

# Leeds Studies in English

## Article:

Alan S. C. Ross, 'Summary [of Kiparsky, Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen (1934)]', *Leeds Studies in English*, 3 (1934), 60-64

## Permanent URL:

[https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object\\_id=134462&silos\\_library=GEN01](https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=134462&silos_library=GEN01)



*Leeds Studies in English*  
School of English  
University of Leeds  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>

V. Kiparsky, *Die gemeinlavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B. XXXII, 2), pp. 329. Helsinki, 1934. Price 60 Finnish marks.

This subject is of very great interest to the Germanic philologist and Dr. Kiparsky's large book bids fair to be accepted as a standard work. It is exhaustive, clearly written and, most important of all, based on a rigorous method. He sets out to consider every word which is to be, has been, or might be regarded as a Pr.Slav. loan-word from Germanic. The book falls into two main sections, dealing with words which cannot be considered as coming under the above rubric and with words which can. The fact that more than half the book is devoted to the first section says much for the rigour of Kiparsky's method and for the advance his work represents.

In an introduction a critical account of the very large literature of the subject from its inception at the time of Dobrovsky up to the present day is given.

The first main section—that dealing with words which *cannot* be considered as Gmc. loans in Pr.Slav.—falls into three sub-sections. In the first of these, words which Kiparsky considers as native Slav. are dealt with under four headings:—

(i) Words which have nothing in common with their supposed Gmc. etyma. Here Kiparsky is mostly concerned with clearing up errors and suggesting etymologies for the Slav. words. Thus Russ.<sup>2</sup> *dolg* 'debt' not to Goth. *dulgs* but (possibly) to OBulg. *dlzgz* 'long'; Russ. *glupy* 'foolish' not to OIcel. *glópr* but to Russ. *glukhoi* 'deaf'; Russ. *moloko* 'milk' not to MnE. *milk* but from IndE. \**melq-* 'wet, wetness' (as in MnBulg. *mloka* 'bog' Goth. *milhma* 'cloud'). In this section too there are several examples illustrating a point of interest

<sup>1</sup> It will be our practice to summarise each year at this page one work of considerable importance which—for any reason—is not (or is not likely to be) well-known to Germanic philologists in England. We have to thank Dr. Kiparsky for having checked this Summary in typescript.

<sup>2</sup> In order to save space one only of a set of cognate words is mentioned in this summary.

to students of loan-word methodology: in dealing with words of an imitative character we must always allow for the possibility of the same type arising independently in the two languages (cf. problems such as that presented by MnE. dial. *yarm* 'to bleat, whine, mew, yell, scold, speak ill-naturedly' in the study of Norse loan-words in English).<sup>3</sup> Thus Kiparsky considers OBulg. *xloxotati* 'strepere,' Russ. *khlopat* 'to bang, slam, pop, crack, clap,' Slovene *hrup* 'tumultus,' Russ. *vopit* 'to cry aloud,' as words ultimately of imitative origin and as such unconnected with (respectively) Goth. *hlahjan*, OHG. *chlaphôn*, Goth. *hrops*, *wopjan*.

(ii) Slavonic words which are ultimately related to (not borrowed from) their supposed Gmc. etyma. Thus Kiparsky considers the following sets of words as ultimately related:—OBulg. *děl* 'part': Goth. *dails*; Russ. *gost* 'guest': Goth. *gasts*; Russ. *grob* 'coffin': OHG. *grab*; Russ. *ljubyi* 'beloved': OE. *lēof*; Russ. *ljudi* 'people': MnHG. *Leute*; OBulg. *mznogz* 'many': Goth. *manags*; early Russ. *olui* 'beer': OE. *ealoþ*; Russ. *strela* 'arrow': OE. *stræl*; Russ. *tysjacha* 'thousand': OE. *þūsend*; Czech *věc* 'thing': Goth. *waihts*; Serbo-Croatian *vládati* 'to rule': Goth. *waldan*; Russ. *vosk* 'wax': MnE. *wax*.

(iii) Slavonic loan-words in Germanic. These are few in number and, with the exception of Goth. *þlinsjan* (: OBulg. *plesati* 'dance') and ON. *serkr* (: Russ. *sorochka* 'shirt, blouse'), not very well-known.

(iv) In this section a difficult problem of Slavonic philology is discussed, namely that afforded by words such as Russ. *bereg* 'shore': if the word is related to OHG. *berg* one would expect in Slavonic, as in other *satem*-languages, a spirant, not a stop, to correspond to the Gmc. *g* (cf. Avestic *barəzah-* 'mountain'); the stop in the Slavonic words might therefore be considered as evidence of borrowing from Germanic. Kiparsky

<sup>3</sup> This word, found in Scotland, the North of England and East Anglia, might be a borrowing of ON. *jarma* 'to bleat' but it might equally well be an independent English formation.

shows that this argument is false and puts forward an interesting explanation of the Slavonic stops.

In the second sub-section words borrowed into Slavonic and Germanic independently are dealt with, namely those from Latin and Romance (the discussions of the difficult words Czech *kříž* 'cross'—OHG. *chrúzi* and OBulg. *ocetz* 'vinegar'—Goth. *ake(i)t* are particularly interesting), Greek (note the discussion of Russ. *sub(b)ota* 'saturday' and the excursus on the Slavonic names of the days of the week) and non-IndE. languages (Russ. *mech* 'sword' is not related to or borrowed from Goth. *mekeis* but is a loan-word from some Caucasian language—cf. Dido *mač'a* 'sabre').

