

ROBERT ORR

## PRASLOVANSKA DIALEKTIZACIJA V LUČI ETIMOLOŠKIH RAZISKAV: A REVIEW

COBISS: 1.19

[HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.3986/JZ.29.2.14](https://doi.org/10.3986/JZ.29.2.14)

*Praslovska dialektizacija v luči etimoloških raziskav: ob stoti obletnici rojstva akademika Franceta Bezlaja: zbornik referatov z mednarodnega znanstvenega simpozija v Ljubljani, 16.–18. septembra 2010* [The Emergence of Proto-Slavic Dialects in the Light of Etymological Research: Collected Contributions from the International Scholarly Symposium Commemorating the Centenary of the Birth of Academician France Bezljaj, 16-18 September 2010], ur. Metka Furlan – Alenka Šivic-Dular, Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, 2012, 322 str.

This work (hereinafter PDL)<sup>1</sup> is a collection of twenty-five short, albeit packed, and seminal, papers by eminent etymologists presented at the eponymous symposium held in Ljubljana to mark the centenary of the birth of France Bezljaj (hereinafter B), who left behind a massive amount of material on Slavic (Sl) etymology and onomastics. B's work (his bibliography in PDL, listing 261 items (11–24)) is cited and commented on consistently, with one of the articles therein, Dimitrova-Todorova, devoted thereto. The individual articles in PDL are very rich in data, and doing the collection justice would be very difficult within a single review. The selection of items of interest to the respective reviewer, and the comparative neglect of others, is inevitable under the circumstances.

---

Robert Orr ■ Ottawa, Kanada ■ [colkitto@rogers.com](mailto:colkitto@rogers.com)

I would like to dedicate this review to the memory of Prof. William R. Schmalstieg, of Pennsylvania State University, who was kind enough to serve as my Ph.D External Examiner, and subsequently took a friendly interest in much of my research, and made many supportive comments over the years.

- 1 When accompanying forms are being cited, the following abbreviations will be used in this article: **Bg** – Bulgarian; **Br** – Belarusian; **CS** – Common Slavic; **Cz** – Czech; **IE** – Indo-European; **OCS** – Old Church Slavonic; **P** – Polish; **R** – Russian; **SC** – Serbo-Croatian; **Sl** – Slavic; **Sn** – Slovenian; **SS** – South Slavic; **SWS** – South-West Slavic (SC and Sn); **U** – Ukrainian; **WS** – West Slavic; **Alb** – Albanian; **E** – English; **Gk** – Greek; **Lith** – Lithuanian; **OE** – Old English; **SG** – Scottish Gaelic; **Skt** – Sanskrit; **We** – Welsh. They will be spelled out in full on their first such occurrence in the text.



Taken together, the articles in PDL cover a comprehensive range of lexicological and etymological topics pertinent to the reconstruction of Common Slavic (CS), and there are also items of interest for Indo-European (IE) specialists, as opposed to narrowly Sl issues, scattered throughout the book, especially in the articles by Kurkina, Loma, Ostrowski, Stanišić, Šivic-Dular, and Varbot, sometimes only to be gleaned after a close reading of the footnotes, extensive in some of the articles, e.g., Deykova (80, fn. 24). Most of the authors also feature in the excellent *Studia Etymologica Brunensia* (SEB) series, edited by Janyšková and Karlíková (both also featured in the present volume) and published in the Czech Republic on an irregular basis. In a general way, many of the articles in PDL appear to develop ideas originally published by their authors in SEB.

To at least some extent, all of the articles deal with more theoretical aspects of etymological studies, mostly illustrating them by detailed discussions of individual etyma. All of them emphasise the importance of etymology for dialectological studies, discussing internal Sl isolexes in some detail. With at least eleven Sl languages, there are a large potential number of possible permutations involving two-way or three-way isolexes.<sup>2</sup>

The preface specifically refers to the Etymological Commission, a subcommittee officially affiliated with the International Committee of Slavists, under whose auspices the well-known International Congress of Slavists have been held in a different Sl cultural centre<sup>3</sup> every five years, for almost a century.

The articles in PDL come in a variety of languages: four each in Russian (R), Bulgarian (Bg), and Slovenian (Sn); three each in Serbo-Croatian (SC), Polish (P), and Czech (Cz); two in Belarusian (Br), and one each in English (E) and Ukrainian (U). In the contents the authors' names are listed in Roman alphabetical order, even the ones cited in Cyrillic, e.g., Цыхун (Cychun) comes immediately after Бјелетић (Bjeletić). Each article begins with a very brief statement in the respective language and concludes with a more extensive summary, of which fourteen are in English, nine in Russian, and one each in French and German.<sup>4</sup>

The authors are mainly scholars working in centres in Sl countries where etymological dictionaries are being produced, e.g., ESJS (OCS, published in Czechia), БЕР (Bulgarian), ЭСБМ (Belarusian), ЭССЯ (Common Slavic, published in Moscow)

2 For the purposes of this review Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian will be mostly subsumed under "Serbo-Croatian (SC)", although such an approach sometimes obscures necessary detail, e.g., Antropaŭ (29-30; this volume) distinguishes between "Belarusian-Serbian" and "Belarusian-Serbo-Croatian" isolexes.

