

With All Due Respect, on Slavic Abstracts in *-y*: The History of Proto-Slavic *cěty* ‘respect’ and Some Comparative Notes on its Congeners (*ljuby* ‘love’, *cěly* ‘healing, greeting’)*

Rafał Szeptyński and Marek Majer

Abstract: The scarcely attested Proto-Slavic **cěty* **-vve* ‘respect’ appears to be a mostly overlooked member of the small class of abstracts in **-y* **-vve*; no precise accounts of the noun’s origin have been proposed so far. Two complementary approaches are put forth in the article: 1) inheritance from a PIE animate *s*-stem **keyt-ōs* >> **koyt-ōs* (paralleling a recent analysis of **ljuby* ‘love’ < PIE **lewb^h-ōs* as well as its presumed secondary association with a verb in **-i-ti*) or 2) inner-Slavic origin based on the formally similar **ljuby* ‘love’ and **cěly* ‘healing (subst.)’. The study also offers novel analyses—based on hitherto unexploited philological and lexicographical data—concerning various related issues (e.g., the status of PSl nominal **cět^v*, verbal **cětiti*, and personal names in **Cěto/i-*; the adposition **cětja*; the semantic and pragmatic developments in **cěly* ‘greeting, kiss’; the secondary rise of masculine **cělov^v/**cělyv^v* ‘kiss’) with the purpose of integrating the entirety of the material concerning the root **cět-* and the abstract type in **-y* **-vve* into coherent pictures.*

1. General Background

The class of feminine nouns in nom.sg **-y*, gen.sg **-vve*, commonly referred to as *ū*-stems, constitutes a well-known declensional model in Proto-Slavic. The type is abundantly represented in Old Church Slavic (cf. familiar nouns such as *smoky* *-vve* ‘fig tree’, *crkvy* *-vve* ‘church’, *neplody* *-vve* ‘infertile woman’) and in other older Slavic idioms, while in the modern Slavic languages—as is well known—the characteristic nom.sg in **-y* has typically been lost and the class

* This article has been written under the research project financed by the National Science Centre (Poland) decision number: 2019/33/B/HS2/02965. We are grateful to Zbigniew Babik, Marija Gmitrović, Stefan Höfler, Paweł Janczulewicz, Irina B. Kachinskaya, Ronald I. Kim, Pavel Kosek, Orsat Ligorio, Thomas Olander, Mikhail N. Saenko, Viktor Savić, Paweł Swoboda, Miguel Villanueva Svensson, and Florian Wandl for various sorts of assistance in the writing of this study as well as helpful comments. Two anonymous reviewers also provided most useful corrections and suggestions. All views expressed are our own.

as a whole assimilated to the productive feminine declensions, i.e., \bar{a} -stem (B/C/S *smǫkva -ē, cřkva -ē*)¹ or *i*-stem (Ru *cěrkov' -vi, ljubóv' -ví, B/C/S ljúbav -vi, Pol cerkiew -wi*). The histories of the individual languages often provide a rich documentation of various stages of this process, whose beginnings are visible already in OCS: the nom.sg of the PSI noun **kry *krъve* 'blood', for example, occurs in OCS almost universally as remodeled *krъvb*.² In some languages, the type has preserved a certain degree of autonomy—Slovenian, for instance, retains a separate inflectional type in *-av* (*cěrkav -kve*), and the word for 'blood' faithfully reflects the nom.sg **kry* to this day (*krí*, extended also to the acc.sg). Useful overviews of the developments of the type in **-y *-vve* across the Slavic languages, with varying levels of detail and different focus, can be found in Vaillant 1958: 266–90; Bräuer 1969: 181–90; or Townsend and Janda 1996: 172.

