

FROM PROTO-SLAVIC INTO GERMANIC OR FROM GERMANIC INTO PROTO-SLAVIC? A REVIEW OF CONTROVERSIAL LOANWORDS

MARTA NOIŃSKA

Uniwersytet Gdański
Wydział Filologiczny
Instytut Rusycystyki i Studiów Wschodnich
Katedra Pragmatyki Komunikacji i Akwizycji Języka
Neofilologia, ul. Wita Stwosza 51, 80-308 Gdańsk, Polska
e-mail: marta.noinska@ug.edu.pl

MIKOŁAJ RYCHŁO

Uniwersytet Gdański
Wydział Filologiczny
Instytut Anglistyki i Amerykanistyki
Katedra Językoznawstwa
Neofilologia, ul. Wita Stwosza 51, 80-308 Gdańsk, Polska
e-mail: mikolaj.rychlo@ug.edu.pl
(nadesłano: 1.09.2017; zaakceptowano: 3.12.2017)

Abstract

From Proto-Slavic into Germanic or from Germanic into Proto-Slavic? A review of controversial loanwords

Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic have been comprehensively analysed by both Western and Eastern scholars, however the problem of borrowings in the opposite direction received far less attention, especially among Western academics. It is worth noticing that Viktor Martynov (1963) proposed as many as 40 borrowings and penetrations from Proto-Slavic into Proto-Germanic. Among these, there are nine (**bljudo*,

**kupiti, *lěkъ, *lugъ, *lukъ, *plugъ, *rьlkъ, *skotъ, *tynъ*) which are considered certain loanwords in the opposite direction in the newest monograph on the topic by Pronk-Tiethoff (2013). The aim of the present paper is to review and juxtapose linguists' views on the direction and etymology of these borrowings. The authors take into consideration the analyses carried out not only by Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff (2013) and Viktor Martynov (1963), but also by Valentin Kiparsky (1934) and Zbigniew Gołąb (1992). An attempt is made to assess which of the nine words could be borrowings from Proto-Slavic in Germanic.

Key words

Proto-Slavic, Germanic, loanword, direction of borrowing.

Резюме

Из праславянского в германский или наоборот: обзор спорных заимствований

Германские заимствования в праславянском языке были всесторонне проанализированы как западными, так и восточными учеными, однако проблема заимствований в обратном направлении получила гораздо меньше внимания, особенно среди западных ученых. Стоит отметить, что Виктор Мартынов (1963) предложил 40 заимствований и проникновений из праславянского языка в прагерманский. Среди них девять, которые считаются заимствованиями в противоположном направлении в новейшей монографии по теме авторства Саскии Пронк-Титхофф (2013). Все они включены в составленный ей список вероятных германских заимствований в праславянском языке. Цель настоящей статьи – обзор и сопоставление взглядов лингвистов на этимологию этих слов (**bljudo, *kupiti, *lěkъ, *lugъ, *lukъ, *plugъ, *rьlkъ, *skotъ, *tynъ*). Авторы учитывают анализы, проведенные не только Саскией Пронк-Титхофф и Виктором Мартыновым, но и Валентином Кипарским (1934) и Збигневом Голомбом (1992). Делается попытка определить, какие из девяти слов на самом деле можно с уверенностью считать заимствованиями из германских языков в праславянский, а также какие слова могли быть заимствованы в противоположном направлении.

Ключевые слова

Праславянский, германский, заимствование, направление заимствования.

Introduction

Occurring whenever two languages come in contact, numerous lexical borrowings can be traced in languages of neighbouring nations, such as Slavic and Germanic. The

question remains when the first encounters of Slavic and Germanic peoples and the first borrowings took place.

Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff believes Slavic and Germanic peoples not to have interacted with each other at least until the beginning of the first millennium AD, a view expressed earlier by Valentin Kiparsky¹. By contrast, Viktor Martynov dates the first contacts already around 500 BC². Zbigniew Gołąb is of the opinion that Slavic-Germanic relations per se commenced about 300 BC³, however, he does not exclude earlier contacts between the Slavic and Germanic tribes. He points out that North-European lexical dialectisms can serve as linguistic evidence in favour of their early contacts. In Gołąb's view, "Most of these lexical dialectisms undoubtedly come from a time when the linguistic ancestors of the Slavs, Balts and Teutons dwelt close to each other, as a group of neighbouring tribes somewhere in Eastern Europe, probably in the third millennium BC⁴".

One of the major issues connected with the possible borrowings from Proto-Slavic into Germanic is the cultural level at the time of contact. Numerous scholars presume that due to the influence of the Roman Empire on Germanic peoples, they surpassed the Slavs in technological development⁵. Martynov, who dates the contacts much earlier, considers previous research biased in assuming cultural hegemony of the Germanic tribes⁶.

