

STUDIA ETYMOLOGICA BRUNENSIA **1**

Editorky:

Ilona JANYŠKOVÁ
Helena KARLÍKOVÁ

Euroslavica
Praha 2000

Some Slavic Etymologies Reconsidered – Formal and Semantic Guidelines*

Јасна Влајић-Поповић (Београд)

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 Indoeuropean 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 **rędъ* „ordo, series, successio, gradus, harmonia, etc.“² has at least four synonyms that are unevenly distributed and attested on Slavic territory: **čęrda*, **(sъ)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

* This paper is a summary of the principal ideas providing minimum illustrations of the conclusions reached on the basis of comparative Slavic material (as well as other IE when necessary). Some points made here may also be discussed in more detail elsewhere.

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 PSI. 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 zurechtlegen“, cf. Pokorny 55), cattlebreeding (IE **kędho-* > Lith. *(s)keřdžius* „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. *rtá-* (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 PSI:

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 unanimous⁶, some instances of homonymy within their word families are suspected of being false homonyms⁷, 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 **rędъ* only, which, in spite of reservations expressed by some IE scholars⁸ (unlike Slavic lexicographers⁹), is deeply rooted in its IE background and unquestionably cognate with a number of continuants of the IE root **ar-* „fügen, passen“ (cf. Pokorny 55-60) in many IE languages¹⁰.

b) containing **čerda* and **(sъ)kladъ*, problematic in terms of multiple etymologies being approximately equally probable, but still they are generally Slavic and with solid Baltic correspondences¹¹ regardless of alternative etymological solutions proposed by various authors¹².

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

**nečeredъje*, **nečerdъnъjъ*, **nexl'udъ* etc., **nekl'udъ* etc., **neladъ*, **nerędъ* (ĖSSJa 24:110, 132, 139, 147, 230-231).

⁶ Verbal priority is commonly supposed only for the pair **klasti* : **(sъ)kladъ*, for **rediti* : **rędъ* just by Bezlaj (i.e. Furlan); for **laditi* : **ladъ* Sławski IV:417 and Bezlaj II:118 recognize the verbal priority; for **kl'uditi* : **kl'udъ* Machek 256 is undecided – for more details on the last two, see below.

⁷ Well-known is the dilemma about PSI. **klasti* „ponere“ and **klasti* „castrare“, convincingly dismissed by ĖSSJa 9:188-189, while we raise the question of Sle. *rediti* „alere“, *rediti* „facere“, *-rediti* „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: PSI. **govędo* < IE **g^hou-*, PSI. **agnędъ* coll. „Amentum; Populus nigra“ < **agne*, etc. (SP 1:63).

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

¹¹ Cf. IE **kerdho-* „Reihe, Herde“ > Lith. *skeřdžiūs* „shepherd“; or IE **kla-* „breit hinlegen“ > Lith. *klóti* „hinbreiten“, *klódas* „Lage, Flöz“, as well as the alternative IE **kel-* „hoch (heben)“ > Lith. *kėlti* „heben“ and IE **kel-*, **kelā-*, **klā-* „schlagen, hauen“ > Lith. *kėlti* „schlagen“, etc.

¹² While **čerda* 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 **(s)ker-* „cut“ (ĖSSJa 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 **klada* „log“, it alone fits well among the continuants of IE **kel-* „schlagen, hauen“ (Pokorny 547), while it almost certainly belongs, like the rest of its word family, to IE **kla-* „breit hinlegen“ where most authors place it. Its least probable origin is from IE **kla-* < **kel-* „hoch heben“, suggested by Vaillant (for more details, cf. ĖSSJa 9:188-189 or Sławski II:254).

and totally lacking in the South¹³, **kl'udъ* 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 mainstream¹⁴, 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 *-dъ* (or *-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 *-iti*, which is typical not only of denominals, but of causatives as well. That opens the possibility of verbs (**ręd-iti*, **čerd-iti*; **lad-iti*, **kl'ud-iti*) being primary, and not denominal, as they have usually been considered. See below (note 23) for the supporting argument of PSl. accent of **lāditi*.

c) The other outstanding feature is that verbal meanings within these word families are more numerous and basically more diversified than the nominal ones¹⁵, and still more significantly, that the polysemy of nominal categories reflects the original verbal syncretism of meanings, rather than metaphors, metonymies or similar developments¹⁶.

IV. The last two observations allow us to establish the premise of verbal genetic priority over nominal formations and to concentrate on the *-d-* element whose place and function seem to be crucial – this has been mentioned individually¹⁷, but no synthetic reviews have been made.

