STUDIA
ETYMOLOGICA
BRUNENSIA

6

Editorky:

Ilona Janyšková
Helena Karlíková

Proto-Slavic *koty, -ъve 'anchor', 'cat' or something else?

Jasna Vlajić-Popović

0. In almost all modern Slavic languages – as well as in Old Russian, Old Polish, Old Czech – there are terms for the notion 'anchor' that can be traced back to the common prototype *koty, -ъve f., or else to its diminutive *kotvica f. Such a situation appears to be ideal for etymological analysis, since the width of the areal distribution and semantic homogeneity generally indicate either the antiquity of a word or a simultaneous borrowing from a single source. In this instance, however, neither is the case.

0.1. Initially explained as a Germanism (Berneker, Bernštejn),[1] later interpreted as an autochtonous word, i.e. the result of a domestic development (Kiparsky, Vasmer, Sławski, Trubačev, Boryś),[2] but in any case unanimously traced back to the homophonous word for 'cat', this noun still remains without a definite etymology. This is even more so since the only dissenting solution, according to which it would be an autochtonous Slavic word from the family of the verb *kotiti 'to roll, throw, etc.' (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: 648), happens to have passed unnoticed.[3] In our opinion, it is exactly this interpretation that appears to be the most promising one. However, since even it does not take into account all the attestations we have at our disposal today, almost three decades later, nor does it specify the ways of formative-semantic development of the term, the need arises for the whole problem to be reconsidered.

0.2. An overall analysis of this topic would call for a wide-range research, a detailed classification of respective data from all the Slavic languages, historical and dialectal attestations, archeological finds about Slavic vessels and anchors, as well as chronology and ways of arrival of the domestic cat among the Slavs who had previously been acquainted only with the wild cat (which they had their own term for). All this should be viewed in a comparative perspective, with regard to the situation in Germanic languages, especially among the Germans, and it should include considering the possibility that the direction of borrowing was inverse, from the Slavs to the Germans.[4]

0.3. Until such a comprehensive study yields more conclusive results in the future, we shall focus on only a few of the elements of its sketch proposed above. After a review of the previous interpretation an inventory of presently available forms and basic arguments in favour of the solution proposed will be presented.

---

[1] It was mostly interpreted as a loanword from LGerm. *Katte*, more seldom as a calque after LGerm. *Katzanker* (e.g. Machek 1968: 284).

[2] According to them, *koty* is the result of internal development 'cat' → 'anchor' on the basis of an older Germanism *kotъ* 'cat', cf. the review in ЭССЯ 11: 214; most recently also Boryś 2005: 254 s.v. *kotwica*.

[3] Ever since it appeared in 1981 in the 9th volume (within the 2nd book which was completed in 1983), there was no time for that interpretation to be taken into account in composing the respective 11th volume of ЭССЯ (1984) or the 2nd book of ЕСУМ (1985), while from e.g. ESJS 6 (1996) the lemma *kotъva* is missing and that word is mentioned only en passant s.v. OCSl. *kotъka* 'anchor'.

[4] Exactly that direction, and in the domain of navigation too, can be traced e.g. by the expansion of PSl. *oldi/*oldьji 'boat, ship' into northern Germanic languages (cf. ESJS 7: 397; SSS 3: 119).

1.0. The hitherto existing explanation of *koty, -ъve 'anchor' as a metaphor from *kotъ 'cat' can be questioned from both linguistic and extra-linguistic standpoints.

1.1. On the linguistic level, there are a few objections, of uneven gravity. Not only has the fact been neglected that the status of the noun kotva differs from language to language (in some of them, it is not even a native word – for the situation in Serbo-Croatian, for example, cf. Влајић-Поповић 2009),[5] but also the exemptions from the meaning 'anchor' have not been duly commented on (cf. note 18). And most importantly, in acknowledging the metaphor 'cat' → 'anchor' too much trust has been given on the one hand, to the the existance of the German parallel (accompanied by total disregard of the possibility that it might well be a Slavic loanword in German, Katze i.e. Katte < *kotъ, cf. note 4) – in other words, that the semantic shift might have been Slavic in origin, only seemingly a shift, but in fact a result of the secondary effect of homonymy i.e. paretymological intercrossing of two word families (cf. § 2.5.) – and on the other hand, to our modern feeling of the associative connections between cat and anchor.[6] From a present-day perspective, the metaphor 'cat' → 'anchor' (or some other technical device) appears to be only natural,[7] but – except for the fact that when it comes to technical terms we cannot be sure that they are not calques from the German language through the speakers of which technical novelties used to be mediated – this interpretation is seriously shaken if we go back for some 10 centuries, to the turn of the first millennium into the second, which is, judging from the linguistic data (cf. § 1.2.1), the latest supposed moment of metaphorisation.

1.2. Extralinguistic aspects of the idea of metaphorisation introduce into consideration many presently unavailable facts about the two realia, the problems of chronology and tracing the ways of arrival of the domestic cat among the Slavs,[8] as well as ac-

---

[5] Thus, e.g. Trubačev used to argue that Ukr. *кітвá* could not be a Polonism since it exhibits regular Ukr. phonetics (ЭССЯ 11: 214).

