

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-010-0019-5

ILONA JANYŠKOVÁ, HELENA KARLÍKOVÁ (eds.). 2009. *Studia Etymologica Brunensia* 6. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny, 411 pp.

In keeping with the three previous volumes (2000, 2003, 2006) this volume is a collection of short articles selected from the contributions to the 4th international conference *Etymologické symposion Brno 2008* (Etymological symposium). The symposium was convened by the Etymological Section of the Institute for the Czech Language of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic (26–28 May 2008). The central theme of the symposium was “Etymology – theory and praxis”. The 45 alphabetically organized contributions – presented in Czech (15), Russian (7), Bulgarian (5), Serbian (5), German (4), Polish (2), Ukrainian, Slovene, Slovak, Byelorussian and English – can be subdivided into four groups: (i) those devoted to the etymological analysis of Slavic lexis, (ii) the contact between Slavic and non-Slavic languages, (iii) etymological interpretation of phraseologisms, and (iv) theoretical aspects of etymological research. Individual contributions vary greatly in their content (ranging from the comments on a single lexeme all the way to the systematic analysis of various groups of lexemes) and length (3–21 pages). Most of the contributions are summarized in English (26), some in Russian (8) and German (8).

The limits of space prevent me to touch on all the highly specialized papers devoted to the etymological analysis of Slavic lexis in (i). Suffice it to mention a few pieces representative of these efforts.

M. Bjeletić (Belgrade), pp. 27–36, traces the contentious S-Cr verb *zanov(ij)etati* ‘grumble’ back to Proto-Slavic **větati* ‘talk’ (?) or rather **(za)noviti se* ‘get tired’.

V. Blažek (Brno), pp. 37–58, investigates systematically the phenomenon of the “missing etyma” in Slavic (esp. in contrast to those existing in Baltic) on the basis of 30 well-established PIE reconstructions. He concludes that in 17 cases it is possible to add missing Slavic reflexes – not included in the standard handbooks – in the form of derivatives, compounds or various grammatical formations. Among others he hypothesizes that the reflex of the PIE etymon **ek’wo-* ‘horse’ can be discovered in the phytonym **sverěpъ* > Croatian *sverepék* ‘Festuca, Aegilops’, Czech *sveřep* ‘Bromus’, Polish *świerzop* ‘Raphanus raphanistrum’ (cf. also the adjective **sverěpъ* ‘growing wild’ hence ‘wild’ (OCSI ἄγριος, Bulgarian *svirep*, Czech *sveřepý*). МАЧЕК (1968) decomposed **sverěpъ* into the reflexive **svo-* and the root *rěp-* seen in Bulgarian *repej*, Old Czech *řěpí* ‘burdock’ (< PSI *rěpъje*). However, the compound **svo-rěpъ* can be taken as reflecting **esvo-rěpъ* ‘horse burdock’ (the aphaeresis of the initial *e-* is seen in Prussian *sweikis* ‘Pflugpfer’ which was traced back to **asveikis* by MAŽIULIS, 1988). Other interesting proposals include potential Slavic reflexes of IE **Hrg* ‘hi-’ ‘testiculi’ (PSI **kьn-orъ* ‘boar’ > Czech *kňour*, Polish *kiernoz/knorz*, Russian *knóroz*, where

kъn-* meant ‘with’, cf. Latin *cum*); **bhāgo-* ‘beech’ (> SCr *bāga*, Macedonian *bāga* ‘part of a chariot’); **bhug’-* ‘goat’ (> **bъzъ*, /buzъ* ‘lilac’ to judge by numerous metaphors of the type *capri-folium*); and others.

M. Jakubowicz (Kraków), pp. 135–138, opposes the standard etymology of Polish *duży* ‘big’ from P-Sl **dъgъ* ‘power’ and proposes two different roots for these two words: *duży* < *IE *dheugh* and *dъgъ* < *IE *dhengh*, respectively.

