

Mariola Jakubowicz

# The Development of Words Across Centuries

An Outline of a Dictionary  
of Semantic Motivations  
Based on the Material of Slavic Adjectives  
Inherited from the Proto-Slavic Period



MONOGRAPHS



Institute of Slavic Studies,  
Polish Academy of Sciences

# The Development of Words Across Centuries



Mariola Jakubowicz

---

## The Development of Words Across Centuries

An Outline of a Dictionary  
of Semantic Motivations  
Based on the Material of Slavic Adjectives  
Inherited from the Proto-Slavic Period

Translated by  
Artur Zwolski

2

MONOGRAPHS



WARSAW 2017



Institute of Slavic Studies,  
Polish Academy of Sciences

Editorial review

*Dr hab. Aleksandra Janowska, Associate Professor, University of Silesia, Katowice  
& Prof. dr hab. Jadwiga Waniakowa, Jagiellonian University, Cracow*

Originally published in 2010 as *Drugi słów na przestrzeni wieków. Zarys słownika motywacji semantycznych na materiale przymiotników słowiańskich odziedziczonych z prasłowiańszczyzny*, Warszawa: Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN).

Praca naukowa finansowana w ramach programu Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego pod nazwą „Narodowy Program Rozwoju Humanistyki” w latach 2014–2017.

This academic publication was financed within the “National Programme for the Development of Humanities” of the Minister of Science and Higher Education in 2014–2017.



**NATIONAL PROGRAMME  
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMANITIES**

ISS PAS MONOGRAPHS SERIES

Editorial supervision

*Jakub Ozimek*

Cover and title page design

*Barbara Grunwald-Hajdasz*

Editing

*Marta Wróbel*

Typesetting and page makeup

*Andrzej Cedro*

© Copyright by Mariola Jakubowicz

© Copyright for the English translation by Artur Zwolski, 2017

**ISBN: 978-83-64031-64-9**

Instytut Sławistyki Polskiej Akademii Nauk

ul. Bartoszewicza 1b / 17

00-337 Warszawa

tel./fax 22/ 826 76 88

sow@ispan.waw.pl, www.ispan.waw.pl

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	9
PART ONE	
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS .....	11
1. MEANING AND ITS CHANGES.....	13
1. Meaning. Terminological Remarks.....	13
2. Changes in Meaning and Polysemy. Diachrony versus Synchrony .....	15
2.1. Polysemy and Homonymy .....	16
2.2. Types of Diversity of the Content of Words .....	17
2.3. Strings of Meanings .....	19
3. The Methods of Researching Semantic Changes.....	20
3.1. An Approach to Semantic Research. Semasiology and Onomasiology ...	20
3.2. The Modes of Describing Semantic Changes.....	22
3.2.1. Traditional Modes of Description .....	22
3.2.2. The Component Analysis of Meaning.....	23
3.2.3. The Methods Adopted from Cognitive Linguistics .....	24
4. Semantic Motivation .....	26
4.1. The Term .....	26
4.2. Parallel Motivating Meanings.....	29
2. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PROTO-SLAVIC MEANING .....	31
1. General Remarks Concerning the Proto-Slavic Language .....	31
2. Reconstruction of Meanings in Non-Attested Languages. Theoretical Problems.....	33
3. The Reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic Meaning in the Lexicographical Practice .....	37
3.1. The Continuants and Their Hierarchy.....	40
4. The Particular Stages of Reconstruction .....	44
4.1. The Principles of Reconstructing the Meaning Which Is Based on Continuants.....	44
4.2. The Reconstruction of the Structural Meaning .....	45

4.3. The Reconstruction of the Etymological Meaning .....	47
4.3.1. The Adjectives Inherited from the Proto-Indo-European Language ...	47
4.3.2. The Reconstruction of the Etymological Meaning on the Basis of the Proto-Indo-European Root. ....	48
4.4. The Value of the Reconstructed Material under Discussion. The Confrontation of Results .....	49
4.5. The Problem of the Homonyms .....	50
4.6. The Role of Acquaintance with the Realia in the Establishment of a Motivation .....	51
3. THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROTO-SLAVIC ADJECTIVE .....	55
1. The Emergence of the Category of the Adjective .....	55
1.1. The Criteria for Establishing the Proto-Slavic Status of a Word .....	58
2. Productive Adjectival Word-Formative Types .....	59
3. The Division of Adjectives According to Their Origins .....	61
3.1. Former Participles .....	61
3.1.1. The Passive Past Participle with <i>-tъ &lt; -to-</i> .....	62
3.1.2. The Passive Past Participle with <i>-nъ &lt; -no-</i> .....	62
3.1.3. The Present Tense Passive Participle with <i>-mъ</i> .....	63
3.1.4. The Past Tense Participle with <i>-lъ</i> (the Second Active Anterior Participle with <i>-lъ</i> ) .....	63
3.2. Adjectives Related to the Proto-Indo-European Roots with a Verbal Meaning .....	64
3.3. Adjectives Associated with the Proto-Indo-European Roots with a Nominal Meaning .....	65
4. THE PARALLELS OF SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT .....	67
1. State of Research and Postulates .....	67
1.1. The First Onomasiological Dictionaries .....	68
1.2. Contemporary Projects .....	69
1.2.1. The Scope of the Languages Involved .....	70
1.2.2. Chronological Scope .....	71
2. The Proposed Forms of the Dictionary .....	73
3. The Ways of Analyzing the Material .....	74
3.1. Semasiological Order .....	74
3.2. Onomasiological and Semasiological Order .....	76
3.3. Onomasiological Order .....	76
3.4. Semantic Motivation in Atlases .....	77
4. The Choice of Method .....	78
5. Individual Problems Associated with the Research of Semantic Changes ...	79
5.1. Semantic Changes Associated with the Varieties of a Language .....	79
5.2. Linguistic Taboo and Its Euphemization .....	80
5.3. Borrowings and Semantic Calques .....	81
5.4. Words Which Are Attested Only Once ( <i>ἀπαξ λεγόμενα</i> ) .....	82

PART TWO	
ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL .....	83
5. THE RESEARCH MATERIAL AND THE MEANS OF ITS ANALYSIS .....	85
1. The Basis of the Material .....	85
2. The Content of the Semantic Field Under Research .....	90
3. The Structure of the Entries and the Arrangement of the Material Within the Entry .....	91
6. CONCEPTUAL GROUPS .....	95
1A. GOOD .....	95
1B. BAD .....	104
2A. PLEASANT .....	115
2B. UNPLEASANT .....	120
3A. PRETTY .....	126
3B. UGLY .....	134
4A. HIGH/TALL .....	141
4B. LOW/SHORT .....	146
5A. FAT .....	148
5B. THIN .....	155
6A. STRONG .....	160
6B. WEAK .....	173
7A. HEALTHY .....	182
7B. SICK .....	186
8A. YOUNG .....	190
8B. OLD .....	193
9A. QUICK .....	197
9B. SLOW .....	203
10A. VIOLENT .....	205
10B. CALM .....	213
11A. CHEERFUL/MERRY .....	218
11B. SAD .....	221
12A. STERN .....	226
12B. MILD .....	230
13A. BRAVE .....	235
13B. TIMID .....	241
14A. PROUD .....	244
14B. HUMBLE .....	248
15A. DILIGENT .....	251
15B. LAZY .....	257
16A. WISE .....	260
16B. STUPID .....	264
7. A DICTIONARY OF SEMANTIC CHANGES .....	269
1. An Onomasiological Dictionary Arranged According to the Received Meanings .....	271

2. An Onomasiological Dictionary Arranged According to Initial Meanings .....	288
SUMMARY .....	299
1. The Degree of Reliability of a Semantic Reconstruction .....	299
2. The Inclusion of Thematic Groups in the Studied Lexis .....	302
3. The Causes for the Changes of Meanings of the Studied Adjectives.....	304
3.1. The Strings of Minimal Semantic Changes.....	305
3.2. Metaphorical Changes.....	306
4. Research Perspectives.....	308
4.1. Further Work Upon the Model of a Dictionary of Semantic Changes.....	308
4.2. The Tasks Associated With a Dictionary.....	310
4.2.1. The Linguistic Image of the World. Axiological Research.....	311
INDEX OF PROTO-SLAVIC WORDS .....	315
INDEX OF LANGUAGES .....	319
ABBREVIATIONS.....	319
REFERENCES .....	320
DICTIONARIES QUOTED IN THE WORK.....	320
OTHER WORKS.....	323

## INTRODUCTION

The principal aim of this work is to present a model of a dictionary of semantic motivations, which is supposed to be an answer to the postulate of creating a dictionary of motivational parallels that has long continued to be put forward. At the outset I would like to make the reservation that my answer is a partial one, for it involves only a small part of the vocabulary. A more comprehensive answer surely exceeds the limits of one work. In order to perform my task I selected adjectives from the lexical-semantic field which "characterizes people." Its content is sufficiently rich to enable the construction of a model which was planned. The aim that is presented here requires the fulfilment of a number of preparatory aims without which the planned work would be impossible. These preparatory aims include the identification of motivational relationships between the meanings of the adjectives that were researched. However, my task is not to concentrate upon the results which particular conceptual groups yield from the field that was researched but to arrange those conceptual groups into a model. A comprehensive, descriptive recapitulation of the results, a very interesting notion in itself, may become the object of other works of research. In order to provide an exhaustive treatment of the subject it is advisable that these works referred to fields of a lesser conceptual volume, e.g. ones that would be limited to the field of physical properties.

An analysis of the semantic development of particular lexemes requires a reconstruction of their initial meaning. Thus, an important part of my research includes a reconstruction of meanings which may be ascribed to the reconstructed Proto-Slavic forms. Due to the lack of scholarly works which would refer to this research task, I included a chapter entitled "The Reconstruction of Meanings of Non-Attested Languages. Theoretical Considerations" in the theoretical part of my work. I present there a method of the reconstruction of meaning for a non-attested language which is reconstructed on the basis of continuant languages. The theoretical part of my work also discusses the problems associated with meaning, changes of meaning and the current state of research concerning semantic development.

The part of the work which contains the material furnishes an analysis of adjectival lexemes which belong to selected conceptual-lexical fields. These lexemes are a part of a very broad hyperfield which "characterizes people." This field contains lexemes which refer to physical and mental properties. In the vast majority of cases the usage of the adjectives that were researched is not limited exclusively to the naming of human properties. Even within the vocabulary of one language in the synchronic perspective there is a dominance of polyfunctional lexemes. This is even more so as far as the diachronic perspective is concerned because the continuants of Proto-Slavic words may be presented as an array of meanings that continues to develop for the Proto-Slavic period until the present time. Monographic works of research that are limited to a single conceptual group are sometimes realized according to a similar arrangement. In order to fulfill my task it was necessary to select a very broad field, so that a model of a dictionary of semantic changes could be created. The recapitulation of the part of the work which contains the material is constituted by a two-part onomasiological dictionary. The semantic development of the lexemes that are discussed in the work is presented in two modes in this dictionary. The first mode is associated with an arrangement which is based on received meanings; the second model is based on the initial meanings. Such an arrangement of the work realizes the model which is required for a dictionary of semantic development, based on the register of changes in a semasiological arrangement (this function is performed by the comprehensive collection of material, accompanied by an alphabetical index) and the aforementioned double onomasiological model.

The final part of the work discusses substantial considerations which were made in the course of research and contains indications of further opportunities for research based on the results that were produced.

PART ONE  
THEORETICAL  
CONSIDERATIONS



# 1

## MEANING AND ITS CHANGES

### 1. Meaning. Terminological Remarks

The core of my work is constituted by semantic changes or the changes of meanings. Therefore before I proceed to discuss this question, I would like to stop and explain my notion of meaning, having in mind Vladimir Zvegincev's statement, according to whom "the point of departure of every semasiological work should be a definition of the meaning of a word (the lexical meaning)" ("Исходным моментом во всякой семасиологической работе должно быть определение значения слова (лексическое значение)") [Zvegincev 1957: 122].

How do linguists define meaning? We may venture a statement that no one has provided an answer to this question yet. Let us mention John Lyons's opinion: "No one has yet presented even an outline of a satisfactory and complete theory of meaning" [Lyons 1975: 444; cf. Lyons 1968: 402]. Renata Grzegorzczkowska devoted the first chapter of her *Wprowadzenie do semantyki językowej* (*An Introduction to Linguistic Semantics*) to the problem of the definition of meaning. She presented an overview of the concepts of meaning, both philosophical ones (including psychological concepts) and linguistic ones [Grzegorzczkowska 1995b: 9–25]. According to the author, the considerations associated with the concept of meaning in linguistic works are far less comprehensive and are most frequently a certain reflection of philosophical approaches [Grzegorzczkowska 1995b: 20]. This is a result of the peculiar nature of both branches of science, of philosophical reflection on the one hand, which stresses the importance of meaning as such, and, on the other hand, of the somewhat task-oriented approach of linguists to the problem of meaning. Therefore the aim of linguistic considerations associated with meaning is to specify this term precisely in order to maintain the clarity and precision of semantic considerations. Various trends in linguistics position meaning

in various ways, which is reflected in the emergence of so many semantic theories [cf. Grzegorzczkova 1995b: 64–89]. The majority of contemporary semantic theories is applicable only to a synchronic description of a language. That is why these theories are beyond the scope of the present work. I will return to those theories which may be useful to research which combines various temporal planes of language further on, in my description of the mode of presentation of semantic changes.

Alongside the term “meaning” the term “concept” is frequently used. The distinction between these terms is not consistently maintained in linguistic works. Very frequently they are treated as synonyms.

Znaczenie jako pojęcie, bez dalszego określania jego istoty, występuje w większości prac z zakresu strukturalnej semantyki językoznawczej, żeby wymienić klasyczne już dziś prace Ullmanna, Kronassera i in. [Grzegorzczkova 1995b: 21].

(Meaning understood as a concept, with no further elucidation of its essence, occurs in most works in the field of structural linguistic semantics, to name the now classic works by Ullmann, Kronasser and others.)

In the classic “semiotic triangle” (of Ogden and Richards’s) meaning is identified with the concept [Ogden, Richards 1923]. This fact is reflected in Polish translations [Grzegorzczkova 1995b: 12; Lyons 1975: 445 (cf. Lyons 1968: 404); Tabakowska 2001: 49].

The use of the term “concept” instead of the term “meaning” is a peculiar feature of the works written by cognitive linguistics scholars. According to the general concept of cognitive linguistics, concepts have a categorizing function and they are the basis of the classification of the ideas about the world of the users of a given language [Taylor 2002: 50; Tabakowska 2001: 33–34]. The classification of the entire lexical field into concepts is not identical for the whole of mankind but it changes according to a given language. This fact is expressed in the varying level of detail associated with conceptual fields of a given area of knowledge. This or that distribution of concepts is determined in each case by the conditions of the life of a given community. These conditions determine the importance of particular referents and the concepts which are associated with them.

I use both terms in my work, whereby the term “concept” is used in more abstract contexts, that is e.g. when I have “meaning” in mind which refers to a group of synonyms. As a result of an assumption that “meaning” is a part of the content of a lexeme, I use this term when I refer to specific words.

A similar solution, namely the replacement of the term “meaning” with the term “notion-field,” appeared as early as in the 1950s – in a work devoted to polysemy [Rudskoger 1952]. According to the quoted work,

the notion-field is not so sharply delimited as the sense given by the dictionary, and the transitions between two or more notion-fields are smoother than between the corresponding senses [Rudskoger 1952: 12–13].

In contradistinction to the author's opinion, I think that the difference between a "notion-field" ("conceptual field") and "meaning" consists not only in the degree of precision of both terms but also in the capacity of the content, because the former term may be applied to much broader content than the content of one lexeme.

Let me also mention that in my analyses the term "lexeme" is also applied to hypothetical semantics because we are dealing with reconstructed semantics. In such cases this term embraces the whole extent of the semantics which is associated with a given dictionary form. Thus it means a lexical unit, used interchangeably with the terms "wyrząd" and "słowo" [both mean 'word'], according to the practice accepted *varietatis causa* in works of linguistic research.

## 2. Changes in Meaning and Polysemy. Diachrony versus Synchrony

When we deal with the research of both semantic motivation and semantic development we face the same problem; that is, the mutual relationship between the meanings that are compared. I used the term "the mutual relationship of the meanings which are compared to one another" instead of the term "change in meaning" – which could be equally appropriate in this context – because I would like to also direct the attention of the reader to two phenomena which occur in the synchronic plane: the coexistence of meanings and ambiguity (polysemy). I present the difference between these phenomena in the paragraphs which follow. The ambiguity which is transposed into the domain of diachrony enables us to verify the validity of combining various meanings with one another of the same continuant. This is the result of the fact that polysemy is a reflection of the effects of semantic changes which are viewed synchronically. We may define polysemy in a figurative manner as a "fixed semantic change" ("zastygła zmiana semantyczna"). The tendency of linguists to disregard diachrony in synchronic research does not change the fact that every meaning has its origin somewhere. That is why the models that are used, – e.g., in the classification of the types of polysemy – do not differ from the models that are used in the discussion of semantic changes, and they are either patterned after them or they may become patterns for them ([cf. Apresjan 1995: 182–183], who employs the models of radial, string and radial string polysemy which were distinguished for the first time on the basis of diachronic material in a work by Arsène Darmesteter published in 1887). Of course, the aforementioned remarks are not a novelty. Stephen Ullmann wrote the following words in a part of his work devoted to the theoretical analysis of semantic changes:

Polysemy is the pivot of semantic analysis. Couched in synchronistic terms, it means that one word can have more than one sense. Translated into diachronistic terminology, it implies that a word may retain its previous sense or senses and at the same time acquire one or several new ones [Ullmann 1957: 117].

The phenomenon of polysemy is richly represented in literature, of which I will present only those aspects which are relevant to my work.

## 2.1. Polysemy and Homonymy

An important problem faced by lexicography is the distinction between the phenomena of polysemy and homonymy.<sup>1</sup> Even when we compare various dictionaries of the same language we may notice that an arbitrary solution of this problem is impossible because the final decision depends on the *Sprachgefühl* of the author of a dictionary entry. The taking of etymology as a basis and the treatment of words which are continuants of the same form as ambiguous ones, and those which originate from various sources, as homonyms – an approach that is sometimes suggested – is not approved by the supporters of the idea of providing a strict distinction between synchrony and diachrony [e.g. Lyons 1977: 550–569; Apresjan 1995: 183–186]. Moreover, the etymological criterion fails also due to the fact that etymologists are not always able to provide an answer to a question concerning the origins of a word – an idea to which I return to later in the my text. The authors of contemporary research works admit that there is still no consensus concerning a consistent distinction between polysemy and homonymy. The only unquestionable<sup>2</sup> cases of homonymy are those that arose due to a chance concurrence of phonetics and spelling<sup>3</sup> of two lexemes which originate from different etymological sources – e.g., Polish *bal* ‘a dance party’ from Fr. *bal* ‘idem’ as opposed to *bal* ‘beam, log’ from German *Balken* ‘beam’ or Polish *klon* ‘a species of tree; *Acer*’ with PSlav \**klenь* and *klon* – an international term used in genetics whose source is the Greek word *κλών* ‘a branch.’ Doubts are caused by cases of words with an identical sound, which may be eventually reduced to one etymon but they reached a given language by different ways e.g. Polish *ikona* ‘a religious picture in the Eastern church,’ borrowed from the Russian word *икона* ‘idem’ and *ikona* ‘a pictorial representation on the computer screen’ borrowed from

<sup>1</sup> An exhaustive account of the issues concerning homonymy is found in a work by Małgorzata Majewska entitled *Homonimia i homonimy w opisie językoznawczym* [Majewska 2002].

<sup>2</sup> Although John Lyons [Lyons 1977: 550] writes about some speakers of English who discern an alleged relationship between the homonyms *ear* ‘the part of a cereal plant which contains its flowers or seeds’ and *ear* ‘the organ of hearing’ (according to NSOED), he concludes that such an intuitive insight, which is uncorroborated by actual usage of words, cannot be taken into consideration by linguists.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. homonymy proper; apart from that there is also homophony and homography.

the English word *icon*. The source of both words is the Greek word *εἰκών*. In my opinion, these cases of polysemy or homonymy, which may be eventually reduced to one source, are equally useful as the polysemous meanings which arose in the context of a given language because they enable us to trace semantic changes.

In so far as in lexicographical practice the necessity of deciding whether there is a case of a polysemous lexeme or two separate lexemes occurs rarely, in research devoted to semantic changes such a decision is an inherent part of every analysis. Danuta Buttler [Buttler 1978: 210–213] distinguishes various types of polysemy of which those that do not hinder linguistic communication endure in the language for a longer period of time, whereas other types that hinder communication are eliminated from the language. The latter type may give rise to the so-called “false friends of a translator” in cognate languages. This happens when from an excessively broad range of meanings, which was initially uniform to cognate languages, only one remains in usage and others become obsolete. In order to illustrate her point, Buttler provides the polysemous Old Polish word *niedziela* which meant both ‘the period of seven days’ and ‘the last day of this period’ [Buttler 1978: 213]. In Russian the word *неделя* retained the first of the aforementioned meanings. The Polish language retained the meaning ‘the day of rest during the week’ – this meaning is genetically original, which is indicated by its structure. Due to their peculiar formal affinity, which is visible until the present times, Slavic languages have remarkable good conditions to create pairs of phonetic or orthographic equivalents with dissimilar meaning. These pairs are above all the object of detailed works of research whose principal aim is to make the learners of a given foreign language sensitive to such lexical traps.<sup>4</sup>

## 2.2. Types of Diversity of the Content of Words

Due to the nature of the semantic field which I analyze in my work, I will direct the attention of the reader to different situations in which the same word may refer to both people and other *denotata*. In some cases this is caused not by polysemy but by the multireferentiality of a given lexeme. This is especially the case with the adjectives which express parametrical concepts (lexemes which mean ‘tall,’ ‘short’ have the same content range regardless of whether they refer to people, buildings or trees) and ones that provide an appraisal in the field of aesthetics. However, the diversity of referents frequently entails

---

<sup>4</sup> Such works of research include: *Czesko-polska homonimia* [Szałek, Nečas 1993]; *Pułapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-bułgarskich* [Karpaczewa, Symeonowa, Tokarz 1994]; *Pułapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-chorwackich* [Tokarz 1998]; *Pułapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-słoweńskich* [Tokarz 1999]; *Słownik serbsko-polskich homonimów i paronimów* [Šipka 1999].

the change of the content of meaning. The concept of “power,” “might” and “weakness” has a different sense in reference to living creatures, a different sense in reference to objects, and a still different sense in reference to elements. Each of the pairs of concepts (and sometimes each of its components) which are described in this work has tendencies which are peculiarly associated with the range of meaning. However, the considerations upon this subject exceed the limits of the considerations associated with polysemy because the objects of such considerations are not lexemes but entire concepts, maybe even conceptual fields.

A case of frequent occurrence is that of polysemy referred to as the metonymic<sup>5</sup> type, which is based on the possibility of a more or less regular transfer of features from one object to the other. This has to do with the usage of the same word in reference both to the possessor of a feature and to its manifestations (e.g. Polish *dumny człowiek* ‘proud man’ → *dumna mina* ‘proud face [lit. facial expression]’, *głupi człowiek* ‘stupid man’ → *głupia odpowiedź* ‘stupid answer’). In the majority of cases this type of polysemy refers to adjectives which are associated with mental features, therefore man is their basic referent. In my work this type of polysemy is marginally referred to because I am interested in the opposite direction of the change of the referent, namely the transfer of names of features from inanimate objects to people. The changes in the semantic structure of a word in the case of polysemy of the metonymic type occur beyond the scope of the semantic field that I am interested in.

The metaphor is most frequently the basis of the extension of a name from objects to people [cf. e.g. Gortan-Premk 1997: 139]. Such an extension may occur in polysemy, therefore with a retention of both meanings – the basic meaning and the metaphoric meaning – also in a semantic change. The latter change occurs when the original meaning fades away and gives way to a newer meaning. As far as the aforementioned types of polysemy are concerned, we may rather expect the emergence of such a situation in the type of polysemy which originated through metaphor in contradistinction to metonymy. The cause of this is apparently associated with the greater diversity of meanings in the case of the former type of polysemy.

---

<sup>5</sup> This term is used by Darinka Gortan-Premk in a work devoted to polysemy *Polisemija i organizacija leksičkog sistema u srpskome jeziku* [Gortan-Premk 1997: 74], similarly as in a work by Eugeniusz Grodziński *Postacie wieloznaczności wyrazów* [Grodziński 1970]. Renata Grzegorzewska defines the same type of polysemy as textual variance [wariancja tekstowa]. Jurij Apresjan, in turn, treats this kind of polysemy as one of the types of regular ambiguity of adjectives. However, he does not define this type and locates it in the subchapter entitled “Другие типы значений” [Apresjan 1995: 200 sq.].

### 2.3. Strings of Meanings

The basis of polysemy, as becomes evident during the research on the development of whole conceptual fields in a longer temporal frame, is usually the phenomenon of implied meanings. This phenomenon is based on the fact that certain meanings regularly evoke other, closely-related meanings, without losing the position of the basic meaning. Adjectival lexemes are markedly susceptible to this type of extension of meanings, which is a result of the coexistence of certain features on the level of referents. The relations which occur in nature are derivatively transferred to the meanings of words. These relations are particularly visible in the development of lexemes which refer to physical properties. These are relations of the following kind: if an object (especially a living one: "a man," "an animal," "a tree") has the "fat" property, then it may be probably referred to as "strong." If it is "fat" and "strong" then it may be referred to as "big." If the object has the "strong" property then it may be referred to as "healthy." These features occur in various configurations, but this happens so often that we may say that "being big" implies "strength," similarly as "being fat," and this in turn implies "health." These relations between properties are reflected in the development of meanings, especially if we consider a broader zone of time and "space," namely the development from the hypothetical Proto-Slavic language to the particular Slavic languages. Each of the aforementioned four meanings have at the same time their own, clearly-defined characteristics. "Big," "fat," "strong" and "healthy" are not synonymous meanings.

The development of this type may be both of a string and radial nature, if we use the topological systematization which was introduced by Arsène Darmesteter [Darmesteter 1887, cited in: Apresjan 1995: 182]. Topological systematization, even if it is applied in synchrony, is of an aetiological nature, i.e., it derives the origin of one meaning from another meaning, either in the temporal or causal perspective. The transition from the development of a string type to the development of a radial nature occurs in the majority of cases when one of the meanings is used figuratively (due to the change of the referent), after which it undergoes further evolution in a way which is typical for a given string of meanings.

The implication of meanings and the consequences of this phenomenon in the form of semantic changes were noticed e.g. by Krystyna Kleszczowa who wrote the following about polysemy:

Nie wszystkie [...] rodzące się znaczenia są przewidziane potencją języka. Niektóre mają charakter konsekwencji (wnioskowania, implikacji), co da się zawrzeć w formule: "jeżeli obiekt ma cechę *x*, to zapewne ma również cechę *y*." Część z nich ma charakter ogólnoludzki, są więc przewidywalne, np.: "jeżeli ktoś jest *dziecinny*, to zapewne jest *naiwny*"; "jeżeli ktoś jest *cierpliwy*, to zapewne jest *opanowany*." [...] Polisemie-konsekwencje są często podłożem przekształceń semantycznych – wystarczy, aby jeden z członów uległ zapomnieniu, por.: "jeżeli ktoś jest protegowany, to

zapewne jest człowiekiem mało wartościowym” (taką implikację potwierdza rozwój znaczenia leksemu *kreatura* [Buttler 1978: 146]) [Kleszczowa 2001: 93–94].

(Not all [...] emerging meanings are anticipated by the potentiality of a language. Some bear the character of a consequence (conclusion, implication), which can be expressed by the formula: “if an object has the property *x*, it probably also has the property *y*.” Some of these consequences are universal in nature, e.g., “if someone is *childish*, they are probably *naïve*”; “if someone is *patient*, they are probably *composed*.” [...] Consequence polysemies are often bases for semantic transformation – all that is needed is for one of the elements to be forgotten, cf. “if someone is [a] protégé, they are probably of little worth” (such implication is confirmed by the evolution undergone by the meaning of the lexeme *kreatura* – see Buttler 1978: 146).)

A semantic string which arises through implication may be referred to as a “potentially polysemous concept.” This term refers not to one lexeme but to the concept which is expressed by synonymous polysemous words of which some may include all semantic variants and others may include only some variants. “Potentially polysemous concepts” systematically become evident in diachrony in the guise of continuants of one Proto-Slavic word.

The causes of the implication of adjectival meanings are most fruitfully explained within the framework of the science of definitional and connotative properties of lexemes. The words which belong to the semantic field of “strong” may include connotative properties of “big,” “healthy” and “fat.” The more we extend the diachronic range of meanings of such a word, the more complete the collection of connotative features will become. We may say that connotative properties are dormant meanings which may arise at some stage of the development of a word. Were it not an abuse to apply the term “connotation” to reconstructed meanings, we might claim that the meanings which arise in the continuants of a given Proto-Slavic form are in the vast majority of cases connotative properties of the meaning of the Proto-Slavic lexeme.

### 3. The Methods of Researching Semantic Changes

#### 3.1. An Approach to Semantic Research.

##### Semasiology and Onomasiology

The history of semantic research is presented by Józef Wierchowski in a work entitled *Semantyka językoznawcza (Linguistic Semantics)* [Wierchowski 1980]. Semantics is a remarkably diverse branch of linguistics. In the present work I am interested only in that part which refers to the research on semantic changes. As everybody knows, this type of research dominated the initial stage of linguistic research, regardless of whether we understand under this

term the linguistic interests of the Classical culture or the *stricte* scholarly research which was begun in the final decades of the eighteenth century. The research of semantic changes, which is implied by the very term “change,” belongs to the sphere of diachronic research, although, as I mentioned in the previous point, their peculiar character does not differ from the research on polysemy. After a long period of time, when diachronic research was marginalized by the work of linguists [*studia diachronica diutissime iacebant inculta*] we may currently discern a renewal of interest in this type of research, which is predominantly associated with the cognitive linguistics trend.

The branches of linguistics whose objects of study are semantic changes are referred to as onomasiology and semasiology. The term “onomasiology” was coined by Ernst Tappolet in 1895 in reference to comparative lexicology (as early as in 1902 this term was applied by Adolf Zauner to semantic changes). The term refers to the research of the relationship between a concept and the lexemes which may express this concept. However, the term “semasiology” was used for the first time in 1839 by Christian Karl Reisig [EJO: 482]. In nineteenth century works of research and until the 1960s this term referred to the science of meaning [e.g. Rozwadowski 1903; Kronasser 1952; Zvegincev 1957]. At the end of the nineteenth century, beside the term “semasiology” the term “semantics” was coined, first in French scholarship (Michel Bréal is the creator of this name), then also in English scholarship. Initially the German term *Semasiologie* and the French term *sémantique* had the same range of meaning and they referred to the science of meaning in general. Today, in reference to this branch of linguistics the term “semantics” is exclusively used. Moreover, this term involves two very different approaches to the science of meaning. However, the term “semasiology” did not become obsolete (despite assertions in EJO: 482 and EWJP: 299), but it changed its application and it is mainly used as the opposite term to “onomasiology.”

The point of departure in onomasiological research is the *denotatum/signifié* or its linguistic equivalent, i.e., the concept, and the aim of such research is to find linguistic units which may express this concept. In semasiological research the point of departure is a word unit and the research is centered upon the pursuit of *designata* to which this unit may refer. Semasiological research may be conducted both on the diachronic level (then the diversity of semantic content is interpreted as semantic changes) and on the synchronic level, when we deal with polysemy. For the sake of precision we must add that it was not until the arrival of cognitive linguistics and its postulate of the unity of synchrony and diachrony that restored the due importance of semasiological-onomasiological research [cf. Tabakowska 2001: 45–71]. Onomasiological research, due to its association with a concept, does not have to be limited to one language and it is a gateway to comparative research. Semasiological research is basically limited to one language. However, this is not a necessary condition of such research. In the present work I embrace the semasiological perspective by taking the Proto-Slavic lexical

units, which bind all Slavic languages together, as a point of departure. The precursor of such research is Svetlana M. Tolstaja, who takes the results of etymological research as a point of departure in her ethnolinguistic research [Tolstaja 2008a].

## 3.2. The Modes of Describing Semantic Changes

Although the research concerning the development of meanings (onomasiological and semasiological research) has a long history, these branches of knowledge are yet to see a consistent mode of description and a consistent terminology.

### 3.2.1. Traditional Modes of Description

The logical classification of semantic changes is still applicable. This classification is derived from the works of Hermann Paul [1880], and was further developed by Arsène Darmesteter [1887] and Michel Bréal [1897]. It is rooted in the traditions of ancient and medieval rhetoric (metaphor and metonymy). The classification takes the semantic range of word as the point of departure. According to the changes in the content of a word, three types of semantic changes are distinguished, i.e., the extension, narrowing down and the shift in the semantic range. Metaphor and metonymy are referred to also in Stephen Ullmann's classification, who devoted a considerable deal of his research to the phenomenon of the regularity in semantic development and the opportunities of the pursuit of this regularity [Ullmann 1957].

Apart from the logical classification, an important role is played by the distinctions based on psychology. The concept of the psychological classification is derived from Karl Jaberg's work, who presented it in the periodical entitled "Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie" in a series of three articles [Jaberg 1901, 1903, 1905]. Almost at the same time Wilhelm Wundt, a doctor-physiologist with a background in psychology, in the first volume of his *Völkerpsychologie* entitled *Die Sprache*, in which he was engaged with semasiology [Wundt 1900]. This work met with severe criticism in a comprehensive review by Jan Rozwadowski, who pointed out linguistic mistakes on the part of the author [Rozwadowski 1903]. The latter mistakes were understandable due to Wundt's profession. Despite all reservations, the terms "pejoration" and "melioration" became the established terminology in the works of semantic research.

The aforementioned three traditional methods of describing semantic changes were presented in the most comprehensive way by Danuta Buttler in the introduction to the work entitled *Zmiany semantyczne w języku polskim* (*Semantic Changes in the Polish Language*) [Buttler 1978: 13–18]. The latter author's book also includes the names of other precursors of the science of

semantic changes. Twenty years later this subject was again undertaken by Grzegorz Kleparski [1999]. His description essentially does not depart from his predecessor's description, and his contribution consists in the fact that he recalled these matters in the *Biuletyn PTJ*, a periodical which enjoys quite a wide readership.

In my work I use logical terminology which includes the transformations of a psychological nature caused by the change of the semantic value of a word. I do so in spite of the obvious deficiencies of this terminology, which are mentioned both by Buttler and Kleparski, because I consider it to be most appropriate for the subject that I have undertaken. In fact, my aim is not to describe the **mode** in which semantic changes occur. I am interested in the result of these changes, i.e., the newly received meanings and the regularity with which some meanings evolve from others.

### 3.2.2. The Component Analysis of Meaning

In the last two decades of the twentieth century component semantics, which is derived from structuralism, had been applied in the research of semantic changes.

By breaking down the content of the word into elements, the component analysis of meaning facilitates the presentation of the differences between meanings. These differences may concern the meanings of words which belong to one semantic field but also the differences between various meanings of one word, both from the synchronic (in the case of polysemy) and diachronic perspective (in the case of the change of the meaning of a word). The question of the application of component semantics in the presentation of semantic changes is theoretically expounded by Ryszard Tokarski [Tokarski 1981, 1983, 1987]. According to the author:

zmiana znaczenia zachodzi jako konsekwencja: a) ujęcia semów, b) dodania semów, c) wymiany semów, tj. ujęcia i równoczesnego dodania, i d) zmiany ich hierarchii. Ujęcie semów wiąże się z procesem uogólniania znaczeń. Dodanie semów to zwężenie znaczenia lub jego przesunięcie na tle metonimicznym. Wymiana semów właściwa jest przede wszystkim zmianom metaforycznym, w których podobieństwo opiera się na semach systemowych, natomiast zmiana hierarchii wiąże się z przesunięciem danego semu z kategorii wirtualnych do systemowych (rzadziej w kierunku odwrotnym) [Tokarski 1981: 103–104].

(a change in meaning occurs as a consequence of: (a) subtraction of semes, (b) addition of semes, (c) exchange of semes, i.e., their subtraction and simultaneous addition, and (d) change in their hierarchy. Subtraction of semes is associated with the process of generalization of meanings. Addition of semes amounts to the narrowing of meaning or its metonymical shift. Exchange of semes is characteristic predominantly of metaphorical changes, in which similarity is based on systemic semes; finally,

exchange of semes is linked with the shift of a given seme from a virtual to a systemic category (or, rarely, in the opposite direction).)

Vincent Blanár [1984] is also a supporter of the application of component semantics in the research of semantic development. The advantage of component semantics consists in the clarity and elegance of the presentation of the analysis of meaning. Its disadvantage consists in the limitation of its research field. This method is fruitfully applied in certain conceptual fields where semes that differentiate meanings may be presented by simple notions. Problems arise when the elements that differentiate meanings have to be presented in a descriptive manner. Of course, this does not preclude the application of this method. However, the method loses its distinctive nature which allowed it to dominate the traditional mode of description.<sup>6</sup> An example of a work in which semantic changes are presented with the application of component semantics is the book by Grzegorz Kleparski. The author analyzes semantic changes in the history of the English language. The scholar applied the method of component analysis to research the evaluative semantic changes which occurred in the field which includes nominative references to man since the Old English period until the present [Kleparski 1990]. As far as the material furnished by Slavic languages is concerned, we may mention a book by Ewa Maślowska which presents the evaluative metaphorical changes of nicknames [Maślowska 1988]. In contradistinction to Kleparski, who presents a suggestion to apply the structural method in diachronic research in his work, Maślowska applies this method, disregarding the temporal aspect. In her work, she emphasizes, above all, the opposition literary language *versus* dialect, not the diachronic perspective.

### 3.2.3. The Methods Adopted from Cognitive Linguistics

In the attempts to present the semantic changes through the application of methods adopted from cognitive linguistics we discern mainly the terminological innovations adopted from this trend in linguistics. Examples of the application of cognitive linguistics terminology may be found in the articles

---

<sup>6</sup> Przemysław Łozowski [1999: 27] claims that a significant limitation or even abandonment of research on the diachronic linguistic changes with the usage of methods suggested by structuralism is testimony to the "abortive attempts to show appreciation to diachrony within the framework of structuralism itself" ("nieudanych prób dowartościowania diachronii w obrębie samego strukturalizmu"), therefore, if I understand correctly, it is a testimony to the inadequacy of these methods in diachronic research. It is difficult to accept this claim in reference to the research of semantic changes with the application of the method of component analysis. The limited extent to which this method may be applied is a result of the fact that this method is applicable exclusively to those semantic fields whose components are manifestly diversified. This remark applies equally to diachrony and synchrony.

by Waldemar Skrzypczak [1995] and above all in the works by Grzegorz Kleparski, including the book entitled *Theory and Practice of Historical Semantics. The Case of Middle English and Early Modern English Synonyms of "Girl/Young Woman"* [Kleparski 1997]. Apart from the traditional terms such as "specialization," "generalization," "metaphor," the author introduces the following terms: "onomasiological substitution," "scanning," "onomasiological track/path," "domains," "base," "profiling" [cf. Kleparski, Malicka-Kleparska 1994: 233–224]. In the work by Patrycja Pałka titled *Rozwój i zmiany semantyczne leksemów "godny," "grzeczny" i "przystojny" w perspektywie kognitywnej (The Development and Semantic Changes of the Lexemes "godny" 'dignified,' "grzeczny" 'courtaneous, well-behaved' and "przystojny" 'becoming, worthy of; handsome' from a Cognitive Perspective* [Pałka 2004]) the cognitive perspective is visible especially in the attempt to discern the mode of perceiving the world in the semantic changes. An interesting suggestion about the elaboration of etymological data with the application of the cognitive linguistics apparatus is mentioned by Aleksandra Niewiara [2003] in her article, which is an account of a text by Gábor Györi [1996]. The aim of the author's work is to present the linguistic change as a panchronic phenomenon whose successive stages may be discerned and described:

Możliwe jest zatem ciągłe tworzenie się nowych konceptualizacji jak w wypadku analizowanego przez Györi słowa *glass* 'naczynie zrobione ze szkła, używane do picia'. [...] Zmiana znaczenia i ustalenie się nowej kategorii przebiega według kolejnych kroków konceptualizacyjnych. Nowy obiekt – bursztyn. Z listy jego atrybutów wybiera się jedną cechę: to, że błyszczy, połyskuje. Kategoria ustalona. Nowy obiekt – szkło (materiał). Na zasadzie analogii wskazuje się, że jest podobny do bursztynu, gdyż jest prześwitujący, połyskujący i może być użyty jako biżuteria. Pierwotnie metaforyczne użycie wyrażenia językowego \**glaza* z czasem staje się literalne. Kategoria ustalona. I wreszcie pojęcie – szklanka. Z listy atrybutów wybiera się cechę odnoszącą się do materiału, z którego jest zrobiona, czyli do szkła [Niewiara 2003: 121].

(Therefore the constant emergence of new conceptualizations is possible, as in the case of the word *glass* 'a vessel made of glass which is used for the purpose of drinking' that was analyzed by Györi. [...] A change in meaning and the establishment of a new category proceeds according to successive conceptualizational stages. A new object – amber. One property is chosen from the list of its attributes: the fact that it glitters. The category is now established. A new object – glass (material). An indication is made *per analogiam* that this object is similar to amber because it is translucent, glittering and it may be used as jewellery. With time the initially "metaphorical usage of the linguistic expression \**glaza*- becomes literal. The category is established. Finally, [another] concept – a glass [vessel]. From the list of its attributes a property which refers to the material that it is made from is chosen – i.e. glass.)

The greatest advantage that may be detected in the application of cognitive linguistics to the research on semantic changes is its flexibility, which consists in its ability to follow linguistic reality. Unfortunately, the terminology which

is applied by the researchers of this profile departs from the simplicity which is a property of works of research devoted to a wider readership [e.g., Tabakowska 2001; Lakoff, Johnson 1980]. At the present time, thanks to a specialized and constantly perfected methodology, cognitive linguistics scholars create their own terminology with which the representatives of other linguistic trends are not necessarily familiar. As a result, the contact with other trends with an equally specialized terminology brings about the “tower of Babel” situation where two branches of linguistics indeed employ completely different languages of analysis. Thus, although I appreciate such attempts as the one made by e.g. Grzegorz Kleparski, whose goal is to make cognitive linguistics scholars interested in the problems of semantic changes [Kleparski 1997], I find it difficult to justify the application of the cognitive linguistics apparatus in a work with a different target audience.

## 4. Semantic Motivation

### 4.1. The Term

The term “motivation” is derived from the science of word-formation where it refers to the dependency between the derivational base and the derivative. The concepts of “word-formative motivation” and of “semantic motivation” share the fact that they are the basis for the word which arises. According to the *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* [EJO], motivation is equal to foundation [fundacja]. The term “semantic motivation” is not included in this lexicon. Motivation in the semantic sense differs from word-formative motivation in that it emphasizes the semantic dependency of the derivative upon its base.

The term “semantic motivation,” which is a part of the title of my work and which is frequently used in it, is borrowed from the works of Russian and Czech scholars. In the Polish linguistic literature the term “semantic motivation” occurs rarely and it is used mainly in onomastics, where the semantic motivation refers to its real significative value, conditioned by the genesis or area, geographical location etc. The term is less frequent in phraseology, where it refers to the realia associated with the origins of a given phrase.

The term “semantic motivation”<sup>7</sup> was disseminated above all by Russian linguists who were engaged in etymological studies.<sup>8</sup> Žanna Ž. Varbot defines

<sup>7</sup> In contemporary Russian works the term “semantic motivation” is so well-established that the term “motivation” alone is also used in the same sense, e.g. “первичная мотивация”/“типы первичной мотивации” (“primary motivation”/“types of primary motivation”) in the works by Žanna Varbot [Varbot 1997: 35–37].

<sup>8</sup> I do not take into consideration Jurij Apresjan’s explanation, formulated for the purposes of synchronic research, according to which semantic motivation means derivation [pochodność, производность] [Apresjan 2000: 164 sq., 1995: 170 sq.], because it is too general.

motivation as the closest meaning which precedes the meaning that we are interested in and which is its source. “Мотивация – ближайший семантический предшественник этого [изучаемого – М. J.] значения” (“Motivation is the closest predecessor of this [studied – M. J.] meaning”) [Varbot 1997: 35]. More attention is devoted to the terms “мотивация,” “мотивировка,” “мотивированность” by Svetlana M. Tolstaja, who mentions a definition in the dictionary of linguistic terms by Olga S. Ahmanova:

Мотивированный – Такой, в котором данное содержание поддается более или менее непосредственному соотношению с соответствующим выражением; имеющий открытую семантическую структуру; поддающийся разложению на лексические морфемы [Ahmanova: 244–245].

(Motivated – one whose content is to a greater or lesser extent directly associated with the **relevant expression**; one whose semantic structure is open; one that may be broken down into lexical morphemes.)

Therefore, in contradistinction to Polish dictionaries of this kind, the definition includes the semantic aspect of motivation, although the latter was not presented as a separate dictionary entry. Among the further definitions presented by Svetlana M. Tolstaja the onomasiological approach is the most relevant to my work. According to this approach, the notion of motivation is considered above all in relation to the problem of the conventionality and unconventionality of linguistic units and with the problem of the internal form of the word. The author is right when she points out that the notion of motivation frequently overlaps with the notion of the mode of nomination [Tolstaja 2008a: 188–190].

Among the Czech and Slovak linguists there is a dominance of treating the word-formative and semantic motivation jointly. Such a position is favoured by Miloš Dokulil, as follows from his definition:

Przez motywację wyrazu w ujęciu genetycznym rozumiemy relację pomiędzy znaczeniem wyrazu a cechą, która była uważana za podstawę nazwania przedmiotu lub zjawiska, czyli była tzw. motywem pierwotnym, przy czym taka relacja znaczeniowa posiada swoją korelację w płaszczyźnie formy językowej – wyraz motywowany opiera się na wyrazie oznaczającym właśnie tę cechę wyjściową, zarówno ze względu na znaczenie, jak i na formę. Tak rozumiana motywacja wyjaśnia, dlaczego dany przedmiot (lub zjawisko) został nazwany w taki sposób, dlaczego otrzymał swoją określoną nazwę [Dokulil 1979: 149].

(By the motivation of a word in the genetic perspective we mean the relation between the meaning of a word and the property that was considered as the basis of naming the object or phenomenon, i.e. that it was the so-called original motive, whereas such a semantic relationship finds its correlation on the level of a linguistic form – the motivated word is based on the word which means exactly this original property, both as regards the meaning and the form. Such a notion of motivation

explains why a given object (or phenomenon) was named in such a way, why it received its peculiar name.)

In his defense of the universal motivation of linguistic signs, Juraj Furdík mentions the general definition of motivation formulated by Juraj Dolník [Dolník 1990: 149]:

Motywacja słowa to pośredni albo bezpośredni stosunek kauzalny między jego składnikiem formalnym (materialnym, fonicznym) i znaczeniowym (idealnym), uwarunkowany stosunkiem słowa do korelacyjnych paradygmatycznie słów danego języka [Furdík 2000: 59].

(The motivation of a word is the indirect or direct causal relationship between its formal component (material, phonic) and semantic (ideal), conditioned by the relationship between a word and the paradigmatically correlative words of a given language.)

In the works of Polish semanticists the term discussed above occurs rarely. Ryszard Tokarski employs this term in one of his articles which takes into consideration the existence in language of two types of motivation between the initial meaning and the derivative meaning of a lexeme: semantic motivation and semantic-cultural motivation<sup>9</sup> – the latter is hyperonymous to the former. The first type is defined in the following manner: “Motywacja semantyczna zachodzi wtedy, gdy znaczenie pochodne rozbudowuje się wokół jednego z komponentów semantycznych znaczenia wyjściowego” (“We are dealing with semantic motivation when derivatory meaning develops around one of the semantic components of the original meaning”) [Tokarski 1999: 67]. The condition of finding the semantic motivation is, according to Tokarski, the ability to indicate a semantic string, i.e., the common semantic element.

The term “semantic motivation,” beside the terms “nominational motivation,” “motivational basis” and “nominational types,” is also used by Janusz Siatkowski [1989]. In reference to the process of giving names the author uses the term “semantic motivation” for the semantic element which links the initial meaning with the received meaning. The names “semantic motivation” and “nominational motivation” refer to the same phenomenon, whereas one of the terms emphasizes the act of naming, the other one on the result of this act.

For the purposes of the present work it is necessary to define not only the semantic motivation but also the motivating meaning. I consider motivating meaning to be the meaning which has common elements according to Tokarski [1999: 67] – “węzeł semantyczny” [semantic string] with the researched meaning

---

<sup>9</sup> The second type of motivation which is distinguished by the author does not refer to the extra-linguistic reality, as we might expect from the name “semantic-cultural motivation,” but it refers to a situation in which an entire lexical-semantic group develops derivative meanings [znaczenia wtórne] in a parallel manner (see also *infra*).

which follows chronologically and due to this fact it is the causative factor for the emergence of new meaning.<sup>10</sup>

**These common elements are frequently connotative properties of the preceding meaning, which become definitional properties in the new meaning.**

In a broader perspective, we may refer to the **direct** and **indirect motivating meaning**. If there is no reference to this precise distinction, we always have in mind the direct motivating meaning. I understand the **semantic motivation** to be the following: a) a nominational process which causes the emergence of a new meaning, b) according to the practice of Russian and Czech scholars, the motivating meaning (*per analogiam* we may also speak about direct and indirect motivation<sup>11</sup>). The second usage of the term is a result of the need to economize the argument, or, to be more precise, to avoid repeating the term “motivating meaning.” Due to the contexts which are associated with the term “semantic motivation” we should not fear that the term may become obscure.

## 4.2. Parallel Motivating Meanings

The units which are the object of my research (i.e. the serially existing motivating meanings which established the regularity of motivation) lack a universally accepted name. The term “types of semantic motivation” [“типы семантической мотивации”] enjoys relative currency. This term was accepted in the research of Russian and Czech scholars, i.e., in those areas where the greatest number of onomasiological works are published. Other terms include: “semantic derivational models” [“semantische Ableitungsmodelle”] [Schuster-Šewc 1975: 13]; “semantic parallelisms” [Popowska-Taborska 1989: 24]; “onomasiological (associative) derivatives” [Brzozowska 2000: 143]; “onomasiological models” [“ономасиологични модели”] [Dejkova 2000]:

Под ономасиологичен модел (ОМ) тук ще се разбира тип на номинация по определен ономасиологичен признак, един от множеството признаци, присъщи на назования предмет [Dejkova 2000: 235].

<sup>10</sup> Certainly, also other conditions must occur for a new meaning to arise. Above all, in the awareness of the users of a language these common features must become relevant to such a degree that they relegate other elements of meaning to the background and they become the dominant features. The latter may be “overgrown” with other, new features (in such a case a shift in meaning occurs) or they may dominate without acquiring new features (the narrowing down of meaning.) In the cases when a broadening of meaning occurs, the entire motivating meaning enters the content of the new meaning, the former is blurred to such a degree that it opens to receive new semantic elements.

<sup>11</sup> In works which represent this branch of knowledge we may also find synonymous terms: **motywacja bliższa = bezpośrednia** (closer = direct motivation) and **motywacja dalsza = pośrednia** (further = indirect motivation).

(Under the term onomasiological model we understand here a type of nomination according to a specific onomasiological property, one of the many properties of the object that is named.)

My attempts at finding a common term in the elaborations of lexical maps in dialectological atlases also proved futile. The authors of these atlases also failed to coin a consistent term, and they use descriptive methods, e.g., Dalibor Brozović discusses the names which are derived from a root with a meaning: “[...] названия образованны от корня со значением [...]” or names with semantic connotations: “[...] названия с семантическими конотациями [...]” (“names formed from the stem meaning [...]” / “names with the semantic connotations of [...]”) [Brozović 1988: 11].

All of the aforementioned authors emphasize the seriality of the effects initiated by these, variously referred to, motivating meanings. According to their research interests, the authors discern an opportunity of employing this fact in etymological research or in research associated with the linguistic image of the world. At this point, it is worth recalling Ryszard Tokarski’s definition which refers to the semantic-cultural motivation mentioned earlier:

Przez motywację semantyczno-kulturową rozumiem zatem predyspozycje nie poszczególnych jednostek leksykalnych, lecz całych semantycznie spójnych grup wyrazowych do podobnego rozwoju semantycznego i do zbliżonych treściowo wartościowań. Sądzę także, że regularności tego rodzaju dają się uzasadnić kulturowo, tzn. można poprzez ich obserwację dotrzeć do [...] obrazu świata utrwalonego w polszczyźnie [Tokarski 1999: 68].

(Therefore, under the term semantic-cultural motivation I understand the predispositions not of particular lexical units but of whole semantically consistent lexical groups to a similar semantic development and to evaluations which are similar content-wise. I also think that the regularities of this kind may be culturally justified, i.e., through their observation we may trace the culturally conditioned evaluations in language, to one of the aspects of the image of the world which is preserved in the Polish language.)

The fourth chapter of my work, entitled “The Parallels of Semantic Development,” is devoted to the postulates and research associated with the arrangement of motivating meanings.

## 2 THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PROTO-SLAVIC MEANING

### 1. General Remarks Concerning the Proto-Slavic Language

Many questions may be raised in reference to the very problem of the Proto-Slavic language, its status, the extent of its uniformity, its dialectal divisions, the period in which it could have existed and the area that it occupied. All of these problems were undertaken by Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński [1946], Franciszek Sławski [1968; reprinted 1989: 33–39], Oleg N. Trubačev [2002] and other scholars. The subject bibliography of the works devoted to these problems is found in the introduction to etymology written by a team of Czech linguists [Večerka 2006: 270–271 for works concerning the ethnogenesis of the Slavic peoples; Večerka 2006: 261–262 for works concerning the position of the Proto-Slavic language in the Indo-European family of languages], see also the bibliography in the textbook introduction to Slavic historical studies [L. Moszyński 2006: 376–388].

What do we understand under the term Proto-Slavic language? Do we consider it to be an abstract entity, a collection of lexemes and grammatical rules which gave rise to the particular Slavic languages, or a well-defined system of equivalents, to make an analogy to a reference to the Proto-Indo-European language by Antoine Meillet,<sup>1</sup> or a specific language which developed in a particular time and place, and which similarly as all other languages which are known to us, was divided into smaller, more strongly associated units? It seems that the second approach definitely dominates. Testimony to this fact is furnished

---

<sup>1</sup> “[...] un système défini de correspondances entre les langues historiquement attestées” (“a defined system of equivalents between historically attested languages”) [Meillet 1903: 27].

by the polemics associated with the period of the existence and the territorial range of the Proto-Slavic language – a problem which was widely discussed and which has not been solved until today. These issues are discussed in an abundant store of research literature to which I make reference [K. Moszyński 1957a; Stieber 1979: 9–13; Birnbaum 1975: 1–83, 220–235, 1998; Sławski 1980 (reprinted 1989: 52–57); Popowska-Taborska 1991; Trubačev 2002; Mańczak 1981, 2001: 29–38, 2004; Gołąb 1992: 187–235; L. Moszyński 2006: 199–206]. In the context of the language itself, the reconstruction of its status as a real entity is testified by the distinguishing of dialects of this language – this subject was undertaken e.g. by Ljubov' V. Kurkina [Kurkina 1992, 2002: 153] and Leszek Moszyński [1980; 1998: 81–85] – or even by attempts at distinguishing an artistic style in this language [Sierociuk 2001].

In the case of the predecessor of the Proto-Slavic language – the Proto-Indo-European language – we deal with the treatment of a reconstructed language as an artificial construct. Testimony of this is furnished by the reconstructions of words in the form of roots<sup>2</sup> for this language or the reconstruction of sounds whose phonetic status is unclear, as in the case of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals. Zbigniew Gołąb, who emphasizes that he himself embraces a definitely realistic approach to the problem of a proto-language, writes the following about the aforementioned approach:

[t]he [...] statement that the reconstructed forms approximate historical reality should be understood as saying that at a period of prehistorical time there was a language, in this case a protolanguage of some linguistic family, whose forms could be imagined with the help of the reconstructed forms. This imagination has, however, an abstract, intellectual character; we reconstruct only the most relevant features, the distinctive ones, which somehow played a role in the later development of the individual languages of the given family. This means that the reconstruction of a concrete linguistic substance, i.e., the phonic substance, is impossible and even irrelevant. For example, we do not know what the phonetic realization of PIE voiced aspirate stops (the *mediae aspiratae*) [...] was, but we mark their voiced character [...] because this feature is relevant in the further development of many historical IE languages, such as Sanskrit, Avestic, Baltic, Slavic, Germanic etc. [Gołąb 1992: 29].

In practice, the scholars who are engaged in the reconstruction of non-attested languages veer between the first and the second approach, and they make a precise definition of these approaches rarely.<sup>3</sup> Wiesław Boryś makes cautious comments about this problem:

---

<sup>2</sup> As a matter of fact, the cause of the construction of the Proto-Indo-European lexicon on the basis of roots was probably the Old Indian dictionary in which the verbs were written exactly in this manner.

<sup>3</sup> In reference to the Proto-Indo-European language more information about the changes in the approach to the treatment of this language as a [uniform] whole may be found in Francisko Adrados's articles [Adrados 1992; 2007].

W epoce prasłowiańskiej rozwój językowy przebiegał, wydaje się, jednolicie na całym terenie do pewnego okresu. Jest jednak prawdopodobne, że przekonanie o jednolitości rozwoju językowego przez długi okres epoki prasłowiańskiej wynika z naszej niewiedzy, z zatarcia wcześniejszych różnic dialektycznych przez późniejsze zmiany językowe. Istnienie nieznanych nam pradawnych różnic terytorialnych w prasłowiańszczyźnie jest prawdopodobne, skoro nie jest znany żaden żywy język na kuli ziemskiej, który nie wykazywałby jakiegoś zróżnicowania terytorialnego, dialektycznego [Boryś 1998b: 29].

(In the Proto-Slavic period the development of the language proceeded, so it seems, uniformly in the whole area until a certain period. However, it is likely that the belief about the uniformity of linguistic development over the long period of the Proto-Slavic language results from our ignorance, from the obfuscation of previous dialectal differences by later linguistic changes. The existence of ancient territorial differences in the Proto-Slavic language of which we are ignorant is likely, since there is not a living language on the globe that would not manifest some kind of territorial or dialectal variety.)

In an article devoted to the areal division of the Proto-Slavic language Genadz' Cyhun stresses a point that the areal structure of the Proto-Slavic language may be discussed only if the Proto-Slavic language is considered a real language which occupies a specific area, and not as an artificial construct – an amorphous collection of reconstructed forms, without its peculiar spatial and temporal features.<sup>4</sup> The selection of the model of reconstruction also influences the mode of the reconstruction of meaning. I discuss this subject in more detail in the relevant chapter.

## 2. Reconstruction of Meanings in Non-Attested Languages. Theoretical Problems

The literature concerning the theoretical problems associated with the reconstruction of non-attested languages is not abundant. A discussion of the basic problems associated with such a reconstruction is found in the compendia of diachronic knowledge [L. Moszyński 2006: 195–199], in the introductory articles of etymological works [e.g. Shevelov 1964: 3–5], and most frequently in the publications prepared for international congresses of Slavists [e.g. Sławski

---

<sup>4</sup> “Зразумела, што пра арэальную структуру праславянскай мовы можна гаварыць толькі ў тым выпадку, калі праславяншчына разглядаецца як рэальная мова са сваёй тэрыторыяй, а не як штучны канструкт – ‘звалка’ рэканструяваных слоў і формаў без уласных прасторавых і часавых характарыстык” [Cyhun 1998: 74].

(“It is obvious that we can talk about an areal structure of Proto-Slavic, provided it is viewed as a real language with its territory, and not as an artificial construct, a ‘dump’ of reconstructed words and forms without its own spatial and temporal characteristics.”)

1958 (reprinted 1989: 17–24), 1968 (reprinted 1989: 33–39); Birnbaum 1973; Trubačev 1988]. In these works of research more attention is devoted to the principles of the reconstruction of the formal aspects instead of the semantic aspects of the particular linguistic units.<sup>5</sup> Even in the textbook which comprises more than 250 pages, entitled *K pramenům slov. Uvedení do etymologie* (*Towards the Sources of Words. Introducing Etymology* [Večerka 2006]), an extended edition of the previous *Úvod do etymologie* (*Introduction to Etymology* [Erhart, Večerka 1981]), prepared by a team of etymologists from Brno, semantic development was discussed in a mere twenty pages of text, of which a half was devoted to the phenomenon of *taboo*. This is regrettable, because the competence and many years of experience in the work devoted to the formation of meanings and semantic motivation of the authors of the textbook made us expect that the subject of the semantic development would finally receive proper treatment. Another, more recent, work entitled *Das Erschließen unbelegter Sprachen* (*Reconstructing Non-Attested Languages*) by Georg Holzer ignores this subject almost completely by devoting literally one paragraph to it:

So wie die Rekonstruktion nichts über den Lautwandel aussagt, der zwischen der Ursprache und den einzelsprachlichen Teilsprachen gewirkt hat [...] sagt sie auch nichts über einen etwaigen Bedeutungswandel; der betreffenden Bedeutungsträger aus. Analog zur lautlichen Seite ist aber auch über die Bedeutungen der ursprachlichen Bedeutungsträger Information gegeben: Die ursprachlichen Bedeutungsträger müssen solche Bedeutungen gehabt haben, daß sich die Bedeutungen der entsprechenden einzelsprachlichen Bedeutungsträger aus ihnen entwickelt haben können (vgl. 4.1.1., 5.2.4.). Diese an sich präzise Information ist nur aufgrund der manchmal auftretenden Schwierigkeiten, möglichen Bedeutungswandel von unmöglichen zu unterschieden, vage. Solange jedoch die Bedeutungen nicht rekonstruiert, sondern bloß die Bedeutungsträger im Rekonstrukt semantisch etikettiert werden sollen, sind diese Schwierigkeiten irrelevant vgl. 5.2.4. Und die bei der Aufstellung der etymologischen Gleichungen zu berücksichtigenden semantischen Fragen berühren die Rekonstruktion als axiomatisches System sozusagen nur von außen (s. 5.8.6.) [Holzer 1996: 126].

(Just as the reconstruction itself tells us nothing about the changes in sounds that took place between the proto-language and the particular partial languages [...], it also tells us nothing about any potential changes in the meaning of the respective carriers of meaning. Like in the case of sounds, so when it comes to the meanings of the proto-language's carriers of meaning, a piece of information is conveyed: as far as

---

<sup>5</sup> I hereby join the ranks of the etymologists, to whom Svetlana M. Tolstaja refers not without a degree of acrimony:

“Не будет преувеличением сказать, что сетования на несовершенство методов и приемов семантической реконструкции как в теоретическом, так и в практическом отношении стали лейтмотивом современных трудов по этимологии” [Tolstaja 2008a: 175].

(“It will not be an exaggeration to say that the complaining about the imperfection of methods and means of semantic reconstruction have become the leitmotif of contemporary etymological studies.”)

the meanings of the proto-language carriers of meanings are concerned, they must have been such meanings that the meanings of the respective carriers of component meanings of partial languages could evolve from them (cf. 4.1.1, 5.2.4). This basically precise piece of information becomes nebulous only in view of the difficulties which sometimes occur in the distinguishing of a possible change of meaning from an impossible one. However, as long as the point is not so much to reconstruct meanings but simply to provide a semantic classification of carriers of meanings within a reconstruction – these difficulties remain irrelevant, cf. 5.2.4. Indeed, the semantic issues that must be considered when elaborating etymological comparisons affect the reconstruction as an axiological system in a superficial manner only (see 5.8.6.)

This piece of information, as it turns out once we decipher the language of the author, is not so much precise as it is a truism, and the “difficulties which sometimes occur” are the fundamental problems with which the etymologists who devote more attention to the semantic side of the reconstruction than the author of the quoted work rack their brains.

More interest in semantic research in reference to the reconstruction of a language is visible in some of the earlier articles which are scattered in periodicals and works by collective authors. The article entitled *Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction* by Émile Benveniste [Benveniste 1954 (reprinted 1966)] is especially important, in which the author puts emphasis on the still relevant problems faced by etymologists. He writes that:

[...] en matière de sens, on n’a pour guide qu’une certaine vraisemblance, fondée sur le “bon sens,” sur l’appréciation personnelle du linguiste, sur les parallèles qu’il peut citer. Le problème est toujours, à tous les niveaux de l’analyse, à l’intérieur d’une même langue ou aux différents étapes d’une reconstruction comparative, de déterminer si et comment deux morphèmes formellement identiques ou comparables peuvent être identifiés par leur sens [Benveniste 1954: 251].

([...] as far as meaning is concerned, we may follow only a degree of likelihood as a guide, based on “common sense,” on the linguist’s personal judgment, on the parallels that he may set forth. The problem, which occurs on all levels of the analysis, within the scope of one language or on the different stages of comparative reconstruction, has to do with establishing whether and how two formally identical or comparable morphemes may be identified on the basis of their meanings.)

In the article entitled *Реконструкция слов и их значений* (*Reconstruction of Words and Their Meanings*), Oleg N. Trubačev [1980] devoted attention to the semantic aspects of the reconstruction. The author in this article, which is partly a critique of the overpowering supremacy of synchrony over diachrony – a peculiar to the beginnings of the 1980s – polemicalizes with the widely accepted yielding to the primacy of formal reconstruction. He recalls Oswald Szemerényi’s opinion as a characteristic one, according to which one of the principles that the etymologist should follow is the necessity to verify an etymology from the perspective of phonology, should it cause semantic doubts:

“Если этимон вызывает предположение о необычном семантическом развитии, исследователь должен заново проверить этимологию с фонологической точки зрения” [Szemerényi 1967: 12].<sup>6</sup> Trubačev emphasizes the inadequacy of the analysis of semes for the research of semantic changes. It is difficult to agree with such a statement because the distinction of semantic components, the presentation of those components which were emphasized and which receded into the background or were eliminated, facilitates a clear demonstration of the process of a semantic change. Thus, the problem is not the inadequacy of this method, but its excessive meticulousness which limits the range of application of this method to semantic fields that contain a small number of lexemes.

The problem of semantic motivation was also undertaken by Valentina Antonovna Merkulova in her articles [Merkulova 1988: 4–5, 1989a, 1989b]. A Bulgarian scholar, Živka Koleva-Zlateva, presented a work with a highly promising title: *Семантична реконструкция. Методологични аспекти* [*Semantic Reconstruction. Methodological Aspects* [Koleva-Zlateva 1998]]. However, the author of this fairly comprehensive work (112 pages) does not suggest her own solutions but she merely presents an account of earlier opinions concerning the problem of the reconstruction of meanings. The deficiency of this work consists in the fact that the author based her research exclusively on theoretical studies. She describes in a profuse manner the opinions concerning the problem of the reconstruction of meaning which are presented in earlier and recent works. She devotes a good deal of space to the classics of semasiology and semantics (e.g. Pisani, Zvegincev and Isačenko). She also takes into account the results of the research of related fields of study (sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, the study of children’s language, cognitive linguistics). However, this does not make up for the lack of reference to material research without which a discussion of theory is impossible.

On the other hand, we should point out that although the semantic aspects of reconstruction never should be ignored, it must not become the cause of

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. “If an etymon involves the assumption of an unusual semantic development, the researcher should re-examine the phonological aspect of the derivation. Often the result will be the discovery of an entirely different, evident, solution” [Szereményi 1977: 306], by pointing out here the danger of an unjustified identification of words [zrównywanie wyrazów] on the basis of the equivalency [odpowiedniość] of their forms and the apparent similarity of their meaning:

“Как показывает приведенный материал, не совпадают пути семантического развития соотносимых балт. и ю.-слав. слов, сближаются семантически неродные слова в их производных значениях, мотивированных разными семантическими признаками. Если этимология, удовлетворительно объясняя форму, вступает в противоречие с семантикой слов, то это может служить сигналом ошибочности этимологии” [Kurkina 1994: 35].

(“As is shown by the quoted material, the avenues of the semantic development of the respective Baltic and South Slavic words do not overlap; non-cognate words approach one another in their derivative meanings which are differently motivated semantic features. If the etymology, in its satisfactory explanation of a form, runs counter to the semantics of the words, this may be a signal that the etymology is incorrect.”)

a too liberal approach to the reconstruction of a form. This mistake is sometimes made even by distinguished etymologists. An example of this is provided by the works of Václav Machek; in two of his subsequently published etymological dictionaries of the Czech and Slovak languages [Machek; Machek<sup>2</sup>] we may encounter a great number of formal transformations (the most recurrent of which is metathesis), which are used to associate Slavic words with words of similar meanings from other Indo-European languages.

### 3. The Reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic Meaning in the Lexicographical Practice

The practical approach of the lexicographers who are engaged in the reconstruction of words from non-attested languages varies. Until now there is still no single school which would define the principles of the reconstruction of the initial meanings in etymological dictionaries. A short paragraph about this subject is included by Franciszek Sławski in the preface to the *Słownik prasłowiański* (*The Dictionary of the Proto-Slavic Language*) [SP]:

Staramy się odtworzyć podstawowe znaczenie ogólne, oczyszczając je od znaczeń nieistotnych, związanych z kontekstem. Chodzi nam o rekonstrukcję rozwoju znaczenia pierwotnego. Opieramy się przede wszystkim na realnie zaświadczonych danych słowiańskich. Uwzględniamy również znaczenia wynikające ze struktury słotwórczej wyrazu [SP 1:7].

(We attempt to reconstruct the basic general meaning by purifying it from irrelevant meanings which are associated with the context. We are engaged in the reconstruction of the development of the initial meaning. We base our research above all on the actually attested Slavic data. We also take into consideration the meanings which result from the word-formative structure of a word.)

In the earliest lexicons by Franz Miklosich [Miklosich] (1886) and Erich Berneker [Berneker] (1908–1913) the meaning of a word was not taken into consideration; these were dictionaries which collected vocabulary above all according to formal criteria. Even in the cases in which the semantics decided about the allotment of the continuants to separate lexical families which had dissimilar Proto-Indo-European sources, the authors failed to explain what motivated their decision about the classification of the continuants. As an example of this, we may present the treatment of the Proto-Slavic *\*jarъ*, traditionally considered as two homonymic Proto-Slavic lexemes: *\*jarъ 1.* and *\*jarъ 2.* Miklosich split the continuants between two source lexemes without a commentary concerning their meanings [Miklosich: 100]. Berneker limited himself to a remark concerning a secondary mixing of continuants in the Slavic languages:

Dabei ist natürlich nicht ausgeschlossen, daß sich die einst verschiedenen Sippen \**ěro-* und \**jaro-* späterhin im Slav. gekreuzt haben können [Berneker: 447].

(Here it is of course not unlikely that in the Proto-Slavic language two, once separate, roots \**ěro-* and \**jaro-* intersected.)

Over the course of time, the importance of the semantic aspects began to be appreciated. The words of Max Vasmer in the conclusion of his etymological dictionary of the Russian language are symptomatic:

Hätte ich die Arbeit von neuem zu beginnen, dann würde ich den Lehnübersetzungen und der semasiologischen Seite größere Beachtung schenken [Vasmer 3: 507].

(Were I to begin my work anew, I would devote more attention to translation calques and to the semantic aspects.)

The most consistent practice is that of the authors of etymological dictionaries who are associated with the Kraków-published *Słownik prasłowiański*, whose main principle is the reconstruction of the initial semantics of the researched lexeme. Therefore the entries included in this dictionary are always furnished with an analysis of meaning. Franciszek Sławski in the *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* (*An Etymological Dictionary of Polish*) and Wiesław Boryś in both of his works: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* and *Słownik etymologiczny kaszubszczyzny* (*An Etymological Dictionary of Kashubian*), of which he is a co-author, consistently include an alleged Proto-Slavic meaning. The same attention to a reliable reconstruction of meaning is manifest in all of the articles by Wiesław Boryś [see: Boryś 2007] and Maria Wojtyła-Świerzowska [e.g. Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1991; 1992], the successors to Franciszek Sławski in the editorship of the *Słownik prasłowiański*.

The authors associated with other research centers proceed in still different manners. As a rule, the *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* (*An Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Languages*) [ESSJ] does not reconstruct the Proto-Slavic meanings, neither in the headword of the reconstructed form of the Proto-Slavic word, nor in the etymological explanation of the word.<sup>7</sup> However, one would be hard put to accuse the etymologists from the Moscow center of disregarding the semantic aspects of etymology. On the contrary, it is their articles themselves that contain an elaborate and in-depth analysis of the semantic development (cf. the following names in the “Bibliography”: Kurkina, Merkulova, Petleva, Trubačev, Varbot). The *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon* by Rick Derksen [see Derksen] includes the reconstructed

<sup>7</sup> This does not apply to the words to which the authors of the ESSJ devoted comprehensive semantic studies, sometimes enhanced by substantial ethnographic data e.g. \**kostra* [ESSJ 11: 159–160], \**koŭja* [ESSJ 12: 71–74], \**koželъ* [ESSJ 12: 81–82], \**krivъjъ* [ESSJ 12: 172–174]. Studies of this type, which are not present in the first ten volumes of the dictionary, become more frequent starting from volume eleven.

meanings in all Proto-Slavic entries. The *Slovenski etimološki slovar* (*The Slovenian Etymological Dictionary*) by Marko Snoj [see Snoj; Snoj<sub>2</sub>] usually provides the meaning of the reconstructed Proto-Slavic lexeme in such cases when this meaning does not overlap with the meaning of the Slovene meaning – in contradistinction to the dictionary edited by Franc Bezlaj [see Bezlaj] which bears the same title and which provides only the reconstructed form. Jiří Rejzek, the author of an etymological dictionary of the Czech language [Rejzek], proceeds in an analogous manner to Snoj. Likewise inconsistent in this respect the practice of Andrzej Bańkowski, the author of *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego* (*An Etymological Dictionary of Polish*), who includes the meanings that he reconstructs himself in some of the Proto-Slavic entries that he (again, himself) reconstructs. The semantic reconstruction is missing also in the *Български етимологичен речник* (*The Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary*) [BER]; in contradistinction to the majority of dictionaries it consistently refuses to provide the meaning in the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European root.

What is the relationship between my proposition of the reconstruction to the reconstruction which is conducted in the *Słownik prasłowiański*? The basic difference is caused by the fact that in my work, in contradistinction to the *Słownik*, the reconstructed meanings and the successive stages of its development are the primary tasks. Therefore I do not limit myself to the provision of all the meanings that may be reconstructed for a given word on the basis of its continuants, but I attempt to present the sequence of the development of these meanings. I embraced the principle about a number of stages of the reconstruction of meaning. I distinguish the following meanings: etymological meaning (on the basis of non-Slavic equivalents or the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European root), structural meaning (based on the meaning of the derivational base), and the meaning which is reconstructed according to the continuants in Slavic languages. The reconstruction of meaning which is thus presented is a model which facilitates a clear presentation of the line of reasoning. However, as with every model, it is bound to simplify to a certain extent the actual state of affairs.

The *Słownik prasłowiański* frequently reconstructs a number of meanings at the same time, which are considered more or less chronologically concurrent. Thus, it approaches the model of a dictionary of languages which actually exist, a dictionary which reconstructs the state of affairs at a given period. However, it does not investigate the sequence of the emergence of polysemous meanings. For me, the most relevant thing is above all the possibility of deriving [wyprowadzanie] some meanings from other meanings.<sup>8</sup> Therefore if I consider

<sup>8</sup> The necessity of devoting more attention to the sequence of the emergence of meanings (especially during the process of comparing words from various languages) was pointed out by e.g. Ljubov' V. Kurkina:

“Для выяснения этимологии важно изучить слово во всей совокупности его семантического содержания, чтобы определить первоначальный семантический признак, который и должен объяснить все существенные значения, восстановить отдельные этапы семантической эволюции сравниваемых слов” [Kurkina 1994: 33].

that the reconstruction of more meanings for the Proto-Slavic period is justified on the basis of continuants, I mark by the means of a graphical symbol the probable sequence of their emergence. If I am unable to establish the sequence of the emergence of these meanings, I enumerate them without providing the “>” sign. I describe the reasons for accepting a given sequence (or the reason for which according to me the establishment of the sequence is impossible) in the part of my work which is devoted to the meaning that is reconstructed on the basis of the continuants in Slavic languages. If a need arises, I make reference to the earlier sections of the same entry. Moreover, the reader has the opportunity to compare all of the meanings that are reconstructed in a given entry, which is supposed to make the semantic development of the discussed words from the Proto-Indo-European times until the present manifest to the reader.

### 3.1. The Continuants and Their Hierarchy

In etymology continuants are terms which refer to actually existing words, derived from the reconstructed proto-form. The correctness of the establishment of these continuants is proven by the conformity with the rules of phonetic development which are peculiar to each of the languages, thus, for example, the appropriate realization of nasal vowels, the groups *TorT-*, *TolT-* and the sonorous velar consonant. In the case of a discrepancy between the word that we are interested in and the expected form we must surmise that the given word is not a continuant of a Proto-Slavic form but a loan-word from a different Slavic language. We deal with a situation of this kind frequently in the Russian language in the case of the so-called (Old) Church Slavonic borrowings whose formal mark is the realization of the groups *TorT-*, *TolT-* as *TraT-*, *TlaT-* instead of the expected full grade [pełnogłos] *ToroT-*, *ToloT-*. For example, the presence of the consonant *h-* instead of *g-* is symptomatic of borrowings in Polish.

Similarly as the form also the meaning may be referred to an earlier stage thanks to research. Needless to say, the early, archaic or, as they are referred to in modern dictionaries, obsolete meanings or such meanings that are recorded in earlier or specially arranged dictionaries are very crucial for the reconstruction of meaning. A special role is accorded to the vocabulary of the Old Church Slavonic language because it was the earliest language for which a writing system was devised. We must not forget that the language itself (one that was created on the basis of South Slavic dialects of the area of the present-day Salonika) was preserved thanks to the translation of the texts of the New Testament and of other texts for liturgical purposes for the Slavs. For this

---

(“For the explanation of etymology it is important to study the entire semantic content of a word in order to define the initial semantic property which is supposed to account for all of the relevant meanings and facilitate the reconstruction of the particular stages of the semantic evolution of the words that are compared.”)

reason there could have occurred a certain kind of adaptation of existing meanings for the purposes of the concepts that were translated. (However, in the semantic field that I selected, one that “characterizes people,” there was allegedly no necessity for creating new meanings, which reduces the risk of adaptation.) The most representative example of such a kind of difficulty in my work is the OCS *jędrъ* with the meaning ‘fast.’ In other languages for which a writing system was devised later the following meanings dominate: ‘strong,’ ‘firm/robust,’ ‘fat.’ The semantic development is therefore quite remote but a reconstruction of the string of semantic transitions which combine the meaning ‘fast,’ recorded in the eleventh century, with the meanings that functioned later, is quite possible. The problem lies in the determination of the direction in which the semantic development proceeded. In the case of such discrepancies the most important thing is the possibility to establish (however, we do not always have this possibility) whether the meaning that was recorded in an eleventh-century text is the main meaning of the lexeme or a secondary [Nebenbedeutung], or even a contextual meaning.

Influences may also be of a formal nature; for example a part of compounds, including compound adjectives which are written in this language, most probably reflect the Greek vocabulary which abounds in such formations<sup>9</sup> [cf. Brodowska-Honowska 1960: 225–229]. By making reference to the dictionaries of the Old Church Slavonic language and the dictionaries which register the oldest layers of the literature of other languages, we bear in mind the fact that these dictionaries are arranged according to the written sources that were accessible and not (as in the present times) on the basis of spoken languages. That is why in the case of the earliest vocabulary we lack “negative evidence/attestation,” i.e., the fact that a word or the meaning that we pursue is missing in a dictionary is no evidence that this word or meaning was absent in the language under research. Of course, this is a result of the number of written sources and their limited thematic scope.

Another source which is crucial for the reconstruction is the dialectal vocabulary. We must exercise caution in our employment of this vocabulary because it is liable both to preserve old meanings and to create innovations. Therefore it is important to know which of the dialects have the most archaic nature.

We must point out that the usage of dictionaries which collect dialectal vocabulary requires a great deal of attention and expertise. It is much more difficult than the usage of explicative dictionaries. Above all, in contradistinction

---

<sup>9</sup> The percentage [udział] of compounds in the vocabulary of the Proto-Slavic language is a disputable question. Both the *Słownik prasłowiański* and the *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* reconstruct quite a great number of two-part words. Some of these words are reconstructed exclusively on the basis of proper names, toponyms and personal names, and despite of this, they are treated as *appellativa*; other words are reconstructed in the function of a proper name by the SP. This subject is undertaken in a more comprehensive manner by Aleksandra Cieślíkowa in her article *Prasłowiańskie wyrazy złożone a nazwy własne – struktura i semantyka (Proto-Slavic Compound Words and Proper Names – Structure and Semantics)* [Cieślíkowa 2002].

to the former type of dictionaries, the very standards of professionalism of the sources varies. They range from specialist research works to amateur studies written by the users of a given dialect.<sup>10</sup> In the research of meanings it is critically important to be aware whether a given dictionary collects all of the meanings of a lexeme, or only those that do not occur in the general vocabulary of a given (standard, literary, non-dialectal) language. It is also important to distinguish whether the meaning that is recorded in a dictionary is a lexicalized meaning in a given dialect or merely a contextual one.

Apart from the benefit of the particular chronological and areal layers of the recorded words and meanings for the reconstruction of vocabulary, and especially of its semantics, the relationship between the languages (dialects) from which the vocabulary originates is very important. The basic dialectal distribution of Slavic languages, i.e., the division into the western, eastern and southern groups, is a widely known and accepted thing [cf. e.g. Stieber 1979: 13–16].<sup>11</sup> Within these groups there are languages which share close genetic links, and this refers also to their lexicon. Therefore, the Czech and Slovak vocabulary, the Serbian and Croat vocabulary, and the vocabulary of both of the Sorbian languages are closely related. I point out these completely obvious facts because they are crucial for the reconstruction that I am interested in. The knowledge of the mutual relations between the languages facilitates the distinguishing of archaisms from innovations. A considerable percentage of the inherited lexicon is found in the languages which are located in the center. On the other hand, due to the close-knit character [zwartość] of these languages, in some cases their contribution to the research in which we are engaged may be smaller than the contribution of peripheral languages and dialects. The preservation of untypical meanings in the remote parts of Slavdom enables us to infer that these meanings are not a common innovation (what could have been likely in the case of the languages of neighboring peoples) but a remnant of a Proto-Slavic meaning which died elsewhere.

The problem of areal relationships between the Slavic languages is engaged among others by Genadz' Cyhun [Cyhun 1998, 2000].<sup>12</sup> The researcher points out that we cannot identify the areal structure with the genetic structure. While only the archaic meanings are crucial for the reconstruction of the initial meaning, in order to describe the development of semantic changes one has to distinguish those innovations which developed independently from those

<sup>10</sup> I am aware of the great usefulness of the latter kind of dictionaries; due to the substantially greater possibilities of an accurate excerption and a proper understanding of the material, the term "standards of professionalism" is used here without its evaluative meaning.

<sup>11</sup> The settling of the dispute concerning the probably earlier division of the Proto-Slavic language into two complexes, the northern and the southern or the eastern and the western complexes, is less important for the purposes of my work. See more on this subject in Boryś [Boryś 2001: 28].

<sup>12</sup> "[...] Пра арэальную структуру праславяншчыны мы можам гаварыць толкі тады, калі нам удаецца адрозніць у праславянскай мове інавацыі ад архаізмаў" [Cyhun 1998: 74]. ("[...] We may speak about the areal structure of Proto-Slavdom only when we manage to distinguish innovations from archaism in the Proto-Slavic language.")

that manifest a dependency upon the innovations which arose in other languages. Of course, linguistic geography also reveals an opposite aspect of the phenomenon associated with the peripheral preservation of relict meanings. The languages of peoples that are located in borderland areas remain under stronger foreign influences. This has to do especially with Sorbian languages and the extinct Polabian language which remained under a many-sided influence of the German element. In the aforementioned languages one may discern numerous borrowings, and what is particularly important during the research of meaning, semantic calques or even changes in the structure of the conceptual content of a lexeme. A lower degree of foreign influence is manifested by South Slavic languages. This influence is associated mainly in the great number of borrowings – a form of influence which interferes in the texture of language to the smallest extent. All of the aforementioned aspects should be taken into consideration during the appreciation of the value of the particular meanings that are attested for the initial meaning.

Moreover, due to the universally-known feature of the lexicon as that part of language which is susceptible to foreign influences to the greatest extent, the image of genetic relationships is somewhat modified by historical events and cultural influences. The Old Polish language, for example, was susceptible to Czech influence. In the Ukrainian and Belarusian languages there are significant lexical influences of the Polish language; a considerable transfer of vocabulary also occurred in the opposite direction. In the Bulgarian language there are many borrowings from the Russian language. The Macedonian language, which manifests a close genetic affinity with the Bulgarian language, approached the Serbian language in the more recent lexical layer, or, in order to avoid a terminological anachronism, the Serbo-Croat language.

In conclusion, we should point out that the initial meanings may be found not only in the direct continuants of the Proto-Slavic words that are researched. Such meanings (or at least the semantic elements which indicate them) may also be preserved in the derivatives of these words.

The *Słownik prasłowiański* and the *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* employ the derivatives apart from the continuants of the reconstructed words in the cases when the reconstructed word has an insufficient number of attestations. It happens recurrently that the initial semantics may be even better preserved in derivatives than in the continuants of the basic word. The fact that this situation may also be associated with words with abundant attestations deserves attention. An example of this is the Proto-Slavic *\*bermę* ‘that which is carried; weight/burden,’ a word which is formed on the basis of the PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>er-* ‘to carry’ which, in contradistinction to the root *\*b<sup>h</sup>erati* ‘to take,’ based on the same root, did not lose the Proto-Indo-European meaning ‘to carry.’<sup>13</sup> The fact that I did not employ the derivatives as an additional source

<sup>13</sup> As a matter of fact, *\*bermę* is not derived from *\*berę* *\*b<sup>h</sup>erati* but directly from the root (owing to the following Indo-European equivalents: OInd. *bhārīman-* ‘carrying,’ Gr. *φέρμα* ‘that which is carried;

in my research does not result from their omission or underestimation but from the impossibility of researching in a work of this kind of whole word families of all the lexemes that were discussed. Of course, the meanings that are abstracted from the derivatives (both Proto-Slavic ones and those whose Proto-Slavic status may be questionable!) should be taken into consideration during the research of the typology of the semantic development as far as possible.

## 4. The Particular Stages of Reconstruction

### 4.1. The Principles of Reconstructing the Meaning Which Is Based on Continuants

Such meaning is associated with the period that is the most distant one chronology-wise. I attempt to reconstruct the meaning which is based on the continuants for every lexical unit that is reconstructed. The reconstruction is based on a comparison of all of the meanings of all Slavic lexemes which are derived from the form that is reconstructed as a Proto-Slavic form. The first stage of this process is the rejection of meanings that are clearly secondary – such meanings that refer to later realia. This activity, which is a common practice as far as the reconstruction of the meanings of nouns is concerned, causes more problems during the reconstruction of the meaning of other parts of speech. Another activity is associated with the reduction of meanings to a “common denominator” – the establishment of whether some of them are variants of the same meaning, i.e., they differ in features which are insignificant. We also establish which of the attested meanings are sufficiently related to consider them as derived from themselves. We may speak of derivability when by way of the change of one semantic element of one meaning we receive a different meaning. Thus, we receive a string of transformations which is mentioned in Darmesteter [1887]. The effect of these operations is the acquisition of one or a number of strings; thus, analogically to synchronic research, we may claim that we deal with a Proto-Slavic monosemantic or polysemantic word. It depends upon the judgment of the researcher to decide whether he or she should pursue to the maximum extent the reduction of meanings to one initial meaning – i.e., to pursue to derive meanings from themselves, meanings which constitute the initial elements of particular strings. One must bear in mind that during the reconstruction of meaning, similarly as during the reconstruction of the entire proto-language, we manoeuvre between the reconstruction of a model and the reconstruction of an

---

foetus’). However, it is without doubt that in the early Proto-Slavic period the relationship between these words was not more distant than in the case of other independent derivatives of the same root.

entity which is similar to a real entity. Consider the following example: as far as an entire language is concerned, we are dealing with a decision whether we want to reconstruct a “pure” language with or without its distinctive dialectal features, which must have been a part of this proto-language, just as is the case with any natural language. Analogically, as far as the meaning is concerned, we may assume only one initial meaning or – as in the case of natural languages – the parallel existence of diversified meanings of one word, meanings derived from themselves (in principle, this approach is embraced by the *Słownik prasłowiański*).

It is clear that the degree of the credibility of reconstruction is the highest when all or almost all meanings of the continuants are equal to one another. In the case of Slavic languages this situation occurs quite frequently. However, we must take into consideration the incompleteness of the material base at our disposal. The period of the Proto-Slavic community is centuries apart from the first written records. During the course of these centuries the particular languages that are derived from Proto-Slavic dialects underwent development. Even the consistent nature of the recorded meanings does not produce complete certainty as far as the initial semantics is concerned. That is the reason why the meaning which is thus reconstructed must be compared with other meanings that are acquired (by the researcher) through the employment of procedures. The latter will be discussed in the further part of this chapter.

In special cases there are reconstructions of meanings which are completely absent [niewidoczne] in the material, if there is a manifest lack of a transitional link in the string of transitions between the structural meaning and the meanings that are actually attested, e.g., \**kyrъ*, \**skъbъnъ*. Each of these aspects is treated in a comprehensive manner in the respective entries.

Very frequently at the beginning of the strings of transformations there are meanings which may be derivable from one another but we do not know which of these meanings was the initial one. In such cases the authors who embrace the “model of a natural language” reconstruct a polysemous word.

There may also be a situation in which the meanings constitute a number of clearly distinctive groups. Therefore the problem consists in the finding of a common source of these meanings. In the case of deverbal derivatives it may be so that the problem is solved by assuming an initial homonymy based on the varied diathesis of the verb.

## 4.2. The Reconstruction of the Structural Meaning

The reconstruction of the structural meaning refers to the reconstructed Proto-Slavic words which are not considered as the words inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language but as formations which were created in the Proto-Slavic context. The reconstruction consists in the finding of the

derivational base of a Proto-Slavic word and the creation (from this base) of a meaning which is compatible with the word-formative structure of this word. In the context of my work the structural meaning is a potential meaning. I do not assume that it actually functioned in the Proto-Slavic period. It could have been merely a carrier of certain semes which were transferred with a meaning of a derivative word from the semantic center [centrum znaczeniowe] to the connotational sphere.

The reconstruction of the structural meaning entails limitations. Above all we cannot find a word-formative basis for each derivative. Frequently, the base is completely concealed under the formants that are accreted. If traces of such a base can be found, the latter should be reconstructed. Both the *Słownik prasłowiański* and the *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* follow this principle. We must also direct our attention to the semantic function of the word-formative formants in the Proto-Slavic period. The situation varies according to the specific parts of speech. On the basis of an overview of the Proto-Slavic word-formation, there were certain formants for nouns which had a quite distinctive semantic function, e.g., the function of the performer of an action [cf. SP 1: 58–141; 2: 13–60; 3: 11–19]; we may also distinguish certain semantic functions of verbs [SP 1: 43–58]. Adjectival formants (ones that are not discussed in the overview of Proto-Slavic word-formation), which may be reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language, basically do not feature semantic content.<sup>14</sup> Whereas the adjectives are such a part of speech for which the basis of derivation, which facilitates the reconstruction of the general structural meaning, may be frequently found in the Proto-Slavic (hypothetical) material.

