100 SLAVIC BASIC ROOTS: ONCE AGAIN ON SLAVIC *SÝTO*
AND THE SLAVIC ETHNOGENESIS

Sorin Paliga
University of Bucharest

Introduction

In a series of papers and other studies I tried to approach two major, and much debated, topics: the origin of Sl. *sýto* (and of other much debated forms, the origin of which has been intensely debated), and a hopefully closer (and better) analysis of Slavic ethnogenesis. I shall not repeat, of course, what I wrote in those quoted papers, but would like to sum up the basic ideas, and to attempt some finetuning of relevant data. In the final part of this paper I shall present a selective list of 100 basic Slavic roots. The selection is subjective, but will hopefully show the relevant data for understanding the essential reference points in early Slavic history.

Our approach is mainly that of a linguist, without ignoring historical or archaeological data.

Once again on Sl. *sýto*

In one of the quoted studies I advanced the hypothesis that Sl. *sýto* is a borrowing from either a northernmost Thracian dialect or from Proto-Romanian. In the third, posthumous, volume of France Bezlaj’s *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, letters P–S: 318 (dopolnila in uredila Marko Snoj in Metka Furlan) we may read:

“Še manj utemeljeno je mnenje, po katerem je psl. *sýto izposojeno iz dak. *su(m)ta < *kmtom, kar naj bi se ohranilo v rum. sutá in trak. atpn. Σουντός (Paliga, SR, XXXVI, 349 ss.).”

I hesitated for years to comment editors’s view on my previous paper in *Slavistična Revija*. I shall perhaps disappoint both Prof. Snoj and Prof. Furlan, but I am compelled to add that, out of all the papers, studies or books dedicated to the complex topic of the numerals in the Indo-European languages, in general, and
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Slavic, in particular, my paper is – I am afraid – the only one which is coherent and brings forth arguments that indeed Sl. *săto* is a borrowing from either North Thracian or Proto-Romanian. I agree with the detail that in this study I concentrated mainly on the situation of Sl. *săto* and just tangentially to other borrowings from North Thracian or Proto-Romanian into PES. I cannot present here the quite extensive list of such words, but some relevant data must be briefly analysed, first of all those which support and confirm that Thr. and/or Proto-Romanian *u* was reflected as PES *u*. One example is obvious: colloquial Latin *cumatra* (classical *commater*) > Proto-Romanian *cumătră* > PES *kămotra*. The case of *cumătră* is relevant, because its clear origin helps reconstructing the details of phonetic evolution.

It would be of course interesting to compile a more comprehensive list of such early borrowings in PES. This is a task of another study, almost finished. Nevertheless, some essential points should be clarified now (even if repeating what already stated before). It is thus sufficient to have a brief look at the status of *săto* among the other Slavic numerals, first of all to compare *săto* with the situation of *deset* and *tysqata* and, as already stated, one may note the essential difference against *săto*: not only the presence of *u* against *e* and *o*, but also the obvious nounlike character of *săto* as compared to the other numerals. This is EXACTLY the situation in Romanian: the numerals for ‘ten’, ‘one hundred’ and ‘one thousand’ ARE NOUNS, in fact. Perhaps this is not very clear if we analyse *zece* ‘ten’ (< Lat. *decem*), but it becomes immediately clear if we note that the forms for 20 etc. behave like nouns: *douăzece* (*două zeci*), lit. ‘two tens’, of feminine gender; similarly, and clearer *o sută* and *o mie* ‘one hundred’ and ‘one thousand’ respectively.

Slavic *săto* and Romanian *sută* are, ultimately, ‘intrusive’ in both Slavic and Romanian, respectively. It would be just simple ignorance to not note the obvious similarity of these situations. And we are again compelled to revert to Giuliano Bonfante’s brilliant study on the earliest influence of Romanian (Proto-Romanian) on Proto-Slavic (initially published in 1966, then a chapter in his reference book *Studi Romeni*).

The overall situation of Sl. *săto* would be of course much clearer if we tempted to analyse it in the context of the numerous Thracian and/or Proto-Romanian elements in Slavic. The epithet *numerous* may seem abusive, so I shall try to explain and clarify why I have used this formula.

The Slavic Homeland and Slavic Ethnogenesis

I shall attempt to only sum up the essential data of a still debated and debatable topic. A brief presentation of the complex Slavic ethnogenesis is to date available in
electronic PDF format. I tried to resume there the numerous hypotheses, with variants and subvariants, of the Slavic ethnogenesis. Very briefly, our basic view is:

1. The Slavic ethnogenesis may be fairly well circumscribed to the interval from the 4th to the 6th century A.D. Earlier archaeological data do not allow us to postulate a Slavic ethnic group as we know it from earliest historical documents.

2. The Slavic ethnogenesis should be analysed and considered in the light of a larger phenomenon of reshaping the linguistic and ethnic realities of that historical period. From this point of view, the Slavs were a component of the major and vast ethnolinguistic changes of the interval from the 4th to the 10th century A.D.

3. Perhaps the oldest theory, namely the Balto-Slavic theory, is the best, with some corrections, allowed by the recent discoveries in this field. We assume that the interval circumscribed from the 4th to the 6th centuries A.D. witnessed a cohabitation, difficult to analyse in very detail, but clear enough by interdisciplinary analysis, of three satem groups, which later led to the Slavic ethnicum: South Baltic, West Iranian and North Thracian. We tried to prove that the Slavic nucleus is presented by the South Baltic component (and this is why we argumented that the oldest Balto-Slavic is basically the best one). To these three satem components, a Germanic component was later added, and THIS IS THE STAGE WE KNOW FROM EARLIEST HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS BEGINNING WITH THE 6TH CENTURY A.D. In the course of time, East Romance (Proto-Romanian) elements were also borrowed and integrated in the Slavic vocabulary.