It is generally agreed—and indeed correct beyond doubt—that the type originates chiefly from Proto-Indo-European nouns in **-uH-* > **-ū-*, a stem class of nominals resulting in distinct inflectional patterns in other Indo-European languages as well (cf. Ancient Greek nouns in *-γς -γος* or Vedic ones in *-ūh -uvalh*). This is evidenced both by the fact that the inflection of Proto-Slavic items in **-y *-vve* is in principle historically identical with that of reflexes of \bar{u} -stems in these languages (e.g., gen.sg PSI **-vve* = Ved *-uvalh*, dat.sg PSI **-vvi* = Ved *-uve*) and by the existence of well-established cognates (e.g., PIE **h₃b^hruH-* 'eyebrow' > PSI **bry *brъve*, Ved *bhrú-*, AGr *ophrŷs*, OE *brū* or PIE **swekruH-* 'mother-in-law' > PSI **svekry *svekrъve*, Ved *śvaśrú-*). Treatments of the Indo-European background of the Slavic type in **-y *-vve* and the latter's relations with stems in **-ū-* in other Indo-European languages can be found in Vaillant 1958: 262–66; Arumaa 1985: 63–68; or Matasović 2014: 58–60.

This is not to say, however, that all details surrounding the Slavic nouns in **-y *-vve* can be considered clarified. On the contrary, as a morphological class conspicuously found in venerable historical corpora ranging from OCS to Polabian but largely absent from the modern Slavic languages and thus constituting a showcase "ancient" feature, feminine nouns in **-y *-vve* have continued to attract the attention of scholars. In fact, the last few years alone have yielded a number of works proposing new interpretations concerning

¹ Abbreviations (we omit those referring to the modern Slavic languages or to obvious categories): AGr = Ancient Greek, ap = accent paradigm, CrCS = Croatian Church Slavic, Čak = Čakavian, Eng = English, Goth = Gothic, Ir = Indo-Iranian, Lat = Latin, Latv = Latvian, Lith = Lithuanian, M = Middle (language stage), med = middle (voice), MGr = Middle Greek, O = Old, OAv = Old Avestan, obl = oblique, OCS = Old Church Slavic, OE = Old English, OHG = Old High German, OPr = Old Prussian, PGmc = Proto-Germanic, PIE = Proto-Indo-European, SerbCS = Serbian Church Slavic, Ved = Vedic Sanskrit, YAv = Young Avestan. Symbols: > phonological development or semantic change; >> (additional) morphological restructuring; → derivation; † reconstruction deemed false.

² See Birnbaum and Schaeken 1997: 147.

these nouns, including their historical origins, functional scope, derivatives, interrelations with other morphological types, and paths of development in the particular Slavic languages. To name just a handful of recent examples, we may mention Pronk-Tiethoff 2014; Repanšek 2016; Šekli 2019; Janczulewicz 2020, 2021, forthcoming; cf. also Majer 2020.

In the present article, we aim to examine and develop the hypothesis put forth in the last of the above-mentioned studies, which deals with the origin of a small group of items in **-Ÿ *-bve* that serve as abstract nouns (prominently **ljuby *-bve* ‘love, desire’). Specifically, we intend to examine little-known, previously uninspected relevant data centered around the noun **čęty *-bve* ‘respect’ and to analyze some implications for the history of the whole type. In order to do so, we shall first review the general status of Proto-Slavic abstract nouns in **-Ÿ* and the possibilities of their historical explanation.

2. Abstracts in **-Ÿ* and the Case of **ljuby*

2.1. Typical Functions of Nouns in **-Ÿ *-bve*

First, it must be pointed out that forming abstract nouns is not a typical function of the class in **-Ÿ *-bve*. Rather, items of Proto-Slavic age belonging here are concentrated in several other areas:

- (1) a. a small number of inherited or early-adapted items of basic vocabulary (**kry* ‘blood’, **bry* ‘eyebrow’, **svękry* ‘mother-in-law’, and a few others);
- b. terms denoting animals (e.g., **ęty* ‘duck’, **žęly* ‘tortoise’);
- c. terms denoting women (e.g., **neplody* ‘infertile woman’, **męžaky* ‘virago’, **vbnyky* ‘granddaughter’);
- d. adaptations of recent borrowings, especially—though not exclusively—from Germanic (e.g., **męrky* ‘carrot’, **pany* ‘pan’, **kony* ‘watering can’, **xoręgy* ‘standard, banner’, **cęrky*/**cıręky* ‘church’, **smoky* ‘fig’, and numerous others);
- e. toponyms, especially hydronyms, many of them adapted (**Nary* ‘Narew/NáraŸ, river in Poland and Belarus’; **Nęęty* ‘Nęęřęva, river in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia, known in antiquity as Narenta’; and numerous others).