The structural meaning that I reconstruct has a form which is supposed to make manifest the transition from non-adjectival semantics to adjectival semantics. If the basis of the derivative under research is a verb, the meaning has the form of an active or passive participle. Apart from that there may be an adjective with a meaning which approaches participial meaning; e.g., in the case of the derivation from *\*duriti* ‘to seethe [burzyć się]’ the structural meaning is assumed to be the participle with the meaning of the passive voice ‘rough, choppy’ (*\*durьnъ*), similarly as from *\*tegti* ‘to tighten, to string,

<sup>14</sup> The most frequent suffix *-ьнъ* doubtlessly does not have this function. The suffix *-ькъ* performs above all a structural function, namely it broadens the original nominal formations by conferring an unambiguously adjectival form to them. The diminutive function, which Franciszek Sławski [Sławski 1: 287] perceives after André Vaillant and Nikolaj Trubeckoj, is not sufficiently corroborated by the material. The suffixes with the base *-a-*: *avъ*, *asъ*, *astъ*, *atъ*, in which we may perceive the function of a diminished intensity in the case of the names of colors (e.g. *\*bělavъ*, *\*bělavъ*, *\*bělavъ* ‘of a color which approaches white, subalbidus’ [SP 1: 228]; *\*bělъ* ‘white, albus’; *\*čjvenavъ*, *\*čjvenavъ*, *\*čjvenavъ* ‘reddish, subruber’ [SP 2: 259]; *\*čjvenъ* ‘red, ruber’; *\*čjnavъ*, *\*čjnavъ*, *\*čjnavъ* ‘of a blackish color, subniger’ [SP 2: 229]; *\*čjnъ* ‘black, niger’), do not have this function in the adjectives with different semantics (cf. *\*čitavъ* ‘whole, intact, incolumis’: *\*čitъ* ‘idem’ [SP 2: 217–218]; *\*dobravъ* ‘good, bonus’: *\*dobrъ* ‘idem’ [SP 3: 293–294]). This allows us to suppose that the present function of diminishing intensity e.g. the Polish suffix *-awy*, is secondary, based on the serial analogy which is discernible in the case of the names of colors.

to stretch [napinać]: ‘tightened, strung [napięty]’ (\**tqg̃*). From \**s̃m̃q̃titi* ‘to muddy/disturb [mącić]: ‘turbid [zmacony]’; ‘muddy/disturbed [mętny]’ (\**s̃m̃q̃t̃ñ*). Analogically, there is the occurrence of participles with the meaning of the active voice: in the case of the derivation from \**doseq̃ti* ‘to reach (to)/to achieve [dosięgać, osiągać]: ‘one who reaches/achieves sth [dosięgający czegoś, osiągający coś]’ (\**dos̃q̃g̃*), from \**r̃q̃gati* ‘to jeer [szydzić]: ‘engaged in jeering [szydzący]’; ‘of a jeering nature [szyderczy]’ (*r̃q̃ž̃ñ*) (apart from ‘jeered [wyszydzany]’), from \**chytati* ‘to get hold of sth [chwytać]: ‘prehensile [chwyający; chwytny]’ (\**chytr̃*). Thus, by reconstructing the structural meaning, I make the choice of the active or passive voice of the participle on the basis of the actual meaning – i.e., the meaning that is reconstructed on the basis of continuants. I think that this solution is better than providing both hypothetical variants each time.<sup>15</sup> Both variants are provided only in such cases when they are attested in continuants cf. \**rychl̃*, \**kr̃q̃t̃*. The structural meaning of the derivatives of these nominal bases (stems) is formed in a descriptive manner, e.g., it may be based on a comparison, as from \**dr̃k̃* ‘pole, trunk [słup, pień]: ‘such as a pole; trunk’ (\**dr̃č̃ñ*). In any case the derivatives with a nominal base are less numerous than those with a double formal motivation: either nominal or verbal motivation (cf. \**grož̃ñ* ‘terrible [groźny]’ from \**groza* or ‘one who threatens, who is dangerous’ from \**groziti*). In the case of deverbial derivatives, the descriptive form is used when there is no other possibility of expressing a given meaning: from \**š̃ibati* ‘to brandish: ‘such that can be brandished’ (\**š̃ib̃k̃*).

### 4.3. The Reconstruction of the Etymological Meaning

A different procedure is applied in the case of the words which are directly inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language. A word that has exact formal equivalents in other Indo-European languages may be considered a word that is inherited directly from the Proto-Indo-European language, i.e., this word manifests the same qualitative and quantitative apophony in the case of the thematic formations or the same suffix; compare the examples below.

#### 4.3.1. The Adjectives Inherited from the Proto-Indo-European Language

As far as the adjectives are concerned, the evidence that could allow us to reconstruct the nominal form along with the adjectival meaning already for

<sup>15</sup> In the description of the reconstruction of meaning I did not take into consideration the peculiar nature of the adjectives which are participles by origin because, according to my presentation in the chapter to follow, the great vacillation of the diathesis precludes the reconstruction of the semantics of the active or passive voice on the basis of the structure of the participle.

the Proto-Indo-European period can be relatively rarely provided. The examples that are used in my work include *\*mōdr̥* < *\*mond<sup>h</sup>-ro* from *\*mend<sup>h</sup>-* with equivalents in Baltic and Germanic languages, cf. *\*mōdr̥*, perhaps also *\*dobr̥* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-ro-* from *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-*, for which Indo-European equivalents exist in Latin and Armenian. They are characterized by vocalism, a typical feature of nominal forms, and the determinant *-ro-* which is added to the root. The etymological meaning may be reconstructed with a great degree of probability for those Proto-Slavic lexemes which have reliable equivalents in Indo-European languages. Even in the cases which involve a complete formal conformity of non-Slavic equivalents we are faced with the question in which language the initial meanings were preserved. The situation becomes simpler when we have at our disposal more than two language groups in which continuants of the given Proto-Indo-European form exist. Then we may speak of the existence of the *tertium comparationis*. If we are dealing with only two groups which preserve continuants, the nature of the concepts to which a given form refers may become the decisive factor. The concepts which refer to more basic referents, e.g., physical properties, should be treated as earlier ones, although sometimes this principle may lead *ad absurdum* whereby exclusively the simplest meanings are reconstructed. An excessive belief in the greater antiquity of certain languages may prove a fallible factor. Since the disintegration of the Proto-Indo-European community until the arrival of the culture of the written word so many years had elapsed that the meanings in each of the languages could undergo a significant development, therefore I consider the conformity (or a simple derivability [wyprowadzalność] of meanings in the languages of various groups as a more reliable fact than the antiquity of the attestation. This approach also refers to the reconstruction within the particular groups of languages, although to a lesser extent, due to the smaller temporal space between the disintegration of the community and the first written records.

#### 4.3.2. The Reconstruction of the Etymological Meaning on the Basis of the Proto-Indo-European Root

We deal more frequently with the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic adjective on the basis of a Proto-Indo-European root, which in the vast majority of cases is a verbal root. In my research the etymological meaning which is thus reconstructed, similarly as the structural meaning mentioned in paragraph 4.2., assumes the form of a participle as the verbal form which is closest to the adjective, or the form of a deverbal adjective.

#### 4.4. The Value of the Reconstructed Material under Discussion. The Confrontation of Results

The situation in which the Proto-Slavic adjective is compared directly with the Proto-Indo-European root provides us with the least reliable results. It seems that one should give up such comparisons as far as possible in favor of actually attested continuants which may be found in the particular Indo-European languages. Apart from the obvious fallibility of comparisons with the reconstructed meaning of the Proto-Indo-European root, which is based on the possibility of creating a vicious circle, if the Proto-Slavic meaning contributed to the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European meaning. The diversification of the value of the equivalents from various Indo-European languages, conditioned by their relationship to the Proto-Slavic language, speaks in favor of such an approach. Due to the close Slavic-Baltic links<sup>16</sup> the comparisons with the Lithuanian language are especially important. Further places in the agenda are occupied by the Slavic-Germanic and Slavic-Iranian comparisons.<sup>17</sup> The common Germanic and Baltic-Slavic vocabulary is the subject of a collection of studies, edited by Anatolij Nepokupnyj [Nepokupnyj et al. 1989].

Our confidence concerning the correctness of our reconstruction is the greatest when the Proto-Slavic meaning, independently reconstructed on the basis of continuants, and the etymological meaning which precedes it, are identical, or when the Proto-Slavic meaning which is reconstructed on the basis of continuants may be easily derived from [wyprowadzone od] the etymological meaning.

In the case of the adjectives which are not word-formatively motivated in the Proto-Slavic context, for which (adjectives) we must reconstruct a number of meanings on the basis of continuants, the establishment of their (i.e., of meanings) sequence may involve serious difficulties. The knowledge of the etymological meaning enables us to solve this problem. However, very frequently we are faced with a situation in which there is a number of more or less convincing etymologies, and each of them may support a different proposition regarding the semantic development (cf. the etymologies of the Proto-Slavic *\*chudъ*, *\*jędrъ*, *\*jarъ*). In such cases the researcher falls into a vicious circle, because if there is a number of equally probable etymologies, the sequence of the emergence of meanings may become the decisive factor, and the latter is dependent upon the choice of a particular etymology. It is exactly in this case that the studies which present the paradigms of the semantic development, treated in a more comprehensive manner in the chapter "The Parallels of Semantic

<sup>16</sup> The genetic affinity of Slavic and Baltic languages is a doubtless fact. However, the nature of their relationship has remained the subject of a debate for many years.

<sup>17</sup> This subject is treated in a comprehensive manner by Sławski [1977]; the oldest Slavic-Iranian linguistic relationships are discussed by Reczek [1991: 89–90]; see also the body of example material: Gołąb 1992: 93–107.

Development,” prove useful. They enable us to estimate the probability of a given semantic change.

Problems also arise in situations when the etymological meaning is admittedly equal to the meanings of some of the continuants but other premises resulting from a comparison of Slavic continuants indicate that the secondary nature of this etymological meaning is more probable. In such situations the researcher hesitates whether to consider such a meaning as a relict one (i.e., such that was preserved as an exceptional instance in the particular Slavic languages, whereas in other Slavic languages it was replaced by newer meanings) or as an innovative meaning which is accidentally equal to the etymological meaning.

#### 4.5. The Problem of the Homonyms

The problem which is associated with only an exiguous number of the reconstructed Proto-Slavic words but one that is immensely important, is the possibility of homonymy. According to Wiesław Boryś:

Jednym z bardziej złożonych problemów leksykologii jest rozróżnianie homonimów i wyrazów polisemicznych. Również przy rekonstrukcji słownictwa prasłowiańskiego nierazdo trzeba rozstrzygnąć problem, czy w konkretnym wypadku mamy do czynienia z dwoma (lub kilkoma) jednobrzmiącymi wyrazami o różnym pochodzeniu, czy też z jednym wieloznacznym wyrazem [Boryś 1980: 39 (reprinted 2007: 196)].

(One of the more complex problems of lexicology consists in the distinguishing of homonyms and polysemous words. Moreover, not infrequently during the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic vocabulary one has to determine whether in a given case we are facing two (or multiple) words which sound identically but which have different origins, or one, polysemous/ambiguous word.)

In the present work the most representative word which forces me to answer this question is the Proto-Slavic *\*jarъ* in which some etymologists see two etymologically dissimilar lexemes, others – one. The problem of the possibility of Proto-Slavic homonymy is the subject of a number of articles. Eva Havlová [1994]<sup>18</sup> points to the pitfalls of excessively broad reconstructions,

<sup>18</sup> “Důkladný sémaziologicko-onomaziologický rozbor je nezbytný zejména v případech, kdy je třeba řešit otázku, zda stejně znějící slova s odlišnými významy pocházejí z jednoho základu nebo zda jde o nepřibuzná homonyma. Bohužel je ještě dosti časté stanovisko pokládající a priori taková slova za přibuzná a snažící se jejich významy všemožně spojit. Pokud je předpokládáný významový přechod jen vymyšlený a nedoložený, nemá žádnou průkaznost, neboť při dobré vůli se dá sémanticky spojit téměř vše. Ani kombinace, předpokládající celý řetěz sémantických přechodů, v němž jsou jen jednotlivé články doloženy paralelou, nejsou o mnoho přesvědčivější [...]. Rozhodujícím kritériem pro to, zda určitá dvojice slov je homonymní, nebo přibuzná, může být jen podrobný průzkum historie příslušných slov, též jejich frazeologického využití, s přihlédnutím k vývoji jednak

general meanings instead of considering them to be homonyms. Specific examples are mentioned by Petr Nejedlý in his article entitled “Rekonstrukce sémantického vývoje a etymologie” [Nejedlý 2000], and also by Maria Wojtyła-Świerzowska. Although the latter author does not refer to the Proto-Slavic period (the word that she analyzes is a late, probably nineteenth-century borrowing), the problem is of a universal nature [Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1999].

#### 4.6. The Role of Acquaintance with the Realia in the Establishment of a Motivation

During the reconstruction of the initial meaning a great role is played by the acquaintance with the realia that existed during the formation and the transformations of the meanings of lexemes.<sup>19</sup> This was already pointed out earlier, especially in the approach which is until today referred to as “Wörter und Sachen,” and this is still pointed out until today [e.g. Němec 1995: 183<sup>20</sup>;

---

jejich synonym, jednak dalších členů jejich slovní rodiny; seznámení s reáliemi, jež slova označují, je samozřejmým předpokladem. Když tento průzkum neukáže přesvědčivé možnosti obě slova spojit, můžeme je pokládat za homonyma a hledat pro jedno z nich nové etymologické korespondence” [Havlová 1978: 309].

(“A precise semasiological and onomasiological analysis is indispensable, especially in the cases when one has to decide whether the words with an identical sound but with different meanings originate from the same base or that we are dealing with non-cognate homonyms. Unfortunately, there is a still-frequent opinion whose supporters consider such words *a priori* as cognates and they do what they can to establish links between their meanings. In so far as the supposed semantic transition is merely hypothetical and not attested, this is no proof, for with a degree of good will one may establish semantic links between everything. Also combinations which suppose an entire string of semantic transitions, in which only single links are attested by parallels, are not more convincing. [...] The decisive criterion of whether a specific pair of words is homonymous or cognate may be associated only with a detailed analysis of the history of given words, also an analysis of their phraseological usage, taking into account both the development of their synonyms and other members of the same semantic family; becoming acquainted with the realia associated with given words is an obvious assumption. If such research does not present a convincing possibility of associating both words, we may consider them as homonyms and seek new etymological equivalents for one of them.”)

<sup>19</sup> I have to give Svetlana M. Tolstaja permission to speak, who tries to trace the realia of the Proto-Slavic period by comparing them with the results of field research conducted in the “bastion of Slavdom,” widely considered to be Polesia. By taking the lexemes *молодоў* and *смапоў* as examples, the author demonstrates that the connotations of these words, preserved in the cultural contexts associated with the phases of the moon, do not depart from those that are preserved in the etymological meaning [Tolstaja 2008a: 184]. However, the recognition of the great significance of such ascertainment for etymological research must be accompanied by stressing the fact that it may constitute exclusively a supplementary proof – it cannot be a counterbalance to traditional methods.

<sup>20</sup> “Vývoj významu slova nemůžeme zkoumat bez poznání historie pojmenovávané reálie. Při tom však nesmíme zapomínat, že slovo nepojmenovává samotnou reálii, ale její odraz z povědomí lidí zkoumaného údobí, což v praxi znamená požadavek nevňášet dnešní pojetí do staré doby” [Němec 1995: 183–184].

Havlová 1999, 2002a]. Maria Wojtyła-Świerzowska [1999] emphasizes the role of the acquaintance with the actual situation in the interpretation of the avenues of semantic development. The question to what extent the particular realia may influence the progress of semantic changes is yet to be answered. The frequently mentioned example of the emergence of a monetary unit from the temple dedicated to Juno that was located in the vicinity of a mint demonstrates that the origins of a meaning may be completely accidental. However, in typical research situations the etymologists deal not with specific instances of nomination but with data which may indirectly indicate a possibility of a given nomination. Semantic parallels, which are mentioned in my work, may help us to establish (to a lesser degree – to exclude – because nominations may be singular) the possibility of a given solution. Nevertheless, one must exercise a great degree of caution in the employment of semantic parallels to the reconstruction of meanings from the pre-literary period. Even in those semantic spheres where, as it seems, the metaphorical relationship of some concepts is widespread (e.g. the transfer of the names of physical reactions to the names of emotions), one must always take into consideration also other possibilities of etymological solutions.<sup>21</sup> Important data is provided by archeological and historical sources. To illustrate this point we may provide the names of sadness, regret, crying, which are motivated by the words which belong to the semantic field “to tear; to cut.” Although their formal explication is known, researchers debate the real motivation of these names. Irina Petrovna Petleva perceives this motivation in the funerary customs which consisted in the tearing of one’s clothes and the cutting of one’s face to demonstrate regret:

Семантические переходы данного типа ‘резать, рвать’ → ‘скорбеть [...]’ обычно считаются элементарными, не требующими обоснования: ‘физическое страдание’ → ‘страдание нравственное’ – см. ЭССЯ 7, 40. Однако для ряда лексем с семантикой ‘скорбеть, горевать [...]’ кажется возможным конкретизировать этот переход промежуточным звеном ‘в скорби (в горе) царапать, раздирать себе лицо, рвать на себе одежду, выдирать волосы,’ которое является языковым отражением элементов древнего погребального ритуала, когда при оплакивании умершего следовало раздирать лица, грудь, одежду, рвать на себе волосы или обрезать их [Petleva 1992: 53–54].

(Semantic transitions of the type: ‘to cut, to tear’ > ‘to be sad [...]’ are usually considered as fundamental ones that do not require a justification: ‘physical suffering’ > ‘moral suffering’ [see ESS] 7: 40). However, for the lexemes with the meaning ‘to be sad, to regret [...]’ a concretization of this transition in the form of an indirect

---

(“The development of a word cannot be researched without the learning about the history of the referent. However, we must not forget that a word does not mean the referent itself but its reflection in the consciousness of the people of the period under research, which in practice means that we are required not to transfer the contemporary meaning of a word to the earlier times.”)

<sup>21</sup> Marija Račeva devotes an article to cases when researchers incorrectly interpret the origins of a word due to the excessive trust in the parallel semantic development [Račeva 2003].

semantic link 'to scratch, cut one's face in mourning (sadness); to tear one's clothes, to pull/tear one's hair out' seems possible. Such a link is a linguistic reflection of the elements of a former funerary ritual when during the mourning of the dead, one should cut one's face, chest, clothes, pull one's hair out or cut it.)

See also remarks by Karlíková [1998: 51–52] as well other remarks concerning the importance of referring to the cultural aspects which are mentioned in authors who are associated with the Moscow dictionary, e.g. Kurkina [2000a: 81].

In comparison to other parts of speech one may notice that the adjective refers to the more timeless realia. The number of things and actions which require new lexemes with which they may be referred to is growing significantly faster than the number of properties. This does not mean that changes do not occur as far as referring to properties is concerned. The properties are revealed exactly in the linguistic analysis. They are presented by the different percentage in the whole body of the vocabulary of the reconstructed lexemes which refer to the particular spheres of life. The conclusions that result from my work are presented in the final part which follows the chapters which contain the material.



### 3

## THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROTO-SLAVIC ADJECTIVE

The part of speech that constitutes the subject of my study is the adjective. Therefore the present chapter is devoted to the discussion of this category of words not from the semantic perspective, but from the perspective of their word-formative structure. In accordance with the profile of my work, I am interested in genetic questions which are associated with the formation of the category of the noun and then the development of this category.

### 1. The Emergence of the Category of the Adjective

In the Proto-Indo-European period the bulk of the lexicon was divided into two categories: the verbal and the nominal. The majority of the elements of the nominal category includes secondary formations, derived from the verbal root. A peculiar feature which may occur in this category is apophony, which formally distinguishes the *nomina* from the initial verbs, which are based on the root.

During the existence of the Proto-Indo-European community we can hardly speak of distinguishing the *substantiva* and *adiectiva* within the nominal category. Although the suffixes did exist, which after the disintegration of the Proto-Indo-European language acquired adjectival specialization, this is not sufficient proof of the existence of a separate adjectival category. The suffix *-ro-* is relatively well-attested. Franciszek Sławski analyzes in his article eleven Balto-Slavic adjectives with the Baltic suffix *-ra-* that was inherited from the Proto-Indo-European *-ro-*, which are characterized by the reduced vocalism of the root [Sławski 1982: 207–209 (reprinted 1989: 58–60)].<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Following a tradition [cf. e.g. Trautmann 1923], the author reconstructs the common Balto-Slavic form for these adjectives.

The features which distinguish adjectives as a category are discussed by Wiesław Boryś, who makes reference to the testimony provided by Slavic languages, but the phenomenon itself is Indo-European in nature.

W epoce psł., we wczesnej fazie rozwojowej prajęzyka, doszło do wyodrębnienia klasy przymiotników z ie. kategorii *nomen*. Podstawę do wyodrębnienia przymiotników, odróżnienia ich od rzeczowników, stanowiły funkcje syntaktyczne. W materiale słowiańskim widoczne są ściśle związki przymiotników z rzeczownikami, świadectwa ich wspólnej genezy: z jednej strony identyczne postaci, z drugiej identyczna fleksja” [Boryś 1998a: 9 (reprinted 2007: 188)].

(In the Proto-Slavic period, at an early stage of the development of the proto-language, the class of adjectives became isolated from the Indo-European category of the *nomen*. The basis for the isolation of adjectives, for their differentiation from nouns, were their syntactic functions. In the Slavic material one can discern direct relations between adjectives and nouns, evidence of their common origins: identical forms on the one hand, identical inflection – on the other.)

In the Proto-Slavic language there were two productive word-formative types. The first one – archaic, suffixless and the second one, suffixal, productive also after the disintegration of the community. The distinctive feature of the suffixless type is the back vocalism of the root, cf.:

W języku prasłowiańskim produktywny typ słowotwórczy stanowiły nomina o motywacji werbalnej, uformowane za pomocą formantów *-o-*, *-ā-*, z apofonią samogłoski rdzennej jako dodatkowym wykładnikiem przynależności wyrazu do klasy imion. Charakteryzowały się one najczęściej wokalizmem *-o-* (*-o-*, *-u-* < *-ou-*, *-ě-* < *-oi-*), alternującymi z *-e-* lub z wokalizmem zredukowanym odpowiedniego czasownika. W czasie, kiedy nastąpiło ściślejsze rozgraniczenie klasy rzeczowników i klasy przymiotników, takie nomina verbalia (i młodsze nomina postverbalia) przekształciły się bądź w rzeczowniki, bądź w przymiotniki. Archaiczne słowiańskie przymiotniki kontynuujące ten typ imion wykazują najczęściej wokalizm *-o-* w opozycji do czasownikowego wokalizmu *-e-* [...] [Boryś 1981b: 35 (reprinted 2007: 177)].

(In the Proto-Slavic language, a productive word-formative type was constituted by verbally motivated nomina with stem vowel apophony as an additional exponent of the word’s membership within the class of names. They were usually characterized by the vocalism of *-o-* (*-o-*, *-u-* < *-ou-*, *-ě-* < *-oi-*), alternating with *-e-*, or else with reduced vocalism of the respective verb. At the time when a more strict separation between the class of nouns and the class of verbs took place, such nomina verbalia (and the younger nomina postverbalia) transformed into either nouns or adjectives. The archaic Slavic adjectives continuing this type of names usually display the *-o-* vocalism as opposed to the *-e-* vocalism of verbs [...].)

Another stage of the acquiring of an independent character by the adjective in the Proto-Slavic period was the emergence of a repository of suffixes which were peculiar exclusively to this category, cf.:

Stary odziedziczony zasób formantów imiennych, używanych również do tworzenia przymiotników, został zastąpiony nowymi sufiksami, specyficznymi wyłącznie dla przymiotników. Sufiksy te, choć mogą mieć podstawy pie., w większości są tworamipochodzenia psł. [Boryś 1998a: 15–16; (reprinted 2007: 195)].

(The old, inherited repository of nominal affixes, used also to create adjectives, was replaced by new suffixes, specific exclusively to adjectives. While these suffixes could have PIE bases, they are in their majority Proto-Slavic inventions.)

In the Proto-Slavic language the sign of the isolation of the adjectival category from the nominal category is the intensive process of accretion of new adjectival suffixes upon the former nominal suffixes, which emphasized their adjectival membership. The identification of the adjectival form is the fundamental function of the suffix *-ькѣ*<sup>2</sup>: cf. *\*bridь* : *\*bridькѣ*; *\*prǫdь* : *\*prǫdькѣ*; *\*krěpь* : *\*krěpькѣ*. The second suffix which frequently has this role – *-ьнѣ* (e.g. *\*bujь* : *\*bujьнѣ*; *\*durь* : *\*durьнѣ*; *\*krasь* : *\*krasьнѣ*) performs this function occasionally and it is not always clear whether its presence is testimony to the accumulation [nawarstwienie się] of *-ьнѣ* on the older nominal form or to the derivation of the adjective from the Proto-Slavic noun or verb (cf. the discussion which is associated with *\*krasь* : *\*krasьнѣ* PRETTY 3A.1, p. 126), which may render difficult the establishment of the Proto-Slavic meaning of the adjective.

The next and the final stage of the differentiation of the adjectives in the Proto-Slavic period was the emergence of complex declension [deklinacja złożona] through the blending of the existing adjectival forms with the appropriate forms of the pronoun *\*ь* (*\*ьь*, *\*ььь*). It was not until the dissemination of this complex declension that brought about the complete morphological separateness of the class of adjectives and the class of nouns. It also caused the fact that the difference between adjectives in the non-oblique cases and nouns may be discerned straightaway.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In works of linguistic research this suffix is reconstructed as *-ькѣ* or *-кѣ*. Usually an assumption is made that in the reconstructed *-u*-stem adjectives the back jer is the continuation of the thematic *-u-*, and in other adjectives it belongs to the suffix. The decision associated with the classification of a given adjective to the group of *-u*-stem adjectives is sometimes open to discussion cf.

“Koncepcja wywodząca przymiotniki na *-кѣ* z tematów na *-ь* w całej rozciągłości utrzymać się nie daje. Na 21 przykładów naszego materiału tylko 7 przynosi ślady dawnych tematów na *-u-*” [Brodowska-Honowska 1960: 192–193].

(“The notion that adjectives ending in *-кѣ* derive from *-ь*-stems cannot be defended completely. Out of 21 examples in our material, only 7 display traces of old *-u-* stems.”)

<sup>3</sup> Due to the contraction of groups of vowels after the disappearance of the intervocalic *-j-* the complex declension partly made itself identical with the non-complex declension in a secondary manner. The results of this process in various languages are treated in a comprehensive manner in textbooks [e.g. Stieber 1979: 163–169].

## 1.1. The Criteria for Establishing the Proto-Slavic Status of a Word

So far the criteria on the basis of which a given word may be located in the Proto-Slavic period has not been not discussed in a comprehensive manner. In the introduction to the *Słownik prasłowiański* Franciszek Sławski wrote the following:

*W Słowniku prasłowiańskim mamy dwie podstawowe warstwy wyrazów: na pewno prasłowiańską i drugą, której prasłowiańskość może być kwestionowana. Do pierwszej zaliczamy wyrazy mające dokładne odpowiedniki indoeuropejskie [...] oraz zbudowane przy pomocy formantów czy w ogóle środków morfologicznych nieproduktywnych w późniejszych językach słowiańskich, np. wykazujących apofonię samogłoski rdzennej, jako dodatkowy środek derywacyjny. [...] Druga wielka warstwa słownictwa prasłowiańskiego to należące do nowego pokładu chronologicznego formacje żywe i produktywnie. Prasłowiańskości znacznej części rekonstruowanych przez nas wyrazów nie da się udowodnić, bo jako typ słowotwórczy produktywny zawsze mogły powstawać paralelnie, a niezależnie w różnych częściach i w różnych epokach Słowiańszczyzny. Dotyczy to np. produktywnych formacji sufiksalnych [...] [SP 1: 8].*

(In the *Słownik prasłowiański* we have two basic layers of words: one that is certainly Proto-Slavic and the other whose proto-Slavic character might be questioned. Counted among the first layer are words with exact Indo-European equivalents [...] as well as those formed with the use of affixes, or more generally morphological devices, that are unproductive in later Slavic languages, e.g., displaying root vowel apophony as an additional means of derivation. [...] The other great layer of Proto-Slavic vocabulary is chronologically newer and contains formations that are living and productive. The Proto-Slavic character of most of the words we have reconstructed cannot be proven, since – being of a productive word-formative type – they could always appear in parallel in different areas and periods of Slavdom. This applies for instance to productive suffixal formations [...].)

One should note that even in the case of morphological means that are considered non-productive in the post-Proto-Slavic period one cannot speak about a fixed boundary. Word-formative means of all kinds may be productive as long as the awareness of the morphological relationship between cognate words is preserved. As long as in the awareness of the users the motivational dependency fades away, the relationship remains viable and it may serve as a matrix for the creation of new derivatives.

## 2. Productive Adjectival Word-Formative Types

We must devote more attention to the problem of the productive word-formative types.

In the adjectival material that I research these types are represented above all by deverbal and denominal adjectives with the suffix *-ьнѣ*. The productivity of this suffix causes problems in the classification of the particular words to the Proto-Slavic layer. The majority of adjectives which are formed with this suffix have a formal verbal or nominal basis in the languages in which it occurs. This speaks in favor of the argument that a derivative was formed in a given language, although we cannot rule out the possibility that both the derivational basis and the derivative are inherited. As far as semantics is concerned, the criterion which could disqualify the Proto-Slavic status of a word in the case of nominal derivatives – namely the fact that those derivatives could refer to various referents which are unrelated – is of little use here.<sup>4</sup> In the case of adjectives, the polyfunctionality, the transfer of references from one object to the other, is a completely typical phenomenon, therefore it does not facilitate the establishment of the age of a word in any way.

Due to the lack of other criteria the basic action whose aim is to examine the date of the origin of adjectives with the suffix *-ьнѣ* and with some other productive suffixes is the study of the geographical and chronological distribution of the attestations. A considerable number of derivatives which are analyzed in my work have an pan-Slavic range and they appear in the earliest sources of given languages. In such cases they are universally considered as Proto-Slavic adjectives, in spite of the fact that the presence of the derivational basis in the same languages theoretically could indicate their later origins. Such adjectives include *\*silьнѣ* from *\*sila*, *\*mogънѣ* from *\*mogъь*, *\*grozьнѣ* from *\*groza* or from *\*groziti* and many more. Problems are caused by adjectives which are peculiar to only one of the language groups. Close relationships within a group speak rather in favor of their later genesis; however, such adjectives are usually frequently included in the *Słownik prasłowiański*. The taking into consideration of the dialectal divisions within the Proto-Slavic language is a crucial aspect of making this language closer to actually existing languages; on the other hand, the reconstruction of the basis of words attested in only one group involves a higher risk of error.

---

<sup>4</sup> Admittedly this issue requires separate treatment because in the *Słownik prasłowiański* there are also nominal entries with structural meanings e.g. ‘something which is distinguished by a white (black) color’ [‘coś, co odznacza się białą (czarną) barwą’] [SP 1: 230, 239 et sqq.; SP 2: 238, 245 et alia], which are indicated by the material comprised not of continuants but of later derivatives, allegedly formed multiple times, renewed in a time when, for some reason, a “slot” in the linguistic system became unoccupied. The reconstruction of structural meanings, not actual meanings, results from the lack of consistent principles which lie at the heart of the concept of the dictionary about the reconstruction of the proto-language as a very schematic entity or an entity which more closely resembles actual languages.

In etymological dictionaries one may encounter differences in the appraisal of the Proto-Slavic status of the particular lexemes, e.g., the adjective SAD from the semantic field that I research, whose reconstructed form would be \**sъmъotъnъ*, found its way into the etymological dictionary of the Czech language by Rejzek, but not in Boryś's dictionary which reconstructs only its derivational basis \**sъmъotiti* as the Proto-Slavic one. Although I recognize that Boryś's caution is justified, I placed this adjective in the appropriate group where one can find arguments *pro et contra* its Proto-Slavic status (cf. SAD, 11B.3, p. 223).

The suffix *-nъ*, despite its most widespread occurrence, certainly is not the only productive suffix of a Proto-Slavic origin. Another productive suffix is *-ivъ* and its variants which emerged through the accretion of this suffix on the original *-l-* participle and then through the separation of the new suffix *-livъ* from thus formed adjectives. The diversification of suffixes speaks against the Proto-Slavic status, as in the case of derivatives of the praesential form from \**r'uti revъ* 'to roar': \**revъnъ*, *revъnivъ*, *revlivъ*. On the other hand, such a situation gives no grounds to suppose that none of the aforementioned forms is a Proto-Slavic form. The activity which intends to confirm or eliminate their Proto-Slavic status proceeds in the same way as in the case of adjectives whose suffixes do not compete with each other.

The suffixes which emerged during the Proto-Slavic period and are still productive also cause a problem of a different nature. Quite frequently we are faced with a situation in which the form of the new derivative formed in the context of one of the languages completely overlaps with the form of the continuant of the Proto-Slavic adjective which is peculiar to this language. In order to exemplify this situation, in this work I took into account also such cases e.g. the entry \**šibъkъ*; its apparent continuant in Slovene probably emerged through an independent process of derivation, already within the context of this language (cf. THIN, 5B.5, p. 157). Therefore in the case of difficulty with the finding of the motivating basis for the meaning of one of the continuants it is important to take into consideration also the possibility of an independent origin of a derivative after the end of the Proto-Slavic period. In such a case we may speak about a sort of a homonymy whereby one element is a continuant of a Proto-Slavic word and the second element is a derivative which emerged independently in one of the languages. This subject is also discussed by Maria Wojtyła-Świerzowska. The scholar advises a limited trust in the possibility of deriving some meanings from other meanings or of constructing excessively complicated strings of semantic transitions [Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1999: 40]. Although the author herself has homonyms of variable/dissimilar roots in mind, her remark may be successfully applied to cases of independent derivation of closely related words.

### 3. The Division of Adjectives According to Their Origins

The first layer distinguished by Sławski [SP 1: 8] comprises both the adjectives that were inherited from Proto-Indo-European and those which emerged in the Proto-Slavic thanks to inherited mechanisms, above all qualitative apophony (the exchange of the front vowel in the verbal root into a back vowel in the nominal stem) and quantitative apophony (the alternation between the normal, reduced and lengthened grade). In this layer we may discern the domination of thematic (suffixless) adjectives and those with old affixes which were unproductive after the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic unity.

Two divisions intersect within the adjectival category. Almost the entire Proto-Slavic adjectival material may be divided into *adiectiva deverbativa* and *adiectiva denominativa*.<sup>5</sup> However, frequently we are unable to answer the question about the formal basis of the motivation of the adjective because there is both a noun and a verb which may perform this function, and neither their structure nor their semantics excludes either of them.

The second division, a chronological one, occurs within these classes. This is a division into adjectival formations, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European and created in the Proto-Slavic context. As far as the framework of both of these divisions is concerned, absolute certainty is elusive, which is discernible in the material that is analyzed in my work. As far as the chronology is concerned, the division may be established between the adjectives formed owing to the means that were already non-productive in the Proto-Slavic language and the adjectives which feature new suffixes, such as those which did not emerge until the Proto-Slavic period. Therefore also with the application of the chronological criterion it is impossible to establish a dichotomous division. A great deal of very important material is beyond the scope of the classification into one of the chronological layers.

Being aware of the limitations of research, and not wanting to give up the presentation of the division of adjectives from the genetic perspective, I distinguished three groups of adjectives below: 1. Ones that emerged through the lexicalization of participles, therefore they have the formal features of the verb (verbal vocalism), 2. Adjectives which are associated with the Proto-Indo-European roots with a verbal meaning but which feature apophonic diversification, 3. Adjectives which are associated with the Proto-Indo-European roots with a nominal meaning.

#### 3.1. Former Participles

It is probably within the earliest deverbal adjectives that one must probably classify participles which through the loss of their temporal character passed

<sup>5</sup> A marginal class is constituted by adjectives based on *composita prepositiva*.

from the verbal category to the adjectival one. Apart from the participles which are reconstructed for the times of the European community and which are described in textbooks devoted to the principles of the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European language<sup>6</sup> one must take into account the participles which arose within the Slavic context.

According to Krystyna Kleszczowa's pertinent remark [Kleszczowa 2003: 109], the adjectives of this origin do not necessarily retain the formal aspect of the participle. This is a different phenomenon from the vacillation of the aspect of the adjectives (that was later mentioned) which are derived directly from the verbal root, but we may suppose that this "inconsistency" of the diathesis also influenced the instability of the content value of the participles.

### 3.1.1. The Passive Past Participle with *-tō* < *-to-*

The perfective participle with *-to-* existed already in the Proto-Indo-European period [Stefański 1991: 56]. According to Oktawiusz Jurewicz:

Formacje z przyrostkiem *\*-to(s)* wyrażały w najdawniejszym stanie języka czynność dokonaną bierną i czynną (*δυνατός* 'możliwy, mogący,' *ἀγνωστος* 'nieznany,' 'nieznający się,' *λυτός* 'rozwiązany,' 'mogący być rozwiązany') oraz możliwość dokonania jakiejś czynności [...] [Jurewicz 1992: 238].

(The formations with the suffix *\*-to(s)* expressed in the earliest state of the language an accomplished active and passive activity (*δυνατός* 'possible,' 'one that is able to do something,' *ἀγνωστος* 'unknown,' 'ignorant,' *λυτός* 'unbound,' 'one that can be unbound') and the possibility of accomplishing a certain action [...].)

Jurewicz's remark refers to the earliest phase of the Greek language, in the Proto-Slavic language we may confirm the active value of the adjective *\*lūtō* 'cutting; sharp,' which continues the PIE *\*leu-to-* derived from the passive participle of the PIE *\*leu-* 'to cut off, to separate.' The original passive participle in *-tō* probably continues *\*t<sub>l</sub>stō* 'having a big volume; fat,' originally 'swollen with water' from the PIE root *\*tēu-/tū-/tu-* 'to swell, to increase the volume of something' (see more at FAT, 5A.2, p. 149).

### 3.1.2. The Passive Past Participle with *-nō* < *-no-*

The participle with the suffix *-no-*, which performs the same function as the participle with the suffix *-to-*, is also of Proto-Indo-European origin. In the Proto-Slavic language it is preserved in the following adjectives: *\*p<sub>l</sub>nō* 'full' from *\*pel-* 'to fill,' *\*k<sub>l</sub>nō* 'crippled' from *\*(s)ker-* 'to cut.'

<sup>6</sup> Schmitt-Brandt 1998: 268–272. About the PIE *participium* see also Stefański 1991: 54–57.

### 3.1.3. The Present Tense Passive Participle with *-mъ*

The participle with *-mo* existed in the Balto-Slavic group (Baltic *-ma* : Proto-Slavic *-mъ*), where it perhaps continues the form which is attested in other Indo-European languages in the composite form *\*-me-no-* [Stefański 1991: 55; Schmitt-Brandt 1998: 270–271]. It is preserved in a relict manner<sup>7</sup> in lexicalized forms of adjectives e.g. Polish *\*łakomy* < *\*olkomъ* ‘greedy’ from *\*olkati* ‘to be hungry,’ cf. Lithuanian *álkti* ‘idem.’ The only adjective which is analyzed in my work is the Proto-Slavic *\*golěmъ*, for which the participial origin is assumed on the basis of comparison with Lithuanian (see TALL, 4A.5, p. 144).

### 3.1.4. The Past Tense Participle with *-lъ* (the Second Active Anterior Participle with *-lъ*)

According to Zdzisław Stieber, we do not know for sure if this was initially a participle or an adjective [Stieber 1979: 185]. This doubt reaches back to the Proto-Indo-European times from which the Proto-Slavic language inherited the adjective *\*milъ* < PIE *\*mī- mēj- mōj-* ‘kind, pleasant’ with the suffix *-lъ* < *-lo-* (also known as a determinant in the Indo-European context). The semantics of the entire Indo-European family does not allow us to assume a verbal basis in this case.

*\*chylъ* ‘inclined’ > ‘weak’ based on the PIE *\*(s)kou :* *\*(s)keu-* ‘to bend’ (unless it is a late Proto-Slavic derivative from *\*chyliti*) and *\*rychlъ* ‘agitated,’ ‘mobile’ based on the PIE *reu-* ‘to dig, to excavate’ have a basis in the Proto-Indo-European. Similarly as *\*chylъ*, which is associated with *\*chuliti*, also *\*rychlъ*, which is associated with *rušati* ‘to set sth. in motion,’ differs from the verb, which is supposed to be its basis, by its varied vocalism. Among the words that are discussed in the work there are participles formed both from the verbs which are reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language on the basis of direct continuants and also on the basis of derivatives, including these very participles, e.g. *\*ěglъ* from the unattested *\*\*ěgti*, *\*naglъ* from the unattested *\*\*nagti*. The Proto-Slavic *mъdblъ* from *\*mъděti* is considered as a suffix with a suffix *-ьlъ* due to the presence of the front jer, which has no justification in the stem of the derivational basis. However, due to the semantic relation of the adjective to the verb we must consider this also to be an original participle.

<sup>7</sup> In the book form of the Russian literary language it was maintained under the influence of the Orthodox church language.

### 3.2. Adjectives Related to the Proto-Indo-European Roots with a Verbal Meaning

Apart from the adjectives whose form indicates that they originally performed the role of participles, therefore they have the most strict relationship with verbs, we may distinguish a considerable group of adjectives which, on the basis of Indo-European analysis, also should be considered as deverbal ones. A peculiar feature of Proto-Indo-European research is the pursuit of verbal bases for *nomina*. We may ponder the extent to which such a basis is legitimate in the case of the formation of a language, which always remains a mere hypothesis, but the fact remains that according to etymological dictionaries the majority of original nouns and adjectives are derived from Proto-Indo-European roots with a verbal meaning, and therefore also their meanings are derived from participial meanings.

However, a closer look at the semantics of the reconstructed Proto-Indo-European roots frequently inspires a question whether or not it is secondary in regard to nominal meanings. This has to do with the meanings whose structure is 'to be of a certain kind,' 'to become a certain kind,' e.g. the Proto-Slavic *\*dǫzъ* from the PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>ers-* 'to be bold, brave.' The mutual semantic relationship between the original *nomina* to the *verbum* and *nomina* is comprehensively discussed by Maria Wojtyła-Świerżowska in a monograph *Prasłowiańskie abstractum. Słowotwórstwo. Semantyka. I. Formacje tematyczne* [Wojtyła-Świerżowska 1992].

If we assume a deverbal origin for e.g. the Proto-Slavic *\*bolgъ* from the PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>elg-* 'to glow,' *\*dorgъ* from the PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>er-eg<sup>h</sup>-* 'to hold, to wield,' *\*strogъ* from the PIE *\*(s)terg-* 'to guard, to protect,' *\*torgъ* from the PIE *\*t<sup>h</sup>eng<sup>h</sup>-* 'to pull,' *\*bridъ* from *\*b<sup>h</sup>rēi-* : *\*b<sup>h</sup>rī-* 'to cut' and other, I assume that the original meaning of the nominal form is motivated by the meaning of one of the participles which is associated with a given verb. The establishment of this fact, followed by its classification and placement in the dictionary are the fundamental aims of my work. Although from a formal point of view participles have a determined category of the active or passive voice, there is ample evidence that in the Indo-European languages the participial value quickly became effaced, as a result of which the adjective which arose from the participle could assume both an active and a mediopassive meaning.<sup>8</sup> Let me mention once again the examples from the Greek language which were mentioned above: *δυνατός*

<sup>8</sup> This phenomenon may be also discerned after the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic community in the context of particular languages, especially in the early stages of their development – this issue is treated in a more comprehensive manner by Danuta Buttler [Buttler 1978: 119–125]. This phenomenon has to do not only with the early participles but with adjectives in general, which may include verbal content; e.g., the adjectives of various Slavic languages derived from the continuants of the Proto-Slavic *\*strachъ* and *\*strašiti* may be conventionally reduced to the proto-forms *\*strach(ъ)livъ* and *\*straš(ъ)livъ*, their meaning is associated with the verb *to fear* and they mean either the one who fears or the one who should be feared. The association of a given form with the first or the second meaning changed over the course of the history of Slavic languages [cf. Jakubowicz 1992].

‘possible,’ ‘one that is able to do something,’ ἀγνωστος ‘unknown,’ ‘ignorant,’ λυτός ‘unbound,’ ‘one that can be unbound.’ In the Proto-Slavic language the examples of adjectives, for which one must reconstruct the heterogeneous semantics of the active or passive voice include the original participle of the unattested verb *\*rychnōti*: *\*rychlō* ‘one that moves itself; agitated’ vs. ‘moving itself, set in motion,’ based on the PIE *\*reu-* ‘to dig’ (more details in QUICK, 9A.1, p. 197) and the deverbal adjectives *\*krqōtō* ‘coiled’ vs. ‘winding’; ‘spinning’ based on the PIE *\*kert-* ‘to turn, to twist’ (STRONG, 6A.7, p. 166), *\*rōžbno* ‘derisive’ vs. ‘derided’ > ‘funny’ from the PIE *\*ureng-* ‘to wrench’ (UGLY, 3B.6, p. 137).

We may claim that this mixing of active and passive (or mediopassive) semantics, which indeed hinders linguistic communication, already had to do with the earliest *nomina*, both nouns and adjectives, cf. Wojtyła-Świerżowska:

[...] *nomina actionis* mogą pełnić, w zależności od potrzeby, różne role semantyczne – implikowane właśnie przez strukturę predykatywno-argumentową podstawy. Zatem *\*biti* ‘bić’ → *\*boj* ‘bicie’ może realizować się jako agens (ros. dial. боў ‘pięściarz, walczący na pięści’) lub instrument (csł. боў ‘bicz, flagellum’), a także miejsce akcji (ros. dial. боў ‘miejsce na brzegu rzeki, gdzie uderza prąd’) [Wojtyła-Świerżowska 1992: 24].

(if necessary, the *nomina actionis* can perform different semantic roles, which are implicated namely by the predicate-argument structure of the base. Thus, *\*biti* ‘to beat’ → *\*boj* ‘beating’ may be realized as an agent (Dialect Russian боў ‘boxer, fist fighter’) or an instrument (Church Slavonic боў ‘whip, flagellum’) as well as a place of action (Dialect Russian боў ‘a place on a river bank hit by the current’).)

### 3.3. Adjectives Associated with the Proto-Indo-European Roots with a Nominal Meaning

At this point, I would like to direct attention to a small number of adjectives whose nominal basis dates back to Proto-Indo-European times.<sup>9</sup> Such a basis, which does not rest upon a verbal root, is assumed for *\*vetōchō* ‘old’ from the PIE *\*uet-* ‘year,’ *\*junō* ‘young,’ from the PIE *\*jeu-* ‘młody.’ Also, two adjectives with the suffix *-elō* lack a verbal basis: *\*debelō* from the PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>eb-* ‘fat, robust’ and *veselō* from the PIE *\*ues-* ‘good’ and *milō* from the PIE *\*mēi-/mōi-/mī-* ‘good.’ The disproportion between the adjectives which are genetically deverbal and those which are genetically denominal rather reflects the research assumptions accepted in Indo-European linguistics than the actual state of the nominational tendencies, which might have occurred in Indo-European times – I mentioned this already in the first sentences of the subchapter entitled “Adjectives Related to the Proto-Indo-European Roots with a Verbal Meaning.”

<sup>9</sup> My work, of course, features adjectives derived from the Proto-Slavic nominal base, e.g. *\*silbno* from *\*sila*, *\*dēlbno* from *dēlo*, *\*volbno* from *\*vola et alia*, for which the formal motivation may be both deverbal or denominal, e.g. *ladbno*.



## 4

# THE PARALLELS OF SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT

The basic aim of my work is to present a model of a dictionary of semantic motivations, therefore I devote the present chapter to the description of the attempts and achievements that were made in this field until the present time. As I indicated in the introduction, my work may also be considered only as yet another in a series of attempts to realize an enterprise which is conceived on a broader scale. I return to this subject in the final part of the work when I discuss the onomasiological dictionary.

### 1. State of Research and Postulates

Linguists have long stressed the necessity of creating a corpus of semantic changes. A hundred years ago, in a very comprehensive review of a work by Wilhelm Wundt which was situated between linguistics and psychology, Jan Rozwadowski appealed:

[...] wyłania się, krótko mówiąc, postulat semazjologicznych porównawczych słowników albo, na początek, monografii porównawczych, traktujących dajmy na to o indoeuropejskich nazwach takich a takich wyobrażeń. Postulat ten wychodzi także od razu poza obręb tych języków: semazjologiczny słownik może obejmować nie tylko języki tworzące genetyczną całość, jak np. indoeuropejskie (albo ich grupy), semickie, ugro-fińskie itd., ale może, ba, z wielką korzyścią, obejmować w ogóle wszystkie języki świata [Rozwadowski 1903: 5].

([...] there arises, shortly put, the postulate of semasiological comparative dictionaries or, to begin with, comparative monographs, dealing with, let us say, the Indo-European names for such and such notions. This postulate furthermore instantly transcends the sphere of these languages: a semasiological dictionary can include not only languages that constitute a genetic unity, such as the Indo-European languages

(or their groups), Semitic or Finno-Ugric languages, and so on, but can also – and indeed, with great benefit – include all the world’s languages altogether.)

The development of this thought was the project of a *Semasiological and Etymological Dictionary*, about which our knowledge is scant, for the full text of this project was never published. In a short report which was published in 1908 by the Akademia Umiejętności the idea of such a dictionary was merely signaled [after: Popowska-Taborska 1989: 20].

## 1.1. The First Onomasiological Dictionaries

A practical realization of Rozwadowski’s intention is, in some sense, Carl D. Buck’s work entitled *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas* [Buck]. Buck’s dictionary, arranged in an onomasiological order, is divided into 22 thematic sections, each of which contains several dozen concepts which belong to a given semantic field or which are somehow associated with it. The arrangement makes a reference to the postulate which was expressed already in 1910 by Heimann Hariton Tiktin, who suggests in an article entitled “Wörterbücher der Zukunft” (“The Dictionaries of Tomorrow” [Tiktin 1910]) that in the future the lexis that is collected in dictionaries should be arranged according to groups of concepts instead of an alphabetical order. Each concept is furnished with a collection of lexemes which express it in the majority of ancient and modern Indo-European languages. The principal part of a conceptual entry constitutes a short presentation of the etymology of the words that are set forth, arranged according to semantic motivations. Although the dictionary also met with critical opinions, above all due to the superficial account of etymologies, which were not only the most reliable ones, until this day it is the most comprehensive presentation of both convergence and variety of semantic motivations of Indo-European languages. A later attempt, which was made by Johannes Schröpfer, is the *Wörterbuch der vergleichenden Bezeichnungslehre. Onomasiologie (A Dictionary of Comparative Study of Designations. Onomasiology)*. The dictionary appeared in 1979–1994 in the periodical *Semantische Hefte* that was published for this purpose in Heidelberg. After Schröpfer’s death the labours associated with this work were assumed by his collaborator, Anton Hönic. The scope of Schröpfer’s dictionary, initially conceived as a supra-Indo-European dictionary [Havlová 1965: 3], was eventually limited to the languages of eastern and southern Europe.<sup>1</sup> In the 1980s, Tamaz V. Gamkrelidze and Vjačeslav V. Ivanov published a work which was an attempt at the reconstruction and historical and typological analysis of the Indo-European language – *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Реконструкция и историко-*

<sup>1</sup> See more about Schröpfer’s dictionary in the following reviews in Anikin 1985 and Klein 2002.

*типологический анализ праязыка и прокультуры* (*The Indo-European Language and Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historico-Topological Analysis of the Proto-Language and the Proto-Culture*). The bulk of the text (ca. 400 pages) of this work constitutes a dictionary with a semasiological arrangement and contains lexis that is associated with the life of the primitive man, therefore it involves the world of animals, plants, the primitive economy, family and social structure, beliefs and ritual. In contradistinction to Schröpfer and Buck, who used ready(-made)/pre-existing etymologies drawn from Julius Pokorny and other etymological dictionaries that existed at that time, the Soviet scholars pursued their own etymological interests in an attempt to present new etymologies, especially those of Ivanov. Moreover, there is another significant difference in the choice of the vocabulary that was collected. Unlike their predecessors, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov concentrated upon the vocabulary that could illuminate the culture of Proto-Indo-European people. This is associated with the overwhelming predominance of the names of realia in their dictionary; that is, the predominance of nouns over other parts of speech. This difference is caused by the different aims of the authors of the particular dictionaries. Whereas the works by Buck and Schröpfer by assumption intended to collect semantic motivations in a cross-sectional manner, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov collect motivational material as if by chance, their main purpose was to reconstruct the language and culture.

## 1.2. Contemporary Projects

The postulate of continuing work upon this subject appears systematically, especially in the community of etymologists, for a dictionary of semantic changes attested by reliable examples would be of invaluable assistance, which could enable a verification of the hypotheses concerning the semantic development of the particular lexemes with obscure etymologies. Although one may indeed meet with questions which concern the purposefulness of grouping semantic parallels, there is an account of this in Kleparski [Kleparski 1999: 77–78], these questions, however, originate outside the community of etymologists. Every few years new articles appear and their authors renew their demands concerning this type of dictionary. The articles include *inter alia*: “О необходимости семасиологического словаря нового типа” (“On the Necessity of a New Type of Semasiological Dictionary” [Trubačev 1964]), “O potřebě slovníku sémantických změn” (“On the Need for a Dictionary of Semantic Changes” [Havlová 1965], “O potrzebie słownika semantycznych paralelizmów” (“On the Need for a Dictionary of Semantic Parallelisms” [Popowska-Taborska 1989]), “Úloha principu sémantických paralel v etymologickém výzkumu” (“The Role of the Semantic Parallels Principle in Etymological Research” [Karlíková 2008]). The articles discuss the fundamental problems concerning the scope and the arrangement of such a work.

### 1.2.1. The Scope of the Languages Involved

There is a number of fundamental issues. The first one involves the scope of languages which should be included in the dictionary. Although it is obvious that the cataloguing of concepts from all languages and their varieties would be of greatest usefulness, one must find a solution which has a chance to be realized. Opinions vary on this subject. Rozwadowski's postulate, who demanded the consideration of various cognate and non-cognate languages, is maintained by Eva Havlová. The lack of genetic and developmental relations between languages that are used for research is not a drawback but an advantage, because it ensures the creation of independent models of strings of semantic changes [Havlová 1965: 3–4]. “[...] tyto údaje by se ovšem musely opírat o historicky doložené sémantické přechody z různých i nepříbuzných jazyků” (“However, this information should be based on the historically attested changes from different and non-cognate languages”) [Havlová 1978: 308–309]. A similar opinion is expressed by Heinz Schuster-Šewc, who emphasizes that the models of semantic derivation should be built on the basis of semantic parallels derived from various, not necessarily cognate languages [Schuster-Šewc 1975: 13].

Der Forscher wird hier nach Möglichkeiten zu suchen haben, die ihm das Auffinden und die Rekonstruktion der urspr. formalen und semantischen Zusammenhänge erleichtern und ihm zugleich größere Sicherheit bei der Bestimmung des zugrunde liegenden Etymons geben. Wie wir bereits mehrfach betont haben, darf als ein derartiges Hilfsmittel die Anwendung sogenannter semantischer Ableitungsmodelle betrachtet werden, die auf der Grundlage des Vergleichs von Bedeutungsparallelen in unterschiedlichen, nicht unbedingt genetisch verwandten Sprachen erarbeitet werden [Schuster-Šewc 1975: 13].

(The researcher should seek opportunities which could enable him to find and reconstruct the original formal and semantic relations, and which at the same time will increase the reliability of the establishment of etymons which are basic. As we have emphasized many times, the so-called semantic derivational models, which are elaborated upon the basis of comparison of semantic parallels in various languages, not necessarily genetically cognate ones, may be used as an auxiliary instrument.)

Trubačev [1964: 100–105] suggests that the dictionary should contain material drawn from all Indo-European languages. In her article entitled “O potrzebie słownika semantycznych paralelizmów,” Hanna Popowska-Taborska pursues real possibilities, therefore she supports the idea of taking into consideration the lexis of Slavic languages, however, without giving up explicit semantic references to other Indo-European languages, which appear during the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic roots [Popowska-Taborska 1989: 23]. Another significant suggestion of the aforementioned author is to take into consideration also selected phraseologies apart from single-word lexemes,

because they may shed light upon the motivational mechanisms [Hanna Popowska-Taborska 1989: 23]. A different premise is embraced by Žanna Ž. Varbot, which has to do with the concentration upon particular languages and the consideration of the great abundance of nominations which occur in their dialectal varieties.

Both the maximalist and the minimalist approach, as far as the number of languages is concerned, have their advantages. The concentration upon the languages with close genetic links, and even on single languages with their dialectal richness, in other words: the concentration upon the semantic motivation of synonymous words which occur in one language instead of the concentration on the motivation of equivalents from various languages, allows us to discern developmental tendencies peculiar to a given ethnos. It is for this reason that ethnolinguists are interested in this approach, which is manifested, for example, in the series of candidate works that are written at the Ural University in Ekaterinburg, which discuss the means of expressing concepts from a selected semantic field by more or less complex lexical units, with a concentration of attention upon their semantic structure, including the data furnished by etymology [cf. "Conclusion," section "Research Perspectives," par. 4.2, p. 308].

The research of non-cognate languages and the languages which belong to various cultural areas has other advantages. It decreases the possibility of recognizing the motivation of words which were formed in the period of common development as parallel, and in the case of languages linked by cultural ties – also semantic calques.

### 1.2.2. Chronological Scope

As far as the chronological range is concerned, we should assume that the majority of authors tacitly agrees with Hanna Popowska-Taborska who claims:

Z góry też założyć wypada, że przedstawiony materiał charakteryzować będzie znaczna rozpiętość czasowa, bowiem badane procesy zmian znaczeniowych – jako związane z różnego typu ogólnymi skojarzeniami – są w dużej mierze niezależne od konkretnych etapów historycznych [Popowska-Taborska 1989: 23].

(One also has to assume at the outset that the presented material will be characterized by a considerable timespan, since the processes of changes in meaning that are considered here – related as they are to various kinds of associations – are largely independent of specific historical stages.)

A slightly different attitude is embraced by Žanna Ž. Varbot who advises to recognise as the basis the analysis of material which is homogeneous linguistically and chronologically. However, she also admits departures from

this norm and the analysis of whole language families, as she does in a series of articles devoted to the motivations of the adjective of the meaning 'fast' in Slavic languages [Varbot 1992a, 1994, 1997]. Cf.:

Надежность определения типов первичной мотивации зависит от объема материала, точности его словообразовательного и семантического анализа, а также от степени языковой и диахронической однородности.

(The reliability of defining the types of original motivation depends on the volume of the material, the exactitude of the word-formative and semantic analysis of motivation and also on the degree of the linguistic and diachronic homogeneity.)

and further:

Привлечение а priori разновременных образований, ославляя весомость полученных результатов как базы для послудующей этимологизации темных лексем определенного хронологического уровня, вместе с тем позволяет судить о степени диахронической устойчивости тех или иных типов первичной мотивации [Varbot 1997: 35].

(The *a priori* employment of forms which belong to various chronological planes – attenuating the value of the received results as the basis for further etymologization of obscure lexemes from a specific temporal plane – enables us at the same time to judge about the degree of the permanence of these or other types of original motivation.)

We must take into consideration the fact that as we reach further and further back into the history of particular languages and their ancestral languages we run the increased risk of making an erroneous link between various words into one etymological family. This is not an exceptionless rule. There are comparisons in the Indo-European context, for example ones that have to do with the etymology of kinship names which are considered completely reliable. However, generally speaking, it is clear that when we study the development of a word nest in one language or in one language family, our activity will be more reliable than when we compare lexemes from more remotely cognate languages. Therefore we must exercise caution in our inclusion of particular elements to the planned register of comparisons in the Indo-European context. Karl Jaberg had no doubts about this when he wrote the following words at the beginning of his article already more than a hundred years ago: “Wer in der Semasiologie auf etymologisch unsicherer Basis baut, fälscht seine Resultate” (“Who makes a construction founded on unreliable etymology in semasiology, falsifies his results”) [Jaberg 1901: 562]. The problem of the reliability of the bases for reconstruction is engaged by Werian Merlingen in a comprehensive article entitled “Über eine Bedeutungsverzweigung im indogermanischen Lexikon” (“About a Narrowing of Meaning in the Indo-German Lexicon” [Merlingen 1978]). I myself have also elaborated upon this subject in an article

entitled “Indogermanische Etymologien in einem Wörterbuch der Semantischen Parallelen” (“Indo-German Etymologies in a Dictionary of Semantic Parallels” [Jakubowicz 2000]).

The question of the reliability of comparisons which are supposed to enter the collection of parallels and serve as a measure for other etymologies is of course discussed in the aforementioned articles, cf. Trubačev “Что касается отбора рубрик-статей, то он должен охватить в первую очередь достоверные случаи семантической эволюции” (“As far as the choice of entry articles is concerned – it should above all include reliable cases of semantic evolution”) [Trubačev 1964: 103] and Havlová “[...] tyto údaje by se ovšem musely opírat o historicky doložené sémantické přechody z různých i nepříbuzných jazyků, nikoliv o etymologické dohady” (“However, this information would have to be based on historically attested changes from various and non-cognate languages and not on etymological hypotheses”) [Havlová 1978: 308–309].

## 2. The Proposed Forms of the Dictionary

It is more difficult to reach a consensus concerning the form of the dictionary that is planned. The aforementioned articles are as a rule illustrated by examples. There one may find specific examples of semantic parallels, arranged according to the rules propounded by the authors, e.g., Trubačev [1964: 104–105] presents the dictionary as a collection of spaces filled with the body of evidence, while each space is supposed to present a specific type of semantic change. The spaces should be arranged in an alphabetical order, according to the initial concept. The process of finding the desired word would be facilitated by an alphabetical index, prepared according to the languages used. The examples of spaces presented by Trubačev are the following: ‘дуть’ → ‘говорить, думать’ [‘to blow’ → ‘to speak, to think’]; ‘рождаться’ → ‘знать (человека)’ [‘to be born’ → ‘to meet (a man), to get to know someone’]; ‘скот’ ↔ ‘имущество’ [‘cattle’ ↔ ‘property, wealth’]; ‘таять’ → ‘молчать’ [‘to thaw, to melt’ → ‘to remain silent, tacere’] (I quote them without the body of evidence). A system of references would direct to the initial concept. Already at this point numerous reservations arise. The proposed alphabetical index of words would enable the location of the lexeme which participates in the semantic change but it would not facilitate, in my opinion, the more desirable location of the required concept.<sup>2</sup> Of course, apart from the index of words one may prepare another index of concepts (meanings). However, it will be difficult to find one’s way around such an index because we do not seek a specific meaning but a more general concept. I will not dwell on practical issues such as the volume of such indices (cf. the index to Pokorny’s dictionary,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also the criticism expressed by Jasna Vlajić-Popović [2002: 23–24].

which in itself is a bulky book) [Pokorny 2] and the difficulties in finding one's way in the index of concepts encountered by anyone for whom the language chosen in the dictionary is a foreign language. For it is without doubt that a dictionary which contains parallels in many languages should be accessible to the broadest scholarly community. One may also have reservations concerning the spaces with examples themselves but comprehensive criticism of this issue deserves to be expressed elsewhere. I am convinced that the planned dictionary should have the form of an onomasiological lexicon, as Buck's dictionary that was criticized by Trubačev. Its main advantage is the facility of finding the concept that is sought without recursing to indices.

Hanna Popowska-Taborska suggests a similar form of entry articles ("spaces" in Trubačev), e.g., 'to hit, to knock, to nudge' → 'to hiccough'; 'to hew, to cut' → 'to eat large amounts of food fast'; 'to bend, to twist, to contort' → 'to inspire fear; to fear': 'to bite, to gnaw' → 'to worry, to bother.' Each of the entries is furnished with at least two different roots which feature the same or very similar semantic changes. In contradistinction to Trubačev, the author admits that the greatest and yet-unsolved problem remains the arrangement of thus conceived collections of entries [Popowska-Taborska 1989: 24–26].

Even more examples may be found in onomasiological and etymological works prepared as a rule by researchers who are engaged in work upon etymological dictionaries. These works practically furnish the material for the dictionary of semantic motivations.

### 3. The Ways of Analyzing the Material

Basically, two ways of ordering the material concerning semantic changes are distinguished. They are based on either the semasiological or the onomasiological approach. Practically, the researchers who embrace the semasiological method combine the two approaches as they do not limit themselves to researching the meanings of single words but they research entire groups collected according to the onomasiological method. We may mention the works by Jasna Vlajić-Popović [2002], Tetjana Černyš [1998, 2003] and Žanna Ž. Varbot [1986] as examples.

#### 3.1. Semasiological Order

As I mentioned before, the semasiological approach – from a lexeme to a concept – usually realizes itself in the analysis of the semantic development of semantic nests – whole groups of cognate lexemes. A typical representative of this approach is a comprehensive work by a Slovene Slavist – Alenka Šivic-Dular – *Besedna družina iz korena "\*god-" v slovanskih jeziki* (*The Word Family with*

*the Root “\*god-” in Slavic Languages*). The author presents an analysis of the semantic development of lexemes derived from the Proto-Slavic root *\*god* which appeared in all Slavic languages [Šivic-Dular 1999]. The authors who embrace the semasiological method frequently decide to juxtapose word families founded upon bases which are in a synonymous relationship. The benefits of employing this method are discussed by e.g. Žanna Ž. Varbot, an adherent of the simultaneous research of the semantic development of word families whose derivational bases were probably in a synonymous relationship in the Proto-Slavic period.

[...] еще одним перспективным методом использования семантических параллелей может быть реконструкция славянского этимологического гнезда на семантических основаниях путем подбора его потенциального лексического наполнения в соответствии с семантическим характеристиками образований другого этимологического гнезда, исходная лексема (корень) которого, судя по данным славянских языков, находилась в отношениях синонимии с исходной лексемой реконструируемого гнезда [Varbot 1986: 34].

(The reconstruction, based on semantics, of the Slavic etymological nest by the restoration of its potential semantic content may be yet another promising means of employing semantic parallels; analogically to the semantic characteristics of another etymological nest, whose basic lexeme (root) was (judging by data provided by Slavic languages) in a synonymous relation to the basic lexeme of the reconstructed nest.)

In the aforementioned article, the author presents such research with the example of word families associated with two Proto-Slavic verbs *\*bъrati* and *\*nesti*, for which she supposes the meaning ‘to carry’ as the original meaning that was inherited from the Proto-Indo-European. The author’s aim is to check whether the Proto-Indo-European meaning could still function in the Proto-Slavic language. In other words, it is an attempt at finding supplementary evidence which would support the derivative from *\*bъrati* – *\*berme* (unquestioned by the etymologists), with the meaning ‘burden, load,’ secondarily ‘foetus’ [e.g. SP 1: 206–207], which documents the traces of the meaning ‘to carry’ in Proto-Slavic. One may wonder to what extent this attempt is successful in this case because not all the examples seem adequate. One may derive the meaning of some of the words that are suggested by that author both from the archaic meaning ‘to carry’ as well as from the common ‘to take’ – this proves the affinity of the meanings of ‘to carry’ and ‘to take’ – a point which that author also notices [Varbot 1986: 34]. Another result of the parallel research of the semantics of derivatives on the basis of synonyms may arise by the finding of explanations of yet-unexplained words with meanings that are close to the meanings of derivatives whose basis is researched in a parallel manner.

The authors of works, which concentrate upon the examination of two word families which are derived from synonymous bases, intend to demonstrate parallels in their development, to explain the differences in the development

or to fill in the gaps with words whose etymological relationship with the nests that are researched and were not noticed before.

### 3.2. Onomasiological and Semasiological Order

The works which compare a greater number of words constituting bases of derivatives have a slightly different nature. We may mention the comprehensive work by Tetjana Černyš as an example of a work of this kind. The author discusses the structural and semantic development of six word families of Proto-Slavic origin, which originally belong to the lexical field known as “words whose original semantics refer to the thermal process” [Černyš 2003]. Tetjana Černyš analyzes particular etymological families within the context of word-formation. She assumes the Proto-Slavic reconstructed words as a point of departure and she comprehensively discusses the semantics of particular derivatives, paying attention to the motivational parallelism which occurs on various levels of derivation.

However, Jasna Vlajić-Popović limits herself to the research of the semantic development within the context of one language. The method that she embraces consists in the analysis of the semantic development in six word families which are contained in the conceptual field of ‘to beat, to hit.’ One should emphasize the creation of a model which enables the reader to quickly find his or her way around the material. In the introduction the author proposes a model which is consistently applied in the entire work. The model is based on the distinguishing of nine groups of meanings divided into more specific subgroups; these include all meanings which are a result of the semantic development in these word families, distinguished by the author in the course of a semasiological analysis. Each of the nine chapters devoted to the particular word nests contains, apart from an etymological part, a “semasiological dictionary” – such is the author’s title – in which the derivatives from a particular nest are distributed according to the model which is presented in the introduction to the work. At the end there is a table which collects data from all “semasiological dictionaries.” This enables the reader to get a grasp of the frequency of the particular changes of meanings. For example, if we desire to learn where the semantic change ‘to beat’ > ‘to steal’ occurred, we check what appears in 3.5.1 in the table which corresponds with the meaning ‘to steal.’ Data about the particular lexemes contained in the table may be easily found thanks to the consistent system of numeration.

### 3.3. Onomasiological Order

However, in the majority of research until the present day there is a dominance of the onomasiological approach whose point of departure are the received

meanings, in other words, the pursuit of semantic motivations. The majority of works are created in Brno, in the circle which is associated with the etymological dictionary of the Old Church Slavonic language ESJS. There is also a card index of literature concerning the research of semantic parallels there, established by Václav Machek and enhanced by the ESJS team. Another card index, which was supervised by Eva Havlová, contains data that was excerpted from the dialectal dictionaries of the Czech language and it is divided into sections concerning the particular spheres of nature and human activity, such as inanimate nature, time, the cultivation of earth, craftsmanship, medicine.<sup>3</sup> The authors from Brno concentrate upon specific semantic fields, which they elaborate upon in a series of articles. Worthy of notice are especially the articles by Iлона Janyšková due to their clear structure, which may become a model for other works of this type. The subject that was elaborated by this author involves the motivations of the names of trees in Slavic languages [e.g. Janyšková 1998a, 1998b, 2000, 2003, 2003–2004]. The objects of research conducted by other authors of the team include: the motivation of floral names [e.g. Havlová 1998]; the names of dishes [e.g. Valčáková 1995], the names of feelings [e.g. Karlíková 1998]. The team that prepares the Moscow etymological dictionary of Slavic languages [ESSJ] produced work concerning the names associated with the features of the landscape [e.g. Kurkina 2000a], the names of diseases [e.g. Merkulova 1989b], the adjective ‘quick’ [e.g. Varbot 1994]. A model which is similar to Janyšková’s works is represented by the work by Hristina Dejkova which concerns the motivation of the names of birds in Slavic languages, enhanced by comparative material drawn from other European languages [Dejkova 2000]. Danuta Keřa elaborates upon the same material in a similar way, although she employs terminology drawn from cognitive linguistics [Keřa 1999]. I presented a more comprehensive bibliography of these works in an article devoted to the research of semantic motivations in Slavic linguistics [Jakubowicz 2010].

### 3.4. Semantic Motivation in Atlases

An overview of works which collect semantic motivations must not omit comparative atlases of various languages. I refer above all to the atlases which involve various languages, especially the *Atlas Linguarum Europae* [Atlas 1983–2007] and the *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас* [Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 1988, 2000a, 2000b, 2003] but the same also applies to the atlases of particular languages and dialects if they contain material that is arranged according to semantic motivations.

<sup>3</sup> I am grateful for this piece of information to Dr Pavla Valčáková.

## 4. The Choice of Method

Which method is the most effective in the realization of the aforementioned aim? According to Jasna Vlajić-Popović the main aim is this:

Zadatak etimologije da rekonstruiše reč u celini, a ne samo njen praoblik, doveo je do nužnosti rekonstrukcije leksičkih značenja, pri čemu izbor domena semantike ili metoda koji se u te svrhe može korisno upotrebiti, za etimologa u suštini nije bitan. Etimološku nauku zanima prvenstveno leksička semantika, što je formalno gledano predmet semasiologije, ali prava potreba etimologije leži u inventarisanju semantičkih paralela. Do njih se može doći samo uspostavljanjem semantičkih tipologija, a ove se pak crpu iz različitih vrsta semantičkih analiza, uključujući onomasiološke [Vlajić-Popović 2002: 19].

(The aim of etymology – to reconstruct a word in its entirety, and not only its form – by necessity brought about the reconstruction of lexical meanings, whereby the choice of the semantic field or method, which could be used to this purpose, is essentially irrelevant to the etymologist. Etymology is interested above all in lexical semantics, which from a formal point of view is the object of semasiology, but the real necessity of etymology is the taking of an inventory of semantic parallels. The latter may be reached only by juxtaposing semantic typologies, and these in turn draw from various kinds of analysis, including onomasiological analysis.)

This does not exempt us from the attempt of providing an answer to the question about the advantages and disadvantages of the particular ways of collecting the material for the dictionary of semasiological parallels. The most difficult thing is to create such a model of a “semasiological dictionary” which would divide the conceptual field under research in a convincing way. However, at this point we are already entering the field of onomasiology. A well-arranged model is such that owing to it one may study lexical “nests” derived from particular synonymous words – not only in one language, as in the aforementioned work of the Serbian author, but in various languages, regardless of their affinity. Such a dictionary could also be enhanced by more examples without sacrificing clarity. Basically, if we desire to avoid the problem of a “vicious circle,” we should give up research with this method of lexical units with a reconstructed meaning, especially of Proto-Indo-European roots. A different opinion is represented by Aleksandr S. Melničuk [1968: 194–195], according to whom it is exactly the study of whole families based on one root that is the promising kind of semantic research, one which also facilitates the verification of previous, uncertain etymologies.

When one researches semantic changes with the semasiological method one must decide whether one is interested only in the development of meanings of a given word or of a word family. In the latter case one must take into consideration the influence of formants upon the meaning of a derivative. In Slavic languages the formants which manifest a greater semantic distinctiveness

include prefixes, which may considerably modify the content of a word, whereas the function of suffixes usually consists in the change of the derivative to a different part of speech or in the location of a word in a specific thematic group (suffixes of place, agent etc.). In the case of including derivatives to an onomasiological dictionary, one should first “clear” them away from the content they acquired by the semantics of the affixes. Such a process may not always be possible to conduct. Therefore, each derivative is a separate lexeme in which the “root” and “suffixal” content are merged into one; in doubtful cases (and these are indeed the most interesting cases for the researcher) it is better to give up including the word in a dictionary of semantic parallels.

## 5. Individual Problems Associated with the Research of Semantic Changes

In the discussion of research of the parallels of semantic changes one must also take into consideration the specific problems which may obfuscate the aforementioned image.

### 5.1. Semantic Changes Associated with the Varieties of a Language

The question remains open about the extent to which such a model may be enhanced without impairing its clarity. The doubts are associated above all with the various registers of a language. Some varieties of specialist languages, namely student and school jargons on the one hand, as well as the thieves’ jargon and the prison jargon on the other, have their specific means of nomination.<sup>4</sup> In these varieties the formation of new words and meanings is very frequently based on jokes, oxymorons, means which seldom occur in general nomination, and also on peculiar associations, which are limited to a given background.<sup>5</sup> That is why one should not include such examples in the general entries of an onomasiological dictionary. However, one must not omit such examples, therefore it seems to me that the best solution is to create separate sections in entries which would include such examples, if they occur.

---

<sup>4</sup> The problems associated with the etymologization of jargon words and the means of nomination which occur in such lexis are discussed by Boris Skalka [2000].

<sup>5</sup> Of the most recent research works about this subject I would like to point out the emergence of an article by Wojciech and Krystyna Kajtoch *O osobliwym postugiwaniu się słowem w czasopiśmie subkultur* (*On the Peculiar Use of Words in Periodicals of Subcultures* [Kajtoch, Kajtoch 2010]), in which the authors describe semantic changes in youth and alternative press. These changes consist in among other things in the imparting to words of meaning which is antonymical toward the meaning which is generally used. This phenomenon is based on the peculiar evaluation of the referents which are described. *Ibidem* further literature on the subject.

Words which are formed in the aforementioned varieties of a language (this has to do above all with the jargon of teenagers) very easily percolate into the general language. This constitutes a serious problem in the qualification of words to particular sections. Good solutions are really hard to come by, and unfortunately, one must resort to the *Sprachgefühl* of the lexicographer. In the majority of cases, the peculiar motivation of colloquial words is legible to the people who use a given language. Sometimes such examples themselves form blocks of parallels, as for example in the case of the motivation of words which have the meaning 'stupid' through the concepts derived from the semantic field of 'to hit, to damage.'

## 5.2. Linguistic Taboo and Its Euphemization

Another problem is associated with the modifications of meaning which are a result of the interference of linguistic taboo. This phenomenon was the subject of many research works in the last decades.<sup>6</sup> In linguistics there is an opinion about the considerable influence of linguistic taboo in the disappearance of the meanings of some referents; such is the explanation of the disappearance of the Indo-European name of the bear in Slavic and Germanic languages, or of the irregular transformation of the form of a word, e.g., the transformation of the Slavic name of the lynx. In my work the examples of the influence of linguistic taboo are not numerous (cf. the footnote to *\*bolgъ*, BAD, 1B.14, p. 111). As I demonstrate in the part of the work which contains the material, one may also find an alternative solution for explaining their development, i.e., the natural development in the form of minimal semantic changes. The phenomenon of enantiosem, which may be a result of euphemization, is sometimes visible in my material, especially in the case of adjectives with an evaluative content.

The meanings which are a result of the application of linguistic taboo and euphemization should be set apart from the general part of a dictionary of semantic parallels as a separate section due to the peculiar mechanism of their emergence. However, one should find an appropriate number of semantic changes for which a taboo basis is established.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Anna Dąbrowska, *Eufemizmy współczesnego języka polskiego (Euphemisms of Contemporary Polish Language)* [Dąbrowska 1993]; Anna Krawczyk-Tyrpa, *Tabu w dialektach polskich (Taboo in Polish Dialects)* [Krawczyk-Tyrpa 2001], as well as the collective works: *Tabu językowe i eufemizacja w dialektach słowiańskich (Language Taboo and Euphemization in Slavic Dialects)* [Czyżewski, Dobrzańska (eds.) 2008]; *Tabu w języku i kulturze (Taboo in Language and Culture)* [Dąbrowska (ed.) 2009].

### 5.3. Borrowings and Semantic Calques

It is also advisable to avoid borrowings and semantic calques in the research of motivational parallels. They diminish the value of research because they are a mere reduplication of a model which arose in one language, projected onto a different language.

The formulation of this postulate is easier than its realization. Borrowings constitute a lesser problem. However, borrowings are not always perceptible within the context of one language family. First, they do not always have phonetic features which distinguish them from native words. As we know, the indication that particular Polish words are borrowings from southern or eastern neighbors include *h* instead of *g* and *u* where one would expect a nasal vowel. However, a frequent phenomenon is associated with the partial or complete adaptation of borrowings to the native form. In such a case the identification of these words requires historical and linguistic research. A word which is borrowed from a different language underwent a semantic evolution in which we are interested already in the language of the donor (in this case we are dealing with the duplication of the motivational model) or in the language of the recipient (in this case the motivational model arose in the context of the borrowing). In both cases it is clear that a single motivational model is involved.

It is considerably more difficult to eliminate words which arose as a result of copying the motivational structure from a different language. This point is important due to the fact that the phenomenon of copying or “calque-ing” the semantic motivational and word-formative structure appears very frequently in the languages belonging to a shared cultural area. In the case of languages of an uneven level of civilizational development these languages normally adopt words for new referents or for newly distinguished concepts as borrowings or the employment of their semantic structure for the creation of a new word. In the case of a calque it is sometimes difficult for the researcher to establish whether the word under research is an independently created example which confirms the motivational model which was realized, or it is merely an adaptation of an already known example to the other language. The pitfalls associated with semantic calques are also pointed out by Hanna Popowska-Taborska [1989: 23–24]. The most reliable examples are furnished by old words – ones that were inherited from the proto-language. For this reason our activity will yield more reliable results if we study the vocabulary of the basic lexical stock, where the influence of foreign sources is less considerable.

A specific example of a copied motivational structure, which is likely to be based on an erroneous identification of the etymology of a word, i.e. the so-called folk etymology, is provided by Janusz Siatkowski [1989: 42–43]; the East Slavic name of the rainbow, *pađýza*, is usually explained as a derivative from *\*radъ* ‘merry’ [ita e.g. Tolstoj 1976: 52]. According to Nikita Tolstoj’s justification, this name may be explained by folk beliefs. The latter were associated

with an idea that the rainbow was a desirable phenomenon, one that was welcomed with joy [Tolstoj 1976: 41–42]. Tolstoj also provides East Slavic examples of the names of the rainbow derived from \**veselъ*, which she considers motivational parallels *padýzy* [Tolstoj 1976: 30–33]. On the basis of the lack of parallels within the context of the remaining parts of Europe, Siatkowski casts doubt upon Tolstoj’s thesis, claiming that the alleged parallels may be semantic calques of the word *padýza*, and *padýza* itself is a frequently supposed Eastern borrowing, perhaps from the Old Ossetic *ardunga-*, which is derived from the Iranian *drunaka-* ‘arcus’ (after Szeremény; *sine loco citato*). In the East Slavic context, *padýza* was secondarily associated with the Slavic *rad-* [Siatkowski 1989: 43]. By refusing to attempt to verify Szeremény’s explanation in the context of etymology, because this issue should be treated in a separate article, I think that the example provided by Siatkowski is a good illustration of the possibility of pitfalls afforded by semantic calques.

#### 5.4. Words Which Are Attested Only Once (*ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*)

One should distinguish lexical meanings, well-attested and described in dictionaries, from meanings which are identified on the basis of single texts. A careful reader will supposedly perceive that the meanings provided in the “innovative meanings” section frequently originate from dialectal records and from the early stages of the development of languages. In these cases we are dealing with a problem similar to the one that was mentioned above (see 5.1.), i.e., with the possibility of the singularity and impermanence of these changes. The placement of such semantic transitions in an onomasiological dictionary may meet with the objection of inconsistency in the treatment of the material. In spite of this, I acknowledged that one should not give up the aforementioned material because it contains a latent potential for semantic change. An additional argument in favour of the idea of taking into consideration of the Old Slavic material (in the sense of the initial stages in the development of the particular Slavic languages) is the fact that in contradistinction to the aforementioned alternative variants of languages, this material is not currently the object of systematic research, therefore its chance of receiving special treatment in the context of innovative semantic changes is smaller. The same applies to the dialectal materials, which – although they are researched – such research does not take into consideration the aspects which I am interested in the present work.

PART TWO  
ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL



# 5

## THE RESEARCH MATERIAL AND THE MEANS OF ITS ANALYSIS

### 1. The Basis of the Material

The source of the material in my work is constituted by definitional (explicative) dictionaries of particular languages. In the case of the lack of such dictionaries, I use translational dictionaries which include examples of usage of the lexemes.<sup>1</sup> Apart from the meanings which are derived from modern languages, I obviously take into consideration the historical and dialectal material, which is the standard procedure in the work of the etymologist.

At this point, it is worthwhile to present the state of Slavic lexicography. It is quite varied as far as the particular languages are concerned. The status of the elaboration of explicative dictionaries, as the majority of Slavic dictionaries have such dictionaries, is quite good.

As far as the Czech and Slovak languages are concerned, these dictionaries include comprehensive dictionaries published in the second half of the twentieth century: *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, ed. Štefan Peciar, vol. 1–6, 1959–1968 (*Dictionary of the Slovak Language* [Peciar]); *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*, ed. Jaromír Bělič, vol. 1–4, 1960–1971 (*Dictionary of Literary Czech*

---

<sup>1</sup> The excerption of material would be facilitated by dictionaries with an onomasiological arrangement of vocabulary. Unfortunately, Slavic languages have such dictionaries only in exceptional cases (e.g. *Русский семантический словарь. Толковый словарь, систематизированный по классам слов и значений*, ed. Natalia J. Švedova, vol. 1–6, 1998 (*The Russian Semantic Dictionary. An Explanatory Dictionary Systematized According to Classes of Words and Meanings* [Švedova])). Also certain dictionaries of synonyms (e.g. *Česky slovník věcný a synonymický*, ed. Jiří Haller, 1974 (*A Thematic Dictionary and Dictionary of Synoms of the Czech Language* [Haller])) have an onomasiological arrangement.

*Language* [Bělič]), and the still valid *Příruční slovník jazyka českého*, ed. Oldřich Hujer et al., vol. 1–8, 1935–1957 (*Concise Dictionary of the Czech Language* [Hujer]). The Lower Sorbian and the Upper Sorbian languages lack dictionaries of this kind, which is associated with the process of disappearance of these languages.<sup>2</sup> As far as these languages are concerned, I used translational dictionaries, prepared as early as the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. In the field of the Upper Sorbian language I consulted the dictionary by Jurij Kral: *Serbsko-němski słownik hornjołužiskeje serbskeje rěče. Sorbisch-deutsches Wörterbuch der Oberlausitzer sorbischen Sprache* (*A Sorbian-German Dictionary of the Lausatian Sorbian* [Kral]) and the one by Christian T. Pfuhl *Obersorbisches Wörterbuch* (*An Upper Sorbian Dictionary* [Pfuhl]). The translational dictionaries of the Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian languages which were published more recently contain a lesser amount of vocabulary; I used them only for the sake of verification, to report potential semantic changes. As far as the Lower Sorbian language is concerned, I used above all the dictionary by Arnošt Muka, which I discuss below.

Works of equally considerable proportions as those in the domain of the Czech and the Slovak languages are represented by the South Slavic languages. The Slovene language is represented by the five-volume *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* [Klopčič et al. (ed.) 1970–1991]. Serbian and Croatian vocabulary is contained in two thesaurus-type dictionaries,<sup>3</sup> the first of which, published by the Yugoslavian Academy of Arts and Sciences (RJAZ), was begun as early as in the nineteenth century and was completed in 1976 [RJAZ]. The dictionary of the Serbian Academy of Sciences (RSAN), initiated in 1959, continues to be developed (volume 19 appeared in 2015 [*Rečnik SANU* 1959–]). As far as the first of the aforementioned dictionaries concentrates upon the registering of the vocabulary of linguistic monuments and the early lexical stock, collected in dictionaries which were compiled earlier, the second one copiously registers dialectal vocabulary. The aforementioned dictionaries of the Serbian and Croatian languages derive from the period when these languages were considered one language, i.e., the Serbo-Croat language or the Croatian-Serbian language.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> It seems that even if at the present time there are not enough readers for whom it would be worthwhile to create monolingual dictionaries, a solution of some utility would be the preparation of dictionaries of the explicative type with explanations in German. The latter language performs the function of the language of everyday contacts for the users of Sorbian languages.

<sup>3</sup> The equivalent of the aforementioned dictionaries which deal with other languages is the *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*, vol. 1–6, 1967–1976 (*Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian Literary Language* [Rečnik]).

<sup>4</sup> The fact that in this work I take into consideration two separate languages, the Serbian and the Croatian languages, is above all the result of a desire to satisfy the requirements of the so-called political correctness. The lexical dissimilarity as far as the semantic fields analyzed in my work are concerned is not reflected in the existing definitional dictionaries published in the last twenty years: *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (*A Dictionary of the Croatian Language* [Anić]); *Rečnik srpskoga jezika* (*A Dictionary of the Serbian Language* [Nikolić (ed.) 2007]).

The Bulgarian language has a number of dictionaries, the most comprehensive of which is the *Речник на българския език*, Sofia 1977– [Čolakova]; it currently reached the letter R. The earlier three-volume *Речник на съвременния български книжовен език* was published in Sofia in the years 1954–1959 [Romanski]. The greatest amount of Macedonian vocabulary is collected in the *Речник на македонскиот јазик*, vol. 1–3, published in Skopje in the years 1961–1966 [Koneski].

The modern East Slavic vocabulary has also received comprehensive treatment. The Russian language has the seventeen-volume *Словарь современного русского литературного языка*, published in 1948–1965 [Obnorskij] and its concise version – the four-volume *Словарь русского языка* from 1957–1961 [Evgen'eva]. The Ukrainian language has the eleven-volume *Словник української мови*, ed. Ivan K. Bilodid, published in Kiev in 1970–1980 [Bilodid], and the Belarusian language has the six-volume *Тлумачальны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, ed. Kandrak K. Atrachovič from 1977–1984 [Atrachovič].

Although the aforementioned sources may seem a little dated, this does not diminish their value from the perspective of my research, and this perspective encompasses more than ten centuries. Their value is determined above all by the presence of contexts which facilitates a better understanding of the content of particular words.

Historical dictionaries constitute a very important source for my research. The languages which have received best treatment in this respect include Polish, Russian, Czech and Slovak. These languages have complete(d) historical lexicons (or ones that are currently in the process of preparation), where the old vocabulary is treated according to the requirements of contemporary lexicography. In the field of the Polish language there is the *Słownik staropolski*, completed in 2003 [Słstpol.] and the *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku* [SP XVI] which reached has been in the works since 1966 and is in an advanced stage of development (vol. 36, published in 2012, reached the letter R). A very valuable dictionary, due to the value of the monuments of Bohemian literature, is the dictionary of the Old Czech language *Staročeský slovník*, begun by Jan Gebauer in 1903 [Gebauer]. After his death the work on the dictionary was continued under Emil Smetánka's supervision, and then subsequently under Frantisek Ryšánek's and Bohuslav Havránek's supervision by the Institute of the Czech Language of the Czech Academy of Sciences.<sup>5</sup> The work upon the preparation of a historical dictionary of the Slovak language has been completed. Also the work on the dictionary of the Old Russian and the Ruthenian language is nearly complete. It contains the material which dates back from the eleventh to the seventeenth century [SR] XI–XVII).<sup>6</sup> A historical dictionary of the Belarusian

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, the publication of the dictionary had been suspended since 2008. The card index of the dictionary has been made accessible in an Internet version. This is a great loss for the readers, who lose access to the material that was elaborated upon by specialists. The card index of the dictionary is accessible on the Internet at: <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/> (accessed 1.04.2017).

<sup>6</sup> This dictionary replaces the already dated three-volume dictionary by Izmail I. Sreznevskij

language [HSBM] remains in a stage of development. The Old Church Slavonic language has received excellent scholarly treatment. The *Slovník jazyka staro-slověnského* (*Dictionary of Old Slovak* [SJS]), published by the Czech Academy of Sciences under the editorship of Josef Kurz, subsequently of Zoe Hauptová, was completed in 1997. As far as the more recent materials of the Church Slavonic language of various recensions are concerned, we still resort to Franz Miklosich's dictionary [Miklosich<sup>2</sup>]. The historical lexical material may be also drawn from early dictionaries, which registered either the vocabulary of the literary language or also dialectal vocabulary, depending on the authors' aims. For the purposes of this work I consulted Samuel Bogumił Linde's 1854–1860 dictionary registering the vocabulary from the sixteenth century until the contemporary times of the author [Linde] and the *Słownik języka polskiego* edited by Jan Karłowicz, Adam Kryński and Władysław Niedźwiedzki (the so-called *Słownik warszawski* (*Warsaw Dictionary*)), published at the beginning of the twentieth century [Karłowicz]. The latter dictionary also registers dialectal and obsolete vocabulary (marked with appropriate qualifiers) apart from general vocabulary. The Czech language has a nineteenth century dictionary by Josef Jungmann [Jungmann]. Among the early dictionaries of the East Slavic languages, the most valuable one is the four-volume dictionary of the Russian language by Vladimir I. Dal' from the final years of the nineteenth century, which abounds in dialectal vocabulary [Dal']. The 1895–1904 dictionary of the Bulgarian language by Najden Gerov [Gerov] dates back to roughly the same period. Important material is furnished by the translational Slovene-German dictionary by Max Pleteršnik, published at the end of the nineteenth century, which also takes into account both early as well as dialectal vocabulary [Pleteršnik]. I mentioned above the thesaurus which comprises the Croatian and Serbian historical material [RJAZ] when I described explanatory dictionaries. It is worthwhile to return to the problem of Sorbian lexicography. Translational dictionaries alone cannot replace definitional dictionaries; the range of content of some German lexemes differs to a greater extent from the range of the Slavic languages than it usually happens in the languages which are so closely related. Very frequently it is impossible to answer the question whether the peculiar meanings which occur in the continuants of Proto-Slavic lexemes in the Sorbian languages are the result of a peculiar development under the influence of the German language or of an imprecise rendition of meaning offered by lexical sources. The best translational dictionary of the Upper Sorbian dictionary contains only the German-Sorbian portion [Jentsch]. The best source for the Lower Sorbian language is the dictionary by Arnošt Muka [Muka]<sup>7</sup> that was published a hundred years ago. Apart from its

---

which appeared in Sankt Petersburg in the years 1893–1912 with the modest title *Материалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменным памятникам* (*Materials for a Dictionary of Old Russian. The Written Relics* [Sreznevskij]).

<sup>7</sup> The team which includes Manfred Starosta, Erwin Hanuš (Hannusch) and Hauke Bartels is currently working upon the preparation of a great German-Lower Sorbian dictionary, which is

volume and detailed explanations, its unquestionable merit consists in the provision of these explanations in German and Russian – this facilitates the precision of the argument. Considerations about the insufficient reliability of the meanings that are registered refer to an even greater extent to the the Polabian language, whose fragments reached us from the accounts of researchers of non-Slavic origin.<sup>8</sup> These exiguous vestiges of the language which are at our disposal had been processed by Reinhold Olesch in *Thesaurus Linguae Dravaenopolabicae* (*Thesaurus of the Polabian Drevani Language* [Olesch]) and by Kazimierz Polański in *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich* (*An Etymological Dictionary of the Polabian Drevani Language* [Polański]).<sup>9</sup> The extent to which I accounted for dialectal materials<sup>10</sup> is associated with their availability. The greatest chances of inclusion were enjoyed by words from languages which have collective lexicons of dialects: Polish [Karłowicz's dictionary and the new *Słownik gwar polskich* (*A Dictionary of Polish Dialects* [SGP]), which encompasses the letters A–E and partly F), Russian [SRNG] and Slovak [SSN]. Very valuable material is furnished by *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej* ([Sychta]) in seven volumes by Bernard Sychta [Sychta]. The material from other dialectal dictionaries was not systematically excerpted, however, it could be included in this work through the medium of etymological dictionaries, especially the *Słownik prastłowiński*.

At this point one should make a reservation concerning the acceptations which are derived from the dictionaries of early vocabulary. We can be sure that the acceptance provided by a lexicon is basic only in the case when we consult dictionaries whose authors are or were actual users of the language of a given period.

Dictionaries compiled by lexicographers who are younger by a number of generations contain meanings which are reproduced on the basis of contexts. They may be appropriately reproduced when the lexicographer has the appropriate number of quotations from varied sources at his or her disposal. However, if the meaning found in a dictionary is supplied with single examples of usage, we cannot be sure if we are actually dealing with a lexical meaning or with a textual realization with a limited range. The same reservation must be sometimes made towards the dialectal dictionaries which are compiled by authors for whom a given dialect is not the native dialect.