[6] Although they are basically atemporal (except when conditioned by the degree of technical development) associations are typically multiple. Without going into the entire polysemanticism of the concept of 'cat', we bear in mind that the Serbian language data indicate that this zoonym can be metaphorised at least triply: on the basis of cat's fur ('catkin, ament'), on the basis of the vaulted profile of a bristling cat ('hump, hunchback; beam; vault'), on the basis of cat's claws ('four fluked anchor') (all according to PCA).

[7] Modern dictionaries of many languages show clearly that zoonyms for cat are frequently metaphorised in various technical terminologies. E.g. in Serbian Vuk Karadžić notes (without location!): Мачка [je] ... рачвасто гвожђе, насађено на дрво, које је приковано под колима, те уз брдо кола уставља; this one, as well as the meaning 'wooden or iron bar on the plough which regulates the width of the furrow' due to their geographic provenance are potential calques from German, but 'brace (wodden, iron, etc.) for joining the roof with gable' from Herzegovina or eastern Serbia: Онде где су везови привеже [се] по једна руковет „крова" и те се руковети зову мачке (all according to PCA) are more likely to be the results of domestic developments. Cf. also Russ. dial. *кошка* 'tool for digging the potatoes manually' [орудие для ручной копки картофеля'] or 'rake fixed to the scythe while reaping the crops [грабельки, прикрепляемые к косе во время косьбы хлебов'], 'iron hook for releasing the net stuck in the water' [железний крючок (лапа) употребляемый для того, чтобы отцепить застрявший в воде невод], 'wooden pitchfork with a weigh used for pulling the sunken torn net out of the water [деревянная рогатка с грузом, употребляемая для извлечения из воды затонувшей оторвавшейся сети] (СРНГ 15: 150).

[8] A similar problem occurs on a broader European level. The fact that Lat. *cattus* as a term for Felis domestica, a domestic animal of Egyptian origin, is first mentioned only in Martial (1st century A.D.) is significant not only as an etymological datum, but primarily as a chronological milestone for the ap-

quaintance with the forms of anchor, techniques of anchoring, etc., all that depending on particular vessels the Slavs were using and the waterways they were sailing on.

1.2.1. If, due to the paucity of archaeological traces of the domestic cat on the Slavic territory, we are to rely on scarce historical and linguistic data, we shall reckon that the Slavs must have encountered the domestic cat, Felis domestica – unlike the wild one, Felis sylvestris, for which they had had a name of their own[9] which they did not transfer to the domestic variety – in the early middle ages (Трубачев 1960: 96–97). An argument in favour of the presumption of its late arrival among the Slavs is the fact that – in spite of a number of common features – there is a great diversity of beliefs about cats among the Slavic peoples (cf. СлМит 349–351, also СлДр 2: 637–640). German mediation is strongly indicated by the fact that the Slavs have named the cat by a Germanism *kotъ. From the fact that LGerm. Katte is only attested in the 9th century (Kluge 2002: 478)[10] it is obvious that the arrival of domestic cat among the Slavs must have happened later. Therefore, the chances that among the Slavs of the turn of the millennia the domestic cat was already so widespread as to be metaphorised for its claws (for modern realisations of this metaphor, cf. note 6) are extremely small.

1.2.2. Maritime professional references provide a number of facts relevant for this analysis. Apart from the general one, about the parallelism of the technical developments of vessels and anchors, there are some specific data: anchors as we know them today are not new, but they are the result of a relatively high technology related to maritime ship navigation, while the primitive anchors used in monoxylon navigation, were regularly stones – either a massive single piece with a hole for tying the rope, or a few stones placed in a net or a basket.[11] According to archaeological finds, it was from the earliest ages till the end of the first millennium A.D. that the Slavs used to navigate exactly such simple (river or lake) boats, and it was only in the period from 10–12th century that, for military purposes, they started building larger vessels, stave boats with masts, sails and ores (SSS 3: 119 ff. s.v. Łodzie u Słowian). So, the Slavs originally anchored with stone – alone, in a net, or stuck into a wooden cross (SSS 2: 495 s.v. Kotwice).[12] In the extreme SW periphery of the Slavic territory, on the lake of

---

pearence of the animal itself in the Roman world from which it spread into the rest of Europe during the migration of nations (so DNP 6: 358 s.v. Katze). From Lat. cattus a number of Germanic terms for cat are derived, e.g. (via OHG kazza, kazzo) and Germ. Katze 'id.' (Kluge 2002: 478); Brückner had it that cats were spread by the Balkan Romance population (ESJS 348 s.v. kotъka); Skok 1971–1974, 2: 170 that it arrived in Europe in the 5th century A.D. by mediation of the Balkan Goths – which ESJS l.c. disagrees with, and Lehmann 1986 does not even mention).

[9] For a detailed description cf. Трубачев 1960: 92–94; most recently also Boryś 2005: 753 s.v. żbik.

[10] With regard to the supposition that the domestic cat set out on its middle European 'campaign' as early as the migration of nations (cf. DNP 6: 358) the question arises – however, not for us and here – why the German zoonym is attested that late.