The “difficult” Russian word *páxat* ‘plough’ (variously etymologized as going back to IE **peHg-* ‘plant a tool into the ground’ or **pā-/pə-* ‘tend cattle, feed’) is tackled by L. Kurkina (Moscow), pp. 173–182. She suggests that **paxati* ‘plow’ is etymologically “identical” with a seemingly unrelated verb **paxati* ‘blow, winnow’, both of them ultimately traceable to the IE root **pes-* ‘blow’ (-*xa* in the innovative Slavic verb **paxati* ‘blow’ is according to her “an expressive formant” suffixed to IE **pes-*).

L. Králik (Bratislava), pp. 167–172, discusses the etymology of the Slovak phytonym *rasca* ‘caraway’ < P-Sl **rъd-tja* (**rъd-ěti* ‘grow red’) < IE *h₁reudh* ‘red’. He opines that *rasca* should rather be traced back to **rastca*/**rostca* < **rъst-ъca*, diminutive of **rъstb* (< **rъd-tb*) ‘something red’ (whence ‘red plant’).

T. Lekova (Napoli), pp. 183–200, demonstrates that the Medieval Bulgarian word *župa* ‘administrative and regional unit’ was not documented in Old Bulgarian and that it resulted by back formation from *županъ* ‘high military leader’ (ultimately from IE **fsu-pāna-* ‘shepherd’, lit. cattle protector, via Middle Turkic *čupan/čoban* ‘deputy village mayor’). The “Proto-Bulgarian” *županъ* (documented during the First Bulgarian Kingdom (681–1018), was reanalyzed as consisting of the root *žup-* and suffix *-anъ*; the root *žup-* was perceived as identical with the Slavic root *žup-* in the word *žup-a* ‘mine, ditch, hole’ (and its derivatives *župelъ* ‘sulphur’, *župište* ‘tomb’).

Several papers pay special attention to the issues of language contact between Slavic and non-Slavic languages.

L. Dimitrova-Todorova (Sofia), pp. 87–92, examines numerous dialectal varieties of the Bulgarian word *xayat* ‘covered entrance to house; balcony; vestibule’ (*fayat*, *ayat*, etc.). The word was borrowed from Turkish *hayat* (of Arabic origin *hāyāt* ‘wall’, Pl *hīyāt*) into other Balkan languages: Albanian *haját* ‘vestibule’, Greek (dialectal) *χαγιάτι* ‘corridor’ and Aroumunian *hāiāte*.

H. Karlíková (Brno), pp. 163–166, examines the trajectory of two Arabic loanwords into Old Czech: *alambik* / *alembic* ‘retort (vessel for distilling)’ and *eliksir* ‘decoction’. At variance with CHANTRAINE (1933: 376) she proposes that *alambik* was borrowed into Arabic from Byzantine Greek (ἀμβίξ ‘cup, goblet’ > Arabic *al-ambik* and thence into Latin *alembicus/alambicum* and all European languages). The word *eliksir* appeared in the Latin translation of Ar-Rāzī’s opus (12th c.) in the form *al-iksīr* in the meaning ‘philosophers’ stone’. In its form the word goes back to Greek ξήριον ‘dry powder’ (derivative of ξηρός ‘dry’). Another word with the Greek > Arabic trajectory is the he phytonym *estragon* borrowed into Slavic languages from French which borrowed the word from Medieval Latin *tarchon/tarcon*;

the source of *tarc(h)on* is the Arabic term *et-tarhūn* ‘Artemisia Dracunculus’, a loan word from the Greek δρακόντιον ‘serpentaria’ (derivative of δράκων ‘serpent, dragon’).

J. Waniakowa (Kraków), pp. 403–411, wonders “What the pencil and the sweet flag have in common”. The sweet flag (*Acorus calamus* L) is a medicinal plant called *tatarak* in Polish (*puškvorec* in Czech); in Polish there is also a dialectal word *kalmus*, a loan word from the German *Kalmus* ‘sweet flag’. The German word in its turn was borrowed from the Latin *calamus* ‘rud; sweet flag’, which in itself is a loan word from the Greek κάλαμος ‘cane, a thing made of cane: pen, rural pipe, fishing rod, etc.’ As is well known, the Greek word was borrowed into Arabic as *qalam* in the meaning ‘reed pen’, whence Osmanli (and a number of Turkic languages) *kalém* ‘pen’. The Russian word *karandaš* ‘pencil’ is actually an old borrowing from Turkish, analyzable as *kalam* ‘cane’ and *daš* ‘stone’ (> *kalan daš* > *karandaš*); the present form is documented in the 15th c. in the meaning ‘graphite’; the metonymic ‘pencil’ is documented in 1671. The other competing etymology based on **kara daš* ‘black stone’ (VASMER 1964) would seem to be semantically satisfactory; however, the *n*-less form *karadaš* is nowhere documented (cf. KOLESNIKOV 1962).