2.2. Abstract Nouns in **-Ÿ *-bve*

Against the above—all of which, it will be noticed, refer to concrete objects, be it animate or inanimate—stands a quite limited group of abstract nouns in

*-y *-vve. This set is prominently represented by the noun **ljuby* *-vve ‘love, desire’, reflected directly in OCS *ljuby* -vve and in several other Slavic languages as the default term for ‘love’: Ru *ljubóv*, B/C/S *ljúbav* etc. The latter items likely represent learned heritage in at least some cases (thus Vaillant: 1958: 279), although the material is not amenable to straightforward evaluation. As for South Slavic, certain attestations bear apparent Church Slavic traits, such as—in several older varieties of the B/C/S area—the spellings with -o- (*ljubovb*) as well as, less obviously, the preservation of the original nom.sg in the indeclinable form *ljubi*. Other facts, however, seem to speak for organic transmission. First of all, we may note the lexeme’s very widespread occurrence in vernacular dialects, including ones outside of the range of Church Slavic influence—particularly in Slovenian.³ Second, one observes old dialectal innovations in some attestations—phonological (Bulg. dial. *libof*) and morphological (Čak *ľubva*). As regards East Slavic material, however, at least some Old Russian (16th century) and modern dialectal (North Russian) attestations point to a Church Slavic loan here due to the close/tense character of the suffix vowel *o* (cf. Bernštejn 1974: 225);⁴ a genuine East Slavic reflex of *-v should have remained an open/lax vowel.⁵

The lexeme stands beside the adjective **ljubv* ‘nice, dear’ and the verb **ljubiti* ‘to love’, analyzed as inherited from PIE **lewb^h*- (see further 2.3 and fn 6). It would perhaps be justifiable to ask the question whether **ljuby*—and thus possibly the type in general, if based on this prominent item—might not be borrowed from Germanic (cf. OHG *liubi* ‘love’, a feminine stem in *-īn-, alongside *lioba* ‘id.’, a feminine stem in *-ō-, EWAhd 5: 1388). Such an analysis was already deemed unlikely by Meillet (1905: 269), who chiefly relied on the argument that the evidence for the relevant source noun(s) in Germanic *-ō was insufficient in his view. This, in itself, need not be decisive, as feminine borrowings from Germanic often enter the class in *-y *-vve regardless of the stem vowel of the donor word (Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 243, with references). Nev-

³ SnojSES3 s.v. *ljúb*: “ljubāv ‘love’ (...) inherited word, often used in the older language and in dialects” (*ljubāv* ‘ljubezen’ (...) podedovana beseda, pogosto rabljena v star. jeziku in v narečjih).

⁴ In old manuscripts it is detectable, e.g., on the basis of the presence of a special diacritic mark called *kamora*.

⁵ No irrefutable traces of the word can be identified in the West Slavic languages. For Old Czech, see Patera and Sreznevskij 1878: 56, where the alleged hapax legomenon from the 13th century or so is recognized as fake; for Lower Sorbian, see SNLJa 1: 843 on the ambiguous material, ultimately not even included in HEWONS; for Polabian, see SEJDP 2: 340–41, where serious phonetic obstacles are acknowledged (cf. Janczulewicz 2021).

ertheless, Germanic origin indeed seems implausible here for a number of reasons and is not normally assumed.⁶

Also directly documented is OCS *cěly -vve*, denoting a ‘healing’ or (less commonly, later-attested) ‘health’ and standing beside **cěliti* ‘make whole, heal’ as well as **cělъ* ‘whole, healthy’. The noun **cěly* is a most interesting item in itself and we shall return to it in 6.2. A number of other examples have been mentioned in the literature, but they are attested with concretized or otherwise shifted meanings and can only be suspected of formerly serving as direct abstracts. The closest to a prototypical abstract would be **dorgy* ‘(time of) high prices; dearth, famine’ (attested only in East Slavic: ORu *dorogъvъ*, Ru dial., Blr dial. *dorogovъ*; SP 4: 121–22), cf. **dorgъ* ‘expensive’; one may also mention **suxy* (ORu *suxva*, B/C/S arch. *suhva* ‘raisin’), cf. **suxъ* ‘dry’, and possibly certain others (see Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1992: 52–55 for a fairly detailed overview). A few further potential examples of concretized abstracts are built from adjectives that are historically suffixed, e.g., with **-ro*⁷ or **-to*⁸, which generally makes them less relevant for deeper diachronic purposes. Finally, a particular sort of concretized abstracts can perhaps be sourced from the rich