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

¹⁴ Cf. Bruss. *склудъ* „wide axe for trimming (wooden) walls“, ORuss. *клюдити* „talk“, LLusat. *klud* „Hüfte; Winkel“, etc.

¹⁵ For example, Russ. *чepедá* f. „order, sequence; herd of big cattle“, dial. „age, time“ as opposed to *чepедúть* „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 enantiosemy: „cause an uproar“, „scold“ (ÉSSJa 4:60-63), where the verb is judged a denominal 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).

¹⁶ Sometimes a verbal meaning has its counterpart in a noun from a different language, e.g. the semantically isolated ORuss. *клюдити* „talk“ finds its first relation in the totally solitary Polab. *kl'aud* „thought, opinion“ (the possibility of this being a coincidence is overruled by the parallelism in ORuss. *класти* „consider“ vs. Cz. dial. *klást* „think“). Remember the previous note too.

¹⁷ All etymologists, from Berneker on, are aware of the element *-d-*, but they have interpreted it differently, e.g. as a determinative alternating with *-t-* (Sławski II:253), as a „widening“ (ÉSSJa 9:188 without going into the nature of it), as a preasens formans (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 *iñdas*, *priēdas*, obs. *samdas* (for the Baltic facts, cf. Otrębski 1965:387)¹⁸.

If we are right in recognizing this very element in some Slavic verbs, the statement that „Lith. verbs in *-d-yti* as a rule do not have exact Slavic correspondences“ (ÉSSJa 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 *-ьda* (cf. Otrębski 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 verbs¹⁹.

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. *ἐπέισθη* „he let himself be convinced, he believed“, *ἐπειράθη* „he attempted, he tried“ (Rix 1976:219-220).

Such composite creations have their semi-counterparts (the first component is nominal!) in Ved. *śraddhā-* „Vertrauen“, aav. *zrazdā* „ergeben, glaubig, vertrauend“, Lat. *crēdere* „vertrauen, glauben“, OIr. *cretim* „glaube“ < IE **kred-* „Herz“ + **dheh₁-* (EWAi II 19/1996 663), with precedents in etymologically related syntagmata like Ved. *antār dhā* — Gk. *κλέος, θέντες*, etc., Ved. *nāma dhā* „einen Namen beilegen“, Gk. *ὄνομα τίθεσθαι*, Lat. *nōmen indere*, Hett. *ŠUM-an-daiš* „he put the name“ (EWAi I 10/1992 786 s.v. DHĀ). Perhaps even older are those like **dhā-kšatrām* „wield power“, **dhā-ṛtām* „establish the truth“ (Gercenberg 1972:90).

More distant typological counterparts can be found in Latin phrases with *facere* like *facio modum* „define the measure“, *facio corpus* „pinguesco“, *facio perriculum* „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 **přidъ*, **udъ*, **zadъ*, etc. (note the formal identity of Lith. *samdas* „rent“ and PSI. **spdъ* „vessel“, with completely different meanings).

¹⁹ Like *-do* in **čędo* < **čęti*, **čьno*, or simply regularly forming derivatives from verbal roots like *-da*, e.g. in **křida* (< **kreidā*) < **krojiti*, cf. SP 1:62-63.

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 *τάσσω* „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 (ĚSSJa 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 **ladъ* „harmonia“ and **lada* „coniunx; 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 postverbals 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 **ladъ* 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. **ōlditi* (or **ālditi*) which would then, by the way of liquid metathesis, have yielded Russ.(etc.) *лѣдуть* (cf. **ōldija* „ship“).

²¹ The other eternal dilemma is the relationship between **ladъ* 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 *ladъ* bylo postverbale“. The significant fact that there are true (formally and semantically undoubtful) denominals, like Bruss. *ладавѣць* „put into order, mend“, Ukr. *ладувѣти*, Pol. *ładować*, Cz. dial. *ladovat se* „idem“ has also been overlooked. The argument of PSl. accent in **lāditi* is presented by Sławski IV:417. In addition, Russ. *лѣдуть*, 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 **ladъ*), supporting it with excellent argumentation and firm parallels for the meaning „coniunx, uxor“ (Trubačev 1959:100-101), has not only abandoned it, but makes no mention of it in reviewing the history of etymologizing these words (ĚSSJa 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. ἁλθαίνω/ἁλθομαι „heile“!), Ukr. *ладний* „grown up; fresh; good; attractive; clean“, Bruss. *ладный* „stout“, „good“, „fed up“ (cf. gr. ἄν-αλτος – „unersättlich“, Pokorny 26), Pol. dial. *ładny* „grown up; stout; attractive; clean“, etc., hitherto considered derivations from the noun **ladъ* „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. **ōlditi* „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“ (> **ladъ* „agreement, peace, order, etc.“).

