ROMANOSLAVICA 40

100 SLAVIC BASIC ROOTS: ONCE AGAIN ON SLAVIC *SЪTO* AND THE SLAVIC ETHNOGENESIS

Sorin Paliga
University of Bucharest

Introduction

In a series of papers and other studies I tried to approach two major, and much debated, topics: the origin of Sl. *sъto* (and of other much debated forms, the origin of which has been intensely debated), and a hopefully closer (and better) analysis of Slavic ethnogenesis. I shall not repeat, of course, what I wrote in those quoted papers, but would like to sum up the basic ideas, and to attempt some finetuning of relevant data. In the final part of this paper I shall present a selective list of 100 basic Slavic roots. The selection is subjective, but will hopefully show the relevant data for understanding the essential reference points in early Slavic history.

Our approach is mainly that of a linguist, without ignoring historical or archaeological data.

Once again on Sl. *sъto*

In one of the quoted studies I advanced the hypothesis that Sl. *sъto* is a borrowing from either a northernmost Thracian dialect or from Proto-Romanian. In the third, posthumous, volume of France Bezlaj's *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, letters P–S: 318 (dopolnila in uredila Marko Snoj in Metka Furlan) we may read:

"Še manj utemeljeno je mnenje, po katerem je psl. **sъto* izposojeno iz dak. **su(m)tə* < **ḱm̥tóm*, kar naj bi se ohranilo v rum. *sută* in trak. atpn. *Σουντους* (Paliga, SR, XXXVI, 349 ss.)."

I hesitated for years to comment editors's view on my previous paper in *Slavistična Revija*. I shall perhaps disappoint both Prof. Snoj and Prof. Furlan, but I am compelled to add that, out of all the papers, studies or books dedicated to the complex topic of the numerals in the Indo-European languages, in general, and

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

Slavic, in particular, my paper is – I am afraid – the only one which is coherent and brings forth arguments that indeed Sl. *sъto* is a borrowing from either North Thracian or Proto-Romanian. I agree with the detail that in this study I concentrated mainly on the situation of Sl. *sъto* and just tangentially to other borrowings from North Thracian or Proto-Romanian into PES. I cannot present here the quite extensive list of such words, but some relevant data must be briefly analysed, first of all those which support and confirm that Thr. and/or Proto-Romanian *u* was reflected as PES ъ. One example is obvious: colloquial Latin **cumatra* (classical *commater*) > Proto-Romanian *cumătră* > PES *kъmotra*. The case of *cumătră* is relevant, because its clear origin helps reconstructing the details of phonetic evolution.

It would be of course interesting to compile a more comprehensive list of such early borrowings in PES. This is a task of another study, almost finished. Nevertheless, some essential points should be clarified now (even i repeating what already stated before). It is thus sufficient to have a brief look at the status of *sъto* among the other Slavic numerals, first of all to compare *sъto* with the situation of *desętь* and *tysǫšta* and, as already stated, one may note the essential difference against *sъto*: not only the presence of ъ against ę and ǫ , but also the obvious nounlike character of *sъto* as compared to the other numerals. This is EXACTLY the situation in Romanian: the numerals for 'ten', 'one hundred' and 'one thousand' ARE NOUNS, in fact. Perhaps this is not very clear if we analyse *zece* 'ten' (< Lat. *decem*), but it becomes immediately clear if we note that the forms for 20 etc. behave like nouns: *douăzeci* (*două zeci*), lit. 'two tens', of feminine gender; similarly, and clearer *o sută* and *o mie* 'one hundred' and 'one thousand' respectively.

Slavic *sъto* and Romanian *sută* are, ultimately, 'intrusive' in both Slavic and Romanian, respectively. It would be just simple ignorance to not note the obvious similarity of these situations. And we are again compelled to revert to Giuliano Bonfante's brilliant study on the earliest influence of Romanian (Proto-Romanian) on Proto-Slavic (initially published in 1966, then a chapter in his reference book *Studi Romeni*).

The overall situation of Sl. *sъto* would be of course much clearer if we tempted to analyse it in the context of the numerous Thracian and/or Proto-Romanian elements in Slavic. The epithet *numerous* may seem abusive, so I shall try to explain and clarify why I habe used this formula.

The Slavic Homeland and Slavic Ethnogenesis

I shall attempt to only sum up the essential data of a still debated and debatable topic. A brief presenttion of the complex Slavic ethnogenesis is to date available in

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

electronic PDF format. I tried to resume there the numereous hypotheses, with variants and subvariants, of the Slavic ethnogenesis. Very briefly, our basic view is:

1. The Slavic ethnogenesis may be fairly well circumscribed to the interval from the 4th to the 6th century A.D. Earlier archaeological data do not allow us to postulate a Slavic ethnic group as we know it from earliest historical documents.

2. The Slavic ethnogenesis should be analysed and considered in the light of a larger phenomenon of reshaping the linguistic and ethnic realities of that historical period. From this point of view, the Slavs were a component of the major and vast ethnolinguistic changes of the interval from the 4th to the 10th century A.D.

3. Perhaps the oldest theory, namely the Balto-Slavic theory, is the best, with some corrections, allowed by the recent discoveries in this field. We assume that the interval circumscribed from the 4th to the 6th centuries A.D. witnessed a cohabitation, difficult to analyse in very detail, but clear enough by interdisciplinary analysis, of three satem groups, which later led to the Slavic *ethnicum*: South Baltic, West Iranic and North Thracian. We tried to prove that the Slavic nucleus is presented by the South Baltic component (and this is why we argumented that the oldest BaltoSlavic is basically the best one). To these three satem components, a Germanic component was later added, and THIS IS THE STAGE WE KNOW FROM EARLIEST HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS BEGINNING WITH THE 6TH CENTURY A.D. In the course of time, East Romance (Proto-Romanian) elements were also borrowed and integrated in the Slavic vocabulary.

4. Aleksandar Loma is the linguists who has lately brought forth the most decisive arguments that we should speak of Proto-Slavic A and Proto-Slavic B (Loma's paper for the International Congress of Slavicists, Ljubljana, August 2003). In Loma's view, we should approach Proto-Slavic (or, better perhaps, PES) as an agglutination of two satem idioms. This is, but otherwise put, what we have been argumenting over the last years: Proto-Slavic, which got its contours to an idiom we know from the second part of the 9th century A.D., is an amalgamation of THREE satem components: South Baltic, North Thracian and West Iranic, with its South Baltic component as, we may say, its basic nucleus, and with North Thracian and West Iranic components as secondary components. In traditional linguistic terms, South Baltic (or, hopefully clearer put, its more southern part of what was once defined as Balto-Slavic) is the stratum, and North Thracian and West Iranic represent the superstratum languages.