⁶ The word *ljuby* is attested in OCS, so that it would have to belong to the earliest, Proto-Slavic layer of Germanic loans rather than be a younger, regional borrowing (it is scarcely credible that a local Germanism picked up in Moravia would have been introduced into the Psalter). As regards feminines in **-y *-vve*, this initial stratum is limited to a handful of items. Putting aside the fact that they are never abstract nouns and invariably belong to different semantic/functional domains, all of them also have a stem-final velar: **buky* ‘beech’, **cъrky* (with variants) ‘church’, **lagy* ‘cask’, **orky* ‘box’, **redьky* (with variants) ‘radish’, etc. At the same time, other early Germanic loanwords of Proto-Slavic age adapted as feminine nouns—including all with stem-final labials—assume the form of *ā*-stems (**duma* ‘thought’, **trъba* ‘trumpet’, **stopa* ‘mortar’, etc.). See Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 245 and passim for details. On a related note, a minority of scholars have opined that even the adjective PSI **ljubъ* is a borrowing from, rather than a cognate of, Germanic **leuba-* (OHG *liob* ‘dear’ etc.; e.g., Hirt 1898: 334–35, who argues that both the adjective and the abstract were borrowed). Nothing in the Slavic material appears to support such an interpretation, however, while the existence of a Baltic cognate (see 2.3) speaks against it.

⁷ E.g., **ostrы *-vve*: Sln. *ostřva* and *ostřv -i*, B/C/S *ðstřva* ‘rack for drying hay’, OPol *ostrew* and *ostrwa* ‘tree trunk with large knags’—cf. **ostrъ* ‘sharp’; **pъstry *-vve*: B/C/S *pъstřva*, Bulg. *pъstърva* ‘trout’—cf. **pъstrъ* ‘colorful’ (Bernštejn 1974: 235; SnojSES3: s.v. *postřv*).

⁸ E.g., **gъsty *-vve*: Pol *gęstwa* ‘thicket, dense bushes; throng’—cf. **gъstъ* ‘thick’ (SP 8: 171); **pъsty *-vve*: Slk. dial. *pъstev* ‘wilderness’—cf. **pъstъ* ‘empty’ (Bernštejn 1974: 221); **čisty *-vve*: perhaps → Sln. derivative *čistvina* ‘clearing in a forest’—cf. **čistъ* ‘clear, clean’ (SP 2: 216; PletSNS s.v. *čistvina*). In addition, the fact that these items are suspiciously often only found in derivatives (*-tvina*, *-tvica*, etc.) or in a shape consistent with **-tva* makes it possible that they may in fact have a historical stem in **-tweh₂*—whose link to the type in **-y *-vve* is far from guaranteed. The matter would merit a separate study.

and often archaic hydronymy utilizing the suffix $*-y$ $*-vve$; cf. examples such as *Tanew* ‘river in SE Poland’ (formerly *Thnew* etc., Ukr dial. *T’enva*) < $*Tbny$ $*-vve$,⁹ apparently from $*tbnv[kv]$ ‘thin’, or *Studwia* ‘river in central Poland’ (formerly *Slodew* etc.) < $*Soldy$ $*-vve$, apparently from $*soldv[kv]$ ‘sweet/salty’ (Babik 2001: 334–35, 337–38).

The conventional explanation for such forms is that they continue a PIE formation in $*-u-h_2$, i.e., the abstract suffix $*-h_2$ added to the productive adjective formant $*-u-$. Although phonologically unassailable, this explanation suffers from a number of weaknesses, as stated by Majer (2020: 88–91). First, in the ancient Indo-European languages—and thus presumably in PIE— u -stem adjectives did not normally form abstract nouns by adding the suffix $*-h_2$ (the proposed Ancient Greek and Vedic parallels are exceedingly few in number and not a single one consists of a transparent adjective / abstract noun pairing); rather, a number of other, clearly defined formations were used for this purpose. Besides, the few attested or quasi-attested Slavic abstracts in $*-y$ $*-vve$ do not correlate with u -stem adjectives: for instance, there is no evidence for the inherited status of $*ljubvk$ < $*lewb^h-u[-ko]-$ or the existence of a form $\dagger lubvk$ < $\dagger lub^h-u[-ko]-$.¹⁰

