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I. The method of parallel study of a number of synonymous words or their lexical-semantic families within a single language or, within a group of cognate languages, has long been recognized in Slavic and Indo-European etymological research. However, since this approach is unrewarding and delicate, the result is that not enough linguists have fully embraced it yet1. That is why the vast majority of words (we have the Slavic corpus in mind) still remain uncovered by this type of comparative study that, through a complete formal and semantic analysis, yields etymological solutions as close to definitive as is possible.

II. The present paper results from an attempt to apply this method to a group of Slavic nouns with the meaning „order“. The general Slavic word for this notion *rědъ „ordo, series, sucsessio, gradus, harmonia, etc.”2 has at least four synonyms that are unevenly distributed and attested on Slavic territory: *čerda, *(srъ)kladъ, *ladъ, *kl’udъ. Naturally, the synonymy of these nouns (and their word families), is neither absolute nor complete but relative and partial, originating not from root synonymy, but from a diversity of principal meanings that evolved according to certain patterns, intercrossing and interaction – initially they each had their own, specific connotations3 that were gradually raised to a level of abstraction describable as „order“.

This notion implies the result of an action of making things the way they should be, proper, fit, mature, becoming, tamed, clean, pure, ... arranged in any respect, either in space or in time, generally4, and particular, in the material sense (line, array, queue, and when order turns into agglomeration: heap; crowd; herd), as well as abstract concepts related to religion or society: rule, govern, trade, wed, set time limits, work in shifts, breed, feed, plus all sorts of cleaning, the object being fields, crops, household, fish, poultry, cattle..., etc.5

---

1 Without going into bibliographic details, we could say that this method has most adherents in the Moscow etymological school and among their disciples elsewhere.

2 In general discussion, words are given in their PSl. forms. For the sake of brevity, the source of words or meanings obtained from standard etymological dictionaries will not be specially quoted.

3 Related to carpentry or crafts (e.g. IE *ar- „fügen, passen“ ...beim Holzbau, aber auch vielfach auf geistiges zurechlegen“, cf. Pokorny 55), cattlebreeding (IE *kerdho- > Lith. (s)kerdžius „shepherd“), or something else material in nature (IE *al- > Lat. alo „feed, breed“, etc.

4 The study of the sense structure and etymology of Ved. rđ- (Toporov 1981) is inspiring and insightful for understanding the dynamic aspect of „making order“.

5 A good idea of principal meanings is provided by negated nominals reconstructed for PSl:
In addition to being synonymous, these nouns have other features in common, mostly problems: the views of their origin in terms of verbal vs. nominal priority are not unanimous\(^6\), some instances of homonymy within their word families are suspected of being false homonyms\(^7\), their Baltic counterparts are sometimes dubious, and their ultimate IE etymologies are generally considered uncertain to a degree reflected in the sequence of their listing above. With regard to this last issue, the five can be classified into three groups:

a) containing *\(\resource\) only, which, in spite of reservations expressed by some IE scholars\(^8\) (unlike Slavic lexicographers\(^9\)), is deeply rooted in its IE background and unquestionably cognate with a number of continuants of the IE root *\(\align\) „fügen, passen“ (cf. Pokorny 55-60) in many IE languages\(^10\).

b) containing *\(\locale\) and *(\sphere)\(\source\), problematic in terms of multiple etymologies being approximately equally probable, but still they are generally Slavic and with solid Baltic correspondences\(^11\) regardless of alternative etymological solutions proposed by various authors\(^12\).

c) containing *\(\source\) and *\(\align\) whose IE relations present serious problems. Needless to say, their Baltic correspondences are highly uncertain or nonexistent. Their geographic distribution is uneven or sporadic (*\(\source\) is well attested in the East only,

\(^6\) Verbal priority is commonly supposed only for the pair *\(\labor\) : *(\sphere)\(\source\), for *\(\research\) : *\(\source\) just by Bezlaj (i.e. Furlan); for *\(\research\) : *\(\source\) \(\in\) Slawski IV:417 and Bezlaj II:118 recognize the verbal priority; for *\(\align\) : *\(\align\) Machek 256 is undecided – for more details on the last two, see below.

\(^7\) Well-known is the dilemma about PSL. *\(\labor\) „ponere“ and *\(\labor\) „castrare“, convincingly dismissed by ESSJa 9:188-189, while we raise the question of Sle. *\(\research\) „alere“, *\(\research\) „facere“, *\(\research\) „purificare“ (cf. Bezlaj III:165).

