

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

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. *û*-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.** *báčva*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *báčva*, Gsg. *báčvê*; **Slov.** *báčvâ, báčkà, bâčva* ‘cask’, *báčəv, bâčva* ‘tub, barrel’; **Bg.** *báčva, băčeva*, [*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. *račŭn* ‘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*, *dъska*; **OR** *dъska*; **R** *doská*, *Asg. dósku*; *cka* (dial.); **Ukr.** *došká*; **OP** *cka*, **P** *deska*; **OCz.** *dśka*, **Cz.** *deska*; **Slk.** *doska*; **US** *deska*; **LS** *cka* (arch.) ‘knead board’; **S/Cr.** *dàska*; *śka* (arch.), *ckā* (arch.); **Slov.** *dāskā*, *dāska*; **Bg.** *dāskā*
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). Bezljaj 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 Slavonic 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 (ÉSSJa 5: 184, HEW 3: 130). Vasmer assumes that the Proto-Slavic vocalism **ъ* instead of expected **ъ* 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 **db-* (e.g., PSl. *dbъnъ* ‘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 **ъ* shows the reflex of **ъ*, e.g., R *tónkij*, next to Macedonian *ténok*, P *cienki* < PSl. *tbъnъkъ* ‘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 *mętvа, mjata*; R *mjáta*; Ukr. *m’játa*; P *mięta, miętkiew* (arch.); Cz. *máta*; Slk. *mäta*; US *mjatej*; LS *mjetwej*; S/Cr. *měta, mětva, mětvice*; Slov. *mętva, męta*

Accentuation: AP (a) (Zaliznjak 1985: 132)

WGmc. **mintā* ‘mint’

OHG *minza*; MHG *minz(e)*; G *Minze*; OE *mintē*; OS *mintā*; Du. *munt*⁹⁷

Etymology: WGmc. **mintā* ‘mint’ was borrowed from Lat. *mentha* ‘mint’, which itself stems from Gr. *μίνθη* ‘mint’. The ultimate origin of the word is unknown.

Bezljaj 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 *û*-stem declension. Feminine *û*-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.** *múřin*; **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 Bezlaž (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 from German.

PSl. **mōlinъ* ‘mill’

SCS *mōlinъ*; **OR** *mlinъ*; **R** *mlin*; **P** *młyn*; **Cz.** *mlýn*; **Slk.** *mlyn*; **US** *młyn*; **LS** *młyn*; **S/Cr.** *mlîn*; *mālin* (dial. Čak.), *mělin* (dial. Kajk.); **Slov.** *mlîn*, *málin* (dial.), *mélin* (dial.)

Accentuation: AP (b); Kortlandt reconstructs a laryngealized vowel in the second syllable of PSl. **mōlinъ* (1975: 70), but the short stressed vowel in the second syllable of PSl. **mōlinъ* 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. **mōlinъ* is regarded as a borrowing from Germanic by Kortlandt (1975: 70), whereas Snoj (2003: 408) and Trubačev (ĖSSJa 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. **mōlinъ* (ĖSSJa 19: 66-67), but the presence of an initial jer is attested in SCS *mōlinъ* as well as in Croatian dialectal forms *mālin*, *mēlin* and Slovene dialectal *mālin*, *mēlin*, which show vocalisation of the weak jer.

PSl. **ocbtъ* ‘vinegar’ (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *ocbtъ*; **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.** *ócat*, 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. *cik*, Gsg. *cika* and *jěsijh* ‘vinegar’ are later loanwords from High German.

Etymology: Lat. *acētum* ‘vinegar’ derives from Lat. *acidus* (adj.) ‘sour, acid’ < PIE **h₂ek-eh₁-* ‘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 **ī* 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. **ocbtǫ* 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. **ocbtǫ* is more plausible because if the word was borrowed from Latin, it is expected that the Proto-Slavs would interpret Lat. *ē* in the stressed (open) syllable (Lat. *acētum*) as a **ī*, rather than as **b* (2011: 88-89). The reflex with /ī/ is found in Germanic in Goth. *akeit* (next to *aket*).