3 I use "cultural centre" rather than "capital" here in order to include Cracow (1998) and Ohrid (2008), both non-capital Congress venues.

4 In this context, apart from the number of articles in Russian in PDL, there are still, three decades after the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, one or two traces of the linguistic hegemony Russian used to enjoy in Central and Eastern Europe, e.g., the citation of Burrow's *The Sanskrit Language* in its Russian translation (169).

both of various stages of CS and the modern national languages. Coverage is not fully comprehensive, though; no etymological dictionaries of Macedonian, Slovak or Sorbian<sup>5</sup> appear to be included, which is a pity, as all three are of great interest. Major Sl etymological dictionaries, published both by collectives and single individuals have also been referenced, works both more recent, e.g., Boryś (2005), and older, e.g., Jungmann (1835-1839), Brückner (1927), Vasmer (1973),<sup>6</sup> as well as non-Sl (e.g., English, Spanish, Italian (57), Albanian (199, passim)).<sup>7</sup> This is particularly appropriate in that B himself passed away leaving his own Sn etymological dictionary incomplete, with the final volumes shepherded through the publication process by other scholars.

As a minor point of interest, considerable discussions are allotted to plant, bird and animal names throughout PDL, cf. especially, but not limited to, Deykova, Račeva, and Waniakowa.<sup>8</sup> Extensive use is made of the Linnaean classification throughout.

Antropaŭ's article "Праславяскія дыялектызмы ў Этымалагічным слоўніку беларускай мовы (ЭСБМ)" (25–32) based on selected volumes of the multivolume Br Etymological Dictionary (1, 6, 12, 13) published in Minsk, treats about twenty Late CS isolexes, mainly, but not exclusively, centring on Belarusian, citing regional, areal, and dialectal issues. His main aim seems to be to bring the details of Br data to the attention of a wider audience — isolexes<sup>9</sup> linking Belarusian to other Sl languages or subgroupings – and the light that Br data can often shed on difficult problems, e.g., трап'е (30), although on the other hand it often reveals extra complexity, e.g., маркаль (29).<sup>10</sup>

As may be seen from her chosen title, "К Семантико-этимологической интерпретации оттопонимических (отэтнотонимических) образований: на материале гнезда<sup>11</sup> 'Русь, русский'" (33–46), Berezovich offers yet another angle on the extensively discussed ethnonym *Rus'*. She cites extensive dialectal material, and, differently from most research into the topic, she focuses mainly on forms

5 Shul'hach (242; 249) does cite Muka's Sorbian dictionary, the latter not being an etymological dictionary as such.

6 In this review Vasmer will be cited in Trubačev's translation.

7 One confusing element here is that dictionaries often have similar names, sometimes even impeding searches.

8 For comparative purposes, one might cite Drummond (1991), Murray (2016) which draw on very similar material.

9 Furlan (96, fn. 13; this volume) actually mentions a Sn-Br isolex (*\*sop-ti*) not covered by Antropaŭ or Сухун, thereby suggesting that Antropaŭ's list of Sn-Br isolexes might be made more comprehensive. Similarly Varbot (286; this volume) cites another SC-Br isolex (*\*sǫvezь*).

10 In this context, the use of data from a less commonly taught language in a large language family, one recalls Lockwood (1961: 1)'s caveat that "Faroese won't solve all the problems [in reconstructing ornithonyms – RAO], of course; in fact it will not infrequently indicate that such exist where none were suspected."

11 Russian "(Этимологическое) гнездо" will be left untranslated in this article; if it must be translated, "etymological complex" seems to be the best rendition, an improvement on "word-nests" (305) in any case.

derived from *Rus'* and their subsequent development, rather than its possible origin and cognates in related languages, as well as the associated folk etymologies. Berezovich's contribution should undoubtedly be integrated into future treatments of the subject, see Danylenko (2006: 3–30), and the literature cited therein, also Orr (2014: 280–281).

By comparison to Antropau's more broadly-based approach, in “О лексичкој породици псл. *\*brъstь/\*brъstь* ‘пупољак, изданак, храна за стоку’ (‘bud’, etc.)” (47–59), Vjelečić (49) concentrates on one “этимологическое гнездо” included in what might be described as another SS-U isoplex (47, fn., *passim*), offering a plausible reinterpretation of the data, with extensive citation of IE background material.<sup>12</sup>

The theme of isoplexes is continued in Cychun's “Эксклюзивныя міжславянскія ізалексы і праславянская арэальная структура” (61–68), an article more theoretical than most of those in PDL, focusing on treatment of the oft-discussed centre-periphery contrast, mainly involving broader ES/SS isoglosses. Cychun's greater scholarly interest in areal rather than genetic factors is fully on display here, as also in his more recent paper (Cychun 2013).

Based on data from ЭСБМ, Cychun integrates most Belarusian-SWS isoplexes into Common Slavic, plus one Belarusian-South-East Slavic example (Br калина(калінка) / Bg калина (< Turkic) ‘viburnum’). He also goes beyond Slavic, citing Baltic and Turkic<sup>13</sup> connections (including material from folklore texts; e.g., Br. явар ‘corn spirit’ < Lith *ievaras* (65–66)).

