

ERIC P. HAMP
(Chicago)

ON SLAVIC ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES

Разматра се обрада прасл. речи *čelъ и њене породице у новијим словенским етимолошким речницима.

Кључне речи: прасловенски, праиндоевропски, етимологија, лексикографија.

Although our reference resources have improved vastly over the past few decades, we are still unfortunately not in a position where it will suffice to consult one inclusive work to find the basic knowledge and evidence on a general level for a fundamental Slavic lexeme. We may take as a useful example the etymon *čelъ, which is, after all, not unexplored. (I will discuss on another occasion a different example for which the chance factor of alphabetization does not eliminate certain unfinished dictionaries.)

Machek *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského* is always worth consulting because he offers many imaginative and original, if bold, ideas. This time, however, he does not (p. 75) offer such good citation of forms as other sources and collections. His conclusion „Psl. *čelъ původu nejasného“ is not very encouraging, yet prudent.

Sławski *SEJP* I 123, s.v. *człōn*, typically supplies an informative citation of forms: Pol. *człōn* 15th cent., *człōnek* membrum, articulus, capitulum; Cz. *člen* (*Słow. Prasł.* 2.125 shows the two lexemes, gen. *-nu* and *-na*, Slovak. *člen* gen. *-na*, dial. *član*), *článek*, dial. *član*, Russ. *člen*, Ukr. *člen*, *čelén*, Russ. CS *čelōnъ*, SCr. *člân*, Čakav. *člén*. Though these mentions are good, and we are especially grateful for the knowledge of Cz. *článek* (*Słow. Prasł.* 2.126: OCz. *čléněk* : *článek*, Slovak *článok*, *členok*, *člienok*, *člonok* pl. *členki*), Čakav. *člén*, the range of Serbo-Croatian forms in these standard works on other languages is insufficient to make a reconstruction lucidly and unambiguously supported.

Fortunately we now have Skok, *ERHiSJ*, which is always indispensable for its Mediterranean, Balkan, and Romance coverage, priceless for its cultural coverage, highly valuable for its essayistic discussion, and

splendid for its bibliographic references. In the present instance much of these virtues does not apply, but Skok nevertheless serves us where the others fail us in establishing the exact vocalism of the etymon — and here we see the great value of dialect citation in all of etymology. Thus we glean: *člân* 13th cent., *čklân*, *čljân*, *člijen*, Ikav. *člin*, *člên*, *čljèn*, *čkljen* (without reproducing all dialect particulars), to which we may add from *Słow. Prast.* 2.126 *člânak*, *člânak*, *čljanak* ~ *š-*, *člénak*, *čljênak* ~ *š-*; and 125, *čkljan* ~ *š-*, *šljèn*. This certainly gives us the material to recover *člĕn*. We further learn that *l* comes from *lj* by dissimilation with *č*, and therefore that *ja* corresponding to *e* reflects **ĕ*. All of this greatly illuminates the cryptic mentions of Sławski (and of Vasmer), and occupies very little space.

This entry of *ERHiSJ* I 331–2 therefore goes far towards justifying the reconstruction **čelnv̄*. We also learn usefully that Romanian *cilen* comes from Russian.

Furthermore, in order to clarify the non-obvious Czech forms we must turn to J. Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* I 1894, 205 (*ě, ie se mění v a/á*), where we will find *czlenek* and *czlanek* and a discussion of the internal Czech development. Without this assurance the Czech and Serbo-Croatian vocalisms remain ambiguous; an etymological dictionary should not leave us in this sort of doubt. In this respect Sławski goes part way by pointing out that in **čel-nv̄* the **el* becomes **ol* „po *č, ž* and *š*“, thus yielding **čol-nv̄*, and citing Meillet *SC* 69, 123.

Vasmer *REW* III 345 gives a learned range of forms, but they are not in all respects the optimum set of citations: Russ. *член* is itself from Church Slavonic; ORuss. *čelenъkъ*, Carpath.-Ukr. dial. *četenky* ‘Fingerglieder’, Srb. CS *članъ* < **člĕnv̄*, Bulg. *član*, *čl’an* ‘Ast’, SCr. *člân*, *člânak*, Sloven. *člĕn* (*Słow. Prast.* 2.125, 126: *člĕn*, *člĕn*, *člĕnek*), Cz. *člen*, Pol. *czlon* (so too for Kašub., and 17th c. Lower Lus. — *Słow. Prast.*), *čłonek*, Upper Lus. *čłonk* (*Słow. Prast.*: *čłónk*, *čłón*, Lower Lus. *čłonk*). Besides these leave many of the doubts or incomplete patches that Sławski leaves; indeed, the latter is a considerable improvement on the aspects which have already been mentioned.

Yet Sławski is less good on the matters external to Slavic that formed a strong part of the experienced Vasmer’s arsenal. Sławski mentions as cognate: Slavic *kol-ĕno*, Lith. *kelys* ‘kolano’, Greek *κῶλον*, *σκέλος*, Skt. *kata* < **kol-to-* ‘Hüfte’.¹ But Vasmer is more critical: He sees as cognates *kolĕno*, Greek *κῶλον*, *κωλέα*, Attic *κολῆ* ‘Hüftknochen’,

¹ See E. P. Hamp, „On the Indo-European origins of the retroflexes in Sanskrit“, *JAOS* 116.4, 719–23, note 9, for references to my revision and formulation of Fortunatov’s Law.

κωλήν, -ῆνος ‘id.’; he is rightly less certain of a relation to Greek σκέλος,² etc.

In fact, there are two general remarks to make here. Because of the meaning it is likely that *kolěno* and Lith. *kelỹs* derive from the IE base **k^wel-* ‘(re)turn’ vel sim., as Pokorny (IEW 640) has it. If that is so, they cannot on phonological grounds be related to Greek κῶλον or κολῆ, κωλήν, nor to σκέλος. I now believe I have shown that κῶλον was a set (IE **l* + laryngeal) base (Γλωσσολογία 2–3, 1983–1984, 163–8). In that case, it cannot be directly related to Skt. *kata-*, although **čělnъ* could be related as **kelə-no-* if it were originally acuted.

The *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* 4 (1977) 44–5, **čělnъ* and **čělnъkъ*, brings us no new crucial data or opinions, but rewards us with good references to the literature.

The IE background to our etymon remains obscure.

Резиме

Ерик П. Хемп

О СЛОВЕНСКИМ ЕТИМОЛОШКИМ РЕЧНИЦИМА

Разматрање одредница у новијим словенским етимолошким речницима посвећених прасл. речи **čělnъ* и њеним рефлексима илуструје различитост њихових приступа и води закључку да њено индоевропско порекло остаје нејасно, уз опаску да се поређења са прасл. **kol-ěno*, лит. *kelỹs* итд. < пране. **k^wel-* ‘окретати се’ и са грч. κῶλον међусобно искључују, јер је, за разлику од првог, овај други корен по свој прилици садржавао ларингал, и реч **čělnъ* би се дала свести на њега под претпоставком да је првобитно била наглашена акутом.

² See now E. P. Hamp, „The laryngeal heteroclitics“, in R. Bielmeier and R. Stempel edd., *Indogermanica et Caucasica: Festschrift für Karl Horst Schmidt zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), esp. p. 38, „CDIAL 13073 *sakthán-*, nom. *sakthi*“, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 40 (1997) 259, and *Linguistica* (Ljubljana) 2003: *sákth-*, *supti-*, + Alb. *sup*.