---

supposed to contain more than 70.000 words as well as a considerable number of phraseological expressions. The historical and documentary dictionary of the Sorbian language is currently at the stage of preparation. The work is supervised by Hauke Bartels. Information about both dictionaries may be found at <http://www.serbski-institut.de/de/Sprachwissenschaft-Projekte/> (accessed 1.04.2017).

<sup>8</sup> According to Paul Rost [Rost].

<sup>9</sup> The first volume was prepared with the co-authorship of Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński.

<sup>10</sup> Due to the semantic nature of my work I concentrate not on the form but on the meanings of the continuants in the particular languages. That is why during the employment of dialectal material I use the forms of the literary language, and I signal the dialectal status of these continuants with the abbreviation *dial*.

## 2. The Content of the Semantic Field Under Research

In this work I analyze the development of adjectives belonging to a very broad conceptual field (a field which is also referred to as the macrofield in this chapter.) This field includes adjectival expressions which may refer to human properties. The lexemes which are included in the particular subfields are not synonyms. A peculiar feature of my research is a certain “blurring” of concepts which are very general and open to related meanings. However, I do not aim at a comprehensive definition of the semantic content of a given field. On the contrary, it is the “underspecification/indeterminacy” that for me is the most crucial thing, because it enables us to embrace the multidirectional transformations of meaning. All of these features result from a panchronic and pan-Slavic nature of this work. The creation of a network of concepts on the supralinguistic level even forces us to use general, imprecise terms.

The subfields under research were grouped in pairs in sixteen chapters. Each of the chapters is devoted to two poles referring to one conceptual field. In this way, each chapter is divided into two subchapters which are autonomous units. The placement of contrarious concepts in the particular chapters results from a desire to demonstrate that the parallelism of antonymous motivations, discernible e.g. in the pair motivating the concepts of ‘straight’ and ‘obliquus,’<sup>11</sup> is a marginal phenomenon. The material that was examined manifests that the motivational consistency/coherence of antonymous concepts, which could be theoretically expected, is not realized.

Parts of chapters are designated with the letters A and B, whereas some of them designated with the letter A may be referred to as “stronger marked” as compared to the part designated with the letter B. This “stronger marking” may result from a positive evaluation in the case of pairs of an evaluative nature, but in other groups of concepts the decisive factor was different, for example, the greater physical intensity of a feature. The arrangement of the particular pairs, depending on the criterion that was embraced, may be open to discussion. A semantic analysis is not the aim of my work and it may play an ancillary role at the most. Therefore, I limit myself to the aforementioned explanation.

The arrangement of the chapters is arbitrary to a certain extent. I start with the pair of evaluative concepts: “good” and “bad,” followed by two pairs which also express an evaluation, but a more specialized one. Further pairs refer to physical properties, ranging from parametric ones, such as height and body mass, to physical properties: “fast” and “slow.” These are followed by pairs which refer to temperament and selected features of character. The final pair contains lexemes which refer to mental capabilities and constitutes the termination of the overview. A peculiar feature of this last group of concepts,

<sup>11</sup> The example that is quoted here is based on the Proto-Slavic *\*pravъ* ‘appropriate; real,’ which continues the PIE *\*prō-yo-* ‘straight’ and the Proto-Slavic *\*zъlъ* ‘bad,’ which continues the PIE *\*ǵʰul-o-* ‘obliquus.’

which undoubtedly occupies a special place in the characteristics of man, is that it contains few words of Proto-Slavic origin.<sup>12</sup> The overwhelming majority of lexemes from this semantic field is constituted not by semantic but by word-formative derivatives which arose in the particular languages.

The choice of Proto-Slavic words which constitute the object of analysis was a result of the author's own selection of semantic associations,<sup>13</sup> verified by consulting translational dictionaries, collections of synonyms and definitional dictionaries. On this basis, I established a collection of 120 reconstructed Proto-Slavic words that referred to human properties either already in the Proto-Slavic period or at the later stage of the development of continuants. The decisive factor in this case was not so much the exhaustion of the lexical and semantic field, but the determination of a certain number of Proto-Slavic lexemes. The decision about the limiting of the number of the lexemes under analysis is arbitrary and is not fully satisfactory even to the author herself. Among the Proto-Slavic words which were chosen there are those which are characterized by very considerable semantic constancy, and for this reason their appeal for the compilation of semasiological dictionary is limited (e.g. *\*vělikъ*, *\*vyšokъ*, *\*silъnъ*, *\*mogъtъnъ*, *\*slabъ*, *\*dobrъ*, *\*mъdrъ*, *\*glupъ*, *\*moldъ*, *\*veselъ*.) However, these words belong to the basic semantic stock, therefore it was impossible to give them up.

### 3. The Structure of the Entries and the Arrangement of the Material Within the Entry

The basis of parts A and B of each chapter are headword articles which are centered around Proto-Slavic words. Because the whole work revolves around the fluidity of meanings, around the transition of motivating meanings into motivated one, the continuants of one Proto-Slavic word appear in various

<sup>12</sup> I developed this theme in a separate article [Jakubowicz 2004].

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the four methods of completing the lexical and semantic field which were distinguished by Władysław Miodunka:

"1) drogą analizy indywidualnych skojarzeń znaczeniowych badacza opartych albo na doświadczeniu pozajęzykowym, albo na związkach semantycznych utrwalonych między wyrazami utrwalonymi w pamięci jednostki, 2) drogą badania skojarzeń znaczeniowych u grupy ludzi, 3) w wyniku analizy tekstów (pisanych lub mówionych) i wydzielania z nich jednostek leksykalnych odpowiadających przyjętemu kryteriom, 4) przez odwołanie się do istniejących słowników, z których wybiera się wyrazy odpowiadające kryteriom przynależności do analizowanego pola" [Miodunka 1989: 142].

("1) by way of analyzing individual semantic associations of the researcher that are based either on extralinguistic experiences or on fixed semantic relationships between the words registered in the individual's memory, 2) by way of establishing the semantic associations in a group of people, 3) by analyzing (written or spoken) texts and excerpting from them the lexical units which meet the set criteria, 4) by referring to existing dictionaries, choosing from them the words which meet the criteria of belonging to the analyzed field.")

chapters, each time when they represent the meaning which is discussed in a given chapter. Therefore, the same Proto-Slavic lexeme may be the focus of a number of headword articles, depending on how many meanings which I am interested in this lexeme (as a reconstructed form) and its continuants have.

Due to the organization of this work each Proto-Slavic word has been linked with a meaning which is **basic** to it (this meaning is printed in bold in the index of Proto-Slavic words). The purpose of this is to achieve a more or less consistent arrangement of the material, which will enable the reader to find his way around the structure of the work, and the author will avoid multiple repetitions of the same information. The according of a **basic** meaning to each word is purely conventional. I embraced a principle that this meaning is the **meaning which is reconstructed on the basis of continuants**, if this meaning is contained in the lexical macrofield under analysis. For example, the explanation of the Proto-Slavic *\*bol'ьjъ* is located in the article GOOD, because among the meanings that are reconstructed on the basis of continuants of this entry there is the meaning 'good' and not (in accordance with the etymological meaning) in the article STRONG. If the meaning that is reconstructed on the basis of continuants does not belong to the macrofield, than the ascription of the **basic** meaning to the word was determined by the earliest or the most frequent of innovative meanings. If among the words that are reconstructed on the basis of continuants of a given Proto-Slavic word there are two meanings which belong to a macrofield, the earlier of these meanings is recognized as the **basic** one. The decisive factors in this process include structural and etymological meanings. On the basis of the **basic** meaning a given Proto-Slavic word was ascribed to one of the thirty two lexical fields. An entry is constructed around a Proto-Slavic word, according to the principles set out below.

In the concluding remarks located at the end of subsequent subchapters, i.e., after the presentation of all headword articles which belong to them, there is a part entitled "Recapitulation of the Semantic Changes." In the latter part, I place models which demonstrate the lines of development of lexemes which are discussed in a given subchapter. These models are a basis for the construction of the onomasiological dictionary located at the end of the work. The models consist of subsequent meanings – links in the chain of semantic transformations of particular lexemes. The choice of motivating meanings was determined on the basis of an analysis of the development of a given lexeme, having considered the actual situation in a specific language in the context of the closest members of the linguistic family. When I present two or even more lines of development of one lexeme, it is a result of the inability to establish how this development proceeded in a given case. I emphasize this point with the conjunction "or," placed between the variants in the line of development. The presentation of the lines of development of each of the Proto-Slavic lexemes in a given subchapter is followed by a brief recapitulation of the direct motivations of the concept which is discussed in the subchapter. Here and there, in the cases of motivational parallelism, indirect motivations are also accounted for.

The particular chapters include headword articles built around the reconstructed Proto-Slavic lexemes. The form of the latter lexemes is reconstructed according to the principles embraced in the *Słownik prasłowiański*, that is that they may differ in their particulars from the reconstructions used for example by the Moscow school – the ones that are found in the ESSJ. Some of the entries occur in two different forms. I embraced the following principles in the notation of these forms: in the case of alternant forms, resulting from the alternation of the root (*\*grǫbъ* : *\*grubъ*; *\*šadъ* : *\*šědivъ*), I used the notation with the sign of alternation: “:”; the forms with various suffixes are separated by a colon (*\*divъ*; *\*dikъ*; *\*dręchlъ* : *\*dręselъ*, *\*pěknъ*, *\*pěkrъ*), whereas the numerous cases of accretion of the productive suffix upon an earlier suffix, usually with fewer attestations, were signaled with the sign “/” (e.g. *\*čitъ*/*\*čitavъ*, *\*dogъ*/*\*dožъ*, *\*durъ*/*\*durъnъ*.) The purpose of this variation in notation is to emphasize the various origins of the different forms of the continuants of the Proto-Slavic lexeme. The complete set of forms is provided at the headword article which is **basic** for a given lexeme. In the remaining articles only that form is provided which refers to the meaning which is discussed there.

A headword article may consist of four parts, of which three: “Etymological meaning,” “Structural meaning” (only for adjectives derived in Proto-Slavic) and “The meaning based on continuants” present a reconstruction of the fundamental meanings, crucial for the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic semantics. This reconstruction is described at the headword article which is **basic** for a given lexeme. However, other articles which are based on the same Proto-Slavic entry, present only the results of reconstruction, with a reference to the chapter and page number where it is discussed. The fourth part of a headword article, whose purpose is to present innovative meanings, is separately provided for each headword article because it refers to the semantics of continuants instead of the reconstructed Proto-Slavic word. Due to the semantic field that was defined I was above all interested in the innovative meanings which refer to people. Not all headword articles have a part entitled “Innovative meanings” because not every meaning of a given lexeme is subject to further semantic development in the direction that I am interested in.

Each entry opens with the etymological meaning, followed by a short justification of its reconstruction, based on non-Slavic etymological data. The etymological meaning refers to the entry word or to its derivational basis. Also, in the latter case the word is given in the adjectival, participial or descriptive form. If the etymology of a word is underresearched, the meaning is referred to as “obscure.” If the etymological research suggests various solutions, the meaning is described as “uncertain.” The word “uncertain” I place (with question marks in parentheses) reconstructed etymological meanings resulting from the etymology that is considered. The latter meanings are included (with question marks which signal their hypothetical nature) in the “Summary of Semantic Changes” sections, located at the end of the particular chapters.

The meaning which in this work is referred to as the structural meaning has to do with adjectives, which are derived from Proto-Slavic stems and this meaning is not inherited from the Proto-Indo-European.<sup>14</sup> The part which justifies the reconstruction of meaning describes the means of derivation of these adjectives. However, sometimes it is impossible to decide whether a given lexeme arose already in the Proto-Indo-European period, or it was formed in the Proto-Slavic period with the assistance of apophonic mechanisms which continued to operate. The determining criterion is associated with the equivalents from other Indo-European languages, however it is impossible to define *a priori* in which case their testimony is sufficient to shift the emergence of a lexeme to the Proto-Indo-European period.

The body of evidence for the meaning based on continuants is placed under this meaning in its entirety only if a great variety of the meanings of continuants obliges me to present the basis for reconstruction in a comprehensive manner. In practice, the basis of the reconstruction of the “meaning based on continuants” is *de facto* frequently constituted by “innovative meanings,” discussed in the subsequent part. At that point I provide only the reconstruction of meaning with a justification, without quoting the same material twice. If the material basis of the meaning is consistent, I only quote examples – from each linguistic group if possible. The selection of examples largely depends on the form of the continuants. In the case when this form considerably diverges in relation to the Proto-Slavic form I try to provide especially the forms which are most remote from the etymon.

The final paragraph of a headword article is devoted to the presentation of innovative meanings, i.e., those which arose already in the period of the independent development of the particular languages. The collection of these meanings is as if a side effect of the work upon the reconstruction of meaning based on continuants. As I have already mentioned in the part which describes the means of reconstructing the meaning based on continuants, the basic difficulty lies in the distinguishing of meanings which existed in the Proto-Slavic language from those which already arose in the independent development of the particular languages. Very frequently a clear distinction of these meanings is even impossible. Thus, the inability to establish the sequence of the semantic development for the meanings of a Proto-Slavic word precludes the establishment of meanings which are present in the continuants as the innovative meanings. In such cases I included in the section “Innovative meanings” only those meanings whose emergence in the context of the particular languages is beyond all doubt, or those meanings whose innovative nature (e.g., in the case of \**chudъ*) is justified by me in the headword article.

---

<sup>14</sup> In this case the etymological meaning referred to the derivational basis.

## 6 CONCEPTUAL GROUPS

### 1A. GOOD

#### 1A.1. *\*dobrǫ*

##### **Etymological meaning** ‘appropriate; well-adjusted’

Etymological dictionaries explain the Proto-Slavic *\*dobrǫ* either as an adjective formed in the Proto-Slavic context from the root *\*dob-* with the suffix *-rǫ* [see SP 3: 316 about the productivity of the suffix *-rǫ*] or as a continuant of the PIE nominal form *\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-ro-* [ESS] 5: 46; SP 3: 310–316 *et alia*, e.g. Snój<sup>2</sup>: 115; Boryś: 115]. The etymology of the Proto-Slavic *\*dobrǫ* should be considered in relation with other lexemes based on the same root – the Proto-Slavic *\*dob-*, continuing the PIE *\*\*d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to adjust,’ ‘appropriate, suitable’ [SP 3: 285; Sławski 1: 151]. [See *\*dob’b*, STRONG, 6A.9, p. 167]

##### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘good’

In all Slavic languages the meaning ‘good’ occurs in both variants – the normative and the psychological.<sup>1</sup> The etymological meaning ‘well-adjusted, appropriate’ indicates that the normative meaning precedes the psychological one chronologically.

##### **Innovative meanings**

The meanings which are provided by dictionaries are hyponyms of the meaning ‘good,’ either the normative one (‘decent, diligent, able’) or the psychological one (‘nice, kind, noble’). The innovation, which appears already in the Old Church Slavonic texts and which is common in various Slavic languages, especially in dialects and in the colloquial style of the general language, there is the meaning ‘big’ (usually referring to a portion of something).

---

<sup>1</sup> This distinction is drawn from Grzegorzcykowska [2003].

## 1A.2. \*lěpъ

### **Etymological meaning** ‘glued together’ > ‘appropriate, well-adjusted’

The adjective \*lěpъ continues the PIE \*loip-o-; the nominal form to *leip-* ‘to make, to form [lepić]’ [Sławski 4: 168–169; Boryś: 285]. It is associated with the Proto-Slavic \*lьpěti, \*lьpnōti ‘to stick to sth, to cling; to be sticky,’ whose closest formal and semantic equivalent is the Lithuanian *lipti limpù* ‘to cling.’<sup>2</sup>

### **Meanings based on continuants** ‘appropriate,’ ‘good,’ ‘pretty’

Today the meaning ‘good’ of the positive degree is rare, although its traces are visible in the early stages of the development of Slavic languages or in their dialects. The continuants of the comparative degree of the Proto-Slavic \*lěpъ and \*lěpъši are more common in this meaning, especially in North Slavic languages, where they form suppletive forms for the positive degree of adjectives with the meaning ‘good.’ This suppletion is especially marked in the Czech and Slovak languages, in which apart from the adjectives in the basic degree: *lepý* ‘pretty, charming; graceful, shapely’ there are formal *comparativa*: *lepší* with the meaning ‘better, more appropriate,’ ones that are semantically incongruent with the basis.

### **Innovative meanings**

As a result of emphasis being put on the various aspects of the normative meaning of ‘good’ new meanings arose, ones that are peculiar to the development of the concept of ‘good,’ e.g., ‘distinguished, well-known’ in the South Slavic languages. A Lower Sorbian innovation is the meaning ‘cunning, skillful.’

## 1A.3. \*godъnъ

### **Etymological meaning** ‘closely adjusted; connected’

The Proto-Slavic \*goditi is based on the PIE root \*g<sup>h</sup>ed<sup>h</sup>-/\*g<sup>h</sup>od<sup>h</sup>- ‘to bind, to adjust,’ ‘to be closely bound’ [Pokorny: 423; SP 8: 20].

### **Structural meaning** ‘aimed at sth, targeted at sth; hit’

The Proto-Slavic \*godъnъ ‘appropriate,’ Southern ‘mature to (do) sth’ [SP 8: 21] is a derivative with the suffix -ъnъ from \*goditi ‘to expect an occasion; to aim, to target, to hit,’ ‘to be appropriate, good, convenient, favorable’ [SP 8: 13–14, 22; ESSJ 6: 190].

### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘appropriate, adequate’ > ‘capable, able to do sth’

The meaning which is reconstructed on the basis of continuants is ‘appropriate, suitable for sth,’ hence ‘fit, capable.’ The new dominating seme is the metaphorically conceived appropriate situation i.e. the fulfilment of the expected requirements. The most distinct trace of the structural meaning is the temporal meaning ‘early’ of the Slovene *góden*, the narrowing down of the meaning ‘appropriate, well-timed, as regards time.’

<sup>2</sup> The semantic relationship is better visible in the Polish ‘to cling [lgnąć],’ which is a continuant of \*lьpnōti, before the Old Polish stage *lnqć* [Sławski 4: 211].

## Innovative meanings

The meaning '*comme il faut*; appropriate' is the point of departure for new meanings, ones that arose through the narrowing down of the content, especially in the Czech language, namely 'good'<sup>3</sup> and 'polite, kind,' colloquially also 'big,' as well as 'beautiful,' 'rich,' 'pregnant (female)' in dialects. Regardless of these meanings there is also the meaning 'mature to do sth.' (Slovene *góden*, Croatian and Serbian *gódan*). Further meanings, which narrow down the sense '*comme il faut*,' refer to impersonal objects, e.g., 'fertile' (Serbian and Croatian *gódan*), 'valuable' (Czech and Slovak *hodný*). Cf. also PLEASANT 2A.9, p. 119, PRETTY, 3A.6, p. 129.

### 1A.4. \**rǫdъ*/\**rǫdbъnъ*

#### Etymological meaning 'arranged in a row, in a series'

The adjective *rǫdъ* and the suffixed *rǫdbъnъ* is related to \**rǫdbъnъ* [see 1A.5, p. 98], with the apophony of the root vowel, peculiar to nominal forms. Due to the lack of equivalents in other Indo-European languages we must recognize the Proto-Slavic \**rǫdъ* as a formation which was created in the Proto-Slavic period.

#### The meanings based on continuants 'correct, appropriate'

The adjective has few attestations, but its structure and geographical distribution (presence in dialects which are remote to one another) indicates its Proto-Slavic origin [cf. Boryś 1981a: 8 (reprinted 2007: 615)]. For the Proto-Slavic period we may reconstruct the general meaning 'correct, appropriate' – one that is semantically close to the normative meaning of 'good' – based on the etymological meaning of 'arranged in a series.'

## Innovative meanings

Innovative meanings are a result of the formation of new semantic centers for the particular continuants. In Cashubian (*rǫdni* 'eager, hard-working, nimble,' *rǫdi* 'nimble, lively, healthy, merry, hot-blooded, spry') new meanings concentrate around the meanings 'nimble, vigorous'. In Slovene (*róden* 'prudent, attentive; caring'; 'shapely; nimble') one can discern two independent semantic dominants – 'decent/strong' and 'nimble, vigorous.' *Ródi* 'dense' and *rud* 'compact, hard' (both examples drawn from Kajkavian dialects of Croatian [SEK 4: 174]) do not refer to people. In the Church Slavonic language, apart from the closely etymologically related meanings of 'bound, joint; appropriate' there is the mysterious meaning of 'low/short,' [see LOW/SHORT, 4B.5, p. 147]. It seems that the basis of the innovative meanings is the hypernym '*comme il faut*,' which may be inferred from the development of other adjectives with similar semantics.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> In the Czech language the continuant of the Proto-Slavic \**gódbъnъ*: *hodný* replaced to a considerable extent the Czech *dobry*, consequently its frequency considerably increased as compared with the frequency of the continuants of \**gódbъnъ* in other languages.

<sup>4</sup> A different concept of the initial meaning is suggested by Wiesław Boryś, who recognises 'sb or sth who skillfully puts sth into order, introducing order; one who manages sth' > 'nimble, adroit, shapely,' therefore on the basis of the active structural meaning of the Proto-Slavic \**rǫdъ* [SEK 4: 174].

### 1A.5. \*rędbnъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘arranged in a row, in a series’

The Proto-Slavic \*rędbъ has very closely related equivalents in Baltic: the Lithuanian *rinda* ‘row, sequence/series,’ Latvian *riņda* ‘sequence; number’ are probably derived from the PIE \*r̥nd-o- ‘arrangement, order,’ forms with the reduced grade of the root \*rend- ‘to put in order’ [Borys: 531], which may be a nasalized variant of the PIE *rēdʰ-* [however; cf. Pokorny: 60].

#### Structural meaning ‘arranged in a row, in a series’

The Proto-Slavic \*rędbnъ is a derivative with the suffix -bnъ from \*rędbъ ‘row.’

#### The meanings based on continuants ‘correct,’ ‘decent’

The continuants of the Proto-Slavic \*rędbnъ indicate the meaning ‘decent’ which is a concretization of the evaluative meaning ‘correct,’ also ‘good’ in Lower Sorbian. They are based on the structural meaning of ‘arranged in a row, in a series,’ thus ‘correctly, carefully arranged.’

#### Innovative meanings

The meanings which arose in a part of the West Slavic languages – ‘pretty, beautiful’ (cf. the dial. Polish *rzędny*, *rzqdny*, Lower Sorbian *rědny*, Upper Sorbian *rjany*) are based on the positive evaluation of order. As a result of concretization there arose from the meaning ‘correct’ the meanings ‘good, decent’ (Lower Sorbian *rědny*). Another innovation of an evaluative nature which arose in the West Slavic languages is the semantic change ‘correct’ > ‘big.’ This suggests that a bigger size is better (perhaps more appropriate or more desired) than the smaller one.

### 1A.6. \*bol’ьjъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘strong’

As far as the etymology is concerned, \*bol’ьjъ is compared with the Old Indic *bāliyas-* ‘stronger,’ Gr. *βελτίων*, *βέλτερος* ‘better, braver’ and the Lat. *de-bilis* ‘powerless, weak,’ although this hypothesis is not recognized by everyone [cf. Helimskij 2000: 328]. On the basis of such a comparison one may think that also the meanings of the Proto-Slavic \*bol’ьjъ, similarly as \*golęmъ, should be derived from ‘strong,’ hence one may infer that the meaning ‘bigger’ is earlier than ‘better.’

#### The meanings based on continuants ‘big,’ ‘good’

The Proto-Slavic \*bol’ьjъ, in a form which is extended by -š-, \*bol’ь ši, is the suppletive comparative degree of the adjectives \*velikъ ‘big’ and \*dobrъ ‘good.’<sup>5</sup> The meanings ‘bigger’ and ‘better,’ ones that used to exist next to each other (the Old Church Slavonic *bol’ii*, *bol’ši*, *bol’e* ‘maior; melior’ and the Old Russian *большии* ‘idem’ apart from *болии*, *больши* ‘maior’), today have a different distribution in the Slavic languages in

<sup>5</sup> According to ESSJ 2: 193, \*bol’ьjъ was originally the comparative degree of ‘big,’ secondarily to ‘good.’

which the Proto-Slavic lexeme is continued. ‘Bigger’ in Ukrainian and Belarusian, and ‘better’ in Slovene, Croatian and Serbian.<sup>6</sup>

## 1A.7. Western and Eastern \**ladьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PRETTY, 3A.3, p. 127]

**Structural meaning** ‘arranged in a row, well-ordered’ (*ut supra*)

The adjective \**ladьnъ* may have a double formal motivation because it may be a derivative both of the noun \**ladъ* as well as of the verb \**laditi*. However, it is only in single instances that we may define this motivation on the basis of the semantics of adjectives (see: Innovative meanings).

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘well-ordered’ > ‘pretty,’ ‘good’ (Eastern), ‘strapping, shapely’

The majority of the continuants of \**ladьnъ* indicate the structural meaning of ‘well-arranged/put together, well-ordered,’ which refers primarily to inanimate objects. Hence arose the meanings of aesthetic evaluation ‘pretty’ and – these are attested in the East Slavic group – of the general evaluation of ‘good.’

### Innovative meanings

In the particular languages the meaning ‘strapping, shapely’ passed into ‘big’ (the dial. Polish *ładny*, dial. Russian *ладны*, dial. Belarusian *ладны*), which underwent further transformation into ‘adult’ (in Polish dialects and in Ukrainian<sup>7</sup>). ‘Well-ordered’ is the basis of the meaning ‘decent’ (dial. Czech *ladný*, Russian *ладный*, also Ukrainian and Belarusian), and its dominant is the result of a correct arrangement – order. The rounds of the narrowing down of the meaning ‘good’ yielded further meanings, ones which no longer involved the etymological ‘order’ in their seme content, namely: ‘healthy’ (dial. Russian *ладный*), as well as ‘fresh,’ ‘tasty’ (dial. Ukrainian *ладний*) and ‘satiated [syty]’ (dial. Belarusian *ладны*).

The Russian and Ukrainian ‘concordant’ are independent derivatives from the East Slavic *ладить/ладити/ладзіць* < \**laditi* ‘to live in harmony’ [see Sławski 4: 423–424]. A similar development may be presumed for the Old Russian meanings of ‘identical’ or ‘similar,’ although dictionaries fail to register the verbal basis with the expected meaning.

<sup>6</sup> The distribution of adverbial meanings which continue the Proto-Slavic \**bol’e* [see SP 1: 316] is different. Also in some languages the general evaluative meaning disappeared, whereas in other languages the meaning which refers to size, and the adjectival meaning not always corresponds with the meaning of the adverb, (cf. Slovene *bólji* ‘better’ : *bólj* ‘more; to a greater degree’).

<sup>7</sup> Jasna Vlajić-Popović [2000; see PRETTY, 3A.3, p. 127] offers a different explanation. The scholar claims that the etymological meaning of the Proto-Slavic \**laditi* is ‘to nourish; to cause growth,’ therefore the meanings ‘big, grown’ of the Proto-Slavic \**ladьnъ* would be relics which preserved the former meaning of the verbal basis.

1A.8. \**krasъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PRETTY, 3A.1, p. 126]

**Structural meaning** ‘motley, colorful’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘beautiful,’ Northern ‘red’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘good’ developed next to the basic meaning of ‘pretty, beautiful’ in Czech and Slovak *krasný*, cf. also the Old Polish “*krasne wino*” ‘good, excellent wine.’ Such modifications occur regularly enough (especially in colloquial vocabulary), that we may speak here about developmental tendencies of the same concept instead of the meanings of particular lexemes. Without doubt we are dealing with the emphasis of connotational features. The range of usage of the particular lexemes in new meanings depends on the linguistic habits of the users of a given language.

1A.9. \**bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure ‘glittering, shining’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘kind, pleasant, amiable,’ ‘happy, favorable’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The special development of the meaning ‘good’ is discernible in South Slavic languages. The latter languages saw the profiling of the meaning ‘prosperous,’ which developed in the material direction into ‘affluent,’ which is clearly visible in the specialized meanings of the continuants of \**bolgъ*: dial. Serbian *блѧз* ‘festive,’ ‘fertile (of land)’ and the substantive *блѧго* ‘treasure; money, wealth; cattle,’ dial. Bulgarian *благ* ‘sweet; tasty,’ Macedonian *благ* ‘sweet’ and the substantive *благо* ‘sweets,’ ‘wealth.’ Similar semantic features are realized by the adjectives of participial origin from \**blažiti* < \**bolžiti* ‘to make sb. happy’: dial. Serbian *блѧжан* ‘meat (adj.), not related to the period of fasting,’ Bulgarian *блѧжен* ‘fat.’

1A.10. \**chytrъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure ‘one who appropriates something to himself’ (?) [see QUICK, 9A.3, p. 198]

**Structural meaning** ‘one who catches/takes hold of/grabs sth’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘dexterous, quick,’ ‘cunning; ready-witted’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In Sorbian languages, apart from the Upper Sorbian ‘fast’ and the word for ‘cunning’ (which earlier existed in both languages), there are innovative meanings of the continuants

which depart from the words which are known from other Slavic languages: Lower Sorbian *chytšy* ‘good,’ ‘big,’ ‘pretty; agreeable,’ ‘decent,’ ‘honest’ and the Upper Sorbian *chětry* ‘of considerable size, big, about a piece of sth,’ ‘important,’ ‘good, delicate.’ The meanings ‘pretty; agreeable,’ ‘decent,’ ‘honest’ may be the specializations of the meaning ‘good,’ although until we establish which of the evaluative meanings arose first, we must also admit the possibility of generalization of one of those meanings. The meaning ‘big’ referring to a portion of something, is regularly based on the meaning ‘good’ (cf. the development of, e.g., Czech *hodný*, dial. Polish *dobry*), where the evaluative feature is its basis. Today Sorbian languages preserve only positively marked meanings, whereas the negatively marked meaning ‘cunning’ which preceded them was replaced. This could have been associated with a glaring semantic incongruity with innovative meanings.<sup>8</sup>

### 1A.11. \**dělnъ*

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with work, with the result of work’ [see DILIGENT, 15A.6, p. 254]

**The meanings based on continuants** Western ‘hard-working,’ Eastern ‘resourceful’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

In the Russian language on the basis of the semantics ‘associated with work, with the work that has been done’ there developed above all meanings referring to man – ‘able, fit to work’ but today there are also meanings referring to things – ‘suitable to be processed, suitable for production.’ Supposedly on the basis of this latter meaning in dialects there developed the generalized meaning ‘of good quality,’ ‘good’ (dial. Russian *дѣльный*), and also secondarily ‘beautiful, strapping.’

### 1A.12. \**grdъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘good’ appeared in the Czech language. Its co-existence beside ‘magnificent; beautiful’ suggests that this meaning of ‘magnificent,’ common in the modern East Slavic languages, is the direct motivation of the meaning ‘good.’ The semantic shift consists in the decreasing of the intensity of the previous meaning.

<sup>8</sup> Heinz Schuster-Šewc [377–378] does not comment upon the semantic development in the Sorbian languages.

### 1A.13. Western and Southern \**drěčьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘extended lengthwise’ [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.2, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** ‘such as a pillar, as a tree trunk’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘well-grown’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning which arose in the Croatian dialects – ‘decent, good; of merit’ is supposedly a result of the generalization of ‘strong; fit for combat’ > ‘good, of merit, in general.’

### 1A.14. \**čilъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘refreshed’ [see HEALTHY, 7A.4, p. 184]

**Structural meaning** ‘one who is resting,’ ‘refreshed’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘refreshed’ > ‘lively,’ ‘vigorous’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The hyponyms of the meaning ‘good’: ‘immaculate, spotless,’ which in the Ukrainian *чїлий* accompany the meanings ‘healthy, strong,’ indicate the arising of the meaning ‘good’ through metaphor, the meaning which was secondarily subject to specialization. Metaphorical meanings supposedly arose on the basis of the positive evaluation of physical fitness.

### 1A.15. \**strogъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘diligent’ > ‘one who is on guard’ [see STERN, 12A.2, p. 226]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘severe, stern’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The unexpected meaning ‘good’ of the Kashubian *strogi* should be supposedly derived from the meanings ‘great, strong’ [see STRONG, 6A.18, p. 170].

## Recapitulation of Semantic Changes

1A.1. \**dobrŏ*

GOOD PSlav ← APPROPRIATE etym. ← WELL-ADJUSTED etym.

1A.2. \**lěpŏ*

GOOD PSlav ← APPROPRIATE PSlav ← RIGIDLY ADJUSTED etym. ← GLUED TOGETHER etym.

1A.3. \**godьnŏ*

GOOD Cz. ← APPROPRIATE PSlav ← WELL-AIMED struct.

1A.4. \**rŏdьnŏ*

CORRECT PSlav ← ARRANGED IN A ROW struct.

1A.5. \**rędьnŏ*

GOOD LSorb ← DECENT Western, Slovene, Bulg. ← ARRANGED IN A ROW struct.

1A.6. \**bol'ьjŏ*

GOOD PSlav ← BIG PSlav ← STRONG etym.

1A.7. \**ladьnŏ*

GOOD Eastern ← WELL-ARRANGED early Pol., USorb, Eastern ← ARRANGED struct.

1A.8. \**krasьnŏ*

GOOD Cz., Slovak ← PRETTY/BEAUTIFUL PSlav

1A.9. \**bolgŏ*

GOOD PSlav ← \*PLEASING TO THE EYE ← SHINING (?) etym.

1A.10. \**chytrŏ*

GOOD LSorb, USorb ← ABLE PSlav ← QUICK PSlav ← CATCHING STH struct.

1A.11. \**dělnŏ*

GOOD dial. Russian ← ABLE Russian ← HARD-WORKING Russian ← ASSOCIATED WITH WORK PSlav

1A.12. \**grdŏ*

GOOD Cz. ← MAGNIFICENT/BEAUTIFUL Northern, Old Church Slavonic ← PROUD Northern, Old Church Slavonic

1A.13. \**drěčьnŏ*

GOOD dial. Croatian ← STRONG Slovak, Slovene, Croatian ← WELL-GROWN Western, Southern ← SUCH AS A TREE TRUNK struct.

1A.14. \**čilŏ*

1A.14.1.

\*GOOD Ukr. ← STRONG Ukr. ← LIVELY/FRESH PSlav ← WELL-RESTED struct.

or

1A.14.2.

\*GOOD Ukr. ← HEALTHY Ukr. ← LIVELY/FRESH PSlav ← WELL-RESTED struct.

1A.15. \**strogŏ*

GOOD Kash. ← STRONG Kash. ← SEVERE PSlav ← ONE WHO IS ON GUARD etym. ← DILIGENT etym.

Among the motivations of the concept of 'good' there are meanings which refer to an arrangement which expresses itself either through fitting in (\**dobrŭ*, \**lěpŭ*, \**godbnŭ*) or through a linear order (\**rŏdbnŭ*, \**rĕdbnŭ*, \**ladbnŭ*). Further motivations are based on other positive evaluations of physical features, namely: skillfulness (\**chyrŭ*, \**dělbŭ*), strength (\**drĕčbnŭ*, \**čilŭ*, \**strogŭ*) or health (\**čilŭ*), greatness (\**bol'bjŭ*). Visual features are the source of still further motivations: beauty (\**krasbnŭ*, \**gŕ'dŭ* – the latter may be motivated by the evaluating 'excellent') and shine (\**bolgŭ* – the indirect motivation is uncertain). And because 'good' is a concept of evaluating nature, it is no surprise that the motivations are based on features which in a given nomination express good. It is also for this reason that the study of motivation sheds life on the hierarchy of values among the Slavs as the whole community.

## 1B. BAD

### 1B.1. \*zŭlŭ

#### **Etymological meaning** 'obliquus/crooked/pravus' > 'bad'

The PSlav \*zŭlŭ is derived from the PIE \**ǵh<sup>h</sup>ulo-s*/\**ǵh<sup>h</sup>ūlo-s* (\**ǵh<sup>h</sup> ū<sup>h</sup>-lo-s* in Pokorny: 489) 'oblique.' The closest equivalents feature a difference in vocalism: Lith. *atžūlūs* 'sharp, rough; merciless,' Lith. *i-žūlūs* 'insolent; shameless,' Avest. *zūrah-* 'injustice' [Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 2: 99; Boryś: 742]. The nominal form is based on the PIE \**ǵh<sup>h</sup>uel-* 'to bend' [Pokorny: 489–490], cf. Lat. *fallere* 'to tell lies'; Lith. *žvalūs* 'lithe, agile, vigorous,' Old Indic *hváras-* 'curvature.' The meaning of Baltic and Avestan equivalents allows us to suppose that the meaning 'bad' arose already before the Proto-Slavic period.

#### **The meaning based on continuants** 'bad' > 'irate'

The common meaning of the continuants of the PSlav \*zŭlŭ is the evaluative 'bad,' which may provide evaluation both as regards the quality and the morality. The secondary meaning 'irate' also arose in the Proto-Slavic period. Apart from its frequency this is indicated by the reconstruction of the semantics of the PSlav abstractum \*zlostŭ 'anger' < 'the lack of good.'

#### **Innovative meanings**

An innovation of the Russian Olonets dialect is the extension of the meaning *злой* 'evil, bad' (of fate) to the experiences of the subject, from which arises a new meaning – 'one whose fate is bad, unhappy.' This change is analogous to the phenomenon (frequent in the development of deverbal adjectives) of the competition between active and passive meanings. A feature which attracts attention in some languages is the presence of meanings which have a distinctly positive overtones [see PRETTY, 3A.11, p. 126; WISE, 16A.6, p. 262]. One may claim that the first stage in the evolution of the meaning 'bad' towards a positive direction was the deprivation of the meaning 'irate' of the negative overtones and the emphasis of the strength and intensity which are associated with this concept.

## 1B.2. Southern and Eastern *\*lochъ/ \*lošъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘weak; of inferior quality’ (?), ‘oblique’ (?)

The etymology of the PSlav *\*lochъ*, preserved in derivatives with accretions, especially with the suffix *-jъ*, in the form *\*lošъ*, is uncertain. According to Pokorny, it belongs to the PIE root *\*lē(i)-*, extended with the formant *-s-* to *\*lē̯s*: *lās* ‘weak, weary’. This category also includes the Goth. *lasiws* ‘weak’, Old English *leswe* ‘weak, angry, irate’, Old Norse *lasinn* ‘weak, spoilt’ [Pokorny: 680; Berneker: 734; Bezlaj 2: 151-152; Skok 2: 319–320]. ESSJ rejects this with an inexplicable commentary: “Это признается ненадежным, семантическим необоснованным” (“This is considered uncertain, semantically unjustified”) [ESSJ 16: 93]. As a second possibility Vasmer<sup>2</sup>: 526; BER 3: 481; Skok l.c. give the association with the Gk. *λοζός* ‘oblique, slanting’, Ir. *losc* ‘lame.’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad, especially in the moral sense’

The PSlav *\*lošъ* is preserved especially in the South Slavic languages with the meanings ‘bad, unfortunate, unpleasant, ‘heavy,’ ‘miserable.’ Apart from the continuants in South Slavic languages and in the Russian dialects, the initial PSlav meaning ‘bad’ is indicated by the derivatives based on the form *\*lochъ*. The latter refer to people and express a negative evaluation. [See: innovative meanings.]

**Innovative meanings**

The extension of the semantic field of *\*lochъ/lošъ*, which is better visible in nominal derivatives, is constituted by the specializations of the meaning ‘bad in a moral sense,’ namely dial. Sk. *loch* ‘sluggard, scrounger; fool,’ *locha* ‘slut,’ *lócha* ‘swindler’ m. and f., *lóchan* ‘vagabond, thief,’ dial. Russian *лох* ‘sluggard, halfwit’. Cf. also WEAK, 6B.11, p. 178.

## 1B.3. *\*chudъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘crushed; crumbled’ (?)

Etymology obscure. Probably derived from the PIE *\*ksoud-o-*, compared with the root *kseud-* ‘to crush, to crumble’ [Pokorny: 625]. Formally related to the OInd *kṣud-rá-* ‘small; miserable; mean’ [ESSJ 8: 112–113] with a different vocalism and an additional formant *-ro-*. Whereas the comparison with the OInd *kṣódhuka-* (< *\*ksaud<sup>h</sup>-uka-* < *\*\*ksoud<sup>h</sup>*) ‘hungry’ [Machek 1938–1939: 174] supposes the presence of an aspirated dental consonant in the PIE *\*kseud<sup>h</sup>-*. Because this comparison is based merely upon competitive OInd forms it is difficult to establish the actual form of the root. Usually compared with the Lithuanian *skaudús* ‘burdensome; unpleasant; painful’ [e.g. Sławski 1: 88–89], with a phonetic metathesis *sk-* < *ks-* and a semantic innovation which indicates the previous meaning ‘bad,’ congruent with the development of the OInd *kṣudrá-*. A comprehensive appraisal of all of the concepts is conducted by Jiří Rejzek [2008: 73-74].

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘small, minute,’ ‘miserable, bad,’ ‘weak,’ ‘thin,’ ‘poor’

On the basis of continuants one may reconstruct a number of different meanings. The etymology of the word is uncertain, therefore it is difficult to opt for one of them as the initial one, considering the etymological meaning. On the basis of the appraisal of the general tendencies of the semantic development one may assume that the meanings

referring to physical features are preceded by meanings referring to the material situation. The selection of the initial meaning among the physical meanings is less relevant because – as one may infer from the research of the names of physical features – they imply themselves. Whereas the meanings ‘thin’ and ‘poor’ are linked by a cause-and-effect relationship, and ‘thin’ and ‘bad’ are linked by an evaluative relationship.

### Innovative meanings

Innovations are, in my opinion, meanings which arose in the Slovene language – ‘strong; vehement, intensive; fast.’ The source of their emergence is most likely the meaning ‘bad; irate’ which was formed in South Slavic languages (Slovene *zèl*, Croatian and Serbian *zàlo*), analogically to the pan-Slavic semantic development of the PSlav *\*zbl̥o*, from ‘bad’ in the axiological sense to ‘bad; irate; irritated.’ Apart from the aforementioned languages the meaning ‘bad, irate’ is contained in the continuants of *\*chud̥o* in Russian dialects. This meaning may also be perceived in the Polabian name of the devil – *χαυδ̥αc* < *\*chud̥ьсь*. The geographical distribution of these, namely their considerable territorial dispersion and peripheral occurrence, could be an argument in favour of their initiality. This is also indicated to a certain degree by the etymological meaning. The latter, however, is too uncertain to consider it a decisive argument. However, the aforementioned premises seem too weak to assume the initiality of the meaning ‘bad, irate’ before ‘bad, miserable, mean; shabby, thin, weak.’

#### 1B.4. *\*lich̥o*

##### Etymological meaning ‘the one who remains; remaining’

The PSlav *\*lich̥o* < *\*\*lik-ch̥o* is probably based on the PIE root *\*leikʰ-so-* ‘to leave behind,’ cf. Greek *λείπειν* ‘to leave behind,’ with the suffix *-so-* (the PIE nominal form *\*loikʰ-o-* is continued by the PSlav *\*(ot̥o)-l̥ek̥o* ‘remnant,’ cf. Lith. *liėkas* ‘odd (of numbers); excessive,’ Latv. *liēks* ‘idem’ [Pokorny: 669–670]).

##### The meanings based on continuants ‘excessive,’ ‘odd (of numbers)’ > ‘bad, miserable’

The basic Proto-Slavic meaning could have been ‘odd (of numbers)’ but its absence in the East Slavic languages may also indicate the development of the Old Russian *лихыи* ‘excessive’ directly from the etymological meaning ‘remaining.’ The meanings ‘excessive’ and ‘odd (of numbers)’ could have arisen already before the branching off [wyodrębnienie się] of the Proto-Slavic language – this is testified by the Baltic equivalents. The diffusion of the meaning ‘bad’ may indicate its presence as a secondary meaning already in the Proto-Slavic language.<sup>9</sup>

### Innovative meanings

The majority of the innovative meanings are derived from the initial meaning ‘odd (of number)’ or ‘excessive’ or ‘missing’; e.g. the meaning ‘strange, alien [obcy]’ in the Old Church Slavonic language, for which one may reconstruct a chain of semantic

<sup>9</sup> The development of meaning from ‘odd (of number)’ to ‘bad’ is interesting from the perspective of cultural research. Was odd (of numbers) negatively evaluated because it involved excess or deficiency, or was it because it was associated with the activity of the unclean spirit?

changes: ‘strange’ < ‘excluded’ < ‘ill-fitting.’ The source of the latter may be both ‘odd (of numbers)’ as well as ‘excessive, redundant.’ It is likely that also the USorb *liči* ‘naked, bald; free from something,’ derived from the earlier ‘deprived of sth.’ may be used in reference to man. A typical semantic development based on ‘bad’ is represented by the Ukrainian *лухій* ‘unhappy’ < ‘miserable’ and early Slovak *lichý* ‘greedy’<sup>10</sup> – instances of the narrowing down of the meaning ‘bad in a moral sense.’ Regardless of that, the East Slavic languages saw the emergence of ‘strong’ (probably on the basis of the meaning ‘excessive’), which underwent further development. Cf. STRONG, 6A.19, p. 170, DARING, 13A.16, p. 239.

## 1B.5. Eastern (?) \**plochъ*

### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘flat’ (?)

The etymology and the range of this word are uncertain because in Slavic languages there was a mixing of the continuants of two separate PSlav adjectives \**plochъ* and \**polchъ* (cf. \**plochъ* TIMID, 13B.1, p. 241), and in the case of the Czech continuant *plochy* one also considers a German borrowing *flach* ‘flat’ (such is the explanation provided by Machek<sup>2</sup>: 462). One must also admit the PIE stem \**plat-/plāt-* from which the PSlav \**ploskъ* ‘flat’ originated [Bezlej 3: 60; Boryś: 443].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘bad’

A certain continuant of the Pslav \**plochъ* is the Russian *плохой* ‘bad’ (in Old Russian *плохий* ‘idem.’ Its exact formal equivalent may be the Czech and Slovak *plochy* ‘flat,’ which is considered by some etymologists as an old variant of the PSlav \**ploskъ* ‘flat’ [see Rejzek: 477]. Trubačev, who assumes such a possibility, reconstructs the following development of the meaning ‘flat’ > ‘even’ > ‘open’ > ‘unprotected’ > ‘left unattended’ > ‘bad’:

Например, между реконструируемым праславянским словом и значением \**plochъ* (вариант к \**ploskъ*) ‘плоский’ (ср. чеш. *plochy* ‘плоский’), с одной стороны, и рус. *плохой* ‘нехороший, негативный, отрицательный, вызывающий осуждение’ – с другой стороны, вытягивается целая цепочка градусов, или шагов, изменяющегося значения: ‘плоский, ровный, открытый, незащищенный, плохо, без присмотра лежащий, плохой’ [Trubačev 1980: 8 (reprinted 2004: 113–114)].

(For example, between the reconstructed Proto-Slavic word and the meaning \**plochъ* (a variant from \**ploskъ*) ‘flat’ (cf. the Czech *plochy* ‘flat’) on the one hand, and the Russian *плохой* ‘bad, evil, negative, contemptible’ on the other hand – there extends an entire chain of degrees or steps of changing meaning: ‘flat, even, open, unprotected, left unattended, bad.’)

The Polish *plochy* ‘fearful, apprehensive,’ which formally fits into this category, is a continuant of the PSlav \**polchъ* ‘apprehensive.’ This is clearly indicated by semantics.

### Innovative meanings

Supposedly the Belarusian meaning *лђху* ‘sickly’ originates from the earlier ‘bad.’ Whereas the Ukrainian *плохий* ‘tranquil; silent; mild,’ which formally continues the PSlav \**plochъ*, was formed on the basis of the semantics of the continuants of \**polchъ*, unless it is a Polish borrowing.

<sup>10</sup> The earlier attestation of the word *lichý* speaks against the influence of the German borrowing *lichwa* ‘usury.’

1B.6. Northern *\*marъnъ***Structural meaning** ‘one that appears in dreams, one who seems’

Probably originates from the PSlav *\*mariti* ‘to dream,’ associated with *\*mъrěti*/*\*mъriti* ‘to scintillate,’ ‘to seem,’ or from the Pslav *mara* ‘dream, illusion,’ which belongs to the same family.

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘fleeting’ > ‘worthless’

Continuants with varied meanings (cf. the innovative meanings below) enable us to reconstruct the meanings ‘worthless’ which are based on the negative evaluation of that which is imaginary, unreal, fleeting.

**Innovative meanings**

Innovative meanings expressing a negative evaluation, e.g. the Czech *marný*, Slovak *márny*, Ukrainian *мáрний* ‘unimportant,’ Old Polish *marny* ‘fleeting impermanent,’ dial. Polish *marny* ‘poor’ and ‘ugly,’ Polish and Belarusian *мáрны* ‘bad,’ ‘small,’ ‘weak,’ ‘meagre,’ dial. Russian *мáрный* ‘tired,’ Ukrainian *мáрний* ‘thin,’ are manifestations of a narrowing down of the meaning ‘deprived of value.’ The meanings of the dial. Russian *мáрнóй* ‘stuffy, hot,’ ‘cloudy’ are independently motivated meanings of the dial. Russian *мáрить*/*мáрить* ‘to be stuffy, sultry, about the air before a storm.’

1B.7. *\*chabъ*/*\*chabъnъ***Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘sour, spoilt’ (?)

Etymology uncertain; a likely relationship with the Lith. *skóbas* : *skóbús* ‘sour.’ The suggestions that were put forward until now are presented by Rejzek [2008: 50–51].

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘bad, miserable’ > ‘weak’

The PSlav *\*chabъ* is attested above all by the Czech and Slovak *chabý* ‘miserable; weak’ and derivatives, e.g. the dial. Polish *chabina* ‘about a thin (old) man,’ *chabeta* ‘about a miserable horse, animal.’ Their semantics also indicates the initial meaning ‘miserable, shabby, crummy’ > ‘weak.’

**Innovative meanings**

The secondary meanings of the continuants of *\*chabъnъ*, extended by the suffix *-ъnъ*, arose as a result of the transfer of the semantic core, e.g. LSorb *chamny* < *chabny* ‘poor,’ dial. Slovene *háben* ‘sick,’ dial. Bulg. *хáбен* ‘blunt, about objects.’ The second series of new meanings arose through an extension of the meaning ‘bad, miserable’ to ‘bad in a moral sense’ and a narrowing down of the new semantic shade to ‘timid.’

1B.8. Western *\*darъmъnъ***Etymological meaning** ‘given’

The PSlav *\*darъ* is the continuant of the PIE *\*dō-ro-* ‘gift’ (the exact equivalent of this is the Gk. *δῶρον* ‘idem’), a derivative with the suffix *-ro-* from the PIE *\*dō-* ‘to give.’

### Structural meaning ‘given; received as a gift’

An adjective with the suffix *-ьнѣ* from the Proto-Slavic adverbial expressions *\*darьmѣ*, *\*darьmo* ‘in vain,’ derived from *\*dariti*, *\*darѣ*.

### The meaning based on continuants ‘worthless’

The meaning ‘worthless’ is attested in all West languages as well as in Ukrainian and Belarusian (the latter ones may feature a borrowing from Polish, which may be testified by the lack of attestations from Russian). The motivation is supposedly based on the conviction about the small value of the thing that is gained without effort, received as a gift.

### Innovative meanings

In the particular languages the meaning ‘received as a gift,’ hence ‘worthless,’ refers to people, designating people with low moral qualities and their specific features such as the Slovak *daromný* ‘lazy,’ Czech *daremný* ‘wicked’ and ‘prankish.’

## 1B.9. *\*rѣd’avѣ*

### Etymological meaning ‘red’

The PSlav *\*rѣd’a* is a derivative of the unattested *\*rѣdѣ* from the PIE *\*rud<sup>h</sup>-o-* ‘red,’ cf. the Gk. *ἐρυτθρός* ‘idem,’ manifesting a fading grade as regards the PIE *\*roud<sup>h</sup>-o-* ‘red,’ the nominal form to *ρευδ<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to become red.’

### Structural meaning ‘having the color of rust,’ ‘struck with rust’

A derivative with the suffix *-avѣ* from the PSlav *\*rѣd’a*.

### The meanings based on continuants ‘having the color of rust,’ ‘struck with rust’

There are common attestations of the meanings ‘rusty,’ ‘rust-eaten, rust-covered.’

### Innovative meanings

In Serbian and Croatian the word *rdav* ‘rust-eaten’ received by extension the meaning ‘spoil’ > ‘worthless,’ from which it was transferred to people in reference to their moral qualities.

## 1B.10. *\*bĕdьnѣ*

### Etymological meaning ‘forced to do sth’

The basis of the PSlav *\*bĕditi* ‘to nag; to force to do sth’ is the PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>oid<sup>h</sup>-* – a causative of *\*b<sup>h</sup>eid<sup>h</sup>-* (unattested in Proto-Slavic) – hence the Gk. *πειθειν* ‘to persuade,’ Lat. *fidere* ‘to trust.’ The Gothic *baidjan* ‘to force’ is also derived from the causative basis. The semantic relationship between the aforementioned verbs is discussed by Benveniste [Benveniste 1969a: 117–118]. The attempt to separate *\*bĕditi* from *\*bĕda* [Snoj: 35] does not seem convincing. A more precise analysis is presented in ERSJ 3: 36.

### Structural meaning ‘poor’

The PSlav *\*bĕdьnѣ* is a derivative (with the suffix *-ьнѣ*) of *\*bĕda*, which in turn is a derivative of *\*bĕditi se* ‘to be forced, to be nagged,’ or directly a derivative of the PIE basis *\*b<sup>h</sup>oid<sup>h</sup>-* [cf. ESSJ 2: 54–57].

**The meaning based on continuants 'poor'**

The meaning 'poor' is attested in all Slavic languages.

**Innovative meanings**

The common development 'poor' > 'bad, miserable' results from the low evaluation of poverty.

1B.11. \**durьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – unclear 'blowing; associated with wind' (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**The meanings based on continuants** 'agitated, violent; impetuous,' Northern 'mad' > 'stupid' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings 'bad; bad in a moral sense' and further negative meanings 'incapable; old, spoilt,' 'unpleasant,' 'ugly,' 'sick' of the Russian *дурной* and of the East Slavic equivalents may have a varied motivation. The nature of the meanings referring to things indicates a low evaluation; therefore the direct motivation may be contained in the meanings 'stupid, mindless; simple.' This also applies to the meaning 'miserable,' hence a further meaning – 'small' – which emerged in Polish dialects. The meanings which refer to man's character are supposedly motivated by the meanings 'impetuous' or 'mad,' and therefore they lack the aforementioned transitional stages. Cf. also STUPID, 16B.3, p. 265.

1B.12. \**gnusьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see UGLY, 3B.1, p. 134]

**Structural meaning** 'revolting' (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'one that inspires physical repugnance' > 'one that inspires moral repugnance' > 'bad in the moral sense'

The meaning 'bad in a moral sense' is secondary toward the physical meaning but it is likely to be already Proto-Slavic. Its basis is the transfer of physical repugnance to the moral sphere.

**Innovative meanings**

Innovative meanings: Old Russian *гнусныи* 'defiled,' Polish *gniśny* and the structural *гнусныи* 'lazy' result from the specialization of the meaning 'bad in a moral sense.'

1B.13. Eastern and Southern \**gadьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'revolting, abhorrent' (?) [see UGLY, 3B.2, p. 135]

**Structural meaning** – ‘revolting’ (*ut supra*)**The meaning based on continuants** ‘disgusting, revolting’ (*ut supra*)**Innovative meanings**

The shift of meaning from ‘revolting’ to ‘bad,’ e.g. in Serbian and Croatian *gădan*, consists in the extension of the range of content, combined with the attenuation of the intensity of meaning.

1B.14. \**bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘shining, glittering’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘good, kind, pleasant,’ ‘happy, auspicious’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In East Slavic languages the form which was adopted from Church Slavonic – *благѡѣ* (hence the Ukrainian *благѡѣ* and the Belarusian *благѣ*) developed pejorative meanings. Here it seems likely that this development followed separate paths in Russian where the adjective assumed the meaning ‘stupid; mad’ [see STUPID, 16B.5, p. 265], and still separate paths in the remaining East Slavic languages. In Ukrainian and Belarusian the motivating feature became the secondary semantic feature “a small degree of intensity,” present in the meaning ‘mild’ which is still present in Ukrainian.<sup>11</sup> This feature assumed the dominant position, becoming the basis of a new meaning ‘weak, not much intensive’ and the supposedly secondary ‘bad, miserable, shabby.’<sup>12</sup> The further development of meaning from ‘bad, miserable, shabby’ to ‘old,’ ‘poor’ is a result of multidirectional specializations. The Polish *blahy*, with a narrowing down of meaning from ‘bad, miserable, shabby’ to ‘unimportant,’ was borrowed from Ukrainian or Belarusian.

1B.15. \**bridъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** [see UGLY, 3B.5, p. 136]

**Structural meaning** ‘cutting’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘sharp,’ ‘unpleasant’ (*ut supra*)

<sup>11</sup> [Bilodid] treats these two groups of meanings as two meanings of a single lexemes, whereby the meanings ‘good, cordial, mild’ are furnished with the qualifier “obsolete,” and ‘weak; sickly;’ ‘old; miserable; poor’ with the qualifier “colloquial.”

<sup>12</sup> Wiesław Boryś explains the development of the meaning ‘miserable, shabby, bad’ as the taboo replacement of the initial ‘good’ by the contrary ‘bad’ [Boryś: 31]. However, it seems to me that if there is a possibility of explaining a semantic change by the method of “minimal semantic changes,” consisting in the changes of the semantic dominant, it is better to give up explaining them by the influence of taboo, although certainly such changes are also well-attested in the history of vocabulary.

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning 'bad, immoral' emerged in the dial. Polish *brzydki* from the earlier 'revolting' by the transfer of the negative evaluation of ugliness from the aesthetical sphere to the moral sphere.

1B.16. \**polchъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'set in motion; one that sets in motion; animated' [see TIMID, 13B.1, p. 241]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'eager to run; eager to flee' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'bad, miserable, shabby,' present in early Czech (perhaps also in early Polish, unless it is a continuant of the PSlav \**plochъ*, *vide supra*), arose through the development of 'unstable, fleeting' > 'impermanent' > 'unimportant; miserable, bad' (cf. *marъnъ*, *vide infra*).

1B.17. \**grozъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** 'horrendous; terrible/dangerous' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'terrible/dangerous, terrifying' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

As far as the meaning 'bad,' beside 'terrifying, repulsive,' in the case of the US *hrozny* and the meaning 'bad, evil,' beside 'horrible; ugly,' in the case of the dial. Bulg *zрѡzen* do not surprise, but in the development of the Slovene *grozen* 'weak, bad, lousy, of low value' one is hard put to discern a similar transitory stage.

1B.18. \**gъrdъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'proud' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings 'bad' and 'unpleasant' (Serbian and Croatian *gъrd*), similarly as 'ugly, repulsive,' which are also attested in the remaining South Slavic languages [cf. UGLY, 3B.9, p. 138], probably arose through the gradual transfer of the semantic dominant.

1B.19. \**slabъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'flaccid, slack' > 'weak' [see WEAK, 6B.1, p. 173]

## The meaning based on continuants 'weak' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

In the Slovene language the continuant *slàb* changed the basic meaning into 'bad, worthless' > 'bad in a moral sense; one who treats others in a bad way.' The tendency to such a development (beside the transition 'weak' > 'worthless' which is common in the conceptual development) also stands out in Serbian and Croatian. However, in these languages *slàb* retains the basic meaning 'weak.'

## Recapitulation of Semantic Changes

1B.1. \*zъlъ

BAD PSlav ← OBLIQUUS etym.

1B.2. \*lochъ

BAD PSlav ← WEAK etym.

1B.3. \*chudъ

1B.3.1.

BAD PSlav ← \*WORTHLESS ← SMALL PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

1B.3.2.

BAD PSlav ← \*WORTHLESS ← THIN PSlav

or

1B.3.3.

BAD PSlav ← \*WORHTLESS ← WEAK PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

1B.3.4.

BAD PSlav ← \*WORTHLESS ← POOR PSlav

1B.4. \*lichъ

BAD Western ← ODD (OF NUMBERS) Western, Southern ← REMAINING etym.

1B.5. \*plochъ

BAD Russian ← FLAT (?) Czech

1B.6. \*marъnъ

BAD Polish, Belarusian ← FLEETING Old Polish ← IMAGINARY struct.

1B.7. \*chabъ/\*chabъnъ

BAD PSlav ← SPOILT (?) etym.

1B.8. \*darъmъnъ

BAD Czech, Slovak ← WORTHLESS PSlav ← RECEIVED AS A GIFT struct.

1B.9. \*rъd'avnъ

BAD Serbian, Croatian ← WORTHLESS Serbian, Croatian ← SPOILT Serbian, Croatian  
← RUST-EATEN PSlav ← RED etym.

1B.10. \*bĕdъnъ

BAD/MISERABLE general ← POOR PSlav ← FORCED TO DO STH etym.

1B.11. \**durьnъ*

1B.11.1.

BAD East ← SIMPLE Czech, Russian ← STUPID North ← MAD North ← IMPETUOUS etym. ← ASSOCIATED WITH WIND etym.

and

1B.11.2.

BAD IN A MORAL SENSE East ← MAD North ← IMPETUOUS etym. ← ASSOCIATED WITH WIND etym.

1B.12. \**gnusьnъ*

BAD dial. Russian ← MORALLY REPULSIVE PSlav ← REVOLTING PSlav

1B.13. \**gadьnъ*

\*BAD ← MORALLY REPULSIVE PSlav ← REVOLTING PSlav

1B.14. \**bolgъ*

1B.14.1.

BAD Russian ← MAD Russian ← BLESSED Southern, Russian-Church Slavonic ← SHINING (?) etym.

and

1B.14.2

BAD Ukrainian, Belarusian ← WEAK Ukrainian, Belarusian ← \*MILD ← PLEASANT PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

1B.15. \**bridъ*/*\*bridьkъ*

BAD dial. Polish ← REVOLTING Western, Church Slavonic, Ukrainian, Belarusian ← EFFECTING AN UNPLEASANT SENSATION UPON THE SENSES ← \*UNPLEASANT TO THE TOUCH ← SHARP PSlav

1B.16. \**polchъ*

BAD early Czech, early Polish ← IMPERMANENT Czech, Polish ← EAGER TO RUN etym. ← ANIMATED etym.

1B.17. \**grozьnъ*

BAD USorb, dial. Bulgarian ← TERRIBLE PSlav ← TERRIFYING/DANGEROUS PSlav

1B.18. \**grdъ*

BAD Croatian, Serbian ← TERRIFYING Southern ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS dial. Polish, Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian, Eastern ← HUGE Slovene, Croatian, Serbian ← BRAVE Old Russian, Russian ← BOLD early Polish, Old Russian ← HAUGHTY PSlav ← PROUD PSlav

1B.19. \**slabъ*

BAD Slovene ← WEAK PSlav ← FLACCID/SLACK etym.

Analogically to the motivations of the antonymous 'good' (substantive) also the motivations of 'evil' enable us to establish which of these features met with negative evaluation. These are physical features: weakness (\**lochъ*, \**bolgъ* – the latter also has an alternative explanation, maybe \**chudъ* as well), obliquus (\**zъlъ*), flat (with a limited degree of certainty, \**plochъ*), perhaps thinness (\**chudъ*) or a small size (\**chudъ*), although the latter meanings are based on the development of a lexeme whose etymology is uncertain, and

also impermanence (\**marьnъ*, \**polchъ*) and spoiling (\**chabъ*, \**rъd'avъ*; here the direct motivation is rather 'worthless'). Motivations may also involve human properties among which one may distinguish a low evaluation, with contempt: poverty (\**bědnъ*, and perhaps \**chudъ* as well) and stupidity (*durьnъ*), or negatively evaluated, with disgust (\**bridъkъ*, \**gnusьnъ*, \**gadьnъ*) as well as (sometimes ambivalently evaluated) madness (\**durьnъ*, \**bolgъ*; in both cases alternative explanations are possible). In rarer cases the motivation is based on features which do not evoke contempt, but on the contrary – fear (\**grozьnъ*), which also is, however, evaluated negatively. Beside particular features the motivation may be a generally conceived lack of value (\**darьmьnъ*, \**rъd'avъ*, \**chudъ*, in the latter case with various possible reasons for such evaluation). Here there is also a motivation associated with being without a pair – \**lichъ* – interesting due to cultural reasons. In comparison with the motivations of the aforementioned 'good' the motivations of the concept 'bad' are characterized by considerably greater variation, which is undoubtedly associated with the greater semantic complexity of the concept itself. In contradistinction to the concept 'good,' the names which belong to the semantic circle of 'bad' may also be motivated by concepts with an antonymous value. A more comprehensive analysis of this phenomenon goes beyond the framework of the present recapitulation.

## 2A. PLEASANT

### 2A.1. \**milъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** 'pleasant, delicate'

The PSlav \**milъ* is based on the PIE root \**mēj-*/\**mōj-*/\**mī-* extended with the formant *-lo-*; equivalents with the same extension occur in Baltic languages: Lithuanian *míelas* 'kind,' 'entire, whole,' Latvian *mīļš*, *mīls* < \**mielas* 'kind, loved,' Old Prussian *mijls* 'kind, loved' and in Celtic languages: Welsh *mul* 'modest.' The meaning of the Proto-Indo-European root is reconstructed on the basis of the root \**mēj-*/\**mōj-*/\**mī-* with various extending formants (*-l-*, *-r-*, *-n-*, *-t-*) which share the same semantics referring to adjectives with a positive marking [see Pokorny: 709–710].

#### **The meanings based on continuants** 'kind, pleasant,' 'dear, loved'

The meanings 'kind, pleasant,' 'dear, loved' (e.g. Polish *miły*, Russ. *ми́лый*) are a characteristic feature of all Slavic languages.

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning is 'one who arouses sympathy,' present in Slovene, Croatian and Serbian, and indirectly attested by the continuants of the derivative \**milostъ* in the new meaning of 'grace' in Old Church Slavonic, Old Polish, Czech and Russian.

2A.2. \**bolgъ***Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘shining, glimmering’ (?)

Etymology – uncertain; the most frequently accepted opinion has to do with the relationship of \**bolgъ* with the PIE \**bʰelg-* ‘to shine, to glitter,’ a root which in its reduced form is also present in the PSlav \**blъščati* ‘to shine’ [e.g. SP 1: 306; Boryś: 32; ESJS: 65 *et alia*].<sup>13</sup>

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘good, kind, pleasant,’ ‘happy, favourable’

In the continuants of the PSlav \**bolgъ* there are no traces of the etymological meaning associated with light. The alleged association may be corroborated by the semantic development of the Polish derivative from *świecić* : *światny* (originally *światny*), which in the Old Polish *blōgi* meant ‘glistening, glimmering’ [Słstpol. 9: 66]. The meanings that are reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language on the basis of the varied meanings of continuants (cf. the innovative meanings) originally referred to inanimate objects, but allegedly already in the Proto-Slavic period they extended from objects, to which such properties are ascribed, to human properties.

**Innovative meanings**

In the course of the development of this lexeme there arose meanings with negative overtones. The pan-Slavic meaning ‘mild’ received positive overtones (with slightly negative overtones in the case of the Macedonian *благ* ‘meek’), whereas in the East Slavic languages this meaning underwent pejoration. The beginning of the process of pejoration may be discerned in the meaning of the Czech *bláhový*, a derivative of *blaho* ‘good, prosperity.’ Whereas *blahý* retains the old meaning ‘pleasant, mild,’ *bláhový* changes the meaning into ‘naïve’ as a result of emphasizing of a secondary semantic feature present in the meaning ‘mild.’ This process went further in East Slavic languages [see. BAD, 1B.14, p. 111 and STUPID, 16B.5, p. 265].

2A.3. \**lagodьнѣ***Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘arranged; decent’ (?), ‘weak’ (?)

There are two suggestions to explain this. Sławski was in favor of the existence of the PSlav \*\**laga* due to the exact Baltic equivalents: dial. Lith. *lōga* : *logà* ‘pile’ (cf. *logūoti* ‘to arrange,’ Latv. *lāga* ‘layer; order.’ There are no other equivalents [Sławski 4: 427]. A competitive explanation was offered by Berneker [Berneker: 684–685]. According to the scholar, the closest equivalents are the Old Norse *lacr* ‘bad, of little value’ and the Latin *laxus* ‘loose, flabby’ with a short vocalism, in contradistinction to the Slavic form continuing the long vowel. From the semantic point of view both explanations are acceptable in spite of antonymous meanings, cf. the development of the PSlav \**bolgъ* [see 2A.2, p. 116].

**Structural meanings** ‘arranged, harmonious,’ ‘calm’

The PSlav \**lagodьнѣ* is a derivative with a suffix *-ьнѣ* from \**lagoda* ‘order, ordo; peace.’

<sup>13</sup> One would expect a Proto-Indo-European form with a palatal *-ǵ* for the PSlav \**blъščati*. Attempts are made to explain this difference by e.g. LIV: 73.

The latter word is probably derived from the unattested PSlav *\*\*laga* with a relatively poorly attested suffix *-oda* [SP 1: 63].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘kind, pleasant’ > ‘mild, calm’

The meanings ‘kind, pleasant’ are attested in the majority of languages; also ‘mild, calm’ arose probably already in the Proto-Slavic period, which is indicated both by the continuants: Church Slavonic *lagodьnъ*, early Slovene *lágoden*, Polish *łagodny* and by the development of innovative meanings.

**Innovative meanings**

Innovative meanings are numerous; they refer to appearance [see THIN, 5B.9, p. 158; WEAK, 6B.18, p. 180] and to character [see MILD, 12B.2, p. 231]. There are also many innovative meanings which refer to other referents, derived directly from the multi-referential ‘kind; pleasant.’

2A.4. *\*jьтъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that is being taken; taken’

PSlav *\*(j)ęti* ‘to take’ belongs to the PIE root *\*em-* ‘to take’ and it is based on its reduced form *\*m̥-*. The closest equivalents in Baltic languages include: Lith. *iñti imù* ‘to take,’ Latv. *jemt̃ jemu* ‘idem.’ The Latin *emere* ‘to buy’ is based on the full form of the PIE root *\*em-*.

**Structural meaning** ‘taken’ > ‘appropriate to be taken, to be held in one’s hand’

The PSlav *\*jьтъnъ* is an adjective with a suffix *-нъ*, based on the *praesens* form *\*jьmъ* of the PSlav verb *\*(j)ęti* ‘to take.’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘pleasant to the touch’ > ‘pleasant, delicate’

The continuants of the PSlav *\*jьтъnъ* are preserved in West Slavic languages with the meanings ‘pleasant, kind,’ early Polish also ‘soft, delicate.’ It is exactly the semantics of the continuants of the PSlav *\*jьтъnъ*, for which the semantic basis in the appropriate verbs is missing (dial. Macedonian *емен* ‘quiet; meek, mild; Russian *у́мный* ‘calm’) seems to indicate the necessity of the reconstruction of the adjective for the Proto-Slavic period.

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings in the particular languages are a continuation of the Proto-Slavic meaning ‘appropriate to be held in the hand; pleasant to the touch.’ Hence the early Polish *jemny* ‘soft.’ Further innovative shifts are visible in the meaning ‘mild,’ hence the meanings which arose through further associations: ‘humble; calm’ > ‘silent.’ There is also an alternative possibility of explaining the meanings ‘humble; calm’ as a semantic development from ‘seized, caught.’

2A.5. *\*něžьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see MILD, 12B.1, p. 230]

**Structural meaning** ‘delicate’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘mild, delicate,’ ‘tender, sensitive’

It is impossible to establish whether the meaning ‘pleasant; kind’ (used in reference to people and other objects), which is a natural link in the chain constituted by ‘delicate,’ ‘tender,’ emerged in the Proto-Slavic period or it is an innovation which emerged independently in various languages. For this reason I omit the paragraph “Innovative meanings” here.

2A.6. \**dorgъ***Etymological meaning** ‘held’

Most likely there is an etymological link with the PSlav \**dǫžati* ‘to hold,’ based on the PIE \**dʰer-egʰ-* ‘to hold’ [SP 4: 121; cf. also Syročkin 1997: 84]. The nominal form has no Indo-European equivalents. The formally consistent Latvian form *dārgs* ‘dear, precious; beloved’ may be Slavic borrowing, adapted to the phonetics of the Latvian language.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘having a great value,’ ‘beloved’

The meaning of continuants is uniform in all Slavic languages. Originally it referred to the material value, secondarily to the emotional value. Most likely it is derived directly from the etymological ‘held’ (due to its great value), without the intermediation of the meaning ‘strong, durable’ suggested by Boryś [Boryś: 127]. A comparison with \**ѣтънѣ* indicates the necessity of taking into account all semantic links in the research of semantic motivation.

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘pleasant’ is one of the innovative semantic varieties of the Proto-Slavic ‘precious for emotional reasons.’ This innovation is consistent with the common tendency of attenuating the expressiveness of words which are strongly marked emotionally.

2A.7. \**dobrъ***Etymological meaning** ‘appropriate; well-adjusted’ [see GOOD, 1A.1, p. 95]**The meaning based on continuants** ‘good’ (*ut supra*)**Innovative meanings**

The emergence of the meaning ‘pleasant, kind’ in various Slavic languages is the narrowing down of the sense ‘*comme il faut*; appropriate’ or of the sense ‘good’ which is secondary to it.

2A.8. \**lěpъ***Etymological meaning** ‘glued together/stuck in’ > ‘appropriate, well-adjusted’ [see GOOD, 1A.2, p. 96]**The meanings based on continuants** ‘appropriate,’ ‘good,’ ‘pretty’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning 'pleasant,' which is present in Upper Sorbian, Slovene and Bulgarian, could have emerged both on the basis of the meaning 'good' as well as of the meaning 'pretty.'

#### 2A.9. \*godьnъ

**Etymological meaning** 'closely adjusted; connected' [see GOOD, 1A.3, p. 97]

**Structural meaning** 'pointed at sth, aimed at sth; hit' (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'appropriate,' 'proper' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The emergence of the meaning 'kind, pleasant' (Croatian and Serbian *gòdan*, Russian *зòдный*) is the narrowing down of the sense '*comme il faut*; appropriate' or of the sense 'good' which is secondary to it and unattested in these languages [cf. 2A.7 \**dobrъ*, p. 118].

## Summary of Semantic Changes

#### 2A.1. \**milъ*

PLEASANT PSlav ← PLEASANT PIE ← POSITIVELY MARKED etym.

#### 2A.2. \**bolъ*

PLEASANT ← \*PLEASANT TO THE EYE ← SHINING (?) etym.

#### 2A.3. \**lagodьnъ*

##### 2A.3.1.

PLEASANT PSlav ← HARMONIOUS struct. ← ARRANGED (?) etym.

or

##### 2A.3.2.

PLEASANT PSlav ← CALM struct. ← WEAK (?) etym.

#### 2A.4. \**ьтъnъ*

PLEASANT PSlav ← PLEASANT TO THE TOUCH PSlav ← APPROPRIATE TO BE HELD struct. ← TAKEN etym.

#### 2A.5. \**něžьnъ*

PLEASANT gen. ← DELICATE/MILD PSlav

#### 2A.6. \**dorgъ*

PLEASANT gen. ← BELOVED PSlav ← VALUABLE PSlav ← OWNED etym. ← HELD etym.

#### 2A.7. \**dobrъ*

PLEASANT gen. ← GOOD PSlav ← APPROPRIATE PSlav ← WELL-ADJUSTED etym.

#### 2A.8. \**lěpъ*

##### 2A.8.1

PLEASANT USorb, Slovene, Bulgarian ← PRETTY PSlav ← WELL-ADJUSTED struct.

or

2A.8.2.

PLEASANT USorb, Slovene, Bulgarian ← GOOD PSlav ← WELL-ADJUSTED struct.

2A.9. \**godьnъ*

PLEASANT Croatian, Serbian, Russian ← \*GOOD ← APPROPRIATE PSlav

The motivations of the notion of 'pleasant' partially overlap with the motivations of the notion of 'good.' Therefore they are based on the way things are arranged, e.g., fitness (\**lěpъ*, \**godьnъ*, \**dobrъ*), order (\**lagodьnъ*; alternative motivation). Other motivations are based on sensory experiences: sight (\**bolgъ*), touch (\**ьmьnъ*). The motivations which are associated with tenderness (\**něžьnъ*) and tranquillity (\**lagodьnъ*; alternative motivation) may also be classified as nominations which are motivated by pleasant sensations. In the case of \**dorgъ*, although the indirect motivation is associated with touch by holding (a sensory experience), the nomination through the material value, itself motivated by holding, is more likely. As far as \**milъ* is concerned, we are dealing with a motivation which was handed over from the Proto-Indo-European language, therefore it is such a motivation whose further study is impossible.

## 2B. UNPLEASANT

### 2B.1. Western and Eastern \**prikrъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** – obscure

The etymology is obscure. Among the existing hypotheses, which indicate either a prefixal derivation directly from the Proto-Indo-European root or a contamination with the PIE continuants \**pik-ro-* [a review of these forms is provided in e.g. Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 3: 364; cf. also Boryś: 498], neither seems probable.<sup>14</sup> Bańkowski [Bańkowski 2: 938] claims that \**prikrъ* is not the original form but \*\**perkrъ* < \**perk-ro-*, continued by the OCz. *přiekrý*. This interesting semantic hypothesis (cf. *protivъnъ*, *vide infra*) is not convincing due to the form of the majority of the continuants. Moreover, the existence of the form *přiekrý* which the author provided is doubtful.<sup>15</sup>

#### **The meanings based on continuants** 'steep' > 'difficult; 'troublesome' > 'unpleasant'

During the times of the Proto-Slavic community the adjective probably referred to objects which were characterized by difficult access. The meaning 'steep' is attested in all languages. Hence probably the already-Proto-Slavic meanings 'difficult, troublesome; unpleasant.'

<sup>14</sup> However, confer E. Słuszkiewicz's attempt at an explanation [Słuszkiewicz 1955].

<sup>15</sup> Etymological dictionaries of the Czech language do not list such an Old Czech form.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning which may also refer to people – ‘unkind, unfriendly in contact due to its psychic features’ – is certainly a secondary meaning, although it is difficult to establish whether it arose already in the Proto-Slavic period or whether it arose in a parallel manner in the particular languages. Allegedly meanings which feature a stronger emotional charge ‘cruel, severus; stern’ probably arose independently [see STERN, 12A.8, p. 228].

### 2B.2. *\*protivъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one which is located in the direction of sight, within sight; one that is located opposite to sth.’

The PSlav *\*proti*/*\*protъ* arose from the PIE *\*proti* ‘opposite (adv.)’ [Kopečný 1: 226]. The etymologists reconstruct alternant forms on the basis of continuants: *\*proti*: *\*preti*, cf. Gk. *πρωτί* ‘toward,’ OInd *práti* ‘toward; opposite,’ Latv. *pret* ‘against.’

**Structural meaning** ‘one that is located opposite to sth; contrarious’

A derivative with a suffix *-ъnъ* from the PSlav adjective *\*protivъ* ‘one that is located opposite to sth; contrarious’ (ossified as an adverb with the meaning ‘against, opposite’), which in turn is based on the PSlav adverb *\*proti*/*\*protъ* [Kopečný 1: 222–226]. The Polish and Sorbian forms with the vowel *e* instead of *o* are – according to Kopečný – a result of the influence of the prefix *\*pre-* (Polish *prze-*, LSorb *pše-*, USorb *pře-*) < *\*per-*. However, he does not rule out the original alternant *\*preti*, perhaps based even on the PIE *\*preti* (cf. *infra*).

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘opposite, inverse; different’ > ‘one that provokes an unfriendly attitude; unpleasant, unkind; hostile; unfavorable, adverse’

The figurative meanings which refer to man – ‘one that provokes an unfriendly attitude; unpleasant, unkind; hostile’ – are well-attested in all Slavic languages. The semantic development might have been based both on the realia: ‘one located on the opposite side’ = ‘hostile,’ as well as on an evaluation: ‘different’ = ‘unfriendly.’ The influence of the verb based on the same adverb – *\*protiviti se* ‘to oppose’ is also probable.

### 2B.3. *\*grъbъ* : *\*grubъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘unprocessed’

The PSlav alternation *\*grъbъ* : *\*grubъ* was probably inherited. It is also manifested by Baltic languages. Its origin is usually established to derive from the PIE *\*g<sup>h</sup>rey-b<sup>h</sup>-*, based on *\*g<sup>h</sup>rēy-/\*g<sup>h</sup>rāy-* ‘to rub, to grate’ [SP 8: 239; Sławski 1: 356]; Snoj’s explanation seems less probable. According to him, *\*grъbъ* is based on the nasalized variant of the PIE *\*gerb-* ‘obliquus’ from the root *\*ger-* ‘to spin, to turn (transitive)’ [Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 192]. Baltic equivalents (Latv. *gruṃba* ‘wrinkle’ : *grumbt* ‘to crease’; Lith. *grūbti grumbù* ‘to solidify; to become rough’) allow us to reconstruct the meaning of the nominal form as ‘rough, with an uneven surface.’ While both the semantic and formal congruity of the

Baltic and Slavic equivalents do not cause doubts,<sup>16</sup> the extra-Balto-Slavic references are hardly convincing due to semantic reasons.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘raw, unprocessed, rough,’ fig. ‘unkind, unfriendly; boorish’

The meaning ‘boorish; unkind, unfriendly’ may be reconstructed already for the Proto-Slavic language on the basis of the meanings in the languages of all groups, e.g. Czech and Slovak *hrubý* fig. ‘vulgar; boorish,’ Serbian and Croatian *grub* ‘coarse, rude,’ Bulgarian *груб* ‘unfriendly, unkind,’ Russian *грубый* ‘rude; unkind.’

#### 2B.4. \**mǐzъ*/\**mǐzъkъ*, \**mǐzlivъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘rotten, decayed’

The PSlav \**mǐzъ* is based on the reduced grade of the PIE root \**merǵ-* ‘to rot, to decay; to waste away’ [ESSJ 21: 166–167; Skok 2: 472]. From the point of view of semantics the derivation of the PSlav meaning \**mǐziti* ‘to chill sth, to cool sth down’ from the PIE \**merǵ-* ‘decay, rot’ is unjustified [Boryś: 325]. More likely phenomena include the development ‘rotten, decayed’ > ‘detestable, revolting’ as well as the derivation of the meanings ‘to freeze,’ i.e., to become cold < ‘to shudder from revulsion.’

**Structural meaning** ‘revolting’

The PSlav \**mǐzъkъ* ‘revolting’ is based on the original \**mǐzъ* ‘idem,’ extended with the suffix *-kъ*.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘revolting’

‘Revolting’ is the most commonly attested meaning both of the lexeme \**mǐzъ* (already since the earliest attestations, e.g. OCS *mrъzъ*, Old Russian *мерзѹи*, as well as \**mǐzъkъ* (e.g. Czech *mrzký*, Serbian *mřzak*, Bulgarian *мѣрзѣк*, Russian *мѣрзкуй*).

**Innovative meanings**

The original, strongly pejoratively marked meaning ‘revolting’ could have been weakened, cf. dial. Slovak *mrzký* ‘unkind,’ also ‘ugly’ [see UGLY, 3B.7, p. 137]. See also LAZY, 15B.7, p. 258, where the continuant of the deverbal adjective with the suffix *-livъ* is discussed.

#### 2B.5. \**verdъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘enlarged; protruding’

The PSlav *verdъ* ‘ulcer’ is most likely based on the PIE \**u̯erdh-*<sup>17</sup> ‘to increase, to grow’ with perhaps an already nominal PIE form \**u̯ordh-* (cf. OInd *várdha* ‘growth; development,’

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also the dial. Polish *gręby* ‘covered with wrinkles,’ and in another dialect ‘bitter,’ which continues both the nasalized form as well as the original meaning.

<sup>17</sup> LIV: 627 reconstructs the form ?\**u̯eRd<sup>h</sup>* on the basis of Vedic forms whereas the Germanic continuants indicate the PIE form of \**u̯erd-*. A clear semantic link makes us presuppose rather a dialectal phonetic change in one of the language groups instead of the independent origin of the Germanic and Indo-Iranian continuants.

Proto-Germanic *warta* ‘wart,’ which may indicate the already Proto-Indo-European meaning ‘excrescence’); cf. also Latvian *ap-vīrde* ‘ulcer, furuncle’ which, similarly as the PSlav *\*verdъ*, presents a different grade of vocalism than the aforementioned nominal forms.

### **Structural meaning** ‘ulcerated’ or ‘wounded; painful’

The derivative with the suffix *-ьнъ* from the PSlav *\*verdъ* ‘ulcer’ > ‘wound’ or from *\*verditi* ‘to wound, to cause pain’ > ‘to do harm,’ which is based on it.

### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘ulcerated,’ ‘harmful’

In the context of the Proto-Slavic language one should reconstruct both the concrete meaning ‘covered with ulcers’ as well as the secondary meaning ‘harmful’; both manifest a link with the meanings of the possible derivational bases. Without doubt one may speak here about a double semantic motivation.

### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning which is present in the Russian language – ‘unpleasant, about a man’ – apart from the meaning ‘harmful’ (at the lexeme *вредный* which continues the Church Slavonic form) is an innovation which weakens the earlier meaning ‘harmful, acting to the detriment of others.’ It was borrowed by the Polish language with its earlier stronger pejorative overtones.<sup>18</sup>

## **2B.6. *\*skvĭnъ***

### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘spoilt’ (?), ‘burnt’ (?)

It is probably based on the PSlav *\*skverti skvĭrŏ*, whose origin is unknown. According to Skok [Skok 2: 251], it is based in the PIE context with the PSlav *\*kvariti* ‘to spoil.’ Boryś [Boryś 556] reconstructs the original meaning of *\*skverti* as ‘to fry, to melt sth.’

### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘dirty; revolting, filthy’

The meanings which refer to a general evaluation, secondarily to a moral evaluation, occur in East Slavic languages (Rus. *скверный* ‘repulsive; unkind, unpleasant’) and South Slavic languages (Slovene *skvĭn* : *skrĭn* and early Croat. *skvrn* ‘sinful; defiled’). In West Slavic languages the adjective is not attested. However, its base occurs in the Pol. *doskwierać* ‘to annoy; to bother sb.’ which may indicate the emergence of the meaning which I am interested in already in the Proto-Slavic language.

### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘unkind, unpleasant,’ which are present in the contemporary Russian language, seems to be a weakening of the earlier ‘repugnant.’ However, one should also take into consideration the possibility of its earlier emergence, *vide infra*.

<sup>18</sup> Sound-similar South Slavic adjectives with the opposite meaning ‘valuable, worthwhile, also about man’ (Serb. *vrédan*, Croat. *vrijèdan*, dial. *vrĭdàn*, dial. Bulg. *врѣден* originate from the continuants of the homonymous PSlav *\*verdъ* ‘value; price’). Cf. Old High German *werd* ‘idem,’ which is considered as the source of borrowing into the Proto-Slavic languages [Gluhak: 684] or as a proto-cognate form [Skok 3: 625].

2B.7. \*grozъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘one that inspires fear; terrible/dangerous’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘terrible/dangerous; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

The meaning ‘unpleasant; disagreeable; troublesome,’ hence in Slovene *grôzen* also ‘troubled, unbearable,’ occurs in LSorb *grozny*, Slovene *grôzen* and Bulgarian *зрôзен*. In Bulgarian, the further development of meaning proceeded to ‘indecent; immoral.’

2B.8. \*durъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing (as a wind); associated with wind’ (?)

[see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘agitated, violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘unpleasant’ in Russian is a result of the extension of the negative overtones of the word.

2B.9. \*zъlъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘obliquus’ > ‘bad’ [see BAD, 1B.1, p. 104]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘bad’ > ‘angry at’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The emergence of the meaning ‘unpleasant’ in all Slavic languages which preserved the Proto-Slavic meaning ‘bad’ is consistent with all the principles of conceptual development.

2B.10. \*grъdъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘bad’ and ‘unpleasant’ (Serbian and Croatian *grъd*), similarly as ‘ugly, repulsive’ (cf. UGLY, 3B.9, p. 136) which are also attested in the remaining South Slavic languages, probably emerged through the gradual transfer of the semantic dominant.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

2B.1. *\*prikrǫ*

UNPLEASANT PSlav ← DIFFICULT PSlav ← STEEP (?) PSlav

2B.2. *\*protivǫnǫ*

2B.2.1.

UNPLEASANT PSlav ← DIFFERENT PSlav ← OPPOSITE PSlav ← ONE THAT IS LOCATED OPPOSITE TO STH struct.

or

2B.2.2.

UNPLEASANT PSlav ← HOSTILE PSlav ← ONE THAT IS LOCATED OPPOSITE TO STH struct.

2B.3. *\*grǫbǫ* : *\*grubǫ*

UNPLEASANT PSlav ← UNPROCESSED etym.

2B.4. *\*mǫzǫkǫ*

UNPLEASANT dial. Slovak, colloq. Russian ← REVOLTING PSlav

2B.5. *\*verdǫnǫ*

UNPLEASANT colloq. Russian ← HARMFUL PSlav ← ULCERATED PSlav ← ENLARGED etym.

2B.6. *\*skvǫnǫ*

2B.6.1.

UNPLEASANT Russian, Ukrainian ← REVOLTING PSlav ← DIRTY PSlav ← SPOILT (?) etym.

or

2B.6.2.

UNPLEASANT Russian, Ukrainian ← REVOLTING PSlav ← DIRTY PSlav ← BURNT (?) etym.

2B.7. *\*grozǫnǫ*

UNPLEASANT LSorb, Slovene, Bulg. ← REVOLTING Western, Southern ← TERRIFYING PSlav ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

2B.8. *\*durǫnǫ*

UNPLEASANT Russian ← BAD Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav

2B.9. *\*zǫlǫ*

UNPLEASANT pan-Slavic ← BAD PSlav ← OBLIQUOUS etym.

2B.10. *grǫdǫ*

UNPLEASANT Croatian, Srb. ← INSPIRING FEAR Southern ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS dial. Polish, Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian, Eastern ← HUGE Slovene, Serb.-Croat. ← BRAVE Old Russian, Russian ← DARING early Polish, Old Russian, ← HAUGHTY PSlav ← PROUD PSlav

The motivations of the concept 'unpleasant' are above all (similarly as in the case of the concept 'evil') physical properties which are a direct motivation of the concept under research but sometimes they constitute a further link. This is manifested by the model presented above. Therefore there are properties

which cause revulsion (*\*mǐzъkъ*): dirty (*\*skvǐnъ*), ulcerated (*\*vrědbъnъ*) or ones that cause problems: difficult/steep (*\*prikъ*), unprocessed (*\*grъbъ*: *\*grubъ*), harmful (*\*vrědbъnъ*) or ones that inspire terror (*\*grozъnъ*, *\*grdъ*). One may also find here a nomination based on location, analogically to the motivation of the concepts 'good' and 'pleasant' and in contradistinction to the concept 'bad' (unless one considers 'obliquous' *\*zъlъ* as a motivation by location). An indirect link between the motivation based on location: located opposite to sth, opposite (*\*protivъnъ*) and the concept 'unpleasant' are, as indicated by the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic meaning, the concept 'hostile' or 'different.' In my material the motivation by the concept 'bad' is represented by *\*durъnъ* and *\*zъlъ*. Due to the obviousness of this semantic transition I did not concentrate upon the identification of further body of proof which would attest it.

### 3A. PRETTY

#### 3A.1. *\*krasъnъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** – obscure

The PSlav *\*krasъnъ* has no reliable etymologies. Most commonly it is associated with verbs which are etymologically connected with Proto-Indo-European roots which refer to fire, e.g., with the PIE *\*ker-* (or *\*k<sup>u</sup>er-*) 'to burn, to blaze.' These explications have clearly semasiological premises which are connected with the meaning 'red.' Ljubov' P. Dronova suggests the 'motley' > 'red' > 'beautiful' semantic development. However, the etymological solution which she embraces is also based above all on semantics, namely on the parallelism with the development of meanings of the PSlav family *\*květ-* [Dronova 2007]. Cf. also a different approach to the same subject [Tolstaja 2008a: 121–133]. A review of the etymological explications is contained in the above-quoted article by Ljubov' Dronova [2007: 75–76] and Jerzy Rusek [2000: 140–141].

##### **Structural meaning** 'motley, colorful'

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, it may be a derivative with the suffix *-ъnъ* from *\*krasa* 'beauty' [Sławski 2: 64–65; ESS] 12: 110] or *\*krasiti* 'to beautify'; however an overlay of the suffix on the residually preserved adjective *\*krasъ* 'motley, colorful; red' is more likely [Boryś: 256].

##### **The meanings based on continuants** 'beautiful,' Northern 'red'

The meaning which occurs in all Slavic languages is 'beautiful.' The meaning 'red' is limited to North Slavic languages. A comparison with the structural meaning allows us to conjecture that the original meaning is 'red,' hence 'beautiful' emerged secondarily, although the residual attestation of the structural meaning does not allow us to establish this piece of information as completely reliable.

##### **Innovative meanings**

Due to the obscure etymology one cannot identify with certainty which meanings are innovations and which are relicts. The meaning 'magnificent,' which arose in various

languages of the entire Slavdom, is allegedly innovative. It became the source of such meanings as ‘strong, healthy, big’ in Russian dialects and ‘valuable; main’ in the Old Russian language. Without doubt the generally-evaluative meaning ‘good’ (dial. Polish, Czech, Slovak, Serbian, early Croatian) is secondary, hence further innovative meanings emerged through the process of narrowing down in the particular languages: Church Slavonic ‘decent; modest’ and the early Serbian and Croatian ‘useful.’ However, the early Polish and dialectal Polish *kraśny* ‘sumptuous; fat’ emerged not as the narrowing down of the meaning ‘good’ (cf. PSlav *\*bolgъ* in South Slavic language) but on the basis of the Pol. *krasić* ‘to season with fat’ with *\*krasiti* [cf. Sławski 3: 63–65].