5. There is a third superstratum language, Germanic, which is also identifiable in a lingustic analysis.

6. And there was also the Uralic adstratum, loosely identifiable in some probably related forms like *kъ́niga, kńiga*, Hung. *könyv*.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

From the archaeological point of view, Godłowski is perhaps the most relevant in also contouring the idea that the Slavic ethnogenesis cannot be dated earlier than the 4th century A.D., and which should be envisaged as a 'mobile ethnogenesis', i.e. the Slavic ethnogenesis consolidated and got its contours known from the earliest documents a short before and some time after the beginning of the expansion.

Compiling a basic set of Protoslavic roots

The following lexicon of 100 Slavic roots is, inevitably, subjective. Nevertheless I have tried to work out a coherent set of rules to reflect:

• the basic vocabulary covering the essential activities of man in an archaic, traditional society;

• the main and secondary components of the Proto-Slavic vocabulary: South Baltic, North Thracian, West Iranic, Germanic and East Romance (Proto-Romanian).

With these in view, we assume that this basic lexicon definitely confirms both Godłowski's archaeological analysis and also Aleksandar Loma's theory of Proto-Slavic A and Proto-Slavic B. In traditional linguistic terms, we assume that:

- The **Slavic stratum** is represented by a southern branch of the reconstructable Balto-Slavic common Indo-European heritage. This would roughly be Loma's Proto-Slavic A.

- The **substratum** is represented by certain elements the etymology of which is isolated, and may sometimes have associations with Fenno-Ugrian but also with older, Pre-Indo-European elements.

- The **superstratum** is represented by north Thracian and east Iranic elements; this latter component is Loma's Proto-Slavic B.

- The **adstratum** is represented by Germanic and Early Romance (i.e. Proto-Romanian) elements.

In Loma's terms, we assume therefore that there were at least three basic elements, which contoured Slavic as we know it from earliest documents: (1) the south component of the Balto-Slavic heritage = the stratum; (2) North Thracian and East Iranic elements = the superstratum; (3) Germanic and East Romance elements = the adstratum.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

100 Slavic Roots

The list below, with its inevitable subjective character, aims at putting together 100 essential Slavic roots. Its main purpose is to show the three satem-type early components of PES, i.e.

(a) a presumably basic nucleus of a satem idiom akin to Baltic (precursor of modern Lithuanian and Latvian, for convenience labelled **Proto-Slavic A**) but also to Iranic (**Proto-Slavic B**) and northern Thracian (**Proto-Slavic C**).

(b) various influences may be observed in PES: Germanic, Iranic, Thracian and East-Romance (Proto-Romanian).

(c) Late PES, which fused the three basic satem-type components mentioned above, was a language which took contours in the first centuries of the Christian era, probably between 4th to 6th centuries. It is difficult (read: impossible) to trace back ProtoSlavic before the 4th century A.D.

1. **ablo** 'apple'. Related to Lith. *abœolas,* German *Apfel,* English *apple*, Old Irish *abhall, ubhal*. The forms are spread only in Europe, so the origin may ultimately be Pre-Indo-European.

2. **aje** 'egg'; in modern Slavic languages with either *j* and *v* and diminutival suffix *-ce*: *jajca, vejce*. IE * *ōv-o-jom* and, according to some linguists, by the law of Vrddhi a derivative from 'bird' as Lat. *avis*. Other related forms are Arm. *ju*, Irish *og* but a common PIE form is difficult to reconstruct.

3. **bojati sę** 'be afraid'. IE **bhey-*, also preserved in Lith. *bijoti-s* 'be afraid', *bajus* 'frightening'.

4. **baran, beran** 'he-sheep'. Old Pre-Indo-European word preserved in some isolated contexts, e.g. Rom. *b"r* 'calling a sheep' (also NL, NM *Bârsa*), Basque *baran*, same meaning as in Slavic.

5. **bělъ** 'white'. IE **bhe-* 'to shine; bright', Lith. *baltas* 'white', Latvian *balts* 'white', hence the name of the Baltic Sea. Related to Rom. *băl, bălan* 'blond, blond-haired', from Thracian, with a normal intervocalic *l* in an indigenous element.

6. **bergъ** 'river side; a peak'. Related to Arm. *berj* 'a peak', Germ. *Berg* 'a hill, mountain'. The expected reflex in Slavic would have been **beržь*, so the word follows a centum influence or a centum borrowing, presumably Germanic. Cf. Rom. NM *Bârgău*.

7. **bogъ** 'god'. Seemingly borrowed from an eastern satem language which must be an Iranic (Scythian) idiom, cf. Neo-Persian *bay* 'god', primitive meaning 'the one

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

who gives, is generous'. • **bogatъ** 'rich' is derived from the basic root. Reflects component B or PES.

8. **bolto** 'a pond'. Related to Lith. *bala* 'marsh'; cf. *bělъ*. Final *-to* is unclear. Anyway, it is related to Rom. *baltă*, Alb. *baltë* 'a pond'. Borrowing from North Thracian or Proto-Romanian? Or should be assigned to component C of PES?

9. **bratrъ**, **bratъ** 'brother'. IE **bhrater*, hence Lat. *frater*, Eng. *brother*, Germ. *Bruder* etc. Old IE root specific for family relations; cf. *sestra*.

10. **brazda** 'a furrow' (= a dig in the earth). Old European farm term, perhaps of Pre-Indo-European origin, cf. Lith. *biržis,* Latv. *birze* 'id.', Gallic *rica* 'id.'

11. **bukъ** 'the beech tree' (*fagus*). Considered an essential word for determining the Slavic homeland; present day distribution is west of the axis Kaliningrad-Danube Delta. Related to Germ. *Buche,* Eng. *beech*; some assume that the Slavs borrowed the word from Germanic.

12. **byti** 'to be', primitive meaning probably 'to grow, to appear', related to Lat. *fuī,* Old Indian *bh*ā*vati* 'happens, exists'.

13. **bьrati** 'to take; carry'. IE **bher-* 'to carry', hence also Lat. *fero*, Arm. *berem* etc.

14. **cěna** 'price', primitive meaning 'compensation for a wound or evil made to someone else', cf. Lith. dial. *kaina* 'revenge, penalty'.

15. **čarь, čarъ** 'a charm, a magic'. Related to Lith. *keri, kereti* 'to charm someone with bad eye', IE **ker-* 'create, make'.

16. **časъ** 'time; course of time-flow'. Seemingly related to *česati* 'to hasten, speed up'; otherwise the etymon is unclear.

17. **čelo** 'forehead'. Origin unknown.

18. **čьrnъ** 'black'. Seemingly an old IE root for denoting dark colours, as in Rom. *cioară* 'a crow' (< Thracian), Alb. *sorrë* 'a crow' (Thraco-Illyrian).