[11] … Kasnije je [čovjek] kamenu dao oblik pluga, kako bi se kamen mogao zariti u morsko dno …, jer težina kamena nije bila dovoljna da drži veće splavi i brodiće… Feničani su uveli željezna sidra s jednom kukom i pandžom na kraju. … Rimljani su upotrebljavali sidro s dvije kuke i s pomičnom m o t k o m na vrhu struka. Iz jezera Nemi u Italiji izvađena su d r v e n a i ž e l j e z n a sidra prilično usavršenog oblika. Veći su brodovi uporebljavali i četvorokraka sidra s drvenim strukom i željeznim krakovima (PomE 7: 264 s.v. Sidra i lanci).

[12] Cf. the description in SSS 2: 495 s.v. kotwice: … Najprostszą formę K. stanowiły kamienie o wadze kilkudziesięciu kg, z otworem dla umocowania liny. … Bardziej rozwinięte K. składały się z drew-

Skadar, only a hundred years ago the way of application of stone in anchoring – the object being fishnets, though, and denoted by a medieval Grecism *sidro* – was described, thus providing us with a good idea of how this technique might have been used in anchoring monoxylon boats.[13]

1.2.2.1. Although in their first southward raids, during the 7th century, the Slavs used monoxyla even for seafaring,[14] in the course of time they mastered more advanced maritime navigation (on bigger ships with appropriate anchors) and adopted respective terminology. That is why many Slavic languages today (at least those whose speakers were seafarers) have already very old loanwords as standard terms for 'anchor', cf. Russ. *я́корь* (Фасмер 1986–1987, 4: 553), Bulg. dial. (Sozopoli) *сѝдро*, S.-Cr. *сѝдро*,[15] Sln. *sidro* (cf. БЕР 6: 638; Skok 1971–1974, 3: 229; Bezlaj 1977–2005, 3: 233 M.S.). It is pretty certain that these various alloglottal terms would not have been borrowed if it were not for the need to designate devices significantly different from the anchors the Slavs had been using before.

2.0. It is our presumption that **koty* might well be a Proto-Slavic noun (hence, older not only than the 10th century, as Trubačev implies by dating it via a Czech anthroponym based on the meaning 'cat'[16] – but probably even more ancient, from before the 5th century i.e. the period preceeding the separation of the southern branch of Slavic languages). Therefore, its nomination would not rest on the metaphor from **kotъ* 'cat' but on some other homonym[17] of that noun belonging to the word-family of **kotiti* as

---

nianego krzyżaka obciazonego przywiązanym do niego ciężkym kamieniem. Dla lepszego zarycia się w dno ramiona krzyżaka posiadały dłutowate zakończenia. Kilka takich K. znaleziono na Rugii (Binz, Mönchgut), w płd. Skandynawii i na płd. wybrzezu Baltyku. ... We wcz. średniowieczu używano także żelaznych K. dzis. typu, tzw. admiralskich. Doskonale zachowanych okazów tego rodzaju K. dostarczyły znaleziska w krajach skand. (np. Nydam IV w., Oseberg – IX w., Gokstad – X w.). Z terenow słow. jedyna K. żelazna znana jest z wykopalisk w Gdańsku (ramię z lopatkowatym zakończeniem).

[13] Cf. the meaning 'stone which holds the net to the bottom [of the lake]' illustrated by the example from Jovićević's description of fishing on the lake of Skadar: Један крај мреже [који први спушта] привеже за **р а к и т у**, **в р б у** или нарочиту жилу, коју сам побије, а свеже и други крај, пошто сврши посао, или ту спусти повећи камен у дно воде, везан за **д у г а ч к и ш т а п**. То се зове сидро. (Mihajlović--Vuković 1977: 335, according to *Српски етнографски зборник* 13, Београд 1909, 206) (spacing by J. V-P.). A similar technique was described in western Siberia in 1865, cf. Russ. dial. *кошка* 'a kind of anchor used for setting fishnets; a stone circumvowen by sticks which is precipitated to the bottom' [род якоря при установке рыболовных снарядов: камень оплетеный прутьями, опускаемый на дно водоема] (СРНГ 15:150).

[14] According to Byzantine chronicles of the sieges of Salonika and Constantinople, Slavic boats were latterally reinforced by planks (cf. SSS 3: 121), but those sources make no mention of anchors.

[15] Cf. also S.-Cr. dial./obs. *ankora*, a Romanism i.e. Italianism (from Lat. *ancora*, cf. Skok 1971–1974, 1: 45). For other European languages whose respective terms for 'anchor' are, via Lat. *ancora* descendants of Gk. *ἄγκυρα* (including Russ. *я́корь*, through OSwed. or OIcl. mediation) cf. Buck 1965: 737, § 10.89.

[16] This particular dating (Трубачев 1960: 97) is not irrevocable since it is based solely on a single interpretation of the name of Grand Moravian prince Kocel (the son of Pribin, 9th century A.D.) which is all but indisputable: **Kocьlь* < **koca* < **kotja* 'she-cat' (cf. ibid., quoting J. Stanislav: Kocel, *Slovenská reč* 15/1950, 165 ff.).

[17] In that way we actually agree with Trubačev's word-formation interpretation which has it that **koty, -ъve* is „a secondary, yet original [i.e. not loaned] form(ation) after **kotъ*" (ЭССЯ 11: 214), simultaneously excluding the possibility that it is a direct postverbal (although Vaillant 1958: 265, i.e. 262–270, § 200–201 among the nouns in -*y*, -*ъve* also mentions that formation category, e.g. *pely*, -*ъve* > *plěva*).

its postverbal. Since those are more than one, while loooking at the whole respective segment of the lexical-semantic family we have to find out which of the immediate prototypes is the most probable one.