\(^8\) „Ganz fraglich“ in Pokorny 60, doubted by Toporov 1981:152, but neither of them offers any alternatives.

\(^9\) Although none have put it in writing, they seem to reckon with the purely phonetic phenomenon of attraction of -\(\d\) to -\(\n\) which could have established in Proto-Slavic a non-etymological -\(\n\) by analogy with, say, the fact that -\(\d\)- widens the primary -\(\n\)-base: PSL. *\(\speak\) < IE *\(\speak\), PSL. *\(\whisper\) coll. „Amentum; Populus nigra“ < *\(\whisper\), etc. (SP I:63).

\(^10\) Although some details of formation remain questionable (even with regard to the Baltic) if we tread beyond common filiation from the root *\(\align\), cf. Machek 528-529, Fasmer II:536, Vaillant 1974:236.

\(^11\) Cf. IE *\(\research\) „Reihe, Herde“ > Lith. *\(\research\) „shepherd“; or IE *\(\research\) „breit hinlegen“ > Lith. *\(\research\) „hinbreiten“, *\(\research\) „Lage, Flöz“, as well as the alternative IE *\(\research\) „hoch (heben)“ > Lith. *\(\research\) „hoch“ and IE *\(\research\), *\(\research\), *\(\research\) „schlagen, hauen“ > Lith. *\(\research\) „schlagen“, etc.

\(^12\) While *\(\locale\) might fall under the special instances of Centum reflexes occurring in a Satem environment (Pokorny 579), it is also independently (and convincingly) explained as a continuant of IE *(\sphere)\(\source\) (ESSJa 4:62). On another occasion, this could be used as an additional argument for revising the rigid division between the reflexes of plain velars and palatals (especially when they are followed by front vowels). As for *\(\research\) „log“, it alone fits well among the continuants of IE *\(\research\) „schlagen, hauen“ (Pokorny 547), while it almost certainly belongs, like the rest of its word family, to IE *\(\research\) „breit hinlegen“ where most authors place it. Its least probable origin is from IE *\(\research\) < *\(\research\) „hoch heben“, suggested by Vaillant (for more details, cf. ESSJa 9:188-189 or Sławski II:254).
and totally lacking in the South\textsuperscript{13}, \( *kl’ud\) is almost ubiquitous - absent from Slovenian and Ukrainian only - yet the network of its attestations is very sparse). On the other hand, the fact that some words from the word families of these nouns have certain meanings in one language only, and that these are often specific and isolated, apparently outside the semantic mainstream\textsuperscript{14}, is actually an indication of their archaic nature, which only makes them more intriguing for study.

III. So what is the advantage of studying these words en masse, and not individually? Apart from the above-mentioned problems they incidentally share, these words have other (thus better recognizable) formal- etymological features in common, the understanding of which could help interpret their ultimate origins.

a) The most striking formal characteristics is that all these nouns end in -\textit{do} (or -\textit{da}, displaying gender variation) which is unlikely to be a part of the root.

b) Another formal uniformity is that all the verbs corresponding to these nouns end in -\textit{iti}, which is typical not only of denominals, but of causatives as well. That opens the possibility of verbs (\( *\textit{rd-iti}, *\textit{erd-iti}, *\textit{lad-iti}, *\textit{kl’ud-iti} \)) being primary, and not denominial, as they have usually been considered. See below (note 23) for the supporting argument of PSl. accent of \( *\textit{tditi} \).

c) The other outstanding feature is that verbal meanings in these word families are more numerous and basically more diversified than the nominal ones\textsuperscript{15}, and still more significantly, that the polysemy of nominal categories reflects the original verbal syncretism of meanings, rather than metaphors, metonymies or similar developments\textsuperscript{16}.

IV. The last two observations allow us to establish the premise of verbal genetic priority over nominal formations and to concentrate on the -\textit{d}- element whose place and function seem to be crucial - this has been mentioned individually\textsuperscript{17}, but no synthetic reviews have been made.

\textsuperscript{13} The apparently relict SCR. dial. \( *\textit{lad} \) i.e. Loc.sg. \textit{na ladiu}, in the negative phrase \textit{Nije na (samo) svojom ladiu} „He is not of a sound mind; he is nutty, silly“, recorded among the almost extinct archaic Gallipoli Serbs by Pavle Ivić (cf. Borys / Vlajic-Popovic 1989:17-19) is to be seriously doubted as belonging here.