Gołąb postulates that "the cultural levels of the respective peoples or tribes before their encounter with the classical Graeco-Roman (Mediterranean) culture were roughly the same, which seems to have been conditioned both by their geographical location in the northern, central and eastern part of Europe and by their common IE heritage"⁷.

The discrepancies in linguists' views are related to the issue of Slavic ethnogenesis (discussed in Noińska 2016)⁸. Despite long-going discussions in various disciplines⁹,

¹ V. Kiparsky. *Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen*. Helsinki: Druckerei der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1934; S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. Amsterdam – New York: Editions Rodopi, 2013, pp. 72–73.

² В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое взаимодействие древнейшей поры*. Минск: Издательство Академии наук БССР, 1963.

³ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 391; Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu...*, p. 343.

⁴ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 126; Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu Słowian w świetle faktów językowych*. Kraków: Universitas, 2004, p. 117; cf. also J. P. Mallory. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans*. Thames and Hudson, 1989, pp. 107–109.

⁵ Compare: S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 24–25. G. Holzer. *Review of Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff's Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. „Slavia Centralis” 2014, No 1, p. 104.

⁶ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*

⁷ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 355.

⁸ M. Noińska. *Genetyka populacyjna a problem etnogenezy Słowian*. „Studia Rossica Gedanensia” 2016, vol. 3.

The article reviews various (autochthonous and allochthonous) theories concerning the origins of the Slavs and describes the recent discoveries in population genetics, which may shed some light on the problem of the Slavic origins.

⁹ e.g. archeologists: Józef Kostrzewski, Tadeusz Makiewicz, Tadeusz Malinowski, Kazimierz Go-

researchers have not reached consensus about the location of the Slavic homeland¹⁰. It seems that the analysis of possible Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic languages could help to answer some questions about the early contacts of Slavic and Germanic peoples.

The topic of Germanic borrowings in Proto-Slavic has enjoyed considerable interest among both Western and Eastern scholars, with a few comprehensive monographs devoted to the topic. Miklošič's *Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen*¹¹, which was published 150 years ago, contains all 9 words discussed in the present paper. Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff's monograph *The Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic* is the latest comprehensive work on the topic. Not only does it provide a thorough review of the words belonging to the oldest layer of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, but it also describes the way the borrowings were adapted to the Proto-Slavic accentual system¹². The dissertation contains a corpus of 78 words that can be regarded as Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Many of them have relatively well-established Indo-European etymology – for an overview see Noińska and Rychło¹³. Among the 78, there are some with less secure etymologies, 9 of which were considered borrowing in the opposite direction in Viktor Martynov's monograph of 1963, *Славяно-германское лексическое взаимодействие древнейшей поры*¹⁴.

Borrowings from Proto-Slavic into the Germanic languages have been discussed far less comprehensively than Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Martynov's book was the first detailed study of possible Proto-Slavic borrowings in Proto-Germanic. Martynov picked cases where the Germanic donors have problematic or unclear etymologies and each time assumed Proto-Slavic to be a possible source of borrowing¹⁵. Focusing only on prehistoric contacts between Germanic tribes and the Proto-Slavs, Martynov's work contains only words supposedly borrowed from or into Proto-Germanic and not from later Germanic languages. Martynov divided the 40 loan-

dłowski, Michał Parczewski, Piotr Kaczanowski; linguists: Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński, Jürgen Udolph, Valentin Kiparsky, Zbigniew Gołąb, Witold Mańczak, anthropologists: Janusz Piątek, Anna Juras.

¹⁰ For a detailed discussion, see: K. Borowiec. *Kanon wiedzy na temat tzw. etnogenezy Słowian. Czas przełomu*. „Kwartalnik Językoznawczy” 2012, No 1; K. Godłowski. *Pierwotne siedziby Słowian*. Kraków: IA UJ, 2000. A. Juras. *Etnogeneza Słowian w świetle badań kopalnego DNA*. Praca doktorska przygotowana pod kierunkiem prof. dra hab. Janusza Piontka w Zakładzie Biologii Ewolucyjnej Człowieka Instytutu Antropologii na Uniwersytecie im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Poznań, 2012; J. Piątek, B. Iwanek, Segda S. *Antropologia o pochodzeniu Słowian*. Monografie Instytutu Antropologii UAM. Poznań: Instytut Antropologii UAM, 2008; W. Mańczak (Ed.). *Praojczyzna Słowian. Zbiór wypowiedzi*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2001, p. 32; M. Noińska. *Genetyka populacyjna...*

¹¹ F. Miklošič. *Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen*. [In:] *Denkschriften (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse)*. Vol. 5. Wien: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1867, pp. 73–140.