19. **dati** 'to give': *damь, dasi,* dast*ь, damъ, date, dadętь* 'I give, you give, etc.'. Related to a largely spread IE family with the same meaning, e.g. Lat. *do, dare* etc.

20. **dъkti** 'daughter'. Related to Eng. *daughter*, all from IE **dhughəter-*'daugher'.

21. **dьnь**, gen. **dьne** 'day', initially 'the bright (= sunny) part of a day' (as opposed to night = the dark part of a day). The masculine gender of the (sunny) day is opposed to the feminine gender of *nocь* 'night' (as in German: *Tag* v. *Nacht*). Old IE root **dei-eu, *dj-eu-* as in Lat. *dies* 'day'.

22. **dьrzъ** 'bold, courageous'. Related to Lith. *drąs* 'bold', Av. *daršyu* 'bold, powerful', Gr. *δϱασύς* 'bold'. The expected form would have been **dьrsъ* which

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

would have resulted in **dьrchъ*. The form may be of Thracian origin, cf. Thracian god-name *Derzelas* 'powerful (one)' and Rom. *dârz* 'powerful, bold', unjustly considered sometimes of Slavic origin. The situation seems rather reverse: a Thracian or Proto-Romanian influence in Proto-Slavic, as in *sъto* (see the list of numerals) and *kъmotra*.

23. drěvo, gen. *drěva* and *drěvese* 'wood'. Proto-form must have been ******dervo,* gen. *derva,* pl. *drъva*. Related to Lith. *dervà* 'wood of the plant *Vaccinium*', Goth. *triu* 'tree, wood', Eng. *tree* etc. IE proto-form probably was ******der-u-* or ******dor-u-*.

24 dǫbъ'oak'. Related to Germanic ******tanw*ō 'fir-tree' and Finnish *tammi* 'oak'. All these forms must ultimately be of Pre-Indo-European origin or, in the light of Andreev's Proto-Boreal theory, of archaic 'Boreal' origin, and reflect indigenous European terms related to a specific flora.

25. duchъ 'spirit, (holy) ghost' and **duše** 'soul'; also related **dychati** 'to breathe'. Old term related to the basic conception of life, spirit, breathing and, by opposition, death. The meaning and form 'spirit' is closely related to Lith. *dvãsas* 'id.', whereas the sphere 'soul' – 'to breathe', IE proto-forms must have been ******dousos* and ******dous-jā* respectively. The Indo-Europeans seemingly had two conceptions: (1) 'soul, breathing' as in OHD ******ātum*, Lat. *anima* (hence Rom. *inimă* 'heart'), Gr. *ψνχή*, and (2) 'spirit, ghost' as in German *Geist* and Hitt. *ištanza*. It is not clear to what extent the Hittite form may be related to Hungarian *Isten* 'god' (also the Christian supreme divinity).

26. gadъ 'snake, serpent'. Related to many folk beliefs. Unclear, probably indigenous of Pre-Indo-European origin.

27. golva 'head'. Related to Lith., Latv. *galva,* perhaps also Lat. *calva*. There is no other detectable relationship, possibly central-east European term of Pre-Indo-European origin.

28. ględǫ, ględěti, iter. **ględajo, ględati** 'to look at, analyse by looking at'. Related to Latv. *glendēt* 'look at, for', Ir. *in-glennat* '(they) look for', M. Eng. *glenten* > *glean*. The archaic meaning must have been related to 'mental analysis by, through, after seeing', so the later developments preserved one of these basic meanings.

29. globokъ 'deep'. Development of type root + *-okъ* as in *šir-okъ* 'broad' and *vys-okъ* 'high', therefore suffix *–okъ* was related to the notion of 'vast, big, deep'. The only relation of Slavic root *glǫb-* may be Old Indian *gambh-* 'depth'.

30. gъnati, goniti 'to run (fast)'. IE root ******gen-* is weakened by ъ not the usual ь. Related to Lith. *genù, giñti* 'to run', Latv. *dzenu, dzìt* and *ganīt*, also Old Prussian *guntwei* 'to run'.

31. gněvъ 'fury'. Unclear origin. Words in the semantic sphere 'fury' may be

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

related to the divine influence, malefic or benefic; see the discussion in Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational.*

32. gora 'hill, mountain'; sometimes 'forest'. The only related forms seem to be Old Indian *giri,* Av. *gairi* 'hill, mountain', Lith. *gìrė, girià* 'forest'. On the other hand, there are Pre-Indo-European forms with root **K-R-, *G-R-* which might be taken into consideration. Cf. Rom. *grui* 'a (low) hill' (frequent in place-names), PN *Gruia.*

33. gorěti 'to burn'. Related to Gr. *θέρομαι* 'I warm up', *θέρος* 'hot, warm' etc.

34. gospodь 'lord, master', in OCS '(My) Lord = God'. In some modern Slavic languages (South and East Slavic) 'Sir, Mr.' Seemingly a compound word from **gos-* from **ghosti-* and *podь* from *potis* 'a master'; the proto-form probably was **ghostis-potis* 'master of the guest'. IE **ghostis* meant 'foreigner' and 'guest'; later some IE languages "worsened" the meaning, and 'foreigner' resulted in 'enemy (foreigner)', then 'enemy' in general. Slavic *gostь* 'guest' is related to Latin *hostis* 'enemy' (hence *hostile*), but English *guest* preserves the same meaning as in Slavic.

35. govędo 'cattle'. Related to Lith. *galvìas '*cattle' and German *Kalb* 'calf'. The initial *l* of the root disappeared by disimilation: *l-n* > *-n*, whereas suffix *-ędo* is isolated and unclear. As in other cases, this was a collective noun with gramatically singular form and plural meaning, as *telę*, in the oblique cases in *-ęt-a,* later turning into *-ęda,* hence a singular *-ędo*. It may be assumed that *govьno* '(animal) excrement' is derived from the same root *gov-,* but not all the linguists agree with this view.

36. govъrъ > **gъvorъ** 'noise' > 'speech'; **gъvoriti, govoriti** 'to speak'. The archaic meaning was 'make a loud noise, to yell'; the Slavic form is isolated, maybe related to Gr. *thórybos* 'noise' from IE **gh*^{w}*orub-os*; if so, with the alternance *b/v* in Slavic.

37. gordъ 'a fortress'; basic meaning: 'to surround with a fence, to make an encircled, protected place' as revealed in the verbs derived from this root (*o-graditi, pre-graditi, za-graditi*). Related to Hittite *gurta-* 'a fortress', AHD *garto,* modern German *Garten* 'garden', Lat. *hortus* 'a garden'. Rom. *gard* 'a fence' (hence also *a îngrădi* 'to make a pen, to encircle'*, îngrăditură* 'a pen for cattle') is not borrowed from Slavic, as formerly held by some linguists, by reflects a parallel heritage from Thracian; also Alb. *gardh* 'a fence', closely related to Romanian.

