex of the a-umlaut: horna 'horn', rather than *hurna. The a-umlaut might be dated to late Proto-Germanic, although it must have operated after the Goths moved away from the Proto-Germanic dialect continuum, in view of the fact that the a-umlaut is not attested in Gothic.

Because the a-umlaut might be dated as early as late Proto-Germanic, it is expected that the a-umlaut is reflected in the West Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Langobardic generally participated in the Northwest Germanic a-umlaut. The language has nevertheless u instead of expected o before an l in closed syllables, e.g., fulcfree 'free', Culdo (personal name, cf. OHG Goldericus) (Bruckner 1895: 80-85). It remains therefore unclear whether PSl. *pъlkъ and *xъlmъ stem from Gothic or from Langobardic. PSl. *stъklo clearly derives from Gothic because the a-umlaut in West Germanic lowered *i in the initial syllable to e and yielded OHG stehhal. PSl. *ovotjь/*ovotje can be identified as a West Germanic loanword because the initial syllable shows the a-umlauted reflex of the Proto-Germanic prefix *ub- to ob-.

NWGmc. *trumba 'trumpet' (PSl. *trǫba) and PGmc. *brunjō- 'harness, breastplate' (PSl. *brъnja) did not participate in the a-umlaut because the a-umlaut did not operate before a nasal cluster (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 35). It is unclear why (N)WGmc. *stubō does not show reflexes of the a-umlaut in High German.

As a result of the i-umlaut, the North and West Germanic stressed back vowels *a, *ā, *o, *ō, *u and *ū were fronted before *i, *ī or *j in the following syllable (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 55).[132] It has been thought that the i-umlaut started in Anglo-Frisian before the Anglo-Saxon migration to Britain (the i-umlaut has been dated to the sixth century in Old English), and spread from there to Old Norse, where it has been dated to the seventh century (dating by Luick, cf. Nielsen 1985: 89-90). It has more recently been believed that the Germanic umlaut processes are caused by "subphonemic variation in the accented vowels in umlaut conditions, i.e. before a, i, u in the following syllables" and were phonemicised at different points of time (Nielsen 1985: 93). This means that the interpretation of the i-umlaut as a development that spread from Anglo-Frisian to other Northwest Germanic languages cannot be maintained (ibid). Kortlandt dates the i-umlaut after the Anglo-Frisian palatalization and second English palatalization because the umlauted vowels did not palatalize *k and *g (2010a: 277). In his relative chronology of phonological developments in Anglo-Frisian, he regards the i-umlaut to be a late development that took place independently in Anglian and Frisian (2010a: 280).

Nielsen considers the i-umlaut to have been phonemicised in Old Norse by the time of the Blekinge inscriptions, which he dates to the seventh century (2000: 121). Kortlandt dates the writing of both the Stentoften and the Björketorp rune stones that were found in Blekinge before the i-umlaut of short vowels, but he dates the Stentoften rune stone before or around the i-umlaut of long vowels, whereas the Björketorp rune stone dates from after the i-umlaut of long vowels (2010a: 308-309; on the separation of the i-umlaut of long and short vowels, cf. Kortlandt 1992b). In contrast to the umlaut reflexes in Old English and Old Norse (which have early umlaut reflexes of all back vowels), only the "Primärumlaut" of *a > e is attested in Old Saxon and Old High German until the tenth century. This reflex is found from the eighth century onwards. The umlaut in Old High German dates after the loss of final short vowels after a long

---

[132] PGmc. *e was raised to *i in North and West Germanic before *i, *ī, *j in the following syllable. This development might have been Proto-Germanic (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 19-20, 32).

root syllable, cf. OHG *anst*, GDsg. *ensti* 'favour' (Kortlandt 1993b: 19). The *i*-umlaut of the other back vowels is attested in Middle High German and Middle Low German manuscripts from the tenth century onwards (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 55-56), and is therefore not expected to be reflected in the Proto-Slavic loanwords.

The loanwords PSl. **kotьlъ* and **osьlъ* do not reflect the *i*-umlaut and point to a donor form **katil-* and **asil-*, respectively. The same goes for PSl. **gobina/*gobino/*gobьdźь*. For this reason, these words have often been regarded as borrowings from Gothic. Nevertheless, because the *i*-umlaut occurred relatively late in the West Germanic dialects the Slavs came into contact with, it cannot be excluded that the words were borrowed from West Germanic before the *i*-umlaut took place. PSl. **petьlja* and **redьky* (**rъdьky*), on the other hand, do reflect the Germanic *i*-umlaut and must therefore be regarded as late borrowings from West Germanic. The vocalism in the initial syllable of PSl. **pěnędźь* results from compensatory lengthening of **penn- > *pěn-*. PSl. **pěnędźь* must therefore derive from a Germanic form in which the initial syllable of original **pandinga-/*pantinga-* had umlauted to **pen-*. This is one of the reasons to derive PSl. **pěnędźь* from West Germanic.

7.2.1.4   RHOTACISM OF **Z TO R IN (NORTH AND) WEST GERMANIC

In North and West Germanic, PGmc. **z* developed into *r* (Nielsen 2000: 213ff.). This development is called rhotacism. Rhotacism did not take place in Gothic, where PGmc. **z* is retained as *z* (and devoiced to *s* in final position), e.g., Goth. *dius*, OS *dior-*, OHG *tior* 'wild animal' (E *deer*). Nielsen regards it "safe to conclude" that the change **z > r* was not completed by the end of the Early Runic period.[133] Because the development of PGmc. **z* to *r* took place in West Germanic prior to the earliest attestations in manuscripts, the rhotacism can be dated somewhere between the fourth/fifth and eighth centuries.

The effects of the rhotacism are not found among the Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic, with the exception of the Kashubian, Slovincian and Polabian reflexes of NWGmc. **nabagaiza-*: Kash. *ńebᵘòzwř*; Slnc. *ńebᵘ̓ɵzǫř*; Plb. *nebüźår*. PSl. **gorazdъ* has been regarded as a loanword from Gothic because of the absence of the rhotacized reflex, but this is not a compelling argument because the rhotacism in West Germanic cannot be accurately dated and seems to have operated relatively late.

---

[133] Kortlandt identifies Runic <R> with voiceless *r* which originated from the "general devoicing of obstruents in North-West Germanic as a result of Grimm's law" (2003c: 73).

7.2.1.5   GEMINATES IN GERMANIC

Several gemination processes have taken place in Proto-Germanic, as well as in West Germanic, which have led to the existence of a large amount of geminate consonants in the Germanic languages (*pp, *tt, *kk; *bb, *dd, *gg; *ff, *þþ, *hh; *ss). In West Germanic, obstruents geminated before *j and partly also before *r, *l, *w (*n). The geminate was sometimes shortened after a long vowel, and regularly in auslaut or before another consonant (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 80, 95-102; the details are left out of consideration). The Proto-Germanic geminates occur especially frequently in the *n*-stems and in the second class of weak verbs (Kroonen 2011: 41). Geminated stops are very rare in Gothic and are found in only four words: Goth. *sakkus* 'sack' (Lat. *saccus*), *smakka* 'fig tree', *skatts* 'money' and *atta* 'father'. Kroonen supposes that the geminated stops in Gothic were in fact more frequent than Wulfila's Bible translation leads one to suspect and that the geminates are for unclear reasons underrepresented in the Gothic texts. The same has been supposed for the Old Saxon *Heliand* epic. Although geminated stops are amply attested in Middle Low German and thus probably existed in Old Saxon as well, they are infrequently rendered in the *Heliand* manuscript (2011: 110-111).

The Proto-Slavic phonological system did not possess geminate consonants and the Germanic geminates are therefore not expected to be represented as such. The geminate consonant of the donor form of PSl. *skotъ (and *smoky, if that word is to be regarded as a loanword from Germanic, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. *smoky) is reflected as a single consonant.

7.2.1.6   FRICATIVES IN GERMANIC: GRIMM'S LAW AND VERNER'S LAW

The consonantal system of Proto-Germanic was shaped by a restructuring of the consonant system that affected all PIE stops and is called Grimm's law. According to the classic formulation, Grimm's law is a consonant shift that turned the PIE voiceless stops *p, *t, *k^(w) into fricatives, PGmc. *f, *þ, *h^(w). The PIE voiced stops *b, *d, *g^(w) yielded voiceless stops PGmc. *p, *t, *k^(w). The PIE voiced aspirated stops *bʰ, *dʰ, *gʰ^(w) lost their aspiration. In the traditional analysis, the reflexes of the PIE voiced stops *b, *d, *g^(w) were reconstructed for Proto-Germanic as voiced fricatives *b̄, *d̄, *g (e.g., Kluge 1913: 48, Streitberg 1900: 116). It has more recently been supposed that the PIE voiced aspirated stops turned into simple voiced stops *b, *d, *g^(w) in Proto-Germanic (e.g., Kortlandt 1988: 3-4, Ringe 2006: 100). The reason for this is that the fricative pronunciation (as in Low German and Dutch) seems to be more recent than the pronunciation as stops (as in Scandinavian, English and High German) (Beekes/De Vaan 2011: 132).

In a number of Germanic words, the PIE voiceless stops *p, *t, *$k^{(w)}$ have a voiced realization, either as voiced stops or as fricatives (in the same way as the PIE voiced aspirated stops *b^h, *d^h, *$g^{h(w)}$). PIE *s is, similarly, often reflected as *z in Germanic. This voicing was explained by Verner's law: the voiceless obstruents became voiced unless the preceding vowel carried the PIE accent. Goth. *broþar* thus has a voiceless fricative *þ* (< PIE *t) because the obstruent directly followed the originally accented syllable of PIE *$b^hréh_2tēr$ 'brother'. The reflexes of PIE *$ph_2tḗr$ 'father', on the other hand, e.g., Goth. *fadar*, ON *faðir*, OE *fæder,* have a voiced obstruent because the stress originally followed the obstruent. The obstruents remained voiceless when they stood in word-initial position (cf. Beekes/De Vaan 2011: 131).

According to the traditional interpretation, Verner's law followed Grimm's law. It was thought that PIE *p, *t, *$k^{(w)}$ became PGmc. *f, *$þ$, *$h^{(w)}$ and that these fricatives, as well as *s, became voiced according to the conditions specified by Verner's law. According to the idea proposed by Vennemann (1984) and taken over by Kortlandt (1988: 5-6), the sequence of Grimm's law and Verner's law in Germanic must be reversed: PIE *p, *t, *$k^{(w)}$ and *s became voiced before the stress and yielded PGmc. *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$ and *z, and the stops later merged with the reflexes of the PIE voiced aspirated stops. The voiced reflexes of PIE *p, *t, *$k^{(w)}$ after Verner's law did not merge with the PIE voiced stops *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$, but rather remained distinct. This has been considered the main objection against the reversed order of Grimm's law and Verner's law. This objection disappears with the reinterpretation of the Proto-Germanic consonantal system in the light of the glottalic theory. According to the glottalic theory, PIE *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$ were in fact preglottalized consonants, which explains why the voiced reflexes of PIE *p, *t, *$k^{(w)}$ did not merge with PIE *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$ after Verner's law: the latter stops were preglottalized and the former were not (cf. Beekes/De Vaan 2011: 134).

The idea that the PIE voiced stops *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$ had to be reconstructed with a glottalic feature was proposed by Gamkrelidze/Ivanov (1973), Kortlandt took over this idea (1977, 1978a), and argues that the glottalic feature has, by and large, been retained into the separate branches of Indo-European (e.g., 1978a, 1985a). He reconstructs the pre-Germanic (dialectical Indo-European) system before Verner's law and Grimm's law as follows: *t, *$ʼd$ (= traditional PIE *d), *d (= traditional PIE *d^h) (1988: 9). He argues that the traditional reconstruction of Proto-Germanic plain voiceless stops (which developed from the PIE plain voiced stops *b, *d, *$g^{(w)}$) cannot explain the "multifarious reflexes" of these stops in the Northwest Germanic languages, in the form of preaspiration, preglottalization or gemination (English, German and Icelandic, for example, have an aspirated pronunciation of the voiceless stops *p, *t, *k in initial position) (1988: 6). These features are much easier to explain if one assumes that

the Proto-Germanic plain voiceless stops were preglottalized. Modern standard English, where tautosyllabic voiceless stops are preglottalized, e.g., *lea^{ʔ}p*, *hel^{ʔ}p*, and the western Jutlandic dialect of Danish have supposedly directly retained the Proto-Germanic preglottalization (Kortlandt 1988: 6-8).

In the light of this system, Kortlandt reinterprets Grimm's law differently from the traditional analysis, which regards Grimm's law as a consonant shift. According to Kortlandt's reconstruction, the consonantal system of pre-Germanic consisted of the following stops before Grimm's law: *t, *'d, *d (as well as *tt from Kluge's law (cf. Beekes/De Vaan 2011: 134), which is left out of consideration here). The plain voiceless stops then lenited to fricatives, *t > *þ, etc.. According to Kortlandt's reformulation of Grimm's law, voicedness was lost as a distinctive feature in Germanic when the voiceless stops were lenited to fricatives (1988: 8), yielding the Proto-Germanic system *þ (< PIE *t), *'t (< traditional PIE *d), *t (< traditional PIE *d^h). Kortlandt thus reconstructs the Proto-Germanic system of obstruents as a system without voiced obstruents, as in found today in Icelandic and dialects of Norwegian (ibid.). He finds no evidence for the preservation of the glottalic feature in Gothic and supposes that Gothic already at an early stage developed a distinction between voiced and voiceless phonemes due to contact with speakers of other languages (1988: 8-9). The same happened in most other Germanic languages under the influence of neighbouring languages (Kortlandt p.c.).

7.2.1.7   THE GERMANIC FRICATIVES IN THE LOANWORDS

The Germanic fricatives *f, *þ, *h$^{(w)}$, *s were taken over as such by the Proto-Slavs only in those cases where the Proto-Slavic inventory possessed a corresponding fricative. In other cases, the Germanic fricative was replaced by a stop. The early Proto-Slavic consonant system included the fricatives *s, *z, *x. The first palatalization of velar consonants supplemented the Proto-Slavic inventory with *š and *ž (§7.2.2.3). The Germanic fricative *f has been replaced by the corresponding voiceless stop *p in Proto-Slavic: *pila, *pъlkъ, *pergynja, *petъlja, *postъ/*postiti sę. The fricative *þ is not attested among the donor words. PGmc. *h was rendered as PSl. *x: *šelmъ, *volxъ, *xlěbъ, *xlěvъ, *xǫdogъ, *xǫsa, *xula/*xuliti, *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a, *xъlmъ.[134] PGmc. *h^w was borrowed as *xv, the only example being PSl. *lixva. The second element of the compound that was the donor of PSl. *userędźь is a reflex of

---

[134] PSl. *šelmъ reflects the first Proto-Slavic palatalization of velar consonants, in which *š developed from PSl. *x (cf. §7.2.2.3).

PGmc. *hringa 'ring'. The initial h- in this cluster was retained in Gothic, as well as in Old Saxon, until the ninth century. The Old High German manuscripts occasionally fail to write initial *h- from the second half of the eighth century (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 147-148). In view of the retention of initial h- in Gothic and the late date of its loss in West Germanic, PSl. *userędźь was likely borrowed from a donor that had retained the h, but the fricative is nevertheless not reflected in the loanword.

Germanic words containing the reflex of PGmc. *s are regularly borrowed with *s in Proto-Slavic: *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *kusiti, *lьstь, *osьlъ, *skotъ, *skrin(j)a, *skutъ, *skьlędźь/*stьlędźь/*štьlędźь, *stǫpa, *stьklo, *užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti, *xǫsa, *xysъ/-a/*xyšъ/-a (also PSl. *xyzъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a).[135] The reflex of Verner's law is probably attested in the Proto-Slavic loanwords *xǫdogъ, *gonoziti and *goneznǫti. The *z of the second element in the Germanic compound *nabagaiza- (< PGmc. *gaisá- 'spear') might be reflected in US njeboz, OCz. nebozěz, neboziez, Cz. nebozez, dialectal Cz. nábosez and Slk. nebožiec. The Proto-Slavic forms *xyzъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a do not seem to go back to a Verner alternation because PGmc. hūsa- does not have Verner reflexes in any of the Germanic languages.

7.2.1.8   THE HIGH GERMAN CONSONANT SHIFT

The High and Low German dialects are separated from each other by the High German consonant shift. According to the traditional analysis, the High German consonant shift shifted the West Germanic voiceless stops to affricates or fricatives, and rendered the voiced stops voiceless. The West Germanic stops *p, *t, *k developed in different ways according to their position in the word. The consonant shift did not occur after fricatives and in the combination *tr.

- in inlaut and auslaut after a vowel, PGmc. *p, *t, *k developed into geminate fricatives ff, ss, hh, which were shortened in auslaut and before a consonant, sometimes also after a long vowel. The new s remained distinct from the old Proto-Germanic *s (see below).
- in anlaut, in inlaut and in auslaut after a resonant, and in geminated position, PGmc. *p, *t, *k developed into affricates: *p > pf <pf, ph>, *t > ts <z> (<zz, tz> for the geminated affricates) *k > [kx] <kh, ch> (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 84-85).[136]

---

[135] PSl. *skrin(j)a is in some Slavic languages attested with initial š-, which might be a more recent borrowing from German.

[136] The High German orthography is not completely suited to render the new consonants resulting from the consonant shift: the grapheme <z> denotes both the fricative and the affricate

The reflex of PGmc. *b is most often written as <p> in High German writings, but writings with <b> also occur. Middle Franconian dialects have the reflex *v* (in auslaut -*f*) from PGmc. *b in inlaut and in auslaut after a vowel, just as in Old Saxon. PGmc. *d is reflected as *t* in all of High German (including parts of Franconian), e.g., Goth. *dauhtar*, OS *dohtar*, but OHG *tohter* < PIE *d^hugh_2-tér- 'daughter', PGmc. *g is reflected as <g> in Franconian dialects of High German. In Upper German dialects, the graphs <g>, <k>, <c> occur next to each other for PGmc. *g (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 87-89).

The High German consonant shift was a process that may have started between the third and fifth centuries and lasted until approximately the eighth century.[137] On the basis of research of names and toponyms, it was supposed that the consonant shift started with the fricativization of the alveolar stop *t. The fricativization of PGmc. *t is first reflected in the sixth century. The change of *p > -*ff*- or *pf*- has been dated to the sixth/seventh centuries and the change of *k > -*hh*- [x] or *ch*- [kx] to the seventh/eighth centuries. The chronological difference is supported by the fact that the lenition of *t has spread over the entire High German dialect area, whereas *p > *pf* is attested in Upper German and East Franconian and the affrication of *k to *kx* in the southern Upper German dialects only; the Franconian dialects of High German were thus less affected by the consonant shift than the Upper German dialects (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 86-87).

Kortlandt gives a different interpretation of the material (1996), which fits with his reinterpretation of the Proto-Germanic system of obstruents as *þ (< PIE *t), *'t (< PIE *d), *t (< PIE *d^h). He attributes the origin of the High German

---

that developed from *t. The graphs <pf, ch> can also denote both the fricative and the affricate from *p (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 85).

[137] There is some debate about the beginning of the consonant shift: Meillet and Vennemann date the beginning of the High German consonant shift to the first century AD, while Braune places the beginning of the consonant shift around the year 600. The majority of scholars seem to date the consonant shift between the sixth and eighth centuries (cf. Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 92 for references, Meillet 1922: 42). Kortlandt dates the beginning of the High German consonant shift immediately after the gemination before *j in West Germanic, which he considers to be a "comparatively recent development" (1996: 55-56).

The High German consonant shift must have taken place after the borrowing of Latin loanwords into Germanic during the imperial epoch because these loanwords participated in the sound shift (Meillet 1922: 42). According to Braune/Reiffenstein, the High German consonant shift regularly operated on all loanwords from Latin that entered Germanic before the eighth century (2004: 82). The sound shift appears to have been almost completed when the oldest remaining Old High German texts were written.

consonant shift to "a lack of firm closure in the latter part of the glottalic plosives". As a result of this, the glottalic stops were lenited to fricatives and the glottal occlusion was oralized (1996: 56). In Kortlandt's interpretation, the High German consonant shift only affected the Proto-Germanic glottalized stops. Because the absence of distinction in voice that arose as a result of Grimm's law, the stops that are traditionally reconstructed as voiced for Proto-Germanic were not affected (i.e., PGmc. *t (traditionally reconstructed as PGmc. *d < PIE *dʰ) remained unchanged).

With the exception of PSl. *xrъstъ, the reflexes of the High German consonant shift are not attested in the Germanic loanwords in Slavic. Among the loanwords from High German, it would not be unexpected to find lenited reflexes of the Proto-Germanic voiceless stops. These reflexes are, however, conspicuously absent. There are several possible reasons for this absence: the words might have been borrowed relatively early before the beginning of the High German consonant shift, the words might have been borrowed from Low German dialects rather than from High German or the Proto-Slavs might have adopted the loanwords in a way that the reflex of the consonant shift was no longer visible. The latter scenario is indeed probable in case of the affricates *pf*, *kx* [kx] and the fricative *f*: PGmc. *f was in loanwords regularly replaced by PSl. *p because the Proto-Slavic phonological system did not contain the corresponding labiodental fricative, nor did the Proto-Slavic phonological system contain the affricates *pf* and *kx*.