### 3A.2. Western *\*pěknъ*, *\*pěkrъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘motley, colorful’

The Western PSlav *\*pěknъ*, *\*pěkrъ*<sup>19</sup> has no reliable etymologies. The most probable original adjectives, formed with the use of the suffixes *-rъ*, *-nъ*, therefore from *\*pojĭ-ro* and *\*pojĭ-no-*, have no equivalents in other Indo-European languages. Its basis is probably the PIE *\*pojĭ-* ‘motley, colorful,’ reconstructed on the basis of the OHG *fēh* ‘motley,’ Greek *ποικίλος* ‘colorful, versicolor, motley’ [Boryś: 434]. For a review of other etymological explanations, see Rusek [2000: 139].

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘beautiful’

In all West Slavic languages the main meaning is ‘beautiful.’

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘kind, delicate,’ ‘well-mannered, polite’ which exist in Sorbian languages arose as a result of the transfer of the content of the word from aesthetic evaluation to general evaluation.

### 3A.3. Western and Eastern *\*ladъnъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** – obscure

There is a number of unconvincing explanations concerning the etymology of *\*ladъnъ* and the entire word family. Even the direction of derivation has not been established. Some assume the noun *\*ladъ/lada* as the original form, others – the verb *\*laditi* [see Sławski 4: 417]. A review of the etymologies which were heretofore suggested was summarised in the following way by the ESS: “Достоверной этимологии слово до сих пор не имеет, ср. прямые признания Бернекера и Фасмера [...] на этот счет” (“The word still lacks a reliable etymology, cf. the direct admissions by Berneker and Vasmer [...] in this regard.”) [ESS] 14: 11]. A proposition of a new etymological explanation was put forward by Jasna Vlajić-Popović. This author, unlike it was done in the explanations provided theretofore, considers the verb *\*laditi* < *\*alditi*, which is the original compound with the *-d-iti* element, whose *-d-* element is cognate with the PIE *d<sup>h</sup>ē-* ‘to lay sth down’ and which is present in five Proto-Slavic verbs with the meaning

<sup>19</sup> The form *\*pěkrъ* is reconstructed on the basis of early derivatives of the Polish language (Old Polish *piekrać* ‘to adorn,’ sixteenth century Polish *piekroszka* ‘ornament’).

‘to put in order, to arrange,’ as the original Slavic formation. The first part of the compound would be the PIE root *\*al-* ‘to nourish; to rise, to grow’ [Vlajić-Popović 2000: 191–199].

### **Structural meaning** ‘arranged in a series, ordered’

The Pslav *\*ladьnъ*, limited to the North Slavic languages, is a derivative of the noun *\*ladъ* ‘arrangement, positioning’ or of the verb *\*laditi* ‘to arrange in a series.’

### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘well-ordered’ > ‘having the appropriate structure of the body’ > ‘pretty,’ Eastern ‘good’

Supposedly the semantic development proceeded from the structural meaning ‘arranged in a row, ordered’ to ‘pleasing due to its arrangement’ > ‘pretty’ (Pol. *ładny*, USorb *ładny*, Czech and Slovak *ladný*, dial. Russian *ладный*, Ukrainian *ладний*, Belarusian *ладны*) [cf. *\*rędnъ*, 3A.5, p. 128]. Most probably the meaning referred above all to inanimate objects from which it was transferred to describe man. One may also assume the possibility of a direct application of the phrase ‘well-ordered, arranged’ to man in the context of an evaluation of harmony which is manifest in the structure of the whole body, hence ‘strapping, shapely’ or the features of somebody’s face.

### **Innovative meanings**

Secondary innovative meanings: ‘big’ (e.g. dial. Polish *ładny*), ‘neat, decent’ (e.g. dial. Czech *ladný*) could arise from the meaning ‘pretty’ but a motivation by ‘good’ is equally likely [cf. GOOD, 1A.7, p. 99].

## 3A.4. *\*lěpъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘glued together’ > ‘appropriate, well-adjusted’ [see GOOD, 1A.2, p. 96]

### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘appropriate,’ ‘good,’ ‘pretty’ (*ut supra*)

The aesthetic meaning ‘pretty, beautiful’ is present across all Slavic languages except Polish, where the continuant *\*lěpъ* at the basic grade does not exist at all. A characteristic feature of the continuants of this lexeme is suppletion [cf. GOOD, 1A.2, p. 96]. It is only in the South Slavic group that the continuants of Proto-Slavic lexemes have mutually corresponding meanings ‘pretty; beautiful’: ‘prettier; more beautiful’ at both grades. Similarly as in the case of the meaning ‘good,’ the basis of motivation is ‘matching/fitting in/adjustment.’

### **Innovative meanings**

‘Pretty’ is the basis for the innovative meanings which refer to appearance in various languages: ‘shapely’ (in the Sorbian languages and in Czech), ‘robust’ (in Serbian and Croatian), ‘handsome’ (in the early Russian language).

## 3A.5. *\*rędnъ*

**Etymological and structural meaning** ‘arranged in a row, in a series’ [see GOOD, 1A.5, p. 98]

## The meanings based on continuants ‘appropriate,’ ‘decent’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘pretty’ (LSorb *rědny*, USorb *rjany*, dial. Polish *rzędny*, *rzqdny*) is a transfer of the meaning ‘arranged in a sequence,’ ‘accordant with a plan’ to the plane of aesthetics [Schuster-Šewc: 1219].

### 3A.6. \*godьnъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘closely adjusted; connected’ [see GOOD, 1A.3, p. 97]

**Structural meaning** ‘measured out, aimed at; hit’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘appropriate, due’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The emergence of the meaning ‘pretty’ in Czech, Slovene, Croatian and Serbian is the narrowing down of the sense ‘*comme il faut*; appropriate’ and the transfer of this meaning to the plane of aesthetics.

### 3A.7. \*kypръ

**Etymological meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.9, p. 210]

**Structural meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘seething’ > ‘one that increases its volume’; ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

It is assumed that the meaning ‘leavened,’ based on ‘seething; with an increased volume’ [for justification, see WEAK, 6B.9, p. 177] emerged in a parallel manner in various languages. A further innovation is the formation of the meaning ‘pretty, beautiful’ on the basis of ‘leavened; ‘mellow/chubby’ in South Slavic languages.<sup>20</sup> Today, it is present in the Bulg. *кѹпѣр* and Macedonian *кѹпѣр*. One may presume that it also existed in Serbian and Croatian, although its sole remnant is the term of abuse recorded by the RSAN: subst. f. *kipra* ‘an old hag’ [Skok 2: 83].<sup>21</sup> The basis of the meaning ‘beautiful’ is not completely clear. What seems most likely is the transfer from ‘mellow,’ caused by a positive evaluation of this feature. (As a matter of fact, in Bulgarian this meaning is attested only in the derivative *кѹпѣрѣ* ‘mellowness (of soil)’ with a qualifier *spec.* – this causes doubts as to the native character of the meaning; according to BER 2: 375 what matters here is the term which was artificially coined on the basis of a Ukrainian word). The same interpretation of the semantic change is offered by Tetjana Čerňiš in

<sup>20</sup> The transitional meanings ‘mellow; porous’ are not attested in South Slavic languages (except for Church Serbian *кypръ* ‘porous’) but a more likely phenomenon seems to be their decline than an attempt at a direct transition from ‘seething’ to ‘beautiful.’

<sup>21</sup> In this case enantiosemy, which is a relatively frequent phenomenon in the field of aesthetic evaluation, could have an ironic basis. The reservations expressed in BER 2: 375 seem unjustified.

a chapter devoted to the semantic development of the continuants of the PSlav \**kyprъ* (“Псл. \**kyprъ*(*jb*) та його контитуанти у слов’янських мовах” [Černyš 2003: 347–352; cf. also ESUM 2: 434]):

Можна припустити, що в основі цих [...] похідних значень теж лежать семантичні риси, пов’язані з тістом. У випадку південнослов’янських слів це буде порівняння з пухкістю, свіжістю, можливо, и, теплом, випічки (пор. уживання такого прикметника, як укр. *пухкий* у стосунку до виробів із тіста, і як окреслення ситого та здорового тіла, зокрема, жіночного) [Černyš 2003: 350].

(One may claim that at the basis of these [...] derivative meanings there are also semantic features associated with dough. In the case of South Slavic words this will involve a comparison with mellowness, freshness, perhaps with the warmth of the baking (cf. the application of such an adjective as the Ukrainian *пухкий* in reference to dough products and as a reference to a full and healthy body, especially a woman’s body.)

Although the dial. Bulg. *kùnpъ* ‘slender’ apart from ‘robust, pretty’ [Sławski 2: 169] is admittedly surprising, but this doubt may be easily accounted for by the loss of the clarity of the internal form of the word. Stefan Mladenov suggests the original meaning ‘big, in reference to breasts,’ mentioning a parallel comparison with Czech: *kyprá ěadra* and assuming a metonymic development from a reference to breasts to a reference to the whole body [Mladenov: 238]. However, what seem more likely is the original reference to the fullness of lips, due to the common phrase *kùnpu ycta* (especially in dialects).

### 3A.8. Western and Southern \**drěčьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘extended lengthwise’ [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.2, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** ‘resembling a pillar, resembling a tree trunk’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘well-grown’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

In Slovak and Czech dialects<sup>22</sup> the meaning ‘pretty’ emerged from ‘tall; slender’ which in turn emerged from ‘well-grown.’ The basis of the meaning has to do with the criteria of aesthetic evaluation, according to which tall, slender height is perceived as delightful to the eye.

### 3A.9. \**gladъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘smooth’ [see FAT, 5A.6, p. 150]

**Structural meaning** ‘smooth’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘smooth, with an even surface’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘pretty’ in early Polish and in dialects, as well as in the Polabian derivative

<sup>22</sup> On the possibility that the Czech dialectal word was borrowed from Slovak, cf. SP 4: 228.

*glotkə* ‘pretty, in reference to a woman’ is supposedly motivated by the smoothness of skin; lack of wrinkles, warts etc.

### 3A.10. \*grozъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘inspiring fear; dangerous’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning based on continuants ‘fearful; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

Dial. Slovene *grôzen* ‘handsome, robust, beautiful.’ In the literary language one of the meanings of *grôzen* is the opposite ‘very ugly, repulsive.’ Due to semantic reasons Bezlaj [Bezlaj 1: 182] discusses the dial. Slovene *grôzen* ‘handsome, robust, beautiful’ separately from the continuants of \**grozъnъ* ‘terrifying, inspiring terror,’ however, he does not decisively question their etymological association and he rejects the suggestion of a relation with the Lith. *gražûs* ‘beautiful’ [Mühlenbach 1: 651]. In the chain of the semantic changes presented above the hypothetical link \*‘strong’ is reconstructed on the basis of the following reasoning: ‘terrifying’ therefore ‘strong’

### 3A.11. \*zъlъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘obliquus’ > ‘bad’ [see BAD, 1B.1, p. 104]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad’ > ‘angry’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The Slovene *zâl* ‘pretty, beautiful; handsome’ < \**zъlъ(jъ)*.<sup>23</sup> Early meanings of this form in Slovene also include ‘considerable; impressive’ which could easily become a motivating meaning for ‘beautiful’ [Pleteršnik 2: 845]. Snoj<sup>2</sup> 845 reconstructs ‘strong’ as the motivating meaning, which emerged from ‘angry, bad,’ and this in turn emerged from the general ‘bad.’ This author makes reference to an analogous development of the comparative grade of the dial. *gôrši* ‘bigger; prettier’ as a parallel with ‘worse.’<sup>24</sup> However, the link ‘strong’ is not confirmed by the material. The attested meanings ‘considerable; impressive’ might have been based on an earlier ‘big; inspiring fear’ with ‘bad; angry,’ but also in this case there is no direct motivation.

### 3A.12. \*grdъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

<sup>23</sup> The basis is the PSlav definite form \**zъlъ(jъ)*, in contradistinction to *zěl* (which is derived) from the indefinite form \**zъlъ* [Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 845].

<sup>24</sup> It seems that the enantiosemic development is a quite frequent phenomenon in Slovene dialects. One of its causes may be associated with the considerable degree of isolation of dialects due to the geographical conditions.

### Innovative meanings

The direct motivational basis of the meaning 'beautiful' in Czech and Slovak is most likely the meaning 'magnificent,' which is also present in these languages and which is common in North Slavic languages. The change of meaning constitutes its narrowing down with a concentration on the aesthetic element.

### 3A.13. \*gyzdavъ

**Etymological meaning** 'inspiring revulsion' [see UGLY, 3B.4, p. 136]

**Structural meaning** 'revolting' or 'ornamental'

According to a formal reconstruction the adjective is a continuant of the PSlav derivative of \*gyzdati or \*gyzdъ [cf. SP 8: 340]. As far as the semantic development is concerned, it is more likely that the meaning of the adjective was based on the meaning of the South Slavic noun \*gizd/\*gizda <\*gyzdъ/gyzda 'ornament; splendour.' From the perspective of the reconstruction of the string of semantic development from 'repulsive; ugly' to 'pretty, beautiful' the decision about whether this development was conditioned by the semantic development of the noun \*gizd/\*gizda<sup>25</sup> <\*gyzdъ/gyzda or whether there was a secondary formal derivation of the South Slavic \*gizdav from \*gizd/\*gizda is not the most important one because the exchange of semes is the same, regardless of the part of speech in which it occurs.

**The meaning based on continuants** 'repulsive, abhorrent' [see UGLY, 3B.4, p. 136]

### Innovative meanings

The Bulgarian *zùzdaв* 'pretty' aside 'dressy,' 'dressed up'; tasteful'; Macedonian *zuzdaв* 'beautiful, dressed up,' 'elegant, refined'; Serbian and Croatian *gìzdav* 'dressed up, elegant, refined' (cf. Slovene *gizdàv* 'kitschy, foppish,' *gìzditi se* 'to boast, to brag'). Considering the semantics of the whole of the South Slavic vocabulary one may claim that in these languages the word initially referred to apparent elegance which was negatively evaluated by the *intuentes*, perhaps also to self-importance (cf. early Slovene *gizda* 'pride, conceit, aloofness'). With the course of time these lexemes lost their negative overtones.<sup>26</sup>

### 3A.14. \*dělъnъ

**Structural meaning** 'associated with work, with the results of work' [see DILIGENT, 15A.6, p. 254]

**The meaning based on continuants** Western 'hard-working,' Eastern 'resourceful' (*ut supra*)

<sup>25</sup> The forms which are reconstructed for the late stage of the development of the South Slavic group after the PSlav \*y > i transition.

<sup>26</sup> The etymology of the Czech *hezky* 'pretty, beautiful' is not clear. One may not rule out its relationship with \*gydъkъ and *gyzdavъ* as a relic of the PSlav \*gъz(d)- : \*gyz(d)-, *gъzdъkъ* alternation with the semantic development manifested by \*gyzdavъ (this possibility is explored in Jakubowicz 2008: 519).

## Innovative meaning

The innovative meaning 'beautiful, strapping' (dial. Russian *дѣльный*) emerged on the basis of the generalised meaning 'high-quality,' 'good' (cf. GOOD, 1A.11, p. 101).

## Summary of Semantic Changes

3A.1. *\*krasъnъ*

BEAUTIFUL PSlav ← RED (?) PSlav ← COLORFUL/MULTICOLORED (?) struct.

3A.2. *\*pěknъ, \*pěkrъ*

BEAUTIFUL Western ← COLORFUL etym.

3A.3. *\*ladъnъ*

3A.3.1. PRETTY Western, Eastern ← WELL-ORDERED Early Polish, USorb, Eastern or

3A.3.2.

PRETTY Western, Eastern ← SHAPELY dial. Polish, Czech, Slovak, Russian, dial. Belarussian ← NEAT/WELL-ORDERED early Polish, USorb, Eastern

3A.4. *\*lěpъ*

PRETTY/BEAUTIFUL PSlav ← APPROPRIATE PSlav

3A.5. *\*rědъnъ*

PRETTY/PRETTY LSorb, USorb ← WELL-ORDERED Western, Southern

3A.6. *\*godъnъ*

PRETTY Czech, Slovene, Croatian, Serbian ← WELL-FITTED PSlav

3A.7. *\*kypъ*

PRETTY/BEAUTIFUL Bulgarian, Macedonian ← PLUMP (of the body) Czech ← MELLOW (of earth) Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian ← POROUS Ukrainian, Slavonic-Serbian

3A.8. *\*drěčъnъ*

PRETTY Czech, Slovak ← TALL Czech, Slovak ← WELL-GROWN Western, Southern

3A.9. *\*gladъkъ*

PRETTY early and dialectal Polish, Polabian ← SMOOTH PSlav

3A.10. *\*grozъnъ*

PRETTY/HANDSOME dial. Slovene ← STRAPPING dial. Slovene ← \*STRONG ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

3A.11. *\*zъlъ*

BEAUTIFUL Slovene ← BIG Slovene ← \*STRONG ← IRATE PSlav ← BAD PSlav

3A.12. *\*grъdъ*

BEAUTIFUL Czech, Slovak ← MAGNIFICENT Western, Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian, Russian ← PROUD Western, Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian, Eastern

3A.13. *\*gyzdavъ*

BEAUTIFUL Bulgarian, Macedonian ← DRESSED UP Serbian, Croatian ← KITSCHY Slovene ← UGLY Western, Southern

## 3A.14. \*dělъnъ

BEAUTIFUL dial. Russian ← GOOD dial. Russian ← HARD-WORKING PSlav ← ASSOCIATED WITH WORK PSlav

It is also among the motivations of the concept ‘pretty’ that the references to the system: arrangement (\*lěpъ, \*godъnъ) and order (\*ladъnъ, \*rědъnъ), which are featured in the chapters devoted to the concepts ‘good’ and ‘kind,’ recur, whereas – similarly as in the case of ‘good’ – they are direct motivations of the concept ‘pretty.’ Other motivations are based on the characteristics of appearance: dress (\*gyzdavъ), color (\*krasъnъ, rěknъ), build: shapely (\*ladъnъ – alternatively), tall (\*drěčъnъ), big (\*zъlъ), strapping (\*grozъnъ), and others: plumpness (\*kyprъ), smoothness (\*gladъkъ). Wonderful (\*gdъ) is a motivation of evaluative nature. Particularly noteworthy are the indirect motivations with negative overtones: badness (\*zъlъ) and ugliness (\*gyzdavъ). They are based, as it seems, on a string of minimal semantic changes. In the case of \*gyzdavъ a changeability of the criteria of aesthetic evaluation might have played a certain role.<sup>27</sup>

## 3B. UGLY

## 3B.1. \*gnusъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure

The *Słownik prasłowiański* [SP 7: 201], similarly as Vasmer<sup>2</sup> [Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 1: 422], claims that some PSlav words are derived from the PIE root \*g<sup>h</sup>en- ‘to rub, to grind,’ juxtaposed with the Old Norse *gnúa* ‘to rub’ and the Greek *χναύνειν* ‘to scrape, to scratch.’ The PSlav \*gnu- was supposed to continue the PIE \*g<sup>h</sup>n-om- : g<sup>h</sup>n-em-, an extended variant of the PIE root at a reduced grade. This juxtaposition – both due to the lack of non-Slavic equivalents which would continue a given Proto-Indo-European form as well as due to the semantic aspects – is not convincing.

**Structural meaning** ‘revolting’

A derivative with the suffix -ъnъ from the PSlav \*gnusъ : \*gnusъ ‘something which is revolting’ or from \*gnusiti ‘to be revolting’ [SP 7: 201].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘causing physical revulsion’ > ‘causing mental revulsion’

Aside the meaning ‘repulsive,’ for the sake of the Proto-Slavic language one may reconstruct the meaning ‘causing physical revulsion,’ which emerged by the transposition of the feeling of revulsion from the physical to the mental sphere [cf. BAD, 1B.12, p. 110].

<sup>27</sup> Cf. also the conclusions which refer to the nominational bases of the lexemes which express the concept ‘pretty’ contained in an article by Krystyna Kleszczowa [2002].

### Innovative meanings

In Russian dialects the meaning ‘ugly’ emerged as a result of the weakening of the meaning ‘repulsive.’ The narrowing down of the meaning ‘causing physical revulsion,’ based on the connoted cause of revulsion, is the meaning ‘dirty’ which is present in Slovak as well as Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects.

### 3B.2. Eastern and Southern \**gadъnъ*

#### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘causing revulsion, disgust’ (?)

The PSlav *gadъ* is based on the PIE \**gʷédʰ-* ‘a thing which causes revulsion’ with the PSlav alternation *-a-* : *-ě-* (cf. *žad-* < *gěd-*) of the root vowel. The original \**gěd* is most closely related with the Baltic \**gēdā* (Lithuanian *gėda* ‘shame, disgrace,’ Old Prussian *gīda-n* ‘shame’), the Old Germanic \**kwæda-* (Old High German *quāt, kōt* ‘excrement’). The original meaning of the root ‘to cause repulsion, revulsion’ is possible but it is poorly attested.

#### Structural meaning ‘revolting’

A derivative with the suffix *-ъnъ* from the PSlav \**gadъ*.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘causing revulsion, repulsive’

The meaning ‘causing revulsion, abhorrent’ is attested in South and East Slavic languages since the earliest written records (Old Church Slavonic *gadъnъ*) until the modern ones (e.g. early Slovene *gáden*, Bulgarian *záden*, dial. Russian *zádnyĭ*).

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings refer to the mental sphere [see BAD, 1B.13, p. 110], more rarely to the physical sphere – ‘dirty’ in Russian dialects. The weakened meaning ‘ugly’ is not attested. This word was included here due to the exact congruence of the meaning based on the continuants with \**gydъkъ*, \**gyzdavъ*.

### 3B.3. Eastern \**gydъkъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘causing revulsion, disgust’

The PSlav \**gydъ* is based on the PIE \**gʷūdʰ-* ‘a thing which causes revulsion,’ cf. OInd *gūtha-* ‘excrement.’ In the PIE context it is related with \**gadъ*, see \**gadъnъ* [SP 8: 336]; cf. also \**gadъnъ* [3B.2, p. 133].

#### Structural meaning ‘causing revulsion’

A derivative with the suffix *-ъkъ* from \**gyditi* whose basis is \**gydъ* ‘a thing which causes revulsion.’

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘causing revulsion, repulsive’

The meaning ‘repulsive’ is attested in all East Slavic languages.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning of the Belarusian *зідкі* ‘ugly,’ aside ‘revolting,’ emerged as a result of the weakening of the original meaning ‘revolting.’

### 3B.4. Western, Southern \*gyzdavъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘causing revulsion, disgust’ [see \*gydъkъ, 3B.3, p. 135 and \*gadъnъ, 3B.2, p. 134]

**Structural meaning** ‘causing revulsion’

A derivative with the suffix *-avъ* from the PSlav \*gy(z)diti, a form with an infix of an expressive origin from \*gyditi, see \*gydъkъ [SP 8: 340].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘revolting, abhorrent’

In West Slavic languages the basic meaning – ‘repulsive, abhorrent’ – which is the source of the meaning ‘ugly’ and of other innovative meanings such as dial. Polish *gizdawy* ‘dirty, slovenly’, ‘lazy’.

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘ugly’, similarly as in the cases discussed above, emerged as a result of the decreased intensity featured in the content ‘causing revulsion.’ For information about the development of the innovative meanings which refer to elegance in South Slavic languages [see PRETTY, 3A.13, p. 132].

### 3B.5. \*bridъ/\*bridъkъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘cutting’

The PSlav \*briti ‘to cut’ is based on the PIE \*b<sup>h</sup>rēǵ- : b<sup>h</sup>ri- ‘to cut,’ cf. OInd *bhri-* ‘to punish, to injure [Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 1: 213].

**Structural meaning** ‘cutting’

The PSlav \*bridъ is a derivative with the suffix *-dъ* from \*briti ‘to cut.’ A greater range is manifested by the form with a secondarily accumulated suffix *-kъ*.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘sharp’ > ‘unpleasant’

The original meaning ‘sharp,’ apart from the OCS *bridъkъ* and the early Slovene *brídek*, was preserved in Czech and Slovak, where a differentiation of forms and meanings occurred. The new form with a progressive assimilation (Czech *břitký*, Slovak *britký*) retained the older meaning, whereas the regular continuant (early Czech *břidký*, Slovak *bridký*) assumed an innovative meaning ‘unpleasant; revolting.’ The same innovative meaning is present in all Slavic languages, e.g. in early Polish *brzydki* ‘repulsive; unpleasant,’ Kashubian *bředki* ‘ugly, unsightly; dirty; bad, immoral,’ USorb *bridki* ‘revolting,’ Slovene *brídek* ‘unpleasant, disagreeable,’ Ukrainian *брудкiй* ‘ugly, revolting.’

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘having a repulsive appearance; ugly’ emerged in the Polish language and both Sorbian ones; it was probably adopted by Belarusian and Ukrainian from Polish. It is a result of the transfer of the meaning ‘disagreeable, unpleasant to the touch’ from the sphere of tactile sensations to the sphere of aesthetic sensations. The meaning ‘unpleasant to the touch’ may be reconstructed on the basis of innovative, specialized meanings, e.g. the dial. LSorb *bridki* ‘softish,’ which is in opposition to ‘sharp.’ As a result

of a synaesthetic ascription of the sensations of one sense [tactile, visual etc.] to other senses there emerged the meaning ‘which acts upon the senses in an unpleasant manner,’ realized by hyponyms, e.g. the USorb *bridki* ‘bland, about a smell,’ dial. Czech *břidký* ‘fatty, about meat,’ in dial. Belarusian *брыдкі* ‘stinking, about smoke,’ in Old Russian *бридо́кыи* ‘acerbic; sour; bitter’ [cf. BAD, 1B.15, p. 111].

### 3B.6. \*rǫžьnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘extended; astride’ (?)

The PSlav *\*regati* ‘to extend oneself; to crack’ (cf. Church Slavonic *регати* ‘to be astride,’ Slovene *régati* ‘to crack; to produce cracks’) probably derives from the PIE *\*ureng-* ‘to twist, to bend.’<sup>28</sup> The unattested one-time form *\*\*regti* has an exact equivalent in the Latin *ringi* ‘to sulk, to be angry; to show the teeth (in annoyance)’. The development of the meaning allegedly proceeded in an analogous manner in the Latin *ringi* ‘to bare one’s teeth’ > ‘to sulk, to become angry’ and the PSlav ‘to bare the teeth when smiling’ > ‘to sneer.’

**Structural meaning** ‘sneering; derisive’ vs. ‘the one who is sneered at’

The PSlav *\*rǫžьnъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-ьнъ* from the PSlav *\*rogati* ‘to sneer at, to deride, to jeer,’ which is an apophonic form from the PSlav *\*regati* ‘to extend oneself; to crack’ [Borys: 670].

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘derisive’ vs. ‘the one being derided’ > ‘funny’

On the basis of structural meanings in the Proto-Slavic language there emerged meanings which were in opposition to themselves of the active subject to the passive ‘derisive’ vs. ‘the one being derided, funny.’

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘revolting,’ hence the weakened ‘ugly,’ is attested in Old Russian; it also exists in Slovene, Croatian and Serbian. It emerged, similarly as the Old Russian *ружньи* ‘shameful, ignominious,’ from the original ‘derided; one that should be derided.’

### 3B.7. \*mǫzъkъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘rotten, decayed’ [see UNPLEASANT, 2B.4, p. 122]

**Structural meaning** ‘revolting’ (*ut supra*)

<sup>28</sup> The reconstruction of the meaning ‘verdrehen, (ver)biegen’ for the PIE root *\*ureng-* is based on the meanings of Germanic verbs which are based on the causative-iterative form *\*urong-* [LIV: 639]. However, due to the possibility of the influence of the continuants of *\*uréng<sup>h</sup>-* ‘winden, zusammendrehen’ [LIV: 639] upon the Germanic verbs it would be better to base the reconstruction upon the meanings ‘to show the teeth in annoyance’ (Lat. *ringi*), ‘to open’ (Church Slavonic *регати*) and ‘to crack, to produce cracks’ (Slovene *régati*) – attested independently in the Romance and Slavonic language groups, which indicate the original meaning ‘to extend; to open.’ The Old Prussian *ranctwei* ‘to steal,’ which is sometimes mentioned [Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 3: 512, Borys: 670], fails to contribute to the solution of the problem.

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘revolting’ (*ut supra*)**Innovative meanings**

The dialectal Slovak *mrzký* ‘ugly’ aside ‘revolting’ emerged as a result of the weakening of the original meaning.

3B.8. \**grozъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘inspiring fear; terrible/dangerous’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘terrible/dangerous; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘revolting,’ hence the softened meaning ‘ugly,’ is an innovation of the particular languages (Polabian *grūznə* (f.), LSorb *grozny* and USorb *hrozny*, Slovene *grōzen*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *grōzen*). It is a result of the association between terror and repugnance.

3B.9. \**grdъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘revolting; ugly’ emerged in the South Slavic area. The reconstruction of the string of minimal semantic changes seems most likely. There is a problem associated with the lack of certain semantic links in the particular languages.

3B.10. \**chudъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘crushed; crumbled’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.3, p. 105]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘small, minute,’ ‘meagre, bad,’ ‘weak,’ ‘thin,’ ‘poor’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘ugly’ emerged independently in Old Russian from ‘lousy, flimsy, bad’ and in Polabian from ‘thin; sickly, miserable’ It is based on the transfer of a negative general evaluation or physical condition onto an aesthetic evaluation.

3B.11. \**marъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** [see BAD, 1B.6, p. 108]

**Structural meaning** ‘the one that is dreamt, that seems (to be sth),’ ‘imaginary’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuant** ‘transitory’ > ‘worthless’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The emergence of the meaning ‘ugly’ in Polish dialects was caused by the transfer of a negative evaluation of the physical condition onto the aesthetic evaluation.

### 3B.12. \*grǫbъ : \*grubъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘unworked / unprocessed’ [see UNPLEASANT, 2B.3, p. 121]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘raw, unworked, rough,’ fig. ‘unkind, unpleasant; boorish’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘ugly’ in South Slavic languages (dial. Croatian *grūb*, dial. Serbian *grúb*, dial. Bulgarian *зруб*) emerged through the generalization of the meaning ‘unprocessed.’

### 3B.13. \*durьnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing (as the wind); associated with wind’ (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**Structural meaning** ‘turbulent’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘agitated, violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning ‘ugly’ was assumed by the Russian *дурной*, which more frequently occurs in the negated form *недурной* ‘pretty.’

### 3B.14. \*chvorъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘wounded; festering’ [see SICK, 7B.1, p. 186]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘sick’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meaning

Instead of the meaning ‘sick’ the Polabian adjective *χōrě* < \**chvorъ* has the meaning ‘bad, ugly, unsightly; dirty, filthy.’ Such a semantic development is caused by a generalization and a secondary specialization in the context of the broader meaning ‘bad, miserable.’ The loss of the general pan-Slavic meaning should be supposedly interpreted by the isolated position of the Polabian language in reference to other Slavic languages.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

3B.1. *\*gnusъnъ*

UGLY dial. Russian ← REVOLTING PSlav

3B.2. *\*gadъnъ*

\*UGLY ← REVOLTING Eastern, Southern

3B.3. *\*gydъkъ*

UGLY Belarusian ← REVOLTING Eastern

3B.4. *\*gyzdavъ*

UGLY dial. Czech ← REVOLTING Western, Southern

3B.5. *\*bridъ/\*bridъkъ*

UGLY Polish, USorb, Ukrainian ← REVOLTING Western, Czech/Slovak, Eastern ← \*ONE THAT ACTS UPON THE SENSES IN AN UNPLEASANT MANNER ← \*UNPLEASANT TO THE TOUCH ← SHARP PSlav

3B.6. *\*rǫžъnъ*

UGLY Slovene, Serbian-Croatian ← REVOLTING Slovene, Serbian-Croatian ← \*CONTEMPTIBLE ← DRAWING A SMILE struct. ← FUNNY/LAUGHING struct. ← HAVING ONE'S MOUTH OPEN struct. ← OPEN/SPREAD struct.

3B.7. *\*mǫzъkъ*

UGLY Slovak ← REVOLTING PSlav

3B.8. *\*grozъnъ*

UGLY Polish, Sorbian, Slovene, Bulgarian, Macedonian ← CAUSING REVULSION Western, Southern ← INSPIRING FEAR PSlav ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

3B.9. *\*grdъ*

UGLY Southern ← CAUSING REVULSION Southern ← INSPIRING FEAR Southern ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS dial. Polish, Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian, Eastern ← HUGE Slovene, Serbian-Croatian ← BRAVE Old Russian, Russian ← BOLD early Polish, Old Russian ← HAUGHTY PSlav ← PROUD PSlav

3B.10. *\*chudъ*

3B.10.1.

UGLY Old Russian ← BAD/MEAGRE PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

and

3B.10.2.

UGLY Polabian ← THIN PSlav

or

3B.10.3.

UGLY Polabian ← MISERABLE PSlav ← WEAK PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

3B.11. *\*marъnъ*

UGLY dial. Polish, Kashubian ← WEAK Polish, Belarusian ← BAD/MEAGRE Polish ← WORTHLESS PSlav ← IMAGINARY struct.

3B.12. *\*grǫbъ : \*grubъ*

UGLY Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian ← UNPROCESSED PSlav

3B.13. *\*durъnъ*

UGLY Russian ← BAD Russian ← VIOLENT etym.

3B.14. \**chvorǔ*

UGLY Polabian ← SICK PSlav

In the motivations of the concept ‘ugly’ there is a strong dominance of causing revulsion (\**gnusъnъ*, \**gadъnъ*, \**gydъkъ*, \**gyzdavъ*, \**bridъkъ*, \**mǫzъkъ*, \**grozъnъ*, \**grǫdъ*, \**rǫžъnъ*). The remaining motivations are based on external features: weakness (\**marъnъ*), thinness (\**chudъ*, alternatively) or on their causes – sickness (\**chvorъ*), lack of refinement (\**grǫbъ*) or on the evaluative assessment: bad (\**durъnъ*, \**marъnъ*, indirect motivation; \**chudъ*, alternatively).

## 4A. HIGH/TALL

4A.1. \**vysokъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘located at the top’ > ‘above a given reference point’ > ‘high/tall’

The basis of the PSlav \**vys-* is the PIE \**ǔpso-*, formed on the basis of the PIE preposition \**up(o)-* ‘on, on the top; to the top’ (cf. the German *auf*). The same basis with the determinant *-lo-* is discernible in the Greek *ὕψηλός* ‘high,’ OIr *uasal* ‘idem.’

**Structural meaning** ‘high’

The PSlav \**vysokъ*<sup>29</sup> is formed from the basis \**vys-*, also preserved in the form of the comparative grade \**vys-je* > \**vyše*. The suffix *-okъ* is peculiar to the names of sizes. Its genesis is not known but it is likely that the suffix \**-kъ* coalesced with the vowel *-o-* which belongs to the stem and which precedes the suffix, and that then it extended over the adjectives which featured similar semantics. The problem consists with the finding of this first adjective, which was a source of analogous changes [cf. Brodowska-Honowska 1960: 198].

<sup>29</sup> A different etymology is suggested by Wojciech Smoczyński. For \**vysokъ* the scholar reconstructs an earlier form \*\**vych-okъ*, juxtaposing it with the Lithuanian *atušà* ‘sprout, sprig, young shoot,’ which he derives from the PIE *ǔš-aka-*. He also mentions parallels of semantic development: “Daß die ‘hoch’ bezeichnende adjektivische Form öfters von dem Verb ‘wachsen’ bzw. ‘wachsen lassen’ herleitbar ist, bezeugt beispielsweise ai. *ūrdhv-á* ‘hoch’ ← \**ūrdh-ú-*, mit einer zu dem obigen urslav. \**ǔš-* parallelen gedehnten Sampras.-Schwundstufe, nämlich \*/urd-/ ← \*/werd-/ , vgl. ved. *várdhate* ‘wächst’ [...]. Bedeutungsnahe ist freilich lat. *altus* ‘hoch, tief,’ eigl. ‘emporgewachsen’ (= ahd. *alt* ‘alt’) von *alere* ‘ernahren, aufziehen, pflegen’ [...]” [Smoczyński 2000: 92].

(“That the adjectival form meaning ‘high’ can often be derived from the verb ‘to grow’ or ‘to increase,’ is attested, e.g., by the OInd. *ūrdhv-á* ‘high’ ← \**ūrdh-ú-*, with parallel prolonged apophony in relation to the PSlav \**ǔš-*, namely \*/urd-/ ← \*/werd-/ , cf. the Vedic *várdhate* ‘grows’ [...]. The Latin *altus* ‘high, deep,’ actually ‘to grow’ (= the Old High German *alt* ‘old’) from *alere* ‘to feed, to grow (transitive), to raise, to tend to,’ is probably semantically close.”)

### The meaning based on continuants ‘high’

The meaning ‘high’ is attested in all Slavic languages, cf. the Czech *vysoký*, Serbian *visok*, Russian *высокий*. The secondary meanings which are mentioned in the “Innovative meanings” paragraph could have begun to emerge already in the Proto-Slavic period.

#### Innovative meanings

The continuants of the PSlav *\*vysokъ* form numerous figurative meanings, which are usually consistent with the figurative meanings formed by descriptors with the basic meaning ‘big’ (but with a more limited range of usage), e.g. ‘strong, of great intensity’ (Polish “*wysoka gorączka*” ‘high fever’), and the ones which express a positive evaluation: Polish “*wysoka jakość*” ‘high quality.’ A peculiar feature of ‘high/tall [wysoki]’ is its capability of forming secondary meanings, based on synaesthesia, referring to sounds: “*wysoki głos, ton*” ‘a high voice, tone.’

### 4A.2. Western and Southern *\*drěčьnъ*<sup>30</sup>

#### Etymological meaning ‘elongated’

The PSlav *\*drěkъ* is a substantivized adjective. It has an exact equivalent in Lithuanian: *draikas* ‘slender, tall (of trees)’ [SP 4: 229].

#### Structural meaning ‘such as a pole, as a tree trunk’

The PSlav *\*drěčьnъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-ьnъ* from *\*drěkъ* ‘trunk, pole, beam’ [SP 4: 228].

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘well-grown’

The Proto-Slavic meaning is based on ‘such as a pole, as a tree trunk,’ which influenced a departure from the etymological meaning and the emergence in Slovak, Slovene and Croatian of the meaning ‘strong, powerful,’ perhaps a common innovation [see STRONG, 6A.11, p. 168] with a residual preservation in Czech and Slovak of the meaning which is closer to the Lithuanian equivalent ‘elongated.’

#### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘well-grown’ is the basis of the Czech and Slovak *drečný* ‘tall,’ hence ‘slender,’ ‘shapely; pretty.’

### 4A.3. Eastern *\*dosogъ*/*\*dosqъbъ*

#### Etymological meaning – obscure

The PSlav *\*segati* ‘to reach out with one’s hand to get sth’ is based on the PIE *\*seg-* (in the PSlav form there is a nasal infix), present in the Lithuanian *sėgti* ‘to affix; to fasten to sth,’ Latv. *segt* ‘to cover,’ OInd *saj-* ‘to hang sth.’ The meaning of the PIE root is difficult to reconstruct due to the discrepancies between the meanings of the continuants.

<sup>30</sup> [SP 4: 228] reconstructs this adjective as a dialectal Proto-Slavic one. However, if Erich Berneker’s remark, which is mentioned there, that some Czech words were likely to have been borrowed from Slovak, then due to the distribution of the word (Slovene, Croatian and Slovak) it should be considered a later common derivative from the PSlav *\*drěkъ*.

### Structural meaning ‘one that reaches up to sth,’ ‘one that reaches sth’

A derivative with the apophony of the root vowel from *\*do-segti* ‘to reach,’ a prefixed *\*segti* ‘to reach.’ The form *\*dosqžb* emerged through a secondary accumulation of the suffix *-jb*.

### The meanings based on continuants ‘big, tall,’ ‘skillful, able’

It is likely that not only the meanings ‘big, tall’ but also ‘skillful, able’ (cf. Old Russian *досужии* ‘dexterous ; able’), based on the figurative meaning of the verb ‘to be able to reach sth in a physical manner’ > ‘to be able to attain sth,’ emerged during the period of the Proto-Slavic community. Therefore, the semantic development occurred at the verbal level.

### Innovative meanings

Innovative changes of the meanings of adjectives proceeded along different tracks. The semantic dominant ‘the ability to be active’ is the basis of such meanings as ‘diligent, eager, laborious; ingenious,’ ‘vigorous, energetic,’ ‘brave, daring,’ ‘curious,’ and a meaning which features negative overtones – ‘stupid,’<sup>31</sup> which is testimony to the fact that the adjective assumed the same of excess, also present in ‘too fast; one that is in a hurry.’ Without doubt the innovative meaning in Russian – ‘one that has free time, free’ – emerged as a consequence of the meaning ‘dexterous, skillful, capable,’ and therefore one that quickly performs the task that he was set to do. [See also OLD, 8B.7, p. 195]

#### 4A.4. *\*velb*/*\*velikb*

### Etymological meaning – obscure

The etymology of the PSlav *\*velb* and the formant *-kb*, *\*velikb*, which emerged by the accumulation upon the definite form *\*velbjb*, is obscure. One most frequently suggests a Proto-Indo-European origin from the root with a reconstructed meaning ‘to want’ (according to Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 812, ‘to rule, to wield power’) – which in this case is related with the PSlav *\*velēti* ‘to command, to order’ < ‘to want, to desire’ – or the homonymous<sup>32</sup> *\*uel-* ‘to clench,’ while the authors of the dictionaries emphasize the uncertainty of the etymology [e.g. Brückner: 616–617; Boryś: 693–694; Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 1: 289; Rejzek: 704]. See also [Helimskij 2000: 325–327].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘big’

The meaning ‘big’ or ‘great’ is indicated by all of the continuants of the PSlav extended form *\*velikb*, as well as the residually preserved *\*velb* (e.g. the Old Polish *wieli*, LSorb *wéli*, Old Russian *велии*).

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘tall’ in the Sorbian languages, in Czech and Slovak is one of the realizations of the meaning ‘big.’ This realization refers to the vertical dimension. The rich

<sup>31</sup> The meaning ‘stupid [дурный, бестолковый]’ is drawn from SRNG 8: 150, where it is accompanied with the following quotation: “досужая голова.” I am unable to account for the exact basis for the change of meaning on this ground.

<sup>32</sup> [LIV: 615–617] reconstructs two different forms: *\*uelH-* ‘to be strong; to be mighty, to wield power’ and *\*uel-* ‘to embrace.’

development of figurative meanings from the original 'big' is typical for the exponents of this concept.<sup>33</sup>

#### 4A.5. \**golěmъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** 'powerful, strong'

The PSlav \**golěmъ* is probably the original present passive participle in *-mъ* from the unattested \*\**golěti* 'to become strong,' of which the Lithuanian *galėti* 'to be able to do sth' is an exact equivalent [SP 8: 36; see also Syročkin 1997: 79–80]. The verb continues the PIE nominal form (according to LIV: 164, the perfective form) \**gal-* from the root with lengthened vocalism \**gēl-* 'to be able to do sth, to be strong.' Cf. also the Welsh *gallu* 'to be able to do sth,' MWelsh *gellit, geill* 'idem,' Armenian *kalaw* 'to seize.'

##### **The meaning based on continuants** 'great, very big, huge'

The meanings of the continuants of *golěmъ* which are mentioned below are varied but without doubt the most distinctive meaning is 'very big, great,' therefore one which is already innovative in relation to the PIE 'strong,' cf.: the Old Polish *golemy* 'very big, great,' Old Czech *holemý* 'big, huge,' Serbian *gòlem* 'very big, great,' 'long; wide; spacious,' 'tall, well-grown,' 'numerous,' Church Slavonic *golěmъ* 'very big, great,' Bulgarian *голям* 'big,' 'very big, huge,' 'long,' 'numerous; abundant,' 'strong, intensive; violent, fast' 'important; distinguished,' Macedonian *голем* 'big,' Old Russian *гольмьѣ* 'very big, great,' dial. Russian *голямый* 'long-legged,' 'numerous,' 'true, similar,' 'without additions, admixtures.'

##### **Innovative meanings**

The continuants of \**golěmъ*, which today are the basic exponents of the concept 'big' in Bulgarian and in Macedonian, underwent in these languages a development which is analogous to the aforementioned development of the PSlav \**velikъ*. The meaning 'high' in the Serbian and Croatian *gòlem* has the same source as in the case of the continuants of the aforementioned \**velikъ*.

#### 4A.6. \**bol'ьjъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** 'strong' [see GOOD, 1A.6, p. 98]

##### **The meaning based on continuants** 'big,' 'good' (*ut supra*)

##### **Innovative meanings**

The Russian *большой* lost its comparative value and it is the basic lexeme which expresses the concept 'big,' including also the content 'high' in Russian.

<sup>33</sup> Ksenija P. Smolina [Smolina 1978] devoted an article to the development of the adjective \**velikъ*, especially in the Old Russian language.

#### 4A.7. Western and Eastern \*dǫžb

**Etymological meaning** ‘pressing’ [see STRONG, 6A.5, p. 164]

**Structural meaning** ‘strong,’ ‘healthy’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘strong’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘strapping, tall’ in Ukrainian, similarly as ‘big, tall’ in Polish, should be treated in the same way as in the case of the continuants of other discussed lexemes with the meaning ‘big.’

#### 4A.8. \*dikb

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 209]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘unused by people’ > ‘untamed’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

It is difficult to explain the emergence of the meanings ‘of great height, big, tall’ aside ‘long’ in the northern dialects of the Russian language or to illustrate it with the parallels of semantic development. It is likely that the meaning ‘tall’ that we are interested in emerged in the process of the narrowing down of the earlier meaning ‘big.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

4A.1. \*vysokb

HIGH/TALL PSlav ← ONE THAT IS AT THE TOP/HIGHER etym.

4A.2. \*drěčbnb

HIGH/TALL Czech, Slovak ← SUCH AS A TREE TRUNK Western, Southern

4A.3. \*dosogb : \*dosožb

HIGH/TALL Eastern ← ONE THAT REACHES STH struct.

4A.4. \*velb/\*velikb

HIGH/TALL Sorbian, Czech, Slovak ← BIG PSlav ← STRONG etym.

4A.5. \*golěmb

HIGH/TALL Serbian, Croatian ← BIG PSlav

4A.6. \*bol’bjb

HIGH/TALL Russian ← BIG PSlav ← STRONG etym.

4A.7. \*dǫžb

HIGH/TALL Polish, Ukrainian ← BIG Polish, Ukrainian ← STRONG Western, Eastern

4A.8. \*dikb

HIGH/TALL dial. Russian ← BIG dial. Russian ← WILD PSlav

The concept 'high/tall' is usually motivated by magnitude and, indirectly, by strength (*\*velikъ*, *\*golěmъ*, *\*bol'ьjъ*, *\*dъžъ*). Other motivations are based on the conceptualization of someone who is able to reach a certain point (*\*dosъžъ*) or of someone who resembles a tree trunk with his or her height (*\*drěčьnъ*). The parametric semantics of the concept 'high/tall' facilitates motivation based on a prepositional concept which expresses a location 'at the top of sth' (*\*vysokъ*).

## 4B. LOW/SHORT

### 4B.1. *\*nizъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'located at the bottom; moving downward'

The adverb and the preposition *\*nizъ* 'down; downward; is based on the PIE *\*nei-* 'down; downward.' The OInd *ni* 'idem' is based on the form with short vocalism – *\*ni*.<sup>34</sup>

**Structural meaning** 'low-situated'

The PSlav *\*nizъkъ* is an extension of the earlier PSlav form *\*nizъ*, attested only in the substantivized adjectives signifying 'a place which is located low.' The basis of the adjective *\*nizъ* is the homophonic adverb and preposition *\*nizъ* 'at the bottom; downward.'

**The meaning based on continuants** 'low'

The meaning based on continuants is very homogenous; *\*nizъkъ*, apart from the basic function of determining the vertical dimension, constitutes secondary meanings which may be referred already to the Proto-Slavic period. To a great extent they correspond to the secondary meanings of the antonymous *\*vysokъ*, although the parallelism of their development is limited.

**Innovative meanings**

At the continuants of the lexeme *\*nizъkъ* secondary figurative meanings emerged which refer to the moral sphere and which do not have antonymous equivalents among the continuants of the PSlav *\*vysokъ*. (In Bulgarian two alternant forms emerged: with a voiced consonant: *nizъkъ* and with the unvoiced one *niszъkъ*, between which a relatively typical distribution of meanings occurred. The new form assumed a concrete meaning whereas the former one retained a figurative meaning used in reference to people: 'mean, lowdown'.)

### 4B.2. *\*malъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'small'

<sup>34</sup> The obscure final *\*zъ* was perhaps added by analogy to other Proto-Slavic prepositions [Borys: 365].

### The meaning based on continuants 'small'

The continuants harmoniously indicate the original meaning 'small.' In certain languages the original form was replaced with adjectives with accumulated suffixes, e.g. the Bulgarian *малък*, Russian *мáленький*.

### Innovative meanings

Similarly as in the case of the antonymous concept 'big,' the exponents of the concept 'small' also realize the meaning 'of low height,' and therefore 'low/short.'

#### 4B.3. \**krnъ*

### Etymological meaning 'cut off'

The PSlav \**krnъ* continues the PIE \**krə-no-*, a participle based on the reduced grade of the PIE root \*(s)*ker-* 'to cut.'

### The meaning based on continuants 'crippled; damaged'

The meaning 'crippled; damaged' is indicated by the continuants with the meaning 'devoid of a part of the body,' e.g. the Church Slavonic *krъnъ* 'with ears that were cut off,' Bulgarian *крън* : *кърн* 'without an ear,' 'about a vessel, chipped,' Old Russian *корныи* 'with a damaged nose or ear,' Slovene *krъn* 'broken; cracked' and others.

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning 'short in stature; short' emerged in the Russian dialects *корный* : *корной* [Sławski 2: 491] as a suggestive expression of low height. An obscure development of the early Polish *kierny* 'angry; irate.'

#### 4B.4. \**krorъ*

### Etymological meaning 'shrunk' [see FAT, 5A.4, p. 150]

### The meaning based on continuants 'short and fat' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

Dial. Bulgarian *крън*, *кран*, *крон* 'short; court' emerged as a result of one semantic element of the original meaning becoming a semantic dominant.

#### 4B.5. \**rōdъnъ*

### Etymological meaning 'arranged in a row, in a series' [see GOOD, 1A.4, p. 97]

### The meaning based on continuants 'appropriate, suitable' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning 'short,' which appears in the Church Slavonic *rōdъnъ* aside the meanings 'linked, joint,' 'appropriate,' probably should be derived from the meaning

‘appropriate.’ Perhaps it is a contextual meaning which realises the content ‘*comme il faut*; not too tall.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

4B.1. \**nizьkъ*

LOW/SHORT PSlav ← LOCATED LOW/AT THE BOTTOM etym.

4B.2. \**malъ*

LOW/SHORT pan-Slavic ← SMALL PSlav

4B.3. \**krъnъ*

SHORT dial. Russian ← DAMAGED ← PSlav ← CUT OFF etym.

4B.4. \**krъpъ*

SHORT dial. Bulgarian ← SHORT AND FAT PSlav ← SHRUNK etym.

4B.5. \**rъdbъnъ*

SHORT Church Slavonic ← APPROPRIATE PSlav

The concept ‘low/short,’ similarly as the antonymous ‘high/tall,’ is motivated by the prepositional concept ‘at the bottom; downward’ (\**nizьkъ*). The motivation through a small size is certainly common but in the Proto-Slavic context it is represented in the case (\**malъ*). Another example of this motivation is the abstraction of a small size from a more complex concept ‘stocky’ (\**krъpъ*). A suggestive motivation involves the association of shortness with damage, cutting off (\**krъnъ*). Due to the lack of parallels, the motivation through being *comme il faut* must be treated with caution.

## 5A. FAT

### 5A.1. Southern and Eastern \**debelъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘strong, stout’

The dial. PSlav \**debelъ*<sup>35</sup> is derived by scholars from the PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>eb-* ‘fat, strong, stout; mighty’ [SP 3: 29–30]. Equivalent forms with different formants exist in the Baltic group (Old Prussian *debikan* ‘great’) and the Germanic group (Middle High German *tapfer*, Middle German *dapfer* ‘heavy; stout, strong’).

<sup>35</sup> The alternant form \**dobelъ* (and \**dobolъ*) which is reconstructed by SP 3: 29–30, may be a result of the contamination of the PSlav \**dobъ* [cf. STRONG, 6A.9, p. 167] and \**debelъ*.

### The meaning based on continuants ‘stout/strong’ > ‘fat, obese’

The meanings ‘stout,’ ‘strong,’ ‘big’ are preserved above all in East Slavic languages where innovations concentrate around these meanings (Old Russian *дебелыи* ‘fat,’ ‘straight,’ Russian *дебелый* ‘fat, stout, stocky,’ ‘healthy; strong, robust,’ ‘unprocessed,’ Ukrainian *дебелий* ‘stocky, robust,’ ‘strong, powerful,’ ‘healthy,’ ‘durable,’ Belarusian *дзябелы* ‘strong,’ ‘powerful, durable,’ ‘healthy,’ ‘fat, stout, obese’).<sup>36</sup> Probably already in the Proto-Slavic period in the South Slavic languages the secondary meaning ‘fat’ became the dominant one.

### Innovative meanings

In the subsequent development of the word the place of the central seme ‘big size’ was assumed by a ‘well-developed adipose tissue.’ This dominant of meaning was a point of departure for the development of further meanings such as ‘fatty (of foods),’ ‘fertile (of land),’ ‘rich, abundant (of crops).’ In South Slavic languages there are also secondary meanings based on synaesthesia and ones that usually accompany the lexical exponents of the concept ‘fat,’ i.e., ‘low (of voice).’

## 5A.2. \*t<sub>1</sub>st<sub>6</sub>

### Etymological meaning ‘one that contains water, swollen’

The PSlav \*t<sub>1</sub>st<sub>6</sub> < \*t<sub>1</sub>z-to- is by origin a passive participle of the unattested PSlav verb \*t<sub>1</sub>zti, based on \*\*telti t<sub>6</sub>l<sub>6</sub> which is also unattested (a closer basis is preserved in Baltic languages, cf. the Lithuanian *tuĩžti* ‘to swell, to become fluffy; to mellow, to rot away’ and the Latvian *tũzti* ‘to swell’). The Baltic verbs and the reconstructed Slavic verb are derived by scholars from the PIE root \*tēu-/tū-/tu- ‘to swell, to increase one’s volume’ (cf. the PSlav \*tyti) with the extension -l- [Borys: 636]. This root occurs more frequently with the extension -k-: \*teu-k- (cf. the PSlav \*tučiti ‘to fatten’).

### The meaning based on continuants ‘having a big volume,’ ‘fat,’ > Western and Southern ‘fat’

The etymological meaning ‘one that contains water’ disappeared completely, yielding place to the meaning ‘one that has a big volume’ which exists to this day in certain languages (e.g. USorb *tolsty* ‘having a big trunk (of a tree),’ Russian *толстый* ‘fat, also when referring to a book,’ deep, low, about a voice,’ Belarusian *моўсты* ‘idem’).<sup>37</sup> The meaning ‘fat, having a big quantity of fat,’ which today is the basic meaning of the continuants in the majority of West and South Slavic languages (e.g. Polish *tlusty*, Slovene *tólst*, Croatian *tũst*, Bulgarian *млѣст*), emerged as a secondary meaning, probably already during the period of the community within the particular dialects.

<sup>36</sup> Also Slovene *débel* ‘big, great’ apart from other meanings which are clearly associated with bodyweight.

<sup>37</sup> In other languages a trace of the meaning which does not refer to fat is found in the continuants of the PSlav derivative of \*t<sub>1</sub>šča ‘the thing which has a big volume,’ e.g. the Polish *tluszcza* ‘a big group of people’ [cf. Borys 1991: 27 (reprinted 2007: 543–544)].

### 5A.3. \*jǣdrъ/jǣdrъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘swollen’ (?), ‘one that is in the middle, at the core’ (?)

There is a lack of a certain etymology. In the majority of cases it is considered to have emerged on the basis of the PIE \**oid-* ‘to swell, to puff up’ with a likely Greek equivalent – *ἀδρός* ‘mature, strong, stout’ [Sławski 1: 536–537, where one can find other suggestions as well]. A different interpretation is furnished by ESSJ 6: 66, which features a reconstruction of a form without the initial *j-*, and which considers the subst. \**ǣdro* ‘core’ as a voiced variant of \**ǣtro* ‘interior’. Also Derksen: 157 is in favor of a relationship between \**ǣdrъ* and \**ǣdro*. These vacillations make it impossible to reconstruct the etymological meaning which in the first case would be ‘swollen’ and in the second one – ‘pertaining to a core.’

**Structural meaning** (only in the case when one accepts the second variant of the etymological meaning) ‘one that has a core’

The PSlav \**jǣdrъ* is preserved only in South Slavic languages (the Old Russian *ядрыи* probably under the influence of the Church Slavonic language). A pan-Slavic range is featured by the form \**jǣdrъnъ* with the suffix *-ъnъ* in which, according to the etymology that one assumes, one may perceive either an extension of the original \**jǣdrъ*, or a derivative of \**jǣdro*.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘vigorous; healthy; robust, firm; fat’

The meanings which are reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language are attested e.g. by the Czech *jadrný* ‘robust, sturdy; strong,’ dial. ‘healthy,’ Serbian and Croatian *jédar* ‘vigorous; robust; healthy; firm,’ ‘well-fed, fat, strapping; sturdy,’ ‘rich, abundant,’ Bulgarian *ѣдръ* ‘big, stout, strapping, fat; strong,’ Ukrainian *ядра́ний*. Žofie Šarapatková suggests ‘good,’ analogically to \**dobrъ*, which subsequently underwent various form of specialization [Šarapatková 1996: 21–22] as the original Proto-Slavic meaning. For information about the problems associated with the establishment of the direction of the semantic development [see QUICK, 9A.5, p. 199].

**Innovative meanings**

The secondary meanings are numerous, although one may merely indicate their direct motivations, e.g. the Serbian and Croatian *jédar* ‘hard; strict, dense’ < ‘robust,’ Bulgarian *ѣдръ* fig. ‘important’ < ‘big; strong,’ ‘fat.’ The establishment of complete sequences of semantic development is impossible due to the unclear semantic motivation.

### 5A.4. \*krǫrъ/\*krǫrъnъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘shrunk’

The PSlav \**krǫrъ* derives from a nominal form with an apophonic marker *-o-* from the PIE root \*(*s*)*kremp-*<sup>38</sup> : \*(*s*)*kremb-* ‘to twist; to shrink, to wrinkle (intransitive verbs)’ (cf. Middle High German *schrimpfen* ‘to wrinkle, to shrink’), which is a nasalized variant of the PIE \*(*s*)*kerb-* : \*(*s*)*kerb<sup>h</sup>-* [Pokorny: 949; Sławski 3: 107]. Cf. also the Lithuanian *skrambl̃ys* ‘a potbellied dwarf’ (with a preserved *-s-* mobile).

<sup>38</sup> A root with a voiceless consonant which is left unreconstructed by Pokorny [Pokorny: 949].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘short and fat’

It is likely that the Proto-Slavic meaning was preserved exactly in the Polish *krępy* ‘stout,’ and it is close to the dial. Croatian *krôpi* ‘round.’ This may be inferred from a comparison with other languages which continue either the meaning ‘short’ or ‘fat.’

### Innovative meanings

After one element of the meaning was eliminated another one became the semantic dominant of the word and it could undergo further development. Thus some of the continuants became antonymous in reference to their equivalents in other languages. The meaning ‘fat’ existed in the Old Czech language and in some of the Bulgarian dialects. The seme ‘short’ became a basis for the meanings in other dialects of the Bulgarian language (cf. dial. Bulgarian *крън, крап, крон* ‘short; short (Fr. *court*).’ As a result of further development there also emerged a meaning which is recorded in the Church Slavonic language – ‘small, minute.’ On the basis of the form *\*krorpъ* there emerged the form (*крорьнѣ*), extended with the suffix *-ьнѣ*, which is present in Russian, Serbian and Croatian (Serbian and Croatian *krûpan*, Russian *крûпный* [Borys: 259]).<sup>39</sup> By way of an extension of the sense, apart from the meaning ‘fat’ there emerged in these languages a meaning which refers to the general magnitude ‘big,’ which in Russian, according to the general tendency of the development of the meaning ‘big,’ yielded the meanings ‘important, considerable; distinguished.’

## 5A.5. *\*sporъ*

### Etymological meaning ‘successful, fruitful’

The PSlav *\*sporъ* is related with *\*spěti* ‘to achieve a [desired] result, to be fruitful, successful.’ The verb is based on the PIE root *\*sp<sup>h</sup>ē-* with the determinant *-ie-*: *\*sp<sup>h</sup>ē-ie-* ‘to be successful, to develop in an auspicious manner.’ The closest equivalents include the Baltic ones (Lithuanian *spėti spėju* ‘to make it on time,’ ‘to guess at sth,’ ‘to bear fruit; to mature,’ Latvian *spēt spēju* ‘to achieve an intended result, to succeed in doing sth’) and the OInd *sphāy-* ‘to become fat,’ cf. the Old English *spōwan* and the Old High German *spuoen* ‘to succeed’ [LIV: 532]. It is probably as early as in the Proto-Indo-European language that there was a nominal form with the suffix *-ro-* although its form is not certain. Aside the PSlav *\*sporъ*, which indicates a regular apophonic form *\*sp<sup>h</sup>o-ro-* there is the OInd, Vedic *sphirá-* ‘fat’ and the Latin (*pro*)*sperus* ‘prosperous,’ which indicate a form with reduced vocalism – *\*sp<sup>h</sup>ə-ro-* [Pokorny: 982].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘efficient, abundant’

The meaning ‘efficient, abundant; one that brings the desired result, fruitful’ is attested in almost all Slavic languages.

<sup>39</sup> Some researchers derive the Serbian and Croatian *krûpan* and the Russian *крûпный* from the PSlav *\*krurьнѣ* and they link it with the family *\*krupa* [Stawski 3: 178; ESS] 13: 46–47]. However, semantic reasons speak against such a solution. The PSlav *\*krupa* and the adjective *\*krurьнѣ* which is derived from it refer to slight objects, in contradistinction to the aforementioned continuants which feature even antonymous meanings.

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings which emerged on the basis of the meanings which are reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic languages are very numerous. They refer to physical features, both strength and size (Czech *sporý* 'strong; stout, stocky,' USorb *spory* 'big; stocky, chunky,' Ukrainian *споруї* 'big,' Belarusian with the suffix *-ьнэ – спóрны* 'dense') as well as to ability (early Polish *spory* 'fast, swift; able,' Slovak *sporý* 'fast,' Czech *sporý* 'eager, zealous; prompt,' Russian *спóрый* 'able,' Belarusian with the suffix *-ьнэ – спóрны* 'quick'). What is interesting is the clear enantiosemey which appears in the Czech and Slovak *sporý* 'miserable, weak; exiguous' aside 'strong; abundant.' These meanings do not result from a natural semantic development but from the influence of the German language, i.e., the word family *sparen* 'to save money; to grudge sb sth,' *spärlich* 'stingy; frugal,' 'rare, exiguous, e.g. of hair.' This is clearly indicated by the meaning which belong to this semantic sphere and which are also present in other languages: USorb *spory* 'thrifty,' Czech *sporý* 'stingy; frugal,' Serbian and Croatian *spòr* 'slow, leisurely.' Antonymous meanings also occur in the continuants of the PSlav *\*sporǫ* which refer to velocity, cf. the Serbian and Croatian *spòr* 'slow, leisurely' as opposed to the early Polish *spory* 'fast.'

### 5A.6. *\*gladъkъ*

#### Etymological meaning 'smooth'

The PSlav *\*gladъ* is derived from the PIE *\*g<sup>h</sup>lād<sup>h</sup>-*. It has an exact equivalent in the Lithuanian *glòdus* 'smooth, even,' whereas the form *\*g<sup>h</sup>lad<sup>h</sup>-* is the basis of the Old High German *glatt* 'smooth, shiny' and the Latin *glaber* < *\*g<sup>h</sup>lad<sup>h</sup>-ro-* 'bald; smooth,' which differ from the other ones because of the presence of a suffix [SP 7: 87].

#### Structural meaning 'smooth'

The PSlav *\*gladъkъ* emerged as a result of the accumulation of the suffix *-kъ* upon the unpreserved adjective *\*\*gladъ*, whose form and meaning is indicated by numerous Proto-Slavic derivatives, e.g., *\*gladъ* 'a smooth, even surface,' *\*gladiti* 'to smooth' *et alia* [see SP 7: 87–89].

#### The meaning based on continuant 'smooth, with an even surface'

The original meaning 'smooth; destitute of unevenness; uniform' is attested in all Slavic languages (e.g. the Czech *hladký*, Old Church Slavonic *gladъkъ*, Russian *гладкий*). It is difficult to say whether the secondary meanings 'one that does not present any difficulty, easy,' 'polite, kind,' reconstructed by the SP 7: 85, are equally old.

### Innovative meanings

Presumably the parallel innovations (e.g. the early Polish *gladki*, Polabian *glott'ě*, Old Russian *гладкуу*) include the meanings 'fed, fattened; fat, obese,' based as it seems on the appearance of an animal which is well-fed (which has no sagging skin).<sup>40</sup> It is likely that the meaning 'pretty' in early Polish, its dialects and in Polabian [cf. PRETTY, 3A.9, p. 130] is motivated in a similar manner. Other meanings: the dial. Polish 'bald

<sup>40</sup> Unlike the SP 7: 85, which for the Proto-Slavic language reconstructs the meaning 'good-looking, fat, chubby.'

[tʲysy]’ and ‘slippery [śliski]’<sup>41</sup> are based on the properties of ‘smoothness.’ The meanings which occur in Russian and Ukrainian dialects: ‘skillful; cunning’ and the ones that do not refer to people: ‘well-ordered,’ ‘tasty’ indicate the presence of an indirect link ‘good.’ It is worthwhile to direct one’s attention to the unexpected dial. Russian ‘empty’ which is presumably a result of the loss of legibility by the meaning ‘destitute of hair,’ understood as ‘deprived of something in general’ > ‘empty.’

### 5A.7. \*tɔgɔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘strained tight, taut’ [see STRONG, 6A.4, p. 163]

**Structural meaning** ‘strained tight, taut’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘strained tight’ > ‘hard,’ Western ‘strong’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘strong’ emerged in Polish as a link in the series ‘strong’ > ‘well-built’ > ‘fat.’ The cause of its emergence was associated with the intention to euphemistically express the concept ‘fat,’ when the latter assumed negative overtones.

### 5A.8. \*grɔbɔ/\*grubɔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘unworked’ [see UNPLEASANT, 2B.3, p. 121]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘raw, unworked, rough,’ fig. ‘unkind, unpleasant; boorish’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘fat’ is probably an innovation which occurred in an independent manner in the Polish context<sup>42</sup> (hence in the Slovak and Czech dialects it is a common expression which refers especially to women who are pregnant) and in Serbo-Croatian.<sup>43</sup> It reached the Ukrainian and Belarusian language probably from Polish, which is indicated by the lack of this meaning in Russian. The innovative meaning ‘formless; unsightly, ugly’ (Serbian and Croatian *grûb*, Bulgarian *зруб*) is motivated by the meaning

<sup>41</sup> It is likely to be a calque from German, which is indicated by the geography (Silesian dialects).

<sup>42</sup> The meaning ‘fat’ probably is not an Old Polish meaning. The *Słownik staropolski* bases its reconstruction of the meaning ‘fat, with a big circumference’ on one example in which the interpretation of the meaning is not obvious (*kon plesznywy.... grubye kolanye* from 1471). The second meaning, ‘coarse, rude,’ which is indicated also by derivatives, is better documented by examples [Słstpol 2: 505].

<sup>43</sup> The *Słownik prastłowiański* also reconstructs the meaning ‘fat’ and it accepts the following chain of development: ‘rough, coarse, uneven’ > ‘without a clear outline, unworked, unshapely’ > ‘fat, chubby, broad, of a big size’ [SP 8: 239]. The drawback of this reconstruction consists in the clearly negative overtones of the meaning ‘fat,’ which was probably absent in the period of the formation of the word.

‘unworked.’ The positively marked figurative meanings ‘important,’ ‘rich’ are present in Czech and Slovak dialects (as well as in the neighboring Polish dialects) and they indicate the positive evaluation of the concept ‘fat.’

### 5A.9. Western and Eastern *\*rychlъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘pertaining to digging; digging; being dug’ [see QUICK, 9A.1, p. 197]

**Structural meaning** Eastern ‘one that moves; set in motion’ vs. Western ‘one that moves; animated’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘mellow; plump; porous; flabby’

The meanings are based on the active meaning of the participle of *\*rychlъ*, peculiar to the West Slavic languages, are not relevant to the emergence of the meaning ‘plump.’

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘obese’ (colloq. Russian *рыхлый*) is based on the meaning ‘plump; flaccid,’ which emerged as a result of a transposition of the semantic dominant due to the lack of density discernible in the structural meaning. For information about a different result of the development of the meaning ‘plump; flaccid’ [see WEAK, 6B.5, p. 176].

## Summary of Semantic Changes

5A.1. *\*debelъ*

FAT PSlav ← STRONG etym.

5A.2. *\*t<sub>l</sub>stъ*

FAT PSlav ← ONE THAT HAS A BIG VOLUME PSlav ← SWOLLEN etym.

5A.3. *\*jędrъ*

5A.3.1.

FAT Southern ← SWOLLEN (?) etym.

or

5A.3.2.

FAT Southern ← STRAPPING Southern ← STRONG Southern ← ONE THAT IS THE CORE (?) etym.

5A.4. *\*krorpъ/\*krorpъnъ*

FAT Old Czech, dial. Bulgarian ← SHORT AND FAT PSlav ← SHRUNK etym.

5A.5. *\*sporъ*

STOCKY Czech, USorb ← STOUT Czech ← EFFICIENT PSlav ← ABUNDANT PSlav

5A.6. *\*gladъkъ*

FAT early Polish, Polabian, Old Russian ← FAT/OBESE dial. Polish, Polabian, Slovene, Eastern ← SMOOTH PSlav

5A.7. \**tqgʷ*

FAT Polish ← STRONG PSlav

5A.8. \**grɔbʷ*/\**grubʷ*

FAT Polish, Serbian, Croatian ← COARSE PSlav

5A.9. \**rychlʷ*

FAT colloq. Russian ← PLUMP PSlav ← FLACCID PSlav

In the case of the concept ‘fat’ what seems crucial is the direction of the attention toward the pole of evaluation. A part of the motivation indicate clearly positive associations for it is based on stoutness, strength (\**debelʷ*, \**sporʷ*, \**tqgʷ*, \**jeɖrʷ*, alternatively). A negative association is present in \**rychlʷ*, motivated through being flaccid. The motivations associated with being swollen (\**jeɖrʷ* alternatively; \**tʃstʷ* indirectly) are probably unmarked suggestive motivations, similarly as the indication of the content of fat itself (\**gladʷkʷ*). As far as \**gladʷkʷ* is concerned, it is interesting to compare its indirect motivation with the antonymous motivation of \**grubʷ* ‘rough, coarse.’ In the case of \**krɔpʷ*, similarly as in the case of the aforementioned concept ‘short,’ one of the elements of the more complex meaning ‘stout’ was abstracted.

## 5B. THIN

### 5B.1. \**libʷ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘thin, weak’

It is derived from the PIE \**lei-bʰo-* ‘weak,’ which in turn is derived from \**lei-* ‘to become thin’ [Pokorny: 661–662]. It has an exact equivalent in Lithuanian – *liebas* ‘weak, of a sickly constitution,’ ‘slim, thin,’ ‘slender, shapely.’

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘thin’

The PSlav \**libʷ* is residually attested in the Western languages. Both the early continuants that were preserved (Old Polish *luby*<sup>44</sup> ‘gracilis’ (hapax), Old Czech *libí* (?), presumably = *libový* ‘thin, without fat’ [Gebauer 2: 248]), as well as the equivalent [ESSJ 15: 74–75; Rejzek: 341; SEK 3: 162–163] indicate the original meaning ‘thin.’

#### Innovative meanings

The Kashubian meaning *lëbi* ‘excessively tall, excessively grown’ is secondary. It emerged as a result of an extension followed by a re-narrowing down but with a different dominant: ‘thin’ > ‘thin and tall, spindly’ > ‘excessively tall.’

The further meaning of the Kashubian *lëbi* ‘weakly, weak; delicate’ are a result of a conviction that thinness is associated with a lack of strength.

<sup>44</sup> In Polish -*u-* under the influence of *luby* ‘pleasant’ or the hypercorrect form in reference to the Czech form.

## 5B.2. Western and Eastern \*ščuplъ

### Etymological meaning – obscure

The PSlav etymology of \*ščupati is uncertain. It probably continues the PIE \*skeup-, associated in the PIE context with \*ščipati < \*skeip-, which is an extension of the PIE \*(s)kēi-/(s)kei- ‘to cut.’

### Structural meaning ‘touched; groped’

The PSlav \*ščuplъ is an early participle of \*ščupati ‘to touch, to grope.’ The structural meaning ‘touched; groped’ could have emerged in reference to an image of someone ‘whose bones may be groped,’ i.e. someone ‘thin.’

### The meaning based on continuants ‘thin’

The innovative meanings, which are discussed below, indicate the PSlav meaning ‘thin,’ which at the later stage of the development assumed a positive or negative tone, determining the further semantic development (cf. Polish *szczupły* ‘slender,’ earlier ‘thin, poor,’ early Czech *štíplý*, Slovak *štíplý* ‘thin, slender’).<sup>45</sup>

### Innovative meanings

In a part of western Slavdom there occurred a modification of the meaning which assumed positive overtones. Unlike in East Slavic languages where the emergence of the meaning ‘miserable, shabby’ is testimony to the preservation of the negative overtones (cf. the Russian *унылый* ‘weakly, miserable,’ Belarusian *унылы* ‘idem,’ Ukrainian *унылий* ‘idem’).

## 5B.3. \*tъščъ

### Etymological meaning ‘empty’

The PSlav \*tъščъ is based on the PIE \*tus-k̑o- ‘empty,’ which refers to \*teu-s- ‘to be empty.’ Exact equivalents are found in Baltic languages (Lithuanian *tūščias* ‘empty,’ Latvian *tukšs* ‘empty; poor’) and in OInd (*tucchyá-* ‘empty; miserable, slight’) [Pokorny: 1085; Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 4: 90–91].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘empty’

The continuants clearly indicate the original meaning ‘empty,’ cf. the Polish *czczy* (Old Polish and dial. *tszczy*) ‘empty, irrelevant,’ early ‘poor,’ Old Czech *tščí* ‘empty; hungry,’ Old Church Slavonic *tъštъ* ‘empty, futile,’ dial. Slovene *těšč* ‘empty,’ Serbian and Croatian *tāšt* ‘empty,’ Old Russian *моуу* ‘empty; inconspicuous, miserable,’ Russian *моуу* ‘thin,’ shabby, miserable; empty, inane,’ Ukrainian *моуу* ‘empty,’ Belarusian *мошчы* ‘empty.’

### Innovative meanings

From the original ‘empty’ there arose meanings which referred both to the physical human properties and states (the Russian ‘thin, emaciated; miserable,’ early Polish ‘poor, scanty’; Kashubian and Old Czech ‘hungry,’ the already Old Russian ‘miserable’)

<sup>45</sup> Machek<sup>2</sup>: 625 classifies the Czech *štíhlý*, Slovak *štíhly* ‘idem’ within the same family.

as well as to the evaluation of his products, e.g., by way of metaphorization there emerged the Polish meaning ‘insignificant’ and the Old Church Slavonic meaning ‘futile, unnecessary.’

#### 5B.4. Western \**сѣkромѣнѣ*

##### **Etymological meaning** ‘cut off’

The PSlav \**kromъ* is the nominal form to the PIE \*(s)*krem-*, which is an extension of the root \**ker-* ‘to cut.’

##### **Structural meaning** ‘cut off’

It is derived from the PSlav \**kromъ* ‘a piece that was cut off; a slice (of bread)’ with the suffix *-ѣнѣ* and the prefix *сѣ-* [Boryś: 554].

##### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘moderate; limited; small’ > ‘modest’

The meanings ‘modest; limited; small’ are attested in Polish *skromny* and Czech *skromný*. The secondary ‘modest’ occurs also in the USorb *skromny* and the Slovak *skromný*, as well as in borrowings: Russian *скромный*, Bulgarian *скромен*, Serbian and Croatian *skroman*.

##### **Innovative meanings**

It is difficult to establish whether in Kashubian the meaning ‘thin’ aside ‘poor’ is a result of the semantic development ‘modest’ > ‘poor’ > ‘thin’ or is a *residuum* of the structural meaning ‘cut off’.

#### 5B.5. \**šibъkъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** [cf. VIOLENT, 10A.4, p. 207]

##### **Structural meaning** ‘one that can be brandished, waved’

The Slovene *šibek* is an indirect Slovene derivative from \**šiba* ‘with, a long thin twig,’ which is the nomen instrumenti from \**šibati* ‘to make violent movements; to throw, to hit; to hurl,’ formally equal to the PSlav \**šibъkъ* [Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 725].<sup>46</sup> It is included in the work due to the formal conformity with the Proto-Slavic lexeme which is discussed in it.

##### **Innovative meanings**

By extending its range of application, the Slovene *šibek* ‘pliant, supple; thin (of a twig)’ assumed the meanings ‘thin, slender; weak, delicate’ to refer to people [see also WEAK, 6B.17, p. 180].

<sup>46</sup> Unlike Boryś: 609, who claims that Slovene word is a continuant of the PSlav \**šibъkъ* ‘violent,’ ‘fast,’ which is discussed in VIOLENT 10A.4, p. 207.

5B.6. \**chudъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure ‘crushed; crumbled’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.3, p. 105]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘thin,’ ‘weak,’ ‘small, slight,’ ‘miserable, bad,’ ‘poor’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

Due to the obscurity of the original semantics it is difficult to establish which of the meanings of the PSlav \**chudъ* is a direct motivation of the meaning ‘thin’ (e.g. Polish *chudy*). Each of the meanings which were mentioned above as already Proto-Slavic ones could play such a role either on the basis of a series of meanings: ‘weak’ > ‘thin’ and ‘small’ > ‘thin’ or of an evaluation: ‘bad’ > ‘thin,’ or of the series cause > effect: ‘poor’ > ‘thin.’

5B.7. \**chvorъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘wounded; festering’ [see SICK, 7B.1, p. 186].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘sick’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

‘Thin’ is the only attested meaning of the Old Czech *chvorý* : *chorý*. It is also attested by the derivatives *chvorost* : *chorost* ‘thinness.’ The change of meaning is based on the association between sickness and an emaciated body.

5B.8. \**dikъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 207]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘unused by people’ > ‘untamed’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The basis of the meaning ‘thin, slender, miserable’ of the dial. Russian *дикуй* is presumably based on the opposition between the herd of fattener animals with the animals which live in the wild, with a secondary application of the adjective also to people.

5B.9. \**lagodьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘arranged/well-mannered; decent’ (?) ‘weak’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.3, p. 116].

**Structural meaning** ‘mild, calm; harmonious’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘kind, pleasant,’ ‘mild, calm’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The LSorb meaning of *tagodny* 'delicate; slender; thin' arose by way of the narrowing down of the meaning of the property which refers to the structure of the body. Other results of the narrowing down include the USorb meanings of *tahodny* 'delicate, weakly, frail'. All of the properties which are mentioned here constitute one string of meanings.

### 5B.10. \*slabъ

**Etymological meaning** 'flaccid, slack' > 'weak' [see WEAK, 6B.1, p. 173]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'weak' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning 'thin; slender' occurs in South Slavic languages aside 'weak' (Bulgarian *слаб*, Macedonian *слаб*).

## Summary of Semantic Changes

### 5B.1. \*libъ

THIN Western ← WEAK etym.

### 5B.2. \*ščuplъ

THIN Western, Eastern ← ONE THAT IS TOUCHED/GROPED struct.

### 5B.3. \*tъščъ

THIN Russian ← MISERABLE Russian ← EMPTY PSlav

### 5B.4. \*szkromъnъ

#### 5B.4.1.

THIN Kashubian ← CUT OFF struct. (?)

or

#### 5B.4.2.

THIN Kashubian ← POOR dial. Polish, Kashubian ← MODERATE PSlav ← CUT OFF struct.

### 5B.5. \*šibъkъ

THIN Slovene ← SUCH AS A TWIG Slovene

### 5B.6. \*chudъ

#### 5B.6.1.

THIN Western, Eastern ← WEAK PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

#### 5B.6.2.

THIN Western, Eastern ← SMALL PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

#### 5B.6.3.

THIN Western, Eastern ← BAD PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

5B.6.4.

THIN Western, Eastern ← POOR PSlav

5B.7. \**chvorъ*

THIN Czech ← SICK PSlav

5B.8. \**dikъ*

THIN dial. Russian ← ONE THAT LIVES IN THE WILD PSlav

5B.9. \**lagodъnъ*

SLENDER LSorb ← DELICATE Western ← MILD PSlav

5B.10. \**slabъ*

THIN Bulgarian, Macedonian ← WEAK PSlav ← FLACCID etym.

Similarly as in the case of the concept ‘fat’ it is worthwhile to direct one’s attention to the pole of the value of association. Negative overtones dominate: there are motivations through weakness (\**libъ*, \**slabъ*, \**chudъ* (?)), sickness (\**chvorъ*), poverty (\**tъščъ*, \**тъkromъnъ* – alternatively, \**chudъ* (?)), or smallness (\**chudъ* (?)), as well as the lack of care on the part of people (\**dikъ*). As far as \**chudъ* which was mentioned here a number of times, is concerned, the direction of motivation is not clear, whereas the negative overtones (or even its bad evaluation – bad) is beyond doubt. The motivation of thinness through pinching or groping (\**щупъ*) is a mysterious problem. Presumably, cutting (\**тъkromъnъ*) should be considered an ironically suggestive motivation. The only motivation which has distinctly positive overtones is mildness – \**lagodъnъ*.

## 6A. STRONG

### 6A.1. \**mogъnъ*

#### Etymological and structural meaning ‘strong’

The PSlav \**mogъ* ‘power, strength’ continues the PIE nominal form with the suffix *-ti-*: \**mag<sup>h</sup>-ti* ‘power, strength’ whose basis is the root \**mag<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to be able to do sth, the have the ability to do sth, to be capable of doing sth’ [ESSJ 19: 113; Pokorny: 695]. The closest equivalents are found in Germanic languages: Gothic *mahts* ‘strength’, Anglo-Saxon *maght*, Old High German *maht* ‘idem’ from the Proto-Germanic \**mah-ti-* ‘strength, power’ [Kluge<sup>23</sup>: 530].

#### Structural meaning ‘strong’

The PSlav \**mogъnъ* is a denominativum with the suffix *-nъ* from \**mogъ* ‘power’

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘strong’

The continuants of the PSlav \**mogъnъ* occur in all Slavic languages with the meaning ‘strong’ (e.g. the Czech *mocný*, Old Church Slavonic *moŝъnъ*, dial. Russian *мо́чный*).

## Innovative meanings

The concept 'strong' extends the semantic range especially toward the expression of considerable intensity.

### 6A.2. \*silьnъ

#### Etymological meaning 'tense'

The PSlav \**silā* 'strength, power'<sup>47</sup> is a continuant of the PIE nominal form with the suffix *-lā-*: \**sēj-lā-*. The closest equivalents are found in Baltic languages: the Lithuanian *siela* 'soul,' Old Prussian *seilin* (acc.) 'effort, attempt; strength.' The basis of the form is the PIE *sē(i)-*: *se(i)-* 'to tighten, to stretch,' cf. OIr *sínim* 'to tighten; to place in a vertical orientation' and the Old Norse *seilask* 'to stretch oneself' [Pokorny: 890; Vasmer<sup>2</sup>: 2, 624; Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 654, cf. also Mur'janov 1982].

#### Structural meaning 'strong'

The PSlav \**silьnъ* is a denominativum with the suffix *-ьnъ* from \**silā* 'strength, power.'

#### The meaning based on continuants 'strong'

The continuants of the PSlav \**silьnъ* occur in all Slavic languages with the meaning 'strong' (e.g. the Czech *silný*, Old Church Slavonic *silьnъ*, Russian *сильный*).

## Innovative meanings

The development of the meanings of the continuants is analogous to the development of the continuants of other adjectives with the same meaning, cf. \**mogъnъ* above.

### 6A.3. \*krěpъ/\*krěpъkъ

#### Etymological meaning – uncertain 'strong,' 'durable' (?)

The PSlav \**krěpъ* and the \**krěpъkъ* which is extended by the suffix *-kъ* do not have certain etymologies. For an overview of explanations [cf. Sławski 3: 223].<sup>48</sup> Among the

<sup>47</sup> The semantics of the PSlav \**silā* in the most remote times are described in a more comprehensive manner by Mur'janov [1982].

<sup>48</sup> A new view about the emergence and the original semantics of the PSlav \**krěpъ* is presented in ESSJ:

"Хотя значительная часть продолжений праслав. \**krěpъkъ* по слав. языкам и диалектам имеет значение 'сильный, крепкий,' это значение по-видимому не было основным и первоначальным для нашего слова. В силу способности производных сохранять подчас более ранние значения, прежде характеризовавшие производящее слово, именно производный глагол \**krěpъnъti* (см.) с его заметными значениями 'цепенеть, делаться твердым, густеть' показывает древний характер значения 'твердый, жесткий,' факультативно выступающего у прилаг. \**krěpъkъ* (см. выше)" [ESSJ 12: 137–138].

("Although a considerable part of the continuants of the PSlav \**krěpъkъ* in Slavic languages and dialects has the meaning 'strong, powerful,' this meaning clearly was not the main and original meaning of the word here discussed. Due to the ability of the derivatives to preserve earlier meanings sometimes, which earlier were typical for a given world, it is the derivative \**krěpъnъti* (qv.) with its interesting meanings 'to stiffen, to become hard, to become dense' demonstrates the

suggestions which are mentioned there the most convincing one has to do with the relationship with the Old Norse *hrǣfa* 'to endure, to bear' with the PIE *\*krēp-*, which is wrongly questioned by Sławski due to semantic reasons.<sup>49</sup> The verbal meaning of the PIE *\*krēp-* should be reconstructed as 'to be strong; enduring.' Such an explanation is favoured by the majority of etymologists [Berneker: 614; Pokorny: 620 *et alii*].<sup>50</sup>

**The meanings based on continuants** 'strong, powerful; resistant, durable (of objects)' > 'hard, resistant, durable (of objects)' > 'strong, resistant (of people)'

I reconstruct the meaning 'strong' on the basis of the common presence of this meaning in the continuants; the meaning 'hard' on the basis of: the Old Polish *krzepki* 'hard, stiff/rigid,' Slovene *krépek* 'hard,' Old Russian *крѣпѣкъи* 'hard; dense; durable (11th c.)' and 'fortified, inaccessible, about a stronghold' (12th c.), Russian *крѣпкій* 'hard; durable,' Belarusian *крѣпкі* 'idem,' and in Old Belarusian also 'stern; stubborn' in reference to people; presumably a similar origin is also featured by the Slovak *krepy* 'boorish.' One may suppose that the original meaning of the PSlav *\*krěpъ(kъ)* was 'strong, powerful; durable, permanent,' therefore a meaning which refers not to people but to materials. One may reconstruct a polysemous meaning already for the Proto-Slavic language depending on the referent: 'hard, durable, permanent (of objects)' and 'tolerant; strong (of people).'

### Innovative meanings

When one conducts such a reconstruction one should consider the meanings based on 'strong, characterized by physical strength, and therefore 'brisk, jaunty; vigorous' in Czech *křepký* and Slovak *krepyký* and 'vigorous; nimble, skillful' in the Serbian and Croatian

---

early nature of the meaning 'hard, rough,' which optionally occurs with the adjective *\*krěpъkъ* (*vide supra*.)")

Although I consider the claim that the original meaning of the PSlav *\*krěpъ*, *\*krěpъkъ* differed from the meanings of the PSlav adjectives *\*silъnъ* and *\*mogъnъ* as well as the reconstructions of the original meaning justified, I completely disagree with the subsequent line of reasoning in which there is a suggestion that originally the words of the word family under research referred to a stiffening corpse and due to this one must seek an etymological link with Indo-European words which mean 'body.' Cf. "Классический и самый яркий образ того, что цепенеет, твердеет, застывает, – это образ **тела, которое покидает жизнь** [emphasis after the ESSJ]" ("The classical and most distinct image of the thing which stiffens, becomes hard and sets is the image of **the body from which life departs**") [ESSJ 12: 137]. This statement alone is questionable because it seems that the classical image of congealing has to do with the transformation of a liquid into a solid state. I think that there are no grounds to accept the hypothesis about an etymological relationship between the PSlav *\*krěpъ* with the Latin *corpus* and other Indo-European words with a similar meaning. See ESSJ 12: 137–138.

<sup>49</sup> According to Franciszek Sławski: "Zestawienie z stnord. hrǣfa 'ściерpieć, znieść, wytrzymać' (...) kwestionuje różnica znaczeń" ("A comparison with the Old Norse *hrǣfa* 'to endure, to bear, to stand' [...] is questioned by the difference of the meanings.") [Sławski: 3, 223]. If one assumes the meanings 'durable, permanent, strong' as the original meanings (*vide* the argumentation *infra*), I consider the semantic relationship with the word that is put into question as completely legitimate.

<sup>50</sup> The main drawback of this etymology is the poorly attested PIE *\*krēp-*. According to Julius Pokorny, its continuants exist only in the Slavic languages and the Old Norse word that was mentioned, and the Welsh *craff* 'fast' which is classified here is supposed to be borrowed from the Old Norse *krappr* < PIE *\*grep-* [Pokorny: 620], although the Norse word which is quoted here occurs only with the meaning 'wide; limited; difficult' [Heidermanns: 342].

*krěpak* (whereas ‘firm; ruddy’ in the same languages usually continues the meaning ‘hard’) as ones that are undoubtedly innovative. On the basis of the proximity of meanings there emerged the Bulgarian *крѣпѣк* and Macedonian *крѣпок* ‘strong’ apart from ‘strong’. Without doubt innovative are the figurative meanings – colloq. ‘rich, affluent’ in East Slavic languages on the basis of which through the change of the dominant and the narrowing down of the meaning there emerged the meanings ‘frugal; stingy’ in Russian dialects. The conceptual development (cf. *\*mogъnъ*, 6A.1, p. 160) expresses itself in the assumption of a part of fixed collocations which refer to intensity, cf. the Russian “*крѣпкій чай*.”

#### 6A.4. *\*tōgъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘strained tight; taut, tense’

The PSlav *\*tōgъ* alternates with the PSlav *\*tęgti* ‘to stretch, to tighten,’ which is derived from the PIE *\*t<sup>h</sup>eng<sup>h</sup>*.<sup>51</sup> ‘to draw.’ For the PIE *\*t<sup>h</sup>ong<sup>h</sup>-o-* there are no attested words which would be the basis of *\*tōgъ* apart from Slavic languages.

**Structural meaning** ‘stretched tight; taut, tense’

It is probably derived in the Proto-Slavic context, with a root apophony which continued to thrive in the Proto-Slavic language, from *\*tęgti* ‘to draw, to stretch.’ Cf. *supra*.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘stretched tight’ > ‘hard,’ Western and Southern ‘strong’

The meanings of the continuants vary, which are mentioned below in the paragraph “Innovative meanings” and which may be derived from the original ‘stretched tight; taut,’ present in the East Slavic languages and clearly discernible in secondary meanings, which are present in those languages. Presumably the meaning ‘strong’ still developed commonly. It is attested in the Church Slavonic *tōgъ* ‘strong’ and in West Slavic languages. It is difficult to say whether its direct motivation was the meaning ‘flexed (of muscles)’ or the meaning ‘hard,’ which is also derived from ‘hard.’

#### Innovative meanings

Innovative meanings: ‘enduring,’ ‘stubborn’ and ‘difficult’ in Czech, ‘intensive; zealous’ in Czech and Slovak, ‘robust; fat,’ as well as ‘brave,’ ‘wealthy’ in Polish emerged in West Slavic languages on the basis of ‘strong; hard.’ The motivation of the Slovene *tōg* ‘stiff, stiffened’ is either the secondary result of the flexing of the muscles or the meaning ‘hard.’ The secondary meanings in East Slavic languages: ‘compact, cramped, stuffed’ and ‘nimble, firm’ are based on ‘tense; taut’ > ‘hard.’ Apart from these meanings the following figurative meanings emerged: the Russian *мызѳѳ* ‘dull; dumbish,’ ‘hard of hearing,’ Ukrainian *мызѳѳ* ‘stubborn,’ Belarusian *мызѳѳ* ‘dull-witted,’ ‘dull.’

<sup>51</sup> Etymologists are still to reach a conclusion about the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European form [cf. Pokorny: 1067]. The reconstruction with an aspirated *t<sup>h</sup>* – after LIV: 598.