¹² S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*

¹³ M. Noińska, M. Rychło. *The Indo-European heritage of the relatively secure Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. (in press)

¹⁴ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*,

¹⁵ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, pp. 36–41.

words into three groups¹⁶ according to the level of reliability and additionally he distinguished between *zaimstvovanija* ‘borrowings’ and *proniknovenija* ‘penetrations’¹⁷. Martynov distinguished:

- 13 penetrations and 2 loanwords with minimal relative reliability (marked ‘*min*’), when the word is proved to be indigenous in the donor language and fails to do so in the recipient language; there is no need for additional arguments to qualify the word into this group;
- 11 penetrations with maximal relative reliability (marked ‘*max*’), when the source of borrowing is proved to be an innovation in the donor language created by means of word-formation processes, native to the donor language;
- 11 penetrations and 3 loanwords with medium relative reliability (marked ‘*med*’)¹⁸ for cases which fulfil the criteria for minimal reliability and there are additional arguments in favour of the source of borrowing.¹⁸

As already mentioned, out of 40 Proto-Slavic loanwords in Proto-Germanic proposed by Martynov, 9 are considered certain Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic in the newest monograph on the topic by Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff (2013). The aim of the present paper is to review arguments given by Pronk-Tiethoff and Martynov and assess whether any of the nine loanwords could have been borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic. The authors take into consideration the analyses carried out by other scholars, especially Valentin Kiparsky (1934) and Zbigniew Gołąb (1992).

Proto-Slavic borrowings in (Proto-)Germanic or the reverse – review

Martynov believes Proto-Slavic **bljudo*, **kupiti*, **lěkъ*, **lugъ*, **lukъ*, **plugъ*, **pъlkъ*, **skotъ*, **tynъ* to be possible borrowings from Proto-Slavic into Proto-Germanic. The table below shows the degree of reliability assigned to each loanword by Martynov and the origin of the discussed words according to Pronk-Tiethoff, Gołąb and Kiparsky.

Word	Origin of the word according to various linguists			
	Martynov	Pronk-Tiethoff	Gołąb	Kiparsky
<i>*bljudo</i>	PSlav. (min)	Goth.	Goth.	Goth.
<i>*kupiti</i>	PSlav. (med)	Goth.	Goth.	Goth.
<i>*lěkъ</i>	PSlav. (min)	Goth.	possibly Slav.	Goth
<i>*lugъ</i>	PSlav. (med)	WGmc.	-	WGmc.
<i>*lukъ</i>	PSlav. (med)	WGmc.	possibly Slav.	WGmc.
<i>*plugъ</i>	PSlav. (med)	WGmc.	Possibly PGmc.	WGmc.

¹⁶ Martynov uses terms *минимальная/ средняя/ максимальная относительная надежность*, which Gołąb translates as minimal / medium / maximal degree of probability. Reliability seems to reflect the meaning of the Russian word *надежность* better and therefore is used in the present article.

¹⁷ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p. 23.

¹⁸ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p. 42.

* <i>pьlkъ</i>	PSlav. (min)	INDET GERMANIC	Goth.	Goth.
* <i>skotъ</i>	PSlav. (med)	INDET GERMANIC	Possibly Slav.	PGmc.
* <i>tynъ</i>	PSlav. (max)	WGmc.	PGmc.	PGmc.

In the table below, translation and related Germanic forms of the discussed loanwords are presented. Considering that the Slavs could have borrowed words from Proto-Germanic, Gothic, Balkan Gothic¹⁹ and the West Germanic dialects, the most important information for the analysis comes from the attested Gothic, Old High German, Old Saxon and Old English forms.