PSl. **ocbtǫ* 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. **b* 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. **ocbtǫ* 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. **avorǫ* ‘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.** *jovârě* (NApl.) ‘maple’; **S/Cr.** *jävōr*, Gsg. *jávora*; (dial. Crn.) *jahor* ‘laurel, plane tree, *Acer pseudoplatanus*, *Acer platanoides*’; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *jávora*, Gsg. *jávora*; **Slov.** *jávor* ‘maple’; **Bg.** *jávor* ‘*Platanus orientalis*’

Accentuation: AP (a)

PGmc. **ēhur(n)a-* ‘platan, plane tree’ (m. *a*-stem)

OHG *āhorn*; **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. **avorǫ* has often been regarded as a Germanic loanword (Kiparsky 1934: 229-230, REW 3: 478-479, Shevelov 1964: 240, ĖSSJa 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. *aer*, 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 *āhorn* (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: *ōhr* (Pernegg, Carinthia), *ūvər* (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 *ἄκαστός* 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 **h₂ek-ro-* ‘sharp’ (e.g., Gr. *ἄκρος* ‘highest, outermost’, OCS *ostrǫ* ‘sharp’, Lith. *aštrūs* ‘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. **avorǫ* was borrowed from a late West Germanic form **āorǫ*, 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 **āorǫ* after which *-v-* was inserted in Proto-Slavic to solve the hiatus. A very late borrowing might also explain the vocalism of PSl. **avorǫ*. 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. **bergō* ‘bank, shore; slope’ (m. *o*-stem)

OCS *brěgō*; **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.** *brĭjeg* ‘small hill’; **Slov.** *brĕg* ‘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’, Mlr. *brí* (Asg. *brig*) ‘hill, mountain’, Hitt. *parku-* ‘high’, Toch. A, B *pärk-* ‘to rise, ascend’ < PIE **b^herǵ^h-* ‘mountain; high, elevated’ (Pokorny 1959: 140-141).

Etymology: PGmc. **berga-* ‘mountain, hill’ derives from PIE **b^herǵ^h-* ‘mountain’. On the basis of the cognates in Avestan and Armenian, the PIE form has been reconstructed with a palato-velar **ǵ^h*. This implies that an inherited Proto-Slavic reflex of PIE **b^herǵ^h-o-* is expected to have stem-final *-z-*. Because PSl. **bergō* 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. **bergō* 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*, **kǫrdō*, **ǵōsō*, **ǵordō*, **žvrdō*, *svekrō/svekry* (1934: 101-108). For PSl. **ǵōsō*, 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 **b^herǵ^h-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 **ǵ^h* next to **g^h*.

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.** *čędo* n. (arch.) ‘child, offspring’; **Bg.** *čędo* ‘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. *καῖνός*, Lat. *recēns* ‘new, fresh’, MW *bachgen* m. ‘boy’, Skt. *kanína-* ‘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. **čędъ* ‘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-d^ho-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 *gotóvit*; Ukr. *hotóvyty*; P *gotować* (arch.); Cz. *hotoviti*; US *hotować*; LS *gotować*; S/Cr. *gòtoviti*; Slov. *gotóviti*; Bg. *gótvyja* ‘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 *taw* ‘to prepare skins’; MDu. *touwen* ‘to prepare skins’

Cognates: Possibly Alb. *gat* ‘ready, prepared’, *gatuaj, gatuej* ‘to prepare, cook’; Gr. *νηάτεος* ‘new-made’.

Etymology: PSl. **gotovъ* and **gotoviti* have mainly been derived from the PIE root **g^weh₂-* ‘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. **gotǫ* 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. *νηγάρτεος* ‘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. ĖSSJa 7: 70–71).

PSl. **gotovǫ* 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. **gǫsb* ‘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.** *gōs*; **SCr.** *gǫska*; **Slov.** *gōs*, Gsg. *gosi*; **Bg.** *gǫska*

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. *žqsis*, Latv. *zūoss*, OPr. *sansy*, Skt. *haṁśa-* ‘goose, swan’, Gk. *χῆν*, Lat. *ānser* < PIE **ǵ^heh₂ns-* (Derksen 2008: 184).