## 6A.5. Western and Eastern \**dǫžb*

### Etymological meaning ‘one that presses’

The PSlav \**dęgnōti* ‘to grow, to harden’ is based on the PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>eng<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to pinch, to press’ [Pokorny: 250]. The semantic development proceeded from ‘to pinch, to press’ to ‘to act with great force,’ hence the nominal meaning ‘strength, power’ in the Slavic languages.<sup>52</sup>

### Structural meaning ‘strong,’ ‘healthy’

The PSlav \**dǫžb* is a denominativum which arose in North Slavic languages as a result of an extension of the noun \**dǫgъ* ‘strength, power; health’ with the suffix *-jb*, which according to SP 4: 195 is an early nomen with *-o-* vocalism to \**dęgnōti* ‘to grow, to harden; to become stronger, healthier.’

### The meaning based on continuants ‘strong’

The meaning ‘strong’ is attested in all languages which feature continuants of the PSlav \**dǫžb* (early Polish *duży*,<sup>53</sup> early Czech *duží*, Slovak *dúži*, Old Russian since the 12th c. *дюжиу* : *дужии*, Ukrainian *дужий*, Belarusian *дужы*). In South Slavic languages the adjective is absent; only the nominal form \**ne-dǫgъ* ‘disease, debility’ is continued. The meaning ‘health’ emerged in a secondary manner from ‘strength,’ which is indicated both by the etymology and the meanings of the adjective \**dǫžb*.

### Innovative meanings

In Ukrainian and Belarusian, as well as in Russian dialects, the meaning ‘healthy’ arose in a parallel manner to the development of the noun \**ne-dǫgъ* ‘disease, debility.’ An innovation which arose in the context of the Polish language is a change of the meaning of the “borrowed” Polish *duży* ‘strong’ > ‘big.’ A similar development in the Ukrainian language is documented by the meaning ‘strapping’ as well as ‘important,’ one that has authority’ (see the chapter about the development of concepts for more information about this subject). The Kashubian derivative with an accreted suffix *-ьнѣ*<sup>54</sup>: *dǫžnii* ‘strong; vigorous, fast, merry’ is a relic which indicates both formally and semantically the unattested Polish \**dqży* ‘strong.’

<sup>52</sup> SP 3: 96 provides the meaning ‘strong, robust’ for the PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>eng<sup>h</sup>-*, which is not satisfactory due to the verbal vocalism of the root.

<sup>53</sup> When one derives the Polish *duży* from the PSlav \**dǫžb* one should explain the origin of *-u-* instead of the PSlav *-o-*; because in this case there are no conditions for dissimilation before a nasal consonant, and the lack of the equivalents with *-u-* in Slovene and Bulgarian does not provide a basis for a reconstruction of the form of \**dužb* alternative to \**dǫžb*, the only possible solution seems to involve a recognition of *duży* as a borrowing from East Slavic languages. I discuss the reasons which make me consider this solution possible in a comprehensive manner in a separate article [Jakubowicz 2009: 135–138].

<sup>54</sup> Apart from Kashubian the derivative with the suffix *-ьнѣ* is attested exclusively by a form with negation [cf. ESS] 24: 127].

## 6A.6. \*čřstvъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘enlaced’ (?), ‘cutting’ (?)

The PSlav \*čřstvъ is usually explained as a continuant of the PIE \*krt-tu-o- – a suffixed nominal form with a reduced vocalism to \*kert- ‘to braid, to enlace, to weave, to tie’ [Pokorny: 584]. Among Proto-Indo-European words (cf. the OInd *krtsná* ‘whole’; Lat. *crassus* ‘fat’) there are no forms which would continue the Proto-Indo-European form with the suffix -tu-. One reconstructs the etymological meaning ‘tightly enlaced, dense, without holes, whole’ by analogy to the aforementioned Indo-European equivalents, which may be recognized as a basis of the meaning which are reconstructed on the basis of the continuants ‘tough, strong’ and ‘healthy’. A drawback of the aforementioned etymology is associated with the lack of non-Slavic proof for the existence of a Proto-Indo-European nominal form with the suffix -tu-.

A different suggestion is presented in ESSJ 4: 160–161, which perceives the PSlav \*čřstvъ (< \*\*čřt-t-vũ) as a derivative of the praesential form of the PSlav \*čersti čřto ‘to cut, to incise, to cut away’ (which is derived in turn from the PIE \*(s)ker- ‘to cut’), as \*mř-t-vъ from \*mřti. It also reconstructs the earlier PSlav \*\*čřstvъ on the basis of derivatives (dial. Slovene *čřsten* ‘idem,’ perhaps also the dial. Polish *cyrski* ‘healthy, robust’), which are considered – probably correctly – by SP 2: 252 as forms which emerged in the context of the particular languages by way of a simplification of consonantal groups. The ESSJ suggests the meanings ‘to beat, to chop’ as a motivational basis of the semantic development – this is done on the basis of such meaning of the Lithuanian *kiřsti kertũ*. However, one should note that the meaning ‘to chop’ is independently attested in Indo-Iranian languages, in Armenian, Albanian and also in Slavic languages. Moreover, even in the Lithuanian language itself, apart from the meanings ‘to cut, to chop’ there is also ‘to cut; to mow’. Therefore, the meanings ‘to cut; to chop’ are without doubt innovations. The development of the meaning from ‘cutting; capable of cutting’ to ‘strong’ (in combat-related vocabulary) should not be ruled out. It would require the location of the alleged derivative in the early Proto-Slavic language before the meaning of the verb \*čřsti specialized itself to ‘to cut; to mark by cutting.’

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘dense; hard; firm,’ ‘vigorous; strong’

The continuants indicate a number of groups of meanings. Their semantics oscillates between meanings which, on the one hand, are associated with hardness and, on the other hand, with vigorousness, and with breeziness and health. Due to the considerable diversity of the continuants I mention the whole body of proof material: Polish *czerstwy* (Old Polish *czarstwy*) ‘vigorous, healthy, stout,’ ‘about bread, hardened,’ early ‘fast, vigorous,’ USorb *čerstwy* ‘fresh, breezy, vigorous; healthy.’ Czech *čerstvý* ‘fresh,’ ‘breezy; vigorous,’ ‘fast,’ ‘healthy,’ Slovak *čerstvý* ‘fresh; refreshing,’ ‘breezy; fast,’ Slovene *čřstev* : *čvřst* ‘strong, robust,’ ‘hard, firm,’ ‘fresh,’ ‘breezy,’ Croatian and Serbian *čvřst* ‘hard, robust; strong; healthy; enduring; firm; dense,’ Church Slavonic *čřstvъ* ‘strong; dense,’ ‘honest,’ ‘important,’ Bulgarian *чврѣст* : *чеврѣст* ‘strong; hard; dense,’ ‘vigorous; skilled,’ ‘fast, diligent,’ Macedonian *чврст* ‘strong, sure,’ ‘dry,’ Russian *чѣрствый* ‘dry, hardened, e.g. about earth,’ early Russian ‘hard, strong; dense,’ Ukrainian *чѣрствий* ‘dry, hardened,’ fig. ‘callous,’ ‘firm, hard; strong; fresh,’ Belarusian *чѣрствы* ‘pure; honest,’ ‘sprightly, fresh.’ The acceptance of the initial meaning ‘firm, hard, especially about farm produce and a young body,’ which may be the basis of the

majority of the aforementioned meanings, seems to be the most feasible solution. Such an initial meaning may be also indicated by the traditional etymology, which enables us to reconstruct the development of the meaning as ‘enlaced’ > ‘dense; hard.’ The etymology which was put forward by Russian etymologists would induce one to accept a different course of the semantic development, *quod vide supra*.

### Innovative meanings

Each of the groups of meanings which are reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language might have been a source of semantic innovations. Hence the opposite meanings of the continuants, such as ‘dry, stale’ from ‘hard,’ and on the other hand, ‘fresh’ from ‘firm.’ The meanings ‘sprightly; fast’ (from which a further development – ‘skillful’ > ‘hard-working’) and ‘healthy’ may be derived from ‘strong.’ However, the latter one, on the basis of the etymology that one accepts, may be considered as the initial one, derived from the etymological meaning ‘cutting; capable of cutting’ or as a secondary meaning in reference to ‘dense, hard; enduring, stout.’

#### 6A.7. \*krǫtъ

##### **Etymological meaning** ‘associated with spinning’

The nominal form at the apophonic grade -o- to the PSlav \*krętati ‘to spin sth; to set sth into a circular motion’ > ‘to set sth in motion.’ The generalized krętati instead of \*\*kretati, which would continue the PIE \*kert- ‘to spin sth, to twist,’ is based on the forms of the present tense with a nasal infix kręťǫ < \*kri-n-t-ĩō (cf. OInd/Vedic praes. kṛṇátti in reference to the OInd root kṛt- ‘to weave,’ where the infixation of the root in the present form is, however, a productive phenomenon and it is not a testimony of the existence of nasalized Proto-Indo-European praesens).

**Structural meaning** ‘twisted’ (vs. ‘winding’; ‘twisting’; see VIOLENT, 10A.10, p. 211)

In all linguistic groups the semantics of the continuants is associated more strictly with the etymological meaning ‘associated with twisting’ instead of the meanings ‘to be in motion, to set sth in motion,’ which occur most frequently in the continuants of the PSlav \*krętati (*sę*). This induces us to reconstruct the initial meaning ‘to spin sth; to set sth into a circular motion.’

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘strongly twisted’ > ‘stiff; hard,’ ‘strong; stout,’ Eastern ‘dense’

One may reconstruct a number of independent semantic strings, whose beginning links, based on structural meanings, emerged already in the Proto-Slavic period. The meaning ‘strong, stout’ had a pan-Slavic range (Old Czech *krutý*, hence the Old Polish *kruty*; USorb *kruty*, LSorb *kšuty*; early Croatian and Serbian *krūt*, early Russian *кpymóу*), and the meaning ‘dense’ (from the earlier meaning ‘boiled to a dense consistency; stiff’) has an East Slavic range. The co-existing meanings in the particular languages induce one to conjecture that the original addition overtones of the meaning ‘strong, stout’ was associated with ‘enduring,’ which indicates the motivation ‘hard’ instead of the theoretically possible motivation – ‘violent.’ [see also STERN, 12A.9, p. 229]

### Innovative meanings

On the basis of the meaning 'strong, stout' there emerged innovative meanings 'great, huge' (Czech *krutý*, early Russian *кρυμόў*) and 'healthy' (early Russian *кρυμού*). The dial. Czech *krúty* 'twisted, e.g. by a disease' is independently motivated by the meaning 'rolled,' similarly as the dial. Polish *kręty* 'convoluted, dishonest,' which was metaphorically applied to the mental sphere.

### 6A.8. \**storbъ*

#### Etymological meaning 'stiff; numb'

The PSlav \**stǫbnŏti* is based on the grade which is reduced in reference to the PIE \*(s)ter- with the determinant -b<sup>h</sup>- 'to stiffen; to become numb,' cf. e.g. the Old High German *sterban* 'to die.' In the Proto-Slavic language there are also continuants of the root without the s- mobile and with an alternative voiceless consonant, namely \**tǫpǣti* \**tǫpnŏti* 'to suffer; to stiffen.'

#### Structural meaning 'hard; stiff'

The basis for this is the Proto-Slavic form at the reduced grade – \**stǫbnŏti* 'to harden; to stiffen.'

#### The meanings based on continuants 'strong,' 'healthy; sprightly'

A weakly attested adjectival form \**storbъ*, reconstructed above all on the basis of the continuants of the denominal \**storbiti* 'to harden, to make sth stiff; to strengthen.'

### 6A.9. \**dob'ъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'appropriate; well-adjusted' [see also \**dobrъ*, GOOD, 1A.1, p. 95]

The PSlav \**dob'ъ* is based on the Proto-Slavic root \**dob-*, which continues the PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>ab<sup>h</sup>-* 'to adjust,' 'appropriate, fitting' [SP 4: 12; Sławski 1: 151].

#### The meaning based on continuants 'appropriate' > 'capable; able to do sth'

The meaning 'appropriate; capable of doing sth' is attested by the Slovene *dóbelj* 'capable of doing sth; one that can do sth.' The basis for the reconstruction is also associated with specialized meanings, *vide infra*.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning 'one that is suitable' (e.g. the Slovene *dóbelj* 'capable, suitable for sth') specialized itself already in the Old Church Slavonic and in the Old Russian languages as 'fit for combat,' hence 'strong,' cf. the OCS *dobl'ъ* 'brave,' 'strong,' Old Russian *доблуу* 'strong, powerful,' 'brave, unflinching,' early Ukrainian *добліў* 'brave,' 'strong.' [See also BRAVE, 13A.12, p. 238]

## 6A.10. \*bъdrъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘vigilant; wakeful’ [see QUICK, 9A.4, p. 199]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘vigilant’ > ‘lively,’ ‘sprightly’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In East Slavic languages, supposedly on the basis of the meaning ‘lively,’ ‘sprightly,’ there emerged innovative meanings – ‘strong; stout; persistent,’ ‘full of strength, of energy’ (Old Russian бодрый, Russian бодрый, Ukrainian бодрий, Belarusian бадзёры).

## 6A.11. Western and Southern \*drěčьnъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘elongated lengthwise’ [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.2, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** ‘resembling a pillar, a tree trunk’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘well-grown’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘strong,’ which emerged from ‘well-grown,’ may be a common Slovene-Croatian and Slovak innovation. This is indicated by the lack of this meaning in Czech. In Slovak it became a basis of the new meaning – ‘brave,’ and in Croatian of the meaning ‘good’ [see BRAVE, 13A.10, p. 138, GOOD, 1A.13, p. 102].

## 6A.12. \*jędrъ/jędrьnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘swollen’ (?) ‘one that is at the center, core (adj.)’ (?) [see FAT, 5A.3, p. 150]

**Structural meaning** ‘having a core’ (?) (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘full of vigor; stout, firm’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The direct motivation of the meaning ‘strong,’ which is a common meaning of the continuants of \*jędrьnъ, as well as of \*jędrъ in South Slavic languages (Croatian and Serbian *jędar*, Bulgarian *ęдр*) is either ‘fat’ (when one accepts an etymology based on the PIE \*oǵd- ‘to swell’) or ‘full of vigor’ (when one accepts a relationship with \*ętro).

## 6A.13. \*sporъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘successful, fruitful’ [see FAT, 5A.5, p. 151]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘efficient, abundant’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings which refer to physical properties, connote strength, even if they do not express it directly, e.g. the early Polish *spory* 'fast; capable,' Russian *спóрый* 'capable,' Belarusian (with the suffix *-ьны*) *спóрны* 'quick,' Czech *spory* 'eager, zealous; prompt' aside 'strong; vigorous, stout.'

#### 6A.14. \*čilʔ

**Etymological meaning** 'rested' [see HEALTHY, 7A.4, p. 184]

**Structural meaning** 'resting,' 'rested' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'rested' > 'lively/crisp,' 'sprightly' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning 'strong' in Slovene, Croatian, Serbian and Ukrainian is a result of the emergence of another link in the semantic string: 'rested' > 'lively/crisp,' 'sprightly.'

#### 6A.15. \*jarʔ

**Etymological meaning** 'of spring' [see VIOLENT, 10A.8, p. 210]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'born or sown in spring'; 'violent, lustful' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The association of youth and lustfulness with strength has resulted in the emergence of the semantic strings 'young' > 'strong' and 'lustful' > 'strong.'

#### 6A.16. \*polchʔ

**Etymological meaning** 'set in motion; setting in motion; mobile' [see TIMID, 13B.1, p. 241]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'eager to run; eager to flee' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning 'stout, strong' in Croatian and Serbian is a development of the meaning 'quick, violent,' which is derived from the meaning 'eager to run.' The latter meaning is not attested directly in continuants.

## 6A.17. \*grozъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘inspiring fear; terrible’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘fearful; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

The meanings ‘strong, powerful, mighty,’ aside ‘great,’ emerged in the Old Russian *грозьныи* and the Ukrainian *грізний*.

## 6A.18. \*strogъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘caring’ > ‘one that is on guard’ [see STERN, 12A.2, p. 226]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘strict, stern’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘great, strong’ of the Kashubian *strogi* result from the inference that ‘strictness, sternness’ must be based on strength, cf. also GOOD, 1A.15, p. 102.

## 6A.19. \*lichъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘the one who remains; the one who remained’ [see BAD, 1B.4, p. 107]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘excessive,’ ‘uneven (of numbers etc.)’ > ‘bad, miserable’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘strong,’ aside the meaning ‘excessive’ inherited from the PSlav language, is an innovation attested in the Old Russian language. Further development in the Russian language in the direction of ‘capable, sprightly,’ attested in dialects, is testimony of an extension of the reference of the meaning ‘strong’ to include humans [cf. also DARING, 13A.16, p. 239].

## 6A.20. \*sъdorvъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘(made) of good wood’ [see HEALTHY, 7A.1, p. 182]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘healthy’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘vigorous; strong, powerful; incolumis, intact,’ which occur aside ‘healthy’ (e.g. as in the case of the Bulgarian *здрав*) are examples of a developmental string.

6A.21. \**snažьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see DILIGENT, 15A.5, p. 253]

**Structural meaning** ‘careful’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘clean,’ ‘diligent, zealous,’ ‘strong’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The original Proto-Slavic meaning, and therefore also the sequence of the meanings that emerged, is difficult to establish due to the considerable semantic discrepancy among the continuants and the unknown etymological meaning. The meaning ‘strong’ occurs in South Slavic languages (Serbian and Croatian *snážan*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *снажен*) and in the dial. Ukrainian *снажний*.

6A.22. \**děľьnъ*

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with work, with the effect of work’ [see DILIGENT, 15A.6, p. 252]

**The meaning based on continuants** Western ‘hard-working,’ Eastern ‘resourceful’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

On the basis of the meaning ‘capable of working’ there emerged the dial. Polish *dzielny* ‘strong, enduring.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

6A.1. \**mogьnъ*

STRONG PSlav ← STRONG etym. PIE

6A.2. \**silьnъ*

STRONG PSlav ← TENSE etym.

6A.3. \**krěpъ* \**krěpьkъ*

STRONG PSlav ← DURABLE etym.

6A.4. \**tqgъ*

## 6A.4.1.

STRONG Western, Church Slavonic ← HARD PSlav ← STRAINED TIGHT PSlav ← ONE THAT IS BEING STRETCHED TIGHT struct.

or

## 6A.4.2.

STRONG Western, Church Slavonic ← STRAINED TIGHT PSlav ← ONE THAT IS BEING STRETCHED TIGHT struct.

6A.5. \**dǫžb*

STRONG Northern ← ONE THAT PRESSES etym.

6A.6. \**čǫstvǫ*

6A.6.1.

STRONG PSlav ← ENDURING PSlav ← HARD PSlav ← ENLACED etym.

or

6A.6.2.

STRONG PSlav ← BEATING etym.

6A.7. \**krǫtv*

STRONG PSlav ← HARD PSlav ← TWISTED struct.

6A.8. \**storbǫ*

STRONG PSlav ← HARD struct. ← STIFF struct. ← NUMB etym.

6A.9. \**dobʹb*

STRONG PSlav ← CAPABLE OF FIGHTING PSlav ← APPROPRIATE etym.

6A.10. \**bǫdrǫ*

STRONG Old Russian, dial. Russian ← LIVELY/SPRIGHTLY Russian ← VIGILANT PSlav  
← WAKEFUL PSlav

6A.11. \**drěčbnǫ*

STRONG Slovak, Slovene, Croatian ← WELL-GROWN Western, Southern ← LIKE A TREE  
TRUNK struct.

6A.12. \**jǫdrǫ*

6A.12.1.

STRONG PSlav ← FULL OF VIGOR PSlav ← HAVING A CORE struct. ← INTERNAL/  
CENTRAL etym.

or

6A.12.2.

STRONG PSlav ← FAT PSlav ← SWOLLEN etym.

6A.13. \**sporǫ*

STRONG Czech ← EFFICIENT PSlav ← ABUNDANT PSlav

6A.14. \**čilǫ*

STRONG Slovene, Ukrainian ← SPRIGHTLY PSlav ← LIVELY PSlav ← RESTED struct.

6A.15. \**jarǫ*

6A.15.1.

STRONG dial. Polish ← YOUNG Western ← BORN THIS SPRING PSlav ← OF SPRING etym.

or

6A.15.2.

STRONG dial. Polish ← LUSTFUL Western ← PECULIAR TO SPRING etym.

6A.16. \**polchǫ*

STRONG Croatian, Serbian ← VIOLENT Croatian, Serbian ← EAGER TO RUN PSlav ←  
MOBILE etym.

6A.17. \**grozbnǫ*

STRONG Eastern ← TERRIFYING PSlav ← TERRIBLE PSlav

6A.18. \**strogǫ*

STRONG Kashubian ← TERRIBLE Polish ← IRATE PSlav ← ONE THAT STANDS ON  
GUARD struct. ← CAREFUL etym.

## 6A.19. \*lichъ

STRONG Old Russian ← EXCESSIVE PSlav ← ONE THAT REMAINED PSlav

## 6A.20. \*szadorъ

STRONG pan-Slavic ← HEALTHY PSlav ← \*STRONG ↔ \*HARD ← (MADE) OF GOOD WOOD etym.

## 6A.21. \*snažъ

STRONG PSlav (?) obscure

## 6A.22. \*dělnъ

STRONG dial. Polish ← CAPABLE OF WORKING Polish ← HARD-WORKING PSlav

A particularly great number of the motivations of the concept 'strong' were formed already during the period of the Proto-Indo-European community. Apart from the inherited motivation, which therefore is no longer legible (\*mogъ), they refer to five lexemes (\*silъ, \*krěpkъ, \*džъ, \*dobъ, \*lichъ). Of course, there is a dominance of motivations associated with physical properties: hardness (\*čъstvъ, \*krōtъ, \*storbъ, \*tōgъ – alternatively), with the reasons of hardness which are indicated by indirect motivations: tension (\*tōgъ), numbness (\*storbъ), being enlaced (\*čъstvъ) or being twisted (\*krōtъ), fatness/thickness (jēdrъ – alternatively). In a number of cases there is emphasis upon the use of physical strength – these motivations are associated with stretching sth tight (\*silъ, \*tōgъ; see above for information about the possibility of a different understanding of this motivation), pressure (\*džъ), perhaps also beating (\*čъstvъ (?)). Motivation by way of the following causes is also possible: youth (\*jarъ – alternatively), health (\*szadorъ), and on the other hand, by way of effect – inspiring fear (\*grozъ, \*strogъ), but also by way of the capability of working (\*dělnъ) or the capability of fighting (\*dobъ). Some motivations emphasize the original nature of the strength to which the lexeme referred, on the one hand – endurance (\*krěpkъ, \*čъstvъ), on the other hand – vitality (\*jarъ, jēdrъ – both alternatively), violence (\*polchъ), sprightliness (\*bъdrъ, \*čilъ). The associations that are invoked by strength also include abundance (\*sporъ) and excess (\*lichъ).

## 6B. WEAK

### 6B.1. \*slabъ

#### **Etymological meaning** 'flaccid, sagging' > 'weak'

The PSlav \*slabъ is derived by scholars from the PIE \*(s)lōb- (or (s)lāb-), a nominal derivative from the PIE \*(s)lēb- \*(s)leb- 'to be flaccid, weak, sagging' [Pokorny: 655, 959; Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 665], cf. the Lithuanian *slōpti slōpstu* (with the devoicing of -b-) 'to become

weak, to faint,' Gothic *slēpan* 'to sleep,' Old High German *slāff(an)* 'idem,' Latin *labi* 'to slide down, to fall.' On the basis of a comparison with the equivalents from Indo-European languages: Latvian *slābs* 'weak; indistinct, bland,' Old High German *slaf* 'weak, flaccid,' 'sluggish, drowsy,' one may reconstruct a nominal derivative with the meaning 'weak' already for the Proto-Indo-European period.

### The meaning based on continuants 'weak'

The meaning 'weak' is common in all languages except Slovene (e.g. the Czech *slabý*, Old Church Slavonic *slabъ*, Russian *слабый*).

### Innovative meanings

Innovative meanings arose in the Slovene language where the meaning 'weak' was assumed by a derivative, and the form which was inherited from the Proto-Slavic language assumed the meanings 'bad; of low quality' (a shift of the semantic dominant from slight physical force to inferior quality which is caused by weakness) and 'incomplete, not full' (a shift of the semantic dominant in the quantitative direction). The meaning 'thin,' included in the connotative sphere of the concept 'weak,' became a secondary meaning of the Serbian *slāb* and Bulgarian *слаб*. The meanings 'sickly,' 'deficient' arise according to the development which is peculiar to this concept and they are usually registered as secondary meanings or semantic variants.

## 6B.2. \*mъdьlъ

### Etymological meaning – obscure

It is difficult to indicate a reliable Proto-Indo-European basis; perhaps there is a relationship with *\*mau* 'weak; indistinct,' continued in the Greek *μαυρός* 'weak, miserable; unclear, eclipsed.' Comparisons are also made with the Latvian *muđēt mudu* 'to grow mouldy' and the Lithuanian *maūsti maudžiū* 'to ache slightly; to ache' [Rejzek: 369] but it is difficult to find a common semantic element in all of these attempts.

### Structural meaning 'slow' > 'tired, weak'

The PSlav *\*mъdьlъ* 'weak, frail' is a derivative with the suffix *-ьlъ*<sup>55</sup> from the PSlav *\*mъděti* 'to be weakened, indistinct, tired,' a verb of state probably associated with *\*muditī* 'to procrastinate, to dawdle away with sth; to waste time,' in reference to which *\*mъděti* remains at the grade of reduction. With this assumption the motivation of the verb which is the basis of *\*mъdьlъ* would be 'to be slow, languid' – a meaning which is actually attested in East Slavic languages (cf. the Russian *мѣдлить* 'to dawdle away with sth, to dilly-dally with sth,' Ukrainian *млявий* (< *\*мдлѣвий*) 'drowsy, slow').

### The meaning based on continuants 'weak'

The adjective is attested primarily in West Slavic languages (e.g. the Polish *mdły*, USorb *modły*, Czech *mdlý*), as well as in Slovene (*meděl*). The meaning 'weak' exists in all of the aforementioned languages. In the eastern part of Slavdom only an adverbial form is attested: dial. Ukrainian *мло* 'bad, not well.'

<sup>55</sup> The alternative form *\*mъdlъ* [cf. Babik 2009: 99], which would indicate a participial origin of the adjective, is reconstructed less frequently.

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings are a result of various interpretations of the property of weakness. In West Slavic languages and in Slovene there emerged the meaning ‘in-distinct, nondescript’ (Polish *mdły*, Czech and Slovak *mdlý*, Slovene *medèl*), in Slovene there is also ‘thin,’ whereas in Lower Sorbian (*mdły*, dial. *medły*) – ‘dead’ – which may be considered a hyperbolization of the original ‘weak.’

### 6B.3. Western and Southern \**klĕkavъ* : *klĕcavъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘slanting, bent’

The PSlav form \**klĕkti*, which is not attested in the material, is based on \**klenk-* ‘to genuflect,’ attested only in Baltic (cf. Lithuanian *klĕnkti klĕnkiu* ‘to walk/go fast’) and in Slavic languages [LIV: 323]. The form \**klenk-k-* is certainly another extension of the PIE \**kle-n* with the determinant *-n-* ‘to bow, to bend,’ which presents a grade of reduction in reference to the PIE \**kel-* ‘idem.’

#### Structural meaning ‘kneeling’

The derivatives with the suffix *-avъ* from the PSlav \**klĕkati* : \**klĕcati* are iteratives from the unattested \**klĕkti*.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘shaky; limping’

The meaning ‘limping, one that is on his or her last legs’ is attested by the Old Czech *klĕcavý* ‘limping,’ Slovene *klĕcav* ‘one that is on his or her last legs,’ Serbian and Croatian *klĕkav* : *klĕcav* ‘one that staggers; shaky, unsure.’

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘weak’ arose in Bulgarian and Macedonian which feature the variant *klĕkav*.

### 6B.4. \**chylъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘bent’

The PSlav \**chylъ* is interpreted either as a deverbativum of \**chyliti* or as an original adiectivum based on the PIE root \*(*s*)*koṷ-* : \*(*s*)*keṷ-* ‘to bend,’ extended by the determinant *-l-* which is present also in the PSlav \**chuliti* ‘to huddle oneself up, to curl oneself up, to bend oneself.’ The form \**chylъ* would be a variant with a shortened root vowel [Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 4: 236].

**Structural meaning ‘inclined’** (only in the case of derivation from \**chyliti*, cf. *supra*)

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘bowed’

The original meaning ‘one that stoops, bowed’ is preserved in the Czech *chylý*, early Slovene *hił*, as well as in Polish and Belarusian dialects.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning 'weak' (cf. Russian *хилый* 'weak, frail, sickly', Belarusian *хілы* 'weak, sickly, doddering, old', the Bulgarian *хил* 'emaciated, frail, weak' is derived also from Russian) is motivated by an association between a stooping man and weakness and infirmity. The meanings 'sickly; frail,' 'old, doddering' emerged for the same reason. It is difficult to establish the direction of the motivation of secondary meanings. It is likely that they arose in a parallel manner, by motivating each other. Cf. also LAZY, 15B.6, p. 258.

## 6B.5. Western and Eastern *\*rychlъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'associated with digging, digging; dug' [see FAST, 9A.1, p. 197]

**Structural meaning** Eastern 'mobile; set in motion' vs. Western 'moving; mobile' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** Eastern 'mobile, unstable' > 'mellow/chubby; porous; flabby' vs. Western 'mobile' > 'fast'

The continuants which occur in East Slavic languages indicate the original meaning 'moving, unstable,' from which probably there emerged already in the Proto-Slavic period secondary meanings (e.g. the Russian *рыхлый* 'porous; mellow, soft, Belarusian *рыхлы* 'idem,' Ukrainian *рыхлий* 'lacking density, porous; loose'). A different situation occurs in West Slavic languages, cf. FAST, 9A.1, p. 197.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning 'obese; fat' (colloq. Russian *рыхлый*) is based on the meaning 'mellow/chubby; soft.' 'Weak' is indirectly attested upon the meaning 'mellow; soft,' hence further, dial. Russian meanings 'sick; sickly,' as well as 'flabby, withered.'

## 6B.6. *\*rъchlъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'set in motion' (?), 'raked up' (?)

The etymology and the PSlav form is uncertain. Perhaps it is a participle in *-lъ* from the PSlav verb with reduced vocalism – *\*rъch-*, alternative to *rach-*, which is further related with *\*rychlъ* (cf. 6B.5), *\*ruchъ*. This may be indicated by the striking convergence of the semantic development with the East Slavic continuants of the dial. PSlav *\*rychlъ* [Bezlaj 3: 145]. Snoj reconstructs the form *\*rachlъ* as a participle from the PSlav *\*rasti rašъ* 'to rake, to stab; to cultivate (soil)' [Snoj<sup>2</sup>: 599].

**The meaning based on continuants** 'soft; weak, impermanent'

The meaning is reconstructed on the basis of the Croatian *rāhao* 'mellow; soft; impermanent,' Slovene *rāhel* 'delicate, weak'

6B.7. \**otъlъ***Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘rotten’ (?)

The etymology is uncertain; there are various hypotheses of which the most likely one is discussed below.

**Structural meaning** – uncertain ‘rotten’ (?)

It is probably a deverbativum from the prefixed/prefixal \**vъ-tъlěti* ‘to rot; to become hollow,’ in which the verbal prefix \**vъ-* assumed the form *o-*, which is peculiar to nominal forms [Boryś: 682].

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘rotten,’ ‘full of holes; hollow, empty’

The original meaning ‘rotten; hollow’ is attested by a number of continuants: the Old Polish *wątlý* ‘rotten, hollow,’ USorb *wutlý* ‘idem,’ Slovene *vótel* ‘idem,’ cf. also the Old Church Slavonic *otъlъ* ‘full of holes, perforated.’

**Innovative meanings**

The earliest innovative meaning whose dating should perhaps be set even at the Proto-Slavic period is ‘destroyed.’ The further development of the meanings is varied. Only in South Slavic languages there arose terms that refer to humans (e.g. the USorb *wutlý* ‘hungry, powerless, weak,’ Polish *wątlý* ‘delicate,’ ‘sickly,’ Czech *útlý* ‘weak’ > ‘delicate; slim’ with a loss of the negative overtones).

6B.8. Eastern \**vędlъ***Etymological meaning** ‘miserable’

From the PIE \*(*s*)*wendh-* ‘to waste away, to wither,’ cf. the German *schwinden* ‘to decline, to diminish, to fade; to dry out, to wither,’ Old English *swindan* ‘to diminish; to shrink; to waste away.’

**Structural meaning** ‘withered’

A participle of the past tense from the PSlav \**vędnoti* ‘to wither.’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘withered’

The meaning ‘withered’ is attested in all East Slavic languages: Russian *вялый*, Ukrainian *в'ялий*, Belarusian *вялы́й*.

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘withered’ was metaphorically transferred from plants to humans and preserved the semantic dominant ‘deprived of a vital force,’ hence ‘weak,’ ‘lazy; slow.’

6B.9. \**kyrъ***Etymological meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.9, p. 210]**Structural meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘violent, ‘seething, one that increases its volume’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The continuants of the PSlav derivative from \**kypěti* ‘to seethe’ have the meaning ‘weak’ in both Sorbian languages (LSorb and USorb *kipry*). The semantic dominant, which in the meaning that developed on the basis of the structural meaning was great volume, became mellowness, lack of density, porosity [cf. Schuster-Šewc: 526]. ‘Weak’ was the source of further meanings referring to humans, both in its literal meaning (cf. the LSorb *kipry* ‘crippled,’ USorb *kipry* ‘sensitive,’ ‘sickly’) as well as the figurative meaning (USorb ‘lenient’).

6B.10. \**chudъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘crushed; crumbled’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.3, p. 105]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘small, minute,’ ‘miserable, bad,’ ‘weak,’ ‘thin,’ ‘poor’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘weak, miserable’ are well-attested by continuants (e.g. the dial. Polish *chudy*, Polabian *χαυδέ*, USorb *chudy* ‘idem,’ Czech *chudý*, Old Church Slavonic *chudъ*, Old Russian *худыи*). However, it is difficult to present the sequence of the development of meanings with any certainty, cf. THIN, 5B.6, p. 158.

6B.11. \**lochъ*/*\*lošъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘weak’ (?), ‘obliquus’ (?) [see BAD 1B.2, p. 105]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad, especially in the moral sense’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning which is secondary in reference to ‘bad’ is the Serbian and Croatian *lōhav* ‘weak, sickly’ – an adjective with a suffixal extension *-av*. It arose on the basis of the PSlav \**lochъ*.

6B.12. \**vetъchъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘old’ [see OLD, 8B.1, p. 193]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘old’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

In the Polish language the only trace of the continuant of *\*vet̃ch̃* – the Old Polish *wiotchy* – is *wiotki* ‘weak; thin, delicate.’ The change of meaning caused an accompanying change of the form; one cannot rule out the adideation to the word *witka* ‘a thin delicate twig.’

### 6B.13. *\*glup̃*

**Etymological meaning** ‘squashed; compressed’ [see STUPID, 16B.1, p. 264]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘stupid’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

Apart from such meanings as ‘primitive, simple; boorish,’ ‘immature; young,’ ‘insignificant, redundant,’ the dial. Russian *злѣный* ‘weak,’ has as its basis a generalization of a negative evaluation followed by its narrowing down, among others to ‘weak.’

### 6B.14. *\*chab̃/\*chab̃ñ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘sour, spoilt’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.7, p. 108]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘bad, miserable’ > ‘weak’

The meaning ‘weak’ presumably arose from the earlier ‘bad, miserable’ already in the Proto-Slavic period. It is attested by the Czech and Slovak *chabý* ‘miserable; weak,’ LSorb *chamny* (< *\*chabny*) ‘weak; aside ‘sick,’ ‘wretched,’ Church Slavonic *chabenz̃* ‘weak, miserable’ [Miklosich<sup>2</sup>: 1087].

### 6B.15. *\*dr̃chl̃*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘rotten’ (?) [see SAD, 11B.2, p. 222]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘sad,’ ‘infirm, debilitated by age’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘weak’ of the Old Russian *дряхлыи* is another link of the string ‘infirm due to age.’

### 6B.16. *\*bolg̃*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘shining; glimmering’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘good, kind, pleasant,’ ‘happy, prosperous’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'weak' of the Ukrainian *блазій* arose from the preceding 'mild' [cf. BAD, 1B.14, p. 111].

## 6B.17. \*šibъkъ

**Etymological meaning** 'one that sets or is set in motion with great force' [see VIOLENT, 10A.4, p. 207]

**The meaning based on continuants** [cf. THIN, 5B.5, p. 157]

**Structural meaning** 'such that can be waved, brandished'

**Innovative meanings**

The Slovene *šibek* 'flexible, lithe; thin, and in reference to man – 'thin, slender; weak, delicate,' most probably is not a continuant of the PSlav \*šibъkъ but it is an independent Slovene derivative whose form is identical [see THIN, 5B.5, p. 157]. The meaning 'weak' emerged by the transposition of the dominant of the meaning 'thin' (in reference to man – 'thin, slender') from posture to physical force.

## 6B.18. \*lagodъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'arranged; decent' (?) 'weak' (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.3, p. 116]

**Structural meaning** 'mild, tranquil; harmonious' (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'kind, pleasant,' 'mild, peaceful' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning 'weak' (dial. Slovene *lahodný* 'weak, frail,' USorb *lahodny* 'delicate, weakly, frail,' cf. LSorb *lagodny* 'delicate; slender; thin') emerged due to a transposition of the meaning 'mild' from the mental to the physical sphere, which is a considerably rarer instance of the direction of development as development in the opposite direction.

## 6B.19. \*něžъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see MILD, 12B.1, p. 230]

**Structural meaning** 'delicate' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'delicate' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'frail, weakly' (Serbian *něžan*, Croatian *nježan*, Bulgarian *нежен*, Russian *нежный*) emerged from the previous 'delicate,' which referred both to physical as well as mental features.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

6B.1. *\*slabъ*

WEAK PSlav ← SAGGING etym.

6B.2. *\*mъdblъ*

WEAK Western, Slovene ← TIRED struct. ← SLOW struct.

6B.3. *\*klękanъ*

WEAK Bulgarian, Macedonian ← SHAKY Western, Southern ← KNEELING struct. ← BENT etym.

6B.4. *\*chylъ*

WEAK Eastern ← INCLINED PSlav ← BENT etym.

6B.5. *\*rychlъ*

WEAK Eastern ← SET IN MOTION struct.

6B.6. *\*rъchlъ*

WEAK Serbian, Croatian ← LOOSE Serbian, Croatian ← SET IN MOTION struct.

6B.7. *\*rotъlъ*

WEAK Western ← ROTTEN PSlav

6B.8. *\*vedlъ*

WEAK Eastern ← WITHERED Eastern

6B.9. *\*kyprъ*

WEAK USorb, LSorb ← LOOSE USorb ← SEETHING struct.

6B.10. *\*chudъ*

6B.10.1.

WEAK PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

6B.10.2.

WEAK PSlav ← SMALL PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

or

6B.10.3.

WEAK PSlav ← BAD PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

6B.11. *\*lošъ*

WEAK Serbian, Croatian ← MISERABLE Southern ← BAD Southern, dial. Russian

6B.12. *\*vetъchъ*

WEAK Polish ← OLD PSlav

6B.13. *\*glupъ*

WEAK dial. Russian ← INSIGNIFICANT Pan-Slavic ← STUPID PSlav ← CLOGGED etym.

6B.14. *\*chabъ/\*chabъnъ*

WEAK Czech, LSorb, Serbian, Croatian, Church Slavonic ← MISERABLE Western, Church Slavonic ← BAD Western ← SPOILT (?) etym. ← SOUR (?) etym.

6B.15. *\*dręchlъ*

WEAK Old Russian ← INFIRM PSlav ← ROTTEN (?) etym.

6B.16. *\*bolgъ*

WEAK Ukrainian ← MILD Polish, Southern, Ukrainian ← PLEASANT PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

6B.17. \*šibъkъ

WEAK Slovene ← THIN Slovene ← LIKE A TWIG Slovene

6B.18. \*lagodъnъ

WEAK dial. Slovak, USorb ← DELICATE ← MILD PSlav

6B.19. \*něžъnъ

WEAK Southern, Russian ← DELICATE PSlav ← MILD PSlav

Numerous motivations of the concept ‘weak’ are based on the properties of physical objects and are associated with their instability: loose (\*slabъ, \*rychlъ, \*kypъ), set swinging (\*klękanъ, \*rychlъ, \*rъchlъ), sagging (\*slabъ), or with impermanence, with being subject to decay: corruption: (\*chabъ – perhaps caused by having gone sour – indirect motivation uncertain), putrefaction (\*otъlъ), perhaps going rotten (\*drechlъ – indirect motivation uncertain), withering away (\*vedlъ), perhaps crumbling (\*chudъ – indirect motivation uncertain). Another group of words is based on motivations based on delicateness (\*bolgъ, \*lagodъnъ, \*něžъnъ) and being thin (\*šibъkъ, \*vetъchъ, which feature(s) a secondary motivation), which differ from the aforementioned motivations by the lack of negative overtones. The following motivations have distinctly negative overtones: insignificant (\*glupъ), bad, miserable (\*chabъ, \*lošъ, perhaps also \*chudъ – alternative motivation). The remaining motivations allegedly refer directly to people and they are associated with being tired, slowness (\*mъdъlъ), old age (\*vetъchъ), as well as with bending (\*klękanъ, \*chylъ – both are indirect motivations), where the closer motivation is kneeling (\*klękanъ) and inclination (\*chylъ).

## 7A. HEALTHY

### 7A.1. \*sъdorvъ

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘(made, consisting) of good wood’

The PSlav \*sъdorvъ is usually considered to have been inherited from the PIE \*sudorua- ‘(made) of good wood,’ a compound consisting of \*su- ‘good’ and \*dorua-; such a semantic development is discernible in the Avestan *dr(u)vō* ‘healthy and Persian *duruva* ‘idem’ [Pokorny: 216]. When one accepts such an etymological meaning it is necessary to accept an intermediary link \*‘hard; strong’ > ‘healthy’.<sup>56</sup> Rick Derksen questions the aforementioned explanation, however, he upholds the relationship with the words representing the Indo-Iranian group [Derksen: 478]. A competing etymology

<sup>56</sup> Cf. the parallel development of the meaning from ‘made of strong material’ to ‘strong, powerful; healthy’ in the dial. Russian *лубянный* ‘strong, healthy’ from the PSlav \*lubъ ‘phloem, bark.’ The intermediary semantic link ‘stiff, hard’ is attested by another derivative: the dial. *любавый*.

is suggested by Schuster-Šewc [Schuster-Šewc: 1365–1366]. By taking the LSorb and USorb form *strowy* as the point of departure, he reconstructs the PSlav *\*storvǫ*, which he links with the poorly attested PSlav *\*storbǫ* ‘strong; healthy’. This hypothesis is not convincing due to phonetic reasons. The Old Church Slavonic form *sǫdrabǫ* with a jер which precludes assimilation is proof of the existence of the voiced vowel *-d-*. The assimilated form with the voiced *zd-* in the syllable onset is present also in the monuments of the Sorbian languages.

### The meanings based continuants ‘healthy’

The meaning ‘healthy’ is the basic meaning in all of the continuants in Slavic languages (cf. e.g. the Czech *zdravý*, Old Church Slavonic *sǫdravǫ*, Slovene *zdrāv*, Russian *здоровый*).

### Innovative meanings

Due to the association of health with strength the meaning ‘strong’ emerged as a secondary meaning in various Slavic languages. Cf. STRONG, 6A.20, p. 170.

## 7A.2. *\*cělǫ*

### Etymological meaning ‘whole; healthy’

It is derived from the PIE *\*kaj-lo-* : *kaj-lu-* ‘healthy, intact.’ There are equivalents in Germanic (e.g. the Gothic *hails* ‘healthy; whole’) and Baltic languages (Old Prussian *\*kailu-s* in *kailūstikan* ‘health’) [SP 2: 73–74].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘healthy’ > ‘sound’

The current basic meaning of all continuants is ‘whole.’ The meaning ‘healthy’ earlier occurred in various languages (Old Church Slavonic, Old Polish, Old Czech, Old Russian, in the Polabian greeting: ‘*baǰǰ zdrów!*’ : ‘*na zdrowie!*’), today only in Russian and Ukrainian dialects. The consistency of the earlier meanings allows us to conjecture that ‘healthy’ could have been the original Proto-Slavic meaning. The continuant *col* (probably under the influence of the German *heil*) is attested in the Polabian languages in the form of the greeting: ‘*baǰǰ zdrów*; Willkommen’ and ‘*na zdrowie*; à votre santé’ [SE]DP: 86].

## 7A.3. Eastern, Southern *\*čitǫ*/*\*čitavǫ*

### Etymological meaning ‘rested’

The PSlav *\*čiti* is derived from the PIE *\*k<sup>w</sup>eiǵ-/\*k<sup>w</sup>iǵē-* ‘to rest’ [SP 2: 218]. The adjectives based on *\*k<sup>w</sup>iǵē-to-* (hence the PSlav *\*čitǫ*, cf. the exact Baltic equivalents: Lithuanian *kietas* ‘hard, strong; Latvian *ciēts* ‘idem’) and the ones based on *\*k<sup>w</sup>i-lo-* (hence the PSlav *\*čilǫ*). Pokorny reconstructs it already for the Proto-Indo-European period [Pokorny: 638].

### Structural meaning ‘rested’

The suffixal extension of the adjective *\*čitǫ* with the suffix *-avǫ*, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language or based on the PSlav *\*čiti* ‘to rest’ [SP 2: 217–218].

**The meaning based on continuants 'sound, intact'**

The meaning 'whole, intact' is attested in all South and East Slavic languages in which the word exists (Serbian and Croatian *čítav*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *чѹтав*, dial. Ukrainian *чѹтавбый*).

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'one who is in a healthy state; healthy' (Serbian and Croatian *čítav*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *чѹтав*, dial. Ukrainian *чѹтавбый* also 'strong; good; decent; laborious') is based on the PSlav meaning 'whole, intact.' Perhaps such a direction of the development of the meaning was set by the structural meaning 'rested,' although it is impossible to determine whether this meaning was still felt at the time of the formation of the meaning 'healthy' and in the remaining meanings which are mentioned above.

## 7A.4. \*čilь

**Etymological meaning 'rested'**

The PSlav meaning \*čiti čьjǫ 'to rest' is based on the same PIE root \*k<sup>u</sup>eiǵ-/ \*k<sup>u</sup>iǵē- 'to rest,' which is discussed above [see 7A.3, \*čítavь, p. 183].

**Structural meaning 'resting,' 'rested'**

The participle in -ь is derived from \*čiti čьjǫ 'to rest' [SP 2: 199].

**The meaning based on continuants 'rested' > 'lively,' 'vigorous'**

The meaning 'rested' is preserved only in South Slavic languages (the Slovene *čil*, Serbian and Croatian *čilo* : *čil*, aside the meanings 'healthy,' 'strong,' 'lively,' 'vigorous, jaunty'). The meanings 'lively, vigorous, animated; sprightly' occur also in the Czech *čily* and USorb *čity*.

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'healthy' in Slovene and Ukrainian (apart from them in Serbian and Croatian there is 'strong') is the result of the emergence of further links of the semantic string: 'rested' > 'lively,' 'sprightly' [see also MERRY, 11A.4, p. 219 and GOOD, 1A.14, p. 102].

## 7A.5. \*storьbь

**Etymological meaning 'stiff; numb'** [see STRONG, 6A.8, p. 167]

**Structural meaning 'hard; stiff'** (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants 'strong,' 'healthy; brisk'** (*ut supra*)

## 7A.6. \*rǫdь

**Etymological meaning 'arranged in a row, in a series'** [see GOOD, 1A.4, p. 97]

**The meaning based on continuants 'correct, appropriate'** (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning 'healthy' is one in the string of the meanings of the Kashubian continuant of the PSlav *\*rǫdъ* : *rǫdi* 'nimble, lively; sprightly,' 'robust, healthy, merry.' The aforementioned meanings resulted from a series of narrowing down of the PSlav meaning 'appropriate' with further changes of the semantic dominant.

#### 7A.7. *\*krěpъ*/*\*krěpъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'strong,' 'enduring' (?) [see STRONG, 6A.3, p. 161]

**The meanings based on continuants** 'strong, powerful; enduring, durable, about objects' > 'hard, enduring, durable, about objects,' 'strong, enduring, about people' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The emergence of the meaning 'healthy' aside from 'strong; robust,' e.g. in the Macedonian language, is an example of a semantic string.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

#### 7A.1. *\*sъdorvъ*

HEALTHY PSlav ← \*STRONG ↔ \*HARD ← (MADE) OF GOOD WOOD etym.

#### 7A.2. *\*cělъ*

HEALTHY PSlav ← WHOLE etym.

#### 7A.3. *\*čitavъ*

HEALTHY Southern ← WHOLE Eastern, Southern ← RESTED etym.

#### 7A.4. *\*čilъ*

HEALTHY Slovene, Ukrainian ← SPRIGHTLY PSlav ← LIVELY PSlav ← RESTED struct.

#### 7A.5. *\*storbъ*

HEALTHY PSlav ← STRONG PSlav ← \*HARD ← STIFF struct. ← NUMB etym.

#### 7A.6. *\*rǫdъ*

HEALTHY Kashubian ↔ SPRIGHTLY Kashubian ↔ ROBUST Kashubian ← APPROPRIATE

#### 7A.7. *\*krěpъkъ*

HEALTHY Macedonian ← STRONG PSlav

The motivations of the concept 'healthy' are concentrated in two areas: the area associated with the properties of material objects: durability (*\*storbъ*), the appropriate material (*\*sъdorvъ*), remaining intact (*\*cělъ*, *\*čitavъ*) and the area associated with the effects of health: sprightliness (*\*čilъ*, *\*rǫdъ*) and strength (*\*krěpъkъ*).

## 7B. SICK

### 7B.1. Western and Eastern \**chvorъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘wounded; festering’

It is probably derived from \**syoro*-<sup>57</sup> (as the Avestan *chvara* ‘wound’), a nominal form to \**syer-* ‘to stab, to wound,’ ‘to be a result of receiving a wound by a sharp object, to fester, to suppurate,’ cf. the Old High German *sweran* ‘to ache; to fester’ [Pokorny: 1050]. One is made curious by the semantic proximity of the PIE \**syer-* and \**syerg<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to be sick; to take care of sth,’ reconstructed on the basis of the Lithuanian *sĩgti sergũ* ‘to be sick’ [for further information see Pokorny: 1051].

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘sick’

The meaning ‘sick’ is attested in all North Slavic languages, e.g. the LSorb *chory* ‘sick,’ Czech *chorý* ‘sick; haggard, emaciated,’ early Russian and colloq. *хóрый* ‘sick, sickly; weak,’ Ukrainian *хóрий* and Belarusian *хóры* ‘idem.’

### 7B.2. \**skrbъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘cut; cutting’ (?) ‘wrinkled, curled up’ (?) [see SAD, 11B.1, p. 221]

**Structural meaning** ‘plaintive; sad’ (*ut supra*)

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘sick,’ ‘sad’

The meaning of the early Russian *скóрбный* ‘sick’ may be derived directly from the meaning ‘cut’ or ‘wrinkled’ for each of the etymological meanings theoretically could have been its basis. However, one is made curious by the lack of the meanings ‘to be sick; to ache’ or any traces of them in the continuants of the PSlav \**skrběti*, which is the basis of the adjective.

### 7B.3. \**durъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing; associated with wind’ (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 205]

**Structural meaning** ‘agitated’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘agitated, violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

In Russian dialects the development of the meanings which refer to a disease pursued two independent paths. On the one hand, these meanings refer to a mental disease

<sup>57</sup> The *ch-* in the onset is probably a result of the expressive nature of the lexeme [Sławski 1: 77].

through the stages ‘mentally ill,’ ‘mad,’ ‘violent,’ on the other hand, they refer to diseases associated with physical debilitation through the stages ‘bad,’ ‘corrupt,’ ‘useless.’

#### 7B.4. \*chudъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘crushed; crumbled’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.3, p. 105]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘thin,’ ‘weak,’ ‘small, diminutive,’ ‘miserable, bad,’ ‘poor’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘sickly’ is present in the Polabian *chaude* and in the dial. Slovak *chudav*.

#### 7B.5. \*kyprъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.9, p. 210]

**Structural meaning** ‘boiling; seething’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘violent,’ ‘boiling, one that increases its volume’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The LSorb *kipry* ‘sickly’ is another link in the semantic string ‘weak’ > ‘sickly.’ For information about the stages of the development cf. WEAK, 6B.9, p. 177.

#### 7B.6. \*chylъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘bent’ [see WEAK, 6B.4, p. 175]

**Structural meaning** ‘inclined’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘inclined’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meanings of the Belarusian *хілы* ‘sickly’ and Russian *хилый* ‘frail’ are based on the association with the stooping human figure, similarly as other meanings which refer to physical properties, cf. WEAK, 6B.4, p. 175.

#### 7B.7. \*otъlъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see WEAK, 6B.7, p. 175]

**Structural meaning** ‘rotten’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘rotten,’ ‘full of holes; hollow’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Polish *wątkły* 'sickly' aside 'delicate,' 'weak' indicates a gradual shift of the semantic dominant, peculiar to the transformations in the semantic string.

7B.8. *\*plochъ*

**Etymological meaning** – unclear 'flat' (?) [see BAD, 1B.5, p. 107]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'bad' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Belarusian *нлѡху* 'sickly' is supposedly derived from the earlier 'bad.'

7B.9. Southern and Eastern *\*lochъ/\*lošъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'weak; of inferior quality' (?), 'obliquus' (?) [see BAD, 1B.2, p. 105]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'bad, especially in the moral sense' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The results of the string of gradual semantic shifts – 'bad' > 'weak' > 'sickly' include the meanings of the Serbian and Croatian derivative *lđhav*, an adjective with the suffixal extension *-av*, which arose on the basis of the PSlav *\*lochъ*.

7B.10. *\*chabъ/\*chabъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'sour; spoilt' (?) [see BAD, 1B.7, p. 108]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'bad, miserable' > 'weak' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning 'sick' of the LSorb *chamny* from the unattested form *\*chabny* emerged as an instance of the narrowing down of the meaning 'weak.'

7B.11. *\*bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'shining, glimmering' (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** 'good, kind, pleasant,' 'happy, prosperous' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘unhealthy, sickly’ (Ukrainian *блазій*, Belarusian *блазі*) is an instance of the narrowing down of the meaning ‘weak; bad, miserable,’ which emerged from the preceding ‘mild’ [cf. BAD, 1B.14, p. 111]. In Belarusian (in contradistinction to Ukrainian) the meanings with positive overtones disappeared completely.

### 7B.12. \*slabъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘flabby, slack’ > ‘weak’ [see WEAK, 6B.1, p. 173]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘weak’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning ‘sick; sickly’ appears in Slavic languages aside ‘weak’ (e.g. the Ukrainian *слабий*) as another link of the semantic string.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

7B.1. \*chvorъ

SICK PSlav ← WOUNDED etym.

7B.2. \*skrbъnъ

7B.2.1.

SICK early Russian ← WRINKLED etym.

or

7B.2.2.

SICK early Russian ← WOUNDED etym.

7B.3. \*durъnъ

7B.3.1.

SICK dial. Russian ← SPOILT dial. Russian ← USELESS dial. Russian ← BAD Russian and

7B.3.2.

SICK dial. Russian ← BAD Russian ← MAD Northern ← VIOLENT PSlav

7B.4. \*chudъ

SICKLY Polabian, dial. Slovak ← WEAK PSlav ← CRUMBLED (?) etym.

7B.5. \*kyprъ

SICKLY LSorb ← WEAK LSorb, USorb ← LOOSE USorb ← ONE THAT INCREASES ITS VOLUME PSlav ← SEETHING PSlav

7B.6. \*chylъ

SICKLY Russian, Belarusian ↔ WEAK Pan-Slavic ← INCLINED PSlav ← BENT etym.

7B.7. \*qtblъ

SICKLY Polish ← WEAK PSlav

7B.8. \*plochъ

SICKLY Belarusian ← BAD PSlav

7B.9. *\*lochъ*

SICKLY Serbian, Croatian ← BAD PSlav

7B.10. *\*chabъnъ*

SICK LSorb ← WEAK PSlav

7B.11. *\*bolgъ*

SICKLY Ukrainian, Belarusian ← WEAK Ukrainian, Belarusian ← MILD Polish, Southern, Ukrainian ← PLEASANT PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

7B.12. *\*slabъ*

SICKLY Pan-Slavic ← WEAK PSlav ← LOOSE etym.

The basis for the motivation of the concept 'sick' is furnished by the causes of a disease: wounds (*\*chvorъ*), cuts (*\*skъbъnъ* – alternatively) or its physical manifestations: wrinkling (*\*skъbъnъ*) and mental ones – madness *\*durъnъ*. In my material more examples refer not so much to a sick person himself or herself as to a person who is prone to a disease. As a rule the basis for the motivation of this concept is being weak (*\*chudъ*, *\*kypъ*, *\*chylъ*, *\*otъlъ*, *\*bolgъ*, *\*chabъnъ*, *\*slabъ*) or being miserable, bad (*\*durъnъ*, *\*plochъ*, *\*lošъ*), which introduces an evaluative element into the process of nomination.

## 8A. YOUNG

### 8A.1. *\*junъ*

#### **Etymological meaning 'young'**

The motivation of the PSlav *\*junъ* 'young' from the PIE *\*ieǵ* is inherited, which is clearly indicated by the cognate words. The latter may be found in various Indo-European languages: Lithuanian *jaúnas* 'young,' Latvian *jaúns* 'idem,' Latin *iuvenis* 'idem,' OInd *yúvant-* 'idem.'

#### **The meaning based on continuants 'young'**

The semantics which was inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language was preserved in the Proto-Slavic language. This is unequivocally indicated by the meanings of the continuants in all Slavic languages. Cf. the dial. Polish *juni* 'young,' dial. Slovak *junný* 'idem,' Slovene *jún* 'idem,' Serbian and early Croatian *jún* 'idem,' Old Church Slavonic *junъ* 'idem,' Old Russian and Russian *юный* 'idem,' Ukrainian *юний* 'idem,' Belarusian *юны* 'idem.'

#### **Innovative meanings**

There are no innovative meanings as far as the adjectives are concerned. Connotative features associated with youth: 'strong' and 'brave' may be found in various Slavic languages in the meanings of the derivatives which may be reduced to the form *\*junakъ* 'daredevil, hero' and 'strongman.'

## 8A.2. \**molǵ*

### Etymological meaning ‘soft; delicate’

The closest formal and semantic equivalent is found in the Old Prussian plural *malđai* ‘children,’ *malđian* ‘foal.’ The Baltic and Slavic form < PIE \**molǵ-/\*malǵ-*, which is alternative in reference to \**mǵdu-* ‘soft, delicate hence the OInd *mǵdú-* ‘soft, delicate,’ Latin *mollis* < \**molǵis* ‘soft,’ Greek \**ἀμαλδύς*, reconstructed on the basis of *ἀμαλδύνω* ‘to mollify, to soothe’ aside *βλαδύς* (with another treatment of the sonant). All of these forms are based on the PIE \**mel-* ‘to crumble’ [Pokorny: 716–718].

### The meaning based on continuants ‘young’

The meaning ‘young’ is attested in all Slavic languages. It is a common Balto-Slavic semantic innovation, which is indicated by the secondary meaning ‘young creature’ – already lexicalized in the Old Prussian language. There is no direct proof that the meaning ‘soft’ was preserved in the Proto-Slavic language (whereas in Old Czech ‘delicate’ is recorded, which theoretically may be a trace of the previous meaning, but it most likely arose due to a chain process of the emergence of successive meanings which differed from each other very slightly). A different opinion is represented by France Bezlaj who claims that the Slovene “*mláđiti* (testo, ilovicu)” ‘to knead one more time (of dough, clay)’ indicates the existence of the residual meaning ‘soft’ in the Proto-Slavic language. He also classifies the Polish “*młodzić piwo*” ‘to add more yeast to beer’ into the same category [Bezlaj 2: 187].

### Innovative meanings ‘fresh,’ ‘unripe,’ ‘recently made’

Also, the Slovene ‘soft, fluffy, about bread’ is supposedly an innovation derived from the meaning ‘recently baked,’ which according to Bezlaj [l.c.] could be considered a residual meaning.

## 8A.3. \**jarǵ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘associated with spring; spring (adj.)’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.8, p. 210]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘spring (adj.),’ ‘manifesting spring-like behavior,’ ‘violent, lustful’ (*ut supra*).

### Innovative meanings

Due to the great variety of the meanings and the various possible paths of the etymological development it is difficult to establish whether the meaning ‘young,’ registered in Polish dialects and in the Czech language, should be reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language or whether it should be considered an independent innovative meaning derived either from ‘lustful’ or ‘vigorous,’ or from ‘born in the spring,’ or from one of the meanings which refer to the physical condition, e.g. ‘healthy, robust.’ This may be indicated by the meanings of other continuants in this language.

## 8A.4. \*jǣdrъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘swollen’ (?), ‘one that is at the center, core (adj.)’ (?) [see FAT, 5A.3, p. 150]

**Structural meaning** ‘having a core’ – only when one accepts the derivation from the PIE \*oid- (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘vigorous; robust, firm’

**Innovative meanings**

The early meaning of the Ukrainian *ядёрний* ‘young’ may be based on an association with vigour, if it is the source of the Proto-Slavic meaning. It may also refer directly to the manifestations of vigor, e.g. to the meaning ‘strong.’

## 8A.5. \*glupъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘crushed; compressed’ [see STUPID, 16B.1, p 264]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘stupid’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘young,’ registered in the Polabian language, which has clearly evaluative overtones, may be motivated either by the lack of experience or by the lack of independence, which could be indicated by the explanation of *glaipe* ‘young; one who lives with his or her parents.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

8A.1. \*junъ

YOUNG PSlav ← YOUNG etym. PIE

8A.2. \*moldъ

YOUNG PSlav ← DELICATE etym. ← SOFT etym.

8A.3. \*jarъ

8A.3.1.

YOUNG dial. Polish, Czech ← LUSTFUL Polish, LSorb, USorb ← MANIFESTING SPRING-LIKE BEHAVIOR PSlav ← SPRING (adj.) etym.

or

8A.3.2.

YOUNG Czech ← SPRIGHTLY Czech ← \*VIGOROUS ← MANIFESTING SPRING-LIKE BEHAVIOR etym.

8A.4. \*jǣdrъnъ

8A.4.1.

YOUNG early Ukrainian ← PHYSICALLY FIT Ukrainian ← ROBUST Ukrainian ← VIGOROUS PSlav

or

8A.4.2.

YOUNG early Ukrainian ← PHYSICALLY FIT Ukrainian ← ROBUST Ukrainian ← FAT etym.

8A.5. \**glupъ*

8A.5.1.

YOUNG Polabian ← NOT INDEPENDENT Polabian ← STUPID PSlav

and

8A.5.2.

YOUNG dial. Russian ← INEXPERIENCED dial. Russian ← STUPID PSlav

In the motivations of the concept ‘young’ one may find contrarious tendencies, which is allegedly associated with the variety of the objects to which a given adjective referred. Tenderness (\**molđъ*) is associated with the attributes of early youth or actually childhood, this in turn is associated with softness (\**molđъ* – intermediate motivation) – it is equally possible that the features *tenderness* and *softness* should be referred not to young creatures but to young plants.

The motivations through physical fitness (\**јѣдрѣнѣ*), sprightliness or lustfulness (\**jarъ* – the motivations are alternative in reference to each other) are associated with youth construed as the period of the full extent of physical powers. A distinctly pejorative association is discernible in the motivations which feature a lack of independence and inexperience (\**glupъ*) where the intermediate motivation is stupidity.

## 8B. OLD

### 8B.1. \**vetъchъ*

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘old’ < ‘(multos) annos natus’

The PSlav \**vetъchъ* ‘old’ – exact equivalents in the Lithuanian *vėtušas* ‘very old’ and Latin *vetus veteris* ‘old’ – continues the PIE \**u̯etus-o-* ‘old,’ formed on the basis of the PIE \**u̯eto-* ‘year,’ cf. the Greek *ἔτος* ‘year,’ OInd *vatsará-* ‘idem.’

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘old’

In the majority of the languages the continuants preserved the original meaning ‘old,’ e.g. the Old Polish *wiotchy* ‘old,’ Czech and Slovak *vetchý* ‘old,’ Serbo-Croat *vět/větah*, Bulgarian *вехт, вет, вѣтъх*. Until today it is preserved only in fixed expressions, e.g. the Russian *Вѣтхуйъ Заветъ* ‘the Old Testament’ and Ukrainian *Вѣтхуйъ Заветъ* ‘idem,’ whereas in other contexts the early lexeme was replaced by the continuants of the PSlav \**starъ* which is earlier in this meaning, according to the tendency to the expansiveness of innovative meanings.

### Innovative meanings

The secondary meanings associated with the properties of oldness/old age, e.g., the Russian *вѣмхуї* ‘doddering, decrepit,’ Ukrainian *вѣмхуї* ‘worn out; used,’ and about people – ‘weak; decrepit’ – allegedly emerged in an independent manner in various Slavic languages. In Polish, probably under the influence of a folk etymology, in association with the word *witka* ‘a thin twig,’ there occurred a change of the form, which facilitated further semantic changes. In contradistinction to other languages there occurred a melioration of the meaning, hence ‘slender; thin.’ The meaning ‘thin’ arose also in Sorbian, where it refers above all to cloths.

### 8B.2. \*starъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘one that stands surely’ > ‘strong; adult’

The PSlav \**starъ* continues the PIE *stā-ro-* ‘standing,’ a nominal form to the PIE *stā-* ‘to stand.’ Its equivalents in Indo-European languages (Lithuanian *stōras* ‘fat,’ Old Norse *stórr* ‘great, strong, virile; important’) clearly indicate physical fitness and prove that initially \**starъ* must have referred to a man in his prime. A similar semantic development may be observed in the OInd *sthavirá-* which is attested both in the meanings ‘wide; fat; stout, strong’ as well as ‘old; venerated, respected’ [Heidermanns: 558].

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘old’

The semantics of the continuants is uniform (e.g. the Czech *starý*, Old Church Slavonic *starъ*, Russian *старый*), and their referents in various Slavic languages include both living creatures, plants (the antonym of \**moldъ*) as well as things (the antonym of \**novъ*).

### 8B.3. \*dręchlъ

#### Etymological meaning – obscure ‘rotten’ (?) [see SAD, 11B.2, p. 222]

#### The meanings based on continuants ‘sad,’ ‘decrepit, debilitated by age’ (*ut supra*)

The meanings that are preserved in East Slavic languages (Russian *дряхлый*, Ukrainian *дряхлий*, Belarusian *дряхлы*) ‘decrepit, weakened by age’ indicate indirectly the meaning ‘old’ with strong negative overtones. Their relationship to ‘sad’ cannot be established due to the uncertainty of the etymology.

### 8B.4. Western \*šędivъ

#### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘grey’ (?) ‘bright’ (?) ‘of an inconspicuous color’ (?)

The PSlav South Eastern \**šadъ* : Western \**šędъ* ‘grey – siwy, szary’ is allegedly linked with the PSlav \**šarъ* : *šęrъ* ‘grey.’ Attempts are made to derive the forms before monophthongization and palatalization (\**chojd-o-* \**chojr-o-*) from the PIE nominal root \**ksoj-*, on which the form with the suffix *-to-* is also based: Avestan *xšaeta* ‘bright’

[Machek: 627]. A further affinity may link these words with the names of colors in Old Germanic and Celtic languages [cf. Borys: 591].

### **Structural meaning** 'grey'

Only the Western adjective with the suffix *-ivъ* is based on the PSlav \**šadъ* (the Southern and Eastern form – \**šědъ*) 'canosus.'

### **The meaning based on continuants** 'grey-haired; grey'

The meaning 'grey-haired; grey' is basic both for the continuants of the non-suffixal form (e.g., the Old Church Slavonic *šědъ*), as well as for the forms with the suffix *-ivъ*, e.g., Czech *šedivý*.

### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'old' of the Polish *sędziwy*, dial. *szedziwy* and of LSorb *šezivy* 'grey, the one who went grey; old' is associated with the grey color of hair.

## 8B.5. \**durъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'blowing,' 'associated with wind' [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**Structural meaning** 'agitated' (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'agitated; violent; impetuous,' Northern 'mad' (*ut supra*)

### **Innovative meanings**

The peculiar meanings of the dial. Russian *дурной* 'old,' similarly as 'ugly' and 'sick,' emerged by way of the narrowing down of the meaning 'bad, not good,' earlier – 'bad in the moral sense,' cf. BAD, 1B.11, p. 110.

## 8B.6. \**chylъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'bent' [see WEAK, 6B.4, p. 175]

**Structural meaning** 'inclined' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'inclined' (*ut supra*)

### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning of the Belarusian *хілы* 'old,' similarly as 'weak,' has its motivation in 'inclined,' cf. WEAK, 6B.4, p. 175.

## 8B.7. Eastern \**dosъgъ*/\**dosъžъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.3, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** 'such which reaches a specific point; big, tall' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘big, tall,’ ‘skillful, capable’ (*ut supra*)**Innovative meanings**

The development of the meaning of the Old Ukrainianian *доцужуи* ‘old’ could have proceeded along the same path as in the case of the adjective *\*starъ*, cf. *supra*, however, a more probable development is ‘such that achieves something’ > ‘proficient’ > ‘experienced’ > ‘old.’

8B.8. *\*bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘shining, glimmering’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘good, kind, pleasant,’ ‘happy, prosperous’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Ukrainianian *благій* ‘weak; old, worn out; miserable, poor’ is associated with the pejoration of the meaning ‘good,’ ‘pleasant’ probably by way of gradual changes of the meanings ‘pleasant’ > ‘mild’ > ‘weak’ > ‘old, worn out; miserable, poor.’ The string of quasi-synonymous meanings discernible in Ukrainianian determines the fact that in this case we must consider the meaning ‘weak’ as the direct motivation instead of the theoretically possible ‘mild.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

8B.1. *\*vetъchъ*

OLD PSlav ← OLD etym. PIE

8B.2. *\*starъ*

OLD PSlav ← ADULT etym. ← STRONG etym. ← ONE WHO STANDS SURELY etym.

8B.3. *\*dręchlъ*

OLD Eastern ← DODDERING Eastern ← ROTTEN (?) etym.

8B.4. *\*šędivъ*

OLD Polish, LSorb ← GREY-HAIRED Western ← GREY-HAIRED etym. PIE

8B.5. *\*durъnъ*

OLD dial. Russian ← BAD Eastern ← SIMPLE Russian ← STUPID Polish, Czech, Slovak, Eastern ← MAD Northern ← VIOLENT PSlav

8B.6. *\*chylъ*

OLD Belarusian ↔ WEAK Russian, Belarusian ← INCLINED PSlav ← BENT etym.

8B.7. *\*dosъgъ/\*dosъžъ*

## 8B.7.1.

OLD Ukrainianian ← SKILLFUL PSlav ← ONE THAT REACHES STH Eastern

or

8B.7.2.

OLD Ukrainian ← BIG Ukrainian ← ONE THAT REACHES STH Eastern

8B.8. \**bolgъ*

OLD Ukrainian ← WEAK Ukrainian ← MILD Polish, Southern, Ukrainian ← PLEASANT  
PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

The motivations of the concept 'old' are varied. They reflect both positive associations: strength (\**starъ*), magnitude or proficiency (\**dosogъ*, alternative motivations) as well as negative motivations: decrepitude (\**dręchlъ*), weakness (\**chylъ*, \**bolgъ*) or even an evaluation: bad. The motivation which lacks evaluative overtones is associated with the grey color of hair: (\**šedivъ*).

## 9A. QUICK

### 9A.1. Western and Eastern \**rychlъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'associated with digging; digging; dug'

The Western and Eastern \**rychlъ* may be a participle of \*\**rychnŋti* which is not attested in the material and which remains in an etymological relationship with \**rušati* 'to set in motion, to move.' The PSlav \**rušati* is an iterativum of the unattested \*\**rusti*, whose exact equivalent exist in Baltic languages (Lithuanian *raūsti rausiù* 'to burrow, to dig,' Latvian *rāust rāušu* 'idem'), based on the PIE root \**rey-* 'idem' with the extension -s- [Boryś: 528–529]. Cf. also \**rъchlъ* WEAK, 6B.6, p. 176.

**Structural meaning** Western 'moving; animated' vs. Eastern 'moving, set in motion' > 'slack; weak'

The participle in -lъ from the unattested \*\**rychnŋti* 'to move.'

**The meanings based on continuants** Western 'animated' > 'quick' vs. Eastern 'set in motion' > 'slack; weak'

It was allegedly already in the Proto-Slavic language that this adjective developed independently in two dialectal groups [cf. Varbot 1984: 88]. In the east the innovative meanings indicate the meaning 'set in motion, unstable'; in the west – the meaning 'animated.' The meaning 'quick,' based on the earlier 'animated,' closer to the structural meaning, is present in all West Slavic languages (cf. Polish *rychły*, LSorb and USorb *rychły*, Czech *rychlý* and Slovak *rychly*).

### Innovative meanings

In the east the original 'set in motion, unstable' gave birth to varied meanings which contain the following semantic element: 'impermanent; one that does not constitute

a coherent whole,' cf. WEAK, 6B.5, p. 176, FAT, 5A.9, p. 154. The LSorb *rychty* 'brave, daring,' Czech *rychlý* 'skillful, nimble,' Old Polish *rychty* 'eager, zealous' emerged on the basis of the meaning 'animated.'

## 9A.2. *\*bystrъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'violent; one that flows rapidly (with great noise)'

The original *\*\*bysrъ* arose from the PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>ūs-ro-*, cf. the Germanic, Old Norse *bysia* 'to flow in a rapid manner,' Frisian *būsen* 'to press, to hum, to rumble.' (The consonant *-t-* is infixed secondarily to facilitate the pronunciation, cf. Polish *zdrój* 'spring, source,' *struga* 'stream' with the following development of the group: a sibilant + a sonant.)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'fast (of a river current)' > 'clean/pure,' fig. 'perspicacious; docile,' 'sprightly'

The original meaning 'rapidly flowing; rapid, about a river current' is preserved in the majority of languages. It was allegedly in the Proto-Slavic language that figurative meanings which refer to people – both to their physical properties: 'sprightly' as well as mental properties: 'perspicacious; docile' > 'sapient' emerged. The meaning 'perspicacious' is based on a comparison with the clearness of rapidly flowing water.

### Innovative meanings

In the dial. Polish *bystry* 'quick' evolved into 'hotheaded' > 'daring,' in dial. Russian *быстрый* 'sprightly' evolved into 'impish.'

## 9A.3. *\*chytrъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'one that (mentally) acquires sth' (?)

The PSlav *\*chyitati* 'to get hold of sth, to grasp,' apophonic in reference to *\*chvatati* 'idem,' is perhaps related with the PIE root *\*sye-* 'suus.'

**Structural meaning** 'capable of taking hold of sth; catching; prehensile'

The Pslav *\*chytrъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-rъ* from the PSlav *\*chyitati*, *chyitati* 'to get hold of sth, to grasp, to catch.'

**The meanings based on continuants** 'skillful; fast,' 'cunning; docile'

The basic meanings which refer to physical properties: 'fast; dexterous' were preserved above all in South Slavic languages (Old Church Slavonic 'dexterous,' Slovene *híter*, Croatian and Serbian *hítar* 'fast; sprightly,' Macedonian *umap* 'fast; nimble'), and also in the dial. Polish (*chytry* 'fast in work') and Upper Sorbian (*chětry* 'fast, quick'). Apart from the meanings based on manual skills: 'fast in work; dexterous,' one may reconstruct the figurative meanings 'cunning, docile' for the Proto-Slavic language [see WISE, 16A.4, p. 261].

### Innovative meanings

For information about the semantic development in the Sorbian languages [see GOOD, 1A.10, p. 100].

## 9A.4. Southern and Eastern *\*bьdrь*

### Etymological meaning ‘vigilant; wakeful’

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, the PSlav *\*bьdrь* may be a derivative with the suffix *-rь* from *bьděti* ‘to be vigilant.’ It is likely that it emerged already in the Proto-Slavic period, which is indicated by the exact equivalents: Lithuanian *bùdras* : *budrùs* ‘vigilant, endowed with an acute sense of hearing;’ Avestan *budra* ‘wakeful’ [ERSJ 2: 63].

### The meanings based on continuants ‘wakeful’ > ‘lively,’ ‘sprightly’

These emerged from the original meaning ‘wakeful,’ attested in the Old Church Slavonic *bьdrь*, Old Russian *бодрыи* and in the early Ukrainian *бодруї* (the meaning ‘wakeful’ also exists in Serbian, but in this language the form *bòdar* indicates that it is a borrowing from Russian); across the entire Slavic area there emerged the meanings ‘sprightly; breezy, spry’ and related ones, which may be reduced to them (Old Church Slavonic *bьdrь* ‘spry,’ ‘lively, sprightly;’ Slovak *bodrý*, Serbian and Croatian *bàdar* ‘lively, ardent; breezy, sprightly,’ Russian *бодрыї* ‘buoyant, breezy, lively,’ early ‘daring, brave’). The word has continuants in South Slavic and East Slavic languages. The form *бодруї* (e.g., Slovak *bodrý* ‘merry, bright, sprightly,’ Serbian *bòdar*, *bòdar* ‘sprightly,’ ‘strong,’ ‘brave,’ Bulgarian *бодър* ‘wakeful; breezy; sprightly’), which was borrowed from Russian (as indicated by the vocalism) by South Slavic and West Slavic languages, has a wider range. The multidirectional semantic development, as well as the presence of original meanings, seem to indicate the antiquity of the borrowing. [See also CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.3, p. 219]

### Innovative meanings

The basis of the meaning ‘fast’ (Serbian and Croatian *bàdar*, dial. Belarusian *бодры* is ‘lively, sprightly.’

## 9A.5. *\*jьdrь*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘swollen’ (?) ‘one that is at the center, core (adj.) [see FAT, 5A.3, p. 150]

**Structural meaning** ‘having a core’ – only when one accepts the origin from the PIE *\*oid-* (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘full of vigor; robust, firm’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning ‘fast, quick’ is the only meaning of the Old Church Slavonic (*jьdrь*, apart from *ядрыи* ‘prompt, eager, willing; fast,’ which is recorded for the Old Russian language, and the early Slovene *jedren*.<sup>58</sup> Among the continuants of the PSlav *\*jьdrь* only the dial. Czech *jadrný* has the related meaning – ‘lively, sprightly.’ A comparison with the meanings reconstructed on the basis of the vast majority of the continuants

<sup>58</sup> The isolation of the meaning ‘quick’ in the aforementioned languages is probably testimony to its Church language nature.

raises questions about the direction of the change.<sup>59</sup> The meaning ‘quick’ may be derived from ‘fat’<sup>60</sup> only by the intermediation of a hypothetical string of semantic changes (‘fat’ > ‘strong’ > ‘violent’ > ‘quick’), which contradicts their chronology.

### 9A.6. Eastern \*ǵlʷ

**Etymological meaning** ‘strong’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.1, p. 205]

**Structural meaning** ‘quick,’ ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘violent,’ ‘fast’ > ‘zealous’ (*ut supra*)

The word is attested by the dial. Russian *яглыѣ* ‘violent, strong; fast; zealous.’ The wider range of the word is indicated by the verbs which are derived from it, e.g. the dial. Russian *езлѣтъ* ‘to make haste or to make someone hasty,’ cf. also the dial. Russian *неяглыѣ* ‘sluggish, lazy, slothful.’

### 9A.7. \*šibʷkʷ

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that sets or is set in motion with great force’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.4, p. 207]

**Structural meaning** ‘one that performs violent movements,’ ‘performed with great force’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘violent,’ ‘quick’ (*ut supra*)

The continuants in North Slavic languages indicate both meanings but one should note that ‘quick’ (Polish *szybki*, dial. Czech and Slovak *šibký*, Russian *шѣбкѣѣ*) is better attested, whereas the meaning ‘violent’ is closer to the structural meaning [see VIOLENT, 10A.4, p. 207].

### 9A.8. \*prǫdʷ/prǫdʷkʷ

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that spring/bounds/jumps up or away’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.2, p. 206]

**Structural meaning** ‘one that performs violent movements’ (*ut supra*)

<sup>59</sup> BER 1: 481 assumes the development based on chronology:

“В новобългар разбоят е отишгъл още по-напред, като от ‘бърз’ > ‘силен, як, здрав’ се е развило значение ‘голям по размери, едър.’”

(“In the New Bulgarian language the development proceeded further, so from ‘quick’ > ‘strong’ ‘robust, healthy’ there emerged the meaning ‘of great size, fat.’”)

<sup>60</sup> When one accepts that the word is derived from the PIE \*oǵd- ‘to swell’ and the etymological meaning ‘fat.’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘violent; impetuous,’ ‘quick’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning ‘quick,’ which occurs in Polish, Czech, dial. Bulgarian (*нрѣд* : *нрѣд*) and in Ukrainian (*нрѣдкый*), probably emerged already in the Proto-Slavic language, perhaps in a parallel manner to ‘violent; impetuous.’

9A.9. *\*naglъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘brave’ (?), ‘violent’ (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.3, p. 204]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘violent; quick’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning ‘quick’ is recorded already in the Old Church Slavonic *naglъ* ‘very quick.’ It is indicated also by the LSorb *nagly*, Slovak *náhly*, Slovene *nágel* ‘quick,’ Old Russian *назлыи*, where the meaning ‘quick’ occurs side by side with ‘violent.’

9A.10. *\*sporъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘successful, fruitful’ [see FAT, 5A.5, p. 151]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘efficient, abundant’ (*ut supra*)

The semantic development which proceeded from the cause to the effect is discernible in various innovative meanings of the continuants of the PSlav *\*sporъ*. The effect is constituted by ‘efficient, effective,’ and the cause is constituted by the properties which facilitate the effect, cf. the early Polish *spory* ‘quick, fast,’ Slovak *spory* ‘quick.’

9A.11. *\*gorlivъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘hot’ [see DILIGENT, 15A.4, p. 253]

**Structural meaning** ‘combustible,’ ‘hot’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘combustible; hot,’ ‘eager’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘fast’ (Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*) emerged by way of a transposition of the semantic dominant of the meaning ‘zealous,’ which enters into a string of meanings with ‘quick.’

9A.12. *\*l'utъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one/sth that cuts sth off; sharp’ [see STERN, 12A.1, p. 226]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘savage, stern’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meaning

The meaning 'quick' in Bulgarian dialects emerged from the meaning 'violent' (cf. VIOLENT, 10A.11, p. 211).

## Summary of Semantic Changes

9A.1. *\*rychlъ*

QUICK PSlav ← VIOLENT Western ← MOBILE PSlav

9A.2. *\*bystrъ*

QUICK PSlav ← ONE THAT FLOWS RAPIDLY WITH GREAT NOISE etym.

9A.3. *\*chytrъ*

QUICK PSlav ← PREHENSILE struct.

9A.4. *\*bъdrъ*

QUICK Western, Eastern ← SPRIGHTLY PSlav ← WAKEFUL etym.

9A.5. *\*jъdrъ*

9A.5.1.

QUICK Old Church Slavonic ← FAST PSlav

or

9A.5.2.

QUICK Old Church Slavonic ← STRONG PSlav ← FAT Southern

or

9A.5.3.

QUICK Old Church Slavonic ← FULL OF VIGOR PSlav

9A.6. *\*ĕglъ*

QUICK dial. Russian ← VIOLENT Eastern ← STRONG etym.

9A.7. *\*šibъkъ*

QUICK Western, Russian ↔ VIOLENT Russian ← PERFORMED WITH GREAT FORCE struct.

9A.8. *\*prōdъ/\*prōdъkъ*

QUICK PSlav ← VIOLENT PSlav ← JUMPING etym.

9A.9. *\*naglъ*

9A.9.1.

QUICK PSlav ← EAGER (?) BRAVE (?) etym.

or

9A.9.2.

QUICK PSlav ← MOBILE struct.

9A.10. *\*sporъ*

QUICK Polish, Slovak, Belarusian ← EFFICIENT PSlav ← ABUNDANT PSlav

9A.11. *\*gorlivъ*

QUICK Serbian, Croatian ← ZEALOUS PSlav ← HOT PSlav

9A.12. *\*lutъ*

QUICK dial. Bulgarian ← VIOLENT Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian ← IRATE Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian ← CRUEL PSlav ← SHARP etym.

Among the motivations of the concept 'quick' there is a dominance of motivations associated with impetuosity (*\*rychlъ*, *\*ǣglъ*, *\*šibъkъ*, *\*lutъ*, *\*prǫdъ*/*\*prǫdъkъ* as well as *\*bystrъ*) and with strength (one of the alternative explanations of *\*jǣdrъ*), which is also an indirect motivation of the majority of the words motivated by impetuosity. One is not surprised by the motivation by zealotry (*\*gorlivъ*). However, one is surprised by the lack of motivation by movement (there is only an indirect motivation – *\*rychlъ*), unless one accepts an alternative explanation of the obscure *\*naglъ*. There are, however, motivations by its hyponyms: to flow (*\*bystrъ*), to get hold of sth (*\*chytrъ*). In the case of *sporъ* one may probably mention a motivation by efficiency, and in the case of *\*bъdrъ* – by the possibility for action.

## 9B. SLOW

### 9B.1. *\*volъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'willing; one that has a choice, one who makes his or her wish come true'

The PSlav *\*vola* 'freedom, liberty' is based on the PIE *\*uel-* 'to want; to choose,' cf. the Latin *velle*, Gothic *wiljan* 'idem.'

**Structural meaning** 'free, independent'

The PSlav *\*volъnъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-ъnъ* from *\*vola* 'freedom, liberty.'

**The meaning based on continuants** 'free, independent'

#### **Innovative meanings**

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, the Polish *wolny* 'slow, leisurely' is a derivative from the adverbial expression *po woli* 'according to one's will, without pressure,' which emerged by the apocope of the prefixal *po-*. This is indicated by the synonymous *powolny*. In its semantic development one may also discern the influence of the homophonic *wolny* 'independent,' a continuant of the PSlav *\*volъnъ*. The development therefore proceeded from 'independent; free; one who acts according to his or her will, one who is not forced to do sth' to the narrowed-down 'one who is not forced to make haste.'

### 9B.2. Eastern *\*vędlъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'withered, miserable' [see WEAK, 6B.8, p. 177]

**Structural meaning** 'withered' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'withered' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘withered’ was metaphorically transposed from the world of plants to the human world with the preservation of the semantic dominant ‘deprived of vital forces,’ hence the Russian *вялый*, Ukrainian *в’ялий*, Belarusian *вялы* ‘weak,’ ‘lazy; sluggish; slow.’

9B.3. *\*dręchlъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure ‘rotten’ (?) [see SAD, 11B.2, p. 222]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘sad,’ ‘infirm, debilitated by age’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘slow’ is another link of the string ‘infirm due to old age,’ ‘tired.’ It occurs in the Old Russian *дряхлау* ‘lazy, tired, slow.’

9B.4. *\*lěnivъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘loose’ [see LAZY, 15B.1, p. 255]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘lazy, ignavus; indolent’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘tardy, slow’ is common and its emergence is a result of the interpretation of slowness as the consequence of laziness.

9B.5. *\*tichъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘quiet’ (?), ‘simple’ (?) [see CALM, 10B.4, p. 215]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘quiet’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

The meaning ‘slow’ in East Slavic languages (Russian *мíхуи́*, Ukrainian *міхуї́*, Belarusian *чixи*, e.g. about steps, water) allegedly emerged from the previous ‘peaceful,’ which was common in the Slavic languages and which is a result of an association based on the observation of reality.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

9B.1. *\*volьnъ*

SLOW Polish, Ukrainian, Russian ← ONE WHO ACTS ACCORDING TO HIS OR HER WILL PSlav ← INDEPENDENT PSlav

9B.2. *\*vędlъ*

SLOW Eastern ← WITHERED PSlav

9B.3. *\*dręchlъ*

SLOW Old Russian ← INFIRM PSlav

9B.4. *\*lęnivъ*

SLOW Pan-Slavic ← LAZY PSlav ← LOOSE etym.

9B.5. *\*tichъ*

SLOW Eastern ← PEACEFUL Pan-Slavic ← QUIET PSlav

The motivations of the concept ‘slow’ are based above all on weakness which may refer to a human: decrepitude (*\*dręchlъ*) or to a plant: withering (subst.) (*\*vędlъ*). Their basis may be associated by a feature of the temperament – peacefulness (*\*tichъ*). The motivations associated with a deliberate choice of slowness due to laziness (*\*lęnivъ*) or a freely made decision (*\*volъnъ*) are distinguished from them.

## 10A. VIOLENT

### 10A.1. Eastern *\*ęglъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘strong’

*\*\*ęgti*, which is not attested in the material, and which is reconstructed on the basis of the eastern dial. PSlav iterative form *\*ęgati* ‘to bustle, to make haste; to be quick, violent,’ has equivalents in Baltic languages: Lithuanian *jęgti jęgù* ‘can, to be able to do sth,’ *jėgà* ‘strength,’ in Latvian *jegt* with the secondary meaning ‘to understand.’<sup>61</sup>

#### Structural meaning ‘quick,’ ‘violent’

It is probably a participle (part. praet. act.) from *\*\*ęgti* [SP 6: 131] which is not attested in the material.

#### The meanings based on continuants ‘violent,’ ‘quick’ > ‘eager’

The word is poorly attested. It is attested above all by the dial. Russian *язлыѣ* ‘violent, strong; quick; zealous.’ Its wider range is indicated by the verbs which are derived from it [see SP 6: 131].

#### Innovative meanings

The Russian *язлыѣ* ‘abundant (of crops); fat, about soil’ is (against the suggestion of ESSJ 1: 53) an innovative meaning. An innovation based on the meaning ‘eager’ is ‘active,

<sup>61</sup> An unreliable hypothesis is put forward in ESSJ 1: 53 which in reference to the PSlav *\*agoda* reconstructs the form *\*(j)aglъ* and the original meaning ‘abundant (of crops)’ by analogy to the Lithuanian *uoga* ‘berry’ vs. *uoglis* ‘growth, shoot.’ One also cannot perceive a justification to accept the original – not prothetic – syllable-onset *j-*.

laborious' (not attested directly in the material), which is discernible in the meaning 'lazy' of the dial. Russian *нея́злы́й* [see DILIGENT, 15A.8, p. 252].

### 10A.2. *\*prǫdъ/\*prǫdъkъ/\*prǫdъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'jumping; to leap into the air'

The PSlav *\*pręsti* is based on the PIE root *\*(s)prend-* 'to jump'.

**Structural meaning** 'one that performs violent movements'

The PSlav *\*prǫdъ* is the original derivative of *\*pręsti prędq* 'to perform violent movements' with an exchange of the root vowel which is typical for the nominal form. There is a secondary accretion of suffixes in the later, more common derivative of *\*prǫdъkъ* and in *\*prǫdъnъ* – the latter is attested in Sorbian languages.

**The meanings based on continuants** 'violent; impetuous,' 'quick'

The meaning 'violent, impetuous' of the PSlav *\*prǫdъ* and *\*prǫdъkъ* is directly attested in the dial. Serbian *prūd*, Czech *prudký*, the early and dial. Polish *prędki*. This meaning is also indicated by further meanings which originated from it, e.g. the dial. Bulgarian *npυd* : *npъd* 'quick' which perhaps emerged already in the Proto-Slavic language, or it emerged in a parallel manner to 'violent; impetuous.'

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings arose above all on the basis of the meaning 'violent' and 'impetuous,' e.g. the Slovene *pródek* 'brave,' dial. Serbian *prūd* 'irate' and 'wild/savage; uncontrollable, unsubjected' (hence 'timid,' cf. TIMID, 13B.4, p. 242), dial. Bulgarian and Macedonian *npυd* : *npъd* 'nervous, impatient.' The more related meanings are also based on 'violent': USorb *prudny* 'disturbing; tiresome' and the early Polish *prędki* 'steep'. The Slovene *pródek* 'eager' also could have emerged on the basis of 'quick,' whereas 'quick' is certainly the basis of the meaning 'early' < 'done very quickly' which is featured in Kashubian.

### 10A.3. *\*naglъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'brave' (?) 'violent' (?)

The etymology is uncertain. Perhaps it is a participle from the unattested PSlav *\*\*nagti* (: *\*\*nagěti*), which is indicated by the Lithuanian *nogėtis nōgis* 'to want; to venture to do sth, to dare' (whose etymology is not established as well) [Borys: 348]. If this hypothesis is correct,<sup>62</sup> then we are faced with the question about which of the languages preserved the original meaning: is it more likely 'brave' or 'violent.' One takes into consideration also the basis prefixed by *na-* [cf. for example, the account of the etymology in ESJS 9: 526]. Helena Karlíková is inclined to accept such an explanation due to the possibility that the adjective joined the PSlav family *\*gъbnōti*, *\*gybati* (from the PIE *\*g<sup>h</sup>eu**b**<sup>(h)</sup>-* 'to move (oneself)') which expresses movement. This interpretation is semantically justified [Karlíková 2005: 163]. Due to the formal difficulties associated

<sup>62</sup> In this situation also the Lithuanian *nōglas* : *nuōglas* 'sudden' should be treated as a native derivative of *nogėtis* and not as a borrowing from Polish, as stipulated by Fraenkel: 506.

with the aforementioned explanation (the necessity to accept the ellipsis *\*\*naǵǵb-lǵ > \*naǵǵ* I consider this problem to be still unsolved.