PSlav.	Translation	Germanic forms
* <i>bljudo</i>	plate, dish	PGmc. * <i>beuda-</i> ‘table, plate’; Goth. <i>biuþs</i> ; OHG <i>biet</i> ; OS <i>biod</i> ; OE <i>bēod</i>
* <i>kupiti</i>	to buy	PGmc. * <i>kaupjan-</i> / * <i>kaupōn-</i> ‘to buy’; Goth. - / <i>kaupon</i> ; OHG <i>koufen</i> / <i>koufōn</i> ; OS <i>kōpian</i> / <i>kōpon</i> ; OE <i>cēapian</i> / <i>cýpan</i> , <i>cīpan</i> ; (E <i>to cheap</i> obs.) Lat. <i>caupō</i> ‘innkeeper, small tradesman’ Lat. <i>caupōnāri</i> ‘to haggle’
* <i>lěkъ</i>	medicine	PGmc. * <i>lěkja-</i> ‘doctor’; Goth. <i>lekeis</i> ; OGH <i>lāhhi</i> ; OE <i>lāce</i> , <i>lāca</i> (E <i>leech</i> (arch.) ‘doctor; bloodsucker’)
* <i>lěčiti</i>	cure	PGmc. * <i>lěkinōn-</i> ‘to cure’; Goth. <i>lekinon</i> ; OHG <i>lāhhenōn</i> ; OS <i>lāknon</i> ; OE <i>lācnian</i> (E <i>lechne</i> , obs.)
* <i>lugъ</i>	lye, caustic soda	NWGmc. * <i>laugō-</i> ; OHG <i>louga</i> ; OE <i>lēah</i> (E <i>lye</i>)
* <i>lukъ</i>	chive, onion	NWGmc. * <i>lauka</i> ; OHG <i>louh</i> ; OS <i>-lōk</i> ; OE <i>lēac</i> (E <i>leek</i>)
* <i>plugъ</i>	plough	NWGmc. * <i>plōga-</i> ‘plough’; OHG <i>phluog</i> ; OE <i>plōg</i> (E <i>plough</i> , <i>plow</i>)
* <i>pьlkъ</i>	regiment, crowd	PGmc. * <i>fulka-</i> ‘people’; OHG <i>folk</i> ; OS <i>folk</i> ; OE <i>folc</i> ‘crowd, people’ (E <i>folk</i>)
* <i>skotъ</i>	cattle	PGmc. * <i>skatta-</i> ‘money, property’; Goth. <i>skatts</i> ‘coin, money’; OHG <i>scaz</i> ; OS <i>skatt</i> ‘coin, property, cattle’; OE <i>sceat</i> ‘property, treasure, tax, bribe, unit of money’ (E <i>skat</i> , obs.)
* <i>tynъ</i>	fence	NWGmc. * <i>tūna-</i> ; OHG <i>zūn</i> ; OE <i>tūn</i> (E <i>town</i>)

It is clear at first glance that certain words are well-established Germanic borrowings in Proto-Slavic. We are going to begin the review with almost certain borrowings from Germanic into Proto-Slavic **kupiti* and **pьlkъ*. Then, we will discuss loanwords with plausible etymologies in Germanic **bljudo*, **tynъ*, **lugъ* and **plugъ*. Finally, we are going to present loanwords likely to have been borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic **lěkъ*, **lukъ* and **skotъ*.

¹⁹ Pronk-Tiethoff might be right in dismissing the Balkan Gothic layer of loanwords in Proto-Slavic (compare: Holzer 2014). However, in view of the fact that Gołąb and Kiparsky include such a layer, its existence should be taken into consideration.

PSlav. **kupiti* 'buy'

PGmc. **kaupjan* 'buy'

Unattested Goth. **kaupjan* is probably the source of Slav. *kupiti*. The phonological shape of the words strongly suggests borrowing (the same stops, as opposed to the opposition *k:h*, *p:f* expected in cognates; the Germanic diphthong **au* could develop in Slavic into *u*, whereas the presence of *j* in the Gothic verb could explain the front vowel *i* in Slavic). Goth. **kaupjan* is usually derived from the noun **kaupo* 'trader' borrowed from Lat. *caupō* 'innkeeper, tradesman', which is probably a borrowing from Greek itself. The etymology of the Greek and Latin words is unclear and this is where Martynov spots a chance to advocate the Slavic origin²⁰. He doubts the Latin origin of the Germanic word and prefers to derive it from Slav. **kupovati*²¹. He tries to prove his point with a long discussion of semantic microstructures, which, however, does not explain the relationship of the Germanic and Latin word and is not very convincing. Moreover, the borrowing from Germanic is accepted as certain by Kiparsky, Gołąb and Pronk-Tiethoff²². All in all, the Slavic origin of the word is highly unlikely. If the Roman empire had had closer relations with Slavs, the word could have been borrowed directly from Latin.

PSlav. **pǫlkǫ* 'regiment; crowd'

PGmc. **fulka-* 'people'

Martynov sees the difficulty in explaining the presence of *f* in Germanic²³. It can be accounted for by substitution of Germanic *f* by a plosive in Slavic, however. The Germanic fricative **f* cannot have been taken over as such into Proto-Slavic because it was absent from its sound inventory and it was replaced by a corresponding stop²⁴. There are more instances of such a process:

PSlav. **pila* and PGmc. **finh(a)lō*; OHG *fīla*; OS *fīla*

PSlav. **postǫ* and PGmc. **fast-*; Goth. *fastubni*; OHG *fasta*, *fasto*; OS *fasta*

PSlav. **pergynja* and PGmc. **fergunjō-*; Goth. *fairguni*;

PSlav. **petǫlja* and NWGmc. **fatila*; OHG *fezzil*; OE *fetel*²⁵

For the above-mentioned reasons, **pǫlkǫ* can be regarded as a borrowing from Germanic in Proto-Slavic.