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Bruss. \textit{skljúd} „wide axe for trimming (wooden) walls“, ORuss. \textit{kliudîti} „talk“, LLusat. \textit{klud} „Hüfte; Winkel“, etc.

\textsuperscript{15} For example, Russ. \textit{cherédâ} f. „order, sequence; herd of big cattle“, dial. „age, time“ as opposed to \textit{cherêdui} „organize, make, produce; take care of someone or something; till the soil; clean, make up (household); clean the intestines of fish or poultry; raise horses; feed“ and, apparently by enantiosis: „cause an uproar“, „scold“ (ESSJa 4:60-63), where the verb is judged a nominal without any explanation of the way in which these verbal meanings could have sprung from the scarcity of nominal ones among which „herd“ prevails, not only in the Slavic realm, but in the IE, too (cf. Pokorny 579).

\textsuperscript{16} Sometimes a verbal meaning has its counterpart in a noun from a different language, e.g. the semantically isolated ORuss. \textit{klaudîti} „talk“ finds its first relation in the totally solitary Polab. \textit{kl’aud} „thought, opinion“ (the possibility of this being a coincidence is overruled by the parallelism in ORuss. \textit{klaásti} „consider“ vs. Cz. dial. \textit{klast} „think“). Remember the previous note too.

\textsuperscript{17} All etymologists, from Bermecker on, are aware of the element -\textit{d}-, but they have interpreted it differently, e.g. as a determinative alternating with -\textit{t}- (Slawski I:253), as a „widening“ (ESSJa 9:188 without going into the nature of it), as a preasens forms (Pokorny 599), etc.
Delving deeper into the IE level, we propose that the -d- element be understood as a formans originating from IE *dh- < *dhē- < *dheh₁, „ponere“, initially constituting the second member of compound verbs in which it served to turn the basic verb into a causative.

The closest parallelism of this type of formation is found in the eastern Baltic verbs ending in -dyti in which -d- element of that suffix is recognized as reflecting the second component of originally compound verbs. It was only later, in the course of time, that this second verb evolved into a suffix, very productive in forming prepositional compounds like ĭndas, priēdas, obs. samdas (for the Baltic facts, cf. Otřebški 1965:387)\(^{18}\).

If we are right in recognizing this very element in some Slavic verbs, the statement that „Lith. verbs in -d- as a rule do not have exact Slavic correspondences“ (ESSJa 10:54) should be reconsidered. The traditional view that this suffix in the Slavic languages only serves to form preasens and as part of the nominal suffix -eda (cf. Otřebški l.c.) should also be revised. It is worth bearing in mind that Slavic suffixes with a basic -d- definitely tend to take part in archaic formations, with a preference for the roots of primary verbs\(^{19}\).

This formation has further etymological and typological parallels beyond Balto-Slavic. Formally and genetically closest are the German weak praeterit (e.g. salbte < *salbō-da with da- < IE *dhē-, where da originally had a transitive function), and the Greek aorist in θη- (< IE *dhē-), whose passive voice is considered to have developed from the causative function, e.g. ἐπειδῆ „he let himself be convinced, he believed“, ἐπείρον „he attempted, he tried“ (Rix 1976:219-220).

Such composite creations have their semi-counterparts (the first component is nominal!) in Ved. śraddha- „Vertrauen“, aav. zráza „ergeben, glaubig, vertrauend“, Lat. crēdere „vertrauen, glauben“, OIr. cretim „glaube“ < IE *kred- „Herz“ + dēh₁ (EWAII 19/1996 663), with precedents in etymologically related syntagmata like Ved. antár dhā — Gk. κλέως, θέντες, etc., Ved. nāma dhā „einen Namen beilegen“, Gk. δῶμα τίθεοναι, Lat. nōmen indere, Hett. ŠUM-an-daiš „he put the name“ (EWA I 10/1992 786 s.v. DHA). Perhaps even older are those like *dhā-kṣatrām „wield power“, *dhā-ṛtām „establish the truth“ (Gerenenberg 1972:90).