4. Aleksandar Loma is the linguists who has lately brought forth the most decisive arguments that we should speak of Proto-Slavic A and Proto-Slavic B (Loma’s paper for the International Congress of Slavicists, Ljubljana, August 2003). In Loma’s view, we should approach Proto-Slavic (or, better perhaps, PES) as an agglutination of two satem idioms. This is, but otherwise put, what we have been argumenting over the last years: Proto-Slavic, which got its contours to an idiom we know from the second part of the 9th century A.D., is an amalgamation of THREE satem components: South Baltic, North Thracian and West Iranian, with its South Baltic component as, we may say, its basic nucleus, and with North Thracian and West Iranian components as secondary components. In traditional linguistic terms, South Baltic (or, hopefully clearer put, its more southern part of what was once defined as Balto-Slavic) is the stratum, and North Thracian and West Iranian represent the superstratum languages.

5. There is a third superstratum language, Germanic, which is also identifiable in a linguistic analysis.

6. And there was also the Uralic adstratum, loosely identifiable in some probably related forms like kňiga, könyv.
From the archaeological point of view, Godłowski is perhaps the most relevant in also contouring the idea that the Slavic ethnogenesis cannot be dated earlier than the 4th century A.D., and which should be envisaged as a ‘mobile ethnogenesis’, i.e. the Slavic ethnogenesis consolidated and got its contours known from the earliest documents a short before and some time after the beginning of the expansion.

**Compiling a basic set of Protoslavic roots**

The following lexicon of 100 Slavic roots is, inevitably, subjective. Nevertheless I have tried to work out a coherent set of rules to reflect:

- the basic vocabulary covering the essential activities of man in an archaic, traditional society;
- the main and secondary components of the Proto-Slavic vocabulary: South Baltic, North Thracian, West Iranian, Germanic and East Romance (Proto-Romanian).

With these in view, we assume that this basic lexicon definitely confirms both Godłowski’s archaeological analysis and also Aleksandar Loma’s theory of Proto-Slavic A and Proto-Slavic B. In traditional linguistic terms, we assume that:

- The **Slavic stratum** is represented by a southern branch of the reconstructable Balto-Slavic common Indo-European heritage. This would roughly be Loma’s Proto-Slavic A.
- The **substratum** is represented by certain elements the etymology of which is isolated, and may sometimes have associations with Fenno-Ugrian but also with older, Pre-Indo-European elements.
- The **superstratum** is represented by north Thracian and east Iranian elements; this latter component is Loma’s Proto-Slavic B.
- The **adstratum** is represented by Germanic and Early Romance (i.e. Proto-Romanian) elements.

In Loma’s terms, we assume therefore that there were at least three basic elements, which contoured Slavic as we know it from earliest documents: (1) the south component of the Balto-Slavic heritage = the stratum; (2) North Thracian and East Iranian elements = the superstratum; (3) Germanic and East Romance elements = the adstratum.
The list below, with its inevitable subjective character, aims at putting together 100 essential Slavic roots. Its main purpose is to show the three satem-type early components of PES, i.e.

(a) a presumably basic nucleus of a satem idiom akin to Baltic (precursor of modern Lithuanian and Latvian, for convenience labelled Proto-Slavic A) but also to Iranian (Proto-Slavic B) and northern Thracian (Proto-Slavic C).

(b) various influences may be observed in PES: Germanic, Iranian, Thracian and East-Romance (Proto-Romanian).

(c) Late PES, which fused the three basic satem-type components mentioned above, was a language which took contours in the first centuries of the Christian era, probably between 4th to 6th centuries. It is difficult (read: impossible) to trace back Proto-Slavic before the 4th century A.D.

1. ablo ‘apple’. Related to Lith. abœolas, German Apfel, English apple, Old Irish abhall, ubhal. The forms are spread only in Europe, so the origin may ultimately be Pre-Indo-European.

2. aje ‘egg’; in modern Slavic languages with either j and v and diminutival suffix -ce: jajca, vejce. IE *ōv-o-jom and, according to some linguists, by the law of Vṛddhi a derivative from ‘bird’ as Lat. avis. Other related forms are Arm. ju, Irish og but a common PIE form is difficult to reconstruct.

3. bojati sē ‘be afraid’. IE *bhey-, also preserved in Lith. bijoti-s ‘be afraid’, bajus ‘frightening’.

4. baran, beran ‘he-sheep’. Old Pre-Indo-European word preserved in some isolated contexts, e.g. Rom. b”r ‘calling a sheep’ (also NL, NM Bârsa), Basque baran, same meaning as in Slavic.


6. bergъ ‘river side; a peak’. Related to Arm. berj ‘a peak’, Germ. Berg ‘a hill, mountain’. The expected reflex in Slavic would have been *beržъ, so the word follows a centum influence or a centum borrowing, presumably Germanic. Cf. Rom. NM Bârgău.

7. bogъ ‘god’. Seemingly borrowed from an eastern satem language which must be an Iranian (Scythian) idiom, cf. Neo-Persian bay ‘god’, primitive meaning ‘the one
who gives, is generous’. • bogatъ ‘rich’ is derived from the basic root. Reflects component B or PES.

8. bolo ‘a pond’. Related to Lith. bala ‘marsh’; cf. bēltъ. Final -to is unclear. Anyway, it is related to Rom. baltā, Alb. baltē ‘a pond’. Borrowing from North Thracian or Proto-Romanian? Or should be assigned to component C of PES?