The reflexes of PGmc. *'t in High German after the consonant shift are a dental affricate and fricative *ts* and (*s*)*s*. The new dental High German *s* remained distinct from the earlier alveolar fricative *s (Kortlandt 1996: 56). This dental articulation of the new High German affricate *ts* might also explain why High German *ts* was not identified with the Proto-Slavic (palatal) affricate *c (/tś/).

Proto-Slavic did have the fricative *x (which in the loanwords corresponds to the reflex of PGmc. *h) and for this reason, it can be expected that both High German sound shift reflexes from the fricative (*h*)*h* resulting from fricativisation of *k could be reflected in Proto-Slavic, as in PSl. *xrъstъ.

7.2.1.9   LOANWORDS THAT ULTIMATELY DERIVE FROM LATIN

The Latin loanwords in Germanic can be divided in a layer of early, Proto-Germanic, loanwords and a layer of later, West Germanic, loanwords. The Proto-Germanic loanwords from Latin that were subsequently borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic, are: PGmc. *arkō (PSl. *orky), *asil- (PSl. *osъlъ), *kaisar (PSl. *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь), *katila- (PSl. *kotьlъ), *kaupōn (PSl. *kupiti), *papa- (PSl. *popъ), *ulband- (PSl. *velьblǫdъ), *wīnan (PSl. *vino).

(N)WGmc. *le(w)o is attested in West Germanic only (the Old Norse form is considered to be a loanword from Old English (De Vries 1977: 353)), but on the basis of the vocalism of PSl. *lьvъ, it seems likely that the word stems from Gothic, even though the word remained unattested in Gothic.

If a Germanic loanword from Latin is attested only in West Germanic, we are likely to deal with a later, regional borrowing. Among the Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic, the ones that can be regarded as West Germanic loanwords from Latin, are: (N)WGmc. *aimbara- (PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ)), *budiniō (PSl. *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь), Christ (also Goth. Krist, PSl. *xrъstъ/*krъstъ), *kirikō (PSl. *cьrky), *kubil- (PSl. *kъbьlъ), *lāgel(l)a (PSl. *lagy), *pandinga-/*pantinga- (PSl. *pěnędźь), *radik- (PSl. *redьky/*rъdьky), *skrīn- (PSl. *skrin(j)a), *stubō (PSl. *jьstъba).[138]

For this reason, PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ), *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь, *xrъstъ, *cьrky, *kъbьlъ, *lagy, *pěnędźь, *redьky/*rъdьky, *skrin(j)a, *jьstъba can be regarded as loanwords from West Germanic or, more specifically, from High or Low German dialects.

In a number of words, the late date of borrowing from Latin into Germanic can be confirmed because the Germanic loanword reflects the voicing of Latin intervocalic voiceless stops (which is a development that took place in the western part of the Romance language family around the middle of the first millennium). This is the case with WGmc. *aimbara- (from Lat. amphora), *budiniō (from Lat. butina), *kubil- (from Lat. cūpella) and probably *stubō (from Lat. *extūfa). The Latin loanwords relating to Christian terminology (OHG Christ, Goth. Krist and WGmc. *kirikō) must have entered Germanic after the break up of Proto-Germanic because Proto-Germanic ceased to exist as a linguistic unity at the beginning of the Christian era.

7.2.2 Indications concerning the dating of the borrowings

7.2.2.1 Diphthongs in Germanic and Proto-Slavic
Proto-Germanic has been reconstructed with the diphthongs *eu, *ai, and *au and perhaps *ei. The PIE diphthong *ei had become a monophthong *ī in all of Germanic before the oldest texts were written (Meillet 1922: 60). The diphthong

---

[138] Reflexes of *aimbara-, *budiniō, *pandinga-/*pantinga-, *skrīn-, *stubō are attested in Old Norse and/or later Scandinavian, but De Vries regards those words as loanwords from Low German or Old English (cf. De Vries 1977: s.v. bytta, pengr/penningr, skrín and stofa).

*ei in the donor form that yielded PSl. *lixva might, therefore, already have monophthongized to [ī] when the word was borrowed into Proto-Slavic. Whether or not this is the case cannot be established on the basis of the Proto-Slavic form: if the word was borrowed with the diphthong *ei it would have monophthongized in Proto-Slavic to *ī as well.

The Germanic diphthong *eu was affected by the a-umlaut in Northwest Germanic when it stood before *a, *ē₁ or *ō. In these positions, PGmc. *eu became OHG io through *eo. In those cases in which the Proto-Germanic diphthong *eu was not affected by the a-umlaut, it became iu in Old High German, which is attested from the earliest manuscripts (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 49). In Old Saxon, PGmc. *eu is reflected as eo, io, ia, ie before the vowels a, e and o or when no vowel followed and raised to iu when it was followed by *i, *j, *w, (*u) in the following syllable (Gallée 1910: 79). The Proto-Germanic diphthong *eu regularly developed into a diphthong iu in Gothic (since every PGmc. *e became i in Gothic), which is directly reflected in the Proto-Slavic loanword *bljudo < **bjudo.

In Old High German, PGmc. *ai developed into ē before r, h, and w. This monophthongization has been dated to the seventh century and probably started off in the north. In other positions than before r, h, and w, PGmc. *ai remained a diphthong and developed into ei by the end of the eighth century (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 44-47). In Old Saxon, PGmc. *ai is reflected as ē in all positions (Gallée 1910: 70). PGmc. *ai probably already had a monophthongal value in Gothic. The writing <ai> is thought to have represented a long or short [æ] (cf. §1.2.1.2), which would be directly continued in the Proto-Slavic loanword *xlěbъ.[139] PSl. *užasъ and *(u-)žasnǫti are thought to derive from Goth. usgaisjan 'to terrify, frighten'. The Slavic reflex *ē of the Gothic monophthong [æ] caused the velar *g to palatalize according to the first palatalization, after which PSl. *ē was regularly lowered to *a. The fact that PSl. *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ underwent the second and not the first palatalization of velar consonants indicates that the word was either borrowed from a West Germanic dialect that retained the diphthong *ai or that the word was borrowed relatively late. The vocalism of PSl. *likъ, which is thought to derive from a reflex of PGmc. *laika-, remains unexplained.

---

[139] Cf. §5.3, s.v. *cěsarь for discussion about the origin of the word. I do not regard PSl. *xlěvъ 'cattle shed, stable' as a loanword from Goth. hlaiw 'grave', as many scholars seem to do, but rather as a borrowing from a West Germanic reflex of PGmc. *hlew(j)a- 'cover (against the weather)' (cf. §5.3, s.v. *xlěvъ).

In Old High German, PGmc. *au monophthongized to ō before *h and all alveolar consonants. This process started in the eighth century. In early High German documents, the Proto-Germanic diphthong *au was retained as such. In other positions, the diphthong au developed into ou in the ninth century (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 47-49). In Old Saxon, PGmc. *au became ō in all positions. The Proto-Germanic diphthong *au had probably yielded a monophthong [ɔ] in Gothic, which was written as <au> (cf. §1.2.1.2). Among the loanwords, those forms that contained original Germanic *au are reflected with *u in Proto-Slavic, irrespective of their origin: PGmc. *skauta- > PSl. *skutъ, Goth. kaupjan > PSl. *kupiti, Goth. kausjan > PSl. *kusiti, NWGmc. *lauka- > PSl. *lukъ, NWGmc. *nauta- > PSl. *nuta, NWGmc. *laugō > PSl. lugъ.

Most Germanic loanwords that are reconstructed with a diphthong in the root seem to have been borrowed into Proto-Slavic when the diphthong had already monophthongized in Germanic. Except for PSl. *bljudo (see above), the only words that contained a diphthong were probably the words with *ai and *au that were borrowed from West Germanic.

The Proto-Slavic system initially contained the inherited diphthongs *ei, *eu, *ai and *au. PIE *eu developed into *iou in Balto-Slavic times. It developed to *jau when *o and *ō delabialized to *a and *ā in an early stage of Proto-Slavic (Kortlandt 2002a: 9). PSl. *jau further developed along similar lines as *au and yielded *ju eventually. The other diphthongs monophthongized in Proto-Slavic as follows: *ei > *ȩ̄ > *ī, *ai > *ē (*ě), *au > *ō > *ū. In late Proto-Slavic, the outcome of the monophthongization of the diphthong *ei is *ī and of *au is *ū, but the development went though a stage in which the results of the monophthongization of *au and *ei were long mid vowels, rather than high vowels: *ei > *ȩ̄ and *au > *ō (Kortlandt 2002a: 9, 12). The beginning of the monophthongization can be dated to approximately 0-300 AD (Kortlandt 2003b: 4), but the process is likely to have been operative for a considerable time because the constraints on the syllabic structure remained until the end of Proto-Slavic.

7.2.2.2   GERMANIC *Ō CORRESPONDING TO PSL. *U

In the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, Gmc. *ō in the stem regularly corresponds to late PSl. *u: PGmc. *bōk- (PSl. *bukъ, *buky), PGmc. *dōma- (PSl. *duma), NWGmc. *plōga- (PSl. *plugъ), PGmc. *hōlōn, *hōlian (PSl. *xuliti). In Proto-Slavic, the mid-open back vowels *o and *ō have supposedly been absent from the phonological system for some time. Early in Proto-Slavic, *a and *ā merged with *o and *ō and delabialised to *a and *ā again at a later stage. A new long vowel *ō developed when the

monophthongization of the diphthongs started to operate: the Proto-Slavic diphthong *au initially monophthongized to *ō.

The reflex *ō (and, similarly, PSl. *ē < *ei) was retained in Proto-Slavic until the vowel system started to shift: the rounded back vowels *u, *ū and *uN delabialised into unrounded central vowels *y, *ȳ and *yN.[140] The delabialization of *u, *ū and *uN to *y, *ȳ and *yN left a gap in the phonological system, which was filled by the raising of the long mid vowel *ō (< *au) to *ū. The front vowel *ē (< *ei) was similarly raised to *ī. This raising can in any case be dated after (or simultaneously with) the delabialization of *u, *ū and *uN because *ū < *ō remained distinct from *ȳ < *ū.

It is likely that the loanwords were borrowed from Germanic when the process of monophthongization in Proto-Slavic was operative and had already yielded the new long vowel *ō. The Germanic *ō was thus identified with the *ō that existed for some time in Proto-Slavic and later developed into *ū.

7.2.2.3   *PALATALIZATIONS OF VELAR CONSONANTS IN PROTO-SLAVIC*

The first palatalization of velar obstruents showed the following results: *k > *č, *g > *ǯ (> *ž), *x > *š before *e, *ē, *i, *ī or *j. The second palatalization of velars yielded *k > *ć, *g > *dź, *x > *ś before the new front vowel *ē (> *ě) that had arisen through the monophthongization of the diphthong *ai. The so-called regressive palatalization of velars was probably part of the same process (Vermeer 2000). As a result of the regressive palatalization of velars, a velar consonant became palatalized after the high front vowels *i, *ī, *iN unless they were followed by a consonant or by one of the high back vowels *u, *ū, *uN (cf. Kortlandt 2002a: 9-10).

PSl. *šelmъ and *užasъ/*(u-)žasnǫti underwent the first palatalization of velar consonants in Slavic. It follows that these words were borrowed when the first palatalization was still operative, at the latest shortly before the beginning of the second palatalization.

PSl. *cěsarь (cf. s.v. *cěsarь for the other forms *cesarь and *cьsarь), *cьrky and *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ show the palatalised reflex of *c < *k and *z < *g resulting from the second palatalization of velar consonants. The suffix *-ędźь in Proto-Slavic (attested in PSl. *koldędźь, *kъnędźь, *pěnędźь, *retędźь, *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь, *userędźь, *vitędźь) reflects the Germanic suffix

---

[140] Kortlandt dates this development to around 300-600 (2003b: 4). The result of this development is attested, for example, in PSl. *tynъ (cf. PGmc. *tūna-), PSl. *xyzъ/*xysъ (cf. PGmc. *hūsa-).

*-inga- and underwent the progressive palatalization, which was caused by the nasal vowel *ę < *in. The progressive palatalization is also attested in PSl. *gobьdźь from a reflex of PGmc. *gabiga-.

7.3   MORPHOLOGICAL ADAPTATION OF THE LOANWORDS

7.3.1   INTRODUCTION

The Germanic loanwords joined the following declensions when they were accommodated to the Proto-Slavic morphological system: masculine *o/jo*-stems, neuter *o/jo*-stems, feminine *ā/jā*-stems, feminine *i*-stems and feminine *ū*-stems. The masculine *u*-stem declension was a disappearing morphological category already in the earliest attested forms of Slavic. In all Slavic languages, already in Old Church Slavic, the *u*-stem and *o*-stem declinations have become mixed, and words that originally belonged to the *u*-stem declination are not clearly identifiable. PSl. *dъlgъ may have been borrowed into Proto-Slavic as an *u*-stem, cf. §8.3.1. The masculine *u*-stems in Proto-Slavic were exclusively or mainly monosyllabic (Orr 1996: 316-317), and for this reason the Germanic polysyllabic masculine *u*-stems PGmc. *asilu- and Goth. *ulbandus** may have become masculine *o*-stems in Slavic. Although the neuter *o/jo*-stems must have been productive at the time of the borrowings, the original Germanic neuters regularly changed gender in Slavic; the only Proto-Slavic neuter form continuing a Germanic neuter form is *vino (see below).

7.3.2   GERMANIC PREFIXES AND SUFFIXES

The words PSl. *gonoziti/*goneznǫti and *gorazdъ reflect the Germanic prefix *ga-. This prefix is attested in the form *ga-* in Gothic and as *gi-* in Old High German. The form *gi-* predominates first in the Franconian dialects, and later spread to the Alemannian and Bavarian dialects. From the second half of the ninth century, *gi-* is predominant in all Old High German dialects (Braune/Reiffenstein 2004: 74). The form of the prefix is *ge-* or *gi-* in Old Saxon. The prefix *ga-* is widely used in Germanic and was especially productive in Gothic (Lehmann 1986: 132). PSl. *gonoziti/*goneznǫti are nevertheless likely to derive from West Germanic (obviously before the change of PGmc. *ga- to *gi-* or *ge-*) because the Gothic raising of PGmc. *e to *i* is not reflected in PSl. *goneznǫti.

The Germanic suffix *-inga-* is attested with the following loanwords into Proto-Slavic: *koldędźь, *kъnędźь, *pěnędźь, *retędźь, *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь,

*userędźь, *vitędźь. The suffix occurs with a number of different meanings: it is most frequently used for creating denominative masculine nouns denoting persons (e.g., kinship terms). This use does not occur in Gothic but it becomes increasingly frequent in the other Germanic dialects. The variant *-unga-* is also found, mainly in Old Norse (Kluge 1926: 11-12). Because the use of the suffix *-inga-* for denominative masculine nouns denoting persons does not occur in Gothic, PSl. *vitędźь and *kъnędźь must stem from West Germanic.

The suffix *-(l)inga-/-(l)unga-* is used to form coin names in all of Germanic. This use is also more widespread in Northwest Germanic than in Gothic (cf. OHG *silbarling* 'silver coin, piece of silver', but Goth. *silubreins* '(piece) of silver'); the suffix *-(l)inga-* for coin names only occurs in Goth. *skilliggs** 'solidus' (Kluge 1926: 53-54). PSl. *pěnędźь might, therefore, from a morphological viewpoint be considered to be a loanword from West Germanic, rather than from Gothic (cf. §7.2.1.3 for phonological reasons to regard PSl. *pěnędźь as a West Germanic loanword).

The Proto-Slavic suffix *-ędźь seems to occur in Proto-Slavic exclusively or almost exclusively with Germanic loanwords. Apart from the seven words with this suffix discussed in this thesis, Vaillant only mentions a number of later Nordic loanwords, especially into Old Russian, e.g., *Varjagъ* 'Varangian' < ON *varingr* and a small number of words with limited distribution in the Slavic languages that might or might not have been borrowed from Germanic. The most important of these are: OR *rabotjagъ* 'slave' (also attested in Old Polish and Old Czech), OR *sterljag-* 'sterlet (*Acipenser ruthenus*, a kind of sturgeon)' from G *Störling* 'small sturgeon', P *mosiądz* 'brass' (also attested in Czech) from G *Messing* 'brass', R *govjáz* '*Symphytum officinale*' (also attested in Ukrainian, Czech, Serbian/Croatian, Slovene, Bulgarian, Macedonian).[141] Vaillant mentions a small number of other words, but these are "mots à finale obscure" (1974: 502-503).

A number of loanwords reflect the Germanic suffix *-ila-*. This suffix derives masculine instrument names mainly from verbs. This use is especially frequent in Old High German, but according to Kluge, it can be coincidental that Gothic has no attestations of this suffix, except for the Latinised form *(h)usabandilus*

---

[141] R *govjáz* and its cognates go back to PSl. *govędźь*, which has been analysed as a compound of PSl. *govędo* 'head of cattle' and *ęzykъ* 'tongue, language' and thus literally means 'ox-tongue' (REW 1: 258, ESSJ 1: 141). The plant belongs to the family of *Boraginaceae*, which is characterised by its hairy leaves, hence the derivation of the plant-name from 'ox-tongue', cf. similar names for other plants in the same family as E *Ox-tongue* (*Anchusa officinalis*, also Du. *Gewone ossentong*) and E *Residual ox-tongue* (*Pentaglottis sempervirens*, Du. *Overblijvende ossentong*).

'garter'. It is not clear whether Goth. *katils* reflects the same suffix (Kluge 1926: 48). The Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic reflecting the suffix *-ila-* are PSl. *grędelь, *petьlja* and perhaps *kotьlъ*.

The Germanic feminine suffix *-(i)lō(n)-* also builds instrument names, as in OHG *fihala*, *fihila* (PSl. *pila*). The function of the suffix *-la-* in Goth. *stikls* (PSl. *stьklo*) is unclear (ibid.: 47-48).

Finally, the suffix *-l-* appears as a substitute suffix in a number of Latin loanwords in Germanic: WGmc. *lāgel(l)a* (< Lat. *lagoena*; PSl. *lagy*), PGmc. *katila-* (< Lat. *catīnus*; PSl. *kotьlъ*), WGmc. *kubil-* (< Lat. *cūpella* or *cūpellus*; PSl. *kъbьlъ*), PGmc. *asila-* (< Lat. *asinus*; PSl. *osьlъ*). It has often been argued that these words were borrowed from the corresponding Latin diminutive forms. This indeed seems to be the case with WGmc. *kubil-* < Lat. *cūpella/cūpellus* because the Germanic word corresponds to the meaning of these Latin forms rather than that of Lat. *cūpa* (cf. §5.4, s.v. *kъbьlъ*). For the other Germanic words, the reason why they would have been borrowed from a Latin diminutive form is less clear. It has therefore been supposed that the Latin words with a suffix *-(i)n-* regularly replaced this suffix with the in Germanic more frequent suffix *-(i)l-* when the words were borrowed into Germanic (Green 1998: 204-205, Kluge/Seebold 2002, s.v. *Lägel*). Kluge posits a sound law that changed PGmc. *-n-* in unstressed syllables to *-l-* (1913: 68). This is a less likely scenario, especially because all the examples he adduces are loanwords, primarily from Latin.

7.3.3   GENDER CHANGE OF GERMANIC NEUTER NOUNS

Germanic neuters in general did not retain their original gender when they entered Proto-Slavic. The only exception is PSl. *vino* from a reflex of PGmc. *wīnan* 'wine' (n. *a*-stem). The change of gender of the Germanic neuter nouns in Slavic has been regarded as a problem in the study of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. It must, however, be noted that not only the Germanic neuter noun loanwords in Proto-Slavic change gender, the Latin neuter loanwords in Proto-Slavic for the most part change gender as well and mainly become masculine (or occasionally feminine) (M. Matasović 2011: 277).

The Germanic neuter words that have changed gender are:
- PSl. *nuta* (f.) from a reflex of NWGmc. *nauta-* 'cattle' (n. *a*-stem).
- PSl. *pъlkъ* (m.) from the Gothic or Langobardic reflex of PGmc. *fulka-* (n. *a*-stem). PGmc. *fulka-* is usually reconstructed and attested as a neuter *a*-stem (e.g., Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 235). OS *folk* is neuter (Holthausen 1954: 21, Tiefenbach 2010: 99). In Old and Middle High German, the word is also attested with neuter forms, although masculine

forms occur as well (Seebold 2008: 312). The attestation *fulcus* in the late eighth-century *Reichenauer Glossen* seems to imply a masculine form, but it is impossible to base conclusions on this because the gloss appears in a Latinised form. It has also been argued that the word in the *Reichenauer Glossen* is not of Gothic origin but rather stems from Old Low Franconian (EWA 3: 451-452). The gender of the unattested Gothic form and of Langobardic *fulc-* remains unclear. Because the Germanic form has been reconstructed as a neuter *a*-stem and because the word is neuter in the early attestations in Germanic, the donor of the Proto-Slavic form is likely to have been neuter.