More distant typological counterparts can be found in Latin phrases with facere like facio modum „define the measure“, facio corpus „pinguesco“, facio perrriculum „challenge“, facio verbum „say“, facio verba „talk“, etc.\(^{20}\)

V. What could be the practical consequence of establishing the causative -d- formans, continuing IE *dhē-, as a factor in Slavic etymology? Better, more convincing, more

\(^{18}\) These last formations have exact Slavic counterparts in *prīdo, *udb, *zadb, etc. (note the formal identity of Lith. samdas „rent“ and PSI. *spdo „vessel“, with completely different meanings).

\(^{19}\) Like -do in *ćedo < *ćēti, *ćēnp, or simply regularly forming derivatives from verbal roots like -da, e.g. in *krida (<*kreidā) < *krojjītī, cf. SP I:62-63.

\(^{20}\) Or even further in modern Gk. τακτοποιέω „arrange, set in order; settle, fix up“, composed from the adjective (pass. part.) τακτός „fixed, appointed“ + ποιέω „make“, alongside the original, non-reinforced verb πάσσω „place, put, marshal; assign, fix“.
logical — in a word, „more economic solutions“ (as postulated by Szemerényi 1962/1977:294, 306, 335 under factors A, B, F). Here is an illustration, taking the examples of the last two words from our list, which allegedly have uncertain etymologies.

A) For the verb *laditi, taken as a denominal, the element *d- has already been interpreted as originating from IE *dh- < *dhē-, but in a prefixal compound (ESSJa 14:11). From a strictly formal viewpoint, such a creation is well paralleled (cf. ibid.), but taken altogether this explanation is unconvincing, both as a type of nominal formation and the idea of the verb being a denominal. It cannot, for instance, solve the ever-present problem of this etymology, the relationship between *lada „harmonia“ and *lada „coniunct; uxor“21. Every mention of this pair — and there have been many — ends inconclusively, probably due to a prejudice about the genetic priority of the noun, which precludes recognizing the two as typical postverbal nouns with a gender difference that allows diverse semantic specificities. So, *lada f. as a term (kinship or social, originally it was the same) persisted in the entire Slavic realm (with some local semantic shifts or as a relict, in a wedding song refrain), while *lada m. (which has either never been ubiquitous, or has receded at a certain point) being confined to the Slavic East, only later penetrated the neighbouring Polish, Czech and Slovak languages, through local dialects or via learned influence22.

With verbal priority as a starting point (which has already been mentioned but without adequate response)23, and mindfull of the entire semantic content of the group we are focusing on, a much more probable solution than the one which departs from the prefixal compound seems to be a verbal derivation from the IE *al- „wachsen, nähren“. This idea is not new, but it has been totally neglected24.

An important formal argument in favour of such an explanation is the fact that for this very root a dh-widening has already been reconstructed (there is no explicit mention of its causative function, but all the examples — from Sanskrit, Avesta and Greek — are verbs of the causative type, cf. Pokorny 27). Such an explanation, however, alters the ProtoSlavic reconstruction, i.e. we should suppose PSl. *ölditi (or *ölditi) which would then, by the way of liquid metathesis, have yielded Russ.(etc.) лодуть (cf. *öldija „ship“).

---

21 The other eternal dilemma is the relationship between *lada and *lagoda — we tend to believe they are merely symphonous (with partly coinciding semantics), and not genetically related.

22 The parallelism of m. and f. forms, usually but not necessarily accompanied by a certain terminological specialization, is present in the majority of the nouns discussed here, the meaning „order“ showing a predilection for masculina.

23 Sławski IV:417, Bezlaj II:118, Machek 317 „pak by lada bylo postverbare“. The significant fact that there are true (formally and semantically undoubtful) denominals, like Bruss. ладавáть „put into order, mend“, Ukr. ладюбáти, Pol. ladować, Cz. dial. ladovat se „idem“ has also been overlooked. The argument of PSl. accent in *låditi is presented by Sławski IV:417. In addition, Russ. ладуть, with its accent on the root vowel (and not on the ending), also indicates a primary verb, and not a denominal (for similar cases, cf. Stang 1942:25).