38. gъrdlo 'throat; neck'. Basic meaning must have been 'to eat' as in *žьrǫ, žrěti* 'to eat', IE **gwerə-*; *gъrdlo* is thus derived with suffix *-dlo* from this root; the different phonetic treatment *gъr v. žьrǫ, žrěti* is due to the initial 'dark' vocalic component of *r* in PIE, preserved in Proto-Slavic.

39. gruša 'a pare'. Related to Lith. *griaušė,* same meaning. No further identifiable relationship, probably an archaic Pre-IE element.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

40. gvězda, zvězda (OCS **dzvězda**) ‘a star’. The modern Slavic languages preserved either forms beginning in *gv-* (in Czech and Slovak *g* turned to *h*, which notes a voiced glottal, opposed to *ch,* unvoiced) or in *zv-*: Czech *hvězda,* Slovak *hviezda,* Polish *gwiazda;* Russian *zvezdá,* Ukrainian *zvizdá*; Bulgarian, Serbian and Slovene *zvezda,* Croatian *zvijezda.* • Closely related to the Baltic forms represented by Lith. *žvaigždė*, Latvian *zvaigzne*, same meaning. The initial meaning was 'to shine, to glitter', lost in Slavic, but preserved in Lith. *dvazgėti*; hence was derived **dvazg-jā*, then *j* was shifted (“anticipated”) in the first syllable (**dvaizg-ā*), followed by a change of the group *d-g* to *g-d*: **gvaizdā* > *gvězda.* In the eastern and southern group the second palatalisation occurred, and the group *gvai-* developed to *dzvě-,* and then again *dz* > *z.*

41. goldъ, OCS **gladъ** ‘hunger’. Considered related to *žlьděti,* S.-Cr. *žudim, žud(j)eti* ‘look for, be greedy’; Gothic *grēdus* ‘hunger’ (related to Eng. *greed*) may belong to the same family. No other relationship is analysable outside Slavic and Germanic.

42. cholpъ ‘mature man; a man in general; young, powerful man’. In modern Slavic languages, the meanings vary: ‘young man’, but also 'mature man' dialectally (Czech), ‘a peasant’ (Polish), ‘idiot’ (Ukrainian). Etymon difficult to identify, possibly related to Old Norse *garpr* ‘tüchtiger Mann’, Icelandic *garpur* ‘tüchtiger Kerl’ as Machek assumes.

43. chlěbъ ‘bread’. Borrowed from, or related to, Germanic **hlaiba-,* Gothic *hlaifs*, the South Germanic word for ‘bread’ against North Germanic *Brot,* Eng. *bread.* There is no decissive argument for/against borrowing from Germanic or for/ against non-borrowing, but most linguists are inclined to consider the form as borrowed from Germanic. This would comply with other arguments regarding Slavic ethnogenesis.

44. chъmeľъ ‘hops’; basic element for preparing beer. Some linguists assume that the term was borrowed from an Oriental or Caucasian language, spread – maybe by the Turkic Bulgars – to Europe; there are similar or identical forms in many European languages. A decisive answer to this problem may be offered by palaeobotanical investigations which would identify the homeland. The term might be Pre-IE, and also shared by some Oriental languages. There is no argument supporting the hypothesis that hops was brought to Europe by Oriental people; it may be rather included in the large category of botanical term specific to the European languages of the IndoEuropean family.

45. chodъ ‘a walk’, **choditi** ‘to walk’. IE **sod-o-s*, from root **sed-* ‘to go, walk’, Gr. *hodós*, same origin and meaning; compare Gr. *ex-odos* and Slavic *is-chodъ* ‘exit’.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

46. chormъ ‘a cathedral; a solid building’. Seemingly related to Hittite *karimmi*, Genitive *karimnaš* ‘a temple, a cult-place’, Old Indian *harmyá* ‘a solid building, a fortress’. Old Indian *h* and Hittite *k* may go back to an initial *gh* in PIE; the initial form in Proto-Slavic may have been **gormъ* > **chormъ*.

47. choťǫ, chotěti ‘to wish (for), to want’. Related to Lithuanian *ketù, ketéti* ‘to have in mind, to plan’ and Greek *χατέω* (< **khateiō*) ‘to wish intensely’. Proto-Slavic form presumably was **kotěti* and had a deep stressing meaning, so replaced the neutral meaning in *vel-* ‘to want, to wish’ (as in Latin *volo, velle*), hence *voliti.*

48. jar- ‘year; spring’. In modern Slavic languages of neutre or feminine gender. The archaic meaning was ‘year’, thus related to Germ. *Jahr*, Eng. *year* etc. < IE **jōr-*. The newer meaning ‘spring’ (as in Czech and Slovak) reflects the traditional, popular New Year which was on March 1st.

49. jebǫ, *jebti (jebati) Usually held for vulgar, taboo word: ‘to have sexual intercourse’; preserved in most Slavic languages, with this sense in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene; in Czech meant ‘to curse, to swear (on)’. Spread at colloquial level, and thus largely used. Seemingly related to Greek *οίφω* ‘to have sexual intercourse with’ (only about humans; referrring to animals, the Greeks used *οχένω*); similarly, formally and semantically, Skr. *yábhati-*.

50. jezero, also **jezerъ** ‘a lake’. Related to Lithuanian *ēžeras*, Latvian *ezers* ‘a lake’; further relationship is unclear. A. Vaillant assumes that is derived from *jez* ‘a levee’, i.e. ‘lakes are obtained by setting levees on a river’, a particularly improbable explanation.

51. językъ ‘tongue’, also ‘language’. Loosely related or relatable to Latin *lingua*, but it is difficult to reconstruct the Proto-Slavic form. For the word in this category there presumably was tabooing, but we can refer to a primitive meaning ‘narrow’, in which case may be related to *ǫzъkъ* ‘narrow’, but this may also be fortuitous.

52. jętro ‘liver’. Related to Old Indian *antrá-* ‘interior (parts)’, Latin *interior,* Greek *’éντερα* < IE **en-tero-, *entr-* ‘interior (part)’ hence ‘essential limb’.

53. jьdǫ, iti ‘to walk’. Suffix *-d-* probably reflects the archaic IE imperative **i-dhi!*; IE root was **ei/i*, **ei-mi,* pl. **i-mes.* Related to Lat. *eo, ire* etc.

54. jьgo (from **jъgo*) ‘a yoke’. Archaic, essential term related to Lat. *jugum,* Gr. *ζυγόν,* Germ. *Joch* etc. < IE **jug-o-m*, **yeug-* ‘to tether; to link’.