2.1. Making an inventory of relevant forms is a continuation of the criticism of the previous interpretation by metaphor which, among other things, neglects the exceptions from the meaning 'anchor' – which are not only numerous,[18] but may well turn out to be indicative of the true origin of those words. Of course, those exceptions do not include terms for modern technical devices or such meanings as S.-Cr. and Bulg. 'soft iron for a magnet', and the like.

2.2. It would be formally most justified to constrict our analysis only to the forms traceable back to *koty, -ъve, i.e. *kotva (incl. *kotvica). Such words are, according to us, over thirty in number (ten of which – attested in 8 out of 14 Slavic languages – do not have the meaning 'anchor', cf. the Table at the end of this paper). However, due to their formal and semantic closeness as well as practical genetic identity, taken into consideration should also be the continuants of PSl. *kotъka, since that femininum also derives from *kotъ.[19] By exception, included should also be some forms outside this triangle, but also derivatives of *kotъ (e.g. the continuants of PSl. *kotъkъ).[20] Of course, and *kotъ itself, with an adequate semantic repertoire (e.g. OPol. kot 'a sort of a small anchor', cf. Sławski 1952–1982, 3: 16).

2.3. One of the principal causes of the problem we are facing lies in the fact that the form *kotъ has multiple homonyms. If, for practical reasons, we rely on their inventory in the Moscow etymological dictionary (cf. ЭССЯ 11: 209–212) and then exclude the first two of them,[21] interesting for us as likely masculine counterparts to the femininum *koty, -ъve, remain *kotъ III 'shed' (= *kotьcь) and *kotъ IV 'throwing, rolling; something round, a bunch of flax; counter-attack logs' (all according to obsolete or dialectal words likely to be postverbals from *kotiti 'to roll, throw, etc.' cf. ibid. 211–212).

2.4. Formal impediments to such derivation are non-existent (as it has been the case with *kotъ 'cat') either with regard to the basic noun *koty, -ъve or to its diminu-

---

[18] True enough, that list of semantic deviations from the prevailing meaning 'anchor' used to be much shorter – besides Polab. t'ötåi 'cat' (for that cf.. ЭССЯ 11: 214, without comment also OCz. kot, kotwa mentioned by Срезневский 1893–1912: 1299 s.v. котъ), previous researchers have had in mind only Cz. dial. kotev 'twig' and LSorb. kótwica 'trap'.

[19] In the case of the zoonym, we are dealing with motion; in other meanings we should depart from **kota; while Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: 648 allows that form, ЭССЯ does not feature its reconstruction although there are grounds for that in Russ. dial. кота 'a kind of large fishing trap' and Serb. dial. кота 'basket' (cf. Влајић-Поповић 2007: 73, 74), with an implied synecdoche 'pole, stick, etc.' → 'an object made of poles, sticks, etc.'.

[20] We do not deal with them specifically, but cf. e.g. ORuss. котки m. pl. 'counter-attack logs precipitated from the fortress walls during the siege' [противоштурмовые бревна, которые скатываются со стен крепости во время приступа] or Russ. dial. коток m. 'winch on a waterwell' [ворот колодца] (according to ЭССЯ 11: 213, from *kotъ IV) or WRuss. каток 'wheel' [кола воза] (ЭСБМ 4: 305), Ukr. каток 'rolling pin [качалка (для тіста)]; a part of weaving loom [деталь ткацького верстата]; dumpling' [галушка] (ЕСУМ 3: 59–60) etc. which are all bassed on the verb *kotiti/*kat(j)ati 'to roll, etc'.

[21] Besides the Germanism *kotъ I 'cat', there is also *kotъ II 'progeny', a postverbal of *kotiti 'to give birth' – both irrelevant for this discussion.

tive *kotъka. The latter should be regarded with special care due to its dual semantics (e.g. in ORuss. it meant both 'anchor' and 'cat',[22] as was the case in some recensions of Old Slavonic, although in the cannonical texts only the meaning 'anchor'[23] can be accounted for). This circumstance can be understood both as a guideline and as a potential source of bewilderment.

2.5. The bewilderment consists of the following, still lesser problem of the unrecognized homonymy of PSl. *kotъka. Since this form can be either a motion counterpart of *kotъ '(Tom) cat' or a diminutive of both **kota and *koty, -ъve, we should reckon with the reality of two homonymous words *kotъka. Their formal coincidence was obviously absolved by divergent developments of new forms in *kot- whose meanings were later associated with: *kotъka I 'cat' → *kotjъka (Russ. кошка, etc.)[24] and *kotъka II 'anchor' → *koty, -ъve , i.e. kotva.