10. brazda ‘a furrow’ (= a dig in the earth). Old European farm term, perhaps of Pre-Indo-European origin, cf. Lith. biržis, Latv. birze ‘id.’, Gallic rica ‘id.’

11. bukъ ‘the beech tree’ (fagus). Considered an essential word for determining the Slavic homeland; present day distribution is west of the axis Kaliningrad-Danube Delta. Related to Germ. Buche, Eng. beech; some assume that the Slavs borrowed the word from Germanic.

12. byti ‘to be’, primitive meaning probably ‘to grow, to appear’, related to Lat. fuī, Old Indian bhāvati ‘happens, exists’.

13. bhrati ‘to take; carry’. IE *bher- ‘to carry’, hence also Lat. fero, Arm. berem etc.


15. čanъ, čanъ ‘a charm, a magic’. Related to Lith. keri, kereti ‘to charm someone with bad eye’, IE *ker- ‘create, make’.

16. časъ ‘time; course of time-flow’. Seemingly related to česati ‘to hasten, speed up’; otherwise the etymon is unclear.

17. čelo ‘forehead’. Origin unknown.

18. černъ ‘black’. Seemingly an old IE root for denoting dark colours, as in Rom. cioară ‘a crow’ (< Thracian), Alb. sorre ‘a crow’ (Thraco-Illyrian).

19. datъ ‘to give’: damъ, dasi, dastъ, damъ, date, dadētъ ‘I give, you give, etc.’. Related to a largely spread IE family with the same meaning, e.g. Lat. do, dare etc.

20. dēkti ‘daughter’. Related to Eng. daughter, all from IE *dhughater-‘daugher’.

21. dny, gen. dnyе ‘day’, initially ‘the bright (= sunny) part of a day’ (as opposed to night = the dark part of a day). The masculine gender of the (sunny) day is opposed to the feminine gender of nocy ‘night’ (as in German: Tag v. Nacht). Old IE root *dei-eu, *dj-eu- as in Lat. dies ‘day’.

22. durъ ‘bold, courageous’. Related to Lith. drąs ‘bold’, Av. darśy ‘bold, powerful’, Gr. ἀρρατός ‘bold’. The expected form would have been *dvrъ which
would have resulted in *dorčhῡ. The form may be of Thracian origin, cf. Thracian
god-name Derzelas ‘powerful (one)’ and Rom. dârz ‘powerful, bold’, unjustly
considered sometimes of Slavic origin. The situation seems rather reverse: a Thracian
or Proto-Romanian influence in Proto-Slavic, as in *stvo (see the list of numerals) and
{k}omotra.
23. drĕvo, gen. drĕva and drĕvese ‘wood’. Proto-form must have been *dervo, gen.
derva, pl. derva. Related to Lith. dervâ ‘wood of the plant Vaccinium’, Goth. triu
‘tree, wood’, Eng. tree etc. IE proto-form probably was *der- u- or *dor-u-.
these forms must ultimately be of Pre-Indo-European origin or, in the light of
Andreev’s Proto-Boreal theory, of archaic ‘Boreal’ origin, and reflect indigenous
European terms related to a specific flora.
25. dučhῡ ‘spirit, (holy) ghost’ and duše ‘soul’; also related dychati ‘to breathe’.
Old term related to the basic conception of life, spirit, breathing and, by opposition,
death. The meaning and form ‘spirit’ is closely related to Lith. dvāsas ‘id.’, whereas
the sphere ‘soul’ – ‘to breathe’, IE proto-forms must have been *dousos and *dous-jā
respectively. The Indo-Europeans seemingly had two conceptions: (1) ‘soul,
breathing’ as in OHD *ātum, Lat. anima (hence Rom. inimā ‘heart’), Gr. ψυχή, and
(2) ‘spirit, ghost’ as in German Geist and Hitt. ıštanza. It is not clear to what extent
the Hittite form may be related to Hungarian Isten ‘god’ (also the Christian supreme
divinity).
26. gadỳ ‘snake, serpent’. Related to many folk beliefs. Unclear, probably
indigenous of Pre-Indo-European origin.
27. golva ‘head’. Related to Lith., Latv. galva, perhaps also Lat. calva. There is no
other detectable relationship, possibly central-east European term of
Pre-Indo-European origin.
28. gleďo, gleđeti, iter. gleďajo, gleđati ‘to look at, analyse by looking at’. Related
to Latv. glendēt ‘look at, for’, Ir. in-glennat ‘(they) look for’, M. Eng. glean >
glean. The archaic meaning must have been related to ‘mental analysis by, through,
after seeing’, so the later developments preserved one of these basic meanings.
29. globokỳ ‘deep’. Development of type root + -okỳ as in šir-okỳ ‘broad’ and
vyš-okỳ ‘high’, therefore suffix –okỳ was related to the notion of ‘vast, big, deep’.
The only relation of Slavic root gleb- may be Old Indian gambh- ‘depth’.
30. gnỳnatì, gnìtì ‘to run (fast)’. IE root *gen- is weakened by n not the usual b.
Related to Lith. genù, giñtì ‘to run’, Latv. dzenu, dzìt and gnìt, also Old Prussian
guntwej ‘to run’.
31. gněvỳ ‘fury’. Unclear origin. Words in the semantic sphere ‘fury’ may be
related to the divine influence, malefic or benefic; see the discussion in Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational.*

32. **gora** ‘hill, mountain’; sometimes ‘forest’. The only related forms seem to be Old Indian *giri*, Av. *ga’ri* ‘hill, mountain’, Lith. *girè*, *girià* ‘forest’. On the other hand, there are Pre-Indo-European forms with root *K-R-*, *G-R-* which might be taken into consideration. Cf. Rom. *grui* ‘a (low) hill’ (frequent in place-names), PN *Gruia*.