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

B) The verb **k(x)l'uditi* 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 **kl'udъ*, alongside Goth. *hlūtrs*, Germ. *lauter* „clean“, Gk. *κλύζω* „spülen“, *κλυδών* „Wellenschlag“, lat. *cluo* „purgo“, etc., is usually traced back to IE **k̑leu-* „spülen, rein machen“²⁷. Borys (l.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-/x-*, 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 **s̑k-* (Borys, l.c.). However, it is unclear what IE root he has in mind, since the continuants of IE **k̑leu-* 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 **vidьnъ(jь)*, **čujьnъ(jь)*, and not **ledьnъ(jь)*, **čarьnъ(jь)*, etc.

²⁶ Note that they are derived from the IE **ar-*, that is in PSl. **rędъ*.

²⁷ Fasmer II:256 implicitly denies the connection with Goth. *hlūtrs*, which Machek 256 and Slawski 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. *kļūdit* „засовывать, совать“ since these Baltic words, along with **kl'uka* and **kl'učь*, 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“ (ĖSSJa 10:54). Nominal priority is also advocated by Berneker 527 and Schuster-Šewc 560-561. However, they both reject filiation with **k̄leu-* „spülen“, and provide good arguments for the etymological link with **kl'uka* (Berneker stressed *kl'učiti se* „passen“, Schuster-Šewc assumes the development „biegen, krümmen“ > „passend machen, fügen“ > 1. „in Ordnung bringen, durch Behauen glätten“, 2. „zähmen“ — 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 ĖSSJa that appears to be most probable, both formally and semantically.

For the IE **klēu-/k̄lāu-* „anhaken, sich anklammern, hemmen“ the causative **dh-* formans 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 **k̄leu-* „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 PSI. **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. *chludzić* „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 **k̄leu-* „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* „zahn machen, bändigen“, LLus. *klučis* „gefügig machen, zähmen, züchtigen“ (< „bend“), further *klud* „Winkel; Hüfte“ (< „crooked like a hook“), or OBg. *klučiti se* „anhaken, sich zusammenfügen, passen, zusammentreffen, sich ereignen“ (cf. LLus. *kludniu* „füge oder ordne zusammen“, *pschikliudnu* „mache gefügig“). These meanings lead to the semantics of some adjectives (probably postverbals, like **ladьнъ*(*ъ*)) traceable to PSI. **kl'udьнъ*(*ъ*) or **kludjъ*, LLus. *kludny* „gefügig, zahm, friedfertig“, Russ. *кдюжий* „cunning; good, pretty, becoming“, Bulg. *влюдан* „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“ (> PSI. **kl'udъ* > LLus. *klud* „angle; hipbone“), „tame, subdue“, „arrange, fit in“, „arrange in general“, „fix, beautify“ (> PSI. **kl'udъ* „order, calmness, peace; beauty, etc.“).

For some seemingly unusual meanings like ORuss. *клюдити* „talk“, compare the corradical OHG. *hliozan* „losen, wahrsagen, zaubern“ (perhaps also Latv. *klūtas* „Schicksal“), for Russ. dial. *кљожиться* „hurt, be in pain“, compare Lith. *kliaudyti* „hindern“, *kliáuda* „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. *kļauīt* „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. *ἀρτύω* „put in order, prepare“²⁸.

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“ (ĖSSJa 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.

References

- BER *Български етимологичен речник*, 1-, София 1971-.
- Bezljaj F. Bezljaj, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, I-, Ljubljana 1977-.
- Boryś 1991 W. Boryś, Студије из српскохрватске и словенске етимологије, *Јужнословенски филолог XLVII*, Београд, 69-82.
- Boryś / Vlajić-Popović 1989 W. Boryś, J. Vlajić-Popović, Iz reliktnе leksike praslovenskog porekla u srpskohrvatskim dijalektima (III), *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику XXXII/1*, Нови Сад, 17-19.
- ĖSBM *Этималагічны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, 1-, Мінск 1978-.
- ĖSSJa *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*, 1-, Москва 1974-.
- ESUM *Этимологічний словник української мови*, 1-, Київ 1982-.
- EWAi M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, I-II, Heidelberg 1986-1996.
- Fasmer M. Фасмер, *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, 1-4, Москва 1986-1987.
- Fraenkel E. Fraenkel, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I-II, Göttingen 1962.
- Gercenberg 1972 Л. Г. Герценберг, *Морфологическая структура слова в древних индоиранских языках*, Ленинград.

²⁸ Their common origin from IE **ar-* „fügen, passen“, the root that belongs within the discussed semantic group, corroborates this correspondence.