2.6. The form *koty, -ъve might have originated regardless of the need for separating the homonyms since formal parallels to the postverbal couple *kotъ m. : *koty, -ъve f. typically do not show significant semantic leaps but only minor nuances of the principal meaning or its local specialisations.[25]

2.7. Therefore, if we encompass the complete semantic repertoire of this lexical family, except for the meaning 'anchor' (present in CSl. котъка, ORuss. котва, Russ. obs. котва, OPol. kotew, kotwa (rarely kotka, kot), Pol. kotwica, OCz. kotev, Cz. kotva, kotvice, Slk. kotva, Sln. kotva, S.-Cr. котва, Mac. котва, Bulg. kòтва, etc.) there are also some other meanings. They are by no means sporadically located but often territorially grouped so that they point at either a late Proto-Slavic dialectism or, on the contrary, at a newer development which has spread by the contact of neighbouring languages: in the NW Slavic terrain, regularly in the form of a diminutive, attested is a phytonym kotwica / kotvica 'Trapa natans' (at least as of the 16th century,

---

[22] Cf. the attestedness of all three forms and both meanings in ORuss. котъ 'felis, catus', котва 'anchor, small anchor' (1653) and котъка 'cat' (XIV–XV c.); 'anchor' (XII c.) (Срезневский 1893–1912: 1299, 1303).

[23] Quite indicative for OCSl. котъка, -ы f. „ancora" (Supr.) could be the example in which it is stressed that котъка is made of iron: имѣаше сии корабль котъкы желѣзны (SJS 15: 57; likewise and ESJS 6: 348). N.B. that this form in OCSl. has no formal pair, either котъ or котъва, or in the meaning 'plain anchor' or 'cat'. On the other hand, attested is the male diminutive котьць, -а m. „Kammer, Verschlag" (ibid.).

[24] Probably under the impuls for separation of homonyms in western and eastern Slavic languages where the zoonym (general and male) has survived in the form *kotъ, as a designation for a female (in some cases it later developed into a general term) – wide established i.e. generalised was the form kočka, koczka i.e. кошка (from *kotjъka, cf. ЭССЯ 11: 207–208, rather than Фасмер 1986–1987, 2: 360).

[25] For the couples *botъ m. : *boty, -ъve f. and *bъtъ m. : *bъty, -ъve f. (which in further analysis will prove to be actual synonyms of the words discussed here, cf. § 3.4.1) see also SP 1: 342, 466; without a gender opposition, but also semantically neutral, and even residing in the domain of similar realia, cf. PSl. *oldi : *oldy, -ъve f. 'boat, ship' (ЭССЯ 32: 53–55). For this comparison irrelevant is the fact that nouns in -y, -ъve usually are primary nouns, like utva, ljubva ... jetrva, rarely deverbals like plěva, occasionally loanwords like crkva, smokva (cf. Vaillant 1958: 265, i.e. 262–270, § 200–201; on zoonyms in particular l.c. 276–278, § 203,; specifically on *koty l.c. 277, with a comment that feminina in -y are specially employed for adaptating Germanisms – which should not be rendered crucial in the case of 'anchor' if we are mindful of the equally probable possibility of a domestic Slavic derivation which is implied by the presented semantic and cultural-historical facts which speak in favour of it.

cf. Sławski 1952–1982, 3: 16); on a part of the same terrain there are LSorb. *kótwica* and OCz. *kotvice* 'trap (for thieves)' (this very semantics lies in the base of the previous phytonym)[26]; similarly in the South, Bulg. *кòтка* 'metal hook attached to shoes as prevention from sliding', Mac. dial. *котки* pl. 'id.; metal rods for trimming trees'. All these meanings boil down to iron, crooked arms and pointed flukes of a metal anchor – which the Slavs have been acquainted with since the early middle ages (cf. § 1.2.2.1., esp. note 12).

2.7.1. However, there are a few meanings which cannot be viewed that way. They are either hapax legomena or, even if occurring in two languages or are similar enough, they are attested in such distant locations that the immediate influence must be excluded as a factor explaining their similarity (cf. both S.-Cr. examples and the first two of the Ukr. meanings). It is the Cz. dial. (and obsol.) *kotev* 'skate' (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: 648), Cz. dial. *kotev* 'bough, twig' (ЭССЯ 11: 214), Cz. dial. *kotva* 'rotating plank in the cauldron for frying plums' [otáčivé prkno v kotli při smažení trnek] (Kazmíř 2007: 7530), Slk. dial. *kotva* 'leaning wire/cable that fixes a pole to the ground' [šikmo do zeme ukotveny, uchytený drôt na upevnenie stlpa (SSN 1: 848, with a note that it is a novel word), Russ. dial *котвица* 'boathook', as well as S.-Cr. dial. 'lever above the grindstone' (Boka, РСА),[27] 'a part of the plough (which?)' (Herceg-Novi, РСА) and Ukr. dial. *кітвиця* pl. 'wooden cylinder which is put under the lever in order to lift the grindstone', 'pulleys in the front part of the plough (which holds the wheel)', 'planks over which a cart is rolled to the river for transport on the other bank' (ЕСУМ 2: 451, with an indication of the relation with *котити*), and another hapax legomenon, WRuss. *кòтва* 'place where they used to roll eggs on Easter' [месца, дзе на вялікдзень качалі яйкі] (ЭСБМ 5: 103, cf. § 3.3.1.); perhaps also Bulg. dial. *котва* [kotwa] 'mold on wine'.[28] On the one hand, all these meanings can hardly be related to the anchor, and on the other hand, such a semantic diversity – especially that reflected in the WRuss. and the last Ukr. examples, as well as in Cz. 'skates' – can easily be traced back to verbal polysemy.