55. jьmę, **jьmene** ‘name’. Unclear relationship to other forms; Lat. *nōmen,* Old Indian *nāma* had root **nō-*, whereas Greek *’óνομα* has prothetic *o* etc. Other forms of this category show that the origin may have been a verb with the supposed meaning ‘to speak, to communicate, to discriminate by choosing a name’, but these are only hypotheses.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

56. **kamy**, **kamene** ‘stone’. The proto-form was *-*mōn,* Gen. ***-*men-es**, with the archaic shift *o/e*, cf. Lith. *akmu›*, Gen. *ak-me–-s*, Latvian *akmens*, Old Indian *aśman*, Avestan *asman-* ‘stone’, etc. The word must be archaic, and some meanings go back to the Neolithic. PIE root was **aḱ-*, so its preservation in the satem area must be explained as either an exception or the influence of the neighbouring *a* and *m* (which cannot be a decisive argument in itself).

57. **kolěno** ‘knee’. Related to Lith. *kelenas* ‘knee’, maybe also Irish *cenél* ‘kneeing, veneration’. No further identifiable relationship.

58. **koń** **ь** 'horse’. Presumably abridged from an older form **komoń* **ь,** which – in its turn – may be related to Lat. *caballus* (with the alternance *b/m*). The word would be non-Indo-European or, at least, not from the PIE vocabulary stock (which resulted in Lat. *equus,* Gr. *ὕ*[11]*ος*, Lithuanian *ašva*, etc.

59. **koza** ‘(she)-goat’. Sacred animal, preserved in seasonal rites until today in various parts of Europe. The word is possibly related to Old Indian *ajā* ‘she-goat’; no other relationship has been identified or is identifiable.

60. **kupiti, kupovati** ‘to buy’. From Germanic ***kaupjan**, German *kaufen,* in its turn derived from *koufo* ‘businessman’, Gothic *kaupōn* ‘make business, be a merchant’ < Latin *caupō, -ōnis* ‘owner of a boutique, small merchant’. The word is ultimately of unknown origin, but reached the far north, as in Finnish *kauppa*, hence *kaupunki* ‘town’ (i.e. place of trade’) and *kauppala* ‘township’, formerly ‘a market place’.

61. **kǫpati,** *kǫpǫ* ‘to bathe’. Unknown origin, maybe related to root *kon-* ‘hemp’; this relation was suggested on the basis that the Scythians did not bathe, but used something related to the Finnish sauna in which they used hemp for certain bathing rites. This somewhat undecided explanation may be eventually replaced by another one, assuming that bathing had the sacred meaning of purification; the word might thus be of Pre-Indo-European origin.

62. **kъmy, kъmene** ‘a trunk; a family tree, an ethnic group’. The initial meaning seems to have been that reflected in IE **teutā*, preserved in Slavic too (see *tudь, ťudь*). This semantic sphere was replaced in Slavic by *kъmy, kъmene* and *plemě*. • Related to Gr. *kȳma* from IE **ku-mōn,* with zero grade in Greek, **ku-mn̥.* Also related is, as often, Lithuanian *kamenas*, with the same meaning as in Slavic.

63. **kъnędzь** ‘princeps’ (a typical term for the local local and military leader until, in some Slavic languages, was replaced by West European and Byzantine terminology). Borrowed from Germanic *kuning* (modern German *König*). The term was also borrowed in Finnish: *kuningas.*

64. **kъńiga, kńiga** ‘a book; a letter, something written’. Pan-Slavic, but obviously

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

not Proto-Slavic. Etymology difficult to determine, the only related form being Hungarian *kšnyv* 'a book'; OCS spelling *kъn* is a mere graphic convention, as the group *kn* could not be spelled as such, but only as *kъn*. • Given the etymological difficulties, some assume that the ultimate origin is Chinese *king*, though this would be the unique case of a Chinese word in Slavic; the route would have been: Chinese > Proto-Bulgar (Turkic) > Hungarian > Slavic; the obvious relation with Hungarian *könyv* would indicate an eastern origin, but this generic assumption is not sufficient. The simplified Chinese transcription *king* may be misleading, as the pronounciation is *t''ng*.

65. ledъ 'ice'. Related to Lith. *lēdas*, Latvian *ledus*. No other relationship outside Balto-Slavic.

66. lěsъ 'a forest, woods'. Old meaning seemingly was 'leaved culture, an area with many leaves', thus may be related to Latin *lūcus* < IE **loiḱ-o-s*; Lith. *šilas* may be derived from the same root, with metathesis **les-/leš- > šil-*; may also be a simple hypothesis.

67. lěto 'year; summer (< 'best part of the year'). Unknown origin, isolated form among the neighbouring languages.

68. lipa 'lime, linden tree (Tilia)'. From **lēipā* the only relantionship may possibly be with Cymric *llwyf* 'elm-tree (Ulmus)'.

69. ľudъ, ľudьje 'people; nation, people viewed as a collectivity'. The basic meaning must have been that preserved in Old Russian *ljudinъ* 'free man' as opposed to *knjaži muže* 'people in the service of the *kъnędzь*'. The *l'udьje* must have been those free people; related to Lith. *liáudis* (fem. gender), Latvian *laudis* (masc. gender), OHD *liut* (German *Leute*), Lat. *līber* 'free', Greek *ἐλεύτερος* (*e-leut-eros*) 'free'. Seemingly the forms reflect an archaic opposition **teutā* 'man' (singular) – **leudh-* 'people' (plural); see also s.v. *tudь, t'udь*.

70. medъ 'bee-honey'. Old word, related to Old Indian *mádhu* 'mead, hydromel', Gr. *μέδυ* 'alcoholic drink, wine', Lith. *medùs*, Latvian *medus*. The initial meaning must have been 'hydromel, mead', and (from taboo reasons?) was transfered to 'honey'. The PIE word for 'bee-honey' is preserved in Latin *mel* and Greek *μέλι*. Similar forms in Finnish *mete,* Hungarian *méz,* Mordvinian *m'ed'*, Lappish *mītt*. All these forms support Andreev's Proto-Boreal theory; the Uralic forms must not necessarily be explained as borrowings from PIE, but independently preserved from Proto-Boreal. • Slavic **medvědъ** 'bear' (lit. 'honey-eater'), eufemistic form for a tabooed animal.

71. melko 'milk'. Related to only Germanic: Eng. *milk,* German *Milch.* Maybe

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

borrowed from Germanic or rather a common indigenous form preserved in the two linguistic groups.

72. **męso** 'meat'. Related to Gothic *mimz*, Latvian *miesa*, proto-forms **mēs-ro-* and **mems-ro-*.