- PSl. **xlěvъ* (m.) derives from a reflex of PGmc. **hlew(j)a*, which is attested as neuter in Old English, Old Frisian and Old Norse. The gender in Gothic unclear (Lehmann 1986: 187). For Old Saxon, Holthausen assumes either masculine or neuter, but Tiefenbach considers OS *hleu* to be masculine (Holthausen 1954: 34, Tiefenbach 2010: 170).
- PSl. **xyzъ/-a*, **xysъ/-a*, **xyžъ/-a*, **xyšъ/-a* (m. and f.) derive from a reflex of PGmc. **hūsa-*, which is attested as a neuter in all Germanic languages.

In the literature, two other examples of the change of gender from Germanic neuter to masculine in Slavic are adduced, but these words are more likely to go back to Germanic masculine *a*-stems:

- PSl. **lukъ* (Matasović 2000: 131). The Germanic forms are likely to derive from a masculine proto-form (cf. Bammesberger 1990: 53): ON *laukr* is masculine. Seebold considers OHG *louh* to be masculine as well (2008: 542). Holthausen considers OS *lōk* to be masculine and Tiefenbach lists the compounds with *-lōk* to be either masculine (*asklōk* 'shalot', *knuflōk* 'garlic', *unlōk* 'onion') or masculine and/or neuter (*bioslōk* 'chives', *hollōk* 'onion') (Holthausen 1954: 48; Tiefenbach 2010: 16, 31, 175, 214, 428).
- PSl. **tynъ* (Stender-Petersen 1927: 513, Matasović 2000: 131). The Germanic forms are generally masculine and seem to go back to a masculine proto-form as well (cf. Bammesberger 1990: 73): OHG *zūn* is regarded as masculine (Seebold 2008: 1005).

We are therefore dealing with four Germanic neuter nouns that changed gender after being borrowed into Proto-Slavic: PSl. **nuta, *pъlkъ, *xlěvъ, *xyzъ/-a*, **xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a*. PSl. **nuta* became feminine in Proto-Slavic because it was perceived as a collective noun.

The only word that is a neuter in Proto-Slavic as well as in Germanic is PSl. **vino*. The neuter gender of PSl. **vino* might have been influenced by PSl. **vinogordъ* which was borrowed from the Gothic compound *weinagards* and in which the medial **o* is a regular reflex from the Gothic medial *a*.

Apart from PSl. *vino, there are other Proto-Slavic neuter forms in the corpus, but they all go back to Germanic masculine or feminine forms: *stьklo was borrowed probably from Goth. *stikls* (m.) and the change of gender of this word has been explained as secondary to other designations for materials such as PSl. *zolto* 'gold', *sьrebro* 'silver' (Stender-Petersen 1927: 397). PSl. *myto was borrowed from OHG *mūta* (f.) and might be a singulative form of an earlier collective noun. PSl. *bljudo was borrowed from Goth. *biuþs* (m.). The word shows variation in gender very early in the attested Slavic languages; in every language in which the word is retained, it occurs as a neuter *o*-stem, but it also appears as a masculine *o*-stem in OCS *bljudъ* as well. I suppose, also on the basis of accentological evidence (cf. §8.3.3.1), that the word was originally borrowed as a masculine word and very early, still in the Proto-Slavic period, analogically became neuter.

Ranko Matasović explains the virtual absence of original Proto-Slavic neuter nouns among the loanwords from Germanic by the transition of thematic neuter nouns with initial stress to the masculine gender. In the prehistory of Slavic, the thematic neuter nouns with initial stress had become masculine, e.g., PIE *d^huór-o-m* yielded OCS *dvorъ* m. 'court(yard)', but cf. Lat. *forum* 'market, forum', which is neuter. Matasović dates this change of gender relatively late in Proto-Slavic after the borrowing of the loanwords from Germanic: he assumes that the Germanic neuter words were borrowed into Proto-Slavic as neuters originally and later on participated in the general transition of thematic neuter nouns to masculines (2000: 130-131, 2008: 51).[142]

According to the dating Kortlandt gives for the transition of part of the thematic neuter nouns to masculines, this chronology is impossible: Kortlandt dates the development to (late) Balto-Slavic because the same transition seems to have taken place in Baltic (2002a: 6-7 for Old Prussian, 1982: 5-6 for Latvian, 1993a for Lithuanian, cf. 1975: 45). It is unlikely that the same development took place in Proto-Slavic and Baltic independently. The new barytone neuter nouns that arose after Hirt's law, according to which the stress was retracted to a pretonic vowel immediately followed by a laryngeal, did not become masculines. It follows that the transition of barytone neuter nouns to the masculine gender must have been completed before Hirt's law (Kortlandt 2002a: 5).

In PIE, the NAsg. ending of the neuter *o*-stems was *-om. This ending was replaced by the pronominal ending *-od in the oxytone neuters in

---

[142] Matasović calls this development Illič-Svityč's law, but I will refrain from this in order to avoid confusion with the 'other' Illič-Svityč's law (see below, cf. also §2.5, §8.3.3.1).

Balto-Slavic.[143], [144] Then, *o before a final nasal narrowed to *u, so the NAsg. ending of the Balto-Slavic barytone neuters became *-uN. The replacement of the ending of the oxytone neuters resulted in the separation of the neuter barytone and oxytone paradigms and to the merger of the old barytone neuters with the barytone masculine o-stems. The old barytone neuters merged with the masculine paradigm in the singular in Proto-Slavic, e.g., NAsg. *dvorъ, but they retained the original neuter ending in the plural for some time, Npl. *dvora. The fact that the old masculine o-stems and the new masculine forms resulting from original barytone neuter o-stems remained distinct from each other in Proto-Slavic is shown firstly by the fact that the original neuter o-stems (the *dvorъ-type) did not participate in Illič-Svityč's law, i.e., the general shift of AP (b)-stressed masculine o-stems to AP (c) (cf. §2.5, §8.3.3.1). The barytone neuter o-stems were still distinct from the masculine o-stems when Illič-Svityč's law operated, probably because of the differing plural forms.

Another indication that the old masculine o-stems and the new masculine forms resulting from original barytone neuter o-stems remained distinct in Proto-Slavic is given by the accentuation of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic: the original Germanic masculine donor words were treated accentologically differently from the original neuter donor words, which indicates that the Germanic neuter nouns did not become 'ordinary' masculine nouns at the moment they were borrowed into Proto-Slavic (cf. §8.3.3.1). Because the original AP (b)-stressed masculine o-stems had become mobile, the Proto-Slavic masculine o-stems with AP (b) by and large continue old neuters (Kortlandt 1975: 44-46, 1983: 183, Derksen 2008: 10-11).

If the change of gender of the original Germanic neuter nouns in Proto-Slavic cannot be attributed to the general transition of thematic neuter nouns with initial accent to the masculine gender, the question remains why PSl. *pъlkъ, *xlěvъ and *xysъ/*xyšъ/*xyzъ/*xyžъ have become masculine in Proto-Slavic (but feminine forms of the latter word are also amply attested). A possible explanation might be that these words were identified with the reflexes of the original barytone neuter o-stems, which fell together with the masculines in the

---

[143] Kortlandt explains this substitution by the fact that the Balto-Slavic Asg. ending *-oN (< PIE *-om) had become "markedly unstressed" (1975: 45).

[144] The replacement of the ending *-om by the pronominal ending *-od in the oxytone neuters in Balto-Slavic has been dated before the operation of Hirt's law in Balto-Slavic because the oxytone neuters that, according to Hirt's law, retracted the stress to a pretonic syllable that was immediately followed by a laryngeal did not participate in the change of gender from neuter to masculine, e.g., S/Cr. jàto 'flock', Vedic yātám (Kortlandt 2002a: 5).

singular (but not in the plural) and had AP (b) in Proto-Slavic. This explanation does not account for PSl. *xysъ/*xyšъ/*xyzъ/*xyžъ because this word has AP (a) in Proto-Slavic.

7.3.4   THE FEMININE *Ū*-STEMS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

It is an interesting phenomenon that quite a number of Germanic loanwords have joined the feminine *ū*-stem flexion in Proto-Slavic. These are words that mainly continue Germanic feminine *ō*-stems. The following words in the corpus belong to the feminine *ū*-stems: *buky, *cьrky, *lagy, *orky, *redьky/*rьdьky.

The Proto-Slavic feminine *ū*-stems basically continue the PIE *-uH-stems. The number of inherited feminine *ū*-stems in Slavic is very small and the type has largely disappeared as a separate stem class in the attested Slavic languages (the old nominative form is retained in, e.g., OP *kry*, Slov. *krî*, but R *krov'* 'blood'). However, at some point in the history of Proto-Slavic, the feminine *ū*-stem flexion must have been exceedingly productive, which is shown by the fact that this stem class includes many loanwords. This productive pattern has often been connected to the loanwords from Germanic. For this reason, Slavic *ū*-stems of unknown origin have sometimes been considered to be of Germanic origin, even if Germanic origin is difficult from a phonological viewpoint. For example, the main reason for PSl. *mъrky 'carrot' to have been explained as a loanword from Germanic seems to be that the word is a feminine *ū*-stem in Slavic (Knutsson 1929: 31 36, Skok 1972: 469), but the etymology of PSl. *mъrky as a loanword from a reflex of WGmc. *murhōn 'carrot' is formally impossible (cf. §6.3, s.v. PSl. *mъrky). However, the occurrence of the feminine *ū*-stems among the loanwords into Slavic cannot be limited to the loanwords from Germanic languages in Proto-Slavic: the feminine *ū*-stem flexion is frequently found among the loanwords from Latin and early Romance dialects as well (Matasović 2011: 279 280), and the feminine *ū*-stems are also frequent among later, post-Proto-Slavic loanwords from German (cf. Knutsson 1929).

It has often been attempted to connect the occurrence of the feminine *ū*-stems among Germanic loanwords to an attested or reconstructed declension type or ending in Germanic. This has, on the whole, remained without avail. Kiparsky concludes: "Es besteht keine Möglichkeit, slav. -*y* im Auslaut auf einen ganz bestimmten Laut zurückzuführen, da es mit großer Sicherheit 4 verschiedenen Lauten entspricht. Offenbar war die *y*-Deklination eine Kategorie, unter welcher alles zusammengefasst wurde, was nicht in das übliche Schema passte" (1934: 295). More or less the same is said by Stender-Petersen, who regards it a matter of coincidence which words became *ū*-stems in Proto-Slavic: "beliebige

Substantive [konnten] ohne eigentlichen Anlass ins Schema der *ū*-Flexion übergeführt werden." (1927: 524).

Knutsson, who has devoted an entire study to this problem, thinks the borrowings stem from West Germanic and dates the borrowing of the Proto-Slavic feminine *ū*-stems after the development of PSl. **y* from earlier **ū*. He explains the transfer of these loanwords to the *ū*-stem declension by the phonetic closeness of PSl. **y* and the German ending **-e* (1929: 27). He concludes that "die nicht betonten Vokale in den Endungen, die im Mitteldeutschen oder schon früher zu *e* werden, in den deutschen Lehnwörtern im Slavischen durch slav. *y* ersetzt werden *konnten* [marking of *konnten* in the original]" (1929: 64). Knutsson connects this development to the appearance of the early Slavs in Bohemia, Moravia and Pannonia where they came under western cultural influence from the seventh century onwards. He therefore assumes that the majority of the Proto-Slavic feminine *ū*-stems were borrowed from Old or Middle High and Low German between 800-1200 (1929: 42). This dating is rather late for words to have a distribution throughout the Slavic language area. Knutsson concludes that the loanwords semantically point to a "gewisse kulturelle Einheit", which implies "konsolidierte Verhältnisse" and "friedliche[r] Verkehr zwischen Slaven und ihren Nachbarvölkern" (1929: 41). The words that Knutsson considers to be certain Germanic loanwords, are: PSl. **bersky* 'peach, apricot', **bruky* 'wild cabbage (*Brassica oleracea*), turnip (*Brassica napobrassica*)', **draty/drety* 'string, waxed end', **kony* 'jug', **kruky* 'crutch, stick', **lagy* 'bottle, cask' (cf. §5.3), **lany* '(shipping) rope', **laty* 'slat, strip of wood', **liny* '(shipping) rope', **listy/*lišty* 'edge, border', **nuny* 'nun', **pany* 'pan', **peky* 'casserole', **raty* 'rat', **riny* 'trench, gutter', **ruky* 'several plants, e.g., Hedge mustard (*Sisymbrium officinale*)', **ruty* 'several plants, e.g., Common rue (*Ruta graveolens*)', **skaly* 'scales; basin', **stǫdy* 'tub'. With the exception of **lagy*, most of these loanwords have been borrowed after the disintegration of Proto-Slavic, and only into the Slavic languages that bordered on the German language area (West Slavic and Slovene); Knutsson himself dates the borrowing of these words after 850 (1929: 24).[145]

The words that, according to Knutsson, have been borrowed from Germanic before about 850, are: **męty* 'mint' (cf. §6.1), **mъrky* 'carrot' (cf. §6.3), **orky* 'box' (cf. §5.2), **pigy* 'fig, quince' (cf. §6.2, fn. 115), **plosky* 'bottle', **redьky/*rьdьky* 'radish, *Raphanus sativus*' (cf. §5.4). Knutsson then discusses the words that have been regarded as loanwords from pre-Gothic or Gothic and

---

[145] PSl. **bersky* probably rather stems from Romance (M. Matasović 2011: 179-180).

concludes that these also rather stem from West Germanic: *bordy '(battle) axe, bearded axe' (cf. §1.1), *bъči 'vat, vessel' (cf. §6.1), *buky 'beech(nut); 'letter, book' (cf. §5.2), *cьrky 'church' (cf. §5.3), *koty 'anchor', *smoky 'fig (tree)' (cf. §6.2) (1929: 65).

The solution proposed by Knutsson is not very attractive because it implies a matter of chance and does not satisfactory explain why certain feminine words became $\bar{u}$-stems, while others followed the more expected $\bar{a}$-stem declination. This theory does not explain how the Romance loanwords or the later German loanwords came to have joined the $\bar{u}$-stem flexion either.

Many of the loanwords that are included in Knutsson's overview refer to domestic plants, fruit trees, technical instruments and containers. This "gewisse kulturelle Einheit" was the main reason for Knutsson to look for a contact area in which friendly relations between the Slavs and the neighbouring Germanic peoples existed (1929: 41-42). The predominance of loanwords referring to domestic plants, fruit trees and containers corresponds, however, exactly to the semantic classes to which Proto-Slavic feminine $\bar{u}$-stems that were borrowed from Latin or early Romance belong: Maja Matasović notes that the Latin loanwords into Proto-Slavic that have become feminine $\bar{u}$-stems are mainly words denoting plants and containers (2011: 279-280). There thus seems to have been a tendency at work by which loanwords (both from Romance and Germanic) denoting domestic plants (and fruit trees) and containers analogically joined the feminine $\bar{u}$-stems in Proto-Slavic and post-Proto-Slavic.[146] This undermines Knutsson's theory that the Slavic feminine $\bar{u}$-stems refer to consolidated relations between Slavic and Germanic peoples and to a western cultural influence on the Slavs in Bohemia, Moravia and Pannonia between 800-1200.

There are only a few feminine $\bar{u}$-stems that can really be regarded as Proto-Slavic and pan-Slavic loanwords from Germanic. These words are: PSl. *buky, *cьrky, *lagy, *orky, *redъky/*rъdъky. It is not possible to assign these words to one specific donor language: PSl. *orky might on formal grounds be either Gothic or West Germanic, *buky and *cьrky probably stem from West

---

[146] The same might have applied to the technical instruments, which Knutsson sees as another defined semantic group within the feminine $\bar{u}$-stems. It must be noted that almost all the technical terms that are represented in Knutsson's corpus seem to refer to shipping terms. In general, the technical loanwords from either Germanic or Latin and early Romance into Proto-Slavic do not have the tendency to become feminine $\bar{u}$-stems.

Germanic, *lagy certainly is a West Germanic loanword and *redьky/*rъdьky is a late loanwords from Low German. For this reason, it is unlikely that the ending in Proto-Slavic corresponds to a single ending in Germanic.

It is, however, remarkable that all Germanic loanwords that follow the ū-stem declination in Slavic have a velar consonant before the ending. The feminine loanwords with a stem ending in a non-velar consonant, on the other hand, on the whole become Proto-Slavic ā/jā-stems: PSl. *brъnja, *bъdьnja, *duma, *jьstъba, *lixva, *nuta, *pergynja, *petъlja, *pila, *skrin(j)a, *stǫpa, *trǫba, *xǫsa. The only exception in this distribution is PSl. *vaga, but this word might be a late loanword. I, therefore, suppose that initially, the distribution of the feminine words over the ā/jā-stem and ū-stem declensions was governed by the stem-final consonant: feminine words with a stem ending in a velar became ū-stems, whereas words with a stem ending in another consonant became ā/jā-stems. At a later stage of Proto Slavic, the ū-stem declension became productive for loanwords from other languages as well, especially for words referring to various kinds of plants and containers. Because of this productivity, the feminine ū-stems in Proto-Slavic came to include many loanwords from later Germanic languages/dialects and from Latin and other Romance languages.

7.4   SEMANTIC LAYERING OF THE LOANWORDS

In the present section, I will provide a classification of the loanwords into semantic categories. It will be investigated whether there is a relation between the semantic group to which a word belongs and its Germanic donor language. This chapter builds on my article "Semantička polja germanskih posuđenica u praslavenskome" (2010), but differs in a number of details. I have added a semantic category 'skills and mental concepts' and in a small number of cases, I listed a word in another semantic category than I did in the article. The most important difference is the fact that I used the corpus devised by Kiparsky (1934) as the basis of the article, whereas the present chapter is based on my own corpus. This means that the words PSl. *avorъ, *bordy, *bugъ, *bъči, *glazъ, *klějь, *mur(in)ъ, *op-, *remy, *smoky, *tjudjь, *želsti are left out here, and the words PSl. *dъlgъ, *gorazdъ, *koldędźь, *lьvъ, *redьky/*rъdьky, *užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti, *vъrtogordъ, *xula and *xuliti are added.

7.4.1   EARLIER RESEARCH

In several scholarly works, the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic have been divided into semantic categories. Friedrich Kluge was the first to make a

semantic classification of the Germanic loanwords in Slavic and his classification is the most adequate to date. He distinguishes five semantic categories: 1. *Staatlich-kriegerische Begriffe*; 2. *Begriffe des Handels und Verkehrs*; 3. *Worte für Ackerbau und Viehzucht, Feld und Wald, Haus und Hof*; 4. *Worte für Künste und Fertigkeiten* and 5. *Kirchlich-religiöse Begriffe* (1913: 41-42).

Investigations into the semantics of Germanic loanwords were later undertaken primarily by Stender-Petersen, but Ranko Matasović and Dennis Green have also included the semantic distribution of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic in their research. The majority of this research only deals with the earliest Germanic loanwords and leaves the West Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic out of account: Kluge's corpus consists of the words that were borrowed "zumeist im 3.-5. Jahrh. aus dem Germanischen und teilweise speziell aus dem Gotischen" (1913: 40). Stender-Petersen included the loanwords from Proto-Germanic and Gothic and Green limits himself to the Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic.

The most elaborate semantic classification is made by Adolf Stender-Petersen (1927). He assumes two layers of Germanic loanwords in Slavic: the oldest layer of loanwords consists of words borrowed into Slavic from Proto-Germanic and is dated to the last centuries BC (cf. §1.3.1). The later layer of loanwords consists of Gothic words and is dated to the period between 213 and at least 376 (1927: 171). In his book, Stender-Petersen arranges the loanwords into a large number of semantic categories. The oldest layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords comprises the following semantic categories: 1. *Völker- und Volksbezeichnungen*; 2. *Herrscher- und Machtbezeichnungen*; 3. *Waffenterminologie*; 4. *Hausbautechnische Ausdrücke*; 5. *Gehöftsterminologie*; 6. *Geländeterminologie*; 7. *Werkzeugs-, Gefäss- und Gerätbezeichnungen*; 8. *Bezeichnungen für Nahrungsmittel*; 9. *Wirtschaftsterminologie*; 10. *Ausdrücke für gesellschaftliche Pflichten*; 11. *Bezeichnungen für Künste und Fertigkeiten*. The second period comprises the following categories: 1. *Bezeichnungen für Donau, Römer und Kaiser*; 2. *Neue Fauna und Flora*; 3. *Geld- und Geldhandel*; 4. *Bezeichnungen für Nutz- und Luxuswaren*; 5. *Gotisch-slavischer Arianismus*; 6. *Gotische Schrift* (1927: ix-x).