2.3. The Animate s -stem Explanation

As an alternative, it is suggested by Majer (2020: 91–98) that Proto-Slavic abstracts in $*-y$ $*-vve$ may have originated (also) from a different PIE source, namely from animate s -stem nouns whose nom.sg ended in PIE $*-ōs$;¹¹ the

⁹ On the secure status of the pre-form $*Tbny$ here (as opposed to $*Tany$ or $*Tbny$ etc., as assumed previously) see the documentation and discussion provided by Babik 2001. It may also be added that the author himself, following Boryś 1995, leans towards interpreting these forms as substantivized feminine forms of the underlying adjectives (as though from $*tḡh_2-u-h_2$ ‘the thin.f one’) rather than abstracts.

¹⁰ The antiquity of $*ljubvk$ ‘nice’ (attested only from the 15th century onwards; cf. B/C/S *ljūbak*, Ru dial. *ljūbkij*, etc.) could potentially be supported by a deradical comparative in $*-jvš-$, i.e., a form like $\dagger ljubljvš-$ (or $\dagger ljubvčajvš-$, cf. Szeptyński 2018: 145–46). However, the deradical comparative actually found in OCS is of the type $*-ě-jvš-$ (nom. sg.n *ljuběje* in Suprasliensis 380,21; see SJS 2: 163) and thus clearly belongs to the thematic adjective $*ljubv$.

¹¹ Animate s -stems are not otherwise considered to be inherited in Slavic, where the only known class of s -stems is the familiar neuter type of $*slovo$ $*-ese$ ‘word’ < PIE $*klew-os$ $*klew-es-es$ ‘fame, something heard’ or $*nebo$ $*-ese$ ‘sky’ < PIE $*neb^h-os$ $*neb^h-es-es$ ‘cloud, wetness’. Potential indirect traces of the word for ‘fear’, $*b^heyH-ōs$ (>> Ved *bhi-yás-*, cf. below) may be sought in derivatives such as PSI $*bēs$ ‘demon’, Lith *baisà* ‘fear’; however, the assumption of an analogical reversal of the RUKI-rule and certain other morphological modifications is required here (cf. Majer 2017: 160–61). More importantly, perhaps, reflexes of a final PIE $*-ōs$ might theoretically be expected in yet other

sound law PIE $*-\bar{o}s$ > PSI $*-y$ would have caused such items to develop a nom. sg in $*-y$ phonologically,¹² while the rest of the paradigm would have been adjusted to the more productive and morphologically transparent class in $*-y$ $*-bve$. Effectively, an expected paradigm of the type $*-y$ $*-(e/o)se$ would have been regularized to $*-y$ $*-bve$ at a certain point after the relevant sound laws made the reflexes of PIE $*-uH$ and PIE $*-\bar{o}s$ indistinguishable.¹³ According to this theory (cf. Majer 2020: 91–98 for the respective details), such an origin can be postulated at least for $*ljuby$ based on the following arguments:

- (2) a. unlike those in $*-u-h_2$, animate nouns in $*-\bar{o}s$ are unequivocally attested as abstracts in the ancient Indo-European languages (AGr *aidōs* -óos ‘reverence, awe’, *érōs* **éroos* ‘love, desire’, Ved *bhiyās-* ‘fear’, productive abstracts in Lat *-or* -ōris [$<-\bar{o}s$ -ōris] such as *timor* ‘fear’), so that this function may be reconstructed for PIE;
- b. in Ancient Greek and Vedic, the few attested items of this type belong to the semantic field of emotions and mental states (‘fear’, ‘love’, etc.), to which PSI $*ljuby$ also corresponds;
- c. Ancient Greek and Vedic abstracts in $*-\bar{o}s$ occur next to a primary middle verb expressing the emotion or mental state in question (AGr *aidomai* ‘be ashamed’, Ved *bháyate* ‘fear’), and there is some evidence for a similar formation built to the root $*lewb^h-$ in PIE;

former animate *s*-stem paradigms—namely, in the nom.sg.m forms of the comparative degree morpheme, PIE $*-(\bar{i})y\bar{o}s$ (cf. PSI $*-’bjv$, with controversial interpretations) and of the perfect participle active, PIE $*-w\bar{o}s$ (cf. PSI $*-’v$). This problem will be treated in more detail in the authors’ further forthcoming studies.