73. **moldъ** 'young'. Old meaning was probably 'mild, fragile' (the IE word for 'young' was **younos* > Slavic *junъ*, Eng. *young* etc.), the opposite of *starъ* 'old'. Related to Lat. *mollis* < IE **m̥dv-i-s*.

74. **moljǫ, moliti** 'to pray (for oneself), to invoke the gods' will'; later the verb turned reflexive. Related to Lith. *melžd*i, *melsti* 'to pray, to ask for something', *maldà* 'a pray', Hittite *malda(i)-* 'to make a promise, to ask gods for something, to offer a sacrifice to gods'.

75. **myslь** 'understanding, thoughts', hence **mysliti, myslěti** 'to think'. Seemingly related to Greek *μῦθος* 'thinking', later 'word, story'.

76. **mъlviti, mlъviti** 'to speak; to make noise'. Related to Old Indian *bravīti* '(he) speaks, says', PIE **mlewə-*.

77. **nagъ** 'nude, naked'. Related to Lith. *nuogas*, Latvian *nuôgs*, German *nackt,* Eng. *naked* etc., IE root **nog-* with various suffix developments.

78. **nebo**, Gen. *nebese* ' sky; heaven'. Related to Hittite *nepis-* 'sky', Old Indian *nábhas* 'sky; cloud; aeral place', Gr. *νέφος* 'cloudy sky, cloud'. After adoption of Christianity, the word was enriched with new meanings; cf. *rajь*.

79. **noktь** 'night'. IE **nogh-t-, *nokt-* as in Lat. *nox, noctis*, Gr. *νύξ, νυκτός,* Gothic *nahts*, Lith. *naktìs,* Latvian *nakts.*

80. **noga** 'leg'. Isolated, possibly related to Old Norse *knakkr* 'table leg', Norse *knakk* 'animal leg'. The old IE root was preserved in Latin *pēs*, Gr. *πούς*, German *Fuß,* Eng. *foot, feet*, preserved in Slavic as an adverb: *pěšь*, seemingly from **pěš-jь* 'by foot' (to walk by foot' as opposed to 'ride a horse').

81. **pьjǫ, piti** 'to drink'. Hence *pivo* 'beer'. Old IE root, reconstructable as **pō-* (Lat. *pōtus* 'a drink') and **pī-* (Gr. *πίνω*).

82. **pľuťa** n. pl. 'lung(s)'. Modern Slavic languages preserved either the original plural form or simplified to singular. Related to Lith. *plaūčiai*, Latvian *plauši*, both masc. pl. Related to Gr. *πλεύ-μων* and Lat. *pulmō*, with the same meaning. These must be related to the root **pneu-* 'to breathe', therefore an alternance **pleu-*/ **pneu-* must be accepted in prehistoric times.

83. **plodъ** 'offspring; fruit' (also figuratively). Related to Old English *bloed* 'fruit', MHD *blāt* 'harvest'; also French *blé* 'wheat' is from Frank (Germanic) **blād*. There is no archaic IE root reconstructable, so these form must be accepted as indigenous Central-European, possibly of Pre-Indo-European origin.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

84. **plugъ** ‘plough’. Similar forms are in Germanic (Germ. *Pflug,* Eng. *plough*), Baltic (Lith. *plūgas*) and Romanian (*plug*). Romanian form is traditionally held for Slavic, whereas the Slavic form would be borrowed from Germanic or is indigenous. The Slavic origin of Romanian *plug* is at least questionable, and rather reflects the linguistic stereotypes of the 19th century; Rom. *grapă* ‘harrow’ is indigenous Thracian (with Albanian parallel *grep, gërepë* ‘fish hook’) and *a ara* ‘to plough’ is of Latin origin. The Germanic, Slavic, Baltic and Romanian (< Thracian) forms rather reflect Central-European farm terminology; a North Thracian or Germanic origin of Slavic *plugъ* is possible, but is not necessary in order to explain the form; all may reflect old terms referring to agriculture. The ultimate origin is rather Pre-Indo-European, root **P-L-* ‘stone, piece of stone’, so the plough reminds the Neolithic and Chalcolithic stone ploughs.

85. **pravъ** ‘right; straight’. Also *pravda* ‘truth’, *praviti* ‘do, say right’. Isolated forms, perhaps derived from an old root **prō* ‘ahead, advanced; right away’.

86. **pišǫ, pьsati, pisati** ‘to write’. Related to Lith. *pieši, piēšti* ‘to paint with colours, to draw with coal’, Lat. *pingō* ‘I paint’ < IE **peiḱ*. In Slavic, associated with *berǫ, bьrati* ‘to take, to carry’ (against the expected *pišǫ, pisati*).

87. **rajь** ‘paradise, Heavens’. Unclear origin, but Pre-Christian. The old meaning must have been ‘blessed place in Heavens, where gods live’; cf. *nebo, nebese.* According to the traditional view, the word would be of Iranic origin, Avestan *ray-* ‘richness; happiness’ (again traditionally, richness means happiness!), Latin *rēs* ‘thing, property’.

88. **rǫka** ‘hand’. Only with Baltic parallels: Lith. *rankà,* Latvian *ruoka*, Old Prussian *rancko* and the isolated Gallo-Romanic *branca* ‘a paw’, also pejoratively ‘hand’ (hence Romanian *pe brânci* ‘on all fours’, used especially about small babies learning to walk). The IE languages developed local forms for ‘hand’, a tabooed word. Slavic *rǫka* probably derives from IE**wer-,* **wren-k-* ‘to curve, to bend’.

89. **sěkǫ, sěšti** ‘to cut’; **sekyra** ‘a hatchet’. Related to Old Lith. *įsekti, iš-sekti* ‘cut out, cut off’ and Lat. *seco* ‘I cut’. Other relationships are not clear.

90. **sěmę** ‘a seed’ < IE **sē-men*, as in Lat. *sēmen* etc. Old IE term related to agriculture.

91. **sestra** ‘sister’ from an older form **sve-sr-ā* (with epenthetic *t*) < IE **swe-sō(r)*; related to Lat. *soror*, Lith. *sesuõ,* gen. *seseṛs* etc. Epenthetic *t* in the sequence *-sr-* rather indicate a Thracian influence, where this is a normal phonetical feature. Cf. *bratrъ, bratъ.*

92. **synъ** ‘son’; related to Lith. *sūnus*, Gothic *sunus* (German *Sohn*, Eng. *son*) < IE **sū-nu-s*.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

93. **sъlnьce** ‘sun’, of neuter gender; related to Lith. *saulė*, fem., Latvian *saule,* Lat. *sōl*, masc. The neuter gender in Slavic may be explained by assuming that Proto-Slavs venerated Sun as a divinity of either masculine or feminine character.