According to Ranko Matasović, the main semantic categories that cover the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic are "ona [polja] koja sadrže riječi koje se često posuđuju [those fields containing words that are often borrowed]: 1. *graditeljstvo* [building]; 2. *konfiguracija zemljišta* [landscape terminology]; 3. *termine iz socijalne sfere* [societal terminology] and 4. *nazive za životinje i stoku* [names for animals and cattle]" (2008: 51).

In his book *Language and History in the Early Germanic World,* Dennis Green divides the Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic into five semantic categories: 1. trade; 2. political power; 3. agriculture; 4. warfare and 5. skills (1998: 173).

Zbigniew Gołąb also discusses the semantics of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, but he does not classify them in semantic categories. He remarks that the semantics of the loanwords are "quite broad", which points to "multifarious relations": there are objects belonging to everyday life, as well as "very important" social terms. Gołąb follows Martynov in distinguishing between so-called penetrations and regular borrowings. The former could only have entered Proto-Slavic in truly bilingual areas (the westernmost part of Slavic territory has been suggested as a contact zone) and encounter a synonym in the receiving language (cf. §1.3.4). Words that, according to Gołąb, entered Slavic through penetration include PSl. **nuta* 'cow, cattle', **želsti* 'to repay, pay for', **xlěbъ* 'loaf, bread', **xǫdogъ* 'skill (?)', **xǫsa* 'robbery, trap', **lьstь* 'cunning (trick)'. According to Gołąb, these words refer to "important social and economic phenomena" and, in case of **xǫsa* and **lьstь,* show an "obvious moral depreciation" of the Germanic meaning (1991: 383-384).

On the basis of the present corpus, which consists of both Gothic and West Germanic loanwords, the main semantic categories in which the loanwords can be divided, are:
1. power and warfare
2. skills and mental concepts
3. technical terminology
4. trade
   a. general
   b. money and buying
   c. containers
5. Christian terminology
6. yard and home grown/made products

The following overview shows the correspondences and differences between the semantic classifications described above:

Pronk-Tiethoff	Kluge	Stender-Petersen	Matasović	Green
power and warfare	Staatlich-kriegerische Begriffe	Herrscher- und Machtbezeichnungen; Waffenterminologie	societal terminology	political power; warfare

skills and mental concepts[147]	Worte für Künste und Fertigkeiten	Bezeichnungen für Künste und Fertigkeiten		skills
technical terminology		Werkzeugs-, Gefäss- und Gerätbezeichnungen		
trade: general	Begriffe des Handels und Verkehrs		societal terminology	trade
trade: money and buying		Ausdrücke für gesellschaftliche Pflichten; Geld- und Geldhandel		
trade: containers		Werkzeugs-, Gefäss- und Gerätbezeichnungen		
Christian terminology	Kirchlich-religiöse Begriffe	Gotisch-slavischer Arianismus		
yard and home grown/made products	Worte für Ackerbau und Viehzucht, Feld und Wald, Haus und Hof	Bezeichnungen für Nahrungsmittel; Wirtschaftstermino-logie; Hausbautechnische Ausdrücke; Gehöftsterminologie	building	agriculture
		Geländeterminologie	landscape terminology	

---

[147] This semantic category is not listed in Pronk-Tiethoff (2010).

		Neue Fauna und Flora	names for animals and cattle	
		Völker- und Volksbezeichnungen		
		Bezeichnungen für Donau, Römer und Kaiser;		
		Bezeichnungen für Nutz- und Luxuswaren		
		gotische Schrift		

According to the material presented in this dissertation, a very clear and hitherto largely unnoticed semantic category is formed by the technical terms. The reason why this category has remained largely unnoticed probably lies in the fact that many scholars have taken only supposed Proto-Germanic and Gothic loanwords into Proto-Slavic into account, whereas the technical terms that were borrowed from Germanic generally derive from West Germanic.

It is striking that Stender-Petersen distinguishes many more semantic categories than the other scholars. Some of these semantic groups consequently contain only a small number of words; the category *Gotische Schrift*, for example, consists only of the word PSl. **bukъ/*buky*. Stender-Petersen distinguishes a category *Werkzeugs-, Gefäss- und Gerätbezeichnungen*, but this semantic category can, in my view, better be subdivided: the words denoting instruments and tools must be separated from the words for containers because the words denoting instruments and tools are (generally West Germanic) loanwords resulting from the fact that the Germanic society was technically more advanced than the Proto-Slavic society, whereas the words for containers are both Gothic and West Germanic loanwords that were mainly borrowed in relation to trade. Stender-Petersen attributes the Christian terminology to Proto-Slavic contacts with the Arian Goths, but it is more likely that the Christian terms entered Slavic through contacts with speakers of West Germanic because there is no evidence that the Slavs were ever Arians.

On the basis of the corpus, there are no indications to posit a separate semantic category of words referring to parts of the landscape ("landscape terminology"

(Matasović), "Geländeterminologie" (Stender-Petersen) and "Feld und Wald" (Kluge, as part of his third category)). The reason for establishing this semantic category is mainly because of the word PSl. *bergъ 'slope, bank', which is sometimes regarded as a Germanic loanword (cf. §6.2).

The semantic category of words relating to house-building ("building" (Matasović), "Hausbautechnische Ausdrücke" and "Gehöftsterminologie" (Stender-Petersen)) has been distinguished because of words like PSl. *jьstъba '(heated) room', *tynъ 'fence', *xlěvъ 'cattle shed, stable' and *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a 'hut, cottage', but I have ranged these words in the category "yard and home grown/made products".

7.4.2 THE SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION

In the following section, I will discuss in more detail the classification into six semantic categories that I distinguish on the basis of the present corpus.

7.4.2.1 1. POWER AND WARFARE

The Proto-Slavs borrowed a number of words from Germanic relating to rulers and society: PSl. *cěsarь, *cesarъ, *cьsarь '(Roman) emperor'; *korljь 'king'; *kъnędźь 'prince, ruler'; *vitędźь 'hero, knight' as well as words for different kinds of weaponry and military equipment: *brъnja 'harness, suit of armour'; *šelmъ 'helmet', *pъlkъ 'regiment, crowd'.

Gołąb mentions that the number of Germanic loanwords words relating to weaponry is "rather insignificant" (1991: 384), but, few though they are, these words form a well-defined sub-group within this semantic category.

In the Byzantine war manual *Stratēgikon*, dating from the late-sixth century and attributed to the Emperor Maurice, the war equipment of the Slavs is described as follows. None of the items described by Emperor Maurice are part of the weaponry terms that were borrowed from Germanic:

> "They are armed with short javelins, two to a man, and some of them with stout shields that are cumbersome. They use wooden bows and short arrows smeared with a poisonous drug, and this kills if a man wounded by it is not safeguarded in time by a draught of antidote, by other aids known to the science of the doctors, or if the wound is not cut away immediately so that it does not spread to the rest of the body." (Dennis 1984: 121).

While the military loanwords from Germanic in Proto-Slavic include types of weapons that were unknown to the Slavs, the army-related loanwords from Latin in Germanic cover a much wider range of words, which is due to the fact

that Germanic people served as mercenaries in the Roman army. In Germanic, we therefore find Latin loanwords relating to the daily life in a Roman camp (e.g., Goth. *anno* 'soldier's pay', Goth. *spaikulatur* 'guard'), and not exclusively terms relating to the battle field as is the case with the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (Green 1998: 202-204).

7.4.2.2   *2. SKILLS AND MENTAL CONCEPTS*

To this category belong PSl. **duma* 'advice, thought, opinion', **gorazdъ* 'experienced, able', **lьstь* 'cunning (trick)', **xǫdogъ* 'skill (?)', **xǫsa* 'robbery, trap' and perhaps **užasъ, *(u-)žasnǫti* and **xula/*xuliti* '(to) abuse, revile'.

7.4.2.3   *3. TECHNICAL TERMINOLOGY*

A number of words relate to technical innovations. These include words for tools: PSl. **pila* 'saw, file', **nebozězъ/*nabozězъ* 'wood drill' and **stǫpa* 'pestle, mortar', a type of plough: **plugъ* 'plough' and **grędelь* 'plough-beam, axis', the chemical term **lugъ* 'lye, caustic soda', the material **stьklo* 'glass(ware)'. Other words in this group are **petьlja* 'noose, snare' and **retędźь* 'chain(s)'.

7.4.2.4   *4. TRADE*

The Slavic and Germanic peoples are known to have maintained commercial relations with one another. This is reflected in many loanwords that relate to trade, money (cf. 4b below) and containers (cf. 4c below).

4A GENERAL

In his discussion of the words relating to viticulture among the Latin loanwords in Germanic, Green distinguishes between 'itinerant' and 'static' terms. Products as 'wine' and 'vinegar' could have been transported and traded anywhere and are thus 'itinerant' terms, whereas terms like 'winepress' or 'to pick grapes' are necessarily connected to areas in which viticulture was practised and are therefore to be considered 'static' terms. Both 'itinerant' and 'static' terms are among the numerous viticultural loanwords from Latin into Germanic (1998: 211-212). Significantly fewer viticultural words were borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic. The only examples are the itinerant term PSl. **vino* 'wine' and the static term **vinogordъ* 'vineyard'.[148] The word for 'donkey' was borrowed

---

[148] Green supposes different Germanic origins for PSl. **vino* and **vinogordъ* because the former is a mobile trade-word, whereas the latter word was taken over "in a wine-growing district

from Latin into Germanic in relation to trade because the Romans used donkeys (and mules) to transport their wares overland and thus introduced the donkey into northern Europe (Green 1998: 204) (cf. also Cr. *tòvar* 'load, shipment', but dialectally also 'donkey'). The word was subsequently borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic as *osьlъ 'donkey'. Two words for cattle were borrowed from Germanic: PSl. *nuta 'cow, horned cattle' and *skotъ 'horned cattle'. The meaning of the Germanic donor of PSl. *skotъ indicates that the word was used to denote possession and might thus relate to trade.

Words relating to market trade are PSl. *kupiti 'to buy', *kusiti 'to try, taste' and *vaga 'weight, scales'. PSl. *lěkъ 'medicine' was perhaps borrowed in relation to trade as well.

4B Money and buying

Trade with the Germanic peoples is directly reflected in two denominations (currencies) that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic: PSl. *pěnędźь 'penny, coin' and *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь 'coin'. The words *lixva 'interest, usury' and *dъlgъ 'debt' point to money dealing. The word *myto 'toll, payment' refers to the toll that traders had to pay for importing or exporting their goods and thus falls on the interface of the semantic categories 'trade' and 'power/society'.

4C Containers

Trade relations between the Slavs and Germanic peoples are also reflected in the large amount of words denoting containers, which often denote measures of capacity in the individual Slavic languages as well: PSl. *lagy 'bottle, cask', *ǫborъ(kъ) 'bucket, quantity of grain', *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь 'tub', *kotьlъ 'kettle' and *kъbьlъ 'tub, quantity of grain'. Other words for containers and vessels are: PSl. *bljudo 'plate, dish', *orky 'box' and *skrin(j)a 'chest'. The original meaning of PSl. *orky is not clear: apart from 'box', it means 'grave, tomb' in a number of Slavic languages.

Words for boxes, cases, crates and other containers are very susceptible to borrowing; the majority of words in this category were borrowed from Latin into Germanic, before they were borrowed from Germanic into Proto-Slavic.

---

further south" (1998: 174). This seems to be unnecessarily complicating; the most natural assumption is to think that PSl. *vino and *vinogordъ were borrowed from the same Germanic source; this could have been in a wine growing district, but it is also conceivable that the *vinogordъ was regularly referred to in a trade situation.

7.4.2.5   5. CHRISTIAN TERMINOLOGY
A number of words relating to Christianity are borrowed from Germanic: PSl. *cьrky 'church', *popъ 'clergyman, priest', *postъ 'fast, Lent', *postiti sę 'to fast', *gonoziti 'to save' (also *goneznǫti 'to recover'), *xrьstъ and *krьstъ 'cross, Christ, baptism'.

Contact between speakers of Slavic and West Germanic has been attributed to the eastward expansion of the Roman Catholic Church and the later Frankish expansion in the same direction (Andersen 2003: 47) and this explains the number of Germanic loanwords relating to Christianity in Slavic. The Slavs are likely to have been at least partly Christianised before the mission of the Slavic apostles Cyril and Method in 863. The conversion of Slavs to Christianity in the Slavic principality of Carantania, for example, began in the middle of the eighth century. Carantania's ruler Hotimir (in contemporary documents also *Chetmarus, Cheitumarus*), the nephew and successor to duke Gorazd (cf. §5.6, s.v. PSl. *gorazdъ), was a Christian who was probably raised in a monastery in Bavaria (cf. Schramm 2007: 62ff.). According to the chronicle in which the conversion of the inhabitants of Bavaria and Carantania is described, Hotimir's attempts to install Christianity first led to disturbances among his people. After some time, the revolts died down and priests were sent to Carantania to do missionary work. Schenker supposed that a large part of the population of Carantania was Christianized by the end of the eighth century (1995: 24, also Leeming 1974: 131, cf. § 6.3, s.v. PSl. *kormola). If Christian terms had first entered Slavic together with the mission of Cyril and Method, a pan-Slavic distribution can hardly be expected (although this remains a difficult subject because PSl. *korljь, which was supposedly borrowed approximately 75 years before the mission of the apostles, did manage to spread through the entire Slavic language area).

As is clear from the overview above, the religious loanwords from Germanic are clearly words relating to the Christian faith. This is in contrast with the Proto-Slavic loanwords from Iranian, which comprise more mythological and abstract religious terms, e.g., PSl. *rajь 'heaven', *bogъ 'god' (cf. Zaliznjak 1962: 41-44, Benveniste 1967).

7.4.2.6   6. YARD AND HOME GROWN/MADE PRODUCTS
Words for part of the (farm) yard or village, are PSl. *jьstъba '(heated) room', *tynъ 'fence', *vъrtogordъ 'garden', *xlěvъ 'cattle shed, stable' and *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a 'hut, cottage'. Words for fruit, garden vegetables and domestic products are: *lukъ 'chive, onion', *ovotjь/*ovotje 'fruit', *redьky/*rьdьky 'radish, *Raphanus sativus*', *xlěbъ 'loaf, bread'.

7.4.2.7   7. REMAINING WORDS

Obviously, not all words can belong to one of the categories distinguished above. The remaining words are: *buky* 'beech(nut); letter; book', *bukъ* 'beech', *gobina/*gobino*, *gobьdźь* 'wealth, abundance', *koldędźь* 'well, spring', *likъ* 'choir (?)', *lьvъ* 'lion', *pergynja* 'impenetrable covert (?)', *skutъ* 'hem, clothing covering the legs', *trǫba* 'trumpet', *userędźь* 'earring', *velьblǫdъ* 'camel', *volxъ* 'Romance-speaking person/people', *xъlmъ* 'hill'.

7.4.3   THE ORIGIN OF THE LOANWORDS IN THE SEMANTIC CATEGORIES

In none of the semantic categories, the words can exclusively be regarded as either Gothic or West Germanic. The semantic groups in which the large majority of words stem from West Germanic are the semantic categories 'technical terminology' (with the exception of PSl. *stьklo*), 'yard and home grown/made products' (with the exception of PSl. *xlěbъ*) and 'Christian terminology' (with the possible exception of PSl. *krьstъ*). This indicates that the Slavs took technical items, Christianity and words relating to the farm yard mainly over from the West Germanic peoples, rather than from the Goths. In the category 'yard and home grown/made products', the words PSl. *xlěvъ*, *ovotjь/*ovotje* and *redьky/*rьdьky* seem to stem from Low German dialects.

The semantic categories 'power and warfare' and 'trade' appear to contain Gothic as well as West Germanic loanwords in more or less equal numbers. The origin of the words referring to 'skills and mental concepts' are by and large unclear.

There is a more elusive difference between the loanwords that are borrowed from Gothic and those that are borrowed from West Germanic. The Gothic loanwords include those referring to money dealing (e.g., PSl. *lixva*, *dъlgъ*) and luxury products (e.g., PSl. *stьklo, *userędźь*), whereas the West Germanic loanwords more seem to refer to domestic terms (e.g., PSl. *lukъ, *nuta, *ovotjь/*ovotje, *xlěvъ*) and practical instruments and utensils (e.g., PSl. *pila, *plugъ, *stǫpa*). Except for PSl. *kotьlъ*, the words for containers that were clearly borrowed in relation to trade (because they denote measures of capacity) stem from West Germanic, viz., PSl. *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь, *kъbьlъ, *lagy, *ǫborъ(kъ)*.

8 ACCENTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL

8.1 SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION

In chapter 3, the two prevailing theories regarding the accentuation of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic have been expounded. According to the first theory, put forward by Meillet, the regular reflex of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic was AP (a). Lehr-Spławiński correctly set the words with a jer in the first syllable apart from this and assumed that these words regularly shifted the stress to the following syllable (1929: 708 fn.). However, we have seen that there are enough loanwords from Germanic with AP (b) to conclude that the regular accentological reflex cannot have been AP (a).

The second theory was formulated by Kuryłowicz. This theory makes a temporal division between older and younger loanwords: the older loanwords regularly joined AP (a) and the younger loanwords joined AP (b). The theory of Kuryłowicz was highly praised in later literature. There are, nevertheless, a number of problems connected to this theory, which make it - both in the light of the etymology of the Germanic loanwords and in the light of the progress in the field of Slavic accentology since the 1950's of the twentieth century - untenable. In the first place, the temporal division that Kuryłowicz applies does not agree with the supposed origin of the loanwords: if we agree that there was an older layer of loanwords (with a heavy syllabic nucleus) joining AP (a) and a younger layer joining AP (b), then we would very much like to see that corroborated in some formal way (for example, if the words that joined AP (a) show different vocalic reflexes from the words that joined AP (b)) or if the words that joined AP (a) were clearly borrowed from Gothic and the words with AP (b) from West Germanic. Unfortunately, no such division can be observed, which is also implied by Kiparsky's unsatisfying and much criticised dating of the categories distinguished by Kuryłowicz (cf. §3.4.1). It is apparent from the corpus that AP (a) contains words that are clearly of West Germanic origin, as well as words that are clearly of Gothic origin, and the same holds for AP (b).

From a modern accentological viewpoint, Kuryłowicz's theory does not hold either: the theory is based on the idea that there was an acute, stem stressed accentuation type and a non-acute, oxytone accentuation type. The acute was thought to be originally long, so the older loanwords with a long vowel or diphthong in the root could only retain their barytonesis by joining the acute, stem-stressed accentuation type, AP (a). The later loanwords were borrowed after the shortening of the acute and could thus only assume the oxytone-stressed accentuation type, AP (b).

It has now been shown that the oxytone accentuation type also goes back to stem stress originally and that the stress remained on the stem almost until the end of Proto-Slavic. This means that at the time when the loanwords were borrowed, Proto-Slavic had two accent paradigms with fixed initial stress which the loanwords could join, namely AP (a) and AP (b). The acute is likely not to have been long, but rather indifferent with respect to length (Kortlandt 1976: 5).

All earlier theories depend on the assumption that the stress pattern in AP (b) was originally oxytone. The natural point of departure was to assume that loanwords would in principle regularly join AP (a) because they would be able to retain their Germanic initial stress in AP (a) only. Dybo's law, however, shows that AP (b) goes back to fixed initial stress as well: the oxytone stress pattern of AP (b) was caused by an earlier forward shift of the stress from a syllable with rising intonation. As Ranko Matasović also noted, the Germanic loanwords were by and large all borrowed before the operation of Dybo's law (e.g., 2000: 131-132). When the words entered Proto-Slavic, they regularly retained their Germanic initial stress and they could do this as either AP (a) or AP (b). Then, at a later stage, some of the words underwent the accent shift known as Dybo's law that was characteristic of AP (b), whereas other words retained their initial stress in AP (a).

As it was shown in §2.2 and §2.3, the difference between AP (a) and AP (b) lay in the intonation of the stressed vowel: the stressed vowel in AP (a) was acute or glottalized while the stressed vowel in AP (b) was rising. When they entered Proto-Slavic, some of the words adopted the acute or glottalic intonation of AP (a) and others adopted the rising intonation of AP (b). It will be investigated in the present chapter why some Germanic loanwords joined the Proto-Slavic accent paradigm (a), while others joined AP (b).

8.2 Presentation of the material according to their Germanic origin

In most works dealing with Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, a number of different layers of loanwords are distinguished, depending on the Germanic origin, viz., Proto-Germanic, Gothic, Balkan Gothic, High German and occasionally also Low German (cf. §1.3). The basis for some of these layers is not evident. A layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic must be excluded on historical rather than on linguistic grounds: many loanwords may formally derive very well from reconstructed Proto-Germanic, but this cannot be the case because the collapse of Proto-Germanic has been dated around the beginning of the first millennium, whereas the first contacts with the Proto-Slavs are not likely to have started before the third century (cf. §4.1). The existence of Balkan

Gothic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (supposedly borrowed from Gothic in the fifth or sixth centuries) is also improbable from a historical viewpoint because it is unlikely that the Proto-Slavs borrowed many words from Gothic when the Goths occupied no more than a marginal position in the Balkans.