Citing her Ph.D thesis, and her other articles, Deykova in “Диалектна диференция в рамките на праславянската орнитологична системна” (69–82) deals with a fairly narrow topic: the reconstruction of Sl ornithonyms, specifically names for ‘hoopoe’, ‘stork’, and ‘woodpecker’, and uses them to illustrate a great deal of theoretical material covering word formation and derivation (74), relying mainly on recent discussions with detailed citations, especially of Cz and Bg examples. Deykova makes extensive use of footnotes, and many of her examples are sometimes only to be gleaned after a close reading thereof. She also includes discussion of semantic relationships involving verbs denoting sounds and ornithonyms and the related compound forms (fn. 24 (80)), e.g., U трясигузка ‘white wagtail’ (\*tręsi- ‘shake’ + \*gqzъka ‘rump’ (76)).<sup>14</sup>

In “Топономичнити приносите на Франце Безлай и тяхното значение за изясняване на произхода на българските топонимите от славянски произход” (83–89) Dimitrova-Todorova includes discussion of B's contribution to Bg toponymical studies, Bg/Sn

12 One wishes that Vjelečić had said more about Russian (R) ветошь (< CS *\*vetъx-jъ*; 55) in the discussion, see Halla-Aho (2006: 174–175), Orr (2010: 162–163).

13 It might be noted, though, that Udmurt is actually Uralic, not Turkic (66 fn. 24).

14 From outside Sl, a well-known example is provided by the Germanic forms E *nightingale*, German *Nachtigall*, a compound of Proto-Germanic *\*naht-* ‘night’ + *\*gal-* ‘sing’, cf. Faroese *gala* ‘crow’ (IE root *\*ghel-* ‘call’, probably also related to CS *\*gāl-* e.g., R галка ‘jackdaw’ (p. 74), discussed by Deykova in an earlier article cited in the bibliography (Deykova 2007), see also Vasmer 1973: I: 387–389; ESJS: 3: 172).

parallels, and the use of B's work by Bg scholars, and the variety of ways in which his materials may be utilized by future researchers, and she suggests that B could have made more use of Bg data. Her article should be seen as offering some constructive criticism and suggestions for continuing along the lines laid down by B's research.

In "Arhaizmi in dialektizacija: na primeru slovanskega jezikovnega gradiva" (91–102) Furlan herself draws attention to the fact that proposed etymologies must be as accurate as possible in order to provide a proper foundation for identifying archaism and innovation in linguistic reconstruction. She identifies five illustrative examples (*\*kamy*; *\*berza*; *\*svilod*; *\*sop-ti*; *\*rъdrъ*; 96–97), dealing with them in some detail.

One form briefly cited by Furlan, however, which deserves a more detailed explanation is CS *\*korva*, which, oddly enough, she only mentions in passing, in the conclusion and then in the R summary. Disappointingly in the context of CS *\*korva*, however, she does not note the coexistence of *centum* and *satem* forms in Slavic, essential for any discussion of the wider typological context of *\*korva*, see, e.g., Shevelov (1964: 142–143), Orr (2000a; 2012: 12).<sup>15</sup> It is to be hoped that Furlan will continue this line of research, as the feeling after reading this article is mild disappointment, one might have expected a bit more.

As can be gleaned from the title of her paper, Jakubowicz's "Próba zastosowania kryterium semantycznego w badaniach nad zróżnicowaniem dialektalnym języka prasłowiańskiego" (103–109) concentrates on the great importance of semantic data in etymological research, offering a new approach to issues of archaism and innovation, citing the semantics of *этимологические гнезда* represented by groups of forms such as *rychlъjъ* 'loose [of earth]'<sup>16</sup> related to, e.g., *ruch* 'movement' contrasting the meanings in East Slavic ('friable', 'crumbling') and West Slavic ('quick'; treated in some detail; see also Varbot, this volume (284)),<sup>17</sup> and those derived from CS *\*grdъ* and *\*jarъ* (107).<sup>18</sup>

15 Recently Gvozdanić, in a series of articles and one book, has been developing a framework for viewing prehistoric Slavo-Celtic relations. Her 2008 article includes a list of Slavic *centum*-forms which she sees as borrowings from Celtic, albeit unlikely for most of the forms that she cites, *korva* (see above) being one of her better examples. The relevant section in her 2009 book (35–40) simply cites most of the same forms, repeating many of the errors.

16 The gloss follows Orr (1996: 331).

17 Regrettably, Jakubowicz omits any mention of the possibility classifying forms such as *rychlъjъ* as original u-stems (Orr 1996: 329–332).

18 CS *\*grdъ* and *\*jarъ* provide further examples of interesting semantic developments, with *\*grdъ* involving semantic splitting between North Slavic (pointing to the original meaning of 'proud, magnificent') and South Slavic (a semantic development to 'bad, terrible') and *\*jarъ* being the result of a merger between two originally distinct forms (originally 'year, season', as exemplified in Gothic *jer*) and 'strong, powerful', as exemplified in Gk ζορός).

Jakubowicz also offers a more general discussion of the overall issue of the incomplete nature of many etymological dictionaries, especially ЭССЯ (Moscow) in this context, contrasting it with *Słownik prasłowiański* (Kraków).<sup>19</sup>

As a small point, Jakubowicz's extensive citation of "Boryś 2002" does not correspond to Boryś 2001, which appears in her list of references.

