

Paliga, Sorin

Review of Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského - ESJS

Opera Slavica. 2020, vol. 30, iss. 4, pp. 71-74

ISSN 1211-7676 (print); ISSN 2336-4459 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/OS2020-4-7>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/143023>

License: [CC BY-SA 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

<https://doi.org/10.5817/OS2020-4-7>

Review of *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského—ESJS*

Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského (ESJS—An Etymological Dictionary of Old Church Slavonic), volumes (sešity) 1–19, Praha, Academia 1989–Tribun EU, 2018. 1164 + LXXX pages. ISBN of the first volume (*sešit*) 80-200-0222-7, then each successive volume has a different ISBN. It is estimated that a compact volume will be published later.

After almost 30 years, an ample etymological dictionary of Old Church Slavonic (hereafter OCS) has been completed. As its elaboration and publication covered a generation, it is obvious that the initial group of linguists was gradually replaced by successive groups. Thus, the first editor-in-chief (*hlavní redaktorka*) was Eva Havlová and her group included known linguists like Emilie Bláhová, Zoe Hauptová, Radoslav Večerka and, last but not least, Ilona Janyšková and Helena Karlková who later became the heart of the new series together with the younger linguists Václav Blažek and Vít Boček. The list of the contributors is of course longer. The scan of the first pages of the first volume and of the 19 volume tries to suggest the long list of authors.

As OCS is a reference point in any study referring to Slavic etymology, it is obvious that this work becomes mandatory for all the etymological analyses referring to the Slavic languages. There is, I think, another similar, ambitious etymological dictionary: the etymological dictionary of the Bulgarian language (*Bǎlgarski etimologičen rečnik—BER*). The first volume was published in 1962 and the editors-in-chief were the well known Bulgarian linguists Vl. Georgiev, Iv. Gălăbov, J. Zajmov and St. Ilčev. The last volume in this series is vol. 8 published in 2017, entries from *tésam* to *fjákalka*, edited by the younger generation of Bulgarian linguists: Liljana Dimitrova-Todorova and Ludwig (Ljudvig) Selimski. We are waiting for (probably) the last volume #9, unless the authors are planning other 2 volumes. I have been compelled to compare the two attempts—ESJS and BER—because they seem the most ample, complete etymological dictionaries of a Slavic language, and elaborated by large groups of linguists.

Of course, we cannot ignore the previous etymological dictionaries of a given Slavic language. First of all Czech, for which one may invoke at least 3 reference dictionaries: that of Machek (of course, with several editions), Holub-Lyer (1st ed. 1952, 2nd ed, 1978) and Jiří Rejzek; for Polish the ‘classical’ etymological dictionary of Aleksander Brückner; for Serbian-Croatian the ‘classical’ dictionary of Petar Skok (*Etimologijski*

rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika, 4 volumes, the last being the index) and the newer attempt of Aleksandar Loma (for Serbian), uncompleted; for Slovene—France Bezlaj, whose work was completed by his disciples Marko Snoj and Metka Furlan; for Ukrainian—O. S. Melnyčuk, 6 volumes; Russian—Max Vasmer. And, of course, the first etymological dictionary of a Slavic language: Franz Miklosich, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1886.

In this context, which is just sketched here, the ESJS concludes a series of brilliant attempts towards clarifying the place and role of the Slavic languages in the larger context of the Indo-European languages. There are some obvious features of this dictionary:

- It is ample, complete;
- The Latin alphabet is used, the specific Cyrillic letters used being only ъ and ѣ. I find this a good and practical decision as it avoids the variants of spelling across time (in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic) and also allows linguists, not necessarily specialized in the Slavic languages, to easily follow the analysis and the references to other forms.

One important feature is the frequent reference to Romanian forms. This is extremely useful for the etymological analysis of Romanian, even if the solutions adopted are not always convincing. One such example is on the very first page of the dictionary: entry *abije* ‘ihned, vtom již = immediately, after some time, already’, p. 45 of the first *sešit*. This OCS form cannot be analyzed separately from Romanian *abia* ‘(modal) with difficulty; (temporal) short time ago, immediately (obsolete, unused)’. The current view among the Romanian linguists is that Rom. *abia* reflects the evolution of Latin *ad vix*, as far as I know there is no other hypothesis accepted or adopted among the Romanian linguists. In ESJS this solution is quoted *inter alia*, as an improbable hypothesis, the conclusion being that OCS *abije* is a loan from an unknown source.

On p. 931 (*sešit* #15) my former hypothesis presented in the *Slavistična Revija* 36, 1988 (Slovansko *sъto – izzivalen problem?) is duly quoted among others. The authors do not dare incline for a clearer explanation, even if Machek was quite clear in showing its borrowed character.