33. **gorèti** ‘to burn’. Related to Gr. *thégoμαι* ‘I warm up’, *thégoς* ‘hot, warm’ etc.

34. **gospodò** ‘lord, master’, in OCS ‘(My) Lord = God’. In some modern Slavic languages (South and East Slavic) ‘Sir, Mr.’ Seemingly a compound word from *gos-* from *ghosti-* and *podè* from *potis* ‘a master’; the proto-form probably was *ghostis-potis* ‘master of the guest’. IE *ghostis* meant ‘foreigner’ and ‘guest’; later some IE languages “worsened” the meaning, and ‘foreigner’ resulted in ‘enemy (foreigner)’, then ‘enemy’ in general. Slavic *gostè* ‘guest’ is related to Latin *hostis* ‘enemy’ (hence *hostile*), but English *guest* preserves the same meaning as in Slavic.

35. **govèdo** ‘cattle’. Related to Lith. *galvia* ‘cattle’ and German *Kalb* ‘calf’. The initial *l* of the root disappeared by disimilation: *l-n > -n*, whereas suffix *-èdo* is isolated and unclear. As in other cases, this was a collective noun with grammatically singular form and plural meaning, as *telè*, in the oblique cases in *-t-a*, later turning into *-èda*, hence a singular *-èdo*. It may be assumed that *goveèro* ‘(animal) excrement’ is derived from the same root *gove*, but not all the linguists agree with this view.

36. **govèrò > gèvòrò** ‘noise’ > ‘speech’; *gèvòritè, govòritè* ‘to speak’. The archaic meaning was ‘make a loud noise, to yell’; the Slavic form is isolated, maybe related to Gr. *thòrybos* ‘noise’ from IE *gh*orub-os; if so, with the alternance b/v in Slavic.

37. **gorìðò** ‘a fortress’; basic meaning: ‘to surround with a fence, to make an encircled, protected place’ as revealed in the verbs derived from this root (*o-graditi, pre-graditi, za-graditi*). Related to Hittite *gurta* ‘a fortress’, AHD *garto*, modern German *Garten* ‘garden’, Lat. *hortus* ‘a garden’. Rom. *gard* ‘a fence’ (hence also a *íngràdi* ‘to make a pen, to encircle’, *íngràditurà* ‘a pen for cattle’) is not borrowed from Slavic, as formerly held by some linguists, by reflects a parallel heritage from Thracian; also Alb. *gardh* ‘a fence’, closely related to Romanian.

38. **gùrdòlo** ‘throat; neck’. Basic meaning must have been ‘to eat’ as in *žour*, *žrèti* ‘to eat’, IE *gweró*; *gùrdòlo* is thus derived with suffix *-dlo* from this root; the different phonetic treatment *g*or* v.* *žour*, *žrèti* is due to the initial ‘dark’ vocalic component of *r* in PIE, preserved in Proto-Slavic.

40. **gvězda, zvězda** (OCS *dzvězda*) ‘a star’. The modern Slavic languages preserved either forms beginning in *gv-* (in Czech and Slovak *g* turned to *h*, which notes a voiced glottal, opposed to *ch*, unvoiced) or in *zv-*: Czech *hvězda*, Slovak *hviezda*, Polish *gwiazda*; Russian *звезда*, Ukrainian *звізда*; Bulgarian, Serbian and Slovene *zvezda*, Croatian *zvijezda*. • Closely related to the Baltic forms represented by Lith. žvaigždė, Latvian *zvaigžne*, same meaning. The initial meaning was ‘to shine, to glitter’, lost in Slavic, but preserved in Lith. *dvazgėti*; hence was derived *dvazg-ją*, then *j* was shifted (“anticipated”) in the first syllable (*dvaizg-ą*), followed by a change of the group *d-g* to *g-d*: *gvaizdą > gvězda*. In the eastern and southern group the second palatalisation occurred, and the group *gvai* developed to *dzvė-*, and then again *dz > z*.

41. **goldъ**, OCS *gladъ* ‘hunger’. Considered related to *žlděti*, S.-Cr. *žudim*, *žud(j)eti* ‘look for, be greedy’; Gothic *grēdas* ‘hunger’ (related to Eng. *greed*) may belong to the same family. No other relationship is analysable outside Slavic and Germanic.

42. **cholъ** ‘mature man; a man in general; young, powerful man’. In modern Slavic languages, the meanings vary: ‘young man’, but also ‘mature man’ dialectally (Czech), ‘a peasant’ (Polish), ‘idiot’ (Ukrainian). Etymon difficult to identify, possibly related to Old Norse *garpr* ‘tüchtiger Mann’, Icelandic *garpur* ‘tüchtiger Kerl’ as Machek assumes.

43. **chlěbъ** ‘bread’. Borrowed from, or related to, Germanic *hlaiba-*, Gothic *hlaifs*, the South German word for ‘bread’ against North Germanic *Brot*, Eng. *bread*. There is no decisive argument for/against borrowing from Germanic or for/against non-borrowing, but most linguists are inclined to consider the form as borrowed from Germanic. This would comply with other arguments regarding Slavic ethnogenesis.