Jakubowicz is followed by two related articles, following a broadly parallel pattern and dealing with specific semantic fields, by scholars working in Brno and closely involved in the production of the excellent ESJS and SEB, both cited elsewhere in this review: Ilona Janyšková's "K lexikálněsémantickému poli 'vonět, zapáchat' ve slovanských jazycích: motivační východiska" (111–123), dealing with a richly detailed, comprehensive survey of the semantic development of forms meaning "smell", and Helena Karlíková's "Vyjádření pojmu 'velký' ve staré češtině a jeho ekvivalenty ve slovanských jazycích" (125–133), with a similar approach to forms meaning "big".

Returning to issues involving isolexes, Kurkina's "К проблеме интерпретации лексических изоглосс" (135–150) continues a long series of substantial works on etymology, integrating discussion both on the theoretical level and dealing with individual isoglosses. Based on this material, she suggests that detailed etymological studies can assist in recovering very early dialect mixture across the Carpathian area, involving the dialect continua that would later become SWS and ES. In addition to ЭССЯ, she also cites two further resources: *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас*, a major project under way for over fifty years in one way or another, and the more recent *Общекарпатский диалектологический атлас*.

19 It should be noted that, even with the modern advances in electronic databases and computer technologies, greatly facilitating searches, one problem in etymological studies is the sheer amount of time taken to compile etymological dictionaries, thus generating a bias in favour of forms coming earlier in the alphabet. As Anttila in his magnum opus on IE \*ag-/ag'- (2000: 13) notes: "... the lucky thing about material beginning with A was that even when the dictionaries stalled or were not finished, the letter A was of course treated. Only Swedish and Finnish would throw some of the material to their end of their alphabets (Å and Ä are at the end of the alphabet), and the Swedish Academy Dictionary is not there yet (but the same situation with the Lithuanian Academy Dictionary does not hinder A). But the *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (LFE) nicely presented its A, and so did Migne's Latin Dictionary." From their beginnings in 1974, the ЭССЯ team, originally headed by the late Oleg Trubachev, are currently ploughing through \*p-, having just worked through the massive number of prefixed forms with initial \*o- (which took up volumes 26–40). The even greater numbers of prefixes in \*p- in SI, the very high frequency of some of these prefixes, and the already evident painstaking cataloguing by the team, suggest that ЭССЯ will be bogged down in that part of the alphabet for a considerable period, and may not even reach \*z- in my lifetime. ESJS, however, with far smaller corpora to work on (see Orr 2000b; 2015), reached \*z- some time ago. Both ESJS and ЭССЯ follow the order of the Roman alphabet.

One minor overall desideratum in Kurkina's article is consistency: citing the same form, *troed*, as уэл. (Welsh) and кимр. (Cymric) on the same page (146)<sup>20</sup> detracts somewhat from the standard of the work, which is, as always with Kurkina's research, otherwise very high.

Loma's "Archaism vs. Annovation. Composition vs. Derivation: a Contribution to the Study of Territorial Variation and Chronological Segmentation within the Common Slavic Vocabulary" (151–161) is the only article in English in PDL, focusing on the forms *\*gribъ* and *\*korbъjъ*, which he sees as original compounds: (*\*gri-bъ* 'forest-grown' (154); *\*kor-bъ* 'bark-beaten' (158)).<sup>21</sup> His treatment of these roots leads Loma to point out that many forms in apparent violation of the well-known IE constraint barring such roots such as \*TeDH/DeD may be explained by reconstructing them as original, often submerged, noun+verb compounds (see also fn. 14 for a more obvious example thereof). Several problematic IE forms might be reexamined in that light. Loma cites copious examples, and it might be suggested that many problematic IE forms might be revisited in the light of his approach.

To Loma's citation of examples of the common semantic development 'mountain' > 'forest' might be added the IE dialectal grouping represented by Lat *collis* E *hill*, contrasted with Scottish Gaelic (SG) *coille* 'wood',<sup>22</sup> see also Kurkina (above, 135–136).

In "Rozważania na temat głoski [r] w językach słowiańskich na tle adekwatnych zjawisk fonetycznych w innych językach, zwłaszcza indo-europejskich" (163–176) Ostrowski offers us some material for discussion on rhotacism, under which term he subsumes a lot of changes in a wide variety of languages, as evidenced by his list of abbreviations.

Ostrowski cites extensive data from a wide variety of languages, Slavic, especially *ž > r*, mostly in Slovenian and adjacent SWS areas, already attested in the Freising Fragments, non-Slavic–IE, and non-IE (Chuvash/Old Bulgar). As with many such studies, however, he neglects pertinent Celtic data, the citation of which could have reinforced many of his points; it is startling to find him citing lenition (166) without any mention of Celtic, and, as a minor point, his juxtaposition of E *iron* and German *Eisen* should have mentioned SG *iarann*, Welsh

20 This confusion in naming the *Cymraeg* language, conventionally known in English as 'Welsh', is also found elsewhere, see also Gvozdanović 2008: 163, 2009: 35, 252–253. Although PDL is not primarily a book about Celtic data, the latter inevitably turn up in the book's IE-oriented discussions, and some degree of consistency would be welcomed. It is as if forms in *deutsch* were to be listed in an English text, on a random basis, as Germ/Nem or Germ/Alle. Furthermore, Russian versions of wikipedia refer to Валлийский язык, adding a further degree of complexity.