Slav. **bljudo* 'plate, dish'

PGmc. **beuda-* 'table, plate'

As Martynov points out, the word is almost unanimously considered a loanword from Germanic, the only controversial point being the exact donor and time of bor-

²⁰ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p.161.

²¹ Ibidem, p. 164.

²² compare: Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu...*, p. 326; S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 112–113.

²³ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p. 224.

²⁴ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 121–122 and 229.

²⁵ Ibidem, p. 229.

rowing²⁶. He tries to prove the opposite direction of borrowing analysing semantic microstructures, which seems insufficient even to himself²⁷. It seems purposeful to have a closer look at the possible Germanic donor, though. The Germanic form probably derives from the verb **beudan-* ‘to offer’, inherited from PIE **b^heud^h-* ‘to be aware’²⁸. Gołąb considers the word to have been borrowed from Gothic between the 2nd and the 4th centuries AD²⁹. Georg Holzer considers Slavic **bljudo* a pre-Gothic borrowing and uses it as a proof for a layer of Proto-Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic:

Slav. **bljudo* ‘plate, table’ (vorursl. **bew̥da* > urslav. **bjaw̥da*) kann nicht aus dem Gotischen stammen, wie Pronk-Tiethoff behauptet (PT 77–78, 222,234), denn got. *biuþs* Sg. *biudis* ‘table’ würde Slav. ***bljъdo* ergeben und nicht **bljudo*. Es muss vielmehr ein vorgotisches **beuda-* entlehnt worden sein, wie es gewöhnlich als urgermanische Lautung des Wortes rekonstruiert wird³⁰.

It may not be clear to all why Goth. *biuþs* ‘table’ would have to result in Slavic ***bljъdo* and not **bljudo*. After all, PS1 **b* developed from earlier **i*, whereas it was earlier **u* that developed into PS1 **b*. The answer is to be sought in the first delabialization of rounded vowels, a sound change that George Shevelov places “not earlier than the sixth century” and “in the seventh-eighth centuries, the first delabialization of *ǔ* was completed”³¹. The word **bljudo* complied with the conditioning environment of the sound change, as the first delabialization of rounded vowels occurred after all palatal(ized) consonants³².

Holzer’s arguments seem convincing, therefore the word can be assumed to have been borrowed from Proto-Germanic.

Slav. **tynъ* ‘fence’
PGmc. **tūn-* ‘fence’

PGmc. **tūn-* is usually considered a borrowing from the Celtic languages (OIr *dún* ‘fort, rampart’; OW *din* ‘castle’). For instance, J.P. Mallory and D.Q Adams believe that

dhūnos (**dhuh₁nos?*) ‘fort’ /... / OIr *dūn* ‘fort’, Welsh *din* ~ *dinas* ‘fort’ (< **‘hill’*), OE *dūn* ‘down, moor, height, hill, mountain’ (> NE *down(s)*), MDutch *dūne* ‘sandy hill’ (borrowed > NE *dune*). Germanic borrowed Celtic **dhūno-* before the phonological changes wrought by Grimm’s Law and thus it appeared in Proto-Gmc as **tūna-* and is attested in OE *tūn* ‘enclosed place, home-

²⁶ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p. 192.

²⁷ Compare: В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, pp. 192–195.

²⁸ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 78.

²⁹ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 2004: 325

³⁰ G. Holzer. *Review of...*, p. 104. “Slav. **bljudo* ‘plate, table’ (PSlav. **bew̥da* > Slav. **bjaw̥da*) cannot stem from Gothic, as Pronk-Tiethoff claims (PT 77-78, 222,234), because Goth. *biuþs*, Sg. *biudis* ‘table’ would result in Slav. ***bljъdo* and not **bljudo*. It is much more probable to have been borrowed from **beuda-*, which is a usual phonological shape of the Proto-Germanic reconstruction of the word” (G. Holzer. *Review of...*, p. 104).

³¹ G.Y. Shevelov. *A Prehistory of Slavic: the Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Carl Winter, 1964, pp. 267, 633.

³² G.Y. Shevelov. *A Prehistory of Slavic...*, p. 264.

stead, village' (>NE *town*), OHG *zun* 'fence, hedge'. A northwesternism confined to Celtic and Germanic.³³

However, Martynov considers the word to have been borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic and assigns to it maximum degree of reliability. Martynov finds borrowing from Celtic improbable on semantic grounds. Indeed, the semantics of the Slavic **tynǔ* 'fence' seems much closer to the meaning of the Germanic word. This argument is a double-edged sword, however, since a close semantic relationship can be used as a supporting argument for borrowing in the opposite direction. Martynov considers **tynǔ* to be a native Slavic word derived from **tyti* 'become fat, grow densely'. He sees the semantic relationship in the fact that a line of thick bushes forms a hedge, which is a kind of fence. Although it seems far-fetched, it could be a possible etymology if we assumed that the Germanic word was neither borrowed from Celtic, nor inherited from PIE.