3.0. It was verbal semantics that Schuster-Šewc had in mind, although in his reconstruction of the triad *koty* / *kotъ* / *kota* 'threepointed hook, anchor' he reaches only as far as the root *kot-*,[29] and supposes the original meaning of the noun to be 'object that hangs on firmly' (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: 648). This author's interpretation of the (post)verbal semantics is just one out of many (and perhaps among the less probable – taking into account the origin and development of the realia proper, cf. § 1.2.2.), but it is interesting and noteworthy because such an onomasiological interpretation re-

---

[26] This Lat. phytonym is probably based on Fr. *trape* 'trap' (cf. Симоновић 1959: 472–473, there also other terms with relatively similar motivation, e.g. S.-Cr. *водени зуби, врагољић, рогате шишке*, etc.).

[27] Cf. the description: Брашно се купи пањем. Палица, која је уђенута кроз „раслаб" више свода, зове се „котва", а испод ње друга, којом се подиже и спушта раслаб, односно „водено коло", зове се „полуга".

[28] For this datum (from the dialectological card catalog of the Institute for Bulgarian language of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia) our cordial thanks are due to our colleague Dr Liljana Dimitrova-Todorova.

[29] For the sake of comparison he mentions OCze. *kotiti*, Russ. *катáть*, and as its cognate OCSl. *kotorati sę* 'to quarrel' – N. B. all that independently from the respective volume of ЭССЯ (cf. note 3).

lates PSl. *koty 'anchor', by basic motivation, to Gk. ἄγκυρα 'anchor' ← 'something crooked' (cf. Buck 1965: 737, § 10.89.) thus depriving it of the status of the single exemption (apart from LGerm. *Katte*) from the omnipresent semantics 'crooked(ness)' – although Schuster-Šewc himself does not mention that fact.

3.1. Departing from all the verbal meanings registered in ЭССЯ as well as those implied on the basis of *kotъ III and *kotъ IV (and owing to the well groundedness of the reconstruction *koty < *kotъ < *kotiti which is undisputable on the levels of both individual links and as a whole), and if the productivity of postverbal word-formation be taken into account, some more[30] homonyms of *kotъ are conceiveable, whose word-formation and semantic profile are hitherto unregistered.

3.2. Most conspicuous is the fact that the heterogenous semantics of *kotъ IV includes abstract nouns as well as very concrete realia (cf. § 2.3.), and what is not explicitly said in ЭССЯ (where only a reference is made to *kotiti) is the fact that nomina abstracta are in fact nomina acti based on the meaning 'to roll, throw' and that 'rolled flax pad' and 'log (which is precipitated from the fortification walls)' are but concretisations of the meaning 'that which is rolled, thrown, precipitated' as regular nomina resultativa of *kotiti.

3.3. Hence we can imagine *koty, -ъve to be the result of specialisation of a concrete *kotъ 'that which is thrown' ← an abstract *kotъ 'throwing' ← *kotiti 'to throw, drop, etc.'. If we are mindful of the looks of primitive anchors – stone or stones placed in a net or basket which is/are thrown into the water (cf. § 1.2.2.) and if we stick to the presumption that the noun *koty (as well as its diminutive *kotъka) judging from the distribution of its continuants, ought to be a Proto-Slavic term from the period prior to the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic unity, this interpretation is to be taken as highly probable.

3.3.1. The same word-formative development, only based upon another aspect of verbal (poly)semantics and with the slight difference in the fact that the verb meaning 'to roll' has produced a nomen acti 'rolling', only to be further developped into a nomen loci, attested today in WRuss. *котва* 'place where they used to roll eggs on Easter' (cf. ЭСБМ 5:103, with the only comment „Да *катаць*").[31] On the basis of the very same primary verbal semantics, probably only after the Proto-Slavic era (maybe even quite recently, since in respective languages the verb itself is in vital use) nomina instrumenti have evolved, namely Cz. obs. 'skates', Ukr. dial. 'planks over which a cart is rolled...' and 'pulleys...'. It is striking that all those forms in various languages are always realisations of the word-formation potentials of the basic postverbal *kotъ.

3.3.2. The motivation of a few meanings still remains insufficiently clear: on the one hand, the meanings like 'felt supports', 'rolled flax pad...' and on the other those like Ukr. 'wooden cylinder... under the lever...', ultimately also Serb. dial. *кат* 'wedge' (besides 'pole, stake', cf. § 3.4.2.) might well have a twofold interpretation. If we reckon that the simplest support was 'rolled flax pad, etc.', an obvious postverbal of

---

[30] Although it is not very likely (cf. note 8), we cannot totally outrule the possibility that all four homonyms in ЭССЯ are postverbals – we cannot be sure that the zoonym is not actually 'the one that rolls, turns over', cf. Bulg. *обръщам котки* „премятам се през глава" (РРОДД 218).

[31] The folk custom by which during the Easter week the youth is amused by rolling coloured eggs down a small hill (true enough, recorded on the Russian terrain) is mentioned in СлМит 235b s.v. *jaje*.

the verb *kotiti 'to roll, etc.' (cf. also LSorb. kotus 'curl, tail, etc.' Schuster-Šewc l.c.) it is only logical that that term could have been transferred to other (and even different) objects performing the same function (wedges, cylinders, etc.). The other possibility would be that those objects – under the effect of enantiosemy – used to denote objects or tools performing actions opposite from rolling and sliding, such as braking, stopping, holding back. In that respect cf. Bulg. and Mac. 'metal hooks ... on shoes...'. These speculations go beyond our present task, but we do mention them as interesting and worthy of further investigation elsewhere.