94. **sьrebro** ‘silver’; related to Lith. *sid‹bras* and Gothic *silubr* (Germ. *Silber,* Eng. *silver*). Further relationship unclear.

95. **tudь, tʾudь** ‘foreign’. Derived with suffix *-jь* from an IE root **tautā, *teutā* ‘nation, ethnic group; foreigner’, hence also Lith. *tautà* ‘nation’, Oscian *touto* ‘a tribe, a group’, and of course the name of the Teutons.

96. **tъrgъ** ‘a market place’. Lith. *turgs*, Latvian *tirgus* and Rom. *târg* are held for Slavic borrowings, but the situation seems more complex. The oldest attested similar forms are in Illyrian *Tergeste*, hence *Tergitio*. As a direct borrowing from Illyrian is impossible (Illyrian became extinct in the 2nd century A.D.) the only reasonable explanation is to assume a Thracian form akin to Illyrian, hence Romanian form as a direct follower of Thracian, and Slavic as a late Thracian or Proto-Romanian borrowing. Baltic forms (Lithuanian and Latvian) may be assumed as borrowed from Slavic. The ultimate, archaic root may be Pre-IE **T-R-* ‘a stone, cliff’, well represented in southeast European place-names.

97. **ucho**, dual form *uši* ‘ear’. Old IE form spread in various languages, e.g. Gothic *ausō*, gen. *ausins* < IE **aus, *ous*.

98. **usta** ‘mouth’ (neutre plural). Standard IE form spread as a gramatically neutre in Indo-Iranic and Italo-Celtic branch as Lat. *ōs* and Old Irish *á* < IE **ōs*.

99. **večer** ‘evening’. Related to Lith. *vãkaras* (< **wekeros*) and Arm. *gišer*, but Lat. *vesperos*, Gr. *‘ésperos* and Cymric *ucher* would require a proto-form **wesperos* as opposed to **wekeros*. There probably was an IE parallel which may lead to **we-kseper-o-s*, hence either **wekeros* or **wesperos*.

100. **viděti** ‘to see’. Old IE root **weid-, *wid-* ‘to see’, hence also ‘to know’ in Slavic **věděti** ‘to know’.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

The Slavic Numerals

jedьnъ, jedinъ There seemingly was no unified word for 'one' in PIE, therefore the IE languages often derived local forms starting from old, basic forms. The primitive construction interpreted 'one' as 'one part/component of a pair', at a time when grammatically the dual was opposed to both 'one' and 'more than two'. The Slavic form resides on a previous construction **ede-inъ*, hence *j-ed-inъ*. The first part of the compound, *-ed-,* is seemingly related to Lat. *–dam* in forms like *quidam, idem*.

dъva, dьvě 'two' (masculine and feminine respectively). PIE **d(u)vō,* cf. Gr. *δύω*, Lat. *duo, duae,* Eng. *two* etc. The numeral was closely associated with the dual form of nouns and verbs, usual with all the IE languages, lost meanwhile in almost all the IE family. As an exception, Slovene still preserves the dual as a vivid form.

trьje, tri 'three'. PIE **tr-ei-es*, Old Indian *tráyas,* Lat. *trēs,* Eng. *three, Germ. drei.*

čtyr- 'four'. PIE **kwet-wor-es,* Gr. *τέτταρες*, Lat. *quattuor* etc.

pęťь 'five'. PIE **penkwe,* hence Gr. πέντε, Arm. *hing,* whereas Lat. *quinque* has *qu-* under the influence of the subsequent *-qu-*; Goth. *fimf* (Germ. *fünf,* Eng. *five*) has second *f* under the influence of the first.

šestь 'six'. The initial form would have been **kseksti,* cf. Lith. *šẽstas*; also Lat. *sex,* Ir. *sé,* Goth. *saíhs*. According to the laryngeal theory, the proto-form could be **s-Hwe-ks*, where *H* notes the laryngeal; *s-* is fluctuant; *k(e)s* could mean 'three'; *Hwe* meant 'two, pair'. As a whole, PIE form meant 'two threes'. There is a long discussion regarding the laryngeals; in this very case, the reconstruction is not the most convincing, which does not mean that the laryngeal theory should be rejected as a whole.

sedmь PIE **septṃ* 'seven', hence Old Indian *sapta,* Lat. *septem,* Ir. *secht*.

osmь 'eight'. PIE **ok'tō(u)* 'eight', Old Indian *aštā, aštāu*, Av. *ašta,* Lat. *octō* etc. Some assume that the ending *ō(u)* is the same as in nom.-acc. dual, so the form would be an archaic 'tetraedric dual', i.e. 'two times four', PIE reconstructed form **ambhi-ḱtō(u)*, in rapid speech reducted to **oḱtō(u).*

devęťь 'nine'. IE **neuṇ*, hence Old Indian *náva,* Lat. *novem,* which is seemingly related to **newos* 'new', i.e. 'nine' is the first numeral after 'two times four' (see above under *osmь*). The archaic Slavic form was probably **devę*.

desęťь 'ten'. Basic numeral of IE origin, Eng. *ten,* Lat. *decem,* etc. The phonetic evolution in Slavic shows it as a genuine old numeral, unlike *sъto* '100', of north Thracian or Proto-Romanian origin. For PIE we may reconstruct **de-k'mt-—m*

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

‘10’ and **k’mt-—m* ‘100’. In Slavic and Germanic, ‘1000’ is derived from ‘100’ and probably meant ‘a big hundred’. There is no reconstructable PIE root for ‘1000’, each language or linguistic family having developed local forms.

съто ‘one hundred’. The expected form would have been **sętь*, if compared to ‘10’ (see), which probably existed before it was replaced by a north-Thracian (or Proto-Romanian) form, cf. Rom. *sută* ‘100’, incorrectly considered of Slavic origin in Romanian. The only Slavic numeral with noun aspect, included in the category of neuters in *-o*. Slavic *sъto* behaves like a noun, as in Romanian and Albanian, where the numerals for ‘10’, ‘100’ and ‘1000’ behave like nouns, a system radically different from Slavic, with the exception of the ‘intrusive’ *sъto*.

tysęšta, tysąšta ‘one thousand’. As in Germanic, ‘1000’ was considered a ‘big, expanded hundred’, and is formed by the prefix **tu-* > Sl. **ty-* + the numeral ‘100’. This Slavic numeral preserves the old form **sętь*, with epenthetic *š* not properly explained, preceded by the prefix *ty-*. Both the forms for ‘10’ and ‘1000’ clearly show that the form ‘100’ is “intrusive”, borrowed.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

References

Beranová, Magdalena 1988. *Slované*. Praha: Panorama.