21 These glosses represent a distillation of Loma's detailed discussion.

22 In toponyms E 'forest' often refers to wild places, e.g., *Forest of Mamlorn*, *Bruach na Frithe* 'brae of the forest', without implying the presence of actual trees.

(We) *haearn* < *\*isarno* (168), as the Germanic forms are generally viewed as early borrowings from Celtic. Another aspect of rhotacism which he might have cited is the sporadic *L-N-R* variation, as exemplified by Scottish E *Culloden*, SG *Cùil Lodair*, cf. also *iolair/ioral* ‘eagle’ (166), although further on he does cite the *N-R* alternation. Also, Ostrowski’s suggestion of an *\*s- > \*h-* based areal subgrouping within IE consisting of Greek, Armenian, and Iranian (116 fn. 6) is called into question by the presence of the same sound-change in Brythonic (cf. Lith *senas*, Lat *sen(ex)*, SG *seann*, contrasting with We *hen*), geographically, chronologically, and, within IE, linguistically fairly remote from Ostrowski’s purported subgrouping. Even bearing in mind that the Greek/Iranian/Armenian sound changes may have taken place at approximately the same date, and the Brythonic change must be quite a few centuries later, *\*s- > \*h-* is quite a commonplace change; outside IE it is also attested in, e.g., Bashkir.

As a small point, Ostrowski suggests that Lat *albus* has been replaced by *\*blancus* (< Germanic) as the unmarked word for ‘white’ throughout Romance, although that meaning is actually still attested within Romance, as Romanian *alb*; Romansh *alv*, as well as derivatives such as French *aube* ‘dawn’ (168, fn. 9).<sup>23</sup>

Račeva’s article, “Към праславянската диалектизация в етимологичното проучване на цветоозначаващите основи *\*las-* и *\*last-*” (177–190), originally ‘bright, white spot’, provides another example of comprehensive discussion of a large number of animal names, bird names, tree names, and plant names, this time based on the root *\*las-* and all its derivatives, specifically in this case dealing with both aspects of semantics and etymology, and linked to the archaic IE suffix *\*-t*, also manifest in CS *\*berz/berst-*, as well as the suffix *\*-k-*. Her extensive use of Linnaean nomenclature is probably quite justified, in view of the confusion that has been known to arise in such circumstances, see Mortenson (2004: 215–220). Mainly concentrating on *Hirundo* ‘swallow’ and *Mustela nivalis* ‘weasel’, she also includes discussion of colour names and their emergence in taboo forms, e.g., Вг бял-/бел- (see БЕР 1: 107-109), Р *lasij* and prefixation (U (підласий), Вr (падласы), Sn forms using the prefix *pod-* for ‘white spot’ (187-188)), with some Carpathian Romance connections worth some further research. She concludes by noting that, rather surprisingly, much of this material appears to have been omitted from ЭССЯ (180).

Rejzek “Slovesa s intenzivní reduplicací v češtině a jiných slovanských jazycích” (191–197) deals with a restricted set of forms with reduplicated TVL/TVR syllables, the best known of which is undoubtedly OCS *glagolati* < *\*gVI-gVI-*. Most of the other forms cited by Rejzek, however, do not appear to be attested in OCS, suggesting another example of an important point all-too-often

23 This footnote is in French, for reasons that are not entirely clear.



forgotten: OCS ≠ CS, see Orr (2010: 154–158; 2015); also Mathiasen (1974: 51–60), fn. 30 below.

One small error on Rejzek's part is the suggestion that Sl has no reduplicated verb forms inherited from IE, startling in the light of OCS *dati* – *dastь* (< \**dad-tь*) – *dad-ęť* 'give', (cf. Skt *dadāmi* Greek (Gk) δίδωμι – id.; *dēti* – *dezdō* (< \**ded-je*) 'put'.

With “О северним индоевропским везама албанског језика (199-211)” Stanišić mainly deals with the position of Albanian within IE dialectology, and its relationship to Sl dialectology, providing a mass of interesting detail. He cites Orel's Albanian Etymological Dictionary (1998) extensively, and not always uncritically. Some areas could have used more discussion, e.g., the connections among the complexes ostensibly represented by Alb *rangë*/ Lith *rankà* /OCS *roka* (208) and Alb *zë* / Gk φωνή / OCS *zvонь* 'sound' (209).<sup>24</sup> A further interesting isogloss noted by Stanišić is represented by Alb *mal* 'mountain' / SG *meall* 'rounded mountain' / *mala* 'eyebrow, slope' (203-204).<sup>25</sup>

Šekli's “Alpskoslovansko in panonskoslovansko v slovenščini” (213–225) deals with the difficulties involved in disentangling the earliest dialect mixtures dating back to the period of the expansion of Common Slavic, specifically the earliest manifestations of the dialect groupings later to become Slovenian and Kajkavian citing, e.g., Alpine Slavic, Pannonian Slavic as attested in the Freising Fragments, One item for which Šekli is to be commended is his grouping features under diatopic/synchronic and syntopic/diachronic, taking into account space (-*top*-) as well as time (-*chron*-).

