

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20185> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia Elisabeth

Title: The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic : origin and accentuation

Issue Date: 2012-11-28

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 **avorǫ*, **bordy*, **bugǫ*, **bǫči*, **Dunovǫ*, **glazǫ*, **klějb*, **mur(in)ǫ*, **op-*, **remy*, **smoky*, **tjudjb*, **želsti* to be certain Germanic loanwords into Proto-Slavic. Church Slavic *bugǫ* '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. **Dunovǫ*) 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. **dǫlgǫ*, **gorazdǫ*, **lbvǫ*, **koldędzǫ*, **redǫky/*rǫdǫky*, **užasǫ*, **(u-)žasnǫti*, **vǫrtogordǫ*, **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. *bordâjĭnâ*. 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. *bordâjĭnâ* is thought to go back to earlier **bordyĭna* (Polański/Sehnert 1967: 39, cf. SEJDP 1: 44), which points to an *ū*-stem declension just as the South Slavic forms. Polański and Lehr-Splawiński, however, allow for the possibility that the form **bordyĭna* 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. *bordâjĭnâ* 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. **nebožězъ*/**nabožězъ* ‘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 chapter 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 \bar{i} . The Gothic letter <i> represents a short vowel *i*. Gothic <e> and <o> denote the long vowels \bar{e} and \bar{o} , 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*, *hw* and *r* as well as $*e$ in reduplicated syllables, and the grapheme *au* reflects PGmc. $*o$ before *h*, *hw* and *r*. Before a vowel, the reflexes of PGmc. $*\bar{e}_i$ and $*\bar{o}$ 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

[ē] before the *h*, *hv*, *r*, and to [ǣ] 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], [ǣ] 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 (Jelinek 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]; *ái*, *áu* represent [e] and [o] and *ai*, *au* represent [ǣ] 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 unlauded 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 gesamt-slavischen 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 *Etimologičeskij 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 *Slovník ukrajins’koi movy* edited by I.K. Bilodid (1970-1980) and O.S. Mel’nyčuk’s *Etymolohičnyj slovník ukrajins’koi 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-Splawiński’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. Cejtin (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 ruskoj* (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 vā 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 Beweisfähigkeit 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 vā 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 “*einzel sprachlich 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 **papežъ* ‘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 *ā* ~ 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.