Bezlaj, France 1961. Die vorslavischen Schichten im slovenischen Namen- und Wortschatz. *VI. Internationaler Kongress für Namenforschung*, München 24.–28. August 1958, hgg. von Karl Puchner, vol. 2: 148–153.

Bezlaj, F. 1976 sq. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.

Bezlaj, F. 1969. Das vorslawische Substrat im Slowenischen. *Alpes Orientales* 5. *Acta Quinti Conventus de Ethnographia Alpium Orientalium Tractantis Graecii Slovenorum 29. III – 1.IV. 1967*. Redegit Niko Kuret. Ljubljana.

Bonfante, Giuliano 1966. Influences du protoroumain sur le protoslave? *Acta Philologica* 5: 53–69.

Duridanov, Ivan 1952. *Mestnite nazvanija ot Lomsko*. Sofia: Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.

Duridanov, Iv. 1960. Der thrakische Einfluss auf die bulgarische Anthroponymie. *Linguistique Balcanique* 2: 69–86.

Duridanov, Iv. 1969. Thrakisch-dakische Studien, I. *Linguistique Balkanique* 13, 2.

Duridanov, Iv. 1975. *Die Hydronimie des Vardar-systems als Geschichtsquelle*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag.

Duridanov, Iv. 1986. Pulpudeva, Plovdiv, Plovdin. *Linguistique Balkanique* 29, 4: 25–34.

Duridanov, Iv. 1989. Nochmals zum namen PLЪPDIVЪ, PLOVDIV. *Linguistique Balkanique* 32, 1: 19–22.

Duridanov, Iv. 1991. Die Ältesten slawishen Entlehnungen im Rumänischen. *Linguistique Balkanique* 34, 1–2: 3–19.

Gimbutas, Marija 1971. *The Slavs*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Godłowski, Kazimierz 2000. *Pierwotne siedziby Słowian*. Wybór pism pod redakcją Michała Parczewskiego. Kraków: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Grafenauer, Bogo 1979. Slovani pred prihodom na Balkanski polotok. *Zgodovina Slovencev,* ed. by Meta Sluga. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba.

Kondratieva, Tamara 2000. *Vechea Rusie*. București: Corint. (French original: Tamara Kondratieva, *La Russie ancienne,* PUF, 1996).

Meillet, Antoine. 1902–1905. *Etudes sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave,* 2 vols. Paris: *f*mile Bouillon.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

Meillet, A. 1922. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 5th ed., Paris.

Mihăilă, Gheorghe 1971. Criteriile determinării mprumuturilor slave în limba română. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 22, 4: 351–366.

Oppermann, Manfred 1984. *Thraker zwischen Karpatenbogen und Ägäis*. Leipzig-Jena-Berlin: Urania.

Paliga, Sorin 1988. Slovansko **sъto* – izzivalen problem? (in Slovene with an English abstract: Slavic **sъto* – a challenging problem?). *Slavistična Revija* 36,4: 349–358.

Paliga, S. 1991. Aperu de la structure étymologique du roumain. *Linguistica* 31: 99–106 (Paulo Tekavčić sexagenario in honorem oblata).

Paliga, S. 1992. Ali obstajo 'urbske' prvine v slovanskih jezikih? (in Slovene with an English abstract : Are there 'Urbian' elements in Slavic?). *Slavistična Revija* 40, 3: 309–313.

Paliga, S. 1993. Slovani, Romunci in Albanci v 1. tisočletju. *Slavistična Revija* 41, 2: 237–243.

Paliga, S. 1997. *Influențe romane și preromane în limbile slave de sud*. București: Lucretius Publishers.

Paliga, S. 1999. *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*. București: Lucretius Publishers.

Raevskij, N.D. 1988. *Contactele romanicilor răsăriteni cu slavii*. Chișinău: Știința.

Rusu, Mircea 1979. Aspecte ale relațiilor dintre romanitatea orientală și slavi. *Acta Musei Napocensis* 16: 189–200.

Sanie, Silviu 1981. *Civilizația romană la est de Carpați și romanitatea pe teritoriul Moldovei, secolele II î.e.n.–III e.n.* Iași: Junimea.

Sîrbu, Valeriu 1993. *Credințe și practici funerare, religioase și magice în lumea geto-dacilor (pornind de la descoperiri arheologice din Câmpia Brăilei)*. Galați: Porto Franco.

Šaur, Vladimír 1975. *Etymologie slovanských příbuzenských termínů*. Praha: Academia.

Tăpkova-Zaimova, V. 1962. Sur les rapports entre la population indigène des régions balkaniques et les "barbares" du VIe–VIIe siècle. *Byzantinobulgarica* 1: 67–78.

Tăpkova-Zaimova, V. 1972. La compétence des sources byzantines sur la survivance de l'ethnie thrace. *Thracia* 1: 223–230.

Teodor, Dan Gh. 1981. *Romanitatea carpato-dunăreană și Bizanțul, secolele V–XI* e.n. Iași: Junimea.

Teodor, D. Gh. 1984. *Continuitatea populației autohtone la est de Carpați. Așezările din secolele VI–XI e.n. de la Dodești-Vaslui*. Iași: Junimea.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1970. *Baltisch-slavisches Wšrterbuch*. Götingen: Vandenhoeck

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universității din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)

& Ruprecht (first edition: 1923).

Váňa, Zdeněk 1983. *Svět dávných Slovanů*. Praha: Artia.

Vasmer, Max 1924. Iranisches aus Südrussland, în *Streitberg Festgabe*. Leipzig.

Velkov, Velizar 1962. Les campagnes et la population rurale en Thrace au IV^{e}–VI^{e} siècle. *Byzantinobulgarica* 1: 31–66.

Velkov, V. 1972. Thrakien in der Spätantike (IV–VI Jhdt.). *Thracia* 1: 213–222.

REZUMAT

100 de rădăcini slave esenţiale: încă o dată despre sl. *sъto* şi despre etnogeneza slavă

Autorul revine asupra unor probleme abordate anterior privind situaţia formei *sъto*, dar şi asupra altor forme vechi româneşti cum ar fi rom. *cumătră*. Lexiconul de 100 rădăcini slave esenţiale confirmă atât analizele anterioare ale autorului cât şi ipotezele relativ recente, datorate lui Kazimierz Godłowski şi lui Aleksandar Loma privind etnogeneza slavilor, cu argumente atât arheologice cât şi lingvistice. Astfel, fondul arhaic slav este reprezentat de un strat balto-slav, apoi de un adstrat nord tracic şi est iranic precum şi de un substrat, reprezentat de câteva forme izolate, uneori având corespondenţe în fondul ugro-finic, precum şi de vechile elemente germanice.

BDD-A24330 © 2005 Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 08:46:34 UTC)