In the third sub-section Germanic loan-words which cannot be considered as Pr.Slav. are dealt with. Thus Russian Church Slav. *(o)xabiti se* 'abstinere' ORuss. *okhabit'(sja)* 'sich enternen, sich vor etwas hüten; beseitigen' Ukrainian *okhabitisja* 'vergessen, verlieren; sich enthalten' Polish dial. *ochabić* 'verschonen' OCzech *ochabiti se* 'meiden, sich enthalten' Serb.-Cr. dial. *habati se* 'sich hüten' Slov. *hábiti se* 'sich vor etwas hüten, sich enthalten' cannot be considered as a loan-word in Pr.Slav. (cf. Goth. *ungahabands sik*). It probably represents a borrowing of late OHG. *gahabén sik* 'abstinere, retinere, prudenter agere' and its wide distribution in Slavonic is due to the influence of Church Slav.

In the second main section of the book—that dealing with Germanic loan-words that *can* be considered as Pr.Slav.—Kiparsky distinguishes four groups of loan-words, those from Primitive Germanic, from Gothic, from 'Balkan-Germanic' (see below) and those from the individual Germanic languages.

He first deals with the *terminus a quo* and shows the view (held by many scholars) that there are Pre-Germanic loan-words in Slavonic (i.e. words borrowed before the first sound-shift) and that contact between the two peoples may have begun as early as the fifth century BC., to be based on faulty linguistic evidence.

For the borrowing of his Pr.Gmc. loan-words Kiparsky

suggests East Prussia as the place and the first few centuries AD. as the time. Examples of such words are:—Russ. *knjaz* 'prince' < Pr.Gmc. \**kuningaz* (= OE. *cyning*); Czech *nebozez* 'auger' < Pr.Gmc. \**naβa-γaiza-* (= OE. *nafogār*); ORuss. *shelom* 'helm' < Pr.Gmc. \**χelmaz* (= OE. *helm*); OBulg. *žlěsti* 'compensare' < Pr.Gmc. \**γelðan-* (= OS. *geldan*).

For the Gothic borrowings the contact between Slavs and Goths in South Russia (fourth century AD. ?) is suggested as a cause. Examples: Russ. *tsar* 'czar' < Goth. *kaisar*; OBulg. *gobezz* 'abundant' < Goth. *gabigs*; Russ. *khleb* 'bread' < Goth. *hlaiba-*; Russ. *kupit* 'to sell' < Goth. \**kaupjan* (= OE. *cēpan*); MnBulg. *kusit* 'to taste' < Goth. *kausjan*; Russ. *lechit* 'to doctor' cf. Goth. *lekeis*; Russ. *lest* 'flattery, cajolery' < Goth. *lists*; Russ. *osel* 'donkey' < Goth. *asilus*; Russ. *polk* 'regiment' < Goth. \**fulka-*; Russ. *steklo* 'glass' < Goth. *stikls*.

In his next section Kiparsky elaborates an idea that should prove of great interest to Germanic philologists since in effect it reveals to them a lost Germanic dialect. His thesis is this: if we find Germanic loan-words which are confined to the South Slavonic languages (or merely borrowed from Church Slav. into Russian or West Slavonic) we must assume a special South Slavonic-Germanic contact. The type of Germanic involved we may call 'Balkan-Germanic'; in some ways it may have been similar to Crimean Gothic. Two examples will serve:—(a) Church Slavonic *skutz* 'extrema vestis, fimbria, amictus' (Russ. *skut* 'hem' < Ch.Slav.) Serb.-Cr. *skût* 'hem; ora, limbus' Mn.Bulg. *skut* 'hem, apron' < Balk.-Gmc. \**skaut-* (cf. Goth. *skaut*). (b) OBulg. *smokzve* (gen.sg.) 'figus' (Russ. *smokva* 'fig(tree), jam' < Ch.Slav.) Serb.-Cr. *smokva* Mn.Bulg. *smokva* Slov. *smokāv* 'fig(tree)' < Balk.-Gmc. \**smakka* (cf. Goth. *smakka*).

In his fourth section words which were borrowed from a particular Germanic language into a particular Slavonic language and spread thence to other Slavonic languages are

discussed. Contact between the Slavs and the West began after about 600 AD. but the continuity of the Slavonic world was not broken until much later (e.g. by the arrival of the Hungarians). Examples from this section are: Russ. *izba* 'communal room, hut' < OHG. *stuba*; OBulg. *myto* 'merces, lucrum' < OHG. *mîta*; Russ. *vitjaz'* 'hero' < ON. *vikingr* (or OFris. *wîzing*?).

In conclusion several cases where it is impossible to decide the relative position of the Germanic and Slavonic words are discussed (e.g. Russ. *kot* 'cat': MnE. *cat*: Lat. *cattus*). Appended to the book is a summary of the phonology and morphology of the Germanic loan-words.

Naturally in a book of this length there must always be a few points on which the reviewer has a different opinion from the author. But, taking the book as a whole, one must admire the excellence of Dr. Kiparsky's painstaking work—in particular in the very difficult task of sorting out his four types of borrowing.

A.S.C.R.

---

THESES ADDED TO LEEDS UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY.

The Morphology and Syntax of the "Vespasian Psalter,"  
by Ruby Roberts, Ph.D. 1934.

An Index Verborum to the "Lindisfarne Gospels," by D. E.  
Chadwick, M.A. 1934.

An edition of the Ireland and Edinburgh texts of "Sir  
Amadace," by Marjorie N. Smith, M.A. 1934.

An edition<sup>1</sup> of the Middle English romance of "Athelston"  
(with an appendix in which are examined A. McI. Trounce's  
views on the provenance of the tail-rhyme romances),  
by George Taylor, M.A. 1934. (see pp. 20-29).

<sup>1</sup> The edition, begun in 1926, was practically complete when Mr. Trounce's appeared in the autumn of 1933. (*Edd.*).