However, as Pronk-Tiethoff points out (after Matasović 2009³⁴), the Celtic and Germanic words could be cognates derived from PIE **d^huHno-* 'enclosure'³⁵. This refutes Martynov's argumentation about the lack of convincing etymology for PGmc. **tūn-*. Even if we accept the inherited etymology of **tynǔ* (from **tyti* 'become fat'), we will be left with strikingly similar Celtic forms (OIr *dún* 'fort, rampart'; OW *din* 'castle'), which we will have to consider unrelated in view of the fact that Proto-Slavic **t* cannot be cognate with Celtic **d*.

Additionally, Gołąb and Kiparsky consider **tynǔ* a certain borrowing from PGmc, which makes this direction of borrowing more likely.

It is worth noticing that there are many derivatives of *tyn* with the meaning 'fence' in Polish dialects such as *tyna*, *tynica*, *tynina*, *tynianka*, *tynka*.

PSlav. **lugǔ*, **luga* 'lye, caustic soda'

PGmc. **laugō* 'bath, lye'

Martynov does not believe **laugō* to derive from the PIE word for 'to wash, bathe'³⁶ (as it is usually assumed), because, in his opinion, it does not account for the presence of *g* in Germanic or Slavic³⁷. In view of the fact that this etymology actually seems convincing and is widely accepted, borrowing from Germanic into Slavic is far more probable. Semantics as well as the sounds correspond well (the words contain the same stops; the Germanic diphthong *au* corresponds to PSlav. **u* and reflects an earlier monophthongization in PSlav.). The word is attested only in West and North Germanic, therefore it probably entered Slavic through one of the West Germanic dialects³⁸.

³³ J.P. Mallory and D.Q. Adams. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. USA and UK, 1997, p. 210.

³⁴ R. Matasović. *Etymological dictionary of proto-Celtic*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.

³⁵ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 96.

³⁶ The root, according to modern conventions, is reconstructed as PIE **leuh₃/*louh₃* - cf. De Vaan (2008: 330–331), or, according to Pokorny (1959: 692) as PIE **lou-*, **louǝ-* 'waschen', **louǝ-tro-* 'Waschbecken'.

³⁷ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p. 166.

³⁸ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 117.

PSlav. **plugъ* ‘plough’
 NWGmc. **plōga-* ‘plough’

The Germanic etymology is not clear: it can be connected with **plegan-* ‘do one’s best’, or regarded as a possible loanword from Gaulish³⁹. According to Martynov, an alternative etymology could be a borrowing from Slavic, if one accepts that it is possible to derive *plugъ* < **plužiti* ‘to drag on soil’⁴⁰. Pronk-Tiethoff uses the argument that Germanic borrowing seems to be more likely, as many names of technical developments were borrowed from Germanic into Slavic. Moreover, phonological and semantic features of the word suggest the Germanic origin⁴¹. Gołąb places the word on his list of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic borrowed before the second century AD either from Proto-East-Germanic or from early Gothic, but he also suggests that the word could have been borrowed into Slavic without the Germanic intermediary from a PIE dialect, which however, does not provide etymology for the Germanic word⁴².

PSlav. **lukъ* ‘chive, onion’
 NWGmc. **lauka* ‘Allium. onion’

The origin of the Germanic word is unclear, therefore Martynov postulates the possibility of borrowing from Slavic into Germanic, with **lukъ* derived from PIE **leuk* ‘light’⁴³. Pronk-Tiethoff includes **lukъ* in her main corpus of certain Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic, but there are serious doubts as to whether the word is the loanword or the donor⁴⁴. The discussion of the argumentation goes beyond the scope of the present paper, and deserves a separate study⁴⁵.

PSlav. **skotъ* ‘cattle, livestock’
 PGmc. **skatta-* ‘money, property’

In view of the fact that the word in Germanic seems to be an isolated formation⁴⁶, whose origin is unknown and that it is possible to put a convincing case in favour of its Slavic origin, **skatta-* is one of a few cases where borrowing from Slavic is plausible. This is not only Martynov’s opinion but also Gołąb’s⁴⁷.

Apart from Martynov’s controversial etymology⁴⁸, there are at least two other conceivable proposals. First, according to Rudnicki, **skotъ* can be considered a derivative of the verb **skočiti* ‘jump’ and its primary form and meaning in Proto-Slavic would

³⁹ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 93.

⁴⁰ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, p.177.

⁴¹ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 87–88.

⁴² Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu...*, pp. 322–323.

⁴³ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, pp. 168–169.