44. **chýmeřъ** ‘hops’; basic element for preparing beer. Some linguists assume that the term was borrowed from an Oriental or Caucasian language, spread – maybe by the Turkic Bulgars – to Europe; there are similar or identical forms in many European languages. A decisive answer to this problem may be offered by palaeobotanical investigations which would identify the homeland. The term might be Pre-IE, and also shared by some Oriental languages. There is no argument supporting the hypothesis that hops was brought to Europe by Oriental people; it may be rather included in the large category of botanical term specific to the European languages of the Indo-European family.

45. **chodъ** ‘a walk’, **choditi** ‘to walk’. IE *sod-o-s*, from root *sed-* ‘to go, walk’, Gr. *hodόs*, same origin and meaning; compare Gr. *ex-odos* and Slavic *is-chodъ* ‘exit’.
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46. chormy ‘a cathedral; a solid building’. Seemingly related to Hittite karimmi, Genitive karimnaš ‘a temple, a cult-place’, Old Indian harmyá ‘a solid building, a fortress’. Old Indian h and Hittite k may go back to an initial gh in PIE; the initial form in Proto-Slavic may have been *gormь > *chormь.

47. chot’q, chotēti ‘to wish (for), to want’. Related to Lithuanian ketu, ketēti ‘to have in mind, to plan’ and Greek ἑτεύω (< *khateiō) ‘to wish intensely’. Proto-Slavic form presumably was *kotēti and had a deep stressing meaning, so replaced the neutral meaning in vel- ‘to want, to wish’ (as in Latin volo, velle), hence voliti.

48. jar- ‘year; spring’. In modern Slavic languages of neutre or feminine gender. The archaic meaning was ‘year’, thus related to Germ. Jahr, Eng. year etc. < IE *jŏr-. The newer meaning ‘spring’ (as in Czech and Slovak) reflects the traditional, popular New Year which was on March 1st.

49. jebъ, *jebti (jebati) Usually held for vulgar, taboo word: ‘to have sexual intercourse’; preserved in most Slavic languages, with this sense in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene; in Czech meant ‘to curse, to swear (on)’. Spread at colloquial level, and thus largely used. Seemingly related to Greek οιρό ‘to have sexual intercourse with’ (only about humans; referring to animals, the Greeks used ὀχέων); similarly, formally and semantically, Skr. yabhati-.

50. jézero, also jézerъ ‘a lake’. Related to Lithuanian ėžeras, Latvian ēzers ‘a lake’; further relationship is unclear. A. Vaillant assumes that is derived from jez ‘a levee’, i.e. ‘lakes are obtained by setting levees on a river’, a particularly improbable explanation.

51. jëzykъ ‘tongue’, also ‘language’. Loosely related or relatable to Latin lingua, but it is difficult to reconstruct the Proto-Slavic form. For the word in this category there presumably was tabooing, but we can refer to a primitive meaning ‘narrow’, in which case may be related to ژزъkъ ‘narrow’, but this may also be fortuitous.

52. jëtro ‘liver’. Related to Old Indian antrá- ‘interior (parts)’, Latin interior, Greek ἑντεῦχα < IE *en-tero-, *entro- ‘interior (part)’ hence ‘essential limb’.

53. jëdo, iti ‘to walk’. Suffix -d- probably reflects the archaic IE imperative *i-dhi!; IE root was *ei/i, *ei-mi, pl. *i-mes. Related to Lat. eo, ire etc.

54. jëgo (from *jëgo) ‘a yoke’. Archaic, essential term related to Lat. jugum, Gr. ζυγόν, Germ. Joch etc. < IE *jug-o-m, *yeug- ‘to tether; to link’.

55. jëmë, jëmenе ‘name’. Unclear relationship to other forms; Lat. nōmen, Old Indian nāma had root *nō-, whereas Greek ὄνομα has prothetic o etc. Other forms of this category show that the origin may have been a verb with the supposed meaning ‘to speak, to communicate, to discriminate by choosing a name’, but these are only hypotheses.
56. **kamy, kamene** ‘stone’. The proto-form was \(^*\)-mōn, Gen. \(^*\)-men-es, with the archaic shift o/e, cf. Lith. akmu, Gen. ak-me—s, Latvian akmens, Old Indian aśman, Avestan asman- ‘stone’, etc. The word must be archaic, and some meanings go back to the Neolithic. PIE root was \(^*\)ak-, so its preservation in the satem area must be explained as either an exception or the influence of the neighbouring a and m (which cannot be a decisive argument in itself).


58. **koṅb** ‘horse’. Presumably abridged from an older form \(^*\)komoṅb, which – in its turn – may be related to Lat. caballus (with the alternance b/m). The word would be non-Indo-European or, at least, not from the PIE vocabulary stock (which resulted in Lat. equus, Gr. ἵππος, Lithuanian ėšva, etc.

59. **koza** ‘(she)-goat’. Sacred animal, preserved in seasonal rites until today in various parts of Europe. The word is possibly related to Old Indian ajā ‘she-goat’; no other relationship has been identified or is identifiable.

60. **kupiti, kupovati** ‘to buy’. From Germanic \(^*\)kaupjan, German kaufen, in its turn derived from koufo ‘businessman’, Gothic kaupōn ‘make business, be a merchant’ < Latin caupō, -ōnis ‘owner of a boutique, small merchant’. The word is ultimately of unknown origin, but reached the far north, as in Finnish kauppa, hence kaupunki ‘town’ (i.e. place of trade’) and kauppala ‘township’, formerly ‘a market place’.

61. **kopati, kępō** ‘to bathe’. Unknown origin, maybe related to root kon- ‘hemp’; this relation was suggested on the basis that the Scythians did not bathe, but used something related to the Finnish sauna in which they used hemp for certain bathing rites. This somewhat undecided explanation may be eventually replaced by another one, assuming that bathing had the sacred meaning of purification; the word might thus be of Pre-Indo-European origin.