Šivic-Dular's own article, “Teoretični in metodološki vidiki etimoloških raziskav in praslovanska dialektizacija” (227–239), treats some groups of forms clearly related, but displaying some degree of irregularity, citing Sławski 1974–1979 and ЭССЯ for material. One interesting aspect, only hinted at by Šivic-Dular and not really dealt with here, involves pairs apparently displaying a -*m*-/-*v*- alternation, of which she quotes only \**čьrть/čьrvь* 'worm (plus relatable meanings; 235-237)' for which she quotes copious forms, omitting, surprisingly \**рьrть/рьrvь* 'first', where Sl forms in -*v*- (R первый) are contrasted with forms in -*m*- (Lith *pirmas*).

Shul'hach's attractively presented article, “Про один із випадків делябізації у слов'янських мовах (лексина система L'ud > Lid-)” (241–250), is devoted to the root \**ljud/lid*. Forms based on *lid*- occur regularly in Czech, and sporadically elsewhere, suggesting a tendency, rather than a regular sound change, see Orr

<sup>24</sup> For OCS *zvонь* 'sound' (209) Stanišić omits quite a bit of the more recent material, see also Orr 2013 and the literature cited therein.

<sup>25</sup> Although this is not the main thrust of Stanišić's article, we should note the citation of Old High German *wurgen* 'squeeze' (208) and his linking it to Bg врьз-; Alb (*z*)*vjerdh* 'wean (a baby); cool feelings, chill desire; alienate, estrange; prune extra roots and sprouts from a grafted plant', see Orr (2003: 48–49) for some further connections.

(2012: 15–17), and the literature cited therein, for further examples. Shul'hach gives a comprehensive list of such forms (including some German ones), and criticises certain SI etymological dictionaries for some omissions.

The late Todor Todorov's short article,<sup>26</sup> "Праслав. \*stapiti, неговото производно \*jъzstapiti (se) и происходът на българските глаголи стъписвам се изстъписвам се" (251–256) offers an original and fairly convincing interpretation of the etymology of Bg стъписвам, suggesting a Gk origin. However, he goes too far when he suggests that the isolation of a form within a part of Slavic does not necessarily imply that it does not go back to Common Slavic ("няма съответствия в други(те) славянски езици и следователно не възхожда към общославянска праформа (252)"), forms such as, e.g., SC -нијети (cognate with Skt *náyati* 'lead', cf. ЭССЯ 25: 105) 'bring' (донијети, etc., which has a suppletive relationship with the more widespread –нести (cognate with Gk ἵνευκον < \*enek-); Old Russian крити 'buy', cognate with such forms as Skt *krīṇāti*, We *pruni*, Gk *πρίασθαι*, *πρίαμαι*, *ἐπρίαμην* 'buy', Lith *krienas* 'money, pay', maybe reinforced by folk etymology.<sup>27</sup>

Starting off by citing B, Tolstaya also uses individual etyma to illustrate broader theoretical issues in "К семантической реконструкции слав. \*vesel- и \*rad-" (257–264), based on two semantically closely related гнезда, and compares and contrasts pairs of semantically identical collocations in SI languages, one using \*vesel- and one \*rad-, e.g., Sn *se veselimo srečanja* / R *радуемся встрече*.

Mainly based on Sn data, Torkar's "Koren \*l'ub- v slovenski toponimiji (v slovanskem kontekstu)" (265–280) is similar to Shul'hach's in that it includes a comprehensive list of forms derived from a single root, this time \*l'ub, with a few surprises, e.g., Carinthian/Bavarian parallels in East Slavic, plus a few German forms, less easy to spot.

With "Значение определения производящих основ лексем славянских языков для суждения о диалектном состоянии праславянского языка" (281–290), extensively referencing her recent compendium (Varbot 2012), Varbot continues a lifetime devoted to SI etymological scholarship. This article contains a number of interesting treatments, such as, e.g., the complex represented by CS \*kerda/kъrdъ 'herd' (284), SG *crodh* 'cattle'.

Throughout the article she deals with several etymologies involving the apparent convergence of originally distinct roots. Some of her etymologies, correct as far as they go, need some further discussion, e.g., the SI semantics of *sočiti* - \*sekw- (\*sek-; 285) may be closest to the original IE, cf. ESJS (9: 530–531;

26 Todorov's passing as PDL was going to press is noted by F and S in the Introduction.

27 This phenomenon may also be encountered elsewhere in IE, e.g., Manx *iu*, the regular reflex of IE \*pib- 'drink', replaced in both Irish and Scottish Gaelic.

hk-ae<sup>28</sup>), actually for *nasočiti*.<sup>29</sup> She offers a detailed discussion of whether two roots are actually involved in the reconstruction of IE *\*sekw-*, finally favouring a single root, with the original meaning ‘být/jít za někým/něčím’. She goes on to suggest ways in which other meanings might be derived from it, see also, e.g., Vasmer (1973: III, 731), who glosses R сочить as “искать, выслеживать (зверя, вора)”; for Bg соча; сочи; OCS сочити, etc., see also the discussions in BEP 7: 376–377, cf. also Orr (2007: 370): сочить “(Wild) auf der Fährte folgen (fährten)”. Varbot also separates *pridь* I ‘доплата доход’, clearly linked to other forms in *-dь*<sup>30</sup> and *pridь* II ‘обод днища деревянного сосуда’ (286), and her concluding example, CS *\*pěstunь* involves a similar approach (286–288). In the latter case Varbot also briefly mentions borrowing from Germanic, about which one wishes more had been said.