⁴⁴ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 87–88)

⁴⁵ M. Rychło and M. Noińska (in preparation). *Proto-Slavic *lukъ ‘chive, onion’: the donor or the loanword?*

⁴⁶ Pronk-Tiethoff’s (2013: 144) final verdict that the origin of PSlav. **skotъ* is Germanic is supported by Kroonen’s etymology (2013: 441) which relates PGmc **skatta-* to the Westphalian German strong verb *schâen* ‘to yield’.

⁴⁷ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 144; Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu...*, pp. 323–324.

⁴⁸ В.В. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, pp. 183–187.

be **skok-to-* ‘calf, calves (collective),’ i.e., ‘jumping (young animal[s])’⁴⁹. Second, according to Stankiewicz, it is possible to derive PSlav. **skotǔ* from PSlav. **skopiti* ‘to castrate’⁵⁰. Both etymologies would refer to nominalizations with a common suffix **-tǔ* found in a large number of abstract and concrete nouns including nomina instrumenti. Parallel examples include: **potǔ* ‘sweat’ (OCS *potǔ*, Russian *pot*, Pol. *pot*) derived from **pekti* ‘bake’ (OCS *pešti*, Russian *pieč*, Pol. *piec*) and **plotǔ* ‘fence’ (OCS *plotǔ*, Old Russian *plotǔ*, Pol. *płot*) derived from **plesti* ‘plait’ (Russian *plestí*, Pol. *pleść*).

The intermediate form with *pt*, i.e. **skopt* could be used to explain the presence of the geminate in the Germanic languages⁵¹. Semantically, cattle and money are related because livestock was often used as a means of payment. Even though the borrowing from Slavic can be phonologically and semantically well explained, Pronk-Tiethoff doubts it because of the word’s wide attestation, including North and West Germanic⁵². If one assumes that the word was borrowed into Proto-Germanic, however, this problem seems to be solved. Pronk-Tiethoff advocates an unspecified Germanic word as the donor, but the borrowing from Slavic seems a more attractive explanation.

PSlav. **lěkǔ* ‘medicine’; **lěčiti* ‘to cure’

PGmc. **lēkja-* ‘doctor’; PGmc. **lēkinōn-* ‘to cure’

Martynov again notices a case where the etymology of the Germanic word is unclear (it could stem from Celtic, but it is uncertain). He finds proving the case of borrowing from Slavic problematic, however⁵³. Gołąb and Matasowić doubt the Germanic origin of the word and derive it from PIE **leik^w* ‘to leave’. Pronk-Tiethoff finds such a semantic shift unlikely⁵⁴. Gołąb even believes **lěkǔ* to be the source of Germanic PGmc. **lēkinōn-* and PGmc. **lēkja-*, which he thinks would fit better phonetically. The explanation offered by Gołąb is that **lěkǔ* could be “an inherited word from PIE **loikó-*, *nomen agentis* from PIE **leik-* ‘leave’⁵⁵ (see Pokorny⁵⁶, s.v. **leik^u-* ‘lassen, zurück-, übriglassen’ and especially the continuations of the PIE adj. **loik^uo-s* ‘übrig’...)” and its “concrete meaning would be ‘decoction remaining in the vessel from brewing medicinal herbs.’” This etymology, if not certain, is yet possible, which makes **lěkǔ* the third plausible borrowing from Proto-Slavic to Germanic.

⁴⁹ M. Rudnicki. *Prasłowiańszczyzna – Lechia – Polska*. Vol. 2, 1961, p. 79 (cf. also Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 126; Z. Gołąb. *O pochodzeniu...*, p. 323–324).

⁵⁰ E. Stankiewicz. *The Slavic languages: unity in diversity*. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter, 1986, pp. 443–446.

⁵¹ Ibidem.

⁵² S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 146.

⁵³ For details B.B. Мартынов. *Славяно-германское лексическое...*, pp. 210–217.

⁵⁴ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, pp. 115–116.

⁵⁵ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 372.

⁵⁶ J. Pokorny. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern–München: Francke Verlag, 1959, p. 669.

Conclusion

The review of etymologies offered by various linguists has shown that **lĕkǔ*, **lukǔ* and **skotǔ* are likely to have been borrowed from Proto-Slavic into Germanic and not the other way round. The remaining words have convincing Germanic etymologies and can be considered as certain Germanic borrowings in Proto-Slavic.

Apart from the two scenarios considered in the present paper, it cannot be excluded that there are other possibilities, such as: common origin (e.g. **bljudo*, **beuda-* and **lugǔ*, **laugō*), or borrowing from a different source (e.g. **kupiti* from Latin *caupō*), though these are less likely.