62. **ksmy, ksime** ‘a trunk; a family tree, an ethnic group’. The initial meaning seems to have been that reflected in IE \(^*\)teutā, preserved in Slavic too (see tŭd̪, tŭd̪h̪). This semantic sphere was replaced in Slavic by ksmy, ksmene and plemč. • Related to Gr. kýma from IE \(^*\)ku-mōn, with zero grade in Greek, \(^*\)ku-μῆ. Also related is, as often, Lithuanian kamenas, with the same meaning as in Slavic.

63. **ksnēdzs** ‘princeps’ (a typical term for the local local and military leader until, in some Slavic languages, was replaced by West European and Byzantine terminology). Borrowed from Germanic kuning (modern German König). The term was also borrowed in Finnish: kuningas.

64. **ksnīga, ksīga** ‘a book; a letter, something written’. Pan-Slavic, but obviously
not Proto-Slavic. Etymology difficult to determine, the only related form being Hungarian kőnyv ‘a book’; OCS spelling kън is a mere graphic convention, as the group kn could not be spelled as such, but only as kън. • Given the etymological difficulties, some assume that the ultimate origin is Chinese king, though this would be the unique case of a Chinese word in Slavic; the route would have been: Chinese > Proto-Bulgarian (Turkic) > Hungarian > Slavic; the obvious relation with Hungarian kőnyv would indicate an eastern origin, but this generic assumption is not sufficient. The simplified Chinese transcription king may be misleading, as the pronunciation is t'ing.


66. lēstę ‘a forest, woods’. Old meaning seemingly was ‘leaved culture, an area with many leaves’, thus may be related to Latin lăucus < IE *loik-o-s; Lith. šilas may be derived from the same root, with metathesis *les-/leš- > šil-; may also be a simple hypothesis.

67. lēto ‘year; summer (< ‘best part of the year’). Unknown origin, isolated form among the neighbouring languages.

68. lipa ‘lime, linden tree (Tilia)’. From *léipā the only relationship may possibly be with Cymric llwyf ‘elm-tree (Ulmus)’.

69. lūds, lūdeje ‘people; nation, people viewed as a collectivity’. The basic meaning must have been that preserved in Old Russian ljudinъ ‘free man’ as opposed to knjaži muže ‘people in the service of the knygdyv’. The lūdeje must have been those free people; related to Lith. liūdaids (fem. gender), Latvian lauds (mas. gender), OHD liut (German Leute), Lat. liber ‘free’, Greek ἐλεύθερος (e-leut-eros) ‘free’. Seemingly the forms reflect an archaic opposition *teutā ‘man’ (singular) – *leudh- ‘people’ (plural); see also s.v. tudę, tūdę.

70. medę ‘bee-honey’. Old word, related to Old Indian mádhu ‘mead, hydromel’, Gr. μέθυ ‘alcoholic drink, wine’, Lith. meduš, Latvian medus. The initial meaning must have been ‘hydromel, mead’, and (from taboo reasons?) was transferred to ‘honey’. The PIE word for ‘bee-honey’ is preserved in Latin mel and Greek μέλι. Similar forms in Finnish mete, Hungarian méz, Mordvinian m’ed’, Lappish mitt. All these forms support Andreev’s Proto-Boreal theory; the Uralic forms must not necessarily be explained as borrowings from PIE, but independently preserved from Proto-Boreal. • Slavic medvědъ ‘bear’ (lit. ‘honey-eater’), eufemistic form for a tabooed animal.

71. melko ‘milk’. Related to only Germanic: Eng. milk, German Milch. Maybe
borrowed from Germanic or rather a common indigenous form preserved in the two linguistic groups.

72. męső ‘meat’. Related to Gothic mimz, Latvian miesa, proto-forms *mēs-ro- and *mēs-ndo-.

73. mols ‘young’. Old meaning was probably ‘mild, fragile’ (the IE word for ‘young’ was *yynos > Slavic jun, Eng. young etc.), the opposite of starb ‘old’. Related to Lat. mollis < IE *mdv-i-s.

74. molj, molit ‘to pray (for oneself), to invoke the gods’ will’; later the verb turned reflexive. Related to Lith. melži, melst ‘to pray, to ask for something’, mald ‘a prayer’, Hittite maldat- ‘to make a promise, to ask gods for something, to offer a sacrifice to gods’.

75. mlslb ‘understanding, thoughts’, hence mlsli, mlsiti ‘to think’. Seemingly related to Greek μυθός ‘thinking’, later ‘word, story’.

76. mlyviti, m lýviti ‘to speak; to make noise’. Related to Old Indian braviti ‘(he) speaks’, says’, PIE *mlewa-.

77. naga ‘nude, naked’. Related to Lith. nugas, Latvian nuogs, German nackt, Eng. naked etc., IE root *nog- with various suffix developments.

78. nebo. Gen. nebese ‘sky; heaven’. Related to Hittite nepis- ‘sky’, Old Indian nábhas ‘sky; cloud; aeral place’, Gr. νέφος ‘cloudy sky, cloud’. After adoption of Christianity, the word was enriched with new meanings; cf. rajb.

79. nokt ‘night’. IE *noght-, *nokt- as in Lat. nox, noctis, Gr. νυξ, νυκτός, Gothic nahts, Lith. naktis, Latvian nakts.

80. noga ‘leg’. Isolated, possibly related to Old Norse knakkr ‘table leg’, Norse knakk ‘animal leg’. The old IE root was preserved in Latin pēs, Gr. πούς, German Fuß, Eng. foot, feet, preserved in Slavic as an adverb: pěš, seemingly from *pěs-jo- ‘by foot’ (to walk by foot) as opposed to ‘ride a horse’.