24 The only author to have come to this idea (starting out from *lada, though, and not from *ladz), supporting it with excellent argumentation and firm parallels for the meaning „coniunct, uxor“ (Trubačev 1959:100-101), has not only abandoned it, but makes no mention of it in reviewing the history of etymologizing these words (ESSJa 14:9-11).
The etymological advantage of (and simultaneously semantic argument for) such an interpretation is the possibility that some adverbs like Russ. dial. ладный „stout, big“, "handsome“, "good“, "healthy“ (cf. Gk. ἀδελφός/ἀδελφαῖς „heile“!), Ukr. ладний „grown up; fresh; good; attractive; clean“, Bruss. ладный „stout“, "good“, "fed up“ (cf. gr. ἀν-ολος - „unersättlich“, Pokorny 26), Pol. dial. ladny „grown up; stout; attractive; clean“, etc., hitherto considered derivations from the noun *ladę „order, peace, accord... etc.“ (despite the semantic difficulties involved), can now be understood as verbal derivatives²⁵, thus reflecting a very old, currently non-attested verbal meaning of the (early)PSl. * ölditi „feed, bring up, grow, rear“. This explanation is not an ideal one, but it does seem more reasonable to reconstruct this one missing link and then have the whole word family, including its formal and semantic elements, regularly structured (with no divergence from the rules of word-formation or semantics) and at the same time properly derived from an IE root (since the thus supposed verb would perfectly continue the original meaning of the IE *al- „breed, feed, grow (tr. and intr.), fatten, etc.“).

The supposed semantic development in the Slavic languages would have gone approximately this way:

„feed (someone) to grow up, to be mature, fit for marriage“ (>*lada „coniunx“), „make a wedding arrangement“, „arrange in general“, „settle in general“ (>*ladę „agreement, peace, order, etc.“).

A good non-Slavic semantic parallel is furnished by the pair of Gk. corradical verbs: ἀρπάξω „join, fit together“ vs. ἀρέξω „make good, repair, appease, please“²⁶.

B) The verb *k/ki)lúditi has already been judged as primary with regard to the noun (Borys 1991:76, partly also Machek 256). However, most authors declare it a denominal (albeit with an uncertain ultimate etymology) — the PSl. noun *klúdę, alongside Goth. hlürrs, Germ. lauter „clean“, Gk. κλίνω „spülen“, κλίνων „Wellenschlag“, lat. cluo „purgo“, etc., is usually traced back to IE *kļeu- „spülen, rein machen“²⁷. Borys (i.c.) agrees with this IE filiation; he was the first to point out at South Slavic attestations without the North Slavic alternation of the initial k-/k-, but showing exclusively x- (in Bulgarian) or the elision of the guttural (in Serbian and Bulgarian). In terms of phonetics, he concludes that the previous view of the expressive x-, as an alternative to the primary k- (which, in turn, is considered an irregular reflection of the IE palatal), in view of South Slavic attestations should be altered in favour of the priority of PSl. x- < IE *sk- (Borys, i.c.). However, it is unclear what IE root he has in mind, since the continuants of IE *kļeu- furnish no instances of s-mobile. The fundamentals of this explanation are also adopted in OS s.v. ljuditi, so this is an opportunity to revise that as well.

Trubačev has no doubts about the denominal nature of the verb. He not only excludes the possibility of a coincidence, but also of any genetic links between PSl.

---

²⁵ Of the type *vidęnti(jb), *šijęnti(jb), and not *ledęnti(jb), *śargęnti(jb), etc.
²⁶ Note that they are derived from the IE *ar-, that is in PSl. *ređę.
²⁷ Fasmer II:256 implicitly denies the connection with Goth. hlürrs, which Machek 256 and Sławiński II:238-9 accept, although their lemmas are titled by the verb they believe originally meant "establishing order, cleanliness, peace".
*kl’uditi and Lith. kliudyti „натыкаться, мешаться“ or Latv. klūdit „завывать, совать“ since these Baltic words, along with *kl’uka and *kl’učć, go with IE *klēu-[„Haken; anhaken, hemmen“], which he considers semantically inadequate and he concludes that „Lith. verbs in -dyti have no exact Slavic counterparts, anyway“ (ÉSSJa 10:54). Nominal priority is also advocated by Berneker 527 and Schuster-Šewc 560-561. However, they both reject filiation with *klēu- „spülen“, and provide good arguments for the etymological link with *kl’uca (Berneker stressed kl’učiti se „passen“, Schuster-Šewc assumes the development „biegen, krümmen“ > „passend machen, fügen“ > 1. „in Ordnung bringen, durch Behauen glätten“, 2. „zählen“ — but fails to object to the fact that, despite so many verbal forms and meanings attested in Upper and Lower Lusatian alike, there is no noun from which those denominals could have originated. Both authors single out the element -d-, without specific comment, seeing it implicitly as corresponding to k-widening.