R. Eckert (Berlin), pp. 93–100, champions a new branch of etymological research addressing the intermediate units between lexemes and sentences, i. e. “phrasemes” (*Etymologie von Phrasemen*, see ECKERT 1991). He maintains that the diachronic study of phraseology is a logical continuation of the synchronic study of phraseology, and establishes a number of postulates for the etymological work in this field such as the consideration of parallels in languages and dialects, the role of linguistic and extralinguistic context and the establishment of “structural-semantic models” (phraseological “nests”). In the second part of his paper he demonstrates the complexity and pitfalls of his approach on the basis of the Middle Russian “phraseme” *sokolom vorony imatb* ‘to catch crows with a falcon’.

V. M. Mokilenko (St. Petersburg), pp. 247–259, studies phraseological neologisms using the method of “structural-semantic modeling”. He introduces the dichotomy of internal sources (subclassified according to their social-functional motivation and linguistic typology) and foreign sources (Anglicisms, Germanisms, Gallicisms, Latinisms, etc.). The contentious role of calquing is exemplified by a relatively recent Russian Americanism *sidet’ v odnoj lodke* ‘to be in the same boat’, spread during the era of *glasnost* and *perestrojka*. In Western European languages this expression appeared earlier (*in einem Boot sitzen*, *être embarqué sur le même bateau*, etc.); however, the author pinpoints that this Americanism has actually “deep European roots” in the Latin phrase *in eadem esse navi* attributed to M.T. Cicero who referred to the government metaphorically as ‘the ship of state’).

Among the new approaches to the dialectal material mentioned in the *Atlas linguarum Europae* is the “motivational” (essentially semasiological) approach. Using this approach L. Čižmarová and M. Šipková (Brno), pp. 67–76, categorize the dialectal denominations for the ‘liver’ into 9 (main) “motivational groups”. In addition to the unmotivated (?) IE basis **iekʷr(t)* they propose groups such as (i) liver as a home of feelings/spiritual movements, (ii) the position of the liver in the body, (iii) the character of the organ, (iv) metonymic expressions from the names of other organs of secretions, (v) metaphoric denominations, (vi) those motivated by cooking of animal liver, (vii) something small, minute, and some oth-

ers. Under (iii) regarding the motivation ‘heavy’, represented by the Byelorussian *cjažkoje* ‘liver’ (< PSI *težьkь* ‘heavy’) – contrasted with *lěgkoje* ‘lung’ a ‘light’ organ – one could add Semitic languages (PS **kabid-* ‘be heavy’, Hebrew *kābēd* ‘be heavy; liver’, Arabic *kabid-/kibd-* ‘liver’ and also metonymically ‘heart’).

On the whole, this is an interesting and stimulating collection of various new proposals and revisions of earlier etymologies in a new theory-oriented way by the leading specialists in etymological research from most Slavic-speaking countries (and Germany and Italy).

REFERENCES

- CHANTRAINE Pierre. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion
- ECKERT Rainer. 1991. *Studien zur historischen Phraseologie der slawischen Sprachen (unter Berücksichtigung des Baltischen)*. München.
- KOLESNIKOV Nikolai P. 1962. “K etimologiji slova *karandaš*”. *Leksikografičeskij sbornik V*, 169–172.
- MACHEK Václav. 1968. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia.
- MAŽIULIS Vytautas. 1988–1997. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, 1–4. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- VASMER Max. 1964–1973. *Etimologičeskij slovar’ russkogo jazyka* (translated by O.N. Trubačev), I–IV. Moskva.

Allatum die 29 mensis Maii anno 2010

Vit Bubenik
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John’s, Canada A1B 3X9
vbubenik@mun.ca