**Structural meaning** ‘mobile’ (?) (only when one assumes a prefixed basis, *vide supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘violent; fast’

The meaning ‘violent’ is attested in nearly all continuants, e.g. the USorb *nahŷy*, Czech *náhŷlý*, Serbian and Croatian *nāǵao*, Russian *háǵlýŷ*, Ukrainian *háǵlíŷ*, Belarusian *háǵlý*. One may reconstruct with equal sureness the meaning ‘quick’ [see QUICK, 9A.9, p. 201].

**Innovative meanings**

From the meaning ‘violent,’ which is commonly attested, there emerged varied innovative meanings: in Czech *náhŷlý*, in USorb *nahŷy* ‘steep,’ Serbian and Croatian *nāǵao* ‘importunate,’ in Old Russian *naǵlyu* ‘daring; brave,’ from which there emerged the Russian *háǵlýŷ* ‘impudent.’ The latter was also borrowed into Bulgarian *háǵǵl*.

#### 10A.4. Western and Eastern *\*šibǵkǵ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that sets or is set into motion with great force’

The PSlav *\*šibati* is probably associated with the PIE *\*kseǵ-b-*, a verbal root with the determinant *-b-* from *\*kseǵ* ‘to set sth in motion with great force,’ on which the OInd *kṣip-* ‘to throw, to cast, to hurl’ is also based [Borys: 609–610].

**Structural meaning** ‘one that performs violent movements,’ ‘performed with great force’

A derivative with the suffix *-ǵkǵ* from the PSlav *\*šibati* ‘to perform violent movements; to throw, to hit; to fling, to brandish, to toss.’

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘violent,’ ‘quick’

The North Slavic continuants indicate both meanings but one must note that ‘quick’ is better attested, whereas the meaning ‘violent,’ which is closer to the structural meaning, is discernible in the series of the early meanings of the Russian *šibkŷŷ* ‘strong, acute, about the intensity of pain, rain,’ ‘sharp; violent,’ ‘loud.’

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings of the lexeme *šibkŷŷ* in Czech and Slovak dialects are ‘nimble; skillful; enterprising.’ Cf. also the independent derivative from *\*šibati* in Slovene [see THIN, 5B.5, p. 157].

#### 10A.5. *\*durǵ/\*durǵnǵ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing; associated with wind’ (?)

The etymology is uncertain. A relationship with *\*duti* ‘to blow’ and a reconstruction of the derivative with the suffix *-rǵ* are probable, although there are reservations associated with the long vocalism; the expected form is *\*\*dyrǵ* [SP 5: 107; ESS] 5: 162].

### Structural meaning ‘impetuous’

The origin of the PSlav *\*durьnъ* may be twofold. A derivation with the suffix *-ьnъ* from the PSlav *\*duriti* ‘to bring sth into a state of turmoil’ vs. ‘to be in turmoil’, as well as the accretion of the secondary suffix *-ьnъ* is possible. The assumption that the origin of this word is deverbal also influences the interpretation of the semantic development which would be supposed to proceed at the level of verbs.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘tumultuous; violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’

Almost all of the meanings which refer to people may be reduced to ‘tumultuous, violent; impetuous,’ e.g. ‘prone to be angry; furious’ (dial. Slovak *durný*, Serbian and Croatian *duran*, dial. Russian *дурный*, dial. Ukrainian *дурний*). One may consider the meaning ‘mad’ as a common North Slavic innovation which emerged perhaps during the period of the Proto-Slavic community.

### Innovative meanings

On the basis of the meaning ‘agitated’ there emerged the meanings ‘furious,’ ‘wild,’ hence also ‘one who is easily scared away’ > ‘timid’ (dial. Slovene *dúr*, dial. Slovak *durný*). The early and dial. Polish also have the meanings ‘proud, conceited’ [see PROUD, 14A.4, p. 246].

## 10A.6. *\*bujъ* / *\*bujьnъ*

### Etymological meaning – obscure

The etymology of the PSlav *\*bujь* is uncertain. Perhaps the word is associated with the OInd *bhūyas-* ‘bigger, stronger, more powerful,’ *bhū-ri-* ‘abundant, numerous, mighty,’ perhaps with *\*byti* from the PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>eu-* ‘to be.’ These doubts preclude the reconstruction of the etymological meaning.

### Structural meaning ‘rapidly growing’

The poorly attested adjective *\*bujь* is the basis of the derivative with the suffix *-ьnъ*: *\*bujьnъ* [SP 1: 443]. I do not take into consideration the deverbal derivative *\*bujanъ* which is reconstructed in SP [l.c.].

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘excessively developed; rapidly growing; abundant’

The meanings ‘excessively developed; rapidly growing; abundant’ are peculiar to all Slavic languages (e.g. the Polish *bujny*, LSorb *bujny*: *bójny*, Czech *bujný*, Slovene *bújen*, Bulgarian *бъен*, Russian *буйный*).

### Innovative meanings

An innovation is constituted by the transposition of the meanings ‘rapidly growing; abundant,’ which originally referred to the growth of plants, hair etc., to people. This transposition was simultaneously accompanied by a polydirectional modification (Old Russian and Church Russian *буй* ‘strong,’ ‘brave,’ ‘mindless, foolish,’ Serbian and Croatian *bújan* ‘lustful; vital,’ Czech *bujný* ‘sprightly,’ dial. Polish *bujny* ‘healthy; strong; fat,’ USorb *bujny* ‘wild, violent; rollicking,’ ‘lustful; lecherous’). Due to the mutual influence of the

original *\*bujь* and *\*bujьнъ*, as well as *\*bujavъ* and the continuants of the verbs *\*bujiti*, *\*bujati*, it is difficult to establish which of the new meanings of the adjectives are motivated by verbal semantics and which arose by way of an independent development.

### 10A.7. *\*divъ*, *\*dikъ*

#### Etymological meaning – obscure

Both adjectives *\*divъ* and *\*dikъ* are based on the same stem *\*dī-*. The exact equivalent with the same suffix in reference to *\*dikъ* is the Baltic adjective (cf. the Lithuanian *dỹkas* ‘empty, vain,’ ‘useless,’ ‘free of charge; inert,’ Latvian *dīks* ‘empty; inert’).<sup>63</sup> The etymological meaning ‘not used by people’ may be reconstructed only for the Balto-Slavic group due to the uncertainty of the relationships beyond this group. The relationship with the PIE *\*deǵu-* ‘a supernatural being,’ which is sometimes postulated by Slavic etymologists [e.g. Bezlaj 1: 103] and non-Slavic ones [e.g. Walde 1: 345], is not likely due to structural reasons, namely *-u-* in the PSlav *\*divъ* has a suffixal nature, which is indicated by the doublet *\*dikъ*. The same argument indicates the lack of an affinity with the homonymic *\*divъ* ‘an evil spirit’ [see SP 3: 225].

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘not used by people’ > ‘untamed’ > ‘violent’

The basic meaning is ‘untamed’ (e.g. the Polabian *dajvě*, USorb *džiwy*, Slovak *divý*, Bulgarian *дуб* and Polish *dziki*, USorb *džiki*, Russian *дику́й et alia*). It is likely that the earlier meaning (although one that today is perceived as a secondary meaning) is ‘not used/cultivated by people, about plants, areas.’ It is difficult to establish whether the meaning ‘violent,’ one that is commonly attested in Slavic languages (e.g. LSorb *žiwý*, Czech *divý*, Polish *dziki*) actually arose in the Proto-Slavic period. SP 3: 206 and 228 reconstructs it as a Proto-Slavic word for both variants: with the suffix *-vъ* and *-kъ*.

#### Innovative meanings

Numerous meanings which arose on the basis of the following semantic strings are innovative: ‘untamed’ > ‘violent’ > ‘irate’ (e.g. the Slovene *divji* ‘furious; irate,’ Old Russian and Russian *ди́виū* ‘severe/stern’) or ‘violent’ > ‘ardent, eager’ (dial. Czech *divý*) > ‘laborious’ (dial. Russian *ди́куй*). Without doubt the meaning which is present in Russian dialects – ‘stupid, slow-witted’ – and whose origin may be associated either with ‘one that shuns the company of people, shy; timid’ or with ‘violent’ > ‘mad,’ from which ‘stupid’ arose first, followed by ‘slow witted,’ is innovative [cf. 16B.6]. On the basis of ‘violent’ there also emerged meanings which refer to physical properties, cf. the Serbian *divalj* ‘great, huge,’ dial. Russian *ди́куй* ‘strong; fierce, bitter.’ What is particularly interesting is the possibility of an opposite, almost enantiosemic conceptual development which reflects two different reactions to being in danger: attack and escape [see TIMID, 13B.2, p. 242].

<sup>63</sup> According to Wojciech Smoczyński, it is more likely that the Baltic adjectives were borrowed from Slavic languages [SEJL: 112], which seems unlikely due to the clearly different direction of the semantic development.

## 10A.8. \*jarъ/\*jarъkъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘of spring’

The etymology is a debatable question. The most likely relationship is with the PIE \*jēro- ‘year; spring.’ The frequently presented suggestion of separating a part of the meanings and linking them with the Greek ζωρός seems to be unjustified in reference to the rich historical material which clearly shows the gradual nature of the development of the particular meanings [Slawski 1: 505]. Due to the uncertainty of the original meaning (it could have been e.g. ‘of spring, associated with the development of nature’ > ‘intensive,’ ‘violent; lustful’), the sequence of the development of meanings is merely hypothetical.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘born or sown in spring’; ‘violent, lustful’

One may reconstruct the meaning ‘born or sown in spring’ (e.g. the Polish *jary*, Czech *jarý*, Slovene *jár*, Croatian *jārī*, Ukrainian *ярый*) with certainty. The meaning ‘violent, lustful’ is reconstructed partly on the basis of clear attestations (Old Church Slavonic *jarъ*, early LSorb *jary*, Russian *ярый*), partly on the basis of the innovative meanings which are derived from it, e.g. in East Slavic languages: Russian *ярый*, Ukrainian *ярый*, Belarusian *яры* ‘irate, furious.’

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings are varied. Because it has not been established whether we are dealing with one-root or double-root homonymy, we are not always able to establish from which of the meanings a given innovative meaning is derived; e.g. both ‘born in the spring’ as well as ‘violent, lustful’ could have become a basis for the meaning ‘young’ (dial. Polish *jary*, Czech *jarý* and Russian *ярый*).

## 10A.9. \*kypъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘boiling; seething’

The PSlav \**kypěti* ‘to boil; to seethe’ is derived from the PIE \**kūp-* ‘to boil, to seethe.’ The closest equivalents are found in Baltic languages: Lithuanian *kūpėti kūpu* ‘to boil, to seethe,’ Latvian *kūpēt* ‘to smoke; to be raised (of dust)’. The form \**kup-* features short vocalism: OInd *kup-* ‘to become angry,’ Latin *cupere* ‘to desire.’<sup>64</sup>

**Structural meaning** ‘boiling; seething’

A derivative (with the suffix *-ръ*) from *kupěti* ‘to boil; to seethe.’<sup>65</sup>

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘boiling, increasing one’s volume,’ ‘violent’

Although it does not appear among the meanings of the continuants, the meaning ‘violent’ supposedly constituted a transitional link between ‘boiling’ and the Old Czech *kyprý*

<sup>64</sup> Unlike LIV: 320 and 334, which separates Baltic and Slavic words from the Old Indic and Latin ones.

<sup>65</sup> The origin of this word from \**kypěti* is questioned by Rick Derksen due to semantic reasons [Derksen: 266]. However, a comparison of all of the meanings enables us to reconstruct the motivation-related processes which link the participial meaning ‘boiling’ with the meanings which are actually attested in Slavic languages.

‘eager; sprightly,’ which I infer from the modern figurative usages of the continuants of the PSlav *\*kypěti*: ‘to seethe’ > ‘to behave in a violent way’ [cf. Černýš 2003: 347].

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings based on ‘violent’ > ‘seething’ are the meanings of the Old Czech *kyprý* ‘eager, sprightly.’ For information about the meanings which arose on the basis of the development ‘seething’ > ‘increasing one’s volume.’ [See PRETTY, 3A.7, p. 129, WEAK, 6B.9, p. 177, SICK, 7B.5, p. 187]

#### 10A.10. *\*krǫtǫ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘associated with spinning’ [see STRONG, 6A.7, p. 166]

**Structural meaning** ‘twisted, twisting’ (vs. ‘twisted’) (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘spinning’ > ‘one that suddenly changes one’s direction,’ ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The explanation of the motivation of the innovative meaning ‘violent’ may differ according to the object with which a given continuant originally entered into a relationship. In East Slavic languages where the reference to a bend/turn [zakręť] is noted as a model one, the meaning ‘twisted; characterized by a sudden change of direction’ (as the Ukrainian *кpыміў* ‘strongly bent,’ ‘twisted’) – which evolved further secondary meanings: ‘strong, of wind,’ ‘ragged, about a shore, a slope,’ also ‘quick’ (dial. Belarusian *кpыміў*), that remained in a synonymous relationship with ‘sudden’<sup>66</sup> – was supposedly the original meaning. The meaning ‘impulsive, impetuous’ is secondary in relation to ‘violent,’ which refers to other objects. Another link of the string of meanings is the dial. Russian *кpымóў* ‘hard-working,’ for which one must reconstruct a transitional link ‘sprightly, eager’ – a continuant of ‘violent; fast.’

#### 10A.11. *\*lʹutǫ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that cuts sth off; sharp’ [see STERN, 12A.1, p. 226]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘cruel, stern’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meaning

The meaning ‘violent,’ which is attested already in the Old Church Slavonic *lʹutǫ* and is present until today in the Bulgarian ‘violent, impetuous; sharp-tempered,’ is a link of the semantic development ‘cruel’ > ‘furious’ > ‘violent.’

<sup>66</sup> Similarly as in Bulgarian, where it is a borrowing from Russian, whereas the dial. form *кpǫm* ‘sharp, violent, e.g. of a turn’ is most likely native.

10A.12. *\*grozъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘inspiring fear; terrible/dangerous’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘terrible/dangerous; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘impetuous, impulsive,’ which arose as a natural link of the semantic development, is attested in the early Polish *groźny* and the Serbian and Croatian *grožan*.

10A.13. *\*polchъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘set in motion; one that sets in motion; mobile’ [see TIMID, 13B.1, p. 239]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘eager to run; eager to flee’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘sudden, violent, impulsive’ of the Croatian and Serbian *plāh* and ‘rollicking, untamed,’ Old Polish *plōchy* are derived from the meaning ‘eager to run,’ which is not directly preserved in the continuants.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

10A.1. *\*ęglъ*

VIOLENT Eastern ← STRONG etym.

10A.2. *\*prǫdъ/\*prǫdъkъ/\*prǫdъnъ*

VIOLENT PSlav ← ONE THAT PERFORMS VIOLENT MOVEMENTS struct. ← JUMPING etym.

10A.3. *\*naglъ*

10A.3.1.

VIOLENT PSlav ← EAGER (?) etym.

or

10A.3.2.

VIOLENT PSlav ← BRAVE (?) etym.

10A.4. *\*šibъkъ*

VIOLENT Russian ← PERFORMED WITH GREAT FORCE struct.

10A.5. *\*durъ/\*durъnъ*

VIOLENT ← IMPETUOUS etym. ← ASSOCIATED WITH WIND etym.

10A.6. *\*bujъ/\*bujъnъ*

VIOLENT PSlav ← GROWING IN ABUNDANCE PSlav

10A.7. *\*divъ, \*dikъ*

VIOLENT PSlav ← UNTAMED PSlav ← NOT USED BY PEOPLE PSlav

10A.8. *\*jarь/\*jarьkь*

VIOLENT etym. ← BORN IN SPRING (?) etym.

10A.9. *\*kyprь*

\*VIOLENT PSlav ← SEETHING etym.

10A.10. *\*krъtь*

VIOLENT PSlav ← ONE THAT SUDDENLY CHANGES ONE'S DIRECTION PSlav ← SPINNING PSlav

10A.11. *\*lutь*

VIOLENT Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian ← IRATE Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian ← CRUEL PSlav ← SHARP etym.

10A.12. *\*grozьnь*

VIOLENT early Polish, Serbian, Croatian ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

10A.13. *\*polchь*

VIOLENT Croatian, Serbian ← EAGER TO RUN PSlav ← MOBILE etym.

The motivations of the concept 'violent' are based on strength (*\*ęglь, \*šibьkь*), movement (*\*prъdь, \*polchь; \*naglь* – alternatively), e.g. on jumps (*\*prъdь*, indirect motivation), running (*\*polchь*), boiling (*\*kyprь*), as well as on the sudden change of direction associated with movement (*\*krъtь*). The motivations associated with the activity of nature, based on wind (*\*durьnь*), the growing of plants (*\*buьjьnь*), perhaps also the association with spring (*\*jarь (?)*) are less pronounced than one would expect. The remaining motivations are associated with properties which may accompany violence: the proclivity to anger (*\*lutь*), the ability to inspire fear (*\*grozьnь*) and its causes: being untamed (*\*divь, \*dikь*). The possible motivations based on the attempts at reconstructing the etymological meaning include: willingness or boldness (*\*naglь*) do not have parallels in the aforementioned material.

## 10B. CALM

10B.1. *\*mirьnь*

**Etymological meaning** 'pleasant, delicate'

The PSlav *\*mirь* is based on the PIE root *\*mēi-/mōi-/mī-* with the extending formant *-ro-*. For information about the semantics cf. *\*milь* [see PLEASANT, 2A.1, p. 115].

**Structural meaning** 'calm; peaceful'

A derivative with the suffix *-ьnь* from *\*mirь* 'peace; tranquillity.'

**The meaning based on continuants ‘calm; peaceful’**

The meanings of the continuants are identical with the structural meaning and are uniform in all Slavic languages (e.g. the Old Polish *mirny*, Czech *mírný*, Bulgarian *мирен*, Russian *мирный*).

**Innovative meanings**

A typical development of semantic strings may be discerned in the following examples: Russian *мирный* ‘calm’ < ‘mild,’ Serbian *míran* ‘calm’ > ‘humble,’ ‘peaceful’ > ‘concordant.’

10B.2. *\*pokojьnъ***Etymological meaning ‘soothing, relieving’**

The PSlav *\*kójiti* ‘to soothe, to relieve; to calm’ is a causativum from the unattested *\*\*čiti* ‘to rest,’ based on the PIE *\*kueǵə-/\*kuǵiē-* (cf. *\*čitъ/\*čitavъ* – HEALTHY, 7A.3, p. 183).

**Structural meaning ‘soothing, relieving,’ ‘calm’**

A derivative with the suffix *-ьnъ* from *\*pokojъ* ‘peace; tranquillity,’ which in turn is based on the verb *\*kójiti* ‘to soothe, to relieve.’

**The meaning based on continuants ‘calm’**

The meaning ‘calm’ is preserved in all of the groups of Slavic languages (e.g. the Old Church Slavonic *pokojьnъ*, Czech *pokojný*, Slovene *pokójen*, Russian *покойный*).

**Innovative meanings**

On the basis of the meaning ‘calm’ there emerged the meaning ‘dead’ as an euphemism (e.g., Slovene *pokójen*, Serbian *pòkójni*).

10B.3. Western *\*kl'udьnъ***Etymological meaning ‘clean’**

The PSlav *\*kl'udъ*, *\*kl'uditi* are based on the PIE *\*kleud-* ‘to clean; to put into order,’ cf. Gothic *hlūtrs* ‘clean,’ Greek *κλύζειν* ‘to wash; to clean.’ The PIE *\*kleu-d-*, with the determinant *-d-*, is based on *\*kleu-* (which is also reconstructed in the form *\*k̑leu-*, due to the Lithuanian *šlúoti šlúoju* ‘to sweep’). The alternative PSlav *\*chl'udъ*, which suggests the presence of *s* mobile in the PIE language, causes difficulties.

**Structural meaning ‘ordered’**

A derivative with the suffix *-ьnъ* from the PSlav *\*kl'udъ* ‘order’ or *\*kl'uditi* ‘to clean; to put into order.’

**The meaning based on continuants ‘clean; neat’ > ‘calm’**

The original PSlav meaning is ‘clean; neat’; today it occurs in the dial. Czech *kludny* ‘neat, tidy.’ The commonness of the meaning ‘calm’ indicates that it originated already in the Proto-Slavic period (cf. the Slovak *kl'udný*, Czech *klidný*, USorb and LSorb *kludny*).

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meanings, which arose independently, are examples of the development of semantic strings, e.g. USorb *kludny* ‘calm’ > ‘mild; tame.’

#### 10B.4. *\*tichъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘quiet’ (?), ‘straight’ (?)

The PSlav *\*tichъ* has an exact equivalent in the Lithuanian *teisus* ‘righteous, honest, just’; it is probably derived from the earlier ‘straight,’ which is derived in turn from ‘spread,’ cf. *tiēstis* ‘to stretch; extend.’ An account of the aforementioned facts is insufficient to draw conclusions about the etymological meaning because two meanings which are remote from each other and which refer to original ideas in the same respect, do not have a *tertium comparationis*. The supporters of the originality of the meanings ‘straight’ < ‘spread’ mention the semantic parallel in the form of the Italian *piano* ‘even; slow; calm, quiet’ from the Latin *planus* ‘spread.’

##### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘quiet’

The meaning ‘quiet’ is attested in all Slavic languages, e.g. USorb *cichy*, LSorb *śichy*, Czech *tichý*, Russian *тихий*, Serbian and Croatian *tih*, Old Church Slavonic *tichъ*.

### Innovative meanings

By way of a transposition of the meaning ‘quiet’ from human behaviour to man himself there emerged the meanings ‘calm’ (e.g. Bulgarian *mux*, Russian *миху́й*), ‘humble’ (e.g. Ukrainian *миху́й*, Belarusian *ціхі*), ‘mild.’

#### 10B.5. Eastern (?) *\*plochъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘flat’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.5, p. 107]

##### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The Ukrainian *плохі́й* ‘calm; quiet; mild,’ which formally continues the PSlav *plochъ*, was formed on the basis of the semantics of the continuants of *\*polchъ*, unless it is not a borrowing from Polish.

#### 10B.6. *\*lagodьnъ*

##### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘arranged; neat’ (?), ‘weak’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.3, p. 116]

##### **Structural meanings** ‘arranged, harmonious,’ ‘calm’ (*ut supra*)

##### **The meanings based on continuant** ‘pleasant, agreeable,’ ‘mild, calm’ (*ut supra*)

The meanings ‘mild, calm,’ similarly as ‘kind, agreeable,’ allegedly arose already in the Proto-Slavic period, which is indicated by the continuants: Church Slavonic *lagodьnъ*,

Slovene *lágoden*, Polish *łagodny* as well as by the direction of the development of the innovative meanings.

### 10B.7. \*jьтънѣ

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that is being taken; taken’ [see PLEASANT, 2A.4, p. 115]

**Structural meaning** ‘taken’ > ‘suitable for being taken, for being held in the hand’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuant** ‘taken’ > ‘pleasant, delicate, pleasant to the touch’ (*ut supra*)

In the Proto-Slavic language the structural meaning ‘taken’ was still viable, which is proven by the Church Slavonic *jemънѣ* ‘conducted for show, for profit.’ A trace of this meaning may be also associated with the dial. Russian *úmный* ‘domesticated/tame; calm’ and the dial. Macedonian *емен* ‘tame; mild.’ It was likely that already in the Proto-Slavic language there emerged the meaning ‘pleasant, delicate, pleasant to the touch,’ attested in the Czech and Slovak *jemný*, and indirectly also in the early Polish *jemny* ‘soft.’

#### Innovative meanings

The innovative shifts are discernible in the meaning ‘mild,’ which paved the way for further associations – ‘calm’ > ‘quiet.’ There is also an alternative possibility of explaining the meanings ‘calm’ as a semantic development from ‘one that is able to be grasped, caught.’

### 10B.8. \*krotъkъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘beaten’ (?) [see HUMBLE, 14B.2, p. 249]

**Structural meaning** ‘tamed by beating; subjugated’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘subjugated; tame’ > ‘mild’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

A further link of the semantic string ‘calm,’ attested e.g. by the Bulgarian *крѡтък*, could have easily arisen from the meanings ‘subjugated; tame, mild’

### 10B.9. \*mъdrъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘thinking’ [see WISE, 16A.1, p. 260]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘wise’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The secondary meaning of the Bulgarian *мѣдръ* ‘calm’ arose due to an inference. One may suppose that it was originally used in reference to domestic animals, although in modern dictionaries the word appears without distributional limitations.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

10B.1. *\*mirьnъ*

CALM PSlav ← DELICATE etym.

10B.2. *\*pokojьnъ*

CALM PSlav ← SOOTHING/SOOTHED struct.

10B.3. *\*kl'udьnъ*

CALM Western ← WELL-ARRANGED struct. ← CLEAN etym.

10B.4. *\*tichъ*

10B.4.1.

CALM Pan-Slavic ← QUIET PSlav

or

10B.4.2.

CALM Pan-Slavic ← QUIET PSlav ← SPREAD etym.

10B.5. *\*plochъ*

CALM Ukrainian ← SHY/TIMID Ukrainian

10B.6. *\*lagodьnъ*

10B.6.1.

CALM PSlav ← ARRANGED etym. (?)

or

10B.6.2.

CALM PSlav ← WEAK etym. (?)

10B.7. *\*jьmьnъ*

CALM Russian ← ONE THAT CAN BE TAKEN IN THE HAND struct.

10B.8. *\*krotъkъ*

CALM Bulgarian ← MILD PSlav ← TAME PSlav

10B.9. *\*mъdrъ*

CALM Bulgarian ← WISE PSlav

The basis of the motivations of the concept 'calm,' similarly as in the case of the group MILD, is associated with words whose semantics is closely related, therefore they are motivated by silence (*\*tichъ*), delicateness or mildness (*\*mirьnъ*, *\*krotъkъ*). The motivations may also be associated with: wisdom (*\*mъdrъ*), orderliness (*\*kl'udьnъ*, *\*lagodьnъ* – alternative motivation), timidity (*\*plochъ*), and even weakness (*\*lagodьnъ* – alternative motivation) i.e. various factors which make one calm.

## 11A. CHEERFUL/MERRY

### 11A.1. \*veselъ

#### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘good’ (?)

According to Pokorny, the PSlav \*veselъ is based on the PIE root \*uesu- ‘good.’ The closest equivalent is the Latvian *vesels* ‘healthy; intact/whole,’ Old Prussian *wessals* ‘merry,’ apart from that the only Indo-European word with the extension *-el-* is represented by the Illyrian proper name *Veselia* [Pokorny: 1174–1175]. The Indo-European facts do not enable us to establish the etymological meaning. The continuants with the determinant *-el-* are exiguous, whereas the commonly assumed association with the root \*uesu- ‘good’ is based merely on semasiological premises. In Pokorny’s lexicon, apart from \*uesu- : \*uēsu-, there are reconstructions of nine roots in the form *ues-* and each of them may be the formal basis \*ues-el-. From the semantic point of view one may consider an affinity with the root which with its heteroclitic determinant *r : ŋ* is the basis of the names of spring: *ues-r*, Gen. *ues-nes*, hence the PSlav \*vesna ‘spring.’

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘merry, joyful’

The continuants of the PSlav \*veselъ occur in all Slavic languages with the meaning ‘merry.’

#### **Innovative meanings**

There are no innovative meanings which refer to people. In Bulgarian and Macedonian there emerged a figurative designation of plants and flowers ‘fresh, green, verdant.’

### 11A.2. \*radъ : \*radъnъ

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘merry, joyful’

The PSlav \*radъ is based on the PIE root \*rēd- ‘to gladden,’ ‘merry’ [Borys: 508]. There is an equivalent in the Old English language: *rōt* ‘merry’; the Lithuanian *rōdas* ‘eager,’ due to the stress and the vowel quality, is considered a borrowing from one of the Slavic languages [Heidermanns: 453].

#### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘merry; satisfied’ > ‘eager’

The continuants of the PSlav \*radъ exist in all Slavic languages – both with the meaning ‘merry’ as well as ‘satisfied, content.’ One may infer from a comparison with Germanic equivalents that the new derivative – from the PSlav \*radostъnъ from the abstractum *radostъ* based on \*radъ – assumed the early meaning, and the basic adjective attenuated its content. Without doubt this change occurred already during the existence of the Proto-Slavic community.

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovation is constituted by the existence of the adjective in the form of an element of adverbial expressions: Czech *býti rád* ‘to be glad,’ *mít rád* ‘to like’<sup>67</sup> (analogically in

<sup>67</sup> *Mít rád* is commonly considered as a semantic calque of the German *gern haben*. However, as far as the remaining phrases are concerned, I have not found a basis in the German language, although an influence of this language is by all means likely also in Slovene and Croatian.

Slovak), Croatian *biti rad* 'to want, to desire,' Slovene *rad biti komu* 'to love someone.' The basis for this innovation arose presumably already in the Proto-Slavic language by way of the emergence of the meaning 'eager.'

### 11A.3. \*bъdrъ, \*budьnъ

**Etymological meaning** 'vigilant; wakeful' [see QUICK, 9A.4, p. 199]

**Structural meaning** 'vigilant; wakeful'

The form \*budьnъ which occurs apart from \*bъdrъ is a derivative with the suffix -ьnъ from \*buditi 'to waken,' a causativum to bъděti 'to be wakeful.'

**The meanings based on continuants** 'vigilant,' 'lively,' 'sprightly' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'merry' arose independently in a number of languages as a developmental string of 'sprightly' (the latter emerged in the Proto-Slavic language) – the same applies to the derivative (of) \*budьnъ, see structural meaning.

### 11A.4. \*čilъ

**Etymological meaning** 'rested' [see HEALTHY, 7A.4, p. 184]

**Structural meaning** 'resting,' 'rested' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'rested' > 'lively,' 'sprightly' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The emergence of the meaning 'merry' in the USorb *čily* – apart from 'sprightly, active, ruddy, robust, lively' – represents a typical string of meanings, which is derived from the etymological meaning 'rested.'

### 11A.5. \*dъžь

**Etymological meaning** 'strong' [see STRONG, 6A.5, p. 164]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'strong' > 'healthy' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In Kashubian there is the continuation of the form *dъžь*, which is absent in the literary Polish language. Another innovative meaning is 'sprightly,' hence 'quick' and 'merry' – it is different from the meaning of the Polish *duży* 'big.'

### 11A.6. \*č'ьstvъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'weaved' (?) 'cutting' (?) [see STRONG, 6A.6, p. 165]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘dense,’ ‘hard,’ ‘firm,’ ‘robust; strong’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘merry’ is a part of the semantic string along with ‘sprightly,’ ‘fast,’ ‘skillful.’ The beginning of this string is presumably ‘strong,’ regardless of the etymological explanation.

11A.7. Western and Southern \**drěčьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘elongated lengthwise’ [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.2, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** ‘such like a pillar, like a tree trunk’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘well-grown’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning of the dial. Czech *drěčný* ‘merry,’ which occurs apart from ‘pretty; shapely,’ presumably arose by way of the intermediation of the unattested ‘sprightly,’ which is directly associated with shapeliness.

11A.8. \**jarъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘of spring’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.8, p. 208]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘of spring,’ ‘violent, lustful’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Czech and Slovak *jarý* ‘merry, sprightly’ refers to other meanings of the lexeme ‘young, lively, spry,’ which also exist in Czech. All of the meanings are motivated by a relationship with spring.

11A.9. \**rъdъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘arranged in a row, in a series’ [see GOOD, 1A.4, p. 97]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘appropriate, suitable’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In a Kashubian dialect a continuant of the Kashubian *rъdi* ‘nimble, lively, healthy, merry, robust, spry’ was preserved. The semantic string concentrates around the Proto-Slavic meaning ‘appropriate.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

11A.1. *\*veselъ*

11A.1.1.

MERRY PSlav ← GOOD (?) etym. PIE

or

11A.1.2.

MERRY PSlav ← ASSOCIATED WITH SPRING (?) etym. PIE

11A.2. *\*radъ*

MERRY PSlav ← MERRY etym.

11A.3. *\*bъdrъ, \*budъnъ*

MERRY Slovak, Croatian, Serbian, Russian ← SPRIGHTLY PSlav ← VIGILANT PSlav

11A.4. *\*čilъ*

MERRY USorb ← SPRIGHTLY Western, Southern ← RESTED struct.

11A.5. *\*dъžъ*

MERRY Kashubian ← SPRIGHTLY Kashubian ← STRONG PSlav

11A.6. *\*čъstvъ*

MERRY dial. Czech ← SPRIGHTLY Western ← STRONG PSlav

11A.7. *\*drěčъnъ*

MERRY dial. Czech ← \*SPRIGHTLY ← SHAPELY Czech ← SLENDER Czech, Slovak ← TALL Czech, Slovak

11A.8. *\*jarъ*

MERRY/SPRIGHTLY Czech, Slovak ← OF SPRING PSlav

11A.9. *\*rъdъ*

MERRY/SPRIGHTLY Kashubian ← APPROPRIATE PSlav

The basic motivation of the concept ‘merry’ is sprightliness (*\*bъdrъ, \*budъnъ, \*čilъ, \*dъžъ, \*čъstvъ, \*jarъ, \*rodъ*). One may conjecture that the same intermediary link existed between the meanings ‘shapely’ and ‘merry’ (*\*drěčъnъ*). The intermediary motivation through concepts associated with spring (*\*jarъ*) could have constituted a parallel for the supposed etymological relationship between spring and cheerfulness.

## 11B. SAD

11B.1. *\*skъrbъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘one that is/has been cut; cutting’ (?), ‘wrinkled, curled up’ (?)

The closest equivalent of the PSlav *\*skъrbiti* is the Lithuanian *skuībti skurbstù* ‘to be poverty-stricken, to be in need of sth.’ As far as the formal aspects are concerned, we

should take two possibilities into consideration. The PSlav *\*skʁbiti* may be based on the reduced grade of the PIE *\*(s)kerbʰ-* ‘to be sharp; to cut;’ cf. Old English *sceorfan* ‘to gnaw,’ Old Irish *cerb* ‘sharp.’ It is also possible that it is derived from the PIE *\*(s)kerb-* ‘to spin, to twist; to curl up, to crease,’ hence the PSlav *\*skʁbnŋti*<sup>68</sup> [cf. Russian *скóрбнуть* ‘to crease’ – Vasmer<sup>2</sup> 3: 650–651], cf. Old High German *schrimpfen* ‘to shrink; to crease’ [LIV: 504].

### Structural meaning ‘woeful; sad’

A derivative with the suffix *-ьнѣ* from the PSlav *\*skʁbiti* ‘to regret.’ The continuants of the verb do not manifest any traces of a concrete meaning – the expected ‘to be sick.’ The only possible trace of this is a derivative in the Russian language which is discussed below.

### The meanings based on continuants ‘sick,’ ‘sad’

The general meaning which is attested in all languages apart from Czech and Slovak is ‘sad,’ e.g. the Bulgarian *скрѣбен*. The meaning in the early Russian *скóрбный* ‘sick’ may be a residue of a more concrete meaning, associated with the etymological meaning, even regardless of the etymology that one chooses.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘stingy; greedy’ of the Czech and Slovak *skrblivý* (earlier *skrbivý*), derivatives from *skrbiliti* of the earlier *skrbiti*, could be most easily derived from the meaning of the Lithuanian equivalent ‘to be poverty-stricken, to be in need of sth,’ as suggested by Rejzek (cf. “Výchozí význam v bsl. byl ‘být v bídě, starostech,’ odtud do č. ‘(nemístně) šetřit” – (“The initial meaning in Balto-Slavic was ‘to be poverty-stricken, to be in need,’ from which it paved the way to the Czech ‘to save up (inappropriately/inordinately)’”) [Rejzek: 577], although an attestation from one language does not furnish a sufficient basis to consider this meaning as the etymological one.

## 11B.2. *\*dręchlъ* : *\*drŋchlъ*, *\*dręselъ*

### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘rotten’ (?)

The PSlav *\*dręchnŋti* : *\*drŋchnŋti* cannot be explained with any degree of certainty. They were considered variants with the voiced syllable onset from PSlav *\*trŋchnŋti* : *truchnŋti* ‘to rot,’ compared with Lithuanian *trėšti* ‘to rot, to decay,’ Latvian *tresēt tresu* ‘to rot, to decay.’ In this case the etymological meaning would be ‘rotten.’

### Structural meaning

The PSlav *\*dręselъ* : *\*dręchlъ* are based on the same basis *\*\*dręchati* : *\*\*drŋchati* or *\*dręchnŋti* : *\*drŋchnŋti* ‘to become weak, decrepit.’ *\*dręchlъ* is an active preterite participle, *dręselъ* is an adjective with the suffix *-elъ* with the incompletely explained transition *-ch-* > *-s-*. SP 4: 223 also mentions the Russian derivative *дряxóтьe* ‘that which is old, decrepit (of a man)’ from the adjective *\*дряхый* < *\*dręchъ*, which could have been the basis of the verbal form.

<sup>68</sup> From the semantic point of view it is not completely justified to separate the Russian words *скóрбнуть* ‘to crease,’ *скóрбить* ‘to make sth rough,’ *скóрблый* ‘dried up; wrinkled; rough, uneven.’ It seems that one should verify the way they were treated as ones that belong to other Proto-Slavic roots.

### The meanings based on continuants ‘decrepit, debilitated by age,’ ‘sad’

The meaning which refers to a mental state – ‘gloomy, sad’ – is well-attested in the oldest sources (Old Church Slavonic *dręchlъ* ‘sad, gloomy,’ *dręselъ* ‘idem,’ Old Russian *дряхлыи* ‘sad’ apart from ‘decrepit due to age, ‘weak,’ ‘tired; lazy, slow,’ ‘cruel, rough/hard, stern,’ as well as the early Czech *drachlý* ‘sad,’ early Ukrainian *дряхлиий* ‘sad, lugubrious’). It occurs also in the Slovene *dresel* ‘sad, lugubrious’ and in Serbian as well as dial. Croatian *drěseo* ‘sad.’ The dating and the geography of the attestations make us reconstruct the meaning ‘sad’ already for the Proto-Slavic language. The obscurity of the etymological meaning does not allow us to answer the question whether the meanings which are registered in all East Slavic languages – ‘doddering, of advanced years, decrepit’ – are derived from the earlier ‘rotten’ and therefore whether or not they precede the meaning ‘sad.’

### Innovative meanings

The meanings of the Old Russian *дряхлыи* ‘tired; lazy, slow’ are based on ‘decrepit due to age, weak.’ The meanings ‘cruel, rough, stern’ require a more comprehensive study. The meanings of the USorb *drjechły* ‘sordid; miserable’ seem to indicate the presence of meanings which refer to physical features also in West Slavic languages, for it is only on their basis that they could have arisen.

### 11B.3. \**szmōtъnъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘clouded, stirred’

The PSlav \**mōtiti*, the basis of the prefixed \**szmōtiti*, is based on the PIE causativum or iterativum to the PIE \**ment<sup>h</sup>*- ‘to stir, to disturb’ [LIV: 395]. The difference between the base and the causative-iterative form in the semantics of the continuants of Proto-Indo-European words is not discernible.

#### Structural meaning ‘clouded, stirred’

A derivative from the PSlav \**szmōtiti* ‘to stir, to disturb.’ Its Proto-Slavic status is debatable.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘turbid, indistinct’

The Old Church Slavonic *szmōtъnъ* ‘turbid, muddy; agitated/choppy,’ Czech *smůtný* ‘sad,’ Polish *smętny* and – the word which arose under the influence of the Czech language – *smutny* ‘idem,’ Russian ‘indistinct,’ ‘turbulent, tempestuous.’ The presence of the derivative in all groups of languages and the preservation of the structural meaning in Russian *смýта*, of which the noun – the basis for the second one – is deprived, and which without doubt is under its influence, speaks in favor of its Proto-Slavic origins. Whereas the Polish *smętny* and Czech *smutný* are most likely derivatives from the verbal continuants of the PSlav \**mōtiti* : Czech *smutiti*, Polish *smęcić*. A change of meaning presumably also occurred at the level of the verb.

### 11B.4. \**ědъnъ*

#### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘edible’ (?), ‘festering’ (?), ‘burning’ (?)

The PSlav \**ědъ* has no well-established etymology [cf. SP 6: 124–125]. It is considered either as an original euphemistic designation of a poison, etymologically identical

with *\*ědъ* ‘food,’ a derivative from *\*ěsti* ‘to eat,’ or as a word based on the PIE *\*oid-* ‘to cause festering, rotting; to swell, to puff up.’ In turn, Kazimierz Moszyński attempted to derive *\*ědъ* from the PIE *\*aidʰ-* ‘to burn (transitive and intransitive),’ supporting his argument with the designation of the taste of poisonous mushrooms: ‘burning, scorching’ [K. Moszyński 1957b: 295].

**Structural meaning** ‘full of venom; venomous’

The PSlav *\*ědъnъ* is a derivative from *\*ědъ* ‘venom, poison,’ and the latter is derived from *\*ěsti*. The meaning of the noun arose from the original ‘food’ as a euphemistic designation of a poison.

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘venomous; poisonous’ > Southern ‘irate,’ ‘unhappy’

The meaning of the noun arose from the original ‘food’ as a euphemistic designation of poison. The North Slavic continuants do not have meanings which could be referred to man, whereas in South Slavic languages a wide range of such meanings arose. SP 6: 129 reconstruct only one figurative meaning ‘full of venom’ > ‘irate.’ The second Pan-South-Slavic figurative meaning is ‘unhappy’; one may derive it from the same basic meaning. The semantic element on which the metaphoric meanings are based is common: ‘full of bitterness,’ hence the South Slavic ‘unhappy.’

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning which refers to sadness arose in South Slavic languages presumably as the string ‘unhappy’ > ‘sad.’

11B.5. *\*revъnъ*/*\*revъnivъ*, *\*revlivъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘roaring’ [cf. DILIGENT, 15A.2, p. 252]

**Structural meaning** ‘roaring’ (*ut supra*)

Derivatives with the suffix *-nъ* (and with *-ivъ* accreted onto it), *-livъ* [cf. DILIGENT, 15A.2, p. 252].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘roaring’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘sad’ of the Polish adjectives *rzewny*, Old Polish *rzewniwy*, *rzewliwy* is derived from ‘one who roars loudly’ through the stage ‘tearful’ (which is also attested), cf. also the Ukrainian *рѣвний* ‘moving,’ although one may not rule out the possibility that this is a borrowing from Polish.

11B.6. *\*grozъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see STERN, 12A.4, p. 227]

**Structural meaning** ‘inspiring fear; terrible/dangerous’ (*ut supra*)

## The meaning based on continuants ‘terrible/dangerous; terrifying’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

In my opinion, the only way to account for the meanings of the early Serbian and Croatian *grôzan* ‘painful, sad,’ ‘unhappy, poor’ and the dial. Bulgarian *зрôзен* ‘sad’ is to apply the model present in the early Polish *strachliwy*, where apart from the meaning ‘fearful’ there emerged the meaning ‘timid.’ The development from ‘timid; scared’ to the meanings which exist in Serbian and Croatian seem to be by all means probable, although a hypothetical intermediary link has not been attested.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

11B.1. *\*skrbьnъ*

11B.1.1.

SAD PSlav ← CREASED etym.

or

11B.1.2.

SAD PSlav ← CUT/WOUNDED etym.

11B.2. *\*dręselъ, \*dręchlъ : \*drôchlъ*

SAD PSlav ← WEAK PSlav

11B.3. *\*sъmôtblъnъ*

SAD Polish, Czech ← TURBID/CLOUDED PSlav

11B.4. *\*ędbъnъ*

SAD Southern ← UNHAPPY Southern ← FULL OF VENOM PSlav

11B.5. *\*revьnъ, \*revьnivъ, \*revlivъ*

SAD Polish ← TEARFUL Polish ← ROARING PSlav

11B.6. *\*grozьnъ*

SAD Serbian, Croatian ← UNHAPPY Serbian, Croatian ← \*SCARED ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

The motivations of the concept ‘sad’ are based on the manifestations of sadness: *fletus* (*\*revьnъ*), perhaps also frowning (*\*skrbьnъ* – an alternative etymological motivation, although one may also perceive here the second alternative motivation – the one associated with cutting). A figurative nature is manifested by the motivation by being muddy (*\*sъmôtblъnъ*). One should treat the motivation by putrefaction (*\*dręselъ : dręchlъ*) in a similar manner, although in this case we are dealing with an uncertain etymological motivation. One of the intermediary motivations of the feeling of unhappiness, and then sad is interesting – being full of venom (*\*ędbъnъ*).

## 12A. STERN

### 12A.1. \**lutō*

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘one that cuts off; sharp’

It is likely that \**lutō* < \**leu-to-* is derived from the Proto-Indo-European participial form from the PIE \**leu-* ‘to cut off, to separate’ [Borys: 291–292].

#### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘hardly bearable, about a taste/frost’ > ‘cruel; stern’

The basic Proto-Slavic meaning was presumably a designation of great intensity which referred e.g. to a taste, frost. It is common to this day in Slavic languages, e.g., Polish *luty* ‘strong (of frost),’ Serbian *ljūt* ‘hot (of food).’ The meanings ‘cruel, stern; very bad’ probably emerged by way of a metonymic transposition of the name of an object to its user; they are attested in the majority of languages (e.g. Old Church Slavonic *lutō*, Czech *lity*, Slovak *lutý*, Russian *лютымъ*). Petleva [1978] devotes more attention to the development of the PSlav \**lutō*.

#### **Innovative meanings**

On the basis of the meaning ‘stern, cruel’ there emerged ‘irate; furious’ (Czech *lity*), ‘wild’ (Czech *lity*, Slovene *ljūt*, Old Russian *лютымъ*). Rich development is represented by the part of the meanings which do not refer to people. The meaning ‘hard, unbearable’ produced many innovative meanings, especially ones that refer to the sense of taste; e.g., in the dialects of the South Slavic languages there emerged the meaning ‘sour’ apart from ‘burning; hot.’ In Serbian the meaning ‘hard’ passed – quite unexpectedly in this context – into ‘fragile, brittle,’ in Polish and in both Sorbian languages – into ‘pure, without admixtures, about a valuable metal ore.’ [Cf. also VIOLENT, 10A.11, p. 211, QUICK, 9A.12, p. 201, BRAVE, 13A.15, p. 239]

### 12A.2. \**strogō*

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘careful’ > ‘one that is on guard’

The PSlav \**strogō* is based on the PIE \**sterg-* ‘to take care of, sich um etw. kümmern’ [cf. LIV: 544], similarly as the PSlav \**stergti* ‘to guard, φυλάττειν’ whose semantic development presumably exerted an influence upon the development of the meaning of the adjective \**strogō*. The form \**strogō* features vocalism which is peculiar to nomina.

#### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘severus, stern’

The meanings ‘severus, stern’ are attested in the majority of Slavic languages.

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings are associated with the transposition of the meanings from man to other objects, e.g. the Russian *cmpόгзуй* ‘strict,’ ‘brief; simple,’ Czech *strohý* ‘idem,’ as well as ‘rough.’

### 12A.3. \*sorgъ

#### Etymological meaning – obscure

There is a possibility of a relationship with the continuants of the PIE \**suergʰ*- ‘to be sick,’ cf. LIV: 558, although the very existence of the Proto-Slavic adjective in the form of \**sorgъ* raises doubts.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘strict/harsh, stern’

The adjective is reconstructed on the basis of the Russian/Church Slavonic *срагъ*, dial. Russian *срѡга* ‘a gruff man.’ Less grounds for reconstruction are furnished by the Polish *srogі* and the early and dial. LSorb *srožyś se* ‘to be angry at someone,’ which are more likely continuants of the PSlav \**strogъ* with a simplification of the consonantal group *str-* into *sr-* [see Boryś: 573]. It is difficult to determine whether we are dealing here with a residually preserved Proto-Slavic adjective (it is certain that it was subject to the influence of the better-preserved \**strogъ*) or with the irregular forms of the continuants of \**strogъ*, which emerged under the influence of the forms with the original group *-orT-*.

### 12A.4. \*grozъnъ

#### Etymological meaning – obscure

The etymology of the PSlav \**groza* is uncertain. According to SP 8: 232–233, the most likely relationship is with the Lithuanian *grasà* ‘menace; sternness,’ *grasùs* ‘terrible/dangerous,’ *grėsti* ‘to endanger.’ According to ESSJ 7: 141–142, instead one should take into consideration onomatopoeic origin, based on the initial \**g-r-g-/g-r-g-*, similarly as in the Greek *γοργός* ‘wild; terrible; stern.’

#### Structural meaning ‘inspiring fear, terrible/dangerous’

A derivative from \**groza*; the meaning is motivated also by the verb \**groziti* [SP 8: 238].

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘dangerous; terrifying’

The meaning ‘menacing; dangerous’ is attested in all Slavic languages, e.g. Old Church Slavonic *грозънъ*. The meaning ‘terrifying’ is a natural link in the semantic development.

#### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘severus, stern; cruel’ – apart from ‘menacing,’ which occurs in many languages (e.g. LSorb *grozny*, Bulgarian *грозен*, Serbian and Croatian *grožan*, Russian *грозный*, Belarusian *грозны*) is an extension of the inherited meaning. There is also a common meaning ‘great’ (early Polish *groźny*, early USorb *hrozny*, Czech and Slovak *hrozný*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *грозен*, Ukrainian *грізний*). Especially noteworthy is the enantiosemic semantic development in the Slovene language [see PRETTY, 3A.10, p. 131 aside UGLY, 3B.8, p. 138]. See also SAD, 11B.6, p. 224.

12A.5. \*zъlъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘obliquus’ > ‘bad’ [see BAD, 1B.1, p. 104]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad’ > ‘irate’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning ‘stern’ is a hyperbolization of the meaning ‘bad,’ which is possible in every Slavic language.

12A.6. \*čъstvъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘enlaced’ [see STRONG, 6A.6, p. 163]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘dense’ > ‘hard’ > ‘firm’ > ‘robust; strong’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings ‘callous, merciless; bad, stern’ arose by way of a figurative usage of the meaning ‘hard.’

12A.7. \*grdъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘weak?’ [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Old Russian meaning ‘stern, irate’ presumably arose on the basis of the meaning ‘dangerous’ (common especially in the South and East Slavic languages), which is derived from the original ‘proud, superbus’ through an intermediary stage ‘daring.’ In South Slavic languages other innovative meanings emerged from ‘terrible/dangerous, menacing’: ‘great,’ ‘bad,’ ‘abhorrent; ugly.’

12A.8. Western and Eastern \*prikrъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see UNPLEASANT, 2B.1, p. 120]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘steep,’ ‘difficult; burdensome,’ ‘unpleasant’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘severus, stern, brutal’ of the Old Polish *przykry* and of the Old Czech *příkrý* are results of a metaphoric transposition of the meaning ‘not easily accessible’ to refer to men.

## 12A.9. \*krǫtǫ

**Etymological meaning** ‘associated with turning/spinning’ [see STRONG, 6A.7, p. 166]

**Structural meaning** ‘twisted; (vs. ‘winding’; ‘spinning’) (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘strongly twisted’ > ‘stiff; hard’

The meaning which also has pan-Slavic range is ‘cruel’: Czech (already in Old Czech) and Slovak *krutý*, Croatian and Serbian *krût* (hence the borrowed Macedonian *кpym*),<sup>69</sup> Russian *кpымóû*, Ukrainian *кpымúû*. The motivational basis of the meaning ‘cruel, merciless’ is most likely ‘hard,’ which is indicated by the strings of co-occurring meanings in the particular languages. In some of the languages (e.g., the East Slavic ones) a secondary motivation through ‘violent’ > ‘irate’ > ‘stern’ is possible.

**Innovative meanings**

In the particular languages innovative meanings motivated by ‘hard,’ fig. ‘stubborn’ (Croatian and Serbian *krût*, dial. Slovak *krutyý*), hence ‘rebellious; disobedient’ (dial. Czech *krutyý*) and ‘boorish’ (LSorb *kšuty*), emerged independently of ‘cruel, merciless.’

## 12A.10. \*bridǫkǫ

**Etymological meaning** [see UGLY, 3B.5 p. 134]

**Structural meaning** ‘cutting’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘sharp’ > ‘unpleasant’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘acerbic,’ ‘stern,’ ‘repugnant’ are attested in Church Slavonic texts apart from the meaning ‘sharp,’ peculiar to the texts of the Old Church Slavonic canon. The meaning ‘sharp’ in which we are interested arose as a metaphoric extension of the concrete meaning.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

12A.1. \*lǫtǫ

STERN PSlav ← CRUEL PSlav ← SHARP etym.

12A.2. \*strogǫ

STERN PSlav ← ONE THAT IS ON GUARD struct. ← CAREFUL etym.

12A.3. \*sorgǫ

STERN PSlav (?) obscure

<sup>69</sup> Probably also a source of the borrowing, although one may not rule out the possibility of an earlier borrowing from Russian (in the context of Bulgarian).

12A.4. *\*grozъnъ*

STERN Polish, LSorb, Bulgarian, Eastern ← TERRIBLE/DANGEROUS PSlav

12A.5. *\*zъlъ*

STERN pan-Slavic ← BAD PSlav

12A.6. *\*čъstvъ*

STERN Eastern ← CALLOUS Eastern ← HARD PSlav ← ENLACED etym.

12A.7. *\*grъdъ*

STERN Old Russian ← MENACING Polish, Southern, Eastern ← DARING Polish, Old Russian ← PROUD PSlav

12A.8. *\*prikъ*

STERN Old Polish, Czech ← INACCESSIBLE Eastern, Western ← STEEP PSlav

12A.9. *\*krъtъ*

STERN PSlav ← CRUEL PSlav ← HARD PSlav ← TWISTED PSlav

12A.10. *\*bridъkъ*

STERN Church Slavonic ← SHARP PSlav ← CUTTING etym.

The positive aspect of sternness is signaled by only one motivation: being on guard, with an intermediate motivation: caring (*\*stroгъ*). The motivations by concepts with negative overtones are considerably more numerous. These may be results of: cruelty (*\*krъtъ*, *\*lъtъ*) or the cause of sternness: callousness (*\*čъstvъ*). Motivations such as burdensomeness (*\*prikъ*), being menacing (*\*grozъnъ*, *\*grъdъ*) may be considered as ones that are objectively referred to the concept 'stern.' The motivations through physical properties are peculiar: asperity (*\*bridъkъ*, *\*lъtъ* – indirect/intermediary motivation); one may also mention the following as indirect motivations: hardness (*\*krъtъ*, *\*čъstvъ*), steepness (*\*prikъ*). The motivation through the concept 'bad' (*\*zъlъ*) in this case does not have evaluative nature but it is based on the secondary meaning of this word: 'angry with sb.'

## 12B. MILD

12B.1. *\*něžъnъ*

### Etymological meaning – obscure

The etymology raises doubts mainly due to semantic reasons. As far as the formal aspects are concerned, the closest equivalent is the Latvian *naigāt* 'to feel a need, desire' which it is difficult to link with the meaning 'delicate.' Until one finds other equivalents it is difficult to express an opinion about the meaning from which the equivalent words could potentially derive.

### Structural meaning ‘delicate’

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, the PSlav *\*něžьnъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-ьnъ* from *\*nega* ‘gentleness,’ although the latter meaning is semantically secondary. The solution of this problem is impossible due to the obscure etymological meaning.

### The meanings based on continuants ‘delicate,’ ‘tender, sensitive’

The adjective is common (its Proto-Slavic status is sometimes questioned) and it occurs everywhere with the basic meanings ‘delicate,’ ‘tender, sensitive’; perhaps the meaning ‘pleasant; agreeable’ (in reference to people and other objects) is also early. Due to the obscurity of the etymological meaning it is impossible to determine whether the Proto-Slavic meaning ‘delicate’ originally referred to physical or to mental properties.

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘weakly; of infirm health’ [cf. WEAK, 6B.19, p. 180] is a result of an association, similarly as the meaning ‘pleasant’ which occurs commonly [see PLEASANT, 2A.5, p. 117].

## 12B.2. *\*lagodьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘arranged; neat’ (?) ‘weak’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.3, p. 116]

**Structural meaning** ‘arranged, harmonious,’ ‘calm’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘agreeable, pleasant’ > ‘mild, calm’

The meanings ‘mild, calm’ arose presumably already in the Proto-Slavic period, which is indicated both by the continuants: Church Slavic *lagodьnъ*, Slovene *lágoden*, Polish *łagodny* as well as the direction of the development of innovative meanings.

### Innovative meanings

On the basis of ‘mild’ (which was probably already a PSlav meaning) there arose meanings which referred to the features of one’s character USorb *lahodny* and Polish *łagodny* ‘lenient,’ LSorb *łagodny* ‘sensitive,’ Ukrainian *лaгoдний* ‘kind-hearted, gracious,’ Belarusian *лагoдны* ‘good-natured; peaceable.’

## 12B.3. *\*mirьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘pleasant, delicate’ [see CALM, 10B.1, p. 213]

**Structural meaning** ‘calm; peace-loving’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘calm,’ ‘peace-loving’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘mild’ arose in various Slavic languages (e.g. the Russian *мирный*).

12B.4. *\*bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘glimmering, shining’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘good, pleasant, delightful’; ‘happy, prosperous’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘agreeable, mild’ is presumably secondary in reference to ‘good, pleasant, delightful’. Also this meaning could have arisen in the period of the existence of the Proto-Slavic community, although its commonness (Polish *blogi*, Slovene *blág*, Croatian *blág*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *благ*, Ukrainian *благий*) may also be caused by a slight shift of the semantic dominant.

12B.5. *\*krotъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that is being beaten’ (?) [see HUMBLE, 12B.2, p. 231]

**Structural meaning** ‘tamed by beating; subjugated’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘subjugated; tame’ > ‘mild’ (*ut supra*)

It was probably already in the Proto-Slavic period that the secondary meaning ‘mild’ arose. It is present in the majority of the Slavic languages (e.g. Croatian *kròtak*, Bulgarian *крòтък*, Russian *крòткий*).

12B.6. *\*milъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘pleasant, delicate’ [see PLEASANT, 2A.1, p. 115]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘pleasant, delightful,’ dear, beloved’ (*ut supra*)

The meaning ‘mild’ is found in the connotations of the meaning ‘pleasant, delightful.’

12B.7. *\*mōdrъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘thinking’ [see WISE, 16A.1, p. 261]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘wise’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning of the Bulgarian *мòдър* ‘calm, mild’ arose due to a shift of the semantic dominant of the meaning ‘wise, rational.’

12B.8. \**polchъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘set in motion; one that sets in motion; mobile’ [see TIM-ID, 13B.1, p. 241]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘eager to run; eager to flee’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

The meaning ‘mild’ (e.g. the Slovak *plachý*) is a link of the string ‘timorous’ > ‘shy’ > ‘mild.’

12B.9. \**pokorъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘punished’ [see HUMBLE, 14B.1, p. 248]

**Structural meaning** ‘one that humbles himself or herself; ‘manifesting humility’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘humble, submissive, complaisant; servile’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

Apart from the meaning ‘humble,’ the LSorb *pokorny*, early Slovene *pokóren* also have the meaning: ‘polite,’ ‘mild,’ which results in a natural way from an association of the features which are contained in these designations.

12B.10. \**ъmъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘being taken; taken’ [see PLEASANT, 2A.4, p. 117]

**Structural meaning** ‘taken’ > ‘suitable to be taken, suitable to be held in the hand’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘pleasant, delicate, pleasant to the touch’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘meek; mild’ of the dial. Macedonian *емеH* could have arisen as a link of the semantic development which results from the meaning ‘taken, apprehended’ > ‘subjugated’ > ‘meek.’ There is also an alternative possibility of accounting for the meanings ‘mild; calm’ as the final link of the string of changes: ‘suitable for being held in the hand’ > ‘pleasant to the touch’ > ‘mild, meek.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

12B.1. *\*něžьnъ*

MILD PSlav (?) obscure

12B.2. *\*lagodьnъ*

12B.2.1.

MILD PSlav ← CALM/HARMONIOUS struct. ← WELL-ARRANGED etym.

or

12B.2.2.

MILD PSlav ← CALM struct. ← WEAK etym.

12B.3. *\*mirьnъ*

MILD PSlav ← CALM PSlav ← PLEASANT/DELICATE etym.

12B.4. *\*bolgъ*

MILD Polish, Southern, Ukrainian ← PLEASANT PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

12B.5. *\*krotьkъ*

MILD PSlav ← TAME PSlav ← SUBJUGATED PSlav ← BEATEN etym.

12B.6. *\*milъ*

MILD PSlav ← DELICATE (?) etym.

12B.7. *\*mъdrъ*

MILD Bulgarian ← CALM Bulgarian ← WISE PSlav

12B.8. *\*polchъ*

MILD Slovak ← SHY Polish ← TIMOROUS PSlav

12B.9. *\*pokorьnъ*

MILD LSorb, Slovene ← HUMBLE PSlav ← PUNISHED etym.

12B.10. *\*jьmьnъ*

12B.10.1. MILD dial. Macedonian ← MEEK dial. Macedonian ← SUBMISSIVE dial. Macedonian ← \*SUBJUGATED ← ONE THAT IS BEING HELD/APPREHENDED struct.

or

12B.10.2.

MILD dial. Macedonian ← SOFT dial. Polish ← PLEASANT TO THE TOUCH Western ← SUITABLE FOR BEING HELD IN THE HAND struct.

The motivations of the concept 'mild' are above all calmness (*\*lagodьnъ*, *\*mirьnъ*, *\*mъdrъ*), being pleasant/kind (*\*bolgъ*, as well as *\*milъ* and *\*mirьnъ* – an indirect etymological motivation), being tame (*\*krotьkъ*), shyness (*\*polchъ*), humility (*\*pokorьnъ*) and submissiveness (*\*jьmьnъ* – alternative motivation). The aforementioned motivating concepts are closely related semantically to the motivated concept. Therefore it is worthwhile to mention the less obvious indirect motivations, which indicate the means that lead to mildness. These include, on the one hand, being beaten (*\*krotьkъ*) being punished (*\*pokorьnъ*) and being punished (*\*pokorьnъ*), on the other hand, wisdom (*\*mъdrъ*). One also cannot rule out the possibility of the existence of motivation through the physical property of softness (*\*jьmьnъ* – alternative motivation).

## 13A. BRAVE

### 13A.1. \*sъměľъ

#### **Etymological meaning** – obscure

The etymology of the PSlav \*sъměti is obscure. The relationship with the PIE \*mē-/mō- ‘to try, to be strong-willed’ [cf. Machek: 459] is too poorly documented with the actual material to be taken into consideration in research.

#### **Structural meaning** ‘one that is brave’

A preterite participle from the PSlav \*sъměti ‘to be brave, to be daring’

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘brave’

The meaning ‘brave, daring’ is attested in all Slavic languages with the exception of the Sorbian languages which lack continuants, e.g. Czech *smělý*, Slovak *smelý*, Slovene *smél*, Serbian *směo*, Bulgarian *смел*, Russian *смѣлый*.

### 13A.2. \*chorbrъ

#### **Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘sharp’ (?)

There is no consensus about the etymology of the PSlav \*chorbrъ. It is usually linked with the adjectives based on the PIE root \*(s)kerb- ‘to cut’; Latvian *skarbs* ‘sharp; stern,’ Old Norse *skarp* ‘rough,’ Old English *scearp* ‘sharp’; if we accept this explanation, we may reconstruct the etymological meaning as ‘sharp.’ [Cf. also Rejzek 2008: 65–66.]

#### **The meaning based on continuants** ‘brave, daring’

The meaning that is reconstructed on the basis of continuants is ‘brave, daring.’ If we rely upon the aforementioned etymology then the intermediary link would be a figurative meaning which refers to man: ‘stern.’

#### **Innovative meanings**

The continuant of \*chorbrъ is probably the dial. Belarusian *chváby* ‘strong, healthy’ with an unexplained transition ( $v > r$ ).

### 13A.3. \*dъzъ

#### **Etymological meaning** ‘brave, daring’

The PSlav \*dъzъ, also extended by the suffix -kъ, \*dъzъkъ, is usually considered to have been inherited from the PIE \*d<sup>h</sup>rs- from \*d<sup>h</sup>ers<sup>70</sup> ‘to dare, to be brave’ (cf. the meanings of Indo-European equivalents: Old Prussian *dyrsos*, pl. ‘the brave ones,’ Greek *θρασύς* ‘brave, daring’ and the OInd *dhṛs-* ‘to dare, to be brave, courageous’).

<sup>70</sup> The PSlav -z- instead of the expected -s- also raises doubts. The former probably arose by way of an assimilation to the syllable onset *d-* [SP 5: 61].

**The meaning based on continuants 'brave' > 'daring'**

In the Slavic languages there is the widespread meaning 'brave' and the secondary one, 'daring,' which features negative overtones.

**Innovative meanings**

In the further semantic development one may discern a differentiation caused by the change of the emotional overtones of the Proto-Slavic word. In the majority of the languages further pejoration occurred, due to which the Czech, Slovak, South Slavic and Russian continuants assumed the meaning 'impudent, boorish'; in the Old Czech language the meaning 'debauched' is also attested. In East and West Slavic languages independently meanings emerged that continue the positive overtones of the meaning 'daring': early Russian 'firm; resolute,' 'fast,' Polish and early Czech 'sprightly.'

13A.4. *\*bujь/\*bujьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain [see VIOLENT, 10A.6, p. 208]

**The meanings based on continuants** 'rapidly growing; abundant' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Old Russian *буйь* 'daring' is motivated by 'strong, wild, violent.' Cf. the similar development of the dial. Russian *бу́ввый* 'impertinent; conceited, superbus'; 'violent, eager to bicker' and the Old Polish *bujny* 'impertinent, conceited.'

13A.5. *\*naglъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'daring' (?) 'violent' (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.3, p. 206]

The hypothetical etymological meaning 'daring' is actually attested only by the Old Russian *наглыи*. It may be indicated by the meaning 'impudent' (Bulgarian *нагъл* 'impudent,' Russian *на́глый*) and 'importunate' (Serbian and Croatian *náđao*), which could have been a result of the increasing pejoration of the sense 'daring.' The fact that the meaning 'daring' is poorly attested forces us to exercise caution in reference to such a hypothesis. One must take into consideration the possibility of an innovative origin of the Old Russian 'daring,' and to consider 'quick, violent; sudden' as a Proto-Slavic meaning.

**The meaning based on continuants** 'quick, violent; sudden' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meanings of the Russian *на́глый* are 'daring; impudent, shameless.' In the light of the doubts associated with the etymology of the word it is difficult to establish what was the direction of their development in reference to 'daring.'

13A.6. *\*bystrǔ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘violent; one that flows in a violent manner’ [see FAST, 9A.2, p. 198]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘rapid (of the current of a river)’ > ‘clean,’ fig. ‘bright’; ‘sprightly’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In the Polish context there emerged the following meanings which are now obsolete: ‘hot-headed,’ ‘plucky, brave.’

13A.7. Western and Eastern *\*rychlǔ*

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with movement’ [see QUICK, 9A.1, p. 197]

**The meaning based on continuants** Western ‘mobile’ vs. Eastern ‘set in motion’ > ‘flabby; weak’

In West Slavic languages there is only the meaning based on the active voice, peculiar to the original participle in *-lǔ*.

**Innovative meanings**

The basis of the meaning ‘brave’ of the LSorb *rychlŷ* is presumably the meaning ‘fast, quick,’ which is also present in this language and is motivated by ‘mobile.’

13A.8. *\*grdǔ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see PROUD, 14A.1, p. 244]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The semantic development from ‘proud’ to ‘brave’ (the latter was already Old Russian and was passed on to Russian) represents a typical string of minimal changes. The meaning ‘proud,’ enhanced by the semantic element “excessively,” became ‘haughty.’ Due to the change of the seme “idea (of oneself)” into “action,” the meaning ‘haughty’ became ‘daring.’ It is also present in the Polish *hardy*: early Polish *gardy*. Finally, by losing the seme “excessively,” it became ‘daring, brave.’

13A.9. *\*bǔdrǔ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘vigilant; wakeful’ [see QUICK, 9A.4, p. 199]

**Structural meaning** ‘wakeful; vigilant’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘vigilant’; ‘lively,’ ‘sprightly’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning which occurs already in Old Russian (*бѣдрый* : *бодрыи*), and then in early Russian and dial. Russian (*бѣдрый* : *бóдрый*) is 'daring, brave; valorous.' The direct semantic motivation is presumably 'combat-ready' – an instance of the narrowing down of the more general meaning 'ready for action.' The latter is derived from 'wakeful.'

13A.10. Western and Southern *\*drěčьnъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'elongated lengthwise' [see HIGH/TALL, 4A.2, p. 142]

**Structural meaning** 'such like a pillar, like a tree trunk' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'well-grown' (*ut supra*)

The meanings 'brave, sprightly' emerged from the meaning 'well-grown' hence 'of robust build' in dial. Slovak.

13A.11. *\*dělъnъ*

**Structural meaning** 'associated with work, with the effects of work' [see DILIGENT, 15A.6, p. 252]

**The meaning based on continuants** Western 'hard-working,' Eastern 'resourceful' (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meaning**

The meaning 'brave, valiant' in Polish and Ukrainian (Polish *dzielny*, early Ukrainian *дільний*) is based on 'capable of fighting,' which is derived from the earlier 'suitable to work, to perform an activity.'

13A.12. *\*dob'ъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'suitable; well-adjusted' [see STRONG, 6A.9, p. 167, cf. *\*dobrъ*, GOOD, 1A.1, p. 95]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'suitable' > 'fit; suitable to do sth'

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'fit for sth' specialized already in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian as 'capable of fighting,' hence further meanings 'valiant, valorous; brave' (cf. Old Church Slavonic *dobl'ъ* 'brave, valorous,' Old Russian *доблуу* 'brave, unflinching/stalwart').

13A.13. *\*jarъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'of spring' [see VIOLENT, 10A.8, p. 210]

**The meanings based on continuants** 'born or sown in the spring'; 'violent, lustful' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The Old Russian *ѣрый* has the meanings ‘irate; furious, violent,’ ‘daring, brave,’ ‘hardy’ > ‘haughty,’ which represent a quite clear line of development through gradual modifications of meaning.

#### 13A.14. \**prǫdъkъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that leaps away’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.2, p. 204]

**Structural meaning** ‘one that performs violent movements’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘violent; impetuous,’ ‘fast’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning ‘brave’ of the Slovene *pródek* is presumably based on ‘impetuous,’ which is reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic language [cf. also TIMID, 13B.4, p. 242].

#### 13A.15. \**lutъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘one that cuts off; sharp’ [see STERN, 12A.1, p. 226]

**The meaning reconstructed on the basis of continuants** ‘cruel; stern’

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘brave, daring’ of the dial. Russian *лѹтый* may be [a result of] a transposition of the semantic dominant of the Proto-Slavic meaning ‘stern,’ although its direct basis also could have been associated with the meanings which refer to physical fitness ‘strong; sprightly’ which occur in these dialects.

#### 13A.16. \**lichъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘the one who remains; the remaining one’ [see BAD, 1B.4, p. 107]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘excessive,’ ‘odd (of numbers)’ > ‘bad, miserable’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

Perhaps the only possibility of accounting for the Ukrainian meaning ‘brave’ is to link it with the Old Russian ‘strong’ < ‘excessive.’ This problem is not discussed by ESUM 3: 249. The fact that there are no attestations of similar meanings in Ukrainian obfuscates the semantic relationship of the two meanings of Ukrainian continuants: *лѹхий* ‘poor, meagre’ and *лѹхий* ‘daring.’ The explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language treats both words as homonyms [Bilodid 4: 248–249].

## Summary of Semantic Changes

13A.1. *\*sъměľъ* (?)

BRAVE PSlav (?) obscure

13A.2. *\*chorbrъ*

BRAVE PSlav ← \*STERN ← SHARP (?) etym.

13A.3. *\*dъzъ*

BRAVE PSlav ← BRAVE etym. PIE

13A.4. *\*bujь*/*\*bujьnъ*

BRAVE Old Russian, early Russian ← VIOLENT Old Russian ← RAPIDLY GROWING PSlav

13A.5. *\*naglъ*

13A.5.1.

BRAVE Old Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav ← BRAVE (?) etym.

or

13A.5.2.

BRAVE Old Russian ← BRAVE (?) etym. PIE

13A.6. *\*bystrъ*

BRAVE early Polish ← HOT-HEADED early Polish ← VIOLENT etym.

13A.7. *\*rychlъ*

BRAVE LSorb ← QUICK Western ← MOBILE Western

13A.8. *\*grdъ*

BRAVE Old Russian, early Russian ← DARING Polish, Old Russian ← HAUGHTY PSlav ← PROUD PSlav

13A.9. *\*brdrъ*

BRAVE early Russian and dial. Russian ← \*COMBAT-READY ← READY TO DO STH Old Russian ← WAKEFUL PSlav

13A.10. *\*drěčьnъ*

BRAVE dial. Slovak ← STRONG Slovak, Slovene, Croatian ← WELL-GROWN Western, Southern

13A.11. *\*dělъnъ*

BRAVE Polish, Ukrainian ← VALIANT Polish, Ukrainian ← CAPABLE OF FIGHTING Polish, Ukrainian ← CAPABLE OF WORKING Polish, Ukrainian ← ASSOCIATED WITH WORK struct.

13A.12. *\*dob'ъ*

BRAVE Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian ← CAPABLE OF FIGHTING Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian ← SUITABLE FOR DOING STH PSlav ← APPROPRIATE etym.

13A.13. *\*jarъ*

BRAVE Old Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav

13A.14. *\*prōdъkъ*

BRAVE Slovene ← HOT-HEADED PSlav ← VIOLENT PSlav ← ONE THAT JUMPS AWAY etym.

13A.15. *\*l'utъ*

13A.15.1.

BRAVE dial. Russian ← STERN PSlav ← SHARP etym.

or

13A.15.2.

BRAVE dial. Russian ← STRONG dial. Russian ← STERN PSlav ← SHARP etym.

13A.16. *\*lichъ*

BRAVE Ukrainian ← STRONG Old Russian ← EXCESSIVE PSlav

The motivations of the concept 'brave' are the features of character, evaluated both negatively: sternness (with an intermediary motivation – sharpness): (*\*chorbrъ*, *\*lutъ*), impudence (*\*grdъ*), impetuosity (*\*bujъ*, *\*bystrъ*, *\*jarъ*, *\*prōdъkъ*, *\*naglъ* – alternative motivation), as well as positively: strength: (*\*lichъ*, *\*drěčъnъ*, *\*l'utъ* – alternative motivation), ability, aptitude for something (*\*dělъnъ*, *\*dob'ъ*), readiness for something (*\*bъdrъ*), quickness; sprightliness (*\*rychlъ*).

## 13B. TIMID

### 13B.1. *\*polchъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'set in motion; one that sets in motion; mobile'

The PSlav *\*polchъ* is based on the PIE *\*polo-* 'movement', the nominal form from *\*pel-* 'to set in motion' (cf. Latin *pellere* 'to urge on'), which in the Proto-Slavic language assumed the suffix *-chъ*. Apart from this word it is also present in *\*strachъ* 'fear'. The continuant of the nominal Proto-Indo-European form which is closest to the Proto-Slavic language is the Greek *πόλος* 'pole.'

**The meaning based on continuants** 'eager to run; eager to flee' > timid; timorous'

The meanings 'timid; timorous', which are preserved residually in all languages apart from innovative meanings, were assumed in various languages by a more recent pan-Slavic derivative with the suffix *-livъ*, which may be reduced to the form *\*polch(ъ)livъ*.<sup>71</sup> When one reconstructs this meaning, apart from the continuants which indicate 'timorous, timid', one should direct one's attention to the innovative meanings (especially to 'fast, sudden' which is preserved in Croatian), in which, similarly as in the derivative *\*polšiti* 'to inspire fear <to cause sb to flee>', preserve perhaps a trace of the meaning 'eager to flee', which continues the etymological 'mobile.'

### Innovative meanings

Since the 16th c. the Croatian language attests the meaning 'fast; sudden', from which 'strong' is presumably derived. The Old Czech *plachý* 'wild' and the early Polish *pfochy*

<sup>71</sup> Due to the phonetic form of the word it is most probable that the words with the suffix *-livъ* emerged in a parallel manner in various languages already when the group *-olch-* shifted in to *-loch-*, *-lach-*, *-oloch-*.

'wild, unbridled, violent,' 'dangerous,' 'mad' are likely to be derived also from the meaning 'fast; sudden.' A different direction of the development of the meaning 'eager to run' is presumably represented by the Polish *płochy* and Czech *plachý* 'changeable; impermanent; fleeting,' hence the Polish 'fickle, imprudent, rollicking,' which is also present in the Slovene *plâh*. In the case of the Polish language where the continuants of *\*polchъ* are identical with the continuants of *\*plochy* [cf. BAD, 1B.5, p. 107] it is difficult to determine whether in some meanings we are dealing with the development 'impermanent' > 'bad; evil,' discernible in the early Czech *plachý* 'miserable, shabby' [cf. *\*marъnъ*, BAD, 1B.6, p. 108] or with the continuant of the PSlav *\*ploch* in the meanings which correspond with the Russian *плохой*.

### 13B.2. *\*divъ, \*dikъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 209]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'not used by people' > 'untamed' (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'shy' is attested in all three groups (Polish *dziki*, Slovene *díjji*, Russian *дикий*, Ukrainian *дикий*, Belarusian *дзікі*); it probably arose in an independent manner. The geography of the attestations admits the common emergence of the meaning 'shy, timid' only for the group of East Slavic languages. The semantic development stopped at the stage of a weak negative evaluation and it never assumed the very strongly negative overtones peculiar to the meaning 'cowardly.'

### 13B.3. *\*durъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'blowing; associated with wind' (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**The meaning based on continuants** 'agitated; violent; impetuous,' Northern 'mad' (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning 'wild/uncouth/shy, timorous' which arose in Slovak dialects, presumably did so in the same way as in the case of the continuants of *\*polchъ* and *\*prъdъ*, and therefore it manifested a relationship with the observation of a violent reaction to danger.

### 13B.4. *\*prъdъ*

**Etymological meaning** 'one that jumps away' [see VIOLENT, 10A.2, p. 206]

**Structural meaning** 'one that performs violent movements' (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** 'violent; impetuous,' 'quick' (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘timorous, timid’ of the dial. Serbian *prūd* is based on the meaning ‘wild’ (or the Bulgarian and dial. Macedonian *npυd* : *npυd* ‘nervous,’ which arose on the basis of the meaning ‘violent’ > ‘unsubjugated, indomitable’). Similarly as in the case of the aforementioned *\*polchz*, one may discern the development of the original meaning which proceeded in opposite directions – to ‘timorous’ and ‘brave’ [see BRAVE, 13A.14, p. 239].

### 13B.5. *\*chabz*/*\*chabъnz*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘sour, spoilt’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.7, p. 108]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad, miserable’ > ‘weak’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘timorous’ in Slovak dialects is a specialization of the meaning ‘shabby, bad,’ which occurs in Czech and Slovak.

### 13B.6. *\*lěnz*/*\*lěnivz*

**Etymological meaning** ‘loose’ [see LAZY, 15B.1, p. 255]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘lazy, ignavus’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meanings of the Old Russian *лѣнливый* ‘slow; irresolute; timorous’ present the possibility of semantic changes from the meaning ‘lazy’ to ‘timorous.’ A similar cycle of changes may be postulated for the early Czech *lěný* ‘tardy, slow.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

### 13B.1. *\*polchz*

TIMOROUS PSlav ← TIMID PSlav ← EAGER TO RUN PSlav ← MOBILE etym.

### 13B.2. *\*divz*, *\*dikz*

TIMID Eastern, Polish, Slovene ← UNTAMED PSlav ← NOT USED BY PEOPLE PSlav

### 13B.3. *\*durъnz*

COWARDLY dial. Slovak ← WILD dial. Slovak ← VIOLENT PSlav

### 13B.4. *\*prqdz*

TIMID dial. Serbian ← NERVOUS Bulgarian, Macedonian ← WILD dial. Serbian ← ONE THAT PERFORMS VIOLENT MOVEMENTS struct. ← ONE THAT JUMPS AWAY etym.

### 13B.5. *\*chabz*/*\*chabъnz*

TIMID dial. Slovak ← BAD PSlav

## 13B.6. \*lěnivъ

TIMOROUS dial. Czech, Old Russian ← IRRESOLUTE Old Russian ← SLOW dial. Czech, Old Russian ← LAZY PSlav

The majority of the terms which express the concept 'timid' and the related concepts are not a part of the Proto-Slavic heritage, which is associated with the fact that the concepts with negative overtones are more susceptible to the assumption of innovative names. The only name which emerged in the Proto-Slavic period is \*polchъ, whose negative overtones are markedly weaker. The motivations with movement as a reaction to fear<sup>72</sup> and therefore with running (\*polchъ), scampering (\*prōdъ – intermediate motivation). They are associated with the motivation by the concept of violence/suddenness (\*durъnъ, \*prōdъ). An even opposite nature is exhibited by the motivation by the inability to make a decision (\*lěnъ). Being undomesticated by people may be the source of both the concept 'skittish' as well as and 'violent' [cf. VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 209]. Motivation by being bad, useless (\*chabъ) has without doubt an evaluative nature.

## 14A. PROUD

## 14A.1. \*grdъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'weak; slow' (?)

The etymology is uncertain. As far as the formal aspects are concerned, the most likely is the affinity with the Lithuanian *gurdus* 'slow; weak,' Latvian *guŗds* 'withered; tired,' Greek βραδύς, which is derived from the PIE \*g<sub>1</sub>rd<sub>1</sub>-; perhaps one may also mention in this context the Latin *gurdus* (<\*g<sub>1</sub>rd<sub>1</sub>-) 'stupid, obtuse; gawky'.<sup>73</sup> The semantic development from 'deprived of strength; slow' to 'proud' seems possible if we accept the existence of intermediate links from 'slow; lazy' > 'such which makes the impression of being lazy by his or her behaviour' > 'proud' or similarly 'congealed, torpid' > 'stiff, reserved; proud' [ESS] 7: 206–207]. However, such a development of the meaning has no parallels. A relationship with the PSlav \*grōdъ 'difficult, unpleasant, tedious' and \*grōstokъ 'idem,' based on the PIE \*g<sup>h</sup>er- 'to crush' [SP 8: 284] is unlikely due to the formal and semantic reasons.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. also the motivation of the PSlav \*lękti se 'to get scared of sth,' initially 'to bend; to stoop' [Sławski 4: 206–208].

<sup>73</sup> This is rejected by Walde's dictionary [Walde 1: 627] due to the differences in the structure and the semantic difficulties, although in the light of the possibilities of the development of the meanings, the latter reservations seem completely unjustified.

### The meaning based on continuants ‘proud’

The continuants in North Slavic languages (e.g. the Czech *hrdý*, Russian *зордый*), as well as Old Church Slavonic *гѣрдѣ* and later monuments of the Church Slavonic recensions indicate the original meaning ‘proud, haughty, overbearing.’ A problem is associated with the modern South Slavic languages in which there is the dominance of the meaning ‘repulsive.’ According to Lubor Králík, the original meaning of the PSlav *\*gъrdъ* was ‘valorous; brave,’ residually attested by the Russian *зордый*, from which, by way of an intermediate link ‘inspiring fear there could have emerged both the meaning ‘proud’ as well as ‘repulsive’:

Es wäre u. E. denkbar, bei der Analyse von urslav. *\*gъrdъ* von der Situation eines starken, mutigen, furchterregenden Krieger auszugehen, der für seine Heldentaten geehrt wird” [Králík 2000: 305–308].

(When we analyze the PSlav *\*gъrdъ* it seems possible – in our opinion – to take as the point of departure the situation of the strong, valorous, fearful warrior, who is respected due to his heroic deeds.)

However, the meaning ‘brave’ is poorly documented and its recognition as the original meaning would require stronger arguments.

### Innovative meanings

In the furthering of the particular development there was the nascent dominance either of the meaning with positive overtones – ‘proud,’ which became the point of departure for the meaning ‘magnificent,’ common in West Slavic languages and the further meanings which are based on it, or the negative ‘conceited,’ which in turn furnished the basis for the emergence of the meanings ‘arrogant, daring’ (Polish *hardy*, Old Russian *зордыи*), and after a further change of the evaluation of the meanings ‘daring, brave’ (Old Russian *зордыи*, dial. Russian *зордый*). The semantic development which occurred in the South Slavic languages departs from the aforementioned development to such an extent that it even made Osten-Sacken reconstruct two homonymic lexemes [Osten-Sacken 1911: 419]; likewise Machek [Machek: 144], who, however, does not maintain this hypothesis any more in the subsequent edition of the dictionary [Machek<sup>2</sup>: 183–184]. However, the majority of the researchers subscribe to the idea that the meanings ‘bad, repulsive; unpleasant,’ which dominate in South Slavic languages, are a result of the semantic development.<sup>74</sup>

## 14A.2. \*pyšъnъ

### Etymological meaning ‘associated with blowing; inflated; panting’

The basis of the PSlav *\*pychati* ‘to pant, to puff’ is the PIE *\*pū-*, a reduced form of the root *\*peu-* ‘to blow [dǎć]; to puff up’ (which is present in the PSlav *\*puchnōti* ‘to swell’).

<sup>74</sup> A derivative formed on the basis of *\*gъrdъ* is also the dial. Russian *горливыи*, attested in rare northern dialects [SRNG 7: 40] in the meanings ‘proud; haughty, overbearing.’ The adjective arose by way of the simplification of the earlier *горливыи*, a derivative of *гордый* with the accreted suffix *-liv-*, cf. Russian *горделивыи* ‘idem.’ The phonetic congruity with the continuants of the Western and Southern *\*gorlivъ* ‘full of passion’ is accidental.

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with panting; with being out of breath’

A derivative from *\*pycha/pychъ*, which is derived from *\*pychati* ‘to pant, to puff, e.g. during blowing’ associated with *\*puchnōti*.

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘proud,’ ‘conceited’

A problem is associated with the fact that the meanings ‘magnificent’ and ‘proud’ lend themselves more to an explanation on the basis of the meaning ‘to assume a great volume,’ which does not occur in the continuants of the formal basis [of] *\*pychati*. A solution of the problem is to recognize the meanings ‘to pant, to puff’ as secondary in reference ‘to blow, to inflate.’

14A.3. *\*bujъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – unclear [see VIOLENT, 10A.6, p. 208]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘rapidly growing’ > ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meanings which refer to self-estimation was assumed by the Old Polish *bujny* ‘conceited, overbearing, self-important’ and LSorb *bujny* ‘conceited, proud; vain.’ The basis for such a development was presumably furnished by one of the fundamental semantic elements – ‘excessive; unrestrained,’ and therefore ‘one who is self-important.’ The meaning ‘stupid’ which co-occurs in Russian additionally indicated the negative evaluation of the feature ‘conceited.’

14A.4. *\*durъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing; associated with wind’ (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘agitated; violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

It seems most likely that the meanings in which we are interested arose on the basis of the meaning ‘agitated, violent, uncontrollable,’ hence ‘self-important.’ The sense of excess, which is hardly discernible in the modern Polish *durny* ‘stupid,’ and which is present in the entire lexical family *\*durъ*,<sup>75</sup> *\*duriti* is distinctly visible in the meanings ‘violent, furious; quick-tempered; mad.’ The latter meanings occur in all groups of the Slavic languages. In the further development of the Kashubian *děrnī* ‘conceited, haughty’ through the stage ‘confident’ also assumed the meaning ‘resolute,’ ‘energetic’ (with melioration) and ‘defiant.’

<sup>75</sup> SP 5: 107 considers *\*durъnъ* as an adjective with the suffix *-ъnъ*, accreted on the original *\*durъ*. However, the author of the dictionary entry does not rule out a motivation by the verb *\*duriti*. This motivation is clearly visible at the level of semantics.

## 14A.5. \*jarǔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘of spring’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.8, p. 210]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘spring,’ ‘violent, lustful’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The Old Russian meaning ‘haughty’ presumably arose by progressing through the stages ‘daring, brave’ > ‘audacious.’

## 14A.6. \*krǔtǔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘associated with spinning’ [see STRONG, 6A.7, p. 166]

**Structural meaning** ‘twisted’ vs. ‘winding’; ‘spinning’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘strongly twisted’ > ‘stiff; hard’

**Innovative meanings**

The basis of the meaning ‘proud’ of the Serbian and Croatian *krūt* (similarly as of the meanings ‘strict,’ ‘cruel,’ which also refer to mental features of man) is most likely a metaphoric use of the meaning ‘hard.’

## 14A.7. \*bǔdrǔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘vigilant; wakeful’ [see QUICK, 9A.4, p. 199]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘wakeful’; ‘lively’; ‘sprightly’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The early Russian *бóдрый* ‘proud’ is probably based on the meaning ‘daring, courageous,’ hence ‘confident.’

## 14A.8. Western and Southern \*gyzdavǔ

**Etymological meaning** ‘repulsive’ [see UGLY, 3B.4, p. 136]

**Structural meaning** ‘repulsive’ [see PRETTY, 3A.13, p. 132]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘revolting, repulsive’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

Similarly as in the case of the meaning ‘beautiful’ [cf. PRETTY, 3A.13, p. 132], the innovative meaning ‘boasting; proud, conceited’ (Croatian *gizdav*, similarly as Slovene *gizdáv* ‘kitschy, foppish; bragging, conceited’) arose at the level of verbs with the meaning ‘to brag,’ which is motivated in the semantics associated with dressing up.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

### 14A.1. *\*gŕdъ*

PROUD PSlav ← SLOW (?) etym.

### 14A.2. *\*ryšъnъ*

PROUD PSlav ← CONCEITED PSlav ← \*HAVING A GREAT VOLUME ← INFLATED etym.

### 14A.3. *\*bujъnъ*

CONCEITED LSorb, dial. Russian ← AUDACIOUS Old Polish, LSorb, dial. Russian ← BRAVE Old Russian, dial. Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav ← RAPIDLY GROWING PSlav

### 14A.4. *\*durъnъ*

CONCEITED early Polish and dial. ← UNRESTRAINED Polish, Russian ← MAD Polish, Russian ← AGITATED PSlav ← VIOLENT PSlav

### 14A.5. *\*jarъ*

PROUD Old Russian ← BRAVE Old Russian ← AUDACIOUS Old Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav ← LUSTFUL PSlav ← OF SPRING PSlav

### 14A.6. *\*krъtъ*

PROUD Serbian, Croatian ← HARD/STIFF PSlav ← TWISTED PSlav

### 14A.7. *\*bъdrъ*

PROUD dial. Russian ← \*CONFIDENT ← BRAVE Old Russian, dial. Russian ← WAKEFUL PSlav

### 14A.8. *\*gyzdavъ*

PROUD Croatian ← BRAGGING Slovene, Croatian ← DRESSED UP Croatian ← KITSCHY Slovene ← UGLY Western, Southern

The motivations of the concept ‘conceited’ are courage or audacity (*\*bujъnъ*, *\*jarъ*, *\*bъdrъ*), which is the direct motivation for *\*durъnъ*. Another motivation is the proneness to bragging caused by one’s appearance which is positively evaluated by oneself (*\*gyzdavъ*). There are also peculiar motivations based on the appearance which is perceived by other people as a manifestation of pride: e.g., stiffness (*\*krъtъ*) or swollenness (*\*ryšъnъ*), although the latter motivation is more peculiar to the derivatives which arose in the particular languages [cf. Jakubowicz 2010: 55–57].

## 14B. HUMBLE

### 14B.1. *\*pokorъnъ*

#### Etymological meaning ‘punished’

The PSlav *\*koriti* ‘to humble oneself’ is related with *\*kara* ‘punishment,’ *\*karati* ‘to punish.’

### Structural meanings ‘one that humbles oneself,’ ‘manifesting humility’

The adjective *\*pokorъnъ* is a derivative with the suffix *-ъnъ* from *\*pokoriti (se)* ‘to humble (oneself)’ or from *\*pokora* ‘humility.’ The expected derivative from the non-prefixed *\*koriti (se)* – *\*\*korъnъ* – is not sufficiently attested (there is only the early Polish *kornu*, attested since the 18th c., dial. Ukrainian *кóрне-пoкóрне* ‘humbly’ and the dial. Belarusian *кóрны* ‘humble’ (perhaps a borrowing from Polish), as well as the Serbian and Croatian *kōran* ‘rebuked, humiliated’ [Sławski 2: 491]).<sup>76</sup>

### The meaning based on continuants ‘humble, submissive, meek; complaisant’

The continuants which indicated the form *\*pokorъnъ* and the meaning ‘humble; complaisant’ are commonly attested in the Slavic languages.

### Innovative meanings

The semantics ‘humble, complaisant’ implies the meaning ‘obedient,’ attested in various languages (e.g. Slovene *pokóren*, Serbian *pòkōran*, Ukrainian *пoкóрний*). The development from cause to effect is discernible in the dial. Russian *пoкóрный* ‘having a deficiency, a shortcoming.’ There is a more complex semantic development from ‘humble’ to ‘necessary, needed’ – the latter meaning also occurs in Russian dialects; it is likely that the intermediate link was in this context the meaning ‘fitting sth’ (from the unattested ‘subordinated to sth’), which is attested only in the adverbial form. Such a reconstruction may be accepted only with reservations associated with its reliability.