¹² While this sound law does remain controversial to some extent, it appears to represent the majority view today; without it, it is indeed difficult to explain certain isolated morphological facts (such as the dat/acc of the 1st and 2nd-person plural pronouns: PSI $*ny$, $*vy < PIE *n\bar{o}s$, $*w\bar{o}s$). For detailed argumentation cf. Majer 2020: 84–85; for further recent discussion and overview of literature see also Kim 2019 (esp. 5–7) and Olander 2015 (esp. 56–57, 131–32, 254; here with some important differences, but likewise acknowledging the special development in final position).

¹³ Some analyses assuming a secondary rise of \bar{u} -stems from *s*-stems of various types (or from the structure $*-\bar{o} + s$) had already been pursued in earlier studies, such as Snoj 1994; Witczak 1998; Furlan 2011; Repanšek 2016; for an overview see Majer 2020: 83–87. One may wonder whether all of the possible examples—ranging from terms denoting people to abstract nouns—can be uniformly accounted for by assuming a remodeling on the basis of the nom.sg form. In the case of abstract nouns, it can be surmised that it is their peculiar assignment to the animate gender that corroborates an increased frequency of the nom.sg form. Besides, it should be borne in mind that the nominative would have also been used in various predicative constructions (rather than being limited to expressing agents, etc.).

- d. the only cognate of PSI **ljuby* in Baltic—Lith *liaupsė* ‘praise, adoration’—features an unexpected element *-s-*, pointing to a preform like **lewb^h-s-iyā*;
- e. recent morphological remodeling may help explain the puzzling occurrence of the form (*prě*)*ljuby* not only as nom.sg, but also as acc.sg in the phrase (*prě*)*ljuby tvoriti/dějati* ‘commit adultery’, widely attested in OCS and other early varieties.¹⁴

Constructed on the basis of scattered indices, the hypothesis offered in Majer 2020 is of course bound to remain quite speculative, especially given the scantiness of the Indo-European comparative material and the lack of overt evidence for the element **-s-* in the family of **ljub-* within Slavic itself. A number of further potential problems may also be raised, which—though not lethal to the theory—merit additional discussion. In the ensuing paragraphs, we shall review certain aspects of the relevant forms and the ways they affect the above scenario.

One unusual feature of both the family of **ljub-* in Slavic and the family of *liaup(s)-* in Lithuanian is the apophonic inertia of the root:¹⁵ we find no traces of either **lub^h-* or **lowb^h-* here, be it inherited or created within (Balto-)Slavic.¹⁶ This may raise a certain degree of suspicion regarding an analysis that invokes archaic derivational phenomena; the most logical explanation would be the fact that the whole (Balto-)Slavic family is either derived from or has been apophonically influenced by the inherited adjective **ljubv* < PIE **lewb^h-o-* (cf. Goth *liufs*), whose reconstruction is somewhat more secure than that of the corresponding primary verbs.¹⁷

We may further note that, among the parallels pointed out in Majer 2020, the Ancient Greek forms in **-ōs* agree apophonically with the corresponding middle verbs in displaying the full grade of the root (*aid-*, *er-*, etc.), while in

¹⁴ Admittedly, in this particular point the account is to some extent circular, given that both the explanandum and the explanans are quite isolated phenomena. Nevertheless, their co-occurrence could be a telling fact in itself, indicative of an exceptional status of the noun.

¹⁵ Here we disregard the prosodic alternation observed between Lith *liaupsė* (ap 4) and *liáupsinti liáupsina* ‘praise, extol’—an internal process also found in many other synchronic derivatives in *-inti* (Skardžius 1943: 539–47), certainly providing no evidence for inherited **lewb^h-*.