3.4. However, probably better grounded would be derivation of *koty 'anchor' from the same verbal semantics 'to throw, roll' and from another homonym *kotъ V (for its numeration cf. § 3.4.1.) with semantic concretisation 'that which is thrown' and further specialisation 'pole, stake, rod, etc.'[32] – as long as the primitive anchor, being in fact 'a basket (of switches, sticks) into which stone is placed' (cf. § 1.2.2.) is understood as a nomination resulting from synecdoche.

3.4.1. This interpretation can be corroborated by the fact that a *kotъ V 'pole, rod, stick, boathook (perhaps also reed)' has already been recognised as a model from which, through synecdoche 'pole, stick' → 'an object made of poles, sticks', particularly 'fence, enclosure in a river for fish hunting; manger, crib; shed' another homonym has developed, in ЭССЯ defined as *kotъ III 'manger, crib'. For its recent word-formation and semantic explanation as a collective form of a provisionally reconstructed singulative *kotъ V 'pole, stick, etc.' employed is also the argument of attestations (missing from the ЭССЯ) of Russ. dial. кот 'fishing equipment in a river' [рыболовный забор в реке]; 'tool for pulling objects out from the river bottom [приспособление для вытаскивания различных предметов со дна реки]; коты pl. 'fishnet; fishing equipment – enclosure (in a river) from poles, sticks, etc.' [мерёжа; приспособление для лова рыбы – заграждение из кольев, прутьев или плетня; закол] (СРНГ 15: 101), as well as the attestations of their synonym with the root vocalism -a-, Serb. dial. кат 'pole, stake; wedge, linch-pin' (cf. Влајић-Поповић 2007: 75).

3.4.2. In evaluating this interpretation one should bear in mind that from the very supposed homonym *kotъ 'pole' at least two other forms have been derived: *kotьcь with widely distributed semantic specialisation of the original meaning (which is almost certainly Proto-Slavic – cf. OCSl form in note 23) and the other less widely distributed *kotъkъ 'counter-attack log; winch on a waterwell' (ЭССЯ 11: 214–215; ibid. 213; cf. also note 20) – both with unjustified diminution.

3.4.3. Belonging in this number, as variations of the basic semantics 'pole, rod, etc.' certainly are meanings like Cz. 'bough, twig', probably also Russ. dial. 'boathook'.

3.5. If we depart from the same primary semantics of the primitive anchor which has already been supposed in § 3.4., formally conceivable and possible is also the specialisation **kota 'fishing trap' → *kotъka 'anchor', with a later association of that semantics with the form *koty for the sake of evading homonymy with *kotъka 'cat'.

---

[32] For word-formation and semantic parallelism *kotiti : *kotъ vs. *mesti : *motъ(ka), etc. with verbal semantics 'to roll, throw', also Russ. валить 'to precipitate, throw' : вал 'lever, spindle' cf. Влајић-Поповић 2007: 75.

However, if we are mindful of chronology, i.e. if we advocate the idea that the Slavs had been using anchors before they came across Felis domestica (i.e. that the cat was not a factor in nominating the anchor), and on the other hand, if we are mindful of the fact that the areal distribution speaks for the antiqueness of the term (in the absence of cat there was no need for avoiding homonymy), such a derivation, although formally possible, is actually not conceivable.

4.0. Regardless of the particular interpretation we decide for (either the one elaborated in § 3.3 or the one in § 3.4.) introducing the idioglottal etymological solution by which *koty* 'anchor' is placed into the word-family of the verb *kotiti*[33] definitely appears to be more prospectful than the previous ones that were essentially alloglottal (cf. § 0.1.). At the same time, previous problems of dating that term and justifying the reasons for a policentrical metaphorisation on the basis of the zoonym – which happens to be attested on a smaller area than the naval term – disappear automatically. We advocate this interpretation as the best and the most reliable one, in terms that it leaves the least doubts when it comes to explaining the highest number of Slavic isomorph words (apart from terms for 'anchor', also § 3.3.1., 3.3.2., 3.4.3 while the whole word-family is expanded by forms mentioned in § 3.4.2.). Good solutions tend to be simple. That is the general advantage od idioglottal etymologies – they eventually turn out to be simple and direct, without the acrobatics the alloglotal ones sometimes call for.[34]

Table of forms and meanings:

	Anchor	Trapa natans	Varia (dialectal or obsolete)
OCSl.	котъка		
R.-CSl.	котъка		
Bulg.	котва		котва [kotwa] 'wine mold'
	котка (obs./dial.)		котки pl. 'iron hooks on shoes…'
			обръщам котки 'премятам се през глава'
Mac.	котва		
	котка (dial.)		'metal hook attached to shoes…'
			'metal rods for trimming trees'
S.-Cr.	котва (liter.)		'lever above the grindstone', 'a part of the plough'
Sln.	kotva (dial.)		
Cz.	kotva, kotvica	kotvice	kotev obs. 'bough', kotva dial. 'skate';
			'rotating plank in the cauldron for frying plums'
OCz.	kotva, kotev		kotvicĕ pl. 'trap (for thieves)'
Slk.	kotva	kotvica	kotva dial. 'leaning wire that fixes a pole to the ground'
USorb.	kótwica	kotwja	
LSorb.	kotwa		kotwica 'trap'
Pol.	kotwica	kotwica	
OPol.	kot		
WRuss.			кóтва 'place where eggs were rolled on Easter'
Russ.	кóтва (obs.)		котвица dial. 'boathook'
Ukr.	кiтвá	котéвка	кiтвиця pl. 1° 'planks over which a cart is rolled to
	кiтвиця	(< Pol.)	the river for transport on the other bank'; 2° 'pulleys in
			the front part of the plough (which holds the wheel)';
			3° 'wooden cylinder which is put under the lever in order
			to lift the grindstone'