Etymology: PSl. **gǫsb* 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 **ǵ^heh₂ns-* ‘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 PSŁ. **gǫsb* 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 PSŁ. **zǫsb* and supposes that this form secondarily became PSŁ. **gǫsb* 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, PSŁ. **gǫserǫ* ‘gander’ has an exact formal correspondence in Lat. *ānser* ‘gander’, which is another argument against borrowing from Germanic (ĖSSJa 7: 88-89).¹⁰⁶

In his 1985 article on “Long vowels in Balto-Slavic”, Kortlandt explained the initial velar stop of PSŁ. **gǫsb* from depalatalization of the original palato-velar. The PIE paradigm has been reconstructed as Nsg. **ǵʰeh₂ns*, Asg. **ǵʰh₂ensm*, Gsg. **ǵʰh₂nsos*. 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. *dėšimt* ‘ten’, *žinóti* ‘to know’, Slavic **zǫnamǫ* ‘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 **ǵʰeh₂ns* ‘goose’ as an *-nt*-participle of the verb **ǵʰeh₂-* ‘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 PSŁ. **gǫserǫ* ‘gander’ in the attested Slavic languages are, e.g., P *gąsior*, *gęsior*; Cz. *houser*; US *husor*; LS *gusor*; Slov. *gosér*; Bg. *găser*.

PSl. **klějb/*klbjb* ‘glue’ (m. *jo*-stem)

CS *klějb* ‘glue’; RCS *klej, klěj, klj*; R *klej*, Gsg. *klēja*; P *klej*; Cz. *klí*, Gsg. *klé* ‘glue, resin’; US *klj* ‘wood glue’; LS *klj*; S/Cr. *klj, klja*; Slov. *klěj*, Gsg. *klēja/klēja* ‘glue, resin’; Bg. *klej* ‘glue, resin’

Accentuation: AP (c)?; the forward shift of the falling tone in Slovene points to AP (c), SCr. *klja* points to AP (a).

WGmc. **klaija-* ‘clay, loam’ (m. *ja*-stem)

G [*klei* ‘heavy clay’ < LG (Kluge/Seebold 2002: s.v. *Klei*)]; OE *clæg*; OFri. *klai*; MLG *klei*; Du. *klei*

Cognates: If PSl. **klějb/*klbjb* 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-*, **loiH-* ‘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. **klějb/*klbjb* 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, ËSSJa 10: 19-20, Snoj 2003: 277, REW 1: 566-567).¹⁰⁷ The connection of PSl. **klějb/*klbjb* 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*, **glěvb*, **glěvb* ‘slime’ < PIE **gloh₁i-uō-* (cf. Gr. *γλοιός* ‘any glutinous substance’) and PSl. **glbjb* ‘clay, loam’ < **glh₁i-o-*, but the connection between the forms remains unclear (2008: 224, cf. 2008: 163, 168). The vocalism of PSl. **klbjb* could be secondary to PSl. **glbjb*.

¹⁰⁷ Vasmer reconstructs PSl. **kvlějb/*kvlbjb* on the basis of Slov. *kālje* ‘carpenter’s glue’ (REW 1: 566-567), but the Slovene form cannot prove the existence of an original **v* 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** *krěpkij, krěpok* ‘strong, firm’; **P** *krzepki* ‘strong, alive, quick’; **Cz.** *křepý* ‘strong’ *křepký* ‘fresh, strong’; **Slk.** *krepy* ‘slow-witted, simple-minded’, *krepký* ‘adroit, smart’; **S/Cr.** *krījep* (arch.), *krěpak* ‘strong, lively’; **Slov.** *krěpāk* ‘hard, stiff, tough’; **Bg.** *krěpāk* ‘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 **kreh₂p-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. *mlākā*; S/Cr. *mlijěko*; Slov. *mlēko*; 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. *melo*ke, *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. **bergǵ*). 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. *mlāka* ‘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 (ĖSSJa 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 *melbziti* ‘to milk’, R *molózivo* ‘colostrums, beestings’, RCS *mlěsti* ‘to bring down, dislodge’, Slk. *mlzt’* ‘to suck’, S/Cr. *mŭsti*, Slov. *mlěsti* < 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/*moltǫ/*molta* ‘draff, grain residual in the beer-making process’

Ukr. *mólot* ‘sediment, lees’; **P** *mlóto, mlóta* (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/*moltǫ/*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/*moltǫ/*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. **mostǫ* ‘(corduroy) bridge’ (m. *o-stem*)

OCS *mostǫ* (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. *môsta*; **Slov.** *môst*, Gsg. *môsta, mostâ, mostû*; **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 (ĚSSJa 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 (ĚSSJa 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.** *öpica*, (dial. Kajk.) *jöpica*; **Slov.** *ôpica*