81. pjo, piti ‘to drink’. Hence pivo ‘beer’. Old IE root, reconstructable as *pō- (Lat. pōtus ‘a drink’) and *pī (Gr. πίνω).

82. pluťa n. pl. ‘lung(s)’. Modern Slavic languages preserved either the original plural form or simplified to singular. Related to Lith. plačiai, Latvian plausi, both masc. pl. Related to Gr. πλεύ-μον and Lat. pulmo, with the same meaning. These must be related to the root *pneu- ‘to breathe’, therefore an alternance *pleu-/*pneu- must be accepted in prehistoric times.

83. plođ ‘offspring; fruit’ (also figuratively). Related to Old English bled ‘fruit’, MHD blät ‘harvest’; also French blé ‘wheat’ is from Frank (Germanic) *blôd. There is no archaic IE root reconstructable, so these form must be accepted as indigenous Central-European, possibly of Pre-Indo-European origin.
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84. pluga ‘plough’. Similar forms are in Germanic (Germ. Pflug, Eng. plough), Baltic (Lith. plūgas) and Romanian (plug). Romanian form is traditionally held for Slavic, whereas the Slavic form would be borrowed from Germanic or is indigenous. The Slavic origin of Romanian plug is at least questionable, and rather reflects the linguistic stereotypes of the 19th century; Rom. grăpă ‘harrow’ is indigenous Thracian (with Albanian parallel grep, gërep ‘fish hook’) and a ara ‘to plough’ is of Latin origin. The Germanic, Slavic, Baltic and Romanian (< Thracian) forms rather reflect Central-European farm terminology; a North Thracian or Germanic origin of Slavic pluga is possible, but is not necessary in order to explain the form; all may reflect old terms referring to agriculture. The ultimate origin is rather Pre-Indo-European, root *P-L- ‘stone, piece of stone’, so the plough reminds the Neolithic and Chalcolithic stone ploughs.

85. pravă ‘right; straight’. Also pravda ‘truth’, praviti ‘do, say right’. Isolated forms, perhaps derived from an old root *prō ‘ahead, advanced; right away’.

86. pišč, pasati, pisati ‘to write’. Related to Lith. pieši, pięsti ‘to paint with colours, to draw with coal’, Lat. pingō ‘I paint’ < IE *peik. In Slavic, associated with ber, brati ‘to take, to carry’ (against the expected pišč, pisati).

87. rajh ‘paradise, Heavens’. Unclear origin, but Pre-Christian. The old meaning must have been ‘blessed place in Heavens, where gods live’; cf. nebo, nebese. According to the traditional view, the word would be of Iranian origin, Avestan ray- ‘richness; happiness’ (again traditionally, richness means happiness!), Latin rēs ‘thing, property’.

88. rūka ‘hand’. Only with Baltic parallels: Lith. rank, Latvian ruoka, Old Prussian rancko and the isolated Gallo-Romanic branca ‘a paw’, also pejoratively ‘hand’ (hence Romanian pe brânci ‘on all fours’, used especially about small babies learning to walk). The IE languages developed local forms for ‘hand’, a tabooed word. Slavic rūka probably derives from IE*wer-, *wren-k- ‘to curve, to bend’.

89. sēkō, sēsti ‘to cut’; sekyra ‘a hatchet’. Related to Old Lith. ĭsekti, ĭš-secti ‘cut out, cut off’ and Lat. seco ‘I cut’. Other relationships are not clear.

90. sēmę ‘a seed’ < IE *sē-men, as in Lat. sēmen etc. Old IE term related to agriculture.

91. sestra ‘sister’ from an older form *sve-sr-ā (with epenthetic t) < IE *swe-sō(r); related to Lat. soror, Lith. sesuō, gen. sesės etc. Epenthetic t in the sequence -sr- rather indicate a Thracian influence, where this is a normal phonetical feature. Cf. bratr, bratro.

92. synn ‘son’; related to Lith. sūnus, Gothic sunus (German Sohn, Eng. son) < IE *sū-nu-s.
93. **słońce** ‘sun’, of neuter gender; related to Lith. saulė, fem., Latvian saule, Lat. sól, masc. The neuter gender in Slavic may be explained by assuming that Proto-Slavs venerated Sun as a divinity of either masculine or feminine character.


95. **tud, tūd** ‘foreign’. Derived with suffix -j from an IE root *tautā, *teutā* ‘nation, ethnic group; foreigner’, hence also Lith. tautà ‘nation’, Oscian *tuto* ‘a tribe, a group’, and of course the name of the Teutons.

96. **tərgı** ‘a market place’. Lith. turgs, Latvian tirgus and Rom. târg are held for Slavic borrowings, but the situation seems more complex. The oldest attested similar forms are in Illyrian *Tergeste*, hence *Tergitio*. As a direct borrowing from Illyrian is impossible (Illyrian became extinct in the 2nd century A.D.) the only reasonable explanation is to assume a Thracian form akin to Illyrian, hence Romanian form as a direct follower of Thracian, and Slavic as a late Thracian or Proto-Romanian borrowing. Baltic forms (Lithuanian and Latvian) may be assumed as borrowed from Slavic. The ultimate, archaic root may be Pre-IE *T-R-* ‘a stone, cliff’, well represented in southeast European place-names.


98. **usta** ‘mouth’ (neuter plural). Standard IE form spread as a grammatically neutre in Indo-Iranic and Italo-Celtic branch as Lat. ơs and Old Irish ă < IE *ăs.