On p. 882 the form *stogǫ* ‘haystack’ is presented, together with the criticized hypothesis of Tiktin, Rosetti and Scărlătoiu that Rom. *stog* is a loan from OCS; the authors correctly note that it is borrowed from a modern Slavic language, specifically from Bulgarian, with which Romanian has oldest and closest relations, possibly consolidated by the relation with Serbian *stog*. Indeed, as elsewhere in ESJS, the Romanian forms of Slavic origin are rarely borrowed directly from OCS, but rather from Bulgarian (or ‘Middle Bulgarian’, Romanian *medio-bulgară*). One such example is Rom. *muncă* ‘work’ < OCS *mъka* ‘torture’ (s. v. *mъka* 2 in ESJS, p. 497–498), with the note that the modern meaning must have been influenced by the evolution in the modern Slavic languages. What is interesting with these forms, and not specified in

the dictionary under scrutiny, is that Rom. *muncă* ‘work’ < OCS *mъka* ‘torture’ repeats (renews) the evolution of meaning of Latin *trepalium* ‘instrument of torture’ made up (initially) of 3 stakes (*tres* and *palus*) which resulted in West Romance forms like French *travail*, Portuguese *trabalho* etc. all meaning ‘work’. This form is not preserved in Romanian (but Latin *palus* resulted in Romanian *par*, with the same meaning).

The role of this review is not to insist on missing points and/or errors, but on its great qualities, as noted in the beginning. I—and we all—must congratulate our Czech colleagues, remarkable etymologists who, with much effort and ambition, have succeeded in completing this remarkable achievement. A compact volume of the dictionary, together with its index, would be much welcome. And having an updated, unified ISBN.

An e-version, installable on the main operating systems, would be of course welcome as well. I have in mind the several etymological and explanatory dictionaries I have installed in my iPad for Latin, Greek, English and other languages. Lingea already has such dictionaries in both printed and e-form. This would be a great achievement for the Slavic studies in general. This must be done as soon as possible.

Addendum

The relevant etymological dictionaries of the Slavic languages, some of them quoted above. The list includes some relevant etymological dictionaries of place names relevant to Slavic etymology, even if their scope is larger, e.g. Kiss 1997.

Berneker, Ernst 1908–1913. *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (A–L). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Bezlaj, France 1976–2007. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Vols. 1–5. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti. Vols. III, IV and V (index) were prepared for print by author’s disciples Marko Snoj, Metka Furlan and Simona Klemenčič.

Brückner, Aleksander 1985. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna (1st ed. 1927).

Derksen, Rick 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

Georgiev, Vl., Iv. Gălăbov, J. Zaimov, St. Ilčev et alii 1971–2017, 8 vols. *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik* (BER). Sofia: Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.

Gluhak, Alemko 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.

Holub, Josef – Lyer, Stanislav 1978. *Stručný etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, 2nd ed. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství (1st ed.: 1952).

Hosák, Ladislav – Rudolf Šrámek 1970–1980. *Místní jména na Moravě a ve Slezsku*. I: A–L; II: M–Z.

- Iľčev, Stefan** 1969. *Rečnik na ličnite i familni imena u Bălgarite*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na naukite.
- Ivanovna, Olga** 1996. *Rečnik na toponimite vo oblata po slivot na Bregalnica*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik „Krstе Misirkov“.
- Kiss, Lajos** 1997. *A földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára* (an etymological dictionary of place names). 2 vol.: I – A–K; II – L–Zs. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó (2nd revised and augmented edition of Kiss 1980).
- Loma, Aleksandar** (ed.) 2003–2006 (uncompleted). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue serbe*. Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti. (There are the first two volumes in my references).
- Lutterer, Iv., Kropáček, L., Huňáček, V.** 1976. *Původ zeměpisných jmen*. Praha: Mladá Fronta.
- Machek, Václav** 1971. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia.
- Mel’nyčuk, O. S.** 1982–2012. *Etymohičnyj slovnyk ukrajins’koji movy*. 6 vols, Kiev: Naukova Dumka.
- Miklosich, Franz** 1886. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.
- Mladenov, Stefan** 1941. *Etimologičeski i pravopisen rečnik na bălgarski ezik*. Sofia.
- Pospelov, E. M.** 1988. *Škol’nyj toponimičeskij slovar’*. Moskva: Prosveščeniye.
- Pospelov, E. M.** 2002. *Geografičeskije nazvanija mira. Toponimičeskij slovar’*. Moskva: Russkije slovari, Astrel, AST.
- Rejzek, Jiří** 2001. *Český etymologický slovník*. Praha: Leda.
- Schuster-Šewc, H.** 1985–1988. *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*. Bautzen: Domowina.
- Skok, Petar** 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–IV. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír** 1970. *Handbuch der slavischen Toponomastik*. Praga: Academia.
- Vasmer, Max** 1953–1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Final Note

The analysis above as well as the list of some relevant etymological dictionaries represent an attempt towards the completion of our etymological dictionary of the Romanian language to be hopefully finalized by the end of 2020.

Sorin Paliga



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-SA 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as images or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.