Judging from the material, a clear distinction can be made between Gothic and non-Gothic loanwords. Some of the non-Gothic loanwords are evidently borrowed from Old High German, while a small number of others seem to come from Low German. The origin of a number of loanwords, however, remains unclear and may on formal and semantic grounds be either Gothic, High German or Low German. I therefore distinguish between the words that derive from Gothic, those that stem from West Germanic and those of which the origin cannot be determined. I refer to the corresponding entries for detailed discussion about the etymologies of the words.

The words that are probably or undoubtedly of Gothic origin, are:
AP (a): *bljudo, *lixva, *xlěbъ;
AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *kupiti, *kusiti, *lěkъ, *vino, *vinogordъ;
AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *kotьlъ, *lьvъ, *osьlъ, *stьklo, *velьblǫdъ;
AP (c): *dъlgъ, *lьstь;
Unknown AP: *gobina/*gobino, *gobьdźь, *userędźь.

The words that are probably or undoubtedly of West Germanic origin are:
AP (a): *bukъ, *buky, *lukъ, *nuta, *pěnędźь, *plugъ, *šelmъ, *skrin(j)a, *stǫpa, *tynъ, *vitędźь, *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a;
AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *cьrky, *grędelь, *korljь, *lagy, *lugъ, *ǫborъ(kъ), *trǫba, *xlěvъ;
AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *gonoziti, *goneznǫti, *kъbьlъ, *kъnędźь, *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ, *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja, *redьky/*rьdьky, *xrьstъ;
AP (c): *jьstъba;
Unknown AP: *bъdьnja/*bъdьnjь, *pila, *retędźь, *vaga, *vъrtogordъ, *xǫdogъ, *xula/*xuliti.
Of these words, PSl. *xlěvъ, *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja, *redьky/*rьdьky and *pila are likely to stem from Low German dialects.

The origin of the following words cannot be established with any certainty:
AP (a): *duma, *koldędźь, *orky, *volxъ;
AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *myto, *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xǫsa, *xъlmъ;
AB (b) with a light syllabic nucleus: *brъnja, *krьstъ, *popъ, *postъ, *postiti sę, *skotъ;
Unknown AP: *gorazdъ, *likъ, *pergynja, *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь.

8.3　Discussion of the material

8.3.1　AP (c)

It is well known that loanwords from Germanic (or from Romance, for that matter) did not regularly join AP (c) (cf. chapter 3). This can be explained by the fact that the stress in Germanic was in principle fixed on the initial syllable of the word. Because AP (c) is characterized by mobile stress, it is unexpected for Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic to join this accentuation type. There are, nevertheless, some words that follow or seem to follow AP (c). These words are: PSl. *dъlgъ, *jьstъba* and *lъstъ*.

Another word that has often been thought to have AP (c) is PSl. *kъnędźь* (e.g., Zaliznjak 1985: 137, Dybo 1981: 171). Kortlandt (p.c.) suggested that this word might rather have belonged to AP (b) originally: PSl. *kъ̀nędźь*, Gsg. *kъ̀nędźa* regularly underwent Dybo's law and yielded PSl. *kъnę̂dźь*, Gsg. *kъnę̂dźa*. Stang's law did not operate from the newly stressed long falling vowel in the nominative because the stress could not retract to a weak jer. In the oblique cases, it would not have operated anyway because Stang's law only operated in final syllables excluding final jers (cf. Kortlandt 2002a: 17). In the oblique case forms, Gsg. *kъnę̂dźa,* etc., the long falling vowel was shortened because it stood in a medial syllable, yielding Gsg. *kъnę̀dźa,* etc. After the deletion of the initial jer, this paradigm might easily have joined AP (c) due to the long falling accent in the nominative form. A similar case might be PSl. *mъlinъ* 'mill' (cf. §6.1).

The reason for PSl. *dъlgъ* to have AP (c) could perhaps be found in the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. In the attested Slavic languages, the *u*-stems cannot be regarded as a separate stem class. In Old Church Slavic already, the old *u*-stem flexion and the *o*-stem flexion had become mixed and there is no clear distinction between the *o*-stems and the *u*-stems. Although the *u*-stems merged with *o*-stems into one paradigm, the *u*-stems left numerous productive formations in Slavic.[149]

---

[149] For example, the genitive ending *-u* that is frequent in West Slavic and Slovene and functions as a partitive genitive for some nouns in Russian, the locative in *-u* that functions as "second locative" in Russian, and occurs, e.g., in Polish after roots ending in a velar and has been generalised in Slovene and Serbian/Croatian, and the GPl. in *-ovъ* has had some productivity in Old Church Slavic and frequently occurs in East and West Slavic forms in order to prevent the Gpl. and Nsg. forms to become identical, and has been generalised for all genders in Sorbian. This is just a selection; all *u*-stem endings have survived in some form in one or more Slavic languages (cf. Bräuer 1969: 140-150).

This indicates that the *u*-stems were at a certain point of time a numerous, influential stem class (Orr 1996: 317-318).

It is impossible to establish with certainty which words originally were *u*-stems. There seems to be agreement among scholars that the following words were *u*-stems: PSl. **domъ* 'house', **medъ* 'honey', **polъ* 'half, **synъ* 'son', **volъ* 'ox' and **vьrxъ* 'top, summit'. All *u*-stems in Proto-Slavic were masculine. It has also been thought that the *u*-stems in Proto-Slavic were all monosyllabic, although there might have been some disyllabic *u*-stems as well (Orr 1996: 316-317). Several indications serve to establish whether a word was an original *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, for example, the occurrence of derivatives of the word in *-ov-*. Roots with the structure *CъRC-*, *CьRC-* relatively often have *u*-stem endings (Orr 1996: 319-320). Mobile accentuation, AP (c), is thought to be the most frequent accent paradigm with the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems (Stang 1957: 77-83, Illič-Svityč 1979: 126-129). From the six certain *u*-stems listed above, four of them have AP (c); only PSl. **volъ* and **vьrxъ* have AP (b). Proto-Slavic *u*-stems with AP (a) seem to have been exceedingly rare or even nonexistent (Stang 1957: 81). Stang analysed the 27 Old Church Slavic words cited by Diels that have a number of *u*-stem endings (not taking into account the forms with the Gpl. ending *-ovъ*, which was productive in Old Church Slavic). These words are all monosyllabic masculines and only about six of these words are not reconstructed with Proto-Slavic mobile accentuation (1957: 79, cf. Diels 1932: 153-158). In addition, eleven of the words cited by Diels have a particular type of mobile stress in Russian with fixed end stress throughout the plural. Stang connects this stress pattern to the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. PSl. **dъlgъ* is one of the forms that has this type of accentuation in Russian (Stang 1957: 77-83).

In view of the indications cited above, PSl. **dъlgъ* might very well have been an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic (even though the Gothic donor form is no *u*-stem): the word is monosyllabic and masculine and has the root structure *CъRC-*, it shows *u*-stem endings in Old Church Slavic (Diels 1932: 154), as well as, e.g., the "second locative" *v dolgú* in Russian, and the adjective formation R *dolgovój*.[150] It has AP (c) of the type that has by Stang been connected to the Proto-Slavic *u*-stems. It may thus be supposed that PSl. **dъlgъ* was an original *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic and for that reason became mobile in Proto-Slavic.

The question remains why PSl. **dъlgъ* would have become an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, whereas other monosyllabic masculine loanwords from Germanic became *o*-stems. Professor Kortlandt suggested to me that the explanation may

---

[150] Leskien considers OCS *dlъgъ* without doubt to be an old *o*-stem, but does not explain why (1962: 78).

be found in the stem-final velar of the word. As an *o*-stem, the velar would be palatalised in the locative (singular and plural, also in the vocative), and this would be unattractive for a loanword. Compare in this respect Polish, where masculine nouns with a stem in a velar regularly have a locative in -*u*.

PSl. **krěpъ*, which has been reconstructed with AP (c) as well (Dybo 1981: 105-106, Zaliznjak 1985: 138) is also likely to have been an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic, because of the Proto-Slavic formation **krěpъkъ*: the suffix in -*k*- has been connected to original *u*-stems as well (Orr 1996: 315, 329, cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. **krěpъ(kъ)*). PSl. **bergъ* might also have been an original *u*-stem, in view of the accentuation according to AP (c), as well as the adjective formation *beregovój* and the "second locative" *na beregú* in Russian (cf. §6.2, s.v. PSl. **bergъ*).

PSl. **jьstъba* may have become mobile on the basis of the suffix. According to Dybo, the Balto-Slavic suffix **-îb-â-* was recessive (2009: 32). In his analysis, the choice of an accent paradigm in Balto-Slavic depended on two factors, viz., whether the root had fixed stem stress (i.e., Lithuanian accentuation types (1) and (2)) or mobile stress (i.e., Lithuanian accentuation types (3) and (4)) and whether the suffix was recessive or dominant. Words with a recessive suffix on a mobile root joined AP (c) in Proto-Slavic (ibid.). The fact that the suffix **-ьbā* in Proto-Slavic was recessive explains why these words mainly had AP (c) (cf. Dybo 2009: 53-56). PSl. **jьstъba* could have become mobile in analogy to these forms.

PSl. **lьstь* is a feminine *i*-stem. On the basis of the structure of the word, the expected accent paradigm of this loanword is AP (b) because the syllabic nucleus of the word is light (see below). However, feminine *i*-stems with AP (b) are extremely rare in Slavic: in his overview of words arranged according to accent paradigm, Zaliznjak lists 25 feminine *i*-stems with AP (a), four with AP (b) and 63 with AP (c) (1985: 132-140). In Croatian, there are no (masculine or feminine) *i*-stems with AP (b) at all (Kapović 2009: 241 fn.). Kapović assumes that there was a tendency in Proto-Slavic already towards generalising AP (c) in the *i*-stems, which started in Proto-Slavic and remained in different degrees productive in the individual Slavic (mainly South Slavic) languages (2009: 236-243). This explains why PSl. **lьstь* (analogically) joined AP (c) instead of AP (b).

8.3.2 AP (B) WITH A LIGHT SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

Loanwords from Germanic with a light syllabic nucleus regularly joined AP (b). Light syllabic nuclei are syllables in which the vowel is the reflex of a PIE short vowel, without a following laryngeal or glottalized stop, i.e., PSl. *ь, *ъ, *e, *o (Vermeer 1992: 120).[151] Light syllabic nuclei did not occur in AP (a), where the acute intonation was caused by laryngeals and glottalized stops. It follows that Proto-Slavic words with a light syllabic nucleus could only join AP (b) or AP (c). As was shown above, the mobile AP (c) is highly irregular among the Germanic loanwords, which can be explained from the fact that Germanic had fixed initial stress. This is the reason why Germanic loanwords with a light syllabic nucleus regularly follow AP (b). AP (b) in these words is irrespective of their Germanic origin and concerns the following words: the Gothic loanwords PSl. *kotьlъ, *lьvъ, *osьlъ, *stьklo, *velьblǫdъ; the West Germanic loanwords PSl. *gonoziti, *goneznǫti, *kъbьlъ, *kъnędźь, *nebozězъ/*nabozězъ, *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja, *redьky/*rьdьky, *xrьstъ and PSl. *brъnja, *krьstъ, *popъ, *postъ, *postiti sę, *skotъ, which are of unknown origin.

In Germanic, these words were generally stressed on the initial syllable of the word and they retained the initial stress in Proto-Slavic (but see below on PSl. *kotьlъ, *osьlъ and *kъbьlъ). With the operation of Dybo's law, the stress of these words regularly shifted to the following syllable.

A number of these words has a full vowel in the initial syllable and a jer in the second syllable. If these words were originally stressed on the initial syllable, the expected reflex would be fixed initial stress. This is the case with PSl. *petьlja, *redьky/*rьdьky (also PSl. *smoky, in the oblique cases *smokъv-, which is disputably of Germanic origin, cf. §6.2). Because of their fixed initial stress, Kuryłowicz regards these words as very late borrowings, for which he created "période 3" in his accentological distribution of Germanic loanwords (1958: 235 and cf. §3.3.3). The accentuation of these words is, however, no more than regular: the words were borrowed from Germanic with fixed initial stress. The stress regularly shifted to the following syllable with Dybo's law and moved back when the jers lost their stressability.

As Meillet already observed (1902: 186), the accentuation of PSl. *kotьlъ, *osьlъ and *kъbьlъ is irregular because the stress did not move back from the medial jer to the initial syllable after the jers lost their stressability. The reflexes of these words in the different Slavic languages rather suggest a late Proto-Slavic (post-Dybo's law) accent pattern of the type *kotьl̲, Gsg. *kotьl̲a (hence R kotël,

---

[151] The vowel of a heavy syllabic nucleus is the reflex of a long vowel of whatever origin or diphthong consisting of a sequence of vowel and *i, *u, *m, *n, *r, *l (Vermeer 1992: 120).

Gsg. *kotlá* and not R *kotël*, Gsg. **kótla*). This seems to imply that the stress was on the second syllable before the operation of Dybo's law. For this reason, Meillet suggested that PSl. **kotъlъ, *osъlъ* and **kъbъlъ* were borrowed from Latin rather than from Germanic because in Latin, the stress was in principle fixed on the penultimate syllable (and on the antepenultimate when the penultimate was short). From phonological, morphological and semantic viewpoints, however, these words are better explained as loanwords from Germanic (cf. §5.4). Berneker regards the accentuation of these words to be secondary after words as PSl. **kozъlъ* 'he-goat' and **orьlъ* 'eagle' (1924: 591), which were stressed on the suffix **-ьlъ* (cf. Derksen 2008: 242, 376). This may very well be correct and this would mean that in the words PSl. **kotъlъ, *osъlъ* and **kъbъlъ*, the place of the stress does not give indications of either Germanic or Romance origin.

8.3.3   AP (A) AND (B) WITH A HEAVY SYLLABIC NUCLEUS

The main group of words for which an explanation is to be found are the words with a heavy syllabic nucleus, which belong either to AP (a) or AP (b). These words are:

of Gothic origin:

- AP (a): **bljudo, *lixva, *xlěbъ;*
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: **kupiti, *kusiti, *lěkъ, *vino, *vinogordъ;*

of West Germanic origin:

- AP (a): **bukъ, *buky, *lukъ, *nuta, *pěnędźь, *plugъ, *šelmъ, *skrin(j)a, *stǫpa, *tynъ, *vitędźь, *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a;*
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: **cьrky, *grędelь, *korljь, *lagy, *lugъ, *ǫborъ(kъ), *trǫba, *xlěvъ;*

of unknown origin:

- AP (a): **duma, *koldędźь, *orky, *volxъ;*
- AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus: **cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *myto, *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xǫsa, *xъlmъ.*

It is clear from the overview above that the words are distributed in almost equal numbers over the accent paradigms (a) and (b). Contrary to what has been assumed before (cf. chapter 3), I suppose that the 'default' accent paradigm for Germanic loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus to join was not AP (a), but rather AP (b), in which the stressed vowel carried a rising tone.

A number of words joined the glottalized AP (a), but only when there were specific reasons to do so. Judging from the material, it seems that there were at least two groups of words that regularly joined AP (a):

1. The Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine words;
2. The West Germanic loanwords with a root ending in a voiceless stop.

8.3.3.1   PROTO-SLAVIC MASCULINE O-STEMS

Many Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems regularly derive from Germanic masculine *a*-stems, but there are also Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems that derive from a Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor form. The Germanic neuter nouns are thought to have regularly changed their gender into masculine when they were borrowed into Proto-Slavic (cf. §7.3.3). It turns out, however, that there is an accentological difference between the words that were masculine in the Germanic donor language, on the one hand, and the Germanic neuter (or feminine) words on the other hand: the Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine words joined AP (a), whereas those from Germanic neuter (or feminine) forms joined AP (b).

The explanation for this distribution can be found in Illič-Svityč's law, according to which Proto-Slavic barytone masculine *o*-stems without an acute root vowel (i.e., the words with AP (b)) generalized accentual mobility and secondarily joined AP (c) (cf. also §2.5 and §7.3.3). This means that Proto-Slavic had no masculine *o*-stems that belonged to AP (b) because these words had all joined AP (c).[152] I assume that for this reason, the Germanic masculine donor words joined AP (a) in Proto-Slavic: the new Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems could not join AP (b) because this accent paradigm did not include any masculine *o*-stems, nor could they join AP (c) because AP (c) was mobile.

It follows that the elimination of masculine *o*-stems from AP (b) according to Illič-Svityč's law must have taken place before the borrowing of the loanwords from Germanic (both from Gothic and from West Germanic). Had Illič-Svityč's law operated after the borrowing of the loanwords, then the masculine *o*-stems with a non-acute root vowel would have partaken in the analogical shift towards mobility and joined AP (c).[153]

---

[152] It has been thought that traces of the original accentuation pattern were retained in Croatian dialects in Istria and on Susak (Illič-Svityč 1963: 109-119). This led to the postulation of a separate AP (d), in which the NAsg. were accented according to AP (c) and the other case forms according to AP (b). It has however, been shown that the material on which AP (d) in the Croatian dialects is based, is not very reliable (Vermeer 2001a: 131-161, Langston 2007).

[153] The only masculine *o*-stem that follows AP (c) is PSl. *dъlgъ*, which probably stems from Gothic. It would be a rather *ad hoc* explanation to assume that this word was the only one

　　　　The secondary transfer of AP (b) masculine *o*-stems to the mobile AP (c) did not include the masculine *jo*-stems. This explains why the words that are borrowed into Proto-Slavic as masculine *jo*-stems, viz., PSl. **cěsarь/*cesarь, *grędelь, *korljь*, are by default stressed according to AP (b).

The Proto-Slavic masculine words that, on the other hand, only became *jo*-stems after the progressive palatalization of velar consonants were initially borrowed into Proto-Slavic as masculine *o*-stems and thus did regularly join AP (a). This concerns the words that have the Proto-Slavic suffix **-ędźь* from Germanic **-inga-*: PSl. **koldędźь, *pěnędźь* and **vitędźь* regularly joined AP (a). The accentuation of PSl. **gobьdźь, *retędźь, *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь* and **userędźь* is unknown and cannot be determined on the basis of the attested forms. Since the syllabic nucleus of PSl. **retędźь* and **skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь* is light, these words could not have joined AP (a), and the same goes for PSl. **kъnędźь*, which can be reconstructed with AP (b), instead of AP (c) as is often suggested (cf. §8.3.1).

The following overview shows the Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus and AP (a) or (b) and the supposed gender of the Germanic donor word:

Proto-Slavic	Accent paradigm	Gender of the donor form
*bljudъ (> **bljudo*)	AP (a)	masculine
*bukъ	AP (a)	feminine (secondarily masc. in Slavic, cf. §5.2)
*koldędźь	AP (a)	masculine
*lukъ	AP (a)	masculine
*pěnędźь	AP (a)	masculine
*plugъ	AP (a)	masculine
*šelmъ	AP (a)	masculine
*tynъ	AP (a)	masculine

borrowed before the operation of Illič-Svityč's law. I suggested in §8.3.1 that the reason for **dъlgъ* to have AP (c) can be explained if the word had become an *u*-stem in Proto-Slavic.

*vitędźь	AP (a)	masculine
*volxъ	AP (a)	masculine
*xlěbъ	AP (a)	masculine
*xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a	AP (a)	neuter[154]
*lěkъ	AP (b)	Proto-Slavic derivative
*lugъ	AP (b)	feminine (secondary masc. in Slavic)
*ǫborъ(kъ)	AP (b)	neuter or masculine?
*pъlkъ	AP (b)	neuter
*skutъ	AP (b)	probably neuter
*vinogordъ	AP (b)	AP (b) after PSl. *vino
*xlěvъ	AP (b)	neuter
*xъlmъ	AP (b)	neuter or masculine?

The distribution according to which the (majority of) masculine *o*-stems deriving from Germanic masculine forms belong to AP (a) and the words that derive from Germanic neuter (or feminine) forms belong to AP (b), applies to both the Gothic and the West Germanic loanwords. According to this distribution, the following words regularly follow AP (a): *xlěbъ, *bljudo* (from Gothic)*, *lukъ, *pěnędźь, *plugъ, *šelmъ, *tynъ, *vitędźь* (from West Germanic)*, *koldędźь, *volxъ* (of indeterminable origin).

The Germanic donor forms of the AP (a)-stressed words *xlěbъ, *pěnędźь, *plugъ, *šelmъ, *vitędźь, *koldędźь* and *volxъ* are masculine beyond any doubt. PSl. *bljudo* (AP (a)) is, of course, a neuter form. The Germanic donor, probably Goth. *biuþs*, is, however, masculine. As the word is attested in Old Church Slavic as masculine as well, viz., OCS *bljudъ*, the masculine gender might be original for the Proto-Slavic borrowing and the neuter forms the result of early analogical adaptation. The original gender of NWGmc. *lauka-* and NWGmc. *tūna-*, from reflexes of which PSl. *lukъ* and *tynъ* (AP (a)) derive, is

---

[154] NB: PSl. *xysъ/-a*, *xyžъ/-a*, *xyšъ/-a* and *bukъ* do not comply with the distribution described below.

sometimes thought to be neuter, but in fact seems to be masculine (cf. §7.3.3). On PSl. *bukъ and *xysъ, *xyžъ, *xyšъ, see below.