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. *kapi-* ‘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. **vōlčica* ‘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 Bezlaž 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. *plačę* (*sę*); R *plákat’*, 1sg. *pláču*; Ukr. *plákaty*; P *plakać*, 1sg. *placzę*; Cz. *plakati*; Slk. *plakat’*; US *plakać*; LS *plakaś*; Plb. *plokāt*; S/Cr. *plākati*, 1sg. *plāčēm*; Slov. *plákati*, 1sg. *plákam*, 1sg. *pláčēm*; 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. **flokān* ‘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. *plóksčias*, 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 it is 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. **ščirǫ* 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'

R *ščir* 'Amarantus'; **Ukr.** *ščir* 'Amarantus'; **P** *szczyr* 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **US** *ščēr* 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **LS** *ščēr* 'Amarantus, Mercurialis'; **S/Cr.** *štīr* 'Amarantus'; **Slov.** *ščīr*, *ščēr* '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. **ščirǫ* 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 *ščerčec* '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*, *smokǫva*; **R** [*smókva* < CS]; **P** [*smokiew*]; **Cz.** [*smokva*]; **Slk.** [*smokva*]; **US** [*smokwa*]; **LS** [*smokwa*]; **S/Cr.** *smǫkva*; **Slov.** *smókav*; **Bg.** *smokinja*

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. **petblja* ‘noose, snare’ and **redbky* ‘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. **skotō*).

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. **tjudjb* ‘foreign’ (adj.)

OCS *štuždb*, *stuždb*, *tuždb*; **CS** *čuždb*; **OR** *čužij*; **R** *čužój* ‘foreign, strange, someone else’s’; **Ukr.** *čužyj* ‘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.** *caužě*; **S/Cr.** *tûđ*; (Čak. dial. Vrgada) *tūjī*; **Slov.** *tūj*, 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. *figus* (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*. PSł. **tjudjb* cannot without formal difficulties be connected to the same root because of the stem-final **d*. For this reason, PSł. **tjudjb* 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. *ljúdski* ‘human, popular; foreign’ (cf. REW 3: 352-353).

PSł. **tjudjb* 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*. PSł. **tvbrdb* ‘hard, firm, solid’ has been adduced as a similar case, for the Baltic cognates have *-t*, cf. Lat. *tvirtas* (ESSlov. 4: 245).¹¹³ Vasmer remains indecisive about the origin of PSł. **tjudjb* 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, **tjudjb* dissimilated to **tudjb*, yielding S/Cr. *tûđ* instead of ***čûđ*, 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).

PSł. (?) **želsti* ‘to repay, pay for’

OCS *žlěsti*, 1sg. *žlědŏ* (Supr.); *žlasti*, 1sg. *žladŏ* (Supr.); **OR** [*želěsti*, 1sg. *želědu*; *žlěsti*, 1sg. *žlědu* ‘to pay off’; *žlasti*, 1sg. *žladu* ‘to pay off’ < CS]

Accentuation: AP unknown

¹¹³ Holzer explains PSł. **tvbrdb* as a Temematic loanword from **tuír-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** *gielðan*, *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 ***gěl*-.

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. **žalǫ* ‘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. **šelmǫ* ‘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.** *brōdā* ‘chin, throat’; **S/Cr.** *bráda* ‘beard, chin’, Asg. *brādu*; **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** [*bard* < MLG *bard* (De Vries 1977: 26)]

Cognates: Lat. *barba*,¹¹⁶ Lith. *barzdà*, Latv. *bārda*, *bārzda* (dial.), OPr. *bordus* ‘beard, chin’ < European Indo-European **b^hard^h-eh₂* (De Vaan 2008: 69, Derksen 2008: 55).

Etymology: The (European) Indo-European proto-form has been reconstructed as **b^harzd^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^harzd^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. ÉSSJa 2: 197-198, ESSlov. 1: 36). They are thought to be a North Indo-European substratum word, going back to **b^hard^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. *čbbvr̥ ‘wooden tub’ (m. *o*-stem)

SCS čbbvr̥; OP dzber; P czeber (dial.); OCz. čber, džber, žber; Cz. džber; Slk. džber; US čwor; Plb. cabâr; S/Cr. čàbar; Slov. čabâr; Bg. čébăr

Accentuation: AP (b) (Illič-Svityč 1979: 122, Dybo 1981: 21).