99. **večer** ‘evening’. Related to Lith. vėkaras (< *wekeros) and Arm. gişer, but Lat. vespers, Gr. ἕοσεπος and Cymric *ucher* would require a proto-form *wesperos* as opposed to *wekeros*. There probably was an IE parallel which may lead to *wekseper-o-s*, hence either *wekeros or *wesperos.

100. **vidětí** ‘to see’. Old IE root *weid-, *wid- ‘to see’, hence also ‘to know’ in SlavicCEDIT *vodětí* ‘to know’.
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The Slavic Numerals

jednъ, jednъ There seemingly was no unified word for ‘one’ in PIE, therefore the IE languages often derived local forms starting from old, basic forms. The primitive construction interpreted ‘one’ as ‘one part/component of a pair’, at a time when grammatically the dual was opposed to both ‘one’ and ‘more than two’. The Slavic form resides on a previous construction *ede-înъ, hence j-ed-înъ. The first part of the compound, -ed-, is seemingly related to Lat. –dam in forms like quidam, idem.

dъva, dъvé ‘two’ (masculine and feminine respectively). PIE *d(u)vō, cf. Gr. δύω, Lat. duo, duae, Eng. two etc. The numeral was closely associated with the dual form of nouns and verbs, usual with all the IE languages, lost meanwhile in almost all the IE family. As an exception, Slovene still preserves the dual as a vivid form.

tъje, trъ ‘three’. PIE *tr-ei-es, Old Indian trāyas, Lat. trēs, Eng. three, Germ. drei.

čtyrъ ‘four’. PIE *kwet-wor-es, Gr. τέταρτος, Lat. quattuor etc.

petъ ‘five’. PIE *penkwe, hence Gr. πέντε, Arm. hing, whereas Lat. quinque has qu- under the influence of the subsequent -qu-; Goth. fimf (Germ. fünf, Eng. five) has second f under the influence of the first.

šestъ ‘six’. The initial form would have been *ksekstъ, cf. Lith. šestas; also Lat. sex, Ir. sé, Goth. sēths. According to the laryngeal theory, the proto-form could be *s-Hwe-ks, where H notes the laryngeal; s- is fluctuant; k(e)s could mean ‘three’; Hwe meant ‘two, pair’. As a whole, PIE form meant ‘two threes’. There is a long discussion regarding the laryngeals; in this very case, the reconstruction is not the most convincing, which does not mean that the laryngeal theory should be rejected as a whole.

sedmъ PIE *septm ‘seven’, hence Old Indian sapta, Lat. septem, Ir. secht.

osmъ ‘eight’. PIE *ok’tō(u) ‘eight’, Old Indian aštā, aštāu, Av. ašta, Lat. octō etc. Some assume that the ending ō(u) is the same as in nom.-acc. dual, so the form would be an archaic ‘tetraedric dual’, i.e. ‘two times four’, PIE reconstructed form *ambhi-ktō(u), in rapid speech reduced to *óktō(u).

devętъ ‘nine’. IE *newtъ, hence Old Indian nāva, Lat. novem, which is seemingly related to *newos ‘new’, i.e. ‘nine’ is the first numeral after ‘two times four’ (see above under osmъ). The archaic Slavic form was probably *deve.

desětъ ‘ten’. Basic numeral of IE origin, Eng. ten, Lat. decem, etc. The phonetic evolution in Slavic shows it as a genuine old numeral, unlike sъto ‘100’, of north Thracian or Proto-Romanian origin. For PIE we may reconstruct *de-k’mt—m
‘10’ and *k’mt---m ‘100’. In Slavic and Germanic, ‘1000’ is derived from ‘100’ and probably meant ‘a big hundred’. There is no reconstructable PIE root for ‘1000’, each language or linguistic family having developed local forms.

sĕto ‘one hundred’. The expected form would have been *sĕţh, if compared to ‘10’ (see), which probably existed before it was replaced by a north-Thracian (or Proto-Romanian) form, cf. Rom. sută ‘100’, incorrectly considered of Slavic origin in Romanian. The only Slavic numeral with noun aspect, included in the category of neuters in -o. Slavic sĕto behaves like a noun, as in Romanian and Albanian, where the numerals for ‘10’, ‘100’ and ‘1000’ behave like nouns, a system radically different from Slavic, with the exception of the ‘intrusive’ sĕto.

tysĕšta, tysašta ‘one thousand’. As in Germanic, ‘1000’ was considered a ‘big, expanded hundred’, and is formed by the prefix *tu- > Sl. *ty- + the numeral ‘100’. This Slavic numeral preserves the old form *sĕţh, with epenthetic s not properly explained, preceded by the prefix ty-. Both the forms for ‘10’ and ‘1000’ clearly show that the form ‘100’ is “intrusive”, borrowed.
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REZUMAT

100 de rădăcini slave esențiale: încă o dată despre sl. șăto
și despre etnogeneza slavă

Autorul revine asupra unor probleme abordate anterior privind situația formei șăto, dar și asupra altor forme vechi românești cum ar fi rom. cumătră. Lexiconul de 100 rădăcini slave esențiale confirmă atât analizele anterioare ale autorului cât și ipotezele relativ recente, datorate lui Kazimierz Godłowski și lui Aleksandar Loma privind etnogeneza slavilor, cu argumente atât arheologice cât și lingvistice. Astfel, fondul arhaic slav este reprezentat de un strat balto-slav, apoi de un adstrat nord tracic și est iranic precum și de un substrat, reprezentat de câteva forme izolate, uneori având corespondențe în fondul ugro-finic, precum și de vechile elemente germanice.