---

[33] The uncertainty about its ultimate origin (cf. e.g. ЭССЯ 11: 205–207) is irrelevant for this discussion.

References

Bezlaj 1977–2005: Bezlaj, F., *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, I–V, Ljubljana.

Boryś 2005: Boryś, W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.

Buck 1965: Buck, C. D: *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, Chicago 1965[2].

DNP: *Der neue Pauly Enzyklopädie der Antike*, 1–16, Stuttgart – Weimar, 1996–2003.

ESJS: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, 1–, Praha 1989–.

Kazmíř 2007: Kazmíř, S., *Slovník valašského nářečí* (valašsko-český, česko-valašský), CD.

Kluge 2002: Kluge, F., *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, bearb. von E. Seebold, Berlin / New York 2002[24].

Lehmann 1986: Lehmann, W. P., *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden.

Machek 1968: Machek, V., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha 1968[2].

Mihajlović–Vuković 1977: Mihajlović, V. – Vuković, G., *Srpskohrvatska leksika ribarstva*, Novi Sad.

PomE: *Pomorska enciklopedija*, 1–8, Zagreb 1972–1989.

Schuster-Šewc 1978–1989: Schuster-Šewc, H., *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, I–IV, Bautzen.

SJS: *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, 1–52, Praha 1958–1997.

Skok 1971–1974: Skok, P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1–4, Zagreb.

Sławski 1952–1982: Sławski, F., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, I–V, *A–łżywy*, Kraków.

SP: *Słownik prasłowiański*, 1–, Kraków 1974–.

SSN: *Slovník slovenských nárečí*, 1–, Bratislava 1994–.

SSS: *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, 1–8, Wrocław etc. 1961–1996.

Vaillant 1958: Vaillant, A., *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome II Morphologie, Première partie: Flexion nominale, Lyon – Paris.

БЕР: *Български етимологичен речник*, 1–, София 1971–.

Влајић-Поповић 2007: Влајић-Поповић, J., Псл. **kotiti/*katati* и **kotъ/*katъ* – трагови -*a*--вокализма на словенском југу. In: *Словенска етимологија данас*, Београд, 67–81.

Влајић-Поповић 2009: Влајић-Поповић, J., Да ли је *котва* књижевна и(ли) народна реч? *Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане* 38 (in print).

ЕСУМ: *Етимологічний словник української мови*, 1–, Київ 1982–.

РРОДД: *Речник на редки остарели и диалектни думи в литературата ни от XIX и XX век*, ред. С. Илчев, София 1974.

РСА: *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика*, 1–, Београд 1959–.

Симоновић 1959: Симоновић, Д., *Ботанички речник*, Београд.

СлДр: *Славянские древности. Этнолингвистический словарь*, 1–, ред. Н. И. Толстой, Москва 1995 (I), 1999 (II), – в. СлМит.

СлМит: *Словенска митологија*. Енциклопедијски речник, ред. С. М. Толстој, Љ. Раденковић, Београд 2001. – в. СлДр.

Срезневский 1893–1912: Срезневский, И. И., *Материалы для словаря древнерусскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ*, I–III, Санкт-Петербург.

СРНГ: *Словарь русских народных говоров*, 1–, Гл. ред. Ф. П. Филин, Москва – Санкт--Петербург (Ленинград), 1965–.

Трубачев 1960: Трубачев, О. Н., *Происхожедние названий домашних животных в славянских языках*, Москва.

Фасмер 1986–1987: Фасмер, М., *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, I–IV, прев. и доп. О. Н. Трубачева, Москва.

ЭССЯ: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*, 1–, Москва 1974–.

ЭСБМ: *Этымалагічны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, 1–, Мінск 1978–.

Псл. *koty, -ъve 'сидро', 'мачка' или нешто друго?

У раду се преиспитују лингвистички и екстралингвистички аспекти досадашег тумачења (п)сл. именице *koty, -ъve 'сидро' као метафоре према општесловенском германизму, зоониму *kotъ 'мачка'. Пружају се и образлажу аргументи за извођење ове именице од домаћег глагола *kotiti 'котрљати, ваљати, бацати' преко неког од његових (четири односно пет) поствербала *kotъ, или путем конкретизације апстрактума у значењу 'бацање' или специјализацијом конкретума у значењу 'мотка итд.'. Иако је тежиште разматрања на термину за 'сидро', узгред се помињу и могућности начелног и конкретног тумачења осталих речи истог облика које до сада нису биле предмет пажње етимолога.

Институт за српски језик САНУ
Кнез-Михаилова 36, 11000 Београд, Република Србија
jasna.vlajic@sanu.ac.rs