Among the loanwords, there are also masculine o-stems that belong to AP (b). These forms are: PSl. *lěkъ, *vinogordъ (from Gothic), *lugъ, *ǫborъ(kъ), *xlěvъ (from West Germanic), *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xъlmъ (of unknown origin). However, contrary to the words discussed above, in none of these words was the donor form a masculine word without any doubt. The noun corresponding to PSl. *lěkъ is not attested as such in Germanic (only words deriving from PGmc. *lēkja- 'doctor' or PGmc. *lekinōn- 'to cure'). PSl. *vinogordъ is a masculine o-stem because of the second element of the compound, but the word is accented in accordance with AP (b) according to PSl. *vino. PSl. *lugъ was borrowed from a reflex of NWGmc. *laugō, a feminine ō-stem. The original gender of NWGmc. *aimbara- 'bucket', from a reflex of which PSl. *ǫborъ(kъ) was borrowed, is unclear and may have been masculine or neuter: both OHG eimbar and OS êmbar are listed as masculine/neuter in the dictionaries (Seebold 2008: 1061, Holthausen 1974: 15). PSl. *xlěvъ derives from a reflex of PGmc. *hlew(j)a, which was neuter. The gender in Gothic and Old Saxon is unclear and might be masculine or neuter (Lehmann 1986: 187, Holthausen 1954: 34), but since the words go back to a neuter proto-form, the word might very well have been borrowed when the original neuter gender was retained. PGmc. *fulka-, from a reflex of which PSl. *pъlkъ is derived, is usually reconstructed and attested as a neuter a-stem (e.g., Fick/Falk/Torp 1909: 235, cf. §7.3.3). The original gender of PGmc. *skauta-, from a reflex of which PSl. *skutъ was borrowed is unclear and might be masculine or neuter: Lehmann assumes a neuter for the Gothic Dsg. skauta (1986: 311). The word is attested in masculine and feminine forms in Old High German (scōz m., scōzo m., scōza f.), ON skaut is a neuter form and Old English scēat is masculine. The word is often regarded as a borrowing from Gothic and may thus have been borrowed from an original neuter form. PSl. *xъlmъ was probably borrowed from an unattested Gothic or Langobardic form. The West Germanic cognates are either neuter or masculine: OS holm is neuter according to Kluge (2002), but masculine according to Holthausen (1954: 35) and the Old Norse forms are masculine (De Vries 1977: 248). This seems to point to a prevalence of masculine forms, but the original gender of the donor form is impossible to reconstruct.

The forms that do not follow the distribution described above, are PSl. *bukъ and *xysъ, *xyžъ, *xyšъ. PSl. *bukъ, from a reflex of NWGmc. *bōkō 'beech' (f. ō-stem), is thought to be secondarily masculine after other monosyllabic Proto-Slavic words for trees (REW 1: 139) and is probably accented according to AP (a) after PSl. *buky and/or because of the distribution that is described below (cf. §8.3.3.2). PSl. *xysъ, *xyžъ, *xyšъ derive from a reflex of PGmc. *hūsa-,

which is attested as neuter in all Germanic languages. The expected reflex is therefore AP (b) instead of AP (a).

It turns out that the distribution of the masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus over the Proto-Slavic accent paradigms (a) and (b) can be predicted on the basis of the gender of the Germanic donor form. There were no original masculine *o*-stems in AP (b) because the original Proto-Slavic non-acute masculine *o*-stems had joined AP (c) according to Illič-Svityč's law. The masculine words that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic therefore joined AP (a), where masculine *o*-stems occurred frequently. The Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor words that for different reasons turned masculine in Proto-Slavic were able to join AP (b), which was the default accent paradigm that the Germanic loanwords joined. This distribution explains the occurrence of AP (a) or AP (b) for the majority of masculine *o*-stems in Proto-Slavic (except for PSl. **bukъ* and **xysъ, *xyžъ, *xyšъ*).

8.3.3.2   WEST GERMANIC ROOTS ENDING IN A VOICELESS STOP

Now that we have explained the fact that words with a light syllabic nucleus joined AP (b) as well as the accentological distribution of the masculine *o*-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus over the accent paradigms (a) and (b), we will investigate the remaining material. It was supposed that the loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus joined AP (b) by default. This leaves the words with AP (a) to be explained. These words are (excluding the masculine *o*-stems): PSl. **lixva* (of Gothic origin)*; *buky, *nuta, *skrinja, *stǫpa* (of West Germanic origin)*;* and **duma, *orky* (of unknown origin).

It is striking that many more West Germanic than Gothic loanwords follow AP (a). (Note that this is again in defiance of the chronological distribution supposed by Kuryłowicz, who stated that the earlier and not the later loanwords tend to become acute). Whereas (including the masculine *o*-stems) only three probable Gothic loanwords have AP (a), there are twelve probable West Germanic loanwords with AP (a). When we look at the West Germanic loanwords and their distribution over AP (a) and AP (b), a phonologically conditioned distribution stands out: the words with a root ending in a voiceless stop tend to follow AP (a) and those with a root ending in a voiced stop follow AP (b): PSl. **buky,*nuta, *stǫpa* (and **bukъ, *lukъ, *vitędźь,* (originally) masculine *o*-stems) have AP (a), whereas **grędelь, *lagy,* and **trǫba* (and **lugъ,*

*ǫborъ(kъ), masculine *o*-stems) have AP (b).[155] No such distribution can be found within the Gothic words. PSl. *cьrky is an exception to this distribution. In the following section, it will be argued that the acute intonation of the Proto-Slavic loanwords with a root ending in a voiceless stop from West Germanic can be connected to the preglottalization of the West Germanic voiceless stops. The absence of acute intonation in PSl. *cьrky can perhaps be explained by the presence of *r* between the vowel and the stop, which may have prevented the Proto-Slavs from perceiving the glottalization.

GLOTTALIZATION IN WEST GERMANIC?

In his discussion about the differences in accentological treatment between Latin and Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic (in which he describes that Germanic loanwords (regularly) became acute, whereas the Latin loanwords rarely joined the acute accentuation type), Lehr-Spławiński concludes that:

> "[i]l ne reste donc que d'admettre que les voyelles accentuées dans des divers dialectes germaniques différaient par leur intonation de celles du latin. Bien que les intonations ne jouaient aucun rôle dans la structure grammaticale des langues en question, la différence était aperçue par les Slaves dont la langue commune possédait un système d'intonations richement développé." (1929: 709).

Kortlandt also suggested that the reason why some of the Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic kept their initial stress and follow AP (a) "must be sought in the pitch characteristics of the Germanic dialects from which the words were taken" (1975: 70). This might very well account for the distribution of the West Germanic loanwords over AP (a) and AP (b). There must be a phonetic reason for West Germanic loanwords with a root in a voiceless stop to join the acute AP (a).

In his discussion of the nature of the acute intonation in Proto-Slavic, Holzer discusses the accentuation of Germanic and Romance loanwords in Proto-Slavic (2009: 152-153). He agrees with Kortlandt, et al., who think that typological and structural reasons make it plausible that the Proto-Slavic acute was a glottalic (laryngeal) element, as in Proto-Indo-European. The fact that Germanic and Romance loanwords frequently adopt AP (a) when they are accommodated to the Slavic accentual patterns, according to Holzer, indicates that the Proto-Slavic

---

[155] PSl. *plugъ supposedly joined AP (a) because it is a masculine *o*-stem deriving from a masculine donor form (see above), just as PSl. *lukъ, *vitędźь.

acute was a "Prosodem" (a suprasegmental feature) and not a "Segment" (2009: 153):

> "Denn damit, dass das Germanische und das Romanische in den betreffenden Positionen selbst ein glottales Element aufgewiesen hätten, ist nicht zu rechnen; wohl aber konnten die betreffenden Silben in den Gebersprachen manchmal allophonisch auf eine bestimmte Weise intoniert oder glottalisiert (mit „creaky-voice") ausgesprochen worden sein, wobei es sich um lautstilistische oder individuelle Varianten gehandelt haben könnte. Auch die Einbettung einer Silbe in eine bestimmte Satzmelodie könnte von den Slaven als Silbenintonation interpretiert worden sein." (ibid.).

I do not think it likely that allophonic pronunciation ("lautstilistische oder individuelle Varianten") in the Germanic donor language caused loanwords to join AP (a). I rather suppose that some dialects of Germanic indeed had a phonemic glottalic element which caused some of the words to join the acute AP (a) in Proto-Slavic, as Holzer thinks impossible. As was described in §2.2 and §7.2.1.6, Kortlandt reconstructs the PIE voiced unaspirated stops $*b$, $*d$, $*g^{(w)}$ as preglottalized stops. In Balto-Slavic, the PIE voiced unaspirated stops caused preceding vowels to become long and acute (Winter's law). Kortlandt states that the acute intonation of AP (a) was caused by the PIE laryngeals and glottalized (= PIE voiced unaspirated) stops only (e.g., 1975: 22, 1978a: 110). The glottal element of these stops and of the PIE laryngeals developed into a feature of the preceding vowel and yielded a contour that can be compared to the broken tone that is found in Latvian and dialects of Lithuanian (Kortlandt, e.g., 1985b: 122).

Kortlandt also supposes that the preglottalization of PIE $*b$, $*d$, $*g^{(w)}$ was retained as such in Germanic until relatively recent (and until today in modern standard English and the western Jutlandic dialect of Danish) (1988: 6-8). Whereas the preglottalization of PGmc. $*p$, $*t$, $*k^{(w)}$ would have disappeared at a relatively early stage of Gothic, it caused preaspiration, preglottalization and gemination in almost all Northwest Germanic languages (Kortlandt 1988: 6-9, cf. §7.2.1.6).

It is striking that exactly the West Germanic words with a root ending in one of the voiceless, supposedly preglottalized, stops joined AP (a); this fits in well with the idea that the preglottalization had been retained in West Germanic, at least in the dialects with which the Proto-Slavs came into contact when they came to central Europe. When taking over the loanwords, the Proto-Slavs identified the glottalic element of the Germanic voiceless stops with their own glottalic element of the words with AP (a). For this reason, the West Germanic stops with a root in a voiceless stop joined AP (a) in Proto-Slavic. The loanwords with a root in a voiceless stop in Proto-Slavic, reflecting a West

Germanic voiceless (preglottalized) stop thus joined AP (a): *bukъ, *buky, *nuta, *stǫpa (*lukъ, vitędźь), whereas the words with a root in a voiced stop by default joined AP (b): *grędelь, *lagy, *trǫba, (*lugъ, *ǫborъ(kъ)). This distribution covers all West Germanic loanwords with a root that ends in a stop (except for PSl. *cьrky, where the transfer of the glottalic element may have been blocked by the resonant between the vowel and the stop.).[156]

Kortlandt found no evidence for the glottal stop in the Low German area and in Gothic (1988: 8). If the glottalic feature got indeed lost at an early stage in the Low German dialects, we would not expect the Low German loanwords in Proto-Slavic to have AP (a) and this indeed is not the case if one looks at the accentuation of the Low German loanwords in the corpus. The words that supposedly come from Low German are: PSl. *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja, *pila, *redьky/*rьdьky and *xlěvъ. PSl. *ovotjь/*ovotje, *petьlja and *redьky/*rьdьky have regularly joined AP (b) because the syllabic nucleus of these words is light. PSl. *xlěvъ has AP (b) and *pila has AP (b) or (c).

8.3.4 Remaining words and exceptions

For a number of words, the exact Germanic provenance cannot with certainty be determined. These words are:

- AP (a): *duma, *koldędźь, *orky, *volxъ;
- AP (b), heavy syllabic nucleus: *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь, *myto, *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xǫsa, *xъlmъ;
- AB (b), light syllabic nucleus: *brънja, *krъstъ, *popъ, *postъ, *postiti sę, *skotъ;
- Unknown AP: *likъ, *pergynja, *skъlędźь/*stъlędźь/*štъlędźь.

See above for the discussion of the accentuation of the words with AB (b) and a light syllabic nucleus, which includes PSl. *brънja, *krъstъ, *popъ, *postъ, *postiti sę, *skotъ (§8.3.2) and the masculine o-stems with a heavy syllabic nucleus, which includes PSl. *koldędźь, *volxъ, *pъlkъ, *skutъ, *xъlmъ (§8.3.3.1). PSl. *cěsarь/*cesarь/*cьsarь joined AP (b) because it was borrowed into Proto-Slavic as a jo-stem. It therefore joined the 'default' accent paradigm for words with a heavy syllabic nucleus. The same goes for PSl. *xǫsa.

This leaves the accentuation of PSl. *duma, *orky (with AP (a)) to be explained. If we apply the distribution of the words with a root ending in a stop

---

[156] For PSl. *plugъ, see above.

that is described above, it follows that *orky* must be a West Germanic (High German) loanword and that *myto* does not derive from Old High German. This is not in conflict with the etymologies that have often been suggested for these words. On the basis of accentological evidence, it can therefore be supposed that PSl. *orky* is a West Germanic loanword and that PSl. *myto* derives from Gothic (Low German might theoretically also be possible but PSl. *myto* has often been thought to derive from Gothic).

The explanations given above for the distribution of the Germanic loanwords over the Proto-Slavic accent paradigms cover the vast majority of the material. The accentuation of a small number of words remains unexplained. The two motivations adduced above for loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus for joining AP (a) do not explain why PSl. *lixva, *skrin(j)a, *xyzъ/-a, *xysъ/-a, *xyžъ/-a, *xyšъ/-a* and *duma* joined AP (a).

9 SUMMARY

The aim of this study has been to present an up-to-date overview of the words that are to be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic and to establish the distribution of the loanwords over the three Proto-Slavic accent paradigms.

CONTACTS BETWEEN SPEAKERS OF PROTO-SLAVIC AND GERMANIC

In the Proto-Slavic homeland, which can be located to the foothills of the Carpathians in the area north and northeast of the Carpathian Mountains and on the vast forest steppes around the river Dniester, the Slavs did not come into contact with speakers of Germanic languages at least until the first half of the third century AD. The first contacts between Slavic and Germanic peoples came about either during the Gothic migration (if their migration took the Goths through the Proto-Slavic homeland) or else shortly after the arrival of the Goths in the Pontic area around 238 AD. The contacts with the Goths are likely to have ended in the fifth century, when the Goths moved to Italy and Spain and the remaining Goths lost their power in the Black Sea area. The contacts between the Proto-Slavs and speakers of West Germanic started when the Proto-Slavs moved westwards beyond the Carpathian Mountains. These contacts have never ceased to exist (speakers of Slavic and German still live in close contacts to each other in many areas where the West Slavic languages, Slovene or Croatian border on German). Loanwords from West Germanic languages could therefore enter Proto-Slavic until its disintegration at the beginning of the ninth century.

Contrary to many scholars who suppose a layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, I assume that a clear distinction can only be made between Gothic and West Germanic loanwords. Occasionally, it is possible to attribute a West Germanic loanword to either High German or Low German. Scholars have often speculated as to which particular Germanic dialect provided the donor of individual Slavic words, sometimes even reconstructing non-existing Germanic dialect forms that formally match the Slavic word. I have as much as possible refrained from this kind of speculation.

In this summary, I will nevertheless hazard a guess as to where and with whom the Proto-Slavs came into contact in central Europe. Both from a temporal and geographical viewpoint, it is attractive to assume that the Langobards were one of the first major Germanic tribes the Slavs met when they moved westwards. In the fifth and sixth centuries, the Langobards occupied a large territory bordering on the Carpathian Mountains in the east and north, more or less corresponding to present-day Slovakia. This means that the speakers of Proto-Slavic that moved westwards from their homeland, as well as the Proto-Slavs that crossed the Carpathians along the river Orava or through

the Moravian gate encountered Langobards. In 528, the Langobards crossed the Alps into Italy, supposedly under pressure of the Avars, who then established their centre of power in the Carpathian Basin, which they retained until they were ultimately defeated by Charlemagne. It has repeatedly been suggested that the Avar armies consisted for a significant part of Slavs, which would prove early contacts between Proto-Slavs and Langobards. I suppose in this dissertation that the Proto-Slavic loanwords *pъlkъ and *xъlmъ were borrowed from Langobardic, if they were not taken over from Gothic.

Another contact area from where Germanic loanwords may have spread through the Proto-Slavic linguistic unity is Slavic Carantania. This Slavic princedom, which bordered on Bavaria, had its centre in present-day Carinthia. Carantania emerged as an semi-independent Slavic state in the seventh century and became a margraviate of the Frankish empire in the early ninth century. In the mid-eighth century, the Carantanian dukes, Borut, Gorazd and Hotimir, ruled Carantania semi-independently from the Frankish empire. Hotimir was raised in a Bavarian monastery and he installed Christianity among his people. The Proto-Slavic loanword *kormola 'rebellion' may have been borrowed in Carantania because this word describes the initial protests of the Slavic inhabitants of Carantania against the Christianization attempts. Given the fact that the Carantanians are known to have been Christianized relatively early, it could be supposed that the Proto-Slavic Christian terminology from Germanic can originally be located to Carantania.

MORPHOLOGY

An interesting morphological peculiarity that has been cleared in this dissertation is the frequent occurrence of feminine $\bar{u}$-stems among the loanwords. The occurrence of the feminine $\bar{u}$-stems has often been connected to loanwords from Germanic, but is in fact frequently found among the loanwords from Latin and early Romance dialects as well. It turns out that the productivity of the feminine $\bar{u}$-stems among loanwords began in the Proto-Slavic loanwords from Germanic: feminine words with a stem ending in a velar consonant became $\bar{u}$-stems, whereas words with a stem ending in any other consonant became $\bar{a}/j\bar{a}$-stems. At a later stage of Proto-Slavic, the $\bar{u}$-stem declension became productive for loanwords from other languages as well, especially for words referring to various kinds of plants and containers.

ACCENTUATION OF THE LOANWORDS IN PROTO-SLAVIC

The corpus of certain Germanic loanwords comprises 78 words, 19 of which have AP (a), 19 loanwords have AP (b) with a heavy syllabic nucleus, 20 have AP (b) with a light syllabic nucleus and only 3 loanwords have AP (c). The accentuation of 17 loanwords remains indeterminable.

It is immediately clear that AP (c) is not a regular accentuation type for Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, which is completely understandable from the fact that the stress in Germanic was fixed on the initial syllable of the word. The loanwords could regularly join AP (a) and (b) in Proto-Slavic because these accent paradigms had fixed stress on the root up until almost the end of Proto-Slavic, when the stress in AP (b)-stressed words was shifted to the following syllable according to Dybo's law. The loanwords with a light syllabic nucleus in the root (PSl. *e, *o, *ь, *ъ from Germanic *e, *a, *i, *u) regularly joined AP (b), because AP (a) only contains words with a heavy syllabic nucleus. The main question is therefore the distribution of the loanwords with a heavy syllabic nucleus over AP (a) and AP (b). I assume, contrary to the earlier theories, that AP (b) was the 'default' accent paradigm for Germanic loanwords to join. Loanwords joined AP (a) only when there was specific reason to do so. I have found two conditioning factors for the loanwords to join AP (a), which taken together explain almost all the material:

1. The loanword is a Proto-Slavic masculine *o*-stem deriving from a Germanic masculine word;
2. The donor of the word is a West Germanic word with a root ending in a voiceless stop.

The first conditioning factor comprises the loanwords both from Gothic and from West Germanic. Since the original Proto-Slavic non-acute masculine *o*-stems had joined AP (c) according to Illič-Svityč's law, there were no original masculine *o*-stems in AP (b). For this reason, the masculine words that the Proto-Slavs borrowed from Germanic joined AP (a), where masculine *o*-stems occurred frequently. The Germanic neuter (or feminine) donor words that for various reasons became masculine in Proto-Slavic were able to regularly join AP (b). This distribution explains the difference in accentuation between such words as PSl. *plugъ AP (a), which was borrowed from a masculine donor, and PSl. *lugъ AP (b), which was borrowed from a feminine donor word.

Secondly, there turned out to be a clear distribution over AP (a) and AP (b) of the West Germanic words with a root ending in a stop. Words with a root ending in a voiceless stop have AP (a) and those with a root ending in a voiced stop have AP (b). This distribution applies to the non-Gothic borrowings ending in a stop, explaining the contrast in accentuation between similar words like PSl. *lukъ AP (a) and *lugъ AP (b) or PSl. *stǫpa AP (a) and *trǫba AP (b).