## 14B.2. *\*krotъkъ*

### Etymological meaning – uncertain ‘beaten’ (?)

The etymology of the PSlav *\*krotiti* ‘to tame; to subjugate’ is not certain. One may perceive it as a continuant of the causative-iterative form *\*krot-* from the root *\*kret-* ‘to shake; to beat, to hit,’ which is probably present in the Greek *κροτεῖν* ‘to tap, to hit,’ and which is also present – with a nasal infix – in Germanic languages [Pokorny: 621].

### Structural meaning ‘subjugated by beating; tamed’

A derivative with the suffix *-ъkъ* from *\*krotiti*. The meaning, usually reconstructed as the basic one for the Proto-Slavic ‘to castrate’ [e.g. Berneker: 625; Boryś: 718], is actually attested in the Old Lower Sorbian language (16th c.), although neither the majority of the attestations in all groups of the Slavic languages nor the presumed equivalents in other Indo-European languages prove this hypothesis. One should consider ‘to subjugate; to tame,’ which is probably derived from the earlier ‘to subjugate by beating,’ as the original meaning of the verb. Traces of the meaning ‘to beat’ are preserved in the dial. Russian *кpoтíть* ‘about fish, to stun by beating,’ dial. Slovene *krotíti* ‘about apples, to knock [apples] from a tree.’

### The meanings based on continuants ‘subjugated; tamed’ > ‘mild’

The meanings ‘broke in, tamed; domesticated’ are well-attested in the Slavic languages of all groups. It is probable that already in the Proto-Slavic language there emerged

<sup>76</sup> According to Sławski [l.c.] the dial. Russian *кóрный* : *кoрнóй* ‘of inferior height, not tall, short,’ which is a derivative from the PSlav *\*kъnъ* ‘cut off; crippled’ does not belong to this category.

the secondary meanings ‘mild’ from ‘tamed,’ and ‘humble; meek’ (e.g. the Kashubian *krotki*, Czech *krotký*, Serbian *kròtak*, Bulgarian *крòтък* from ‘subjugated’).

### Innovative meanings

Due to the lack of intermediate links attested in Russian, which could bring about the emergence of enantiosemic meanings ‘strict, bad, cruel,’ ‘impetuous, violent’ in the dial. Russian *крòткiй*, what seems most likely is the influence of the similarly sounding Russian adjective *крьтóй* which features the same meanings.

#### 14B.3. \**szkromъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘cut off’ [see THIN, 5B.4, p. 157]

**Structural meaning** ‘severed [off]’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘moderate; limited; slight’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

In the Old Polish *skromny* ‘humble’ the development progressed from ‘moderate as far as one’s requirements are concerned’ to ‘humble.’

#### 14B.4. \**mirъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘pleasant, delicate’ [see CALM, 10B.1, p. 213]

**Structural meaning** ‘calm; peaceful’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘calm’ > ‘mild,’ ‘peaceful’ > ‘concordant’ (*ut supra*)

### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘meek, humble’ arose in the USorb *mirny*, Serbian and Croatian *miran* as a further link of the semantic development, either directly from ‘calm’ or from ‘mild.’

## Comparison of Semantic Changes

#### 14B.1. \**pokorъnъ*

HUMBLE PSlav ← PUNISHED etym.

#### 14B.2. \**krotъkъ*

HUMBLE PSlav ← SUBJUGATED PSlav ← BEATEN etym.

#### 14B.3. \**szkromъnъ*

HUMBLE PSlav ← MODERATE PSlav ← CUT OFF etym.

#### 14B.4. \**mirъnъ*

HUMBLE USorb, Serbian, Croatian ← MILD USorb, Russian ← CALM PSlav ← PLEASANT etym.

The motivations of the concept ‘humble’ are associated above all with activities which impose humility, and therefore beating (*\*krotъkъ*) or generally administering punishment (*\*pokornъ*). The motivation by cutting (*\*sъkromъnъ*) probably has to do not with physical violence but with setting limits, moderation. A similar type is represented by motivation by mildness (*\*mirъnъ*).<sup>77</sup>

## 15A. DILIGENT

### 15A.1. Western and Eastern *\*pilъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘moving (transitive); one that sets in motion’ vs. ‘moved; set in motion’

The PSlav *\*piliti* is an iterative form to *\*pelti pьlq*, with the extension of the vocalism of the present stem; *\*pelti pьlq* is derived from the PIE *\*pel-* ‘to set in motion, to move,’ cf. Latin *pellere* ‘to drive (forward), to hasten,’ Greek *πέλειν* ‘to set in motion’ [Borys: 436].

**Structural meaning** ‘driving forward’ vs. ‘driven forward’

The PSlav *\*pilъnъ* is a derivative from *\*piliti* ‘to drive forward, to urge forward.’

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘diligent; zealous,’ ‘one who strives to do sth; one that applies himself or herself to sth’

The continuants (e.g. USorb *pilny*, Czech *pilný*, Russian *пильный*) which feature the meanings ‘diligent; zealous’ are attested in all North Slavic languages. The innovative meanings which are discussed below demonstrate that in the content ‘to apply oneself to sth, to strive after sth’ emphasis could have been put either on haste (in which one may perceive a reflex of the etymological and structural meaning) or on diligence.

### Innovative meanings

In Polish, Czech and Slovak, apart from the meanings ‘diligent; zealous,’ i.e., ‘one that does sth with haste’ there emerged the meaning ‘something that has to be done expeditiously.’ Because the vacillations of the diathesis which constitute the basis for such changes were a frequent phenomenon at the initial stage of the codification of the language [Buttler 1978: 119–124], there is no need to reconstruct this meaning for the Proto-Slavic language. On the basis of the meaning ‘one that applies himself or herself to sth’ there emerged the meanings ‘attentive; careful’ (early Polish *pilny*, Czech *pilný*, Ukrainian *пильний*) and ‘careful; conscientious, caring’ (early Polish *pilny*, Czech *pilný*).

<sup>77</sup> The problem of the etymological motivation of the exponents of the concept ‘humility’ and ‘haughtiness’ is elaborately discussed by Renata Grzegorzczkova [1993].

## 15A.2. \*revъnъ : \*revъnivъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘roaring’

The PSlav \**r’uti revъ* ‘to roar’ most likely has onomatopoeic origins, similarly as the PSlav \**rykati* : \**ryčati* which has the same meaning. Both Proto-Slavic families may be based on the PIE root \**reu-*, \**rēu-*, \**ru-*, \**rū-* [cf. Boryś: 527].

**Structural meaning** ‘roaring’

Derivatives with the suffix *-nъ* and *-ivъ*, which is accreted onto it, from the personal inflection of the verb \**r’uti revъ* ‘to roar’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘roaring’

The existence of the meaning ‘roaring’ in the Proto-Slavic language seems to be indirectly proven by the existence of the Polish continuants: *rzewny* and the early *rzewniwy* (cf. also the Old Polish *rzuć, rzwać, rzwieć*, ‘to roar’) and by the Macedonian *ревлус* ‘strident; tearful’

**Innovative meanings**

It is probable that the meaning ‘zealous’ is an independent innovation in various languages. It is common, although it is difficult to accord a Proto-Slavic status to it because it is present in various deverbal derivatives. Only a few of the latter continue the PSlav forms \**revъnъ*/\**rъvnъnъ* and \**revъnivъ* (Serbian and Croatian *rěvan*/*rěvan* ‘zealous, laborious, diligent’, Ukrainian *рєвний* ‘diligent, conscientious’ – with a further development of the meaning, Czech *řevnivý* and Belarusian *раўнівы*). Other adjectives with the meaning ‘zealous’ (Serbian and Croatian *рэвностан*, Macedonian *ревносен*, Russian *рєвностный*) are based on a derivative from \**revъnъ* with the suffix *-ostъ*. A meaning which is motivated by ‘zealous’ is ‘jealous/envious’ (e.g., Czech *řevnivý*, Russian *ревнивый* ‘envious’, early ‘zealous’, cf. also the Bulgarian and Macedonian *ревнив* ‘envious’ from *ревна -иш* ‘to be envious’). A different direction of the semantic development may be discerned in Ukrainian where the meaning ‘heavy, about rain’ probably has the basis ‘violent; strong,’ and this, similarly as ‘zealous,’ is associated with the intensity of a roar. Cf. also SAD, 11B.5, p. 224.

## 15A.3. Western and Eastern \*ščirъ : \*čirъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘separated; without foreign admixtures’

The PSlav \**ščirъ* : \**čirъ* is derived from the PIE \*(*s*)*kei-ro-* ‘cut off, clearly separated, without admixtures.’ In the Proto-Slavic languages there is the continuation of both the form with the *s-* mobile (e.g. the Old Polish *szczury*, dial. Russian *щирый*) as well as without it (Czech *čirý* and Slovak *čírý*). A nominal derivative with the suffix *-ro-* indicates that the meaning ‘separated from foreign admixtures’ was already Proto-Slavic (cf. Gothic *skeirs* ‘distinct’, Old Norse *skirr* ‘pure, transparent’, German *schier* ‘undiluted, without additions’, OIr *cir* ‘pure’). The meaning is innovative in reference to the PIE root \*(*s*)*kei-* : \*(*s*)*kēi-* ‘to cut, to separate’ [Pokorny: 919].

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘uniform, without admixtures’

The meaning ‘pure, uniform, without admixtures’ is attested in East Slavic languages and in Old Polish whereas the continuants in other languages are motivated by this

meaning. Perhaps it was already in the Proto-Slavic language that the adjective was applied to man in a metaphoric psychological meaning ‘hiding nothing; frank,’ which is indicated both by the East Slavic languages as well as Polish and Lower Sorbian.

### Innovative meanings

The meanings of the Czech and Slovak word – ‘pure, transparent,’ ‘authentic’ – are derived directly from the Proto-Slavic meaning and they clearly indicated it. Among the innovative meanings the ones that are most relevant for my work are those that refer to man, namely the LSorb *šćiry*, which features the development from ‘frank’ to ‘naive, simple’ (but also to ‘honest’) and further intensification of pejoration to ‘boorish,’ as well as the similar development in the Belarusian *цёрпы* to ‘trustful, simplehearted.’ In Belarusian and Ukrainian the lexemes *цёрпуй*, *цёрпы* also developed the meaning ‘zealous’ and then ‘diligent.’

## 15A.4. \*gorlivъ

### Etymological meaning ‘hot’

The PSlav *\*gorěti* – a verb of state – is based on the PIE perfective stem *\*g<sup>h</sup>or-* (similarly as the exact Lithuanian equivalent *garėti gariù* – early ‘to burn,’ modern ‘to change into a pair’). The basis is the PIE *\*g<sup>h</sup>er-* ‘to become hot; to burn,’ cf. Greek *θερεῖν*, Armenian *džeraw* ‘to have a fever.’

### Structural meaning ‘combustible,’ ‘hot’

A derivative with the suffix *-livъ* from *\*gorěti* ‘to burn.’

### The meanings based on continuants ‘combustible; hot,’ ‘fervent/zealous’

The meaning ‘combustible’ is attested by the Old Czech *horlivý* as well as Croatian and Serbian *gòrljiv*. ‘Fervent’ is a metaphoric meaning arose presumably already in the Proto-Slavic period.

### Innovative meanings

On the basis of the metaphoric meaning ‘fervent’ there emerged further meanings which refer to human features: ‘diligent’ (Polish *gorliwy*, Slovak *horlivý*, Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*), ‘conscientious, caring’ (Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*), ‘fast; mobile’ (Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*), ‘passionate’ (Czech *horlivý*), ‘envious’ > ‘heated’ early Polish *gorliwy*, ‘irate,’ dial. Polish *gorliwy*, ‘violent’ (dial. Polish *gorliwy*, Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*), ‘ambitious’ dial. Polish *gorliwy*, ‘kind; cordial; valuable’ (Serbian and Croatian *gòrljiv*).

## 15A.5. \*snažьnъ

### Etymological meaning – obscure

The PSlav *\*snaga* does not have a reliable etymology [cf. the review in ESUM 5: 332].

### Structural meaning ‘conscientious, careful’

A derivative from the PSlav *\*snaga* ‘conatus, effort.’

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘pure,’ ‘fervent/zealous,’ ‘strong’

The initial Proto-Slavic meaning is difficult to establish due to the considerable semantic discrepancies between the continuants and the unknown etymological meaning. The meaning ‘pure’ is indicated by the early and dial. Polish *snażny*, Slovene *snážen*, early Serbian and Croatian *snážam* and Old Russian *снажныи*. It is therefore attested in all groups of the languages. The meaning ‘strong’ is attested in South Slavic (Serbian and Croatian *snážan*, Bulgarian and Macedonian *снажен*) and East Slavic languages (dial. Ukrainian *снажній*). The meanings ‘diligent, fervent; strenuous’ are peculiar to West Slavic languages (Old Polish *snażny*, Czech and Slovak *snažný*).

**Innovative meanings**

The impossibility of establishing the initial Proto-Slavic meaning also makes it impossible for us to determine which of the meanings may be recognized as an innovative meaning and what the sequence of the emergence of the particular meanings was.

15A.6. Western and Eastern \**dělnъ***Etymological meaning** ‘laid/set (down)’

The PSlav \**dělo* is a derivative with the suffix *-lo* from the verbum \**děti*, which is derived in turn from the PIE \**dhē-* ‘to lay/ponere.’

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with work, with the results of work’

A derivative from the PSlav \**dělo* ‘work, the effect of work.’

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘associated with work,’ Western ‘hard-working,’ Eastern ‘industrious’

In the continuants of \**dělnъ* one may clearly perceive the structural meaning ‘associated with work.’ In the west there is the dominance of the meaning ‘hard-working’ (e.g. USorb *džělny*, LSorb *žělny*, Czech *dělný*) whereas in the East – ‘industrious’ (Russian *дѣльный*).

15A.7. \**sporъ***Etymological meaning** ‘successful, fruitful’ [see FAT, 5A.5, p. 151]**The meaning based on continuants** ‘efficient, abundant’ (*ut supra*)**Innovative meanings**

The meanings ‘diligent, willing to do sth’ in the early Polish and in Polish dialects, ‘eager, prompt’ in Czech arose as a result of an association result: ‘efficient’ > cause: ‘fast,’ ‘able,’ ‘fervent/zealous,’ ‘eager.’

15A.8. Eastern \**ěglъ***Etymological meaning** ‘strong’ [see VIOLENT, 10A.1, p. 205]**Structural meaning** ‘quick,’ ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

### The meaning based on continuants ‘violent,’ ‘quick’ > ‘fervent’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The innovation which is derived from the meaning ‘fervent/zealous’ is the directly unattested ‘active, hard-working,’ discernible in the adjective with negation – dial. Russian *неяглый*.

#### 15A.9. \*dikъ

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 207]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘not used by people’ > ‘undomesticated’ > ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The meanings ‘fervent/zealous; diligent; enterprising, hard-working’ which occur in north Russian dialects are probably motivated by mobility, and therefore they could have emerged from the previous meaning ‘violent.’

#### 15A.10. \*skrbъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘cut; cutting’ (?) ‘wrinkled, curled up’ [see SAD, 11B.1, p. 221]

**Structural meaning** ‘doleful; sad’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘sick,’ ‘sad’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The meanings ‘caring; careful’ in the western part of the South Slavic group (Slovene *skrben*, Croatian and Serbian *skrban*) emerged by way of a gradual transposition of the semantic dominant ‘sad’ > ‘concerned about sth’ > ‘striving after sth; caring.’ It arose probably from ‘sad,’ not directly but by the intermediation of the Serbian and Croatian *skrbiti* ‘conari; to care for sth’ from the earlier ‘to be concerned about,’ and therefore with a secondary deverbal semantic motivation.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

#### 15A.1. \*pilъnъ

##### 15A.1.1.

DILIGENT Western, Eastern ← URGING FORWARD struct. ← SETTING IN MOTION etym.

or

##### 15A.1.2.

DILIGENT Western, Eastern ← URGED FORWARD struct. ← SET IN MOTION etym.

15A.2. *\*revъnъ, \*revъnivъ*

DILIGENT Serbian, Croatian ← ZEALOUS Serbian, Croatian ← ONE THAT ROARS FROM EFFORT PSlav ← ROARING etym.

15A.3. *\*ščirъ/\*čirъ*

DILIGENT Eastern ← HONEST Western, Eastern ← UNIFORM Western, Eastern ← SEPARATED etym.

15A.4. *\*gorlivъ*

FERVENT/ZEALOUS Western, Serbian, Croatian ← HOT etym.

15A.5. *\*snažъnъ*

15A.5.1.

DILIGENT PSlav (?) obscure

or

15A.5.2.

DILIGENT ← FERVENT/ZEALOUS PSlav (?) ← CONSCIENTIOUS struct. (?)

15A.6. *\*dělъnъ*

DILIGENT ← ASSOCIATED WITH WORK struct.

15A.7. *\*sporъ*

DILIGENT Polish, Czech ← EFFICIENT PSlav ← ABUNDANT PSlav

15A.8. *\*ěglъ*

\*DILIGENT (=LAZY with negation) Belarusian ← FERVENT/ZEALOUS early Russian ← VIOLENT dial. Russian ← STRONG etym.

15A.9. *\*dikъ*

DILIGENT dial. Russian ← FERVENT/ZEALOUS dial. Russian ← \*MOBILE ← VIOLENT PSlav ← UNDOMESTICATED PSlav ← NOT USED BY PEOPLE PSlav

15A.10. *\*skъbъnъ*

DILIGENT Slovene, Croatian, Serbian ← CONSCIENTIOUS Slovene, Croatian, Serbian ← CARING Slovene, Croatian, Serbian ← SAD Southern, Eastern

A peculiar feature of the concept 'diligent' is that it enters the semantic string with the concept 'fervent,' on the one hand, and with 'conscientious' on the other. Fervency constitutes the direct motivation of the meaning 'diligent' in the development of the lexemes (*\*revъnъ, \*snažъnъ, \*gorlivъ, \*ščirъ/čirъ, \*sporъ, \*dikъ*); it is likely that this motivation was featured also by a continuant of *\*ěglъ*, which is attested only with negation in the antonymous meaning. The meaning 'conscientious' is in the majority of cases secondary in reference to 'diligent,' although a reverse situation is also possible (*skъbъnъ*, perhaps also *\*snažъnъ* – indirect, uncertain motivation). The motivation of the concept 'diligent' by work (*\*dělъnъ* in this context) is peculiar to the words derived in the particular Slavic languages.

## 15B. LAZY

### 15B.1. \*lěnъ/\*lěnivъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘loose’

The PSlav \*lěnъ continues the PIE \*lē-no-, a nominal form from the root \*lē- ‘to loosen; to let go, to leave,’ continued by the verbs based on the PIE forms which are extended by a suffix: \*lē-*u-*: e.g. Gothic *lewjan* ‘to betray’ < ‘\*to leave behind, to abandon’: \*lē-*d-*-, e.g., Gothic *letan* ‘to leave,’ Albanian *lodh* ‘to tire’ [LIV 1998: 358]. There are exact equivalents in Baltic languages: Lithuanian *lėnas* : *lėnas* ‘calm, quiet, mild; weak, slow,’ Latvian *lēns* : *lēns* ‘slow, mild, calm; lazy, sluggish’ and in Latin – *lēnis* ‘calm, mild; slow, lazy’ [Sławski 4: 158]. The PSlav \*lěnъ is continued residually [see Sławski: l.c.]. In all languages, except Serbian and Croatian, the adjectival function was assumed by the adjective with the suffix -*ivъ* – \*lěnivъ.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘lazy’

The meaning ‘lazy’ is attested as the basic meaning in all Slavic languages.

#### Innovative meanings

The innovative meaning ‘slow’ is attested in the Old Church Slavonic *lěnъ*, Czech *líný*, USorb *lěni*, dial. Russian *леной*, Belarusian *ланы́*.

### 15B.2. Eastern \*vędlъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘miserable, withered’ [see WEAK, 6B.8, p. 177]

**Structural meaning** ‘withered’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘withered’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The meaning ‘withered,’ metaphorically transferred from plants to man, with the preservation of the semantic dominant ‘devoid of vigor,’ hence ‘weak,’ ‘lazy; slow.’

### 15B.3. \*gnusъnъ

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain [see UGLY, 3B.1, p. 134]

**Structural meaning** ‘revolting’ (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘causing physical revulsion’ > ‘causing mental revulsion’ (*ut supra*)

#### Innovative meanings

The Polish *gnuśny* in the meaning ‘lazy’ is an extension of the meaning ‘causing mental revulsion.’

#### 15B.4. Western and Southern \*gyzdavъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘revolting’ [see UGLY, 3B.4, p. 136]

**Structural meaning** ‘revolting’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘revolting, abhorrent’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The dial. Polish *gizdavy* in the meaning ‘lazy’ is an extension of the meaning ‘causing mental revulsion.’

#### 15B.5. \*dręchlъ

**Etymological meaning** – ‘rotten’ (?) [see SAD, 11B.2, p. 222]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘decrepit, weak due to old age,’ ‘sad’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

In Old Russian the meanings ‘slow’ > ‘lazy’ arose on the basis of the meaning ‘decrepit, weak due to old age.’

#### 15B.6. \*chylъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘bent’ [see WEAK, 6B.4, p. 175]

**Structural meaning** ‘obliquus’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bent’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The Russian *хилый* ‘ignavus, drowsy; lazy’ is a secondary meaning, based on ‘weak’

#### 15B.7. \*mъzlivъ

**Etymological meaning** ‘rotten, decayed’ [cf. UNPLEASANT, 2B.4, p. 122]

**Structural meaning** ‘abhorrent’ (*ut supra*)

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘abhorrent’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The South Slavic deverbial adjective with the suffix *-livъ*: \*mъzlivъ assumed the meaning ‘lazy’ in Bulgarian (*мързелѝв*) and Macedonian (*мрзелув*). The basis is the meaning of the verb *м(ъ)рзу ме* ‘I am disgusted by sth, especially about work.’

15B.8. *\*lochъ/\*lošъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘weak’ (?) ‘obliquus’ (?) [see BAD, 1B.2, p. 105]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘bad, especially in the moral sense’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The dial. Russian *лѡшій* ‘lazy’, apart from which there is also the subst. ‘idler; dullard’, is an instance of the narrowing down of the meaning – a result of a negative evaluation.

## Summary of Semantic Changes

15B.1. *\*lěnъ/\*lěnivъ*

LAZY PSlav ← LOOSE etym.

15B.2. *\*vędlъ*

LAZY Eastern ← WITHERED Eastern

15B.3. *\*gnusъnъ*

LAZY Polish ← REVOLTING PSlav

15B.4. *\*gyzdavъ*

LAZY dial. Polish ← REVOLTING PSlav

15B.5. *\*dręchlъ*

LAZY Old Russian ← DEVOID OF STRENGTH/DECREPIT PSlav

15B.6. *\*chylъ*

LAZY Russian ← WEAK Eastern ← OBLIQUUS PSlav ← CURVED etym.

15B.7. *\*mјzъ*

LAZY Bulgarian, Macedonian ← ABHORRENT PSlav

15B.8. *\*lochъ/\*lošъ*

LAZY dial. Russian ← BAD PSlav

The motivations of the concept ‘lazy’ are associated either with its causes or with a result which has to do with a negative evaluation of laziness, namely causing revulsion (*\*gnusъnъ*, *\*gyzdavъ*) or with the evaluation itself (*\*lošъ*). The causes of being lazy, which constitute the basis of nomination, involve being disgusted by work (*\*mјzlivъ*), lack of strength, weakness (*\*dręselъ* : *\*dręchlъ*, *\*chylъ*) and the features which are manifestations of weakness: withering (*\*vędlъ*) and lack of tension, slackness (*\*lěnъ/\*lěnivъ*).

## 16A. WISE

### 16A.1. \*mōdrъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘thinking’

The PSlav \*mōdrъ is derived by scholars from the PIE \*mond<sup>h</sup>-ro-, a nominal form with the suffix -ro-, based on the PIE \*mend<sup>h</sup>- ‘to learn,’ considered a PIE compound of men- ‘mind; thought’ and d<sup>h</sup>ē- ‘to lay (transitive), ponere.’ The exact equivalents include Baltic languages: Lithuanian *mandrūs* ‘proud; brave; daring, arbitrary,’ Latvian *muōdrs* ‘lively, energetic’ and Germanic languages: e.g. Old High German *muntar* ‘sprightly, energetic; fervent/zealous’ [Heidermanns: 416]. When one compares the Proto-Slavic word with the aforementioned words, the former represents the initial meaning.

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘wise’

In the continuants in all Slavic languages the basic meaning is ‘wise; knowledgeable; rational’ (cf. e.g. Sorbian *mudry*, Slovene *móder*, Bulgarian *мъдър*, Belarusian *мудры*).

#### Innovative meanings

Instances of a development toward meanings referring to features of character are rare, e.g., Bulgarian *мъдър* ‘wise, rational’ > ‘calm, mild,’ early Croatian *mūdar* ‘careful, watchful.’ In these cases the semantic development consists in the shift of meaning toward the result of ‘being wise.’ A crucial semantic innovation, above all in the dialectal variants of the languages, consists in the transposition of the dominant from theoretical to practical skills, also with an additional semantic element ‘using one’s abilities to the detriment of other people’ (dial. Polish *mądry* ‘cunning; sly,’ dial. Czech *moudrý* ‘idem,’ dial. Serbian *mūdar* ‘idem,’ dial. Russian *мудрый* ‘idem’). A development combined with the transposition of the reference to inanimate objects may be discerned also in dialects where the continuants of \*mōdr assumed the meaning ‘of good quality’ (e.g., the dial. Polish “*mądre jabłko* [apples],” dial. Russian “*мудрый хлеб* [bread],” dial. Ukrainian *мудрий* ‘tasty’). Of the whole conceptual structure only the seme of positive overtones was preserved here.

### 16A.2. \*umъnъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘perceiving; experiencing sth with one’s senses’

The PSlav \*umъ ‘intellect’ continues the PIE \*aumō- ‘idem.’ The closest equivalent, based on a consonantal stem, is the Lithuanian *aučiū* ‘intellect.’ The Proto-Indo-European noun is based on the verbal root \*au- ‘to experience sth with one’s senses; to feel.’

#### Structural meaning ‘associated with the intellect’

A derivative with the suffix -ъnъ from the PSlav \*umъ ‘intellect.’

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘wise, rational’

The continuants in all Slavic languages indicate the meanings ‘wise; rational; prudent’ (e.g. Slovak *umný*, Slovene *úmen*, Bulgarian *умен*, Russian *умный*).

### Innovative meanings

In the particular languages the meaning 'rational' was extended. Thus, on the one hand, there emerged the meaning 'spiritual' apart from 'mental' (Old Church Slavonic *умьнѣ*) and 'associated with dexterity, with manual skills' (early Czech and Slovak *umný*) on the other.

#### 16A.3. *\*kovarьнѣ*

##### **Etymological meaning** 'associated with hitting, whacking'

The PSlav verb *\*kovati* is derived by scholars from the PIE root *\*kāu-* 'to hit, to whack, to strike' [Borys: 271; LIV: 308].

##### **Structural meaning** 'characteristic of/pertaining to a smith'

A derivative with the suffix *-ьнѣ* from *\*kovarь* 'smith'; 'doer', which is based on *\*kovati* 'to forge.'

##### **The meaning based on continuants** 'dexterous, skillful' > 'sly'

The meanings which are attested in Slavic languages prove that it was already in the Proto-Slavic language that the meaning 'dexterous, skillful' developed into 'sly', which may indicate a positive evaluation of the meaning 'sly' and the presence of the seme 'wise' in this meaning. Therefore perhaps also the meaning 'wise,' which seems to be an innovation of the Russian language (*коварный*) should be reconstructed as an intermediary developmental link between 'dexterous, skillful' and 'sly.'

#### 16A.4. *\*chytrѣ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain 'one that acquires sth' (?) [see QUICK, 9A.3, p. 198]

**Structural meaning** 'capable of grasping; grasping,' 'prehensile' (*ut supra*)

**The meanings based on continuants** 'quick,' 'skillful'; 'cunning/smart; bright' (*ut supra*)

##### **Innovative meanings**

On the basis of the meaning 'bright, capax' there emerged meanings with positive overtones – 'wise, rational, intelligent' – and negative overtones – 'cunning, sly.' It is interesting that in the Kashubian dialect or in the Ukrainian language the meanings 'wise' and 'cunning' exist side by side. The second Polish meaning of the lexeme *chytry* 'one who pursues material goods, avidus' may contain traces of the initial motivation with the meaning 'to grasp.' From this meaning there emerged further meanings with negative overtones and which contain the sense 'to grasp' > 'to want to have sth for oneself': colloq. 'stingy' and dial. 'jealous' (dial. also 'fastidious').

16A.5. *\*bystrǫ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘violent; rapidly flowing’ [see QUICK, 9A.2, p. 198]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘rapid, about a river current’ > ‘clean,’ fig. ‘bright;’ ‘sprightly’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘bright’ which may be considered an aspect of the concept ‘wise’ probably emerged already in the Proto-Slavic period as a figurative meaning referring to people. The basis of the metaphoric meaning may be both speed, as well as transparency, purity.

16A.6. *\*zъlъ*

**Etymological meaning** ‘obliquus’ > ‘bad’ [see BAD, 1B.1, p. 104]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘bad’ > ‘irate’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘wise, capable; cunning, sly, wiseacre (adj.),’ ‘skillful/capable;’ fig. ‘about memory, very good, retentive’ appear in Russian dialects as the meanings of the lexemes *злой, зол* (< *\*zъlъjъ, \*zъlъ*) apart from the meanings which express intensity (‘fond of sth,’ ‘strong (of frost)’). It seems that it is the seme of intensity (the same that is present in the meaning ‘irate,’ which was probably already a Proto-Slavic meaning) played a significant role in the formation of meanings associated with intellectual capabilities. The semantic development of the PSlav *\*chudъ* in the Slovene language is consistent with this development until a certain stage [see BAD, 1B.3, p. 105].

16A.7. *\*dělъnъ*

**Structural meaning** ‘associated with work, with the result of work’ [see DILIGENT, 15A.6, p. 254]

**The meaning based on continuants** Western ‘hard-working,’ Eastern ‘resourceful’ (*ut supra*)

**Innovative meanings**

In some languages on the basis of the meaning ‘capable of working; hard-working, laborious’ there emerged meanings which referred to mental capabilities (early Polish *dzielny* ‘rational, prudent,’ Russian *дѣльный* ‘idem’).

## Summary of Semantic Changes

16A.1. *\*mōdrъ*

WISE PSlav ← THINKING etym.

16A.2. *\*umьnъ*

WISE PSlav ← EXPERIENCING STH WITH ONE'S SENSES etym.

16A.3. *\*kovarьnъ*

WISE Old Russian, Russian-Church Slavic ← DEXTEROUS PSlav ← PERTAINING TO A SMITH struct.

16A.4. *\*chytrъ*

WISE PSlav ← CUNNING/SMART PSlav ← SLY PSlav ← QUICK PSlav ← PREHENSILE struct.

16A.5. *\*bystrъ*

16A.5.1.

WISE PSlav ← TRANSPARENT PSlav ← QUICK PSlav

or

16A.5.2.

WISE PSlav ← QUICK PSlav

16A.6. *\*zъlъ*

WISE dial. Russian ← \*INTENSIVE (?) ← BAD PSlav

16A.7. *\*dělьnъ*

WISE Polish, Russian ← CAPABLE OF WORKING PSlav ← ASSOCIATED WITH WORK struct.

The motivations of the concept 'wise' are associated with all of the spheres of man's existence: with thinking<sup>78</sup> (*\*mōdrъ*), feeling (*\*umьnъ*), and finally, with various kinds of physical activity where physical properties such as speed (*\*bystrъ*, *\*chytrъ* – intermediate motivation), the proficiency in a given craft (*\*kovarьnъ* – intermediate motivation) or the capability of working in general (*\*dělьnъ*) are transposed to the mental sphere. In both of the aforementioned cases the direct motivation is presumably proficiency, skill but also cunning, shrewdness. An attempt at explaining the indirect motivation of the concept 'wise' by 'bad' was presented above.

<sup>78</sup> This obvious motivational sphere is peculiar above all to the derivatives which emerged independently in various Slavic languages.

## 16B. STUPID

### 16B.1. \*glupъ

#### Etymological meaning ‘crushed; compressed’

It is most likely derived from a nominal form \*glou-po- (similarly as \*gluchъ < \*glou-so-), from the PIE \*g(ə)ley-, which in turn is derived from the original \*gel- ‘to crush, to squeeze, to stuff up,’ extended by the determinant -ey-. A less probable relationship would be with the PSlav *glumъ* ‘iocus, derision,’ probably based on the PIE \*g<sup>h</sup>ley- ‘to be merry; to jest’ [cf. Sławski 1: 296]. An attempt is made to combine both interpretations by Čop [1973: 45–46].

#### The meaning based on continuants ‘stupid’

The meaning ‘stupid’ is preserved in all Slavic languages. Perhaps one should reconstruct the meaning ‘dark’ as the initial one (cf. dial. Russian “злунáя нóчь” ‘a dark night,’ similarly in Ukrainian and Belarusian), based – as in the semantic development of the related \*gluchъ ‘deaf’ – on the limiting of the possibilities of sensory experiences by clogging, contracting, crushing.

#### Innovative meanings

A common innovative meaning is ‘mad’ (e.g. the Polish *głupi*, dial. Czech *hloupý*, Russian *злуный*) as an extension of the conceptual sphere which refers to mindlessness. A different direction of development is discernible in ‘unimportant’ (e.g. Polish *głupi*, Slovak *hlupý*, Serbian *glûp*), hence other references to a man of inferior worth, e.g., the dial. Russian *злуный* ‘miserable, mean; poor,’ ‘simple’ > ‘boorish,’ ‘naive’ > ‘immature.’ The development of the Polabian continuant *glaiþǣ* ‘young’ presumably pursued a similar course.

### 16B.2. \*tǫpъ

#### Etymological meaning – uncertain

As far as the formal aspects are concerned, it seems likely that the PSlav \*tǫpъ is a continuant of a nominal form from the PIE \*temp- ‘to stretch,’ cf. the Lithuanian *tem̃pti tempiti* ‘to stretch.’ However, it is difficult to justify semantically. One is struck by the semantic identity with the Proto-Germanic \*stumpa- (German *stumpf*, Dutch *stump*), although it must be referred to a Proto-Indo-European form with a voiced consonant. The Proto-Germanic \*stumma- ‘mute’ is also semantically related. In this case the assimilation-related changes preclude the establishment of the original quality of the vowel.<sup>79</sup> However, in both cases we are faced with the problem of the syllable-onset s- in Germanic, which, if we support the idea of the relationship with the PSlav \*tǫpъ, one should treat it as s- mobile.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. a comparison of the reconstructed Proto-Germanic alternate form \*\*stumba- with the PSlav \*tǫpъ [Heidermanns: 564].

### **The meanings based on continuants** ‘blunt, not sharp,’ ‘stupid (?)’

The basic meaning which is commonly preserved in Slavic languages is ‘blunt, not sharp’ (e.g. Polish *tępy*, Czech *tupý*, Slovene *tóp*, Russian *мынóу*). The meaning ‘incapable; stupid’ is also pan-Slavic. It is difficult to decide whether this innovation arose still in the Proto-Slavic language or – as a productive phenomenon – it arose beyond the Slavic realm in the later period. The same metaphor is visible in the emergence of other meanings, e.g., in the Czech language which refer to the low degree of something, especially when talking about the senses, e.g., ‘weak, about the sense of hearing, smelling, memory etc.’

### 16B.3. *\*durъ/\*durъnъ*

**Etymological meaning** – uncertain ‘blowing, associated with wind’ (?) [see VIOLENT, 10A.5, p. 207]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘agitated, violent; impetuous,’ Northern ‘mad’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The meaning ‘mad’ may be considered a common North Slavic innovation, which arose perhaps still during the existence of the Proto-Slavic community. Then a transposition of the dominant and a change of meaning occurred, e.g. Polish *durny* from ‘mad’ > ‘stupid; limited; mentally retarded.’

### 16B.4. *\*bujъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.6, p. 208]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘overdeveloped; rapidly growing; abundant’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The innovative meaning ‘stupid,’ based on the preceding link ‘mad,’ is attested already in the earliest stages of the development of the languages: Old Church Slavonic *bujъ* ‘stupid, mad,’ Old Russian *буѣь* ‘daring; mad; stupid.’

### 16B.5. *\*bolgъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure ‘shining, gleaming’ (?) [see PLEASANT, 2A.2, p. 116]

**The meanings based on continuants** ‘good, kind, pleasant,’ ‘happy, prosperous’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

Russian *благóу* (a South Slavic form of Church Slavonic origin instead of *бологóу*) ‘stupid, quick-tempered’ apart from ‘good, respectable; happy.’ Two possibilities may

be considered. Either the intermediation of the unattested meaning ‘naïve’ (cf. Czech *bláhnový* ‘idem,’ a derivative from *blaho* < \**bolgo* ‘good(ness); happiness, prosperity’) or a development from ‘happy; blessed’ to ‘mad,’ which sometimes could be culturally motivated but today is perceived as a euphemism.

### 16B.6. \**dikъ*

**Etymological meaning** – obscure [see VIOLENT, 10A.7, p. 209]

**The meaning based on continuants** ‘not used by people’ > ‘untamed’ > ‘violent’ (*ut supra*)

#### **Innovative meanings**

The basis of the meaning ‘stupid’ of the dial. Russian *дикий* is probably ‘undomesticated; untamed,’ which is motivated by an anthropocentric evaluation of reality. However, due to the common semantic development ‘mad’ > ‘stupid’ one should also take into consideration the possibility of the following development: ‘wild’ > ‘violent’ > ‘mad’ > ‘stupid.’

## Summary of Semantic Changes

### 16B.1. \**glupъ*

#### 16B.1.1.

STUPID PSlav ← INACCESSIBLE etym. ← CLOGGED etym.

or

#### 16B.1.2.

STUPID PSlav ← FUNNY etym.

### 16B.2. \**topъ*

STUPID pan-Slavic ← NOT SHARP PSlav

### 16B.3. \**durъnъ*

STUPID Northern ← MAD Polish, Russian, Ukrainian ← VIOLENT etym. ← ASSOCIATED WITH WIND (?) etym.

### 16B.4. \**buъbъ*

STUPID Old Russian, Russian, Ukrainian ← MAD Eastern ← VIOLENT PSlav ← OVER-DEVELOPED PSlav

### 16B.5. \**bolgъ*

#### 16B.5.1.

STUPID Russian ← \*NAÏVE ← MILD PSlav ← SHINING (?) etym.

or

#### 16B.5.2.

STUPID Russian ← MAD Russian ← BLESSED ← HAPPY PSlav

### 16B.6. \**dikъ*

#### 16B.6.1.

STUPID dial. Russian ← UNTAMED PSlav

or

16B.6.2.

STUPID dial. Russian ← MAD dial. Russian ← VIOLENT PSlav ← UNTAMED PSlav

Among the motivations of the concept ‘stupid’ madness clearly sets itself apart (*\*durьnъ*, *\*bujь*, *\*bolgъ*, *\*dikъ* – alternative motivation), which in two or three cases (*\*durьnъ*, *\*bujь*, possibly *\*dikъ*) is motivated by violence. This clearly indicates that stupidity is motivated by a lack of judgment. The motivations associated with limiting,<sup>80</sup> caused either by a lack of access (*\*glupъ*) or a lack of an appropriate tool (*\*topъ*) are very different from this motivation. The motivation based on naïveté as a result of stupidity belong to yet another sphere. The names which belong to this semantic group may constitute a rewarding field of research of the etymological qualities in the connotations of a word.

---

<sup>80</sup> The motivation by limiting is typical for other derivatives which are not analyzed in the work. See Jakubowicz 2004.



## 7

# A DICTIONARY OF SEMANTIC CHANGES

The dictionary of semantic changes is by design an onomasiological index, whereas the material which is contained in this index may be arranged according to the final concepts (here the basis of the arrangement has to do with the received meanings – motivated meanings) or according to the initial concepts (the basis of the arrangement are motivating meanings, also known as semantic motivations).<sup>1</sup> The authors of diachronic research of the changes of meanings choose one of these arrangements, usually according to the final meaning, which I discuss in a more comprehensive manner in the context of the description of research of the parallels of semantic development that was conducted heretofore.

The following sample of the dictionary actually contains two dictionaries with an onomasiological arrangement: one is arranged according to final concepts, the other according to initial concepts. The sequence in the dictionary arranged according to final concepts is analogous to the sequence of the chapters which refer to the material. This sequence was retained for the sake of the reader's convenience who peruses these chapters. However, I believe that in a dictionary based on a greater corpus of semantic changes it would be beneficial to give up an interchangeable arrangement of semantic groups (of words with antonymous meanings).

The onomasiological dictionary is arranged according to initial concepts, compiled on the basis of the material of my work; it is apparently similar to a semasiological dictionary because the same Proto-Slavic lexemes occur relatively

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the premise which is embraced at the beginning of the work, when I use the term **concept**, I have in mind the whole group of words with one meaning, whereas I use the term **meaning** in reference to the particular lexemes.

frequently in the role of initial concepts in a given group.<sup>2</sup> Such a state of affairs results from the perforce limited number of lexemes which were included in the dictionary. The greater their number will be, the easier it will be to compose conceptual groups. In the present state of things, these groups are dispersed to a great extent because it is not the initial motivation, but the final meaning, which conditioned the choice of lexemes.

In the dictionary I put not only Proto-Slavic meanings as the initial, motivating, meanings but also those that motivated the particular links of the semantic string in the entire developmental process. This is consistent with the premises of my work, that is with the reconstruction of the subsequent meanings that emerged: ranging all the way from the etymological meaning across structural meanings to the reconstructed meanings on the basis of the meanings of the continuants and further on, until we reach the innovative meanings which emerged after the dissolution of the Proto-Slavic community. The dictionary includes both direct motivating meanings as well as indirect ones. Therefore sometimes surprising combinations such as: motivations by antonymous concepts, e.g. 'good' by 'bad' or 'pretty' by 'repulsive.' As a matter of fact, it is such paradoxical combinations that best justify the compilation of dictionaries of semantic parallels. The very possibility of seeking motivations in them resulting from developmental strings is useful but is not sufficient to solve the most complex etymological mysteries. The greatest number of such unexpected motivations are associated with the etymological meanings which are easy to find among the other ones in the schema that I employed because they are provided in the verbal form instead of the adjectival form, as in the case of the other ones. One should note that such a group of meanings contains the greatest number of lexemes which are accompanied by a question mark. The latter is used to mark such cases in which the reconstruction of the etymological meaning is based on uncertain or even doubtful foundations. Another reason for employing the question mark is the lack of certainty as far as the course of the semantic development is concerned. In each of these cases the reasons for using the question mark may be found in the part of the work which contains the material.

A separate problem is associated with the arrangement of concepts in the index which follows not the alphabetical order but the onomasiological order. And because the author of an index of semantic changes faces the same problems as the one faced by an author of any onomasiological dictionary, there is no need to present these problems in a comprehensive manner. The practical solutions which I decided to embrace are visible in both parts of the present dictionary, especially so in the dictionary arranged according to the initial concepts, where the concepts are much more varied and thus are more difficult

---

<sup>2</sup> In the model of a dictionary which is presented here all lexemes are provided in the Proto-Slavic form. In a dictionary in which the material would be more varied, it is reasonable to provide actually attested forms of words.

to arrange. One should also add that not every meaning emphasized in the “summaries of semantic changes” is included in the dictionary. I decided not to include there meanings which were not sufficiently distinct and which would hardly lend themselves to the model of the second index – the one arranged according to initial concepts. I could indulge in such an arbitrary solution because the present dictionary is an attempt at a dictionary of semantic motivations, or: a proposition which is directed to the reader’s consideration. Therefore the inclusion of all meanings is not the main goal of this dictionary.

## 1. An Onomasiological Dictionary Arranged According to the Received Meanings

**RECEIVED** concepts are printed in uppercase letters, **initial concepts** are printed in lowercase letters. The *Proto-Slavic lexemes* printed in italics, which follow initial concepts, realize a given schema of semantic development.

### 1A. GOOD

#### location

**well-adjusted** *\*dobro \*lěro \*godьno*

**arranged in a series** *\*rōdьno \*rēdьno \*ladьno*

#### appearance

**pretty** *\*krasьno*

**colorful** *\*krasьno*

**shining** *\*bolgo (?)*

#### physical features

**big** *\*bol'ьь \*drěčьno*

**strong** *\*bol'ьь \*drěčьno \*čilь*

#### healthy

**able** *\*dělьno \*chytro*

**quick** *\*chytro*

#### features of character

**hard-working** *\*dělьno*

**proud** *\*gřdь*

#### evaluation

**pleasant** *\*bolgo*

**pretty** *\*krasьno \*bolgo*

**magnificent** *\*gřdь*

#### association

**with a tree trunk** *\*drěčьno*

**with work** *\*dělьno*

**activities and states****to grasp** \*chytr̥**to stick, to glue** \*l̥p̥

## 1B. BAD

**appearance****red** \*r̥dʼav̥**shining** \*bolg̥ (?)**physical features****obliquous** \*z̥l̥**flat** (?) \*ploch̥**weak** \*loch̥ \*bolg̥ \*slab̥ \*chud̥ (?)**small** \*chud̥**impermanent** \*mar̥n̥ \*polch̥**sharp** \*brid̥k̥**loose** \*slab̥**temperament****violent/rapid** \*dur̥n̥**mad** \*bolg̥ \*dur̥n̥**inspired** \*bolg̥**features of character****mild** \*bolg̥**proud** \*g̥d̥**evaluation****revolting** \*gnus̥n̥ \*gad̥n̥ \*brid̥k̥**nasty** \*brid̥/\*brid̥k̥**pleasant** \*bolg̥**distinguished/singled out** \*bolg̥**stupid** \*dur̥n̥**primitive** \*dur̥n̥**worthless** \*mar̥n̥ \*dar̥m̥n̥ \*r̥dʼav̥ \*chud̥**poor** \*b̥d̥n̥ \*chud̥ (?)**horrible** \*groz̥n̥**other****odd (of numbers)** \*lich̥**remaining** \*lich̥**false** \*mar̥n̥**association****with wind** \*dur̥n̥**activities and states****to move (intransitive)** \*polch̥**to flee** \*polch̥**to cut** \*brid̥k̥**to dream** \*mar̥n̥**to give** \*dar̥m̥n̥

**to force** \*bědъnъ  
**to spoil (to become spoilt)** \*rъd'avъ \*chabъ (?)  
**to rust** \*rъd'avъ

## 2A. PLEASANT

### location

**well-adjusted** \*godъnъ \*dobrъ \*lěpъ  
**arranged in a sequence** \*lagodъnъ (?)

### appearance

**shining** \*bolgъ (?)

### features of character

**calm** \*lagodъnъ

**mild** \*něžъnъ

### evaluation

**good** \*dobrъ \*lěpъ \*godъnъ

**beloved** \*dorgъ

**pretty** \*lěpъ

**dear** \*dorgъ

### activities and states

**to hold** \*jъtъnъ \*dorgъ

**to touch** \*jъtъnъ

## 2B. UNPLEASANT

### location

**located opposite sth** \*protivъnъ

### physical features

**obliquus** \*zъlъ

**steep** \*prikrъ

**dirty** \*skvъnъ

**ulcerated** \*vrědъnъ

### temperament

**violent** \*durъnъ

### features of character

**proud** \*grdъ

### evaluation

**bad** \*durъnъ \*zъlъ

**revolting** \*mъzъkъ \*skvъnъ \*vrědъnъ

**terrible/dangerous** \*grozъnъ

**hostile** \*protivъnъ

**difficult** \*prikrъ

**different** \*protivъnъ

**association****with wind** \*durьnъ**activities and states****to spoil** \*skvjьnъ (?)**to do harm** \*vrědьnъ

## 3A. PRETTY

**location****well-adjusted** \*lěpъ \*godьnъ**arranged in a series** \*rědьnъ \*ladьnъ**appearance****red** \*krasьnъ**multicolored** \*krasьnъ \*pěknъ/\*pěkrъ**dressed up** \*gyzdavъ**smooth** \*gladъkъ**ugly** \*gyzdavъ**physical features****big** \*zьlъ \*drěčьnъ \*grozьnъ**high/tall** \*drěčьnъ**thin** \*drěčьnъ**shapely** \*ladьnъ**mellow** \*kypъ**smooth** \*gladъkъ**obliquus** \*zьlъ**features of character****proud** \*grďъ**evaluation****ugly** \*gyzdavъ**bad** \*zьlъ**magnificent** \*grďъ**good** \*dělьnъ**association****with a tree trunk** \*drěčьnъ**with work** \*dělьnъ

## 3B. UGLY

**physical features****weak** \*marьnъ**thin** \*chudъ (?)**sick** \*chvorъ**rough** \*grqьbъ**sharp** \*bridъkъ**rotten** \*mjъzъkъ

**temperament****violent** \*durьnь**features of character****proud** \*gʹdь**evaluation****revolting** \*bridьkь \*gnusьnь \*grozьnь \*gʹdь \*gadьnь \*gydьkь \*gyzdanь \*mʹzьkь  
\*rəžьnь**bad** \*marьnь \*chudь (?) \*durьnь**terrible/dangerous** \*grozьnь \*gʹdь**funny** \*rəžьnь**association****with wind** \*durьnь**activities****to cut** \*bridь/\*bridьkь**to spin/twist** \*grəbь**4A. HIGH/TALL****location****at the top** \*vysokь**physical features****big** \*bol'ьjь \*dəžь \*golěmь \*velь/\*velikь**strong** \*bol'ьjь \*dəžь \*golěmь \*velikь**association****with a tree trunk** \*drěčьnь**activities and states****to reach** \*dosəžь**4B. LOW/SHORT****location****arranged in a series** \*rədbьnь**at the bottom** \*nizьkь**physical features****small** \*malь \*krəpь \*kʹnь**stout** \*krəpь**damaged** \*kʹnь**evaluation****appropriate** \*rədbьnь**activities and states****to shrink** \*krəpь**to cut** \*kʹnь

## 5A. FAT

**location****inside** \*jɛdrɔ̃ (?)**physical features****big** \*jɛdrɔ̃ (?)**strong** \*debelɔ̃ \*sporɔ̃ \*tɔgɔ̃ \*jɛdrɔ̃ (?)**stout** \*krɔpɔ̃/\*krɔpɔ̃nɔ̃**swollen** \*jɛdrɔ̃ (?) \*t|stɔ̃**smooth** \*gladɔ̃kɔ̃**rough** \*grɔbɔ̃/\*grubɔ̃**shrunk** \*krɔpɔ̃/\*krɔpɔ̃nɔ̃**fat** \*gladɔ̃kɔ̃ \*rychlɔ̃**mellow** \*rychlɔ̃**activities and states****to spin/to twist/to roll** \*grɔbɔ̃ (?)/\*grubɔ̃ (?)**to be successful** \*sporɔ̃

## 5B. THIN

**location****arranged in a series** \*lagodɔ̃nɔ̃ (?)**physical features****weak** \*jibɔ̃ \*slabɔ̃ \*chudɔ̃ (?)**small** \*chudɔ̃ (?)**empty** \*tɔ̃šɕɔ̃**sick** \*chvorɔ̃**delicate** \*lagodɔ̃nɔ̃**loose** \*slabɔ̃**evaluation****bad** \*chudɔ̃ (?)**miserable** \*tɔ̃šɕɔ̃ \*chudɔ̃ (?) \*sɔ̃kromɔ̃nɔ̃ (?)**association****with a thin twig** \*šibɔ̃kɔ̃**activities and states****to grope** \*šɕuplɔ̃**to pinch** \*šɕuplɔ̃**to cut** \*šɕuplɔ̃ (?) \*sɔ̃kromɔ̃nɔ̃ (?)

## 6A. STRONG

**location****at the center** \*jɛdrɔ̃ (?)**physical features****big** \*drɛčɔ̃nɔ̃**tense** \*silɔ̃nɔ̃ \*tɔgɔ̃ (?)

**hard** \*krěpъ/\*krěpъkъ \*tоgъ (?) \*krотъ \*storbъ \*čъstvъ (?)

**dense** \*čъstvъ (?)

**fat** \*jędъ (?)

**healthy** \*sъdorvъ

**stiff** \*storbъ

#### age

**young** \*jarъ

#### temperament

**violent** \*polchъ

**lustful** \*jarъ

**quick** \*polchъ

**sprightly** \*bъdrъ \*čilъ \*jarъ

**lively** \*čilъ

#### features of character

**stern** \*strogъ

**hard-working** \*dělъnъ

#### evaluation

**appropriate** \*dobъ

**excessive** \*lichъ

**terrible/dangerous** \*strogъ

#### other

**abundant/efficient** \*sporъ

#### association

**with a tree trunk** \*drěčъnъ

**with work** \*dělъnъ

**with good-quality wood** \*sъdorvъ

#### activities and states

**to run** \*polchъ

**to press** \*dоžъ

**to beat** \*čъstvъ (?)

**to enlace/to weave/to twist** \*čъstvъ \*krотъ

**to spin** \*krотъ

**to endure** \*krěpъkъ \*čъstvъ (?)

**to grow numb** \*storbъ

**to be successful** \*sporъ

**to rest** \*čilъ

**to be on guard** \*strogъ

**to care** \*strogъ

## 6B. WEAK

#### location

**arranged in a series** \*lagodъnъ (?)

#### appearance

**shining** \*bolgъ (?)

**age****old** \*vetʰchʰ**physical features****thin** \*ʂibʰkʰ \*vetʰchʰ**loose** \*slabʰ \*kypʰrʰ \*rʰchʰlʰ \*rychʰlʰ**fragile/brittle** \*chudʰ (?)**thin** \*chudʰ**empty** \*ʧtʰlʰ**tired** \*mʰdbʰlʰ**taste****sour** \*chabʰ (?)**temperament****slow** \*mʰdbʰlʰ**mental feature****mild** \*bolgʰ \*lagodʰnʰ \*nʰžʰnʰ**evaluation****bad** \*loch/\*loʂʰ \*chabʰ/\*chabʰnʰ \*chudʰ (?)**insignificant** \*glupʰ \*bolgʰ**stupid** \*glupʰ**association****with a thin twig** \*ʂibʰkʰ**activities and states****to seethe** \*kypʰrʰ**to rot** \*ʧtʰlʰ**to decay** \*drʰchʰlʰ (?)**to wither** \*vʰdlʰ**to sag** \*slabʰ**to shake/to totter** \*rʰchʰlʰ \*rychʰlʰ \*klʰkʰavʰ**to bend (oneself)** \*chylʰ \*klʰkʰavʰ**to incline** \*chylʰ**7A. HEALTHY****location****arranged in a series** \*rʰdʰ**physical features****strong** \*storʰbʰ \*rʰdʰ \*krʰpʰkʰ**hard** \*storʰbʰ**stiff** \*storʰbʰ**whole** \*cʰlʰ \*ʧitʰavʰ**temperament****sprightly** \*rʰdʰ \*ʧilʰ**lively** \*ʧilʰ**evaluation****appropriate** \*rʰdʰ

**activities****to rest** \**čitav̆***to grow numb** \**storb̆***association****with good-quality wood** \**s̆dorv̆*

## 7B. SICK

**appearance****shining** \**bolğ* (?)**physical features****weak** \**kypr̆* \**chud̆* \**chyl̆* \**ϕt̆l̆* \**bolğ* \**slab̆***loose** \**slab̆***temperament****mad** \**dur̆n̆***evaluation****bad** \**dur̆n̆* \**ploch̆* \**loš̆***activities and states****to wrinkle** \**skrb̆n̆* (?)**to twist** \**skrb̆n̆* (?)**to cut/to wound** \**skrb̆n̆* (?) \**chvor̆*

## 8A. YOUNG

**location****at the center** \**j̆dr̆n̆* (?)**physical features****delicate** \**mold̆***soft** \**mold̆***able** \**j̆dr̆n̆***fat** \**j̆dr̆n̆* (?)**features of character****stupid** \**glur̆***temperament****lustful** \**jar̆* (?)**sprightly** \**jar̆* (?)**evaluation****inexperienced** \**glur̆***stupid** \**glur̆***association****with spring** \**jar̆*

## 8B. OLD

**appearance****grey-haired** \*šǝdiv̄**shining** \*bolḡ (?)**physical features****big** \*dos̄oḡ / \*dos̄ož̄**strong** \*star̄**weak** \*dr̄ęchl̄ \*bolḡ \*chyl̄**bent** \*chyl̄**rotten** \*dr̄ęchl̄ (?)**age****adult (adj.)** \*star̄ \*dos̄oḡ**features of character****mild** \*bolḡ**simple** \*dur̄n̄**stupid** \*dur̄n̄**skillful** \*dos̄oḡ**evaluation****bad** \*dur̄n̄**pleasant** \*bolḡ**association****with wind** \*dur̄n̄**activities****to reach** \*dos̄oḡ

## 9A. QUICK

**location****at the center** \*j̄edr̄ (?)**physical features****fat** \*j̄edr̄ (?)**strong** \*j̄edr̄**abundant** \*spor̄**sharp** \*lut̄**efficient** \*spor̄**temperament****violent** \*ęgl̄ \*šib̄k̄ \*bystr̄ \*lut̄ \*pr̄ođ̄ / \*pr̄ođ̄k̄**sprightly** \*b̄dr̄**features of character****vigilant** \*b̄dr̄**eager** \*gorliv̄**activities and state****to move (oneself)** \*rychl̄ \*nagl̄ (?)**to grasp** \*chytr̄**to jump** \*pr̄ođ̄ / \*pr̄ođ̄k̄

**to flow** \*bystr̥

**to cut** \*l'ut̥

**to be wakeful** \*b̥dr̥

## 9B. SLOW

### physical features

**weak** \*dr̥chl̥

**loose** \*l̥n̥iv̥

### temperament

**calm** \*tich̥

### features of character

**lazy** \*l̥n̥iv̥

### other

**free/independent** \*vol̥n̥

### activities and states

**to wither** \*v̥dl̥

## 10A. VIOLENT

### physical features

**strong** \*ǣgl̥ \*šib̥k̥

**abundant** \*buj̥n̥

**sharp** \*l'ut̥

### temperament

**furious** \*l'ut̥

**eager** \*kyp̥r̥

### features of character

**brave** \*nagl̥ (?)

### evaluation

**horrible** \*groz̥n̥

**untamed** \*div̥/\*dik̥

### association

**with spring** \*jar̥ (?)

**with wind** \*dur̥/\*dur̥n̥ (?)

### activities and states

**to be angry** \*l'ut̥

**to move (intransitive)** \*nagl̥ (?)

**to seethe** \*kyp̥r̥

**to spin/to twist (transitive)** \*kr̥qt̥ (?)

**to jump** \*pr̥d̥/\*pr̥d̥k̥

**to run** \*polch̥

**to grow** \*buj̥ \*buj̥av̥ \*buj̥n̥

**to cut** \*l'ut̥

## 10B. CALM

### location

arranged in a sequence \**lagodьnъ* (?)

arranged neatly \**k'ľudьnъ*

### physical features

weak \**lagodьnъ* (?)

clean/pure \**k'ľudьnъ*

### features of character

mild \**mirьnъ* \**krotьkъ*

shy \**plochъ*

### mental features

wise \**mьdrъ*

### association

with the animal world

tame \**ьmьnъ*

### other

silence \**tichъ*

### activities and states

to rest \**pokojьnъ*

to hold/to take \**ьmьnъ*

to beat \**krotьkъ*

## 11A. CHEERFUL/MERRY

### location

arranged in a series \**rьdъ*

### physical features

strong \**dьžь* \**č'fstvъ*

shapely \**drěčьnъ*

slender \**drěčьnъ*

high/tall \**drěčьnъ*

sprightly \**ьdrъ* \**budьnъ* \**čilъ* \**dьžь* \**č'fstvъ* \**jarъ* \**rьdъ*

### features of character

vigilant \**ьdrъ*/\**budьnъ*

### evaluation

good \**veselъ*

appropriate \**rьdъ*

### association

with a tree trunk \**drěčьnъ*

with spring \**jarъ* \**veselъ* (?)

### states

to beat \**č'fstvъ* (?)

to rest \**čilъ*

## 11B. SAD

**physical features****decrepit** \*dr̥esɛl̥ \*dr̥ɛchl̥ (?)**evaluation****terrible/dangerous** \*grozɔn̥**association****with venom** \*ɛdɔn̥**activities and states****to wrinkle** \*skr̥bɔn̥ (?)**to spin/to twist** \*skr̥bɔn̥ (?)**to cut** \*skr̥bɔn̥ (?)**to roar/to cry** \*revɔn̥**to stir up/to disturb** \*sɔmɔtɔn̥

## 12A. STERN

**physical features****sharp** \*bridɔkɔ \*lʉtɔ**steep** \*prikɔ**hard** \*ɟʹstvɔ \*krɔtɔ**obliquus** \*zɔlɔ**features of character****callous** \*ɟʹsrvɔ**daring** \*gɹdɔ**proud** \*gɹdɔ**careful** \*strogɔ**cruel** \*krɔtɔ \*lʉtɔ**evaluation****bad** \*zɔlɔ**difficult** \*prikɔ**terrible/dangerous** \*grozɔn̥ \*gɹdɔ**activities and states****to be irate** \*zɔlɔ**to scare** \*grozɔn̥ \*gɹdɔ**to be on guard** \*strogɔ**to beat** \*bridɔ/\*bridɔkɔ \*lʉtɔ \*ɟʹstvɔ**to twist/to spin** \*krɔtɔ

## 12B. MILD

**position****arranged in a series** \*lagɔdɔn̥ (?)**appearance****shining** \*bolgɔ (?)

**physical features**

**weak** \*lagodьnъ

**delicate** \*milъ

**temperament**

**calm** \*mъdrъ \*lagodьnъ \*mirьnъ

**features of character**

**shy** \*polchъ

**timorous** \*polchъ

**humble** \*pokorьnъ

**mental features**

**wise** \*mъdrъ

**evaluation**

**delightful** \*bolgъ

**pleasant** \*bolgъ \*milъ \*mirьnъ

**activities**

**to tame** \*krotьkъ

**to hold** \*jьtьnъ (?)

**to punish** \*pokorьnъ

**to beat** \*krotьkъ

**to flee** \*polchъ

13A. BRAVE

**physical features**

**strong** \*bujь/\*bujьnъ \*drěčьnъ \*dob'ь \*lichъ \*lutъ (?)

**big** \*drěčьnъ

**sharp** \*chorbrъ (?) \*lutъ

**temperament**

**violent** \*bujь \*bystrъ \*jarъ \*prъdъkъ

**wild** \*bujь/\*bujьnъ

**quick** \*rychlъ

**sprightly** \*rychlъ

**valorous** \*dělьnъ

**features of character**

**daring** \*gъdъ

**haughty** \*gъdъ

**proud** \*gъdъ

**stern** \*chorbrъ (?) \*lutъ

**evaluation**

**suitable** \*dob'ь

**capable** \*dělьnъ

**association**

**with a tree trunk** \*drěčьnъ

**with work** \*dělьnъ

**activities**

**to be vigilant** \*bьdrъ

**to beat** \*chorbrъ (?) \*lutъ

## 13B. TIMID

**temperament****violent** \*durьnь \*prɔdь**wild** \*durьnь \*dikь \*divь \*polchь**lazy** \*lєnivь**slow** \*lєnivь**evaluation****bad** \*chabь**association****with wind** \*durьnь**activities and states****to jump** \*prɔdь**to run** \*polchь**to move (intransitive)** \*polchь

## 14A. PROUD

**physical features****strong** \*bьdrь**sprightly** \*bьdrь**hard** \*krɔtь**stiff** \*krɔtь**swollen** \*pyšьnь**features of character****daring** \*bujьnь \*jarь \*bьdrь**audacious** \*bujьnь \*jarь \*bьdrь**temperament****violent** \*bujьnь \*durьnь \*jarь**mad** \*durьnь**lustful** \*jarь (?)**association****with wind** \*durьnь**with spring** \*jarь**activities and states****to spin** \*krɔtь**to be vigilant** \*bьdrь**to blow** \*pyšьnь

## 14B. HUMBLE

**features of character****moderate** \*szьkrotьnь (?)**mild** \*tirьnь

**activities and states**

**to punish** \**pokorɔnɔ*

**to beat** \**krɔtɔkɔ*

**to cut** \**sɔkromɔnɔ* (?)

15A. DILIGENT

**physical features**

**hot** \**gorlivɔ*

**strong** \**ɛglɔ*

**uniform** \**ščirɔ*

**temperament**

**violent** \**ɛglɔ*

**lively** \**čilɔ*

**fervent/zealous** \**ɛglɔ* \**snažɔnɔ* \**revɔnɔ* \**gorlivɔ* \**ščirɔ* \**sporɔ*

**other**

**efficient** \**sporɔ*

**abundant** \**sporɔ*

**uniform** \**ščirɔ* / \**čilɔ*

**features of character**

**frank** \**ščirɔ*

**hard-working** \**dělɔnɔ*

**vigilant** \**bɔdrɔ*

**careful** \**snažɔnɔ* \**skɔbɔnɔ*

**caring** \**skɔbɔnɔ*

**sad** \**skɔbɔnɔ*

**evaluation**

**bad** \**zɔlɔ*

**association**

**with work** \**dělɔnɔ*

**activities and states**

**to roar** \**revɔnɔ* / \**revɔnivɔ*

**to hasten (transitive)** \**pilɔnɔ*

**to cut** \**ščirɔ* \**skɔbɔnɔ* (?)

**to crease** \**skɔbɔnɔ* (?)

**to twist/to spin** \**skɔbɔnɔ* (?)

**to rest** \**čilɔ*

15B. LAZY

**appearance**

**ugly** \**gyzdavɔ*

**physical features**

**weak** \**vɛdlɔ* \**drɛchlɔ* \**chylɔ*

**loose** \**lɛnɔ* / \**lɛnivɔ*

**evaluation****revolting** \*gnusʰnʰ \*gyzdavʰ**bad** \*loʂʰ**activities****to wither** \*vɛdlʰ**to rot** \*mʲzlivʰ

## 16A. WISE

**physical features****obliquus** \*zʰlʰ**quick** \*chytrʰ**dexterous** \*kovarʰnʰ**skillful** \*kovarʰnʰ**features of character****cunning** \*chytrʰ**sly** \*kovarʰnʰ**evaluation****bad** \*zʰlʰ**association****with work** \*dɛlʰnʰ**with a smith** \*kovarʰnʰ**activities and states****to grasp** \*chytrʰ**to hit** \*kovarʰnʰ**to feel** \*utʰnʰ**to think** \*mʰdrʰ

## 16B. STUPID

**location****lack of access** \*glurʰ**appearance****shining** \*bolgʰ (?)**physical features****blunt** \*tʰrʰ**abundant** \*bujʰ**temperament****violent** \*durʰnʰ \*bujʰ**mad** \*durʰnʰ \*bujʰ \*bolgʰ (?)**features of character****naïve** \*bolgʰ**evaluation****good** \*bolgʰ**blessed** \*bolgʰ**funny** \*glurʰ (?)

**association****with wind** \*durь/\*durьnъ (?)**activities and state****to clog** \*glurь**to develop** \*bujь

## 2. An Onomasiological Dictionary Arranged According to Initial Meanings

**INITIAL** concepts are printed in uppercase characters, **received concepts** are printed in lowercase characters. The *Proto-Slavic lexemes*, printed in italics, realize a given model of the semantic development.

**LOCATION****OPPOSITE****unpleasant** \*protivьnъ**INSIDE****fat** \*jьdrь (?)**strong** \*jьdrь (?)**young** \*jьdrь (?)**quick** \*jьdrь (?)**AT THE TOP****high/tall** \*vysokъ**AT THE BOTTOM****low/short** \*nizьkъ**WITH THE MAINTENANCE OF ORDER****good** \*dobrь \*lěpь \*godьnъ \*rōdьnъ \*rēdьnъ \*ladьnъ**pleasant** \*godьnъ \*dobrь \*lěpь \*lagodьnъ (?)**pretty** \*lěpь \*godьnъ \*rēdьnъ \*ladьnъ**low/short** \*rōdьnъ (?)**thin** \*lagodьnъ (?)**strong** \*dob'ь**weak** \*lagodьnъ (?)**healthy** \*rōdьnъ**calm** \*lagodьnъ \*kl'udьnъ**merry/cheerful** \*rōdьnъ**mild** \*lagodьnъ (?)**brave** \*dob'ь**WITHOUT A COUNTERPART****bad** \*lichъ**AT EASE (adv.)****slow** \*volьnъ

**PARAMETRIC FEATURES****OLD****weak** \*vetъchъ**ADULT****old** \*starъ \*dosogъ**YOUNG****strong** \*jarъ**BIG****good** \*bol'ьjъ \*drěčьnъ**pretty** \*zъlъ \*drěčьnъ \*grozъnъ**high/tall** \*bol'ьjъ \*dъžъ \*golěmъ \*velъ/\*velikъ**fat** \*jędrъ (?)**strong** \*drěčьnъ**old** \*dosogъ**brave** \*drěčьnъ**ABUNDANT****stupid** \*bujъ**violent** \*bujъ/\*bujavъ/\*bujьnъ**SMALL****low/short** \*malъ \*krъpъ \*kъnъ**thin** \*chudъ (?)**bad** \*chudъ**FAT****strong** \*jędrъ (?)**young** \*jędръ (?)**quick** \*jędръ (?)**low/short** \*krъpъ**pretty** \*kypъ**MELLOW/CHUBBY****pretty** \*kypъ**fat** \*rychlъ**THIN (and LEAN)****ugly** \*chudъ (?)**weak** \*chudъ (?) \*šibъkъ**pretty** \*drěčьnъ**FEATURES OF APPEARANCE****PRETTY****good** \*krasъnъ**UGLY****pretty** \*gyzdavъ**lazy** \*gyzdavъ**SHINING****bad** \*bolgъ (?)**good** \*bolgъ (?)

**pleasant/kind** \*bolgʷ  
**weak** \*bolgʷ (?)  
**sick** \*bolgʷ (?)  
**old** \*bolgʷ (?)  
**mild** \*bolgʷ (?)  
**stupid** \*bolgʷ (?)

**COLORS**

**COLORFUL**

**good** \*krasʷnʷ  
**pretty** \*krasʷnʷ

**RED**

**bad** \*rdʷavʷ

**GREY**

**old** \*šǣdivʷ

**SMOOTH**

**pretty** \*gladʷkʷ  
**fat** \*gladʷkʷ

**FEATURES OF PHYSICAL FITNESS**

**STRONG**

**good** \*bolʷjʷ \*drǣčʷnʷ \*čilʷ  
**high/tall** \*bolʷjʷ \*dʷǫžʷ \*golǣmʷ \*velʷ/\*velikʷ  
**fat** \*debelʷ \*sporʷ \*tʷgʷ \*jǣdrʷ (?)  
**healthy** \*storbʷ \*rʷdʷ \*krǣpʷkʷ  
**old** \*starʷ  
**violent** \*ǣglʷ \*šibʷkʷ  
**brave** \*bujʷ/\*bujʷnʷ \*drǣčʷnʷ \*dobʷ \*lichʷ \*lʷutʷ (?)  
**proud** \*bʷdrʷ

**ABLE**

**good** \*dǣlʷnʷ \*chytʷ  
**young** \*jǣdrʷnʷ

**WEAK**

**bad** \*lochʷ \*bolgʷ \*chudʷ (?)  
**ugly** \*marʷnʷ  
**thin** \*libʷ \*slabʷ \*chudʷ (?)  
**sick** \*kyprʷ \*chudʷ \*chylʷ \*ʷtʷlʷ \*bolgʷ \*slabʷ  
**old** \*drǣchlʷ \*bolgʷ \*chylʷ  
**slow** \*drǣchlʷ  
**calm** \*lagodʷnʷ (?)  
**mild** \*lagodʷnʷ (?)  
**lazy** \*vǣdlʷ \*drǣselʷ \*drǣchlʷ \*chylʷ

**QUICK**

**good** \*chytʷ  
**strong** \*chytʷ \*polchʷ

**violent** \*rychlʰ

**brave** \*rychlʰ

**wise** \*chytrʰ

#### SLOW

**weak** \*mʰdʰlʰ

**timorous** \*lʰnivʰ

### FEATURES OF TEMPERAMENT

#### VIOLENT

**bad** \*durʰnʰ

**unpleasant** \*durʰnʰ

**ugly** \*durʰnʰ

**strong** \*polchʰ

**quick** \*ʰglʰ \*ʰibʰkʰ \*bystrʰ \*lʰutʰ \*prʰdʰ/\*prʰdʰkʰ

**stern** \*jarʰ (?) \*durʰnʰ \*prʰdʰ

**brave** \*bujʰ \*bystrʰ \*jarʰ \*prʰdʰkʰ

**proud** \*bujʰnʰ \*durʰnʰ \*jarʰ

**diligent** \*ʰglʰ

**stupid** \*durʰnʰ \*bujʰ

#### CALM

**pleasant** \*lagodʰnʰ

**slow** \*tichʰ

**mild** \*lagodʰnʰ \*mʰdrʰ \*mirʰnʰ

#### MILD

**bad** \*bolgʰ

**pleasant/kind** \*neʰʒʰnʰ

**weak** \*bolgʰ \*lagodʰnʰ \*neʰʒʰnʰ

**old** \*bolgʰ

**calm** \*mirʰnʰ \*krotʰkʰ

#### SPRIGHTLY

**strong** \*bʰdrʰ \*ʰilʰ \*jarʰ

**healthy** \*rʰdʰ \*ʰilʰ

**young** \*jarʰ (?)

**quick** \*ʰilʰ \*bʰdrʰ

**violent** \*rychlʰ

**cheerful/merry** \*bʰdrʰ \*budʰnʰ \*ʰilʰ \*dʰʒʰ \*ʰstʰvʰ \*jarʰ \*rʰdʰ

**brave** \*rychlʰ

**proud** \*bʰdrʰ

**diligent** \*bʰdrʰ \*ʰilʰ

#### LUSTFUL

**strong** \*jarʰ

**young** \*jarʰ (?)

**stern** \*jarʰ (?)

**proud** \*jarʰ (?)

#### MAD

**bad** \*bolgʰ \*durʰnʰ

**sick** \*durʰnʰ

**proud** \*durɔnɔ  
**stupid** \*durɔnɔ \*bujɔ \*bolgɔ (?)

## FEATURES OF CHARACTER

### DARING

**stern** \*grɔdɔ  
**brave** \*grɔdɔ  
**proud** \*bujɔnɔ \*jarɔ \*bɔdrɔ

### BRAVE

**proud** \*bujɔnɔ \*jarɔ \*bɔdrɔ  
**violent** \*nagɔɔ (?)

### PROUD

**good** \*grɔdɔ  
**bad** \*grɔdɔ  
**unpleasant** \*grɔdɔ  
**pretty** \*grɔdɔ  
**ugly** \*grɔdɔ  
**stern** \*grɔdɔ  
**brave** \*grɔdɔ

### HARD-WORKING

**good** \*dɛɔɔnɔ

### CUNNING

**wise** \*chytɔɔ

### LAZY

**slow** \*lɛnɔ/\*lɛnivɔ  
**timorous** \*lɛnivɔ

## MENTAL FEATURES

### STUPID

**bad** \*durɔnɔ  
**young** \*glupɔ

### NAÏVE

**stupid** \*bolgɔ

### TO THINK

**wise** \*mɔdrɔ

## MENTAL STATES

### HAPPY

**stupid** \*bolgɔ

## PHYSICAL FEATURES OF OBJECTS

### ROUGH

**ugly** \*grɔbɔ/\*grubɔ  
**fat** \*grɔbɔ/\*grubɔ

**SHARP****bad** \*bridʒkɔ**ugly** \*bridʒ/\*bridʒkɔ**quick** \*l'utɔ**violent** \*l'utɔ**stern** \*bridʒ/\*bridʒkɔ \*l'utɔ**brave** \*chorbrɔ (?) \*l'utɔ**HARD****strong** \*krɛpʒ/\*krɛpʒkɔ \*tɔgɔ (?) \*krɔtɔ \*storbɔ \*čʲfstvɔ (?) \*sɔdorvɔ**healthy** \*storbɔ \*sɔdorvɔ**stern** \*čʲfstvɔ \*krɔtɔ**proud** \*krɔtɔ**SOFT****young** \*moldɔ**LOOSE****bad** \*slabɔ**thin** \*slabɔ**weak** \*slabɔ \*kypʀɔ \*rɔchlɔ \*rychlɔ**sick** \*slabɔ**slow** \*lɛnivɔ**lazy** \*lɛnivɔ**DENSE****strong** \*čʲfstvɔ (?)**STEEP****unpleasant** \*prikʀɔ**stern** \*prikʀɔ**OBLIQUUS****bad** \*zɔlɔ**unpleasant** \*zɔlɔ**pretty** \*zɔlɔ**stern** \*zɔlɔ**wise** \*zɔlɔ**EMPTY****thin** \*tɔšɕɔ**weak** \*ɔtɔlɔ**sick** \*ɔtɔlɔ**WHOLE****healthy** \*cɛlɔ \*čʲitavɔ**EVALUATION****GOOD****stupid** \*bɔlgɔ**APPROPRIATE****brave** \*dob'ɔ**BAD****pretty** \*zɔlɔ

**ugly** \*marьнѣ \*chudѣ (?) \*durьнѣ  
**weak** \*lošь \*chabь/\*chabьнѣ \*chudѣ (?)  
**sick** \*durьнѣ \*plochѣ \*lošь \*bѣdьнѣ  
**stern** \*zьlѣ

**REVOLTING**

**ugly**\*bridькѣ \*gnusьнѣ \*grozьнѣ \*gьrdѣ \*gadьнѣ \*gydькѣ \*gyzdavь \*mъzькѣ \*rѣzьнѣ  
**bad** \*gnusьнѣ \*gadьнѣ \*bridькѣ

**FUNNY**

**revolting** \*rѣzьнѣ  
**stupid** \*glupѣ (?)

**INSIGNIFICANT**

**weak** \*glupѣ

**DIFFICULT**

**unpleasant** \*prikьrѣ  
**stern** \*prikьrѣ

**MISERABLE**

**thin** \*tѣščь

**ASSOCIATIONS WITH METEOROLOGICAL PHENOMENA**

**WITH WIND**

**bad** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**unpleasant** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**ugly** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**sick** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**old** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**violent** \*durь/\*durьнѣ (?)  
**timorous** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**proud** \*durьнѣ (?)  
**stupid** \*durь/\*durьнѣ (?)

**WITH SPRING**

**strong** \*jarѣ (?)  
**young** \*jarѣ (?)  
**violent** \*jarѣ (?)  
**cheerful/merry** \*jarѣ (?) \*veselѣ (?)  
**daring** \*jarѣ (?)  
**proud** \*jarѣ (?)

**ASSOCIATIONS WITH THE PLANT WORLD**

**WITH A TREE TRUNK**

**good** \*drěčьнѣ  
**pretty** \*drěčьнѣ  
**strong** \*drěčьнѣ  
**high/tall** \*drěčьнѣ  
**cheerful/merry** \*drěčьнѣ  
**brave** \*drěčьнѣ

**WITH A TWIG****weak** \*šibʔkʔ**thin** \*šibʔkʔ**WITH WOOD****strong** \*sʔdorvʔ**healthy** \*sʔdorvʔ**TO GROW****violent** \*bujʔnʔ**ASSOCIATIONS WITH THE ANIMAL WORLD****WITH VENOM****sad** \*šdʔnʔ**TO ROAR****sad** \*revʔnʔ/\*revʔnivʔ/\*revlivʔ**WILD****brave** \*bujʔ/\*bujʔnʔ**timid** \*durʔnʔ \*dikʔ \*divʔ \*polchʔ**TAME****pleasant** \*jʔmʔnʔ**calm** \*jʔmʔnʔ \*krotʔkʔ**mild** \*jʔmʔnʔ \*krotʔkʔ**humble** \*krotʔkʔ**ACTIVITIES AND PROCESSES****DESTROYING****TO SPOIL****sick** \*skʔbʔnʔ (?)**sad** \*skʔbʔnʔ**TO BEAT****strong** \*čʔstvʔ (?)**calm** \*krotʔkʔ**merry/cheerful** \*čʔstvʔ (?)**stern** \*čʔstvʔ (?)**mild** \*krotʔkʔ**humble** \*krotʔkʔ**wise** \*kovarʔnʔ**TO PUNISH****humble** \*pokorʔnʔ**TO SCARE****stern** \*grozʔnʔ \*gʔdʔ**revolting** \*grozʔnʔ \*gʔdʔ**TO PRESS****strong** \*dʔžʔ

**TO CUT****bad** \*bridʷkə**ugly** \*bridʷ/\*bridʷkə**low/short** \*kʷnə**thin** \*ščuplʷ (?) \*səkromʷnə**strong** \*čʷstvʷ (?)**sick** \*skʷbʷnə (?)**quick** \*lʷtə**violent** \*lʷtə**cheerful** \*čʷstvʷ (?)**sad** \*skʷbʷnə (?)**stern** \*bridʷ/\*bridʷkə \*lʷtə \*čʷstvʷ (?)**brave** \*chorbrʷ (?) \*lʷtə**humble** \*səkromʷnə**diligent** \*skʷbʷnə (?) \*ščirʷ**TO GROPE****thin** \*ščuplʷ**TO STIR UP/TO DISTURB****sad** \*səkromʷnə**UNDERGOING DESTRUCTION****TO ROT (OF WOOD)****weak** \*qʷtʷlʷ**TO WITHER****slow** \*vʷdlʷ**TO RUST****bad** \*rʷdʷavʷ**TO ROT****unpleasant** \*mʷzʷ/mʷzʷkə**ugly** \*mʷzʷkə**lazy** \*mʷzlivʷ \*drʷchlʷ (?)**weak** \*drʷchlʷ (?)**old** \*drʷchlʷ (?)**slow** \*drʷchlʷ (?)**sad** \*drʷselʷ (?) \*drʷchlʷ (?)**TO GO NUMB****hard** \*storbʷ**TO SEETHE****loose** \*kʷprʷ**violent** \*kʷprʷ**TO SWELL****fat** \*jʷdrʷ (?) \*tʷstʷ**proud** \*pʷšʷnə

**STATES****TO BE WAKEFUL****brave** \*bɛdrɔ**proud** \*bɔdrɔ**TO REST****healthy** \*çitavɔ**TO BECOME EXHAUSTED****weak** \*mɔdɔlɔ**MOVEMENT****TO MOVE****bad** \*pɔlchɔ**strong** \*pɔlchɔ**mild** \*pɔlchɔ**violent** \*rychlɔ \*pɔlchɔ**brave** \*rychlɔ**timorous** \*pɔlchɔ**TO JUMP****quick** \*prɔdɔkɔ**timorous** \*prɔdɔkɔ**daring** \*prɔdɔkɔ**TO RUN****bad** \*pɔlchɔ**strong** \*pɔlchɔ**mild** \*pɔlchɔ**violent** \*pɔlchɔ**timorous** \*pɔlchɔ**TO TOTTER****weak** \*rychlɔ**loose** \*rɔchlɔ**PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES****TO WORK****good** \*dɛlɔnɔ**pretty** \*dɛlɔnɔ**strong** \*dɛlɔnɔ**brave** \*dɛlɔnɔ**diligent** \*dɛlɔnɔ**wise** \*dɛlɔnɔ**TO TURN/TO TWIST/TO ROLL****ugly** \*grɔbɔ (?) \*rɔʒɔnɔ**fat** \*grɔbɔ (?) \*grubɔ (?)

**strong** \*krɔtɔ

**sick** \*skɪbɔnɔ

**violent** \*krɔtɔ

**sad** \*skɪbɔnɔ

**stern** \*krɔtɔ

**proud** \*krɔtɔ

**diligent** \*skɪbɔnɔ

**TO WEAVE/TO ENLACE**

**strong** \*čʲstvɔ (?)

**TO BEND**

**old** \*chylɔ

**TO TIGHTEN**

**strong** \*silɔnɔ \*tɔggɔ (?)

**TO WRINKLE/TO CREASE**

**sad** \*skɪbɔnɔ

**sick** \*skɪbɔnɔ (?)

**TO GRASP**

**wise** \*chytɔ

**TO GIVE**

**worthless** \*darɔmɔnɔ

## SUMMARY

### 1. The Degree of Reliability of a Semantic Reconstruction

Before I proceed to discuss the conclusions that may be drawn from the part of the work which contains the material, I would like to direct the reader's attention once again to the necessity of exercising caution in reference to the works which treat reconstructed material. The results of semantic reconstruction are characterized by considerable variety as far as the reliability of such a reconstruction is concerned. We may determine the reliability of a Proto-Slavic meaning only when we have partial meanings at our disposal. Their mutual relationship demonstrates the extent of the reliability of the meanings that is assumed/received. The most reliable reconstructions are those in which the etymological meaning (or etymological and structural meaning) overlaps with the meaning reconstructed on the basis of the semantics of the continuants, and the aforementioned meaning is indicated by the continuants in an unquestionable manner.

Below I classify the lexemes discussed in the work in reference to the degree of the reliability of their reconstructed meaning. Such a classification is crucial in the construction of a corpus of semantic parallels. In my work I present for the time being a general overview of such a corpus therefore I restrict myself to ascribe a question mark (placed in parentheses) to the meanings which were evaluated as uncertain in the course of the analysis.

We deal with a reliable situation when a uniform meaning based on continuants is consistent with the etymological or structural meaning, e.g.:

*\*bystrъ* 'rapidly flowing; rapid, about a river current,' *\*dъzъ* 'brave,' *\*gladъkъ* 'smooth,' *\*gadъnъ* 'revolting,' *\*chylъ* 'bent, stooped,' *\*chvorъ* 'sick,' *\*junъ* 'young,' *\*milъ* 'beloved; pleasant,' *\*mogъnъ* 'strong,' *\*mъdrъ* 'wise,' *\*radъ* 'merry/cheerful,' *\*revъnъ* 'roaring,' *\*sibъkъ* 'mobile,' *\*slabъ* 'weak,' *\*storbъ* 'stiff,' *\*vetъchъ* 'old,' *\*zъlъ* 'bad.'

A very great degree of reliability occurs also in the case when a uniform meaning based on the continuants is close to the etymological (or structural) meaning i.e. it may be derived from it by way of one of the simple semantic operations. Examples of the subsequent links of a semantic string include the following: 'good' < 'appropriate' (\**dobrъ*), 'suitable' < 'accurate' (\**godъnъ*), 'big' < 'strong' (\**golъmъ*), 'weak; tired' < 'slow' (\**mъdъlъ*). Examples of pairs of meanings combined by a sensory association include 'unpleasant' < 'sharp' (\**bridъkъ*) and 'revolting' < 'rotten' (\**mъzъkъ*). An example of a motivation based on evaluation is 'bad' < 'obliquus' (\**zъlъ*). A semantic operation may also consist in an inference drawn from the motivating meaning e.g. 'thinking' i.e. 'wise' (\**mъdrъ*), 'grasping' i.e. 'quick' (\**chytrъ*), 'correct' i.e. 'arranged in a sequence' (\**rêdъnъ*), 'imaginary' i.e. 'worthless' (\**marъnъ*). A greater intellectual effort is necessary to draw an inference that 'given' (structural and etymological meaning) is 'of inferior value' (\**darъmъnъ*). A less obvious relationship but one that is completely admissible is the relationship between the pair of meanings 'stout; short as well as fat' and 'shrunk' (\**krъpъ*).

The determination of a motivating relationship of one pair of meanings frequently has parallels in another motivating relationship referring to a meaning which may be a part of the same semantic string; e.g., the motivation of the meaning 'weak' by 'saggy' (\**slabъ*) has a parallel in the motivation of the meaning 'lazy' by 'loose' (\**lъnъ*). Sometimes our knowledge about the existence of such a relationship facilitates the determination of the motivation of the antonymic pair, and therefore the meaning 'strong' by 'tense' (\**silъnъ*).

We deal with a string of changes in the case of the word \**drěčъnъ* 'well-grown' < 'one that is like a tree trunk' (struct.) < 'elongated lengthwise' (etym.).

Sporadically, we deal with adjectives whose only source of motivation which is legible to us is the preposition. A case in point is the PSlav \**vysokъ*, an adjective based on the PIE \**up(o)-* 'on, at the top; to the top.' The meaning 'located above' which is reconstructed for this word is not the direct source of the meaning 'high/tall' but it may be a clue for the researcher.

If the meaning which is reconstructed for the Proto-Slavic lexeme is based on the complete or almost complete consistency of the continuants, we seldom correct it in order to bring it closer to the etymological meaning. However, one should take into consideration such a possibility as well. Apart from very numerous cases when the justification of the motivating is not an issue, we may encounter a situation when both the meaning based on continuants as well as the etymological meaning is established beyond doubt but the relationship between them apparently seems impossible. Such an example is \**starъ* 'old' whose etymological meaning is 'one that stands fast.' A formal analysis clearly indicates an origin from the PIE *stā-ro-* 'standing', a nominal form from the PIE *stā-* 'to stand.' In such a case we must posit the early Proto-Slavic meaning 'one that stand fast on his or her feet' > 'strong; adult' which disappeared completely and was supplanted by 'old' – an innovation of the Proto-Slavic language. The correctness of a reconstruction of the etymological

meaning is proven by equivalents from other languages: Lithuanian *stóras* 'fat' and Old Norse *stórr* 'great, strong, virile; important.'

More frequently we deal with a situation when we may reconstruct a meaning on the basis of the continuants but it will not be proven by Indo-European data. Sometimes the structural meaning will come to our succor. In the case of adjectives, especially those which feature suffixes, we frequently have the structural meaning at our disposal. However, it may not necessarily help us solve the problem of the origin of a word, for in the majority of cases the derived adjective and its formal basis correspond to each other semantically. Examples of such adjectives include: *\*gnusъnъ* 'revolting' from *\*gnusъ* 'disgust,' *\*grozъnъ* 'terrible/dangerous' from *\*groziti* 'to threaten' or *\*groza* 'horror,' *\*něžъnъ* 'mild' from *něga* 'mildness,' *\*skъ'bъnъ* 'sad' from *\*\*skъ'biti* 'to worry,' *\*sъmělъ* 'brave, daring' from *\*sъměti* 'to dare.' Further adjectives with a uniform meaning based on continuants and the etymological meaning (which is completely explained) include e.g. *\*dъ'zъ* 'brave,' *\*chvorъ* 'sick,' *\*pěknъ/pěkrъ* 'beautiful,' *\*velъ* 'big,' *veselъ* 'merry/cheerful.'

Above I presented situations when the meaning reconstructed on the basis of continuants is not doubtful. Frequently, the meanings of the continuants are not completely consistent but when one considers their dating, geographical distribution and their content itself, one may establish the probable initial meaning. The examples of Proto-Slavic adjectives which manifest a great degree of consistency of the meanings of continuants as well as an affinity with the etymological meaning include the following: *\*debelъ* 'strong, stout' : 'fat, chubby' (etym.), *\*dogaъ* : *\*dōžъ* 'strong' : 'to stretch tight' (etym.), *\*gorlivъ* 'zealous, jealous' : 'burning; combustible' (etym. and struct.).

In the aforementioned examples the etymological meaning would only confirm a correct reconstruction of the meaning on the basis of continuants. A different situation occurs when a comparison of continuants does not provide unambiguous proof as far as the original nature of one of the meanings is concerned. In the present work I concentrate upon the origin of meanings therefore I cannot constrain myself to the reconstruction of the string of polysemous meanings (although they could have actually existed in the Proto-Slavic period in the lexeme that is researched) but I should strive to establish the sequence in which they arose. Therefore the possibility of making reference to the structural and etymological meaning is crucial.

When we are dealing with Proto-Slavic words which feature continuants whose semantics was strongly diversified but their etymology may be considered reliable due to the existence of reliable equivalents of other languages we may base our argument on the etymological meaning and thus establish the initial Proto-Slavic meaning. Such is the case of the adjective *\*lichъ* for which we reconstruct 'odd (of numbers)' as the Proto-Slavic meaning due to the etymological meaning 'remaining.' As far as *\*lěpъ* is concerned, among the meanings 'beautiful' and 'good,' reconstructed on the basis of continuants, we choose 'good,' which is based on 'well-adjusted' (struct.) < 'glued together'

(etym.) and which has motivational parallels in other adjectives which express the concept 'good.' Quite frequently the role of a determining factor is played by the structural meaning. As far as the PSlav *\*chytъ* is concerned, among the meaning 'quick; swift,' 'bright,' 'cunning,' 'sly,' 'wise' we consider 'dexterous; quick in work' as the initial meaning due to the structural meaning 'grasping.' In the case of *\*dosozъ* 'dexterous, skilful,' 'diligent, hard-working, careful; capax,' 'big, huge' we choose the latter meaning due to the structural meaning 'one that can reach sth.'

Quite frequently a discrepancy between the meanings of continuants makes us reconstruct two structural meanings: one in the form of a participle with a passive meaning and another one with the active or reflexive meaning. Examples include the following: *\*rychlъ* 'set in motion' in reference to 'mobile,' *\*krqtъ* 'twisted' in reference to 'spinning' > 'mobile,' *\*kyprъ* 'the one that boiled over' in reference to 'boiling over/seething,' *\*šibъkъ* 'the one with which one wags' and 'wagging/brandishing.' The meanings of the adjectives which arose in this way may be completely different although it may happen (as in the case of the continuants of *\*krqtъ*) that some of them may be interpreted as the ones that arose on the basis of both the passive as well as the reflexive meaning.