Despite some inaccuracies, Martynov's work inspired other scholars to consider the possibility of Proto-Slavic borrowings in (Proto-)Germanic. Both most comprehensive works concerning early Slavic-Germanic contacts written after Martynov's publication (i.e. Gołąb 1992 and Pronk-Tiethoff 2013) contain sections on Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic. There is no consensus among linguists as to the exact number of borrowings from Germanic in Proto-Slavic or the reverse. Even a brief analysis shows great discrepancies in views of various scholars. The number of borrowings from Proto-Slavic into Germanic and the reverse is also highly controversial. Gołąb speaks of 13 and 45 loanwords, whereas Pronk-Tiethoff mentions 8 and 76 respectively. The low number of loanwords from Proto-Slavic into Germanic advocated by Pronk-Tiethoff results from the fact that she dismisses the possibility of interaction between speakers of Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic. Out of 8 probable Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic listed by Pronk-Tiethoff, none overlaps with the borrowings quoted by Martynov, the reason being dating the time of the first contact by eight centuries later and locating the Slavic homeland further to the east. According to Pronk-Tiethoff, "if it is possible to prove or put a convincing case for Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic, these must be words that were either borrowed into Gothic or into West Germanic"⁵⁷.

Gołąb believes there are 13 plausible Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic. Insignificant as this number may seem, Gołąb considers it a solid evidence that the contacts between the Proto-Slavs and Germanic tribes were not as one-sided as it is sometimes assumed⁵⁸. Out of the 8 probable Proto-Slavic loanwords in Germanic listed by Pronk-Tiethoff only 1 is mentioned by Gołąb. The words could be assigned to various periods of borrowing, making the corpus of possible Proto-Slavic loanwords in the Germanic languages significantly larger.

It seems that Germanic did not remain untouched by Slavic lexical influence. However, in view of the fact that there has been little research into Proto-Slavic borrowings in Germanic, there is definitely a need for further investigation of the topic.

Bibliography

Borowiec K. *Kanon wiedzy na temat tzw. etnogenezy Słowian. Czas przełomu*. „Kwartalnik Językoznawczy” 2012, No 1.

⁵⁷ S. Pronk-Tiethoff. *The Germanic Loanwords...*, p. 70.

⁵⁸ Z. Gołąb. *The Origins...*, p. 342.

- Godłowski K. *Pierwotne siedziby Słowian*. Kraków: IA UJ, 2000.
- Gołąb Z. *O pochodzeniu Słowian w świetle faktów językowych*. Kraków: Universitas, 2004.
- Gołąb Z. *The Origins of the Slavs. A Linguist's view*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1992.
- Holzer G. *Review of Saskia Pronk-Tiethoff's Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. „Slavia Cestralis” 2014, No 1.
- Juras A. *Etnogeneza Słowian w świetle badań kopalnego DNA*. Praca doktorska przygotowana pod kierunkiem prof. dra hab. Janusza Piontka w Zakładzie Biologii Ewolucyjnej Człowieka Instytutu Antropologii na Uniwersytecie im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Poznań, 2012.
- Kiparsky V. *Die gemeinславischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen*. Helsinki: Druckerei der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft, 1934.
- Kroonen G. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2013.
- Mallory J.P. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology, and Myth*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- Mallory J.P. and Adams D.Q. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London and Chicago, 1997.
- Mańczak W. (Ed.) *Praojczyzna Słowian. Zbiór wypowiedzi*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2001, p. 32.
- Matasović R. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 9, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Miklošič F. *Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen*. [In:] *Denkschriften (Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse)*. Vol. 5. Wien: Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1867, pp. 73–140.
- Noińska M. *Genetyka populacyjna a problem etnogenezy Słowian*. „Studia Rossica Gedanensia” 2016, vol. 3, pp. 143–156.
- Noińska M., Rychło M. *The Indo-European heritage of the relatively secure Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. (in press)
- Orel V. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Pokorny J. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern–München: Francke Verlag, 1959.
- Piontek J., Iwanek B., Segda S. *Antropologia o pochodzeniu Słowian*. Monografie Instytutu Antropologii UAM. Poznań: Instytut Antropologii UAM, 2008.
- Pronk-Tiethoff S. *The Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. Amsterdam–New York: Editions Rodopi, 2013.
- Rudnicki M. *Prasłowiańszczyzna – Lechia – Polska*. Vol. 2: *Wspólnota słowiańska – Wspólnota lechicka – Polska*. Seria Prace Komisji Filologicznej – Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Vol. 19, No 1. Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961.
- Rychło M. and M. Noińska (in preparation). *Proto-Slavic *lukъ ‘chive, onion’: the donor or the loanword?*
- Shevelov G.Y. *A Prehistory of Slavic: the Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1964.
- Stankiewicz E. *The Slavic Languages: Unity in Diversity*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1986.
- Мартынов В.В. *Славяно-германское лексическое взаимодействие древнейшей поры*. Минск: Издательство Академии наук БССР, 1963.