I think that the explanation for this distribution can be found in the preglottalization that has been reconstructed for the Proto-Indo-European voiced unaspirated stops. Kortlandt supposes that the preglottalization was retained as such in Germanic until relatively recently in the reflexes of the Proto-Germanic voiceless stops *p, *t, *k^(w). In Proto-Slavic, the preglottalized stops (as well as the PIE laryngeals) yielded the acute intonation of AP (a). At

the time when the Slavs came into contact with speakers of West Germanic, they themselves had a series of laryngealized vowels in the words with AP (a), as the Latvians have until the present day in the words with a broken tone. The speakers of Germanic they came into contact with had a system that contained preglottalized stops. The preglottalized stops were retained in modern standard English (where tautosyllabic voiceless stops are preglottalized, e.g., E *leaˀp*, *helˀp*). It is not very far-fetched to suppose that the two phenomena were connected by the Proto-Slavs when they took over the Germanic words, for the difference between a glottalized vowel and a vowel followed by a preglottalized stop cannot have been very large. The distribution of the West Germanic loanwords over AP (a) and AP (b) provides unexpected corroboration for Kortlandt's idea that the glottalization of the PIE voiced unaspirated stops has been retained in West Germanic.

10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

10.1 BIBLIOGRAPHIC ABBREVIATIONS

BER   Georgiev: Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik.
DG   Grimm: Deutsche Grammatik.
DWb   Grimm and Grimm: Deutsches Wörterbuch.
ERHSJ   Skok: Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika.
ĖSRJ   Vasmer: Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka.
ESSlov.   Bezlaj: Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika.
ĖSSJa   Trubačev: Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov.
ESUM   Mel'nyčuk: Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy.
EWA   LLoyd: Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen.
EWN   Philippa: Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands.
HEW   Schuster-Šewc: Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbi-
          schen Sprache.
LEW   Walde: Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.
LitEW   Fraenkel: Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.
MNW   Verwijs/Verdam: Middelnederlandsch woordenboek.
MSDJ   Sreznevskij: Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskago jazyka.
REW   Vasmer: Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.
RGA   Hoops: Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde.
RJA   Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti: Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika.
RSA   Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti: Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog
          jezika.
SEJDP   Polański/Lehr-Spławiński: Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich.

10.2 REFERENCES

Adams, J.N.
    2007   *The regional diversification of Latin: 200 BC – AD 600, Cambridge-New York.*
Allen, W.S.
    1974   *Vox Graeca*, London.
Andersen, H. (ed.)
    1969   "Lenition in Common Slavic", *Language* 45/3, 553-574.
    2003   *Language contacts in prehistory: studies in stratigraphy* (Current Issues in Linguistic
           Theory 239), Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
Anić, V. (et al., ed.)
    2002   *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, Zagreb.
Baist, G.
    1886   "Ploum - plaumorati", *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik mit
           Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins* 3, 285-286.
Bammesberger, A.
    1990   *Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens*, Heidelberg.

Bandle, O. (et al.)

2002 *The Nordic languages: an international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages, volume 1*, Berlin.

Barford, P.M.

2001 *The early Slavs: Culture and society in early medieval Eastern Europe*, London.

Beekes, R.S.P.

1987 "On Indo-European 'wine'", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48, 21-26.

2009 *Etymological dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10), Leiden-Boston.

Beekes, R.S.P. and M. de Vaan

2011 *Comparative Indo-European linguistics, an introduction: Second edition, revised and corrected by Michiel de Vaan*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.

Bennett, W.H.

1949 "The Monophthongization of Gothic ai au", *Language* 25/1, 15-21.

1950 "The Germanic development of Indo-European ē", *Language* 26/2, 232-235.

Benveniste, E.

1967 "Les relations lexicales slavo-iraniennes", *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 11 October, 1966*, The Hague-Paris.

Berneker, E.

1924 *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

Bezlaj, F., M. Snoj, M. Furlan and S. Klemenčič

1976-2007 *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, Ljubljana.

Bilodid, I.K. (ed.)

1970-1980 *Slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy: v 11 tomax*, Kyjiv.

Birnbaum, H.

1973 "The original homeland of the Slavs and the problem of early Slavic linguistic contacts", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 407-421.

1984 "Zu den ältesten lexikalischen Lehnbeziehungen zwischen Slaven und Germanen", *Festschrift für Gerta Hüttl-Folter zum sechzigsten Geburtstag* (Wiener Slawistischer Almanach 13), 7-19.

Bosworth J. and T. Northcote Toller

1898 *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary, based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*, http://bosworthtoller.com.

1921 *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary, Supplement*, http://bosworthtoller.com.

Brather, S.

2004 *Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie: Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, Band 42), Berlin.

2008 *Archäologie der westlichen Slawen. Siedlung, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Ostmitteleuropa, 2., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, Band 30), Berlin.

Bräuer, H.

1969 *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft 2, Formenlehre 1. Teil*, Berlin.

Braune, W. and I. Reiffenstein

2004 *Althochdeutsche Grammatik, I. Laut- und Formenlehre, 15. Auflage, bearbeitet von Ingo Reiffenstein*, Tübingen.

Bruckner, W.

1895 *Die Sprache der Langobarden*, Strassburg.

Brückner, A.
  1927   *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego,* Kraków [reprint: Warszawa, 1985].
  1929   "Die germanischen Elemente im Gemeinslavischen", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 42,
          125-146.
Cejtlin, R.M., R. Večerka and Ė. Blagova
  1999   *Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X-XI vekov)*, Moskva.
Čolakova, K. (ed.)
  1977- *Rečnik na bălgarskija ezik*, Sofia.
Curta, F.
  2001   *The making of the Slavs: history and archaeology of the Lower Danube region, c. 500–
          700*, Cambridge.
  2004   "The Slavic Lingua franca", *East Central Europe/ECE* 31/1, 125-148.
Dahl, Ö.
  2001   "The origin of the Scandinavian languages", in: Ö. Dahl and M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm
          (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages: volume 1: past and present*, Amsterdam-
          Philadelphia, 215-236.
Dähnert, J.C.
  1781   *Platt-deutsches Wörter-Buch: nach der alten und neuen pommerschen und rügischen
          Mundart*, Stralsund.
Dennis, G.T.
  1984   *Maurice's Strategikon: handbook of Byzantine military strategy*, Philadelphia.
Derksen, R.H.
  2008   *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European
          Etymological Dictionary Series 4), Leiden-Boston.
De Vaan, M.
  2008   *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* (Leiden Indo-European
          Etymological Dictionary Series 7), Leiden-Boston.De Vries, J.
  1977   *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Leiden.
De Vries, J. and F. De Tollenaere
  1997   *Nederlands etymologisch woordenboek*, Leiden.
Dewing, H.B.
  1962   *Translation from Procopius in seven volumes, with an English translation by H.B.
          Dewing, volume 4,* London-New York.
Diels, P.
  1932   *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik, mit einer Auswahl von Texten und einem Wörterbuch*,
          Heidelberg.
Dubisz, S. (ed.)
  2003   *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, Warszawa (digital version: http://sjp.pwn.pl).
Dybo, V.A.
  1981   *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*, Moskva.
  2009   "Sistema poroždenija akcentnyx tipov proizvodnyx v balto-slavjanskom prajazyke i
          balto-slavjanskaja metatonija", in: V. A. Dybo (ed.), *Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva,
          meždynarodnyj naučnyj žurnal* 2 (vestnik RGGU 16), Moskva, 25-64.
Erben, C.J.
  1855   *Regesta diplomatica nec non epistolaria Bohemiae et Moraviae. Pars I, annorum 600-
          1253*, Pragae.
Feist, S.
  1939   *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache: mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen
          und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen*, Leiden.

Fraenkel, E.

  1962-1965 *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

Fick, A., H. Falk and A. Torp

  1909 *Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen. Dritter Teil: Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit* (electronic version by Sean Crist, 2003).

Franck, J. and N. van Wijk

  1912 *Franck's Etymologisch woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal: Tweede druk door Dr. N. van Wijk*, 's-Gravenhage.

Friedrich, P.

  1970 *Proto-Indo-European trees: the arboreal system of a prehistoric people*, Chicago.

Gallée, J.H.

  1910 *Altsächsische Grammatik: zweite völlig umgearbeitete Auflage* (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte 6), Leiden-Halle.

Gamkrelidze, T.V. and V.V. Ivanov

  1973 "Sprachtypologie und die Rekonstruktion der gemeinindogermanischen Verschlüsse", *Phonetica* 27, 150-156.

Georgiev, V.I. (et al., ed.)

  1962-2002 *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik*, Sofija.

Gluhak, A.

  1993 *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*, Zagreb.

Gołąb, Z.

  1991 *The origins of the Slavs: a linguist's view*, Columbus.

Graff, E.G.

  1836 *Althochdeutscher Sprachschatz, oder: Wörterbuch der althochdeutschen Sprache*, Berlin.

Grimm, J.

  1819-1837 *Deutsche Grammatik 1-4*, Göttingen.

Grimm, J. and W. Grimm

  1854-1961 *Deutsches Wörterbuch: 16 Bände, in 32 Teilbänden*, Leipzig. www.dwb.uni-trier.de.

Green, D.H.

  1998 *Language and history in the e*arly Germanic world, Cambridge.

Hehn, V.

  1883 *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere in ihrem Übergang aus Asien nach Griechenland und Italien sowie in das übrige Europa*, Berlin.

Herrmann, J. (ed.)

  1985 *Die Slawen in Deutschland. Geschichte und Kultur der slawischen Stämme westlich von Oder und Neiße vom 6. bis 12. Jahrhundert: ein Handbuch*, Berlin.

Heyse, K.W.L. and J.C.A. Heyse

  1849 *Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache: mit Hinsicht auf Rechtschreibung, Abstammung und Bildung, Biegung und Fügung der Wörter, so wie auf deren Sinnverwandtschaft, 2. Band*, Magdeburg.

Hirt, H.

  1898 "Grammatisches und Etymologisches", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur (PBB)* 23, 288-357.

  1931 *Handbuch des Urgermanischen I: Laut- und Akzentlehre*, Heidelberg.

Höfer, M.

  1815 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der in Oberdeutschland, vorzüglich aber der in Österreich üblichen Mundart*, Linz.

Hoffmann-Krayer, E. and H. Bächtold-Stäubli (eds.)

1935   *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens: Band 6 Mauer-Pflugbrot*, Berlin-Leipzig.

Hofmann D. and A.T. Popkema

2008 *Altfriesisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

Hofstra, T.

2003   "Changing views on Vikings", *TijdSchrift voor Skandinavistiek* 24/2, 147-160.

Holthausen, F.

1956   *Altsächsisches Wörterbuch*, Münster-Köln.

Holthausen, F. and D. Hofmann

1985   *Altfriesisches Wörterbuch: Zweite, verbesserte Auflage von Dietrich Hofmann*, Heidelberg.

Holzer, G.

1989   *Entlehnungen aus einer bisher unbekannten indogermanischen Sprache im Urslavischen und Urbaltischen*, Wien.

1990   "Germanische Lehnwörter im Urslavischen: Methodologisches zu ihrer Identifizierung", *Croatica – Slavica – Indoeuropaea* (*Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch Ergänzungsband* 8), 59-67.

2005   "Zur relativen Datierung prosodischer Prozesse im Gemeinslavischen und frühen Kroatischen", *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 31-71.

2007   *Historische Grammatik des Kroatischen: Einleitung und Lautgeschichte der Standardsprache* (Schriften über Sprachen und Texte 9), Frankfurt am Main-Berlin-Bern-Bruxelles-New York-Oxford-Wien.

2009   "Urslavische Prosodie", *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 55, 151-178.

Hooper, N. and M. Bennett

1996   *The Cambridge illustrated atlas of warfare: the Middle Ages*, Cambridge.

Hoops, J. (founder), H. Beck (ed.)

1986   *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, Band 6*, Berlin.

1989   *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde, Band 7*, Berlin.

Illič-Svityč, V.M.

1961   "K akcentuacii slavjanskix zaimstvovanij iz germanskix jazykov (ū-osnovy)", *Tezisy dokladov, prednaznačennyx dlja obsuždenija na 1-j Vsesojuznoj konferencii po voprosam slavjano-germanskogo jazykoznanija*, Minsk, 29-31.

1963   *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*, Moskva.

1979   *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*, Cambridge, MA-London (translated from *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom*, Moskva 1963).

Ivšić, S.

1911   "Prilog za slavenski akcenat", *Rad JAZU* 187, 133–208.

Jedvaj, J.

1956   "Bednjanski govor", *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik* 1, 279-330.

Jellinek, M.H.

1926   *Geschichte der gotischen Sprache* (Grundriss der germanischen Philologie 1,1), Berlin-Leipzig.

Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti

1881-1976   *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika 1-23*, Zagreb.

Juškova, M.A.

2006   "North-Western Russia before its settling by Slavs (8th century BC – 8th century AD)", in: J. Nuorluoto (ed.), *Slavica Helsingiensia* 27, *The Slavicization of the Russian North. Mechanisms and chronology*, Helsinki, 140-153.

Jurišić, B.
  1973   *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade II: Rječnik* (Biblioteka hrvatskog dijalektološkog zbornika), Zagreb.
Kalsbeek, J.
  1998   *The Čakavian dialect of Orbanići near Žminj in Istria* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 25), Amsterdam-Atlanta.
Kapović, M.
  2005   "The development of Proto-Slavic quantity (from Proto-Slavic to modern Slavic languages)", *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51, 73-111.
  2009   "Rising mobility in Slavic i-stems", in: R. Lühr and S. Ziegler (eds.), *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*, Wiesbaden, 236-243.
Karulis, K.
  1992   *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*, Riga.
Kiparsky, V.
  1934   *Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen*, Helsinki.
  1958   "Zur Datierung der gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen", *Istituto Universitario Orientale, Annali Sezione slava* 1, 17-24.
Kloekhorst, A.
  2008   *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden-Boston.
Kluge, F.
  1913   *Urgermanisch. Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte* (Grundriß der germanischen Philologie 2), Strassburg.
  1926   *Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte*, Halle.
Kluge, F. and E. Seebold
  2002   *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, 24., durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage, bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold* (on CD-ROM), Berlin.
Knutsson, K.
  1926   *Über die sogenannte zweite Palatalisierung in den slavischen Sprachen*, Lund-Leipzig (n.v.).
  1929   *Die germanischen Lehnwörter im Slavischen vom Typus buky*, Lund-Leipzig.
Köbler, G.
  1993   *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, www.koeblergerhard.de/ahdwbhin.html.
König, E. and J. van der Auwera (eds.)
  1994   *The Germanic languages*, London-New York.
Kortlandt, F.H.H.
  1975   *Slavic accentuation: a study in relative chronology*, Lisse.
  1976   "The Slovene neo-circumflex", *The Slavonic and East European Review* 54/1, 1-10.
  1977   "Historical laws of Baltic accentuation", *Baltistica* 13/2, 319-330.
  1978a "Proto-Indo-European obstruents", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 83, 107-118.
  1978b "I.-E. palatovelars before resonants in Balto-Slavic", *Recent developments in historical phonology* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 4), The Hague, 237-243.
  1982   "Innovations which betray archaisms", *Baltistica* 18/1, 4-9.
  1983   "On final syllables in Slavic", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 11, 167-185.
  1984-85 "On reduced vowels in Slavic", *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28 [Festschrift Ivić], 367-368.
  1985a "Proto-Indo-European glottalic stops: The comparative evidence", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 6/2, 183-201.

1985b "Long vowels in Balto-Slavic", *Baltistica* 21, 112- 124.

1985c "Slavic *imamĭ*", *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 31-32 [Fs. Birnbaum], 235-239.

1986 "The origin of the Old English dialects", *Linguistics across historical and geographical boundaries I: Linguistic theory and historical linguistics* [Fs. Fisiak], Berlin, 437-442.

1988 "Proto-Germanic obstruents", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik 27*, 3-10.

1992a "The Germanic fifth class of strong verbs", *North-Western European Language Evolution* 19, 101-107.

1992b "The Old Norse i-umlaut", *North-Western European Language Evolution* 20, 27-31.

1993a "Tokie šalti rytai", *Baltistica* 28/1, 45-48

1993b "Old High German umlaut", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 37, 19-20.

1996 "The High German consonant shift", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 46, 53-57.

1997 "Baltic ê- and î/jâ-stems", *Baltistica* 32/2, 157-163.

2002a "From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic", *www.kortlandt.nl*.

2002b "The origin of the Goths", *www.kortlandt.nl*.

2003a "An Indo-European substratum in Slavic?", in: A. Bammesberger and Th. Vennemann (eds.), *Languages in prehistoric Europe*, Heidelberg, 253-260.

2003b "Early dialectal diversity in South Slavic I", *www.kortlandt.nl*.

2003c "Early Runic consonants and the origin of the younger futhark", *North-Western European Language Evolution* 43, 71-76.

2006 "Germanic *ē¹ and *ē²", *North-Western European Language Evolution* 49, 51-54.

2007a "On the relative chronology of Slavic accentual developments", *www.kortlandt.nl*.

2007b "Miscellaneous remarks on Balto-Slavic accentuation", in: M. Kapović, R. Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, Zagreb, 229-235.

2008a "Rise and development of Slavic accentual paradigms", *www.kortlandt.nl*

2008b "Accent retraction and tonogenesis", in: T. Olander and J.H. Larsson, *Stressing the past: Papers on Baltic and Slavic accentology* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 35), Amsterdam-Atlanta, 75-82.

2009 "West Slavic accentuation", www.kortlandt.nl.

2010a *Studies in Germanic, Indo-European and Indo-Uralic* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 17), Amsterdam-New York.

2010b *An outline of Proto-Indo-European*, www.kortlandt.nl.

2012 "Palatovelars before syllabic resonants: another look" (ms.).

Kroonen, G.

2010 "Proto-Germanic *krēpja-* and Proto-Slavic *krěpъ* 'strong'", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 38/3, 4, 402-408.

2011 *The Proto-Germanic n-stems: a study in diachronic morphophonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 18), Amsterdam-New York.

Kuryłowicz, J.

1952 *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes,* Kraków.

1958 *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes* (second edition), Wrocław-Kraków.

1987 = 1951 "Związki językowe słowiańsko-germańskie", *Studia językoznawcze* 398-413 (originally published in 1951).

Langston, K.

2007 "Common Slavic Accentual Paradigm (d): A reevaluation of evidence from Čakavian", in: M. Kapović, R. Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology*, Zagreb, 121-150.

Leeming, H.
    1974   "The etymology of Old Church Slavonic *kramola*", *The Slavonic and East European Review* 52/126, 128-131.

Lehmann, W.P.
    1986   *A Gothic etymological dictionary*, Leiden.

Lehr-Spławiński, T.
    1929   "Les emprunts latins en slave commun", *Eos* 32, 705-710.

Leskien, A.
    1962   *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*, Heidelberg.

Lloyd, A.L., O. Springer and R. Lühr (eds.)
    1998-   *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen,* Göttingen-Zürich.

Lubotsky, A.
    1989   "Against a Proto-Indo-European phoneme *a", in: Th. Vennemann (ed.), *The new sound of Indo-European: essays in phonological reconstruction* (Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 41), Berlin-New York, 53-66.

Lunt, H.G.
    1982   "On dating Old Church Slavonic gospel manuscripts", in: A.A. Barentsen and M.G.M. Tielemans (eds.), *South Slavic and Balkan linguistics*, Amsterdam, 215-232.
    1984-85   "On Common Slavic", *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28 [Festschrift Ivić], 417-422.

Machek, V.
    1950   "Quelques noms slaves de plantes", *Lingua Posnaniensis* 2, 145–161.
    1957   *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha.

Mallory, J.P. and D.Q. Adams (eds.)
    1997   *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*, London-Chicago.

Mańczak, W.
    1987   "On the Ausgliederung of Germanic languages", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 15, 1-17.
    2009   "The original homeland of the Slavs", *Studia Mythologica Slavica* 12, 135-145.

Mantello, F.A.C and A.G. Rigg (eds.)
    1996   *Medieval Latin: an introduction and bibliographical guide*, Washington, DC.

Martynov, V.V.
    1963   *Slavjano-germanskoe leksičeskoe vzaimodejstvie drevnejšej pory,* Minsk.

Matasović, M.
    2011   *Analiza najstarijih latinskih posuđenica u hrvatskom u kontekstu ranih kontakata Romana i Slavena* (unpublished dissertation, Sveučilište u Zagrebu), Zagreb.

Matasović, R.
    2000   "Germanske posuđenice u praslavenskome: pitanja relativne kronologije", *Filologija* 34, 129-137.
    2007   "On the accentuation of the earliest Latin loanwords in Slavic", in: M. Kapović, R. Matasović (eds.), *Tones and theories: Proceedings of the International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology,* Zagreb, 105-120.
    2008   *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb.
    2009   *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Celtic* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9), Leiden-Boston.
    2010   "The loss of *g before *m in Proto-Slavic", *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 36/2, 299-306.

Meillet, A.

1902 *Études sur l'étymologie & le vocabulaire du vieux slave 1*, Paris.

1905 *Etudes sur l'etymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave 2,* Paris.

1909 "Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Berneker" (review), *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 2, 57-70.

1922 *Caractères généraux des langues germaniques*, Paris.

1927 "De quelques mots relatifs à la navigation", *Revue des études slaves* 7 1/2, 5-8.

Mel'nyčuk, O.S.