OHG zubar, zwibar; MHG zuber, züber; G Zuber ‘tub’

Cognates: Lith. kibiras ‘bucket’

Etymology: Mainly on the basis of the semantic correspondence between PSl. *čbbvr̥ ‘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. *čbbvr̥ ‘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. *čbbvr̥ does not formally correspond to the attested Germanic forms. For this reason, the etymology of PSl. *čbbvr̥ as a Germanic loanword has now by and large been rejected (ĖSSJa 4: 139, cf. Snoj 2003: 81, HEW 3: 131).

PSl. *čbbvr̥ is rather to be regarded as an inherited word. The word is related to PSl. *čbban̥ ‘jug’ and has been connected to Lith. kibiras ‘barrel’, cf. Lith. kibti ‘to hang’ (cf. Kiparsky 1934: 23-24, ĖSSJa 4: 139, Sławski 1976: 306-308). This suggests that PSl. *čbbvr̥ originally denoted a vessel with a handle that could be hung from the wall (Snoj 2003: 81).¹¹⁷

PSl. *děl̥ ‘part’ (m. *o*-stem)

OCS děl̥; RCS děl̥; R del ‘share (of booty, production)’; Ukr. dil ‘valley; lower part, bottom’; P dział; Cz. díl; Slk. diel; US džěl; LS žěl; S/Cr. dīo, Gsg. dijēla ‘part’; Slov. děl ‘part’; Bg. djal

Accentuation: AP (b); Derksen notes that the accentuation of PSl. *děl̥ 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 dæl m.; E deal; OFri. dēl ‘part, juridicial district’; OS děl; Du. deel

¹¹⁷ Fraenkel rejects the connection of Lith. kibiras ‘bucket’ with Lith. kibti ‘to hang’ and Gr. κόφινος ‘basket’, and connects Lith. kibiras to Latv. ciba ‘round wooden vessel’ (LitEW 1: 250, 200).

PSl. **dělitī* ‘to divide’

OCS *dělitъ* 3sg. (Supr.); R *delít*; P *dzielicz*; Cz. *dělitī*; Slk. *deliti*; S/Cr. *dijèliti*; Slov. *delíti*; Bg. *delja*

Accentuation: AP (c) on the basis of Slovene, Old Russian (Zaliznjak 1985: 140). Kajkavian (Bednja) *delīti* also points to AP (c) (Jedvaj 1956: 315).

PGmc. **dailjan-* ‘to divide, distribute’

Goth. *dailjan*; OHG *teilen*; G *teilen*; OE *dāelan*; OFri. *dēla*; OS *dēlian*; Du. *delen*

Etymology: The connection of the Germanic forms with the cognates in other languages, such as Skt. *dáyate* ‘divides’ and Gr. *δαίωμα* ‘divide’, Lith. *dailýti* (obs.) ‘to divide’ < PIE **deh₂i-* ‘to divide’ (Derksen 2008: 102, ËSSJa 5: 8-9), is difficult because the initial PGmc. **d* points to PIE **d^h*, 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. *deel*₂). The Germanic form has thus been explained from a PIE anlaut doublet **d^h* 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 **d^hoil-* (**d^hail-*) - 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. **děľb*, **dělitī* 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. ËSSJa 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 *glaz*, *glaza* ‘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 **g^hel-* ‘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 **glóǵno-* (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’, *χλευάζω* ‘to joke’, Lith. *glaudas*, *glauda* (arch.) ‘amusement’, *gláudoti* ‘to joke’, Latv. *glaudāt* ‘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, ÉSSJa 6: 147-148).

PSl. **glupъ* (adj.) ‘foolish, stupid’

CS *glupъ*; R *glúpyj*; OP *ghupi*; P *ghupi*; 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-Splawinski 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-* (ÉSSJa 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 *grad* ‘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. *gaĩdas* ‘fence, enclosure, stall’, Skt. *grhá-* ‘house, residence’, Alb. *garth* ‘hedge’, Phryg. *-gordum* ‘town’, Hitt. *gurtas* ‘fortress’ < PIE **gʰerdʰ-o-/*gʰordʰ-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 **gʰordʰ-* ‘enclosure’ < PIE **gʰer-* ‘to enclose, grab’. The plain velar results from depalatalization of the Proto-Indo-European palatovelar **ǵʰ* 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, ĚSSJa 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 *Kromolów*, Sorbian *Kromola*.