On a personal note, it is gratifying to see Varbot paying attention to the u-stem factor, in contrast to Jakubowicz (see above, 106; *ruch/rych-* 284), e.g., her treatment of *bobrь* (285).<sup>31</sup>

Vlajić-Popović’s “Псл. *\*p(r)etro* ‘таван(ица)’, ‘грета’, ‘сушара’, или ‘остава’?” (291–306) also deals with forms in a single этимологическое гнездо; already discussed by a number of distinguished Slavists, as she points out.

On quite a few occasions etymologies first mooted by early Slavic scholars and then neglected have been revived,<sup>32</sup> and this is the approach taken by Vlajić-Popović to *\*p(r)etati*. Citing copious typological support, she opts for an etymology going back to a subsequently ignored proposal by Mikkola.

PDL concludes with Waniakowa’s slightly misleading title “Słowiańskie nazwy roślin w świetle badań etymologicznych (na wybranych przykładach)” (307–322), clearly implying treatment of a variety of plant names, but in practice centred around plantains. As with Shul’hach, her layout is very good.

All the articles in PDL repay a close reading. One major omission is indexes covering individual forms and scholars, which would have made the work much more user-friendly, and enhanced its already considerable value.

28 Following the method of crediting authors in ESJS.

29 The unelaborated citation offered by ESJS for the unprefixed form *-sočiti* (14: 854) serves as yet another reminder of the incomplete nature of the OCS corpus; *-sočiti* itself is actually unattested as such in OCS, and the discussion cited here can be found under *nasočiti*, referenced by the *-sočiti* entry.

30 Not included in Orr 1996 as a u-stem, although it could probably be related to forms such as *\*perdь*, *\*podь* (see Orr (1996: 320–321) and the literature cited therein; see also ESJS 12: 713–714 for further discussion of *pridь* I).

31 The form *bobrь* provides a further illustration of some of the pitfalls of relying too heavily on OCS as a surrogate for Common Slavic, see Orr (2015: 294–295), also Račeva, for another set of forms, see Mathiassen (1974: 51–60), although he expresses himself slightly differently, also Bjørnflaten (2006: 58 fn.).

32 See Orr (2003: 57) for another example of this phenomenon.

There are a few trivial errors in style, such as minor misprints/misspellings, especially in the English summaries, e.g., *thé* in *thé uherské* and *thé římské* should be *čaj* (42); “Roman and German” should probably be “Romance and Germanic”; “(etnonymic) derivats”; “propones”; “fix on a bank” should be “fix on a bench” (46), “nominates” should be “denotes”; “formaly”, “aboundantly” (59), “tana” should be “ta na” (99); “rotacism” (176; summary); “инсиситира” should be “инсистира” (200), “Gotic” (209); OCS “гвоздь” should be “гвоздь” (209).

An English editor could maybe have cast an eye over all the English summaries, which do display a clumsy style on occasion, but given that none of the contributors is a native speaker of English, the result is impressive. Such post-editing, however, would probably not be absolutely essential overall, as actual comprehension is hardly ever impaired to any great extent. Furlan and Šivic-Dular are to be congratulated on PDL, as also acknowledged by some contributors, e.g., Dimitrova-Todorova (84 fn. 1).

## REFERENCES

- Anttila 2000** = Raimo Anttila, *Proto-Indo-European \*Aǵ-: a Drove of Driven Driving Words*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.
- Bjørnflaten 2006** = Jan Ivar Bjørnflaten, Chronologies of the Slavicization of Northern Russia Mirrored by Slavic Loanwords in Finnic and Baltic, in: *The Slavicization of the Russian North: Mechanisms and Chronology*, ed. Juhani Nuorluoto, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2006 (Slavica Helsingiensia 27), 50–77.
- Boryś 2005** = Wiesław Boryś, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2005.
- Brückner 1927** = Aleksander Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza, 1927.
- Cychun 2013** = Henadz’ A. Cychun, *Aspekty slavjanskaj areal’naj lingvistyki, daklad na XV Mižnarodnym zezdze slavistaw*, Minsk: Prava i ekanomika, 2013.
- Danylenko 2006** = Andriy Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica: Ukrainian in Context*, München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2006 (Sagners Slavistische Sammlung 31).
- Drummond 1991** = Peter Drummond, *Scottish Hill and Mountain Names*, Glasgow: Scottish Mountaineering Trust, 1991.
- ESJS** = *Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Staroslovenského* I–X, Praha: Academia, 1998.
- Gvozdanović 2008** = Jadranka Gvozdanović, Centum Elements in Slavic revisited, *Deutsche Beiträge zum 14 Internationalen Slavistenkongress = Die Welt Der Slaven XXXII* (2008), 159–169.
- Gvozdanović 2009** = Jadranka Gvozdanović, *Celtic and Slavic and the Great Migrations*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 2009.
- Halla-Aho 2006** = Jussi Halla-Aho, *Problems of Proto-Slavic Historical Morphology: on the Basis of Old Church Slavic*, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 2006.
- Janyšková – Karlíková 2000** = Ilona Janyšková – Helena Karlíková (eds.), *Studia Etymologica Brunensia*, Prague: Euroslavica [subsequent volumes Nakladatelství Lidové Noviny], 2000.
- Jungmann 1835–1839 (1989–1990)** = Josef Jungmann, *Slovník česko-německý* I–V, Praha: Academia, 1989–1990.
- Lockwood 1961** = William B. Lockwood, *The Faroese Bird Names*, Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1961.
- Mathiassen 1974** = Terje Mathiassen, *Studien zum Slavischen und Indo-Europäischen Langvokalismus*, Oslo: Universitetsforlag, 1974.
- Mortenson 2004** = Philip Mortenson, *This is not a Weasel: a Look at Nature’s Most Confusing Terms*, Hoboken: Wiley, 2004.