Finally, there is also a considerably great group of adjectives for which neither the meaning based on continuants nor the etymological meaning can be established with a sufficient degree of certainty. When one desires to include these changes in the corpus of semantic changes one should mark their unclear status distinctly in order not to explain *obscurum per obscurum*.

## 2. The Inclusion of Thematic Groups in the Studied Lexis

In my work I traced the semantic development of more than a hundred adjectives of Proto-Slavic origin, which, as it seems, enables us to draw certain conclusions associated with the frequency of the particular thematic groups in the lexicon that is reconstructed. There is an abundance of research works whose authors study the lexis of Proto-Slavic origin in the quantitative approach: [Lehr-Spławiński 1938; Jankowiak 1997; Orłóś 1958; Radewa 1963; Pizłówna 1971; Petleva 1968]. However, these scholars are on the safer side because they analyze lexis which belong to only one particular language. The aim of their research is to evaluate the percentage of the vocabulary inherited from the protolanguage in reference to the entire lexicon. Such research (especially research according to Lucyna Jankowiak) refers to the contribution of the Proto-Slavic language in the various registers/styles of the Polish language and, what is even more interesting for me, in the various thematic groups of the Polish language. The task of dividing the whole body of the vocabulary into thematic groups is not easy and one should not be surprised

that the results cause reservations to be made. A fundamental question arises to what extent a part of the lexicon may be representative for the entire lexicon (an attempt is made on the basis of the lexicon contained in the seven volumes of the *Słownik prasłowiański*). However, an evaluation of this type of research should be conducted elsewhere.

An attempt at a “statistical” approach to the material collected in the present work clearly demonstrates how great an obstacle the lack of the editing of the entire lexicon in the research of Proto-Slavic vocabulary is. Franz Miklosich managed to compile an overview of the entire body of Proto-Slavic vocabulary, although his work, published in 1886, is obsolete to a great degree. Berneker’s dictionary, which was more modern in reference to the aforementioned dictionary, reached the letter *M*, and ESSJ – the letter *P*. Of the lexica that were edited in modern times only the one-volume dictionary by Rick Derksen includes the whole alphabet, however, as in the case of Miklosich, it has a perfunctory nature as it does not embrace the entire material. Currently, the *Słownik prasłowiański* stopped at the letter *G*. This is the reason why it was easier to reach the words from the early and dialectal material that are not registered in explanatory dictionaries, if they begin with a letter from the first half of the alphabet, e.g., those which furnished the basis for the reconstruction of the PSlav \**ęglъ*, \**chabъ*, \**chylъ* and \**libъ*.

Such words, which without doubt exist also in the further part of the alphabet, were not found and therefore they are not included in this work. This mere fact opens to question the purposefulness of statistical conclusions. Secondly, the semantic reconstruction itself cannot be reliable enough to furnish numerical data on its basis. Apart from the reconstructed Proto-Slavic meanings, which are completely or well-justified, there is also a considerable number of meanings whose reconstruction is problematic whereas the likelihood of a correct reconstruction may be different in each case. We already discussed this issue above. Due to the aforementioned reasons one may draw only very general conclusions, namely ones that say that the majority of the meanings of Proto-Slavic adjectives, reconstructed on the basis of continuants, refer to physical features. Their predominance is manifested by the very bulk of the chapters which feature the material. The chapters which provide an analysis of the lexemes which refer to physical features are more comprehensive than others because, according to the arrangement that is used in the work, they discuss the etymology of the majority of the lexemes.

To a certain degree we may draw conclusions about the number of the lexemes which feature the Proto-Slavic meanings under research on the basis of the relationship between the entries without cross-references to other groups and the entries which have such cross-references. However, these proportions (which are easy to establish because the entries without cross-references precede as a rule the entries with cross-references) do not “give the whole picture,” for example in the VIOLENT group the ratio between the entries without cross-references to the entries with cross references is 9:4. In all nine

cases I considered that the reconstruction of the meaning 'violent' already for the Proto-Slavic language is possible. A completely different situation occurs in the group FAT where the ratio between the entries without cross-references and the entries with cross-references is similar (6:3). The meaning 'fat' is reconstructed only for four out of six lexemes. The remaining cases involve lexemes whose reconstructed Proto-Slavic meaning does not belong to any of the groups discussed in the work (*\*sporъ* 'efficient, abundant' and *\*gladъkъ* 'smooth') and which were classified within the group FAT due to the innovative meanings.

In conclusion, I think that any attempts at statistical analyses in my material shed more light on the objective difficulties associated with the research of ancient lexis caused by the insufficient studies of the source materials than on the conceptual relationships in the names of human features. In order to endeavor to provide an efficient analysis one must above all have a uniformly researched corpus of Proto-Slavic words at one's disposal. Without doubt we must still wait until such a corpus is compiled.

### 3. The Causes for the Changes of Meanings of the Studied Adjectives

When the scholars discuss the changes of meanings they emphasize, according to the approach they embrace, either extralinguistic reasons associated with the changes of the realia or – what is the peculiarity especially of structuralists – intralinguistic reasons, which are indicated by the correlations of the changes that occur. In my work, I put emphasis obviously on the extralinguistic reasons, therefore ones that are independent from the system. I would not endeavor to analyze the system of the Proto-Slavic language. We are and will always be ignorant about too many things about it. The object of research is the linguistic material which is a part of at least a dozen or so separate systems. This fact necessitates that one approaches the material from an extralinguistic position and that one purposefully ignores the fact that each semantic change causes an infraction upon a given lexical system, and it may therefore cause further changes.

A problem which I would like to emphasize is associated with the discerning of a schematic development of some groups of meanings<sup>3</sup> and the individual semantic changes. By way of a convention I call these phenomena a conceptual

---

<sup>3</sup> The tendency of some semantic groups of adjectives to extend the semantic range differs from the regular polysemousness of adjectives, to which Apresjan devotes one of his chapters [Apresjan 1995: 211–216]. Among the adjectives that he discusses there are no cases that I am interested in, even in the group of parametrical adjectives, which are Apresjan's [Apresjan 1995: 211] and mine object of interest, see below. It was already Krystyna Kleszczowa [1989: 97] who emphasized the inadequacy of Apresjan's methods to research which is not based on the speech act.

development and a semantic development, in accordance with the principle that the term “meaning” is used by me in reference to specific words, and when I have in mind the meaning referring to a group of synonyms I also use the term “concept.”

A feature of the conceptual development is that some concepts – regardless of the exponent which expresses them – may assume other, predictable meanings. This phenomenon involves many conceptual groups and has an extralinguistic nature. Due to its commonness it also does not constitute a problem in the interpretation of semantic changes.

As far as the semantic development is concerned, we may distinguish two clear-cut groups in reference to the reasons for the occurrence of changes.

### 3.1. The Strings of Minimal Semantic Changes

The first group involves meanings which arose in the course of the development of semantic strings which constitute the majority of the cases discussed in the part of the work which features the material. The reason for the emergence of strings of meanings (which in the present work are also referred to as semantic strings) i.e. when given concepts imply further concepts (which differ from the initial concepts) in a regular manner is that language follows nature. The discernment of the coexistence of certain features in nature causes an extension of the range of the meanings of words. In the context of language one may describe this phenomenon as a string of minimal semantic changes. The transition/passage from one meaning of this string to the other consists in the transposition of the semantic dominant (the latter is also known as a semantic center). Danuta Buttler describes it in the following way:

Podłoże przesunięcia centrum semantycznego stanowi mechanizm wnioskowania o właściwościach desygnatu na podstawie cech zawartych w znaczeniu tradycyjnym. Mówiąc innymi słowy – do zmodyfikowanej treści wchodzi elementy implikowane przez jej dawne cechy składowe [Buttler 1978: 126].

(The foundation of the transposition of the semantic center constitutes a mechanism of inferring about the properties of the referent on the basis of the features contained in the traditional meaning. In other words, elements implied by former component features of the modified content are introduced into the modified content.)

This transposition does not always cause a complete change of meaning. Frequently, polysemous words arise in this way, which preserve the initial meaning as the basic meaning, and which function in secondary meanings. However, perhaps – what is brought into relief by the perspective of a wide time span – a complete change of meaning may occur which usually involves a decline of the transitional semantic links and an accompanying loss of the legibility of the semantic motivation of the lexeme. When we have the whole

series of semantic strings which present the analogous changes at our disposal we are able to understand the semantic transformation which lost its motivation over the course of centuries – this turns out to be even trivial.

The emergence of semantic strings is frequently accompanied by metonymic changes which consist in the change of the referent that it alluded to. These are names of features which until a certain stage of the development of a language involve impersonal referents and as they involve people, they function in a metaphorical manner.<sup>4</sup> At a certain point the metaphor ceases to be perceived, and the subsequent links of the semantic string refer to people. For example, the concept 'soft' becomes such a "turning point," which in reference to man means 'mild, submissive.'

It is also worthwhile to direct the reader's attention to the superiority of the semantic transpositions in the strings of meaning in reference to other, predicted mechanisms. If, by undertaking work on this book, I took into consideration the possibility of a certain dependence of the semantic development of antonymous concepts then the material demonstrated that such influences occur rarely. The asymmetry of the conceptual development of antonyms was also pointed out by Oleksandr O. Taranenko [see Taranenko 1980: 68]. A clear asymmetry may be discerned for example when we compare and examine the content of the following chapters which feature the material: 10: A. VIOLENT : B. CALM; 12: A. STERN : B. MILD; 14: A. PROUD : B. HUMBLE. As far as the concepts which belong to B groups: 'calm,' 'mild' and 'humble' most frequently are referred to by lexemes which continue the same Proto-Slavic words, such a dependency cannot be discerned among the concepts which belong to group A: 'violent,' 'stern' and 'proud.' The aforementioned example is the most distinctive one but a similar asymmetry may be discerned also in other groups of concepts that are analyzed in my work.

### 3.2. Metaphorical Changes

The second group of phenomena was described by linguists in a more comprehensive manner, about which we should not be surprised for due to its not obvious nature it attracted their attention. What we refer to is the phenomenon when particular concepts involve referents which go beyond their basic range. Such a situation as a rule occurs when non-physical referents involve lexemes of the physical domain.

---

<sup>4</sup> Frequently, due to the decline of the etymological motivation, the awareness of the metaphorical origin of meanings disappears. The departure from the usage of the present passive participle in *-mъ* caused that the etymological meaning of the Polish *łakomy* 'tasty' became illegible. The users of the language perceive that the application of this adjective to man is initial and to meals is secondary, whereas from the genetic point of view it is the other way around. A similar case is associated with the adjective *szczerzy* 'sincere' which already in the Old Polish period was a synonym of *czysty* 'clean, pure.'

There are many semantic groups in which this phenomenon may be discerned. Its peculiar feature is that it is not constrained to the changes in the lexemes but that it also involves lexical combinations which *prima facie* seem to be more noticeable. Therefore it is the center of attention of various groups of researchers, including experts in cognitive studies and ethnolinguistics [cf., e.g., Krzeszowski 1994; Pajdzińska 1995]. A typical area in which metaphorical combinations of meanings regularly occur involves the names of physical sensations and emotions. All researchers who study the names of emotions – one of the most common themes of cognitive research – emphasize the relationships of these semantic fields [Kövecses 1986; Mikołajczuk 1994; Nowakowska-Kempna 1995; Pajdzińska 1990; Tomczak 1994].

Another semantic field in which the seriality of metaphoric changes manifests itself in a particular way involves parametrical adjectives i.e. the ones that refer to dimensions. For example, the words which belong to the lexical and semantic field 'big' have a tendency to assume meanings referring to the rank of a man if they are used to refer to people. Examples in which words with the meaning 'big' may have the meanings 'well-known,' 'valued' may be found in various languages, not only Indo-European ones.

The words which refer to the vertical dimension also refer to tension, tones in music, which is a part of synaesthetic changes. On the other hand, along with the parametrical adjectives which refer to the generally understood considerable size ('great, big') they are commonly used to refer to concepts associated with evaluation and ranks. Also, the concepts associated with age belong to the group of concepts which manifest a development in such a direction. It is worthwhile to note that in this case the words which refer to a person who is "greater" by his or her age develop according to the general direction of the metaphorical development of parametrical concepts. "Senior" in various languages refers to a person whose rank is more important than the rank of "junior" therefore the evaluation of the concepts 'old/senior' : 'young/junior' is opposite than in the general framework. Of course, this fact does not require special justification. Firstly, these names are associated with the actual progress of the *cursus honorum*, therefore in this context language follows reality; secondly, what is also very important, the concept 'older/senior' has a completely different evaluative image than the concept 'old' (this applies in a considerably lesser degree to the concepts 'young' : 'younger/junior').

Although the tendency of the metaphorical development of parametrical adjectives in the direction that was presented occurs commonly, the distribution of the range of the use of the particular adjectives is not completely random, but it is constrained to certain semantic fields, whereas these collocations do not overlap completely in various languages. This phenomenon is sometimes the subject of confrontative research [cf., e.g., the articles included in Grzegorzczkowska, Waszakowa (eds.) 2000].

The tendency to broaden the range of use is also discernible in the group of adjectives which refer to sensory perceptions [cf., e.g., Pajdzińska 2000]. This

phenomenon is commonly referred to as synaesthesia and it is a common feature of Indo-European languages. The very term “synaesthesia” is derived from psychology. It is assumed that the extensions of meanings are conditioned by psychological factors.<sup>5</sup> If this was actually the case, then one should classify them as strings of semantic changes consisting in the representation of extralinguistic relationships by language. Because I do not have scholarly data which would enable me to determine the extent to which synaesthetic phenomena are based on physiological conditions at my disposal, I prefer to exercise caution and stipulate that the nominations which are associated with them result from a convention (*θέσει*) rather than nature (*φύσει*), to use the ancient terminology.

What remains relevant to my work is the phenomenon which of the tendencies of the conceptual development may be considered to have been active already in the Proto-Slavic period and which should be ascribed to cultural contacts. I am afraid that it is difficult to provide a final answer to this question. It is due to the commonness of these changes that in the part which features the material I did not comprehensively discuss the innovative meanings which arose due to the serial semantic development. This is an immensely interesting phenomenon, although it requires special elaboration upon a material that would be broader than one linguistic group.

After reading this chapter the reader may receive an impression that the changes of meanings discussed in the work are above examples of a conceptual, therefore serial, development. This is not far from the truth. It is known that in each set of semantic parallels there are conceptual transitions which were mentioned here. However, they are not the most important ones. The principal goal of the dictionary of semantic changes is to collect less typical semantic transitions – such that cause doubts among the researchers.

## 4. Research Perspectives

No research problem is ever elaborated upon in such a way which would leave no further tasks, and on the other hand the possibilities of constructing further works on the basis of what was already done. Below I present both avenues of research that may be explored.

### 4.1. Further Work Upon the Model of a Dictionary of Semantic Changes

There is a fundamental need to enhance and extend the models of an onomasiological dictionary that are presented here. My idea is to devise a model

<sup>5</sup> A comprehensive discussion of synaesthesia in language is provided by Irmina Judycka [1963].

in such a way so that it could accommodate any semantic changes. Although the present sample features the superior grammatical and thematic criterion (adjectives with which one may describe features of man), I do not think that it would be relevant in a dictionary of a greater scope. The fact of grammatical classification has negligible relevance for semantic changes and we could see just on the basis of the material that is presented that sometimes it is not possible to determine which word of the family where a semantic change occurred was its heart. An even more conventional criterion involved a thematic limiting of the material under research.

The problems associated with the range of languages which the dictionary would be supposed to include were discussed in Chapter Four, devoted to the history of scholarship. At this point, I would only like to point out that in order to enhance the scope of research one should change the language used in the compilation of entries. If one constrains himself or herself to Slavic languages, it seems that Russian would be sufficient; if we decide to open ourselves to other European languages one should perhaps present dictionary entries in a number of languages (perhaps English, French, German, Russian). It seems that it is probably too early to include languages beyond the sphere of European culture. Although such a postulate was already put forward by Jan Rozwadowski and it was maintained by other linguistics, the differences in the conceptual division of the world in the context of various cultures were not taken into consideration. The works of Anna Wierzbicka – to mention only the most famous contemporary author – clearly demonstrate that the European conceptual system is not a universal one and therefore the creation of a common onomasiological dictionary requires a considerable degree of caution and support drawn from other studies.

The model that is suggested here has been presented in book form. I am convinced that with the possibilities provided by modern technology it is reasonable to prepare a computer version of the onomasiological dictionary with cross-references in which one could proceed from the particular received concepts (see the onomasiological dictionary arranged according to received meanings at the end of my work) to the schematic onomasiological dictionaries focusing upon one concept, which in the present work are mentioned under the particular chapters which feature the material, i.e., "Summary of Semantic Changes." An analogous possibility should be offered to the reader of an onomasiological dictionary arranged according to the initial meanings. Whereas the particular lexemes (in my work these are reconstructed Proto-Slavic lexemes) could enable the reader proceed to trace their semantic development which in my work was placed in the chapters with the material in the particular small entry chapters. In such a form the dictionary would be clearer because it would not force the reader to constantly browse through the book to find the justification of putting a specific lexeme in a given place of onomasiological dictionaries.

## 4.2. The Tasks Associated With a Dictionary

Also other research possibilities based on the same premises which were presented in this work loom on the horizon. Their aim is to inspect the models of semantic development. The method which attracts the attention of etymologists has to do with the analysis of whole clusters of lexical entries [cf. Varbot 1986, 2008; Šivic-Dular 1999]. The research of lexical families (clusters) should supplement an onomasiological dictionary focused on the systematization of the models of semantic development. In this case a supplement cannot be associated with a lesser work. Due to the plurality of the derivatives the research of semantic changes which occur in one lexical family is more labour-intensive than the research of the semantic development of single lexemes. In this case the task of a compiler of a dictionary of semantic parallels will be to choose from the semantic changes which refer to all derivatives only those which did not arise due to the function of the suffix and due to the passage of a derivative to another word class. The elimination of semantic changes which occurred under the influence of suffixation is a relatively simple task whereas the evaluation of the influence of the change of class upon the content of the derivative requires the knowledge of many contexts, and it may be subjective to a great degree and dependent upon the prejudices of the researcher. A supplement of a dictionary of semantic transitions may be furnished by the changes that occurred in the formal derivatives which could have theoretically arisen by way of derivation itself/alone. As far as the formulation of this condition is relatively simple, but the evaluation whether it is fulfilled in a specific case is a very subjective question.

The research of the semantic development of the particular lexical families, and therefore research which selects a specific lexemes as its point of departure, may be combined with onomasiological research. The examples of studies of the developmental parallelism of families based on synonymous or quasi-synonymous verbal stems were already discussed by me in Chapter Four, devoted to the history of research, on pages 76–77.

Svetlana M. Tolstaja [Tolstaja 2000, 2002, 2007, 2009] engaged in comparative analyses of lexical families with a common conceptual basis. Although this author also takes the etymology of the particular lexemes into consideration, her research concentrates upon a minute analysis of the meanings which arose along with the contexts in which they appear. The researcher is interested above all in historical and dialectal contexts, especially ones drawn from the most conservative dialects. Thus, her words are immensely relevant also for etymological studies. In order to emphasize the differences in the meanings derived from one lexeme the author employs the method of comparing continuants representing the particular meanings with synonymous words therefore she frequently brings up relationships of meanings whose semantic link was broken. Cf. the study referring to the words with the initial semantics of scarcity, lack, where she conducted an analysis of the development

of the following Proto-Slavic words: *\*suchъ*, *\*prěšъnъ* and *\*pustъ* [Tolstaja 2006, reprinted 2008a: 50–98], *\*trudъ* and *\*mъka* [Tolstaja 2008a: 114–120]. In other works Tolstaja confines herself to a confrontation of the development of two lexical families with similar or convergent semantics [cf. Tolstaja 2000, reprinted 2008a: 102–113], *узрать* and *гулять*, *\*kras-* and *\*květ-* [Tolstaja 2008a: 121–133], *\*gluchъ* and *slěpъ* [Tolstaja 2008a: 134–172]. I already mentioned a different approach, which is also oriented toward ethnolinguistics, when I discussed the research of the particular conceptual fields. In contradistinction to Svetlana M. Tojstaja's works, these works are characterized by an onomasiological approach, i.e., they concentrate not upon lexical families, but on the final meanings which belong to a given semantic field [cf., e.g., Ermina 2003; Feokistova 2003; Kubasova 2004; P'jankova 2008]. The aforementioned works were written in the Ural University in Ekaterinburg under the directorship of Elena L'vovna Berezovič.

#### 4.2.1. The Linguistic Image of the World. Axiological Research

The cataloguing of semantic changes in a dictionary arranged onomasiologically enables us to compare the motivational bases of various concepts. This opportunity supposedly will be eagerly seized upon by linguists who are engaged in the reconstruction of various aspects of the linguistic image of the world and who use etymological data for this purpose. Such attempts were frequently made [e.g. Brzozowska 2009; Burzyńska, Kamieniecki 1998]. The article by Aleksandra Niewiara [2000] deserves special attention. In the article the author attempts to reconstruct a portion of the linguistic image of the world on the basis of etymological data drawn from various Indo-European languages. The adjectives that she collected refer to certain human features, namely age, height and axiological evaluation. The material that she presented is too scanty to draw far-reaching conclusions from, and therefore the author confines herself to a presentation of the most distinctive examples which are supposed to justify the purposefulness of such research.

The research of the linguistic image of the world on the basis of etymology is associated with attempts to reach the original axiological evaluations.<sup>6</sup> Motivation always consists in the association between the motivating concept and the motivated thing, therefore it also indicates evaluative relationships which exists between the underlying referents. What seems most promising is an analysis of semantic changes which lead to the emergence of the concepts

<sup>6</sup> In Polish linguistics Renata Grzegorzczkova is the pioneer of using etymological data in axiological research. The author engages this subject in many articles [e.g., Grzegorzczkova 1993, 1995a, 1996, 2003]. A similar position is represented by Jerzy Bartmiński who frequently points out the importance of discovering the onomasiological bases of new names in order to receive a complete image of the concepts that are researched [cf., e.g., Bartmiński 2007].

that are most strongly marked axiologically, i.e., the evaluators 'good,' 'bad'; 'pleasant,' 'unpleasant'; 'pretty,' 'ugly.' The research of the motivational bases of these concepts enables us to answer the question which of the realia at the moment a given motivation arose were evaluated positively or negatively. The material which involves the concept 'good' demonstrates that at the top of the hierarchy of features which are positively evaluated one finds order, location in the right place, precise adjustment. On this basis one may infer that the axiological meaning 'such as should be' is basic for the concept 'good' instead of 'the one which is good to other people.' An analysis of the motivational bases also indicates the high evaluation of the basic physical properties such as dexterity or strength which are necessary for day-to-day existence. Of course, an equally worthwhile endeavour may be associated with a pursuit of concepts for which evaluative adjectives furnish a motivational basis. An onomasiological dictionary, arranged according to initial meanings, will service this ambition.

The proposed analysis does not always yield the expected results. For example, an overview of the motivations of the concept 'pretty' does not provide a clear answer to the question about the type of beauty that was preferred when subsequent nominations occurred. The most peculiar motivations are the motivations by meanings which refer to order. This may mean that a harmonious build and regular features were valued more than some distinctive properties of pulchritude. A contradiction of this statement has to do with the fact that in the motivations of the concepts 'pretty, beautiful' the intensity of the property and the impression which it produces seems to be important. This is proved by the motivations based on the concept 'huge' and 'terrifying.'<sup>7</sup>

From the axiological point of view the motivation of the concepts referring to age is interesting. Contrary to what one would expect, the basic Proto-Slavic lexeme for the concept 'old' is associated with strength [cf. *\*starъ*, OLD, 8B.2, p. 192], analogically the basic lexeme for the concept 'young' is based on the concept of softness which in a sense may be considered contrary to the concept of strength.

As far as interesting gems associated with evaluation are concerned, one may also mention the Polabian continuant of the PSlav *\*glupъ*, used in this language in the meaning 'young.' Apart from the adjectival meaning there is also a substantivized meaning 'a man who lives with his parents' therefore one may claim that the reason for the negative evaluation of 'youth' is the lack of independence. An overview of the motivations of the exponents of the concept 'wise' such as *\*chytrъ*, *\*kovaгънъ* reveals that the same which determined the motivation is experience, which makes us interpret the opposition 'wise' : 'stupid' as 'experienced' : 'inexperienced.' What is interesting is that the material indicates clear motivational relationships between the concept 'wise' and the concepts which feature negative overtones: 'cunning; sly.'

<sup>7</sup> This example demonstrates that one may draw conclusions from etymological research only when one exercises great caution.

As I mentioned above, when one draws conclusions of axiological nature from etymological data one should exercise great caution. One of the reasons is the great chronological diversity of the material. The overtones of referents may undergo considerable re-evaluations and the Proto-Slavic motivation reflects the overtones peculiar to that period. Of course, this opens a new field for comparative research, if one may find a sufficient number of examples dating back to various periods which may be testimony to the changes in evaluation.

A different approach to the question of evaluation may be associated with the research of the number of exponents which express a given concept. If we compare these figures, we may find out which concepts were more important and which were less important for a given community. From this perspective the concept 'strong' has a special position. Research demonstrates that already before the Proto-Slavic community arose from the Indo-European languages it was characterized by a great number of lexemes which could express it, and this state was preserved also in the Proto-Slavic period. Whereas the lexemes which refer to intellectual capabilities in the vast majority of cases were emerging already in the period of the culture of writing, although among them there are also such which have Proto-Indo-European origins.

Axiological pursuits based on the results of research of the earliest lexical strata are subject to great limitations. One must be aware about the extent to which we are prone to base our argument on our own conceptual system, which we inevitably acquired along with the language. Because we operate in a uniform cultural circle we usually fail to notice that it is only one of the possible ways of perceiving the world. It is quite likely that in its structure the conceptual system of the Proto-Slavs or Proto-Indo-Europeans resembled more the systems of the contemporary peoples which remain at the stage of tribal culture (and therefore which are completely different genetically) than the system of European languages which are direct descendants of the Proto-Indo-European language. However, this is only a supposition which should be corroborated by research, although we will find material foundations for such research in a long time, if ever.



## INDEX OF PROTO-SLAVIC WORDS

The index contains all reconstructed Proto-Slavic adjectives discussed in the work. The location within a given semantic group and the page number are provided. A cross-reference to the place where the reader may find a justification of the reconstruction of the etymological, structural meaning as well as the meaning based on continuants is printed in bold. Alternate forms are separated by the sign “:”, e.g. *\*grǫbъ* : *\*grubъ*; the forms with different suffixes are separated by a comma, e.g. *\*divъ*, *\*dikъ*, whereas forms which feature a secondary accretion of a suffix such as *\*bridъ*/*\*bridъkъ*, *\*durъ*/*\*durъnъ*, *\*lochъ*/*\*lošъ* are written with the sign “/”.

*\*bǣdъnъ* **BAD, 1B.10.** (109)

*\*bolgъ* GOOD, 1A.9. (100); BAD, 1B.14. (111); **PLEASANT, 2A.2.** (116); WEAK, 6B.16. (179); SICK, 7B.11. (188); OLD, 8B.8. (196); MILD, 12B.4. (232); STUPID, 16B.5. (265)

*\*bol'ъjbъ* **GOOD, 1A.6.** (98); HIGH/TALL, 4A.6. (144)

*\*bridъ*/*\*bridъkъ* BAD, 1B.15. (111); **UGLY, 3B.5.** (136); STERN, 12A.10. (229)

*\*bujъ*/*\*bujъnъ* **VIOLENT, 10A.6.** (208); BRAVE, 13A.4. (236); PROUD, 14A.3. (246); STUPID, 16B.4. (265)

*\*bъdrъ* STRONG, 6A.10. (168); **QUICK, 9A.4.** (199); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.3. (219); BRAVE, 13A.9. (237); PROUD, 14A.7. (247)

*\*bystrъ* **QUICK, 9A.2.** (198); BRAVE, 13A.6. (237); WISE, 16A.5. (262)

*\*čelъ* **HEALTHY, 7A.2.** (183)

*\*chabъ*/*\*chabъnъ* **BAD 1B.7.** (108); WEAK, 6B.14. (178); SICK, 7B.10. (188); TIMID, 13B.5. (243)

*\*chorbrъ* **BRAVE, 13A.2.** (235)

*\*chudъ* **BAD, 1B.3.** (105); UGLY, 3B.10. (138); THIN, 5B.6. (158); WEAK, 6B.10. (178); SICK, 7B.4. (187)

*\*chvorъ* UGLY, 3B.14. (139); THIN, 5B.7. (158); **SICK, 7B.1.** (186)

*\*chylъ* **WEAK, 6B.4.** (175); SICK, 7B.6. (187); OLD, 8B.6. (195); LAZY, 15B.6. (258)

*\*chytrъ* GOOD, 1A.10. (100); **QUICK, 9A.3.** (198); WISE, 16A.4. (261)

- \**čil* GOOD 1A.14. (102); STRONG, 6A.14. (169); **HEALTHY, 7A.4.** (184); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.4. (219)
- \**čit*/*\*čitav* **HEALTHY, 7A.3.** (183)
- \**čfstv* **STRONG, 6A.6.** (165); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.6. (219); STERN, 12A.6. (228)
- \**daromъn* **BAD, 1B.8.** (108)
- \**debel* **FAT, 5A.1.** (148)
- \**děln* GOOD, 1A.11. (101); PRETTY, 3A.14. (132); STRONG, 6A.22. (171); BRAVE, 13A.11. (238); **DILIGENT, 15A.6.** (254); WISE, 16A.7. (262)
- \**div*, \**dik* HIGH/TALL, 4A.8. (145); THIN, 5B.8. (158); **VIOLENT, 10A.7.** (209); TIMID, 13B.2. (242); DILIGENT, 15A.9. (255); STUPID, 16B.6. (266)
- \**dobr* **GOOD, 1A.1.** (95); PLEASANT, 2A.7. (118)
- \**dob's* **STRONG, 6A.9.** (167); BRAVE, 13A.12. (238)
- \**dorg* **PLEASANT, 2A.6.** (118)
- \**dosog*/*\*dosož* **HIGH/TALL, 4A.3.** (142); OLD, 8B.7. (195)
- \**dož* HIGH/TALL, 4A.7. (145); **STRONG, 6A.5.** (164); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.5. (219)
- \**drěčn* GOOD, 1A.13. (102); PRETTY, 3A.8. (130); **HIGH/TALL, 4A.2.** (142); STRONG, 6A.11. (168); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.7. (220); BRAVE, 13A.10. (238)
- \**dręchl* : \**dręchl*, \**dręsel* WEAK, 6B.15. (179); OLD, 8B.3. (194); SLOW, 9B.3. (204); **SAD, 11B.2.** (222); LAZY, 15B.5. (258)
- \**dřz*/*\*dřzk* **BRAVE, 13A.3.** (235)
- \**dur*/*\*durъn* BAD, 1B.11. (110); UNPLEASANT, 2B.8. (124); UGLY, 3B.13. (139); SICK, 7B.3. (186); OLD, 8B.5. (195); **VIOLENT, 10A.5.** (207); TIMID, 13B.3. (242); PROUD, 14A.4. (246); STUPID, 16B.3. (265)
- \**ěbn* **SAD, 11B.4.** (223)
- \**ęgl* QUICK, 9A.6. (200); **VIOLENT, 10A.1.** (205); DILIGENT, 15A.8. (254)
- \**gadъn* BAD, 1B.13. (110); **UGLY, 3B.2.** (135)
- \**gladъk* PRETTY, 3A.9. (130); **FAT, 5A.6.** (152)
- \**glup* WEAK, 6B.13. (179); YOUNG, 8A.5. (192); **STUPID, 16B.1.** (264)
- \**gnusъn* BAD, 1B.12. (110); **UGLY, 3B.1.** (134); LAZY, 15B.3. (257)
- \**godъn* **GOOD, 1A.3.** (96); PLEASANT, 2A.9. (119); PRETTY, 3A.6. (129)
- \**golęm* **HIGH/TALL, 4A.5.** (144)
- \**gorliv* QUICK, 9A.11. (201); **DILIGENT, 15A.4.** (253)
- \**grozъn* BAD, 1B.17. (112); UNPLEASANT, 2B.7. (124); PRETTY, 3A.10. (131); UGLY, 3B.8. (138); STRONG, 6A.17. (170); **VIOLENT, 10A.12.** (212); **SAD, 11B.6.** (224); **STERN, 12A.4.** (227)
- \**grqb* : \**grub* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.3.** (121); UGLY, 3B.12. (139); **FAT, 5A.8.** (153)
- \**gdz* GOOD, 1A.12. (101); BAD, 1B.18. (112); UNPLEASANT, 2B.10. (124); PRETTY, 3A.12. (131); UGLY, 3B.9. (138); STERN, 12A.7. (228); BRAVE, 13A.8. (237); **PROUD, 14A.1.** (244)
- \**gydъk* **UGLY, 3B.3.** (133)
- \**gyzdav* PRETTY, 3A.13. (132); **UGLY, 3B.4.** (136); PROUD, 14A.8. (247); LAZY, 15B.4. (258)
- \**jar* STRONG, 6A.15. (169); YOUNG, 8A.3. (191); **VIOLENT, 10A.8.** (210); CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.8. (220); DARING, 13A.13. (238); PROUD, 14A.5. (247)
- \**jędr*/*\*jędrъn* **FAT, 5A.3.** (148); STRONG, 6A.12. (168); YOUNG, 8A.4. (192); QUICK, 9A.5. (199)
- \**jun* **YOUNG, 8A.1.** (190)
- \**јmъn* **PLEASANT, 2A.4.** (117); CALM, 10B.7. (216); MILD, 12B.10. (233)

- \*klękanъ* : *\*klęcanъ* **WEAK, 6B.3.** (175)  
*\*klūdъnъ* **CALM, 10B.3.** (214)  
*\*kovaъnъ* **WISE, 16A.3.** (261)  
*\*krasъnъ* **GOOD, 1A.8.** (100); **PRETTY, 3A.1.** (126)  
*\*kręprъ*/*\*kręprъkъ* **STRONG, 6A.3.** (161); **HEALTHY, 7A.7.** (185)  
*\*krotъkъ* **CALM, 10B.8.** (216); **MILD, 12B.5.** (232); **HUMBLE, 14B.2.** (249)  
*\*krōprъ*/*\*krōprъnъ* **LOW/SHORT, 4B.4.** (145); **FAT, 5A.4.** (150)  
*\*krōtъ* **STRONG, 6A.7.** (166); **VIOLENT, 10A.10.** (211); **STERN, 12A.9.** (229); **PROUD, 14A.6.** (247)  
*\*krynъ* **LOW/SHORT, 4B.3.** (147)  
*\*kyprrъ* **PRETTY, 3A.7.** (129); **WEAK, 6B.9.** (177); **SICK, 7B.5.** (187); **VIOLENT, 10A.9.** (210)  
*\*ladъnъ* **GOOD, 1A.7.** (99); **PRETTY, 3A.3.** (127)  
*\*lagodъnъ* **PLEASANT, 2A.3.** (116); **THIN, 5B.9.** (158); **WEAK, 6B.18.** (180); **CALM, 10B.6.** (215); **MILD, 12B.2.** (231)  
*\*lęnъ*/*\*lęnivъ* **SLOW, 9B.4.** (204); **TIMID, 13B.6.** (243); **LAZY, 15B.1.** (257)  
*\*lęprъ* **GOOD, 1A.2.** (96); **PLEASANT, 2A.8.** (118); **PRETTY, 3A.4.** (128)  
*\*libъ* **THIN, 5B.1.** (155)  
*\*lichъ* **BAD, 1B.4.** (106); **STRONG, 6A.19.** (170); **BRAVE, 13A.16.** (239)  
*\*lochъ*/*\*lošъ* **BAD, 1B.2.** (105); **WEAK, 6B.11.** (178); **SICK, 7B.9.** (188); **LAZY, 15B.8.** (259)  
*\*lutъ* **QUICK, 9A.12.** (201); **VIOLENT, 10A.11.** (211); **STERN, 12A.1.** (226); **BRAVE, 13A.15.** (239)  
*\*malъ* **LOW/SHORT, 4B.2.** (146)  
*\*marъnъ* **BAD, 1B.6.** (106); **UGLY, 3B.11.** (138)  
*\*milъ* **PLEASANT, 2A.1.** (115); **MILD, 12B.6.** (232)  
*\*mirъnъ* **CALM, 10B.1.** (213); **MILD, 12B.3.** (231); **HUMBLE, 14B.4.** (250)  
*\*mogъnъ* **STRONG, 6A.1.** (160)  
*\*moldъ* **YOUNG, 8A.2.** (191)  
*\*mōdrъ* **CALM, 10B.9.** (216); **MILD, 12B.7.** (232); **WISE, 16A.1.** (260)  
*\*mъzъ*/*\*mъzъkъ*, *\*mъzlivъ* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.4.** (122); **UGLY, 3B.7.** (137); **LAZY, 15B.7.** (258)  
*\*mъdъbъ* **WEAK, 6B.2.** (174)  
*\*naglъ* **QUICK, 9A.9.** (201); **VIOLENT, 10A.3.** (206); **BRAVE, 13A.5.** (236)  
*\*nęžъnъ* **PLEASANT, 2A.5.** (117); **WEAK, 6B.19.** (180); **MILD, 12B.1.** (230)  
*\*nizъkъ* **LOW/SHORT, 4B.1.** (146)  
*\*ōtblъ* **WEAK, 6B.7.** (177); **SICK, 7B.7.** (187)  
*\*pęknъ*, *\*pękrъ* **PRETTY, 3A.2.** (127)  
*\*pilynъ* **DILIGENT, 15A.1.** (251)  
*\*plochъ* **BAD, 1B.5.** (107); **SICK, 7B.8.** (188); **CALM, 10B.5.** (215)  
*\*pokoјъnъ* **CALM, 10B.2.** (214)  
*\*pokořъnъ* **MILD, 12B.9.** (233); **HUMBLE, 14B.1.** (248)  
*\*polchъ* **BAD, 1B.16.** (112); **STRONG, 6A.16.** (169); **VIOLENT, 10A.13.** (212); **MILD, 12B.8.** (233); **TIMID, 13B.1.** (241)  
*\*prikrrъ* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.1.** (120); **STERN, 12A.8.** (228)  
*\*protivъnъ* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.2.** (121)  
*\*prōdъ*/*\*prōdъkъ*/*\*prōdъnъ* **QUICK, 9A.8.** (200); **VIOLENT, 10A.2.** (206); **BRAVE, 13A.14.** (239); **TIMID, 13B.4.** (242)  
*\*pyšъnъ* **PROUD, 14A.2.** (245)  
*\*radъ* **CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.2.** (218)  
*\*revъnъ* **SAD, 11B.5.** (224); **DILIGENT, 15A.2.** (252)

- \**rędóno* **GOOD, 1A.5.** (98); **PRETTY, 3A.5.** (128)  
 \**ródz*/*\*ródóno* **GOOD, 1A.4.** (97); **LOW/SHORT, 4B.5.** (147); **HEALTHY, 7A.6.** (184);  
**CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.9.** (220)  
 \**rǫžóno* **UGLY, 3B.6.** (137)  
 \**réd'avó* **BAD, 1B.9.** (109)  
 \**rěchló* **WEAK, 6B.6.** (176)  
 \**rychló* **FAT, 5A.9.** (154); **WEAK, 6B.5.** (176); **QUICK, 9A.1.** (197); **BRAVE, 13A.7.** (237)  
 \**sílóno* **STRONG, 6A.2.** (161)  
 \**skřybóno* **SICK, 7B.2.** (186); **SAD, 11B.1.** (221); **DILIGENT, 15A.10.** (255)  
 \**skvřóno* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.6.** (123)  
 \**slabó* **BAD, 1B.19.** (112); **THIN, 5B.10.** (159); **WEAK, 6B.1.** (173); **SICK, 7B.12.** (189)  
 \**snažóno* **STRONG, 6A.21.** (171); **DILIGENT, 15A.5.** (253)  
 \**sorgó* **STERN, 12A.3.** (227)  
 \**sporó* **FAT, 5A.5.** (151); **STRONG, 6A.13.** (168); **QUICK, 9A.10.** (201); **DILIGENT, 15A.7.** (254)  
 \**staró* **OLD, 8B.2.** (194)  
 \**storbó* **STRONG, 6A.8.** (167); **HEALTHY, 7A.5.** (184)  
 \**strogó* **GOOD, 1A.15.** (102); **STRONG, 6A.18.** (170); **STERN, 12A.2.** (226)  
 \**sědorvó* **STRONG, 6A.20.** (170); **HEALTHY, 7A.1.** (182)  
 \**sěkromóno* **THIN, 5B.4.** (157); **HUMBLE, 14B.3.** (250)  
 \**sěměľó* **BRAVE, 13A.1.** (235)  
 \**sěmqtóno* **SAD, 11B.3.** (223)  
 \**šadó* : \**šědivó* **OLD, 8B.4.** (194)  
 \**ščiró*, \**čiró* **DILIGENT, 15A.3.** (252)  
 \**ščupľó* **THIN, 5B.2.** (156)  
 \**šiběkó* **THIN, 5B.5.** (157); **WEAK, 6B.17.** (180); **QUICK, 9A.7.** (200); **VIOLENT, 10A.4.** (207)  
 \**tichó* **SLOW, 9B.5.** (204); **CALM, 10B.4.** (215)  
 \**třstó* **FAT, 5A.2.** (149)  
 \**třgó* **FAT, 5A.7.** (153); **STRONG, 6A.4.** (163)  
 \**třpó* **STUPID, 16B.2.** (264)  
 \**těščó* **THIN, 5B.3.** (156)  
 \**umóno* **WISE, 16A.2.** (260)  
 \**veló*/*\*velikó* **HIGH/TALL, 4A.4.** (143)  
 \**verdóno* **UNPLEASANT, 2B.5.** (122)  
 \**veseló* **CHEERFUL/MERRY, 11A.1.** (218)  
 \**vetěchó* **WEAK, 6B.12.** (178); **OLD, 8B.1.** (193)  
 \**vědló* **WEAK, 6B.8.** (177); **SLOW, 9B.2.** (203); **LAZY, 15B.2.** (257)  
 \**volóno* **SLOW, 9B.1.** (203)  
 \**vysokó* **HIGH/TALL, 4A.1.** (141)  
 \**zěľó* **BAD, 1B.1.** (104); **UNPLEASANT, 2B.9.** (124); **PRETTY, 3A.11.** (131); **STERN, 12A.5.** (228); **WISE, 16A.6.** (262)

## INDEX OF LANGUAGES

Albanian	MWelsh – Middle Welsh
Anglo-Saxon	OCS – Old Church Slavonic
Armenian	Old Czech
Avest. – Avestan	Old English
Baltic	Old High German
Belarusian	OInd. – Old Indian
Bulg. – Bulgarian	OIr. – Old Irish
Church Slavonic	Old Norse
Croat. – Croatian	Old Polish
Cz. – Czech	Old Prussian
Dutch	Old Russian
English	Old Welsh
Fr. – French	Persian
Germanic	PIE – Proto-Indo-European
Gothic	Polabian
Gr. – Greek	Polish
Irish	Proto-Germanic
Kash. – Kashubian	PSlav – Proto-Slavic
Lat. – Latin	Russ. – Russian
Latv. – Latvian	Serb. – Serbian
Lith. – Lithuanian	Sk. – Slovak
LSorb – Lower Sorbian	Slovene
Mac. – Macedonian	Ukrainian
Middle Low German	USorb – Upper Sorbian
Middle High German	Welsh

## ABBREVIATIONS

dial. – dialectal  
etym. – etymological

fig. – figuratively  
struct. – structural

## REFERENCES

### DICTIONARIES QUOTED IN THE WORK

- Ahmanova – Ольга С. Ахманова, 1966, *Словарь лингвистических терминов*, Москва: изд. Советская Энциклопедия.
- Anić – Anić Vladimir, 1996, *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (2nd edition), Zagreb: Novi Liber.
- Atrahovič – Кандрат К. Атрахович, 1977–1984, *Тлумачальны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, Минск: Беларуская Савецкая Энцыклапедыя.
- Bańkowski – Andrzej Bańkowski, 2000–, *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Bělič – Jaromír Bělič et al. (ed.), 1960–1971, *Slovník spisovného jazyka českého*, vol. 1–4, Praha: Academia.
- BER – Владимир И. Георгиев (ed.), 1971–, *Български етимологичен речник*, vol. 1–, София: Институт за български език.
- Berneker – Erich Berneker, 1908–1913, *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Bezljaj – Franc Bezljaj (ed.), 1977–2007, *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, vol. 1–5, Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša.
- Bilodid – Иван К. Білодід (ed.), 1970–1980, *Словник української мови*, vol. 1–17, Київ: Наукова думка.
- Boryś – Wiesław Boryś, 2005, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Brückner – Aleksander Brückner, 1970, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wiedza Powszechna (2nd edition).
- Buck – Carl D. Buck, 1949, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Čolakova – Кристилина Чолакова (ed.), 1977–, *Речник на българския език*, Sofia: Izd-vo na Bŭlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Dal' – Владимир И. Даль, 1880–1882, *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*, vol. 1–4, Санкт-Петербург–Москва: М.О. Вольф.
- Derksen – Rick Derksen, 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series), Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- EJO – Kazimierz Polański (ed.), 1993, *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

- ERSJ – Александар Лома (ed.), 2003–, *Этимолошки речник српског језика*, vol. 1–, Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ.
- ESJS – Eva Havlová (ed.), 1989–, *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, vol. 1–, Praha: Academia.
- ESSJ – Олег Н. Трубачев (ed.), 1974–, *Этимологический словарь славянских языков*, vol. 1–, Москва: Наука.
- ESUM – Олександр Савич Мельничук (ed.), 1982–, *Етимологічний словник української мови*, Київ: Інститут мовознавства НАН.
- Evgen'eva – Анастасия П. Евгеньева (ed.), 1957–1961, *Словарь русского языка*, vol. 1–4, Москва: Институт русского языка Академии наук СССР.
- EWJP – Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), 1978, *Encyklopedia wiedzy o języku polskim*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Fraenkel Ernst, 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1–2, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gebauer – Jan Gebauer, 1970, *Slovník staročeský*, vol. 1–2, Praha: Academia (2nd edition).
- Gerov – Найден Геров, 1895–1904, *Речник на български език*, vol. 1–5, Пловдив: дружествена.
- Gluhak – Gluhak Alemko, 1993, *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*, Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Haller – Haller Jiří (ed.), 1974, *Český slovník věcný a synonymický*, Praha: SPN.
- Heidermanns – Frank Heidermanns, 1993, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*, Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- HSBM – Аркадзь І. Жураўскі (ed.), 1982–, *Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы*, Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- HSSJ – Milan Majtán (ed.), 1991, *Historický slovník slovenského jazyka*, Bratislava: Veda.
- Hujer – Oldřich Hujer et al., 1935–1957, *Příruční slovník jazyka českého*, vol. 1–8, Praha: Státní nakladatelství; Školní nakladatelství: SPN.
- ISUJ – Евгений К. Тимченко (ed.), 1930–, *Историчний словник українського язика*, Харків-Київ: VPE.
- Jentsch – Helmut Jentsch, 1989–1991, *Němsko-hornjoserbski słownik. Deutsch-Obersorbisches Wörterbuch*, Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag.
- Jungmann – Josef Jungmann, 1834–1839, *Slovník česko-německý*, vol. 1–5, Praha: W kněžec arcibiskupské knihotiskárně....
- Karłowicz – Jan Karłowicz, Adam A. Kryński, Władysław Niedźwiedzki, 1900–1927, *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–8, Warszawa: Nakładem prenumeratorów.
- Koneski – Блаже Конески, 1961–1966, *Речник на македонскиот јазик*, vol. 1–3, Скопје: Институтот за македонски јазик “Крсте Петков Мисирков.”
- Korečnů – František Korečnů, 1973, *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena*, ed. Bohuslav Havránek, Praha: Academia.
- Kluge<sup>23</sup> – Friedrich Kluge, 1999, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (23rd edition), ed. Elmar Seebold, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kral – Kral Jurij, 1927, *Serbsko-němski słownik hornjołužiskeje serbskeje řeče. Sorbisch-deutsches Wörterbuch der Oberlausitzer sorbischen Sprache*, Bautzen: Domowina (phototypical edition 1986).
- Linde – Samuel Bogumił Linde, 1854–1860, *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–6, Lwów: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich (2nd edition).
- LIV – Helmut Rix (ed.), 1998, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Machek – Václav Machek, 1957, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského*, Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
- Machek<sup>2</sup> – Václav Machek, 1968, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského*, Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd (2nd edition).
- Miklosich – Franz Miklosich, 1886, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*, Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.
- Miklosich<sup>2</sup> – Franz Miklosich, 1862–1865, *Lexicon paleoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae: Guilelmus Braumüller.

- Mühlenbach – Karl Mühlenbach, 1923–1932, *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1–4, Riga: Kulturars Fonda Izdevums.
- Muka – Arnošt Muka, 1911–1928, *Słownik dolnosербске reči a jeje narečow*, vol. 1-3, Petrohrad–Praga: Nakladatelství České akademie věd a umění.
- NSOED – *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, 1993, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Obnorskij – Сергей П. Обнорский et al. (eds.), 1948–1965, *Словарь современного русского литературного языка*, vol. 1–17, Москва–Ленинград: Изд-во Акад. наук СССР, Наука.
- Olesch – Reinhold Olesch, 1983–1984, *Thesaurus Linguae Dravaenopolabicae*, vol. 1–3, Köln–Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Paul – Paul Rost, 1907, *Die Sprachreste der Draväno-Polaben im Hannöverschen*, Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Peciar – Štefan Peciar, 1959–1968, *Slovník slovenského jazyka*, vol. 1–6, Bratislava: VEDA.
- Pfuhl – Pfuhl Christian T., 1866, *Obersorbisches Wörterbuch*, Bautzen: Maćica Serbska (phototypical edition 1990).
- Pleteršnik – Max Pleteršnik, 1894–1895, *Slovensko-nemški slovar*, vol. 1–2, Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU.
- Pokorny – Julius Pokorny, 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern–München: Francke.
- Polański – Kazimierz Polański, 1962–1994, *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich*, fasc. 1–6, vol. 1–4, Wrocław–Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich; vol. 5–6, Warszawa: Energeia.
- Rečnik – Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*, 1967–1976, vol. 1–6, Novi Sad–Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Rejzek – Jiří Rejzek, 2001, *Český etymologický slovník*, Voznice: Leda.
- RJAZ – *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1880–1976, vol. 1–23, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Romanski – Стоян Романски, 1955–1959, *Речник на съвременния български книжовен език*, vol. 1–3, София: Българска академия на науките.
- RSAN – Ljubomir Matić et al. (eds.), 1959–, *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika*, vol. 1–, Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Schuster-Šewc – Heinz Schuster-Šewc, 1978–1989, *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, Bautzen: Domowina.
- SEJDP – Kazimierz Polański, 1971–1994, *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich*, No. 1–6 (No. 1 with Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński), Wrocław etc.: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- SEJL – Wojciech Smoczyński, 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński, Wydział Filologiczny.
- SEK – Wiesław Boryś, Hanna Popowska-Taborska (eds.), 1994–2010, *Słownik etymologiczny kaszubszczyzny*, vol. 1-6, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN).
- SGP – *Słownik gwar polskich*, 1979–1991, vol. 1 No. 1 – vol. 4 No. 2, ed. Mieczysław Karaś; Teresa Gołębiowska; Jerzy Reichan, Stanisław Urbańczyk, Wrocław–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- *Słownik gwar polskich*, 1993–, vol. 4 No. 3–, ed. Jerzy Reichan, Stanisław Urbańczyk; Jerzy Reichan, Joanna Okoniowa; Jerzy Reichan, Joanna Okoniowa, Barbara Grabka, Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- SJS – Josef Kurz, Zde Hauptová (eds.), 1958–1997, *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, vol. 1–4, Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
- Skok – Petar Skok, 1971–1974, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, vol. 1–4, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Sławski – Franciszek Sławski, 1952–1982, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, vol. 1–5, Kraków: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego.
- Stšpol. – Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), 1953–2002, *Słownik staropolski*, vol. 1–11, Warszawa–Kraków: IJ PAN.
- Snoj – Marko Snoj, 1997, *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

- Snoj<sup>2</sup> – Marko Snoj, 2003, *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- SP – Franciszek Sławski (ed.), 1974–2001, *Słownik prasłowiański*, vol. 1–8, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- SP XVI – Maria Renata Mayenowa, Franciszek Peplowski (eds.), 1966–1994, *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, vol. 1–34, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Krzysztof Mrowcewicz, Patrycja Potoniec (eds.), 1995–, *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, vol. 36–, Warszawa: IBL PAN.
- Sreznevskij – Измаил И. Срезневский, 1893–1912, *Материалы для словаря древне-русского языка по письменным памятникам*, Санкт-Петербург: Отделения русского языка и словесности Императорской Академии наук.
- SRJ XI–XVII – Степан Григорьевич Бархударов (ed.), 1975–, *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, vol. 1–, Москва: Наука.
- SRNG – Федот П. Филин et al. (eds.), 1965–, *Словарь русских народных говоров*, vol. 1–, Москва–Ленинград: Наука.
- SSN – *Slovník slovenských nářečí*, 1994–, vol. 1–, Bratislava: Veda.
- Švedova – Наталия Ю. Шведова, 1998, *Русский семантический словарь. Толковый словарь, систематизированный по классам слов и значений*, vol. 1–6, Москва: Азбуковник.
- Sychta – Bernard Sychta, 1967–1976, *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*, vol. 1–7, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Vasmer – Max Vasmer, 1950–1958, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vasmer<sup>2</sup> – Макс Фасмер, 1964–1973, *Этимологический словарь русского языка. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения члена-корреспондента АН СССР О. Н. Трубачева*, vol. 1–4, Москва: Прогресс.
- Walde – Alois Walde, 1938, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter (3rd edition, ed. Johann Baptist Hofmann).

## OTHER WORKS

- Adrados Francisco R., 1992, The New Image of Indo-European, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, No. 97, pp. 1–28.
- Adrados Francisco R., 2007, Must we Again Postulate a Unitary and Uniform Indo-European?, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, No. 112, pp. 1–25.
- Anikin 1985 – Александр Е. Аникин, (a review) *Wörterbuch der vergleichenden Bezeichnungstheorie. Onomasiologie. Begründet und herausgegeben von J. Schröpfer*, Bd. I. Lief. 1/2, 3/4, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1979–1981, *Этимология*, 1982, pp. 173–176.
- Apresjan 1995 – Юрий Д. Апресян, *Избранные труды*, vol. 1: *Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка*, Москва: Восточная литература РАН.
- Apresjan Jurij D., 2000, *Semantyka leksykalna. Synonimiczne środki języka*, trans. Zofia Kozłowska, Andrzej Markowski, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich (2nd edition).
- Atlas 1983–2007 – Atlas Linguarum Europae I*, fasc. 1–4, Assen–Maastricht: Van Gorcum; fasc. 5–7, Roma: Poligrafico.
- Bartmiński Jerzy, 2007, *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Benveniste Émile, 1954, Problèmes sémantiques de la reconstruction, *Word*, No. 10, 2–3, pp. 251–264.
- Benveniste Émile, 1966, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Paris: N.R.F., pp. 289–307.
- Benveniste Émile, 1969a, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 1, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

- Benveniste Émile, 1969b, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vol. 2, Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Birnbaum Henrik, 1973, O możliwości odtworzenia pierwotnego stanu języka prasłowiańskiego za pomocą rekonstrukcji wewnętrznej i metody porównawczej. (Kilka uwag o stosunku różnych podejść), in: *American Contribution to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists*, vol. 1, ed. Ladislav Matějka, The Hague: Mouton, pp. 33–58.
- Birnbaum Henrik, 1975, *Common Slavic. Progress and Problems in its Reconstructions*, Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Birnbaum Henrik, 1998, Jak długo trwał okres prasłowiański, in: *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Warszawa: Energeia, pp. 21–27.
- Blaňár Vincent, 1984, *Lexikálno-semantická rekonštrukcia*, Bratislava: Veda.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1980, O rozwoju znaczenia psł. \*piti, \*pojiti, *Rocznik Sławistyczny* 40, pp. 39–42.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1981a, Archaiczny słowiański przymiotnik rądi, *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 20, pp. 7–10.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1981b, Psł. przymiotniki dewerbalne z apof. o : ѵ (dial. \*dropъ, \*stromъ, \*tromъ), *Rocznik Sławistyczny* 41, pp. 35–41.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1991, Etymologie polskie, *Język Polski*, No. 71, pp. 22–34.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1998a, Kształtowanie się klasy przymiotników w epoce prasłowiańskiej, *Rocznik Sławistyczny* 51, pp. 9–16.
- Boryś Wiesław, 1998b, *Prasłowiański – poprasłowiański. Na granicy dwóch epok*, in: *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Warszawa: Energeia, pp. 29–33.
- Boryś Wiesław, 2001, Rozpad wspólnoty prasłowiańskiej w świetle słownictwa, in: *Słowianie, Słowiańszczyzna – pojęcie i rzeczywistość dawniej i dziś*, ed. Kwiryna Handke, Warszawa: Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN), pp. 25–33.
- Boryś Wiesław, 2007, *Etymologie słowiańskie i polskie. Wybór studiów z okazji 45-lecia pracy naukowej*, ed. Władysław Sędzik, Warszawa: Sławistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN).
- Bréal Michel, 1897, *Essai de sémantique. Science des significations*, Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- Brodowska-Honowska Maria, 1960, *Słowotwórstwo przymiotnika w języku staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN.
- Brozović 1988 – Далибор Брозович, Классификация названий луны в языках Европы, in: *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Материалы и исследования. 1984*, ed. Вячеслав В. Иванов, Москва: Наука, pp. 9–23.
- Brzozowska Małgorzata, 2000, Derywaty onomazjologiczne (asocjacyjne) w językowym obrazie świata, in: *Język a Kultura*, vol. 13, *Językowy obraz świata i kultura* (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2218), ed. Anna Dąbrowska, Janusz Anusiewicz, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 144–152.
- Brzozowska Małgorzata, 2009, *Etymologia a konotacja słowa. Studia semantyczne*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Burzyńska Anna B., Kamieniecki Jan, 1998, Wpływ przeszłości na językowy obraz śmierci ludzi i zwierząt w polszczyźnie, *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury* 9/10, pp. 81–91.
- Buttler Danuta, 1978, *Rozwój semantyczny wyrazów polskich*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UW.
- Černyš 1998 – Тетяна О. Черниш, Компаративно-зіставне дослідження слов'янської лексики у контексті етимологічних ґнізд із близькозначними коренями, *Мовознавство*, 1998, No. 2–3, pp. 168–179.
- Černyš 2003 – Тетяна О. Черниш, *Слов'янська лексика в історико-етимологічному висвітленні*, Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.
- Cieślakowa Aleksandra, 2002, *Prasłowiańskie wyrazy złożone a nazwy własne – struktura i semantyka*, in: *Dzieje Słowian w świetle leksyki*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Leszek Bednarczuk, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 95–100.
- Čop Bojan, 1973, *Prispevek k zgodovini labialnih pripon v indoevropskih jezikih*, Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Сухун 1998 – Генадзь Цьхун, *Арэальная структура праславяншчыны*, in: *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Warszawa: Energeia, pp. 73–77.

- Cyhuň 2000 – Генадзь Цыхун, *Арэальныя аспекты семантычнай рэканструкцыі*, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 201–207.
- Czyżewski Feliks, Dobrzańska Anna (eds.), 2008, *Tabu językowe i eufemizacja w dialektach słowiańskich*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Dąbrowska Anna, 1993, *Eufemizmy współczesnego języka polskiego*, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Dąbrowska Anna (ed.), 2009, *Tabu w języku i kulturze* (Język a Kultura 21), Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Darmesteter Arsène, 1887, *La vie des mots étudiée dans leur significations*, Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave.
- Dejkova 2000 – Христина Дейкова, Към славянските названия на птиците, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 235–245.
- Dokulil Miloš, 1979, *Teoria derywacji*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Dolník Juraj, 1990, *Lexikálna sémantika*, Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.
- Dronova 2005 – Любовь П. Дронова, Прилагательное благой в историко-культурном контексте, in: *Известия Уральского государственного университета*, vol. 39, pp. 175–190.
- Dronova 2007 – Любовь П. Дронова, Прекрасный красный, in: *Этимология*, 2003–2005, pp. 73–86.
- Eremina 2003 – Марина А. Еремина, *Лексико-семантическое поле “Отношение человека к труду” в русских народных говорах. Этнолингвистический аспект*, Екатеринбург: Уральский государственный университет.
- Erhart Adolf, Večerka Radoslav, 1981, *Úvod do etymologie*, Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Feokistova 2003 – Любовь А. Феоктистова, *Номинативное воплощение абстрактной идеи (на материале русской лексики со значением ‘пропасть, исчезнуть’)*, Екатеринбург: Уральский государственный университет имени А. М. Горького.
- Furdík Juraj, 2000, Мотивация слотоворчца между innymi типами мотивации лексыкалnej, in: *Словотворство а inne sposoby nominacji: materiały z 4 konferencji Komisji Słowotwórstwa przy Międzynarodowym Komitecie Słowistów*, ed. Krystyna Kleszczowa, Ludwig Selimski, Katowice: Gnome, pp. 59–62.
- Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1984 – Тамаз Валерианович Гамкrelidze, Вячеслав Всеволодович Иванов, *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы, Реконструкция и историко-типологический анализ праязыка и прокультуры*, Тбилиси: Тбилисский государственный университет.
- Gołąb Zbigniew, 1992, *The Origins of the Slavs. A Linguist's View*, Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Gortan-Premk Darinka, 1997, *Polisemija i organizacija leksičkog sistema u srpskome jeziku*, Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Grodziński Eugeniusz, 1970, Postacie wieloznaczności wyrazów, *Poradnik Językowy*, No. 3, pp. 157–164.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 1993, Pokora, pycha i pojęcia pokrewne, in: *Nazwy wartości. Studia leksykalno-semantyczne*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Małgorzata Mazurkiewicz-Brzozowska, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 23–39.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 1995a, Wpływ etymologii na współczesne rozumienie wyrazów, *Studia z językoznawstwa słowiańskiego. Prace Instytutu Filologii Słowiańskiej UJ*, No. 14, pp. 59–62.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 1995b, *Wprowadzenie do semantyki językoznawczej*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 1996, Badania semantyczno-porównawcze w aspekcie diachronicznym, in: *Semantyka a konfrontacja językowa*, ed. Violetta Koseska-Toszewa, Danuta Rytel-Kuc, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN), pp. 217–226.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, 2003, Jeszcze w sprawie rozumienia dobra i dobroci, in: *Język w kręgu wartości. Studia semantyczne*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 261–272.
- Grzegorzczkova Renata, Waszakowa Krystyna (eds.), 2000, *Studia z semantyki porównawczej. Nazwy barw, nazwy wymiarów, predykaty mentalne*, part 1, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa UW.
- Györi Gábor, 1996, Historical Aspects of Categorization, in: *Cognitive Linguistics in the Redwoods. The Expansion of a New Paradigm in Linguistics*, ed. Eugene H. Casad, Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 175–206.

- Havlová Eva, 1965, O potřebě slovníku sémantických změn, *Jazykovědné aktuality*, No. 4, pp. 3–4.
- Havlová Eva, 1978, K aktuálním otázkám etymologie, *Slovo a slovesnost*, No. 39, pp. 308–309.
- Havlová Eva, 1994, Slovanská etymologie a homonymie, *Slavia* 63, pp. 141–148.
- Havlová Eva, 1995, Úloha rekonstrukce v etymologii a etymologie v rekonstrukci, in: *Pocsta Dušanu Štosarovi*, ed. Petr Karlík, Jana Pleskalová, Zdenka Rusínová, Boskovice: Albert, pp. 249–255.
- Havlová Eva, 1998, Benennungen des Keulen-Bärlapps in den slavischen Sprachen, *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university A* 46, pp. 27–38.
- Havlová Eva, 1999, Komplexní situace jako sémantické východisko při vzniku slovanských slov (na příkladu sémantického východiska 'chřadnout'), *Slavia* 68, pp. 287–294.
- Havlová Eva, 2002a, Etymologie a praslovanské reálie, in: *Dzieje Słowian w świetle leksyki*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Leszek Bednarczuk, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 121–124.
- Havlová Eva, 2002b, Paluba, *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity A* 50, pp. 61–66.
- Helimskij 2000 – Евгений А. Хелимский, *Компаративистика, уралистика. Лекции и статьи*, Москва: Языки русской культуры.
- Holzer Georg, 1996, *Das Erschließen unbelegter Sprachen. Zu den theoretischen Grundlagen der genetischen Linguistik*, Frankfurt am Main–New York: P. Lang.
- Holzer Georg, 2001, *Rekonstruowanie języków niepoświadczonych*, trans. Jolanta Krzysztoforska-Doschek, Kraków: Collegium Columbinum.
- Пјинский 1904 – Григорий А. Ильинский, Чешское hezký „красивый”, *Известия* 9, No. 2, pp. 279–282.
- Jaberg Karl, 1901, Pejorative Bedeutungsentwicklung im Französischen, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 25, pp. 561–601.
- Jaberg Karl, 1903, Pejorative Bedeutungsentwicklung im Französischen, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 27, pp. 25–71.
- Jaberg Karl, 1905, Pejorative Bedeutungsentwicklung im Französischen, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 29, pp. 57–71.
- Jakubowicz Mariola, 1992, Czy straszliwy też się boi?, *Język Polski* 72, pp. 283–285.
- Jakubowicz Mariola, 2000, Indogermanische Etymologien in einem Wörterbuch der semantischen Parallelen, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 209–215.
- Jakubowicz Mariola, 2004, Die Bezeichnungen für 'dumm' und 'klug' in den slavischen Sprachen und ihre etymologische Motivation, in: *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik (Polyslav)*, vol. 7 (Die Welt der Slaven 25), ed. Markus Bayer, Michael Betsch, Joanna Błaszczak, München: Otto Sagner, pp. 96–100.
- Jakubowicz Mariola, 2009, O rekonstrukcji pewnego przymiotnika psł.: \*dužъ czy \*dožъ?, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 6*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Lidové noviny, pp. 135–138.
- Jakubowicz Mariola, 2010, Badania nad motywacjami semantycznymi w językoznawstwie słowiańskim, *Slavia* 79, pp. 51–60.
- Jankowiak Lucyna A., 1997, *Prasłowiańskie dziedzictwo leksykalne we współczesnej polszczyźnie ogólnej*, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN).
- Janyšková Ilona, 1998a, Etymologicko-onomaziologická analýza slovanských názvů dřevin, *Slavia* 67, pp. 39–48.
- Janyšková Ilona, 1998b, K některým makedonským názvům dřevin, in: *Makedonско-чешка научна конференција*, ed. Мито Миовски, Скопје, pp. 143–150.
- Janyšková Ilona, 2000, Отражение жизни и представлений славян в названиях можжевельника, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia*, vol. 1, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 57–66.
- Janyšková Ilona, 2003, Vztah starých Slovanů ke stromům z hlediska jejich jmen, in: *Česká slavistika 2003. České přednášky pro 13. mezinárodní kongres slavistů, Ljubljana 15. – 21. 8. 2003*, ed. Ivo Pospíšil, Praha: Academia, pp. 83–91.

- Janyšková 2003–2004 – Илона Янышкова, Заметки по поводу слав.\*sosna, *Балканско езикозна-ние* 43, No 2–3, pp. 307–314.
- Janyšková Ilona, 2008, K některým aktuálním otázkám slovanské etymologie, *Slavia* 77, No. 1–3, pp. 77–84.
- Judycka Irmína, 1963, Synestezja w rozwoju znaczeniowym wyrazów, *Prace Filologiczne* 18, part 1, pp. 59–78.
- Jurewicz Oktawiusz, 1992, *Gramatyka historyczna języka greckiego*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Kajtoch Wojciech, Kajtoch Krystyna, 2010, O osobliwym posługiwaniu się słowem w czasopiśmie subkultur, in: *Relatywizm w języku i kulturze*, ed. Anna Pajdzińska, Ryszard Tokarski, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 295–321.
- Karlíková Helena, 1998, Typy a původ sémantických změn výrazů pro pojmenování citových stavů a jejich projevů ve slovanských jazycích, *Slavia* 67, p. 49–56.
- Karlíková Helena, 2005, Hněv ve staročeském lexiku, in: *Verba et historia*, ed. Petr Nejedlý, Miloslava Vajdllová, Igor Němec, Praha: Ústav pro Jazyk Český Akademie Věd České Republiky, pp. 161–165.
- Karlíková Helena, 2008, Úloha principu sémantických paralel v etymologickém výzkumu, *Slavia* 77, No. 1–3, pp. 85–92.
- Karpaczewa Marta, Symeonowa Chriska, Tokarz Emil, 1994, *Pułapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-bułgarskich*, Katowice: Śląsk.
- Кепа Danuta, 1999, Pochodzenie wyrazu a współczesny obraz językowy odpowiadającego mu desygnatu (na przykładzie nazw gatunkowych ptaków), in: *Przeszłość w językowym obrazie świata*, ed. Anna Pajdzińska, Piotr Krzyżanowski, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 137–148.
- Klein Franz-Josef, 2002, Von Anspruch und Problematik einer universalen Onomasiologie. Anmerkungen zum Wörterbuch der vergleichenden Bezeichnungslehre, (a review): Wörterbuch der vergleichenden Bezeichnungslehre, Onomasiologie. Red. J. Schröpfer, A. Hönig, t. 1, z. 1–8, 1980–1989, *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 18, No. 1–4, pp. 1–13.
- Kleparski Grzegorz, 1990, *Semantic Change in English: A Study of Evaluative Developments in the Domain of Humans*, Lublin: KUL.
- Kleparski Grzegorz, 1997, *Theory and Practice of Historical Semantics. The Case of Middle English and Early Modern English Synonyms of "Girl/Young Woman,"* Lublin: KUL.
- Kleparski Grzegorz, 1999, Kierunki typologiczne w badaniach nad zmianą znaczeniową wyrazów, *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 55, pp. 77–91.
- Kleparski Grzegorz, Malicka-Kleparska Anna, 1994, Panchroniczne zagadnienia onomazjologii w ujęciu gramatyki kognitywnej, in: *Podstawy gramatyki kognitywnej*, ed. Henryk Kardela (Biblioteka Myśli Semiotycznej), Warszawa: Zakład Semiotyki Logicznej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego: Znak-Język-Rzeczywistość, Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne, pp. 219–242.
- Kleszczowa Krystyna, 1989, *Verba dicendi in historii języka polskiego. Zmiany znaczeń*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Kleszczowa Krystyna, 2001, "Moralny" po staropolsku. Studium leksykalno-aksjologiczne, in: *Prace językoznawcze*, vol. 26, ed. Anna Kowalska, Olga Wolińska (Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego 2022), Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, pp. 93–101.
- Kleszczowa Krystyna, 2002, Zmiany w klasie polskich przymiotników ocen estetycznych, in: *O doskonałości. Materiały z konferencji 21–23 maja 2001*, vol. 1, Łódź: Archidiecezjalne Wydaw. Łódzkie, pp. 207–218.
- Kleszczowa Krystyna, 2003, *Staropolskie derywaty przymiotnikowe i ich perspektywiczna ewolucja*, Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.
- Klopčič Mile et al. (eds.), 1970–1991, *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, vol. 1–5, Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Koleva-Zlateva 1998 – Живка Колева-Златева, *Семантична реконструкция. Методологични аспекти*, Велико Търново: Знак '94.
- Kövecses Zoltan, 1986, *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love: a Lexical Approach to the Structure of Concepts*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Králik Lubor, 2000, Urslavisch \*gъrdъ und seine baltischen Parallelen, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 1, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 305–310.

- Krawczyk-Tyrpa Anna, 2001, *Tabu w dialektach polskich*, Bydgoszcz: Wydawnictwo Akademii Bydgoskiej.
- Kronasser Heinz, 1952, *Handbuch der Semasiologie, kurze Einführung in die Geschichte, Problematik und Terminologie der Bedeutungslehre*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Krzyszowski Tomasz P., 1994, Parametr aksjologiczny w przedpojęciowych schematach wyobrażeńiowych, *Etnolingwistyka*, No. 6, pp. 29–51.
- Kubasova 2004 – Анна А. Кубасова, *Семантико-мотивационное поле "отношение к собственности" в русских народных говорах. Этнолингвистический аспект (Дипломная работа)*, Екатеринбург: Уральский государственный университет имени А. М. Горького.
- Kurkina 1992 – Любовь В. Куркина, Славянские этимологии (\*skovorda, \*raščkati), *Этимология*, 1988–1990, pp. 57–62.
- Kurkina 1994 – Любовь В. Куркина, Славянские этимологии (ю.-слав. \*trap, слав. \*šerati, \*pelest'), *Этимология*, 1991–1993, pp. 32–45.
- Kurkina 2000a – Любовь В. Куркина, Еще раз к этимологии рус. плечо, in: *Этимология 1997–1999*, pp. 77–86.
- Kurkina 2000b – Любовь В. Куркина, Понятие границы в системе пространственных представлений древних славян, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janýšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 127–136.
- Kurkina 2002 – Любовь В. Куркина, К реконструкции динамики диалектных отношений на карте праславянского языка, in: *Dzieje Słowian w świetle leksyki*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Leszek Bednarczuk, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 153–159.
- Lakoff George, Johnson Mark, 1980, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lehr-Spławiński Tadeusz, 1938, Element prasłowiański w dzisiejszym słownictwie polskim, in: *Studia historyczne ku czci Stanisława Kutrzeby*, vol. 2, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, pp. 469–484.
- Lehr-Spławiński Tadeusz, 1946, *O pochodzeniu i praojczyźnie Słowian*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Zachodniego.
- Łozowski Przemysław, 1999, Panchronia, czyli językoznawstwo bez synchronii, in: *Przeszość w językowym obrazie świata*, ed. Anna Pajdzińska, Piotr Krzyżanowski, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 25–50.
- Lyons John, 1968, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons John, 1975, *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Lyons John, 1977, *Semantics*, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press.
- Machek Václav, 1938–1939, Untersuchungen zum Problem des anlautenden *ch-* im Slavischen, *Slavia* 16, pp. 161–219.
- Majewska Małgorzata, 2002, *Homonimia i homonimy w opisie językoznawczym*, Warszawa: Elipsa.
- Mańczak Witold, 1981, *Praojczyzna Słowian*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Mańczak Witold, 2001, *Praojczyzna Słowian. Zbiór wypowiedzi pod redakcją Witolda Mańczaka*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Mańczak Witold, 2004, *Przedhistoryczne migracje Słowian i pochodzenie języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego*, Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Masłowska Ewa, 1988, *Derywacja semantyczna rzeczowników ekspresywnych*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Meillet Antoine, 1903, *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie.
- Melničuk 1968 – Александр С. Мельничук, Корень *kes-* и его разновидности в лексике славянских и других индоевропейских языков, *Этимология*, 1966, pp. 194–240.
- Merkulova 1988 – Валентина А. Меркулова, Проблема семантической реконструкции в этимологическом словаре, in: *Этимологические исследования*, vol. 4, Свердловск: Уральский государственный университет, pp. 4–7.
- Merkulova 1989a – Валентина А. Меркулова, К вопросу о семантической реконструкции, in: *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Материалы и исследования*, 1985–1987, Москва: Наука, pp. 266–268.

- Merkulova 1989b – Валентина А. Меркулова, Народные названия болезней (на материале русского языка), IV, *Этимология*, 1986–1987, pp. 140–152.
- Merlingen Werand, 1978, Über eine Bedeutungsverzweigung im indogermanischen Lexikon, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 83, pp. 40–106.
- Mikołajczuk Agnieszka, 1994, Objawy emocji gniewu utrwalone w polskich metaforach potocznych, *Poradnik Językowy* 7, pp. 20–29.
- Miodunka Władysław, 1989, *Podstawy leksykologii i leksykografii*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Moszyński Kazimierz, 1957a, *Pierwotny zasięg [!] języka prasłowiańskiego*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Moszyński Kazimierz, 1957b, Uwagi do 5. zeszytu 'Słownika etymologicznego języka polskiego' Fr. Sławskiego, *Język Polski* 37, pp. 292–299.
- Moszyński Leszek, 1980, Najstarsze zróżnicowanie dialekcyjne prasłowiańszczyzny, *Slavia Orientalis* 29, No. 1–2, pp. 195–200.
- Moszyński Leszek, 1998, Językowe i pozajęzykowe kryteria dotyczące podziału dialekcyjnego prasłowiańszczyzny, in: *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*, ed. Jerzy Rusek, Wiesław Boryś, Warszawa: Energeia, pp. 79–85.
- Moszyński Leszek, 2006, *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej*, Warszawa: PWN (2nd edition).
- Mur'janov 1982 – Михаил Ф. Мурьянов, Сила (понятие и слово), *Этимология*, 1980, pp. 50–56.
- Nejedlý Petr, 2000, Rekonstrukce sémantického vývoje a etymologie, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 223–226.
- Němec Igor, 1980, *Rekonstrukce lexikálního vývoje*, Praha: Academia.
- Němec Igor, 1995, Diachronní lexikografie, in: *Manuál lexikografie*, ed. František Čermák, Praha, Jinočany: H & H, pp. 182–207.
- Нерокупный et al. 1989 – Анатолий П. Непокупный, Наталия Н. Быховец, Изабелла Р. Буниятова, *Общая лексика германских и балто-славянских языков*, Киев: Наукова думка.
- Niewiara Aleksandra, 2000, Badania etymologii a odtwarzanie językowego obrazu świata, in: *Język a Kultura*, vol. 13, *Językowy obraz świata i kultura* (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, 2218), ed. Anna Dąbrowska, Janusz Anusiewicz, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 97–105.
- Niewiara Aleksandra, 2003, Zmiany semantyczne w ujęciu panchronicznym, in: *Śląskie studia lingwistyczne*, ed. Krystyna Kleszczowa, Joanna Sobczykowa, Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, pp. 115–122.
- Nikolić Miroslav (ed.), 2007, *Rečnik srpskoga jezika*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Nowakowska-Kempna Iwona, 1995, *Konceptualizacja uczuć w języku polskim. Prolegomena*, Warszawa: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna Towarzystwa Wiedzy Powszechnej w Warszawie.
- Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 1988 – Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия лексико-словообразовательная*, vol. 1: *Животный мир*, ed. Рубен И. Аванесов, Москва: Наука.
- Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 2000a – Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия лексико-словообразовательная*, vol. 2: *Животноводство*, ed. Jan Basara et al., Warszawa: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 2000b – Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия лексико-словообразовательная*, vol. 3: *Растительный мир*, ed. Александр И. Подлужный, Минск: [s.n.].
- Obščeslavjanskij lingvističeskij atlas 2003 – Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия лексико-словообразовательная*, vol. 8: *Профессии и общественная жизнь*, ed. Jan Basara, Janusz Siatkowski, Warszawa: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Ogden Charles Kay, Richards Ivor Armstrong, 1923, *The Meaning of Meaning*, London: Kegan Paul.
- Orłós Teresa Z., 1958, Element prasłowiański w dzisiejszym słownictwie czeskim, *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 3, pp. 277–283;
- Osten-Sacken W. Freiherr von den, 1911, Die Bedeutungssphäre der Eigenschaftsabstrakta auf slav. -oba, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 28, pp. 416–24.

- P'jankova 2008 – Ксения В. Пьянкова, *Лексика обозначающая категориальные признаки пищи в русской языковой традиции. Этнолингвистический аспект*, Екатеринбург: Уральский государственный университет имени А. М. Горького.
- Pajdzińska Anna, 1990, Jak mówimy o uczuciach? Poprzez analizę frazeologizmów do językowego świata, in: *Językowy obraz świata*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Ryszard Tokarski, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 87–107.
- Pajdzińska Anna, 1995, Motywacja semantyczna przymiotników wartościujących, *Etnolingwistyka. Problemy Języka i Kultury*, No. 7, pp. 5–20.
- Pajdzińska Anna, 2000, "Temperatura" jako domena źródłowa metafor językowych, *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska* 18, Sectio FF, pp. 201–212.
- Pałka Patrycja, 2004, Rozwój i zmiany semantyczne leksemów "godny," "grzeczny" i "przystojny" w perspektywie kognitywnej, *Język Polski* 84, pp. 174–183.
- Paul Hermann, 1880, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Petleva 1968 – Ирина П. Петлева, Праславянский слой лексики сербохорватского языка I, *Этимология*, 1968, pp. 114–156.
- Petleva 1978 – Ирина П. Петлева, Этимологические заметки по славянской лексике. X (слав. \*lǫtь), *Этимология*, 1976, pp. 42–50.
- Petleva 1992 – Ирина П. Петлева, Этимологические заметки по славянской лексике. XVII, *Этимология*, 1988–1990, pp. 52–57.
- Pizłówna Barbara, 1971, Element prasłowiański w słownictwie współczesnego języka serbsko-chorwackiego, *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 12, pp. 285–300.
- Popowska-Taborska Hanna, 1989, O potrzebie słownika semantycznych paralelizmów, in: *Paralele w rozwoju słownictwa języków słowiańskich*, ed. Hanna Popowska-Taborska, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, pp. 19–26.
- Popowska-Taborska Hanna, 1991, *Wczesne dzieje Słowian w świetle ich języka*, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Račeva 2003 – Мария Рачева, Към проблематиката на семантичната имплицитност, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 2, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Lidové noviny, pp. 163–178.
- Radewa Sabina, 1963, Element prasłowiański w dzisiejszym słownictwie bułgarskim, *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* 4, pp. 171–199.
- Rečnik SANU 1959– – Александар Белић (ed.), 1959–1989, *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, vol. 1–14, Београд: САНУ.
- *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, 1996, vol. 15, Београд: САНУ.
- Митар Пешикан (ed.), 2001–2006, *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, vol. 16–17, Београд: САНУ.
- Даринка Гортан-Премк (ed.), 2010–, *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, vol. 18–, Београд: САНУ.
- Reczek Józef, 1991, *Polszczyzna i inne języki w perspektywie porównawczej*, Wrocław etc.: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Rejzek Jiří, 2008, *The Proto-Slavic Word-Initial x-*, Praha: Nakladatelství Karolinum.
- Rozwadowski Jan, 1903, *Semazyologia czyli nauka o rozwoju znaczeń wyrazów. Jej stan obecny, zasady i zadania*, Lwów: Towarzystwo Filologiczne.
- Rudskoger Arne, 1952, *Fair, Foul, Nice, Proper. A Contribution to the Study of Polysemy*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Rusek Jerzy, 2000, Nazwy dla 'piękny' w językach słowiańskich, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 1, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 137–143.
- Šarapatková Žofie, 1996, Sémantický vývoj psl. jędrъ, *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* A 44, pp. 21–23.
- Schmitt-Brandt Robert, 1998, *Einführung in die Indogermanistik*, Tübingen: Francke.
- Schuster-Šewc Heinz, 1975, Modellierung semantischer Prozesse und Etymologie, in: *Slawische Wortstudien, Sammelband des internationalen Symposiums zur etymologischen und historischen Erforschung des slawischen Wortschatzes, Leipzig*, Bautzen: Domovina, pp. 12–19.

- Shevelov George Y., 1964, *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Siatkowski Janusz, 1989, Europejskie paralele motywacyjne słownictwa słowiańskiego (na marginesie "Atlasu języków Europy"), in: *Paralele w rozwoju słownictwa języków słowiańskich*, ed. Hanna Popowska-Taborska, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, pp. 39–49.
- Sierociuk Jerzy, 2001, Czy istniał prasłowiański język poetycki, *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza* 8, pp. 127–137.
- Šipka Danko, 1999, *Słownik serbsko-polskich homonimów i paronimów*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Šivic-Dular Alenka, 1999, *Besedna družina iz korena "god-" v slovanskih jezikih*, Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Skalka Boris, 2000, Problematika etymologizování slangových a argotických výrazů, in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karlíková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 271–276.
- Skrzypczak Waldemar, 1995, Cognitive Linguistics and Paradigmatic Change, *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. English Studies VI. Humanities and Social Sciences* 301, pp. 13–35.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1958, Uwagi o badaniach etymologicznych nad słownictwem słowiańskim, in: *Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych. Prace językoznawcze i etnogenetyczne na IV Międzynarodowy Kongres Slawistów w Moskwie 1958*, ed. Przemysław Zwoliński, Warszawa: PWN, pp. 99–107.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1968, Z zagadnień rekonstrukcji słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego, in: *Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych, Prace na VI Międzynarodowy Kongres Slawistów w Pradze 1968. 3. Językoznawstwo*, ed. Witold Doroszewski, Warszawa: PWN, pp. 35–41.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1977, Zgodności leksykalne słowiano-germańskie, *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 24, No. 2–3, pp. 399–402.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1980, Praojczyzna Słowian w świetle etymologii, in: *Etnogeneza i topogeneza Słowian*, ed. Irena Kwilecka, Poznań: PWN, pp. 23–28.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1982, O bałtosłowiańskich przymiotnikach z sufiksem -ra- o zredukowanym wokalizmie pierwiastka, *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 14, pp. 207–209.
- Stawski Franciszek, 1989, *Slavica. Wybrane studia z językoznawstwa słowiańskiego*, ed. Władysław Sędzik, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Szuskiewicz Eugeniusz, 1955, Notatki etymologiczne 1. Przykry, *Poradnik Językowy*, No. 1, pp. 20–24.
- Smoczyński Wojciech, 2000, *Untersuchungen zum deutschen Lehngut im Altpreussischen*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Smolina 1978 – Ксения П. Смолина, К изучению семантической истории прилагательного великий, in: *Эскурсы в историю русской лексики*, ed. Евдокия Т. Черкасова, Москва: Наука, pp. 109–127.
- Stefański Witold, 1991, *The Diathesis in Indo-European*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Stieber Zdzisław, 1979, *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Syroćkin 1997 – Валерий В. Сырочкин, Этимологические заметки. II, *Этимология*, 1994–1996, Москва: Наука, pp. 75–78.
- Szałek Marek, Nečas Jiří, 1993, *Czesko-polska homonimia*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Szemerényi Oszvald, 1967, Славянская этимология на индоевропейском фоне, *Вопросы языкознания*, No. 4, pp. 3–25.
- Szemerényi Oszvald, 1977, Principles of Etymological Research in the Indo-European Languages, in: *Etymologie*, ed. Rüdiger Schmitt, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgeschellschaft, pp. 287–346.
- Tabakowska Elżbieta, 2001, *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa*, Kraków: Universitas.
- Taranenko 1980 – Олександр О. Тараненко, *Полісемічний паралелізм і явище семантичної аналогії*, Київ: Наукова думка.
- Taylor John R., 2002, *Cognitive Grammar*, Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tiktin Heimann Hariton, 1910, Wörterbücher der Zukunft, *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, No. 2, pp. 243–253.
- Tokarski Ryszard, 1981, Derywacja semantyczna jako jedno ze źródeł polisemii wyrazowej, in: *Pojęcie derywacji w lingwistyce*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS, pp. 91–105.

- Tokarski Ryszard, 1983, Teorie pól znaczeniowych a analiza semowa, *Język Polski* 63, pp. 179–188.
- Tokarski Ryszard, 1987, *Znaczenie słowa i jego modyfikacje w tekście*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Tokarski Ryszard, 1999, *Językowy obraz świata w metaforach potocznych*, in: *Językowy obraz świata*, ed. Jerzy Bartmiński, Lublin: Wydawnictwa UMCS, pp. 65–78.
- Tokarz Emil, 1998, *Pałapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-chorwackich*, Katowice: Śląsk.
- Tokarz Emil, 1999, *Pałapki leksykalne. Słownik aproksymatów polsko-słoweńskich*, Katowice: Śląsk.
- Tolstaja 2000 – Светлана М. Толстая, *Играсть и гулять: семантический параллелизм, Этимология*, 1997–1999, pp. 164–171.
- Tolstaja 2002 – Светлана М. Толстая, Мотивационные семантические модели и картина мира, *Русский язык в научном освещении*, No 1 (3), pp. 112–127.
- Tolstaja 2006 – Светлана М. Толстая, О семантике каритивности (слав. и его *prěsnъ* парадигматические портнеры), in: *Ad fontes verborum. Исследования по этимологии и исторической семантике. К 70-летию Ж.Ж. Варбот*, ed. Анатолий Ф. Журавлев, Москва: Индрик, pp. 363–380.
- Tolstaja 2007– Светлана М. Толстая, Почему слепой не видит? (к этимологии слав. \**slěp-*), in: *Словенска этимологија данас*, ed. Александар Лома, Београд: Институт за српски језик, САНУ, pp. 409–419.
- Tolstaja 2008a – Светлана М. Толстая, *Пространство слова. Лексическая семантика в общеславянской перспективе*, Москва: Индрик.
- Tolstaja 2008b – Светлана М. Толстая, Семантическая реконструкция и проблема многозначности праславянского слова, in: *Славянское языкознание. XIV Международный съезд славистов, Охрид, 10–16 сентября 2008 г.: доклады российской делегации*, ed. Александр М. Молдован, Москва: Индрик, pp. 451–474.
- Tolstaja 2009 – Светлана М. Толстая, ‘Кормить’ и ‘хоронить’ (к семантической реконструкции славянской погребальной лексики), in: *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 6, ed. Ilona Janýšková, Helena Karliková, Praha: Lidové noviny, pp. 341–355.
- Tolstoj 1976 – Никита И. Толстой, Из географии славянских слов: 8. ‘радуга,’ *Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Материалы и исследования 1974*, pp. 22–76.
- Tomczak Katarzyna, 1994, Frazеologizmy nazywające strach w języku polskim, *Poradnik Językowy* 9, pp. 26–33.
- Trautmann Reinhold, 1923, *Baltisch-Slawisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Trubačev 1964 – Олег Н. Трубачев, ‘Молчать’ и ‘таять.’ О необходимости семасиологического словаря нового типа, in: *Проблемы индоевропейского языкознания. Этюды по сравнительно-исторической семантике индоевропейских языков*, Москва: Наука, pp. 100–105.
- Trubačev 1980 – Олег Н. Трубачев, Реконструкция слов и их значений, *Вопросы языкознания*, No. 3, pp. 3–14.
- Trubačev 1988 – Олег Н. Трубачев, Приемы семантической реконструкции, in: *Сравнительно-историческое изучение языков разных семей. Теория лингвистической реконструкции*, ed. Владимир Н. Топоров, Москва: Наука, pp. 197–222.
- Trubačev 2002 – Олег Н. Трубачев, *Этногенез и культура древнейших славян. Лингвистические исследования*, Москва: Наука (2nd edition).
- Ullmann Stephen, 1957, *The Principles of Semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell (2nd edition).
- Valčáková Pavla, 1995, Die slawischen Namen der Fleischfüllen und der mit ihnen gefüllten Erzeugnisse, *Slavia* 64, pp. 409–419.
- Varbot 1984 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, *Праславянская морфология, словообразование и этимология*, Москва: Наука.
- Varbot 1986 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, О возможностях реконструкции этимологического гнезда на семантических основаниях, *Этимология*, 1984, pp. 33–40.
- Varbot 1992a – Жанна Ж. Варбот, К этимологии славянских прилагательных со значением ‘быстрый.’ I, *Этимология*, 1988–1990, pp. 44–49.
- Varbot 1992b – Жанна Ж. Варбот, Связи значений и семантическая реконструкция в этимологии, *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 38, pp. 233–241.

- Varbot 1994 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, К этимологии славянских прилагательных со значением 'быстрый.' II, *Этимология*, 1991–1993, pp. 54–57.
- Varbot 1997 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, К этимологии славянских прилагательных со значением 'быстрый.' III, *Этимология*, 1994–1996, pp. 35–46.
- Varbot 2000 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, *Слав. \*рільпъ(јъ)*, in: *Балто-славянские исследования 1998–1999. XIV*, ed. Антон Болеславович Брейдак и др., Москва: Индрик, pp. 24–26.
- Varbot 2008 – Жанна Ж. Варбот, Этимологические гнезда и лексико-семантические поля в диахронии и синхронии, in: *Славянское языкознание. XIV Международный съезд славистов, Охрид, 10–16 сентября 2008 г.: доклады российской делегации*, ed. Александр М. Молдован, Москва: Индрик, pp. 84–95.
- Večerka Radoslav, 2006, *K pramenům slov. Uvedení do etymologie*, Praha: Lidové noviny.
- Vlajić-Popović Jasna, 2000, Some Slavic Etymologies Reconsidered – Formal and Semantics Guidelines, *Studia etymologica Brunensia 1*, ed. Ilona Janyšková, Helena Karliková, Praha: Euroslavica, pp. 191–200.
- Vlajić-Popović Jasna, 2002, *Istorijska semantika glagola udaranja u srpskom jeziku. Preko etimologije do modela semasiološkog rečnika*, Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.
- Wierzychowski Józef, 1980, *Semantyka językoznawcza*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Wojtyła-Świerzowska Maria, 1991, Dlaczego głuchy nie słyszy? Rozważania o etymologii psł. \*głuchъ, *Južnoslovenski filolog* 47, pp. 209–220.
- Wojtyła-Świerzowska Maria, 1992, *Prasłowiańskie abstractum. Słowotwórstwo. Semantyka. I. Formacje tematyczne*, Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (IS PAN).
- Wojtyła-Świerzowska Maria, 1999, Od homonimii do polisemii (na marginesie drobiazgów etymologicznych), *Kieleckie Studia Filologiczne* 13, pp. 149–155.
- Wundt Wilhelm, 1900, *Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythos und Sitte*, vol. 1: *Die Sprache*, Leipzig: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Zvegincev 1957 – Владимир А. Звегинцев, *Семасиология*, Москва: Издательство Московского университета.