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, ĚSSJa 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 *ljudъje*; **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.** *lud*; **Cz.** *lid* ‘people, the masses’, *lidé* pl. ‘people, folk’; **Slk.** *ľud* ‘people (the masses)’; **US** *lud*, *ludžo*; **LS** *lud*, *luže*; **Plb.** *laudi*, *laidaj*; **S/Cr.** *ljūdi* ‘people’; **Slov.** *ljūd* ‘people, nation’, *ljudjê* ‘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 bishop 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. *lāudis* ‘people’, Skt. *ródhati* ‘to grow’, Gr. *ἐλεύθερος* ‘free’, Lat. *liberī* ‘children’ < PIE **h₁leudʰ-* ‘to grow’ (Pokorny 1959: 685, Derksen 2008: 282).

Etymology: Both PGmc. **leudi-* and PSl. **ljudъ* ‘people’ derive from PIE **h₁leudʰ-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, ĚSSJa 15: 194–200, Snoj 2003: 361, HEW 12: 865, cf. Derksen 2008: 437).

PSl. **mečъ/*mъčъ* ‘sword’ (m. *jo*-stem)

OCS *mečъ*; R *meč*, Gsg. *mečá*; Ukr. *meč*; P *miecz*; Cz. *meč*; Slk. *meč*; US *mječ*; LS *mjac*; S/Cr. *măč*, Gsg. *măča*; Slov. *mèč*; Bg. *meč*

Accentuation: AP (b)

PGmc. **mē_ik-*

Goth. *mekeis* m. (attested Asg. *mekí*); Crimean Gothic *mycha*; OE *mēce*; OS *māki* m; ON *mækir*

Etymology: Fick/Falk/Torp connect PGmc. **mē_ik-* to OIr. *machtaim* ‘slaughter (1sg.)’ (1909: 303). The ultimate origin of the word is unclear and has, perhaps apart from the Old Irish form, 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. **mečъ/*mъčъ* has been disputed. The main problem is the twofold reflex of the root vowel: S/Cr. *ă* goes back to a jer, but Slovene and Russian point to a proto-form **mečъ*. In Old Church Slavic, both *mečъ* and *mъčъ* 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 *o* 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 **mečb* 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. **mečb*/**mčb* 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 *mex* 'sickle', Lezgian *maχ* 'iron' (REW 2: 158).

PSl. **mørky* 'carrot, carrots' (f. *ū*-stem)

OR. *morkovb*, *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.** *mřkva*; **Slov.** *mřkav*, Gsg. *mřkve*; (dial.) *mřkva*

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.) *βράκαρα* '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. **mørky* 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 **mørxy*, 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. **mørky* as well (HEW 13: 950).

Derksen derives PSl. **m̥rky* 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. ÉSSJa 20: 247-249).

PSl. **remy* ‘bridle, belt’ (m. *n*-stem)

OCS *remenъ*; **OR** *remykъ*; **R** *reménъ*, Gsg. *remnjá*; **Ukr.** *réminъ*; **OP** *rzemień*; *rzemyszek*; **P** *rzemień*; **Cz.** *řemen*; **Slk.** *remeň*; **US** *rjemjeń*; **LS** *rjemjeń*; **S/Cr.** *rēmēn*; *rēmik*; **Slov.** *rémen*, Gsg. *reměna*; *jérmen*, Gsg. *jerměna*;¹²⁴ **Bg.** *rémaĭk*
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’, *ῥοφος* ‘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 **Hreg^{wh}-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 **Hreg^{wh}-mn-*, but with a zero-grade in the suffix: in this position, **m* was syllabic and **g^{wh}* yielded **w* in Germanic between vowels (Pronk 2010: 314-315).

¹²⁴ Pronk derives Slov. *jérmen*, Gsg. *jerměna* from the same proto-form, but with a zero grade in the root: **jbrC-* : **reC-*, where the zero grade form **jbrC-* was retained in Slovene next to Slov. *rémen*, which reflects a full grade (2010: 314).

¹²⁵ Pokorny derives the Greek forms from PIE **reb^h-* 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** *strzala*; **Cz.** *střela* ‘bullet, shot’; **Slk.** *strela* ‘missile, shot’; **US** *třěl* (arch.) ‘arrow’; **LS** *stšěla* (arch.) ‘arrow’; **S/Cr.** *strijèla*, **Npl.** *strijele*; **Slov.** *stréla* ‘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).