¹⁶ This is not the case in other branches, and therefore hardly in the proto-language; for **lub^h-* cf. OLat *lubet* (classical Lat *libet* ‘is pleasing’), for **lowb^h-* cf. Goth *[ga]laubjan* ‘permit’.

¹⁷ Note, incidentally, that an adjective in **-o-* with *e*-grade in the root is likely to be archaic (cf. Nussbaum 2017: 243–63, especially 245 on the rapport **lewb^h-ó-* ‘dear’ vs **lówb^h-o-* ‘deariness’, the latter in OE *lēaf* ‘license’).

Indo-Iranian the single attested example has the zero-grade of the root (Ved *bhiy-*). This ablaut configuration is compatible with the assumption of an original PIE amphikinetic paradigm in this derivational type,¹⁸ but the synchronic apophonic associations with the respective verbal bases should be borne in mind too (in the case of **ljuby*, the analogue could be sought in the verb **ljubiti*).

Finally, if the form underlying **ljuby* is indeed to be analyzed as an archaism only explicable within the derivational mechanisms of PIE, one might consider yet other means of accounting for them besides the traditional explanation and the one offered in Majer 2020. In particular, one parallel that comes to mind—though an isolated formation itself—is AGr *plēthýs* f. ‘crowd’, apparently an original deverbal abstract of *plēthō* ‘to fill’ (< **pleh₁-d^he-*, cf. OAv *frā-daṭ* ‘advance, support’). If the form *plēth-ýs* represents a virtual **pleh₁-d^h-uH-*, then a suffix with an identical structure—though otherwise barely known¹⁹—could underlie PSI **ljuby* as a direct deverbal abstract (**lewb^h-uH-*).²⁰ Cf. also Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1992: 55.

2.4. Interim Conclusions and Research Perspectives

The above deliberations are not meant to invalidate or replace the theory presented in Majer 2020. On the contrary, they are meant to show the potential for an even more precise description of the relevant word-formation class, both in the comparative Indo-European context and as a self-contained entity functioning within Proto- or Common Slavic. The basic task here, of course, would be to find further examples with a profile similar to **ljuby*—i.e., lexemes that belong to the morphological type in **-y *-vve*, directly attest abstract meaning (preferably in the semantic domain of emotions and mental states), and are potentially linkable with forms containing a suffixal **-s-* either within Slavic or elsewhere in Indo-European. Locating any such items might make it possible to corroborate, refute or modify the above theory, as well as—more generally—to shed further light on the history of the Slavic class in **-y *-vve*.

¹⁸ On the accent/ablaut types of PIE see Meier-Brügger 2010: 336–53.

¹⁹ Cf. perhaps AGr *iskh-ýs* ‘power’ vs. *iskh-ō* ‘restrain’; see Nussbaum 1998: 534; de Lamberterie 1990: 297.

²⁰ It is also possible, however, that the long monophthong **-ū-* was introduced here within the history of Ancient Greek as an apophonic replacement of older **-ēw-*; this latter solution (e.g., Klingenschmitt 1992: 127) might enable a direct link between AGr *plēthýs* and Lat *plēbēs* f. ‘common people’. Solutions connecting the latter two items via a reconstruction like **pleh₁-d^h-uh₁-s*, gen. **-weh₁-s* or similar (see de Vaan 2008: 471 for discussion) have to be couched within a quite specific framework of PIE ablaut models. As regards the synchronic verbal connections of abstracts in **-y *-vve*, cf. section 6.3.2.

Interestingly, it appears that at least one such word can indeed be added to the evidence.

3. PSI *cěty ‘respect, reverence’

3.1. Introduction

Despite the relatively advanced and detailed reconstructions of the Proto-Slavic lexicon (cf. works such as ÈSSJa and SP; see also Derksen 2008), it often happens that noteworthy words escape scholars’ attention due to their omission or highly specific manner of lemmatization in the standard secondary sources. This is evidently the case with the rare noun *cěty *-bve ‘respect, reverence’ (SP 2: 208, s.v. *čisti *čbtǫ),²¹ whose unique characteristics make it the closest possible formal comparandum for *ljuby *-bve ‘love’ as described above.

Since the data serving as the basis of the reconstruction in question are very limited and have not been presented at length anywhere yet, it seems useful to exhibit them here in full before we proceed to issues of interpretation. The material is limited to West Slavic—mostly to Middle Polish and modern Polish dialects.²² Nevertheless, as will be discussed further below, the derivational mechanisms involved are difficult to account for Polish-internally and point towards an inherited form.