1982–2006 *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koji movy*, Kyjiv.

Mierow, C.C.

1915 *The Gothic history of Jordanes. In English hersion with an introduction and a commentary* [reprint: Merchantville, 2006].

Miklošič, F. [Miklosich, F.]

1867 "Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen", *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 15, Wien, 73-140.

Mladenov, S.

1908 *Staritě germanski elementi vă slavjanskitě ezici*, Sofija (n.v.).

Mucke, K.E.

1965 = 1891 *Historische und vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre der niedersorbischen (niederlausitzisch-wendischen) Sprache. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Grenzdialecte und des Obersorbischen* [reprint: Leipzig, 1965].

Nahtigal, R.

1936 *Starocerkvenoslovanske študije*, Ljubljana.

Newman, P.B.

2001 *Daily life in the Middle Ages*, Jefferson.

Nichols, J.

1993 "The linguistic geography of the Slavic expansion", in: R.A. Maguire and A. Timberlake (eds.), *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists. Bratislava, August-September 1993. Literat*ure, Linguistics, Poetics, Columbus, 377-391.

Nielsen, H.F.

1985 *Old English and the continental Germanic languages: a survey of morphological and phonological interrelations*, Innsbruck.

2000 *The early Runic language of Scandinavia: studies in Germanic dialect geography*, Heidelberg.

Nitsch, K. (ed.)

1953-2002 *Słownik staropolski,* Warszawa.

Olander, T.

2001 "Common Slavic accentological word list", *www.staff.hum.ku.dk/olander*.

Orel, V.E.

1998 *Albanian etymological dictionary*, Leiden.

2003 *A handbook of Germanic etymology*, Leiden-Boston.

Orr, R.

1996 "Again the *ŭ-Stems in Common Slavic", *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 4/2, 312-343.

Palander, H.

1899 *Die althochdeutschen Tiernamen 1: die Namen der Saugetiere*, Darmstadt.

Peciar, Š. (ed.)

1959-1968 *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, Bratislava.

Peršič, M.

    1998   "Dormouse hunting as part of Slovene national identity", *Natura Croatica* 7/3, 199-211, Zagreb.

Philippa, M., F. Debrabandere, A. Quak, T. Schoonheim and N. van der Sijs (eds.)

    2003-2009 *Etymologisch woordenboek van het Nederlands*, Amsterdam. www.etymologiebank.nl.

Pleteršnik, M.

    1894-1895 *Slovensko-nemški slovar*, Ljubljana.

Pohl, H.D.

    2005   "Die Slavia submersa in Österreich: ein Überblick und Versuch einer Neubewertung", *Linguistica 45, Ioanni Orešnik septuagenario in honorem oblata 1*, 129-150.

Pokorny, J.

    1959   *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern-München.

Polański, K. and T. Lehr-Spławiński

    1962-1994 *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich,* Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk.

Polański, K. and J.A. Sehnert

    1967   *Polabian-English dictionary*, The Hague.

Pritzel, G. and C. Jessen

    1882   *Die deutschen Volksnamen der Pflanzen: neuer Beitrag zum deutschen Sprachschatze, aus allen Mundarten und Zeiten zusammengestellt*, Hannover.

Pronk, T.

    2009   *The Slovene dialect of Egg and Potschach in the Gailtal, Austria* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 36), Amsterdam-New York.

    2010   "Etimologija praslavenskoga *jarьmъ, *jarьmo", *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 36/2, 307-316.

    forthc.   "Odakle su nam emocije? O etimologiji i semantičkom razvoju hrvatskih riječi koje se odnose na emocije", in: A. Kapetanović (ed.), *Iskazivanje i poimanje emocija u hrvatskoj pisanoj kulturi srednjega i ranoga novoga vijeka* (Biblioteka znanstveni zbornici), Zagreb.

Pronk-Tiethoff, S.E.

    2010   "Semantička polja germanskih posuđenica u praslavenskome", *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 36/2, 317-327.

Radić, A.

    1898   "Semantika u službi narodoznanstva", *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* 3/1, Zagreb, 17-23.

Riecke, J.

    2004   *Die Frühgeschichte der mittelalterlichen medizinischen Fachsprache im Deutschen, Band 2: Wörterbuch*, Berlin.

Ringe, D.A.

    2006   *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic* (A Linguistic History of English 1), Oxford-New York.

Robinson, O.W.

    1992   *Old English and its closest relatives: a survey of the earliest Germanic languages*, Stanford.

Schaarschmidt, G.

    1997   *The historical phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian Languages*, Heidelberg.

Schaeken, J.

    1987   *Die Kiever Blätter* (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 9), Amsterdam.

Schenker, A.M.
    1995   *The dawn of Slavic: an introduction to Slavic philology,* New Haven-London.
Schmeller, J.A.
    1872-1877   *Bayerisches Wörterbuch* [reprint: München, 2008].
Schramm, G.
    2007   *Slawisch im Gottesdienst: Kirchenwortschatz und neue Schriftsprachen auf dem Weg zu einem christlichen Südosteuropa*, München.
Schröer, K.J.
    1870   *Wörterbuch der Mundart von Gottschee*, Wien.
Schrötter, F., Freiherr von (ed.)
    1930   *Wörterbuch der Münzkunde* [reprint: Berlin, 1970].
Schuster-Šewc, H.
    1983-1996   *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, Bautzen.
Schützeichel, R.
    2006 *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch. 6. Auflage, um die Glossen erweitert*, Tübingen.
Schwarz, E.
    1926   "Bemerkungen zur slavischen Lehnwortkunde", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 40, 284-292.
Seebold, E.
    2001   *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)*, Berlin-New York.
    2008   *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin-New York.
Seldeslachts, H.
    1991   "Varia etymologica", in: L. Isebaert (ed.), *Studia etymologica Indoeuropaea: Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens dicata (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta)*, Leuven, 256-258.
Shevelov , G.
    1964   *A prehistory of Slavic: the historical phonology of Common Slavic*, Heidelberg.
Sławski, F. (ed.)
    1974-   *Słownik prasłowiański*, Wrocław
Smoczyński, W.
    2007   *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno.
Snoj, M.
    1994   "Naglaševanje praslovanskih *-y/-uv*-osnov ženskega spola", *Slavistična revija* 42/4, 491-528.
    2003   *Slovenski etimološki slovar: 2., pregledana in dopolnjena izdaja*, Ljubljana.
Skok, P.
    1910   "Serbokroatische Lehnwörter", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 31, 318-320, 472-476.
    1915   *Pojave vulgarno-latinskoga jezika na natpisima rimske provincije Dalmacije*, Zagreb.
    1971-1973   *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Zagreb.
Sreznevskij, I.I.
    1893-1912   *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskago jazyka*, Sankt-Peterburg.
Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti
    1959-   *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezi*ka, Beograd.
Stang, C.S.
    1957   *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo.
Stankiewicz, E.
    1986   *The Slavic languages: unity in diversity*, Berlin-New York.

Stender-Petersen, A.

 1927 *Slavisch-germanische Lehnwortkunde: eine Studie über die ältesten germanischen Lehnwörter im Slavischen in sprach- und kulturgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Göteborg.

 1936 Review of: V. Kiparsky, Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen, *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 13, 246-259.

Stone, G.

 1972 *The smallest Slavonic nation: the Sorbs of Lusatia*, London.

Streitberg, W.A.

 1900 *Urgermanische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der altgermanischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg.

 1920 *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.

Tacitus, P.C.

 1854 *The works of Tacitus: the Oxford translation revised, with notes, volume 2*, London.

Tiefenbach, H.

 2010 *Altsächsisches Wörterbuch/A concise Old Saxon dictionary*, Berlin-New York.

Todd, M.

 2004 *The early Germans*, Malden, MA-Oxford-Carlton.

Trubačev, O.N. (ed.)

 1974- *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*, Moskva.

Udolph, J.

 1979 *Studien zu slavischen Gewässernamen und Gewässerbezeichnungen: ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der Urheimat der Slaven*, Heidelberg.

 1994 *Namenkundliche Studien zum Germanenproblem* (Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, Band 9), Berlin-New York.

Uhlenbeck, C.C.

 1893 "Die germanischen Wörter im Altslavischen", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 15, 481-492.

Vaillant, A.

 1950 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves: tome 1, phonétique*, Lyon-Paris

 1974 *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves: tome 4, la formation des noms*, Lyon-Paris.

Van Loon, J.

 2011 "De etymologie van *Aarle, Taarlo, Arendonk* e.d.", *Toponymie & dialectologie* 83, 289-296.

Van Veen, P.A.F. (ed.)

 1994 *Etymologisch woordenboek: de herkomst van onze woorden*, Utrecht-Antwerpen.

Vasmer, M.

 1953-1958 *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

 1964-1973 *Ètimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* [reprint: Moskva, 2003].

Vennemann, Th.

 1984 "Hochgermanisch und Niedergermanisch: Die Verzweigungstheorie der germanisch-deutschen Lautverschiebungen", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 106, 1-45.

Vermeer, W.R.

 1984 "On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: the quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5/2, 331-395.

 1992 "In the beginning was the lengthened grade: On the continuity of Proto-Indo-European vowel quantity in Slavic", in: R. Beekes (et al., eds.), *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 31. August - 4. September 1987*, Innsbruck, 115-136.

2000 "On the status of the earliest Russian isogloss: four untenable and three questionable reasons for separating the progressive and the second regressive palatalization of Common Slavic", *Russian Linguistics* 24, 5-29.

2001a "Critical observations on the modus operandi of the Moscow Accentological School", in: W. Lehfeldt, *Einführung in die morphologische Konzeption der slavischen Akzentologie*, 2d edition, München, 131-161.

2001b *Slavic historical accentology: a very brief overview* (ms.).

Verwijs E. and J. Verdam

1895-1929 *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, 's-Gravenhage, http://gtb.inl.nl.

Vondrák, V.

1906 *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik: 1. Band: Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre*, Göttingen

Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann

1938, 1954 *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: 3., neubearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann*, Heidelberg.

Weijnen, A.A.

1996 *Etymologisch dialectwoordenboek*, Assen.

Wild, J.P.

1976 "Loanwords and Roman expansion in North-West Europe", *World Archaeology* 8/1, 57-64.

Wollmann, A.

1993 "Early Latin loan-words in Old English", *Anglo-Saxon England* 22, 1–26.

Wright, J.

1892 *A primer of the Gothic language, with grammar, notes, and glossary*, Oxford.

1906 *An Old High German primer, with grammar, notes, and glossary,* Oxford.

1910 *Grammar of the Gothic language, and the Gospel of St. Mark, selections from the other Gospels and the Second epistle to Timothy with notes and glossary*, Oxford.

Zaliznjak, A.A.

1962 "Problemy slavjano-iranskix jazykovyx otnošenij drevnejšego perioda", *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 6, 28-45.

1985 *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*, Moskva.

2004 *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt: vtoroe izdanie, pererabotannoe s učetom materiala naxodok 1995-2003*), Moskva.

Zupko, R.E.

1985 *A dictionary of weights and measures for the British Isles: the Middle Ages to the twentieth century*, Philadelphia.

11 SAMENVATTING

Al voordat het Slavisch aan het einde van het eerste millennium na Christus uiteenviel in de verschillende Slavische talen kwamen de sprekers van het Proto-Slavisch in contact met Germanen. De eerste contacten dateren waarschijnlijk van het midden van de derde eeuw na Christus, toen de Slaven zich over Centraal- en Zuid-Europa begonnen te verspreiden. In dit proefschrift worden de leenwoorden geanalyseerd die in het Proto-Slavisch terecht gekomen zijn als gevolg van deze vroegste contacten tussen Slaven en Germanen. Leenwoorden in de individuele Slavische talen uit bijvoorbeeld het Duits of Engels, die dateren van na de uiteenval van het Proto-Slavisch, zijn in dit proefschrift buiten beschouwing gelaten.

De leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch zijn afkomstig uit verschillende Germaanse talen en dialecten. Het is zeker dat de Proto-Slaven woorden ontleenden aan het Gotisch. De leenwoorden uit het Gotisch konden tot de vijfde eeuw in het Slavisch opgenomen worden, omdat de Goten na de vijfde eeuw hun machtspositie in het Zwarte Zeegebied verloren en wegtrokken naar Spanje en Italië. Daarnaast lijkt een behoorlijk aantal woorden ontleend te zijn aan (één of meer) Hoogduitse dialecten en aan het Laagduits. De contacten met sprekers van het Hoogduits begonnen toen de Slaven vanuit hun *Urheimat* naar het westen trokken, en bleven bestaan tot na het uiteenvallen van het Proto-Slavisch.

Dit proefschrift geeft een up-to-date overzicht van de Germaanse leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch. Het corpus van (min of meer) zekere Germaanse leenwoorden bestaat uit 78 woorden. Daarnaast worden ook de woorden besproken die in eerdere literatuur als leenwoord bestempeld zijn, maar die ik niet als zodanig beschouw. De bespreking van het corpus wordt gevolgd door een taalkundige analyse van het materiaal, waarbij met name gekeken wordt naar aanwijzingen voor het bepalen van de donortaal van het Slavische woord. De analyse spitst zich vervolgens toe op de accentuatie van de leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch. Hoewel de donortaal in sommige gevallen onduidelijk blijft, blijkt het in veel gevallen mogelijk om met redelijke zekerheid te bepalen of een woord afkomstig is uit het Gotisch of uit het West-Germaans. Het aantal West-Germaanse leenwoorden blijkt ongeveer twee maal zo groot als het aantal Gotische leenwoorden.

Semantisch zijn de leenwoorden in zes categorieën te verdelen: 1. oorlogsterminologie en benamingen voor machthebbers, etc., 2. woorden met betrekking tot vaardigheden en geestelijke concepten, 3. technische terminologie, 4. woorden met betrekking tot handel (onder te verdelen in algemene handelstermen, woorden voor geldeenheden en woorden voor

emmers, bakken, etc.), 5. christelijke terminologie, en 6. woorden met betrekking tot het boerenerf en landbouwproducten. Terwijl de leenwoorden uit het Gotisch vaak betrekking hebben op luxeartikelen (ook bijvoorbeeld geldhandel), zijn de West-Germaanse leenwoorden vaak meer praktische gebruiksvoorwerpen en landbouwproducten.

In het hoofdstuk over de morfologie geeft dit proefschrift een verklaring voor de verspreiding van de vrouwelijke $\bar{u}$-stammen in het Slavisch. Relatief veel Germaanse leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch zijn vrouwelijke $\bar{u}$-stammen, maar dit geldt ook voor Romaanse in het (Proto-)Slavisch en voor latere Duitse leenwoorden die dateren van de tijd dat het Slavisch al uiteenviel in verschillende dialectgroepen. De oorsprong van de verspreiding van de vrouwelijke $\bar{u}$-stammen is nooit goed verklaard. Analyse van de vroege Germaanse leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch laat zien dat de $\bar{u}$-stam flexie in eerste instantie alleen voorkwam bij vrouwelijke Germaanse leenwoorden met een stam die eindigde op een velaar. De vrouwelijke leenwoorden met een stam eindigend op een andere consonant namen de meer frequente $\bar{a}$-stam flexie aan. In een later stadium van het Slavisch werden de $\bar{u}$-stammen een productieve stamklasse voor leenwoorden uit de Romaanse talen en voor leenwoorden uit het Duits. Met name woorden voor planten en voor emmers en andere opbergbakken zijn vaak vrouwelijke $\bar{u}$-stammen.

Het Proto-Slavisch was een toontaal. Alle woorden in de taal behoorden tot één van de drie accentparadigma's die we voor het Proto-Slavisch kunnen reconstrueren. Op het moment dat een leenwoord in de taal werd opgenomen en aan het fonologisch systeem van het Proto-Slavisch werd aangepast, nam het woord ook één van de drie Proto-Slavische accenttypen aan. Dit proefschrift beoogt een verklaring te geven voor de verdeling van de Germaanse leenwoorden over de drie Proto-Slavische accentparadigma's (a), (b) en (c).

Accentparadigma (c) wordt gekenmerkt door mobiel accent. Dit accenttype komt zelden voor bij leenwoorden uit het Germaans, hetgeen overeenkomt met onze verwachting: de Germaanse talen hebben vast accent op de eerste lettergreep van het woord, en men verwacht niet dat deze woorden in het Slavisch plotseling mobiele accentuatie krijgen. Slechts drie leenwoorden in het corpus kunnen gereconstrueerd worden met accentparadigma (c). Alle leenwoorden met een beklemtoonde Proto-Slavische klinker $^{\star}e$, $^{\star}o$, $^{\star}ь$, $^{\star}ъ$ (overeenkomend met Germaans $^{\star}e$, $^{\star}a$, $^{\star}i$, $^{\star}u$) die niet gevolgd werd door een laryngaal of tautosyllabische sonant, hebben accentparadigma (b). De woorden die gereconstrueerd worden met een beklemtoonde lange vocaal uit Germaans $^{\star}\bar{e}$ of $^{\star}\bar{o}$ of met een korte vocaal of syllabische sonant die gevolgd werd door een laryngaal of tautosyllabische sonant zijn gelijkelijk verdeeld over de accentparadigma's (a) en (b). In tegenstelling tot alle eerdere theorieën neem ik aan dat accentparadigma (b) het "standaard" accentparadigma was voor

Germaanse leenwoorden wanneer zij aangepast werden aan het Proto-Slavische klanksysteem. Slechts onder bepaalde voorwaarden namen de leenwoorden accentparadigma (a) aan. Twee van deze voorwaarden kunnen vastgesteld worden:

1. Het woord was een mannelijke *o*-stam in het Proto-Slavisch, en had een mannelijk woord als donor.

Als gevolg van de wet van Illič-Svityč in een eerder stadium van het Proto-Slavisch waren de niet-acute mannelijke *o*-stammen mobiel geworden. Als gevolg hiervan waren er in accentparadigma (b) geen oorspronkelijke mannelijke *o*-stammen meer over. Dit is een reden voor Germaanse mannelijke woorden (zowel uit het Gotisch als uit het West-Germaans) om accentparadigma (a) aan te nemen, waarin mannelijke woorden wel frequent voorkwamen.

2. Het woord was een leenwoord uit het West-Germaans (Hoogduits) met een wortel die eindigde in een stemloze consonant.

De verklaring voor het gegeven dat West-Germaanse leenwoorden met een wortel in een stemloze stop accentparadigma (a) aannamen, kan gevonden worden in de preglottalisatie die gereconstrueerd wordt voor de Proto-Germaanse consonanten *p, *t, *k (uit PIE *b, *d, *g). Kortlandt veronderstelt dat deze preglottalisatie relatief lang als zodanig bewaard is gebleven in de individuele Germaanse talen, met uitzondering van het Gotisch en het Laagduits. In het Proto-Slavische accentparadigma (a) was de beklemtoonde klinker geglottaliseerd (eveneens, onder andere, als gevolg van de preglottalisatie van PIE *b, *d, *g). De Germaanse preglottalisatie werd door de Slaven verbonden met de geglottaliseerde klinkers die zij zelf hadden in accentparadigma (a), en verklaart dat de woorden met een wortel die eindigde in een stemloze consonant in het Slavisch accentparadigma (a) aannamen.

12 CURRICULUM VITAE

Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff werd geboren op 22 december 1981 in Den Haag. Na haar eindexamen gymnasium aan het Vrijzinnig-Christelijk Lyceum in Den Haag begon zij in 2001 met de studie Slavische talen & culturen aan de Universiteit Leiden. Vanaf 2003 studeerde zij daarnaast Vergelijkende Indo-Europese taalwetenschap. De studie Slavische talen & culturen sloot zij in 2008 *cum laude* af. Haar masterscriptie had de vorm van een onderzoek naar enkele 18^e-eeuwse Hoogsorbische teksten die toegeschreven worden aan de kanunnik Měrćin Golian. De studie Vergelijkende Indo-Europese taalwetenschap sloot zij, eveneens in 2008, af met een doctoraalscriptie over de accentuatie van Germaanse leenwoorden in het Proto-Slavisch. Deze tweede scriptie vormde de basis voor haar promotieonderzoek.

Naast haar studie is Saskia twee jaar lang voorzitter geweest van Most, de studievereniging Slavische talen & culturen en Ruslandkunde. In 2007 en 2008 heeft zij zich als student-assistent beziggehouden met de organisatie van de *Leiden Summer School in Languages and Linguistics*.

Na haar afstuderen verliet zij voor korte tijd de wetenschap voor een baan als projectleider bij de stichting QANU in Utrecht. In december 2009 verhuisde zij met haar man naar Zagreb (Kroatië), waar zij met een onderzoeksbeurs van de *Hrvatska zaklada za znanost* haar promotieonderzoek begonnen is. Het promotieonderzoek heeft zij verricht als buitenpromovenda van het *Leiden University Centre for Linguistics*. Naast haar promotieonderzoek heeft zij in 2010 en 2011 de collegereeks *Inleiding taalkunde* aan de vakgroep Neerlandistiek van de Universiteit van Zagreb verzorgd.