- Murray 2016** = John Murray, *Reading the Gaelic Landscape: Leughadh Aghaidh na Tìre*, Dunbeath: Whittles Publishing, 2016.
- Orel 1998** = Vladimir Orel, *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill, 1998.
- Orr 1996** = Robert Orr, Again the \*-ŭ-stems in Common Slavic, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 4.2 (1996), 312–343.
- Orr 2000a** = Robert Orr, Filling in the Gaps - The Reflexes of IE \*ag- in Slavic, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1: sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní vědecké konference Etymologické symposium Brno 1999 (Slovenská etymologie v indoevropském kontextu)*, eds. Iлона Janyšková – Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, 2000, 311–316.
- Orr 2000b** = Robert Orr, A Lexicographical Tradition Continues, Review of Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského (Etymological Dictionary of the Old Church Slavonic Language) 8 luna-mrščati Doplnky k bibliografickému aparátu II, pp. 445-502, I-X, PRAHA: ACADEMIA: Nakladatelství Akademie Věd České Republiky, 1998, *Canadian Slavonic Papers* XLII.1–2 (2000), 191–199.
- Orr 2003** = Robert Orr, Murk - a Neglected Slavic Loanword in Germanic?, *Canadian Contributions to the XIII International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana 2003 = Canadian Slavonic Papers* XLV.1–2 (2003), 47–60.
- Orr 2007** = Robert Orr, A Russian-German Dictionary of Hunting and Related Fauna: Lorenz: *Jagd-wörterbuch Russisch-Deutsch*, *Canadian Slavonic Papers* XLIX.3–4 (2007), 369–374.
- Orr 2010** = Robert Orr, Review of Jussi Halla-Aho, *Problems of Proto-Slavic Historical Morphology: On the Basis of Old Church Slavic*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press. 2006, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 18.1 (2010), 153–168.
- Orr 2012** = Robert Orr, An Irregular Indo-European Soundchange Reflected in Slavic?, in: *Studien zu Sprache, Literatur, und Kultur bei den Slaven: Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov aus Anlass seines 100. Geburtstages und 10. Todestages*, eds. A. Danylenko – S. Vakulenko, München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2012, 7–17.
- Orr 2013** = Robert Orr, Combing Hamp and Holzer – Gentlemen, You Are Both Right, *Canadian Contributions to the XV International Congress of Slavists, Minsk 2013 = Canadian Slavonic Papers* 55.1–2 (2013), 151–163.
- Orr 2014** = Robert Orr, Review of Andriy Danylenko: *Islamica: Ukrainian in Context*, München: Verlag Otto Sagner (2006), XVIII, 460 (Sagners Slavistische Sammlung, vol. 31), *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 22.2 (2014), 277–291.
- Orr 2015** = Robert Orr, The Limitations of Old Church Slavonic (OCS) in Reconstructing Common Slavic (CS), in: *Etymological research into Old Church Slavonic: proceedings of the Etymological symposium Brno 2014*, eds. Iлона Janyšková – Helena Karlíková, Praha: Lidové noviny, 2015 (*Studia etymologica Brunensia* 18), 293–298.
- Shevelov 1964** = George Y. Shevelov, *A Prehistory of Slavic*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1964.
- Ślawski 1974–1979** = Franciszek Ślawski, *Słownik prasłowiański*, Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1974–1979.
- Varbot 2012** = Zhanna Varbot, *Issledovanija po russkoj i slavjanskoj etimologii*, Moscow: Nestor-Istoriya, 2012.
- Vasmer 1973** = Max Vasmer, *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, Moscow: Prosveščenie, 1964–1973.
- БЕР 2007** = *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik*, Sofija: Izdatelstvo na bălgarskata akademija na naukite, 1971–2017.
- Общекарпатский диалектологический атлас** = *Obščekarpatskij dialektologičeskij atlas*, Kišinev: Știinca, 1989–<2003>.
- Общеславянский лингвистический атлас** = *Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas. Serija leksiko-slovoobrazovatel'naja 4: domašnee hozjajstvo i prigotovlenie pišči*, ed. A. Ferenčikova, Bratislava, 2012.
- ЭСБМ 1978** = *Etymalogičny slovník belaruskaj movy*, Minsk: Navuka i Texnika, 1978.
- ЭССЯ 1974** = *Etimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskijh jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*, Moscow: Nauka, 1974.