3.2. The Archetype *cěty *-bve ‘respect’

3.2.1. Middle Polish Data

The noun itself is attested twice in a single 16th-century monument, viz. Jan Radomski’s translation of the *Augustan Confession* published in Królewiec/Königsberg²³ in 1561 under the title *Confessio Augustana, to jest wyznanie wiary niektórych książąt i miast niemieckich* (see SPXVI 3: 134). In both instances we

²¹ The dedicated lemma “cěty cětbve” (p. 84) redirects to the verbal entry of *čisti (p. 206–08). The word *cěty makes no appearance in ÈSSJa and Derksen 2008. It is also mostly omitted from etymological dictionaries of Polish—with the exception of ESJP 1: 109, where it is rightly called an “interesting Proto-Slavic relic”.

²² Since the Middle Polish texts discussed below are treated by the authors of SPXVI as “non-canonical” and consequently were not excerpted exhaustively, we have conducted a full excerption of the material for the needs of the present article by ourselves.

²³ Now Kaliningrad (Russia).

are dealing with the loc.sg *catwi*, specifically in the phrase *w wielkiej catwi* ‘in great esteem’:

- (3) A tefzci ftan Mażeńfky we wżecz prawach Cefarfkych/ y we wżecz Monarchiach/ gdzie vftawy a prawa byly/ **w wielkiej** chwale a **catwi** był (ConfRad: G3v)

So ist auch der ehestand inn Keiserlichen rechten und inn allen Monarchien, wo jhe gesetz und recht gewesen, **hochgelobet**

(BSLK: 140)

Matrimony is moreover **commended highly** in imperial governments, and in every monarchy in which justice and law prevail

(CBC: 122)

(Art. XXIII)

- (4) A przytym lud vczą s wielką pilnością/ iak vciefzne słowo Abfolutij iest/ y iako **w wielkiej catwi** a wadze rozgrzezenie ma być (ConfRad: H3)

Dabey wird das l volck vleissig unterricht, wie tröstlich das wort der Absolution sey, wie **hoch** die Absolution **zuachten** (BSLK: 146–48)

The people, moreover, are diligently instructed with regard to the comfort afforded by the words of absolution, and the **high** and great **estimation** in which it is to be held

(CBC: 125)

(Art. XXV)

The two instances of the loc.sg form *catwi* point either to MPol nom.sg **catew* or **catwia*, whereas the feminine gender of the noun is ascertained by the adjective with which it agrees.

3.2.2. Dialectal Polish Data

A slightly different state of affairs is reflected in the single dialectal record from the vicinity of Wysokie Mazowieckie (NE Poland) dating back to the 1930s (Dworakowski 1935: 60):

- (5) Dziedziczki są »w wielkiej catwie«. [footnote:] ‘cenione są’
The heiresses are “in great c.” [footnote:] ‘are valued’²⁴

²⁴ Translations by the present authors unless a different source is specified. Wherever there are non-trivial differences between different language versions of a text, our English translations follow the Polish.

Here, the attested form is loc.sg *catwie*, which—if not analyzed as a secondary form, which it presumably is—would appear to point to a nom.sg **catwa*.²⁵

Thus, we are facing a choice among three different forms for the non-attested nom.sg. In principle, **catew* seems the most plausible one, since (i) the type in *-wia* (cf. **catwia*) is known to be an optional replacement for *-ew* (> *-ew*) that only emerged in the 16th century²⁶ and (ii) the antiquity of **catwa* is excluded due to the chronology of the evidence. That being said, we cannot take it for granted that a nom.sg **catew* was indeed in use at the time when the above Middle Polish data were recorded. In fact, one is tempted to assume that the word in question did not have a full paradigm anymore in that period; it may well be that its use had become limited to a single collocation featuring the loc.sg form, viz. *w wielkiej catwi* ‘in great esteem’. Thus, one can even hypothesize that no other nom.sg form beside the original **caty* was ever created; the latter would have presumably been lost by the end of the Old Polish period (note that such paradigms were still possible at this stage, cf. OPol nom.sg *