In the light of our understanding the element -d- as a causative formans, it is precisely the interpretation that is overruled in ÉSSJa that appears to be most probable, both formally and semantically.

For the IE *klēu-/*klau- „anhaken, sich anklammern, hemmen“ the causative *dh-forms is already attested in Lith. kliudyti „anhaken machen“ (Pokorny 605), which fits our etymology equally well, or even better, than the unclearly motivated -*d- in *kleu- „spülen“. Furthermore, the attested s-mobile among the German continuants of *klēu- „anhaken, etc.“ (which makes such a reconstruction for Slavic quite reasonable), actually eliminates all phonetic doubts and alleged irregularities inherent in previous explanations. In the first place, there is no problem of the Centum reflex of an IE palatal (which all authors take as just one more in the list of such exceptions), and secondly, the alternation PSl. *k- : *x- quite regularly reflects IE *k- : *(s)k-, without the need to presuppose formal expressivity that is not semantically grounded (e.g. Pol. dial. chludźić „clean, make up“ is quite neutral). And finally, the overall semantics of IE *klēu-corresponds to the meanings of the lexical family *kl’uditi much better than is the case with the semantically monotonous IE *kleu- „spülen“ which only covers the meaning „clean, wash“, without paving the way for others like „bend; tame, calm down, settle; collect crops; ... talk; tease, insult“, not to mention the nouns meaning „angle; hipbone; „accord, peace, order, etc.“ An additional semantic argument is the fact that, derived from this very root (with k-widening, though, and not with the causative -d- element we are interested in), and also within the realm of Slavic, are verbs like OCSl. ključim „biegen, krümmen“ (cf. ULus. kludzić „zahm machen, bändigen“, LLus. klužić „gefährig machen, zählen, züchtigen“ (< „bend“), further klud „Winkel; Hüfte“ (< „crooked like a hook“), or Obg. klučiti šg „anhaken, sich zusammenfügen, passen, zusammen treffen, sich ereignen“ (cf. LLus. kluđnij „füge oder ordne zusammen“, pschikluđnu „mache gefügten“). These meanings lead to the semantics of some adjectives (probably postverbs, like *ladnîvъ{l,v̂}b) traceable to PSl. *kludnîvъ{l,v̂}b or *kludnîvъ{l,v̂}b, LLus. kludny „gefährig, zahm, friedfertig“, Russ. klđomîj „cunning; good, pretty, becoming“, Bulg. vlódan „tame; well-bred, decent“, etc.

In addition to the reconstruction proposed by Schuster-Šewc (cf. above), the semantic development in the Slavic languages can be postulated as follows:
"bend" (> PSl. *kl’udb > LLus. klud "angle; hipbone"), "tame, subdue", "arrange, fit in", "arrange in general", "fix, beautify" (> PSl. *kl’udb "order, calmness, peace; beauty, etc.").

For some seemingly unusual meanings like ORuss. клюдить "talk", compare the corradical OHG. hlotoz "loosen, wahrsagen, zaubern" (perhaps also Latv. klītās "Schicksal"), for Russ. dial. кложиться "hurt, be in pain", compare Lith. kliaudyti "hindern", kliūda "körperliches Gebrechen" (but also "Vertrauen, Zuversicht") (for more, cf. Fraenkel 560). These Lithuanian words are at the same time the closest formal IE counterparts, along with Latv. klāi "neigen, schmiegen".

A fine non-Slavic semantic parallel is provided by the pair of Gk. verbs: ἀρτάω "fasten to, hang one thing upon another" vs. ἀρτίνω "put in order, prepare".

VI. The possible results of this attempt to argue in favour of recognizing a causative formans -d- (< IE *dh- < *dhē- < *dheh₁- "ponere") for this semantic group of Slavic verbs indicate two major points:

a) The list of Slavic-Baltic correspondences is extended by a new item, thus affecting the view that Lith. verbs in -dyti have no exact Slavic counterparts (ESSJa 10:54).

b) If the hypothesis of the existence of such a formans is adopted, it could open up the way to reconsidering some other, allegedly problematic words, and possibly lead to additional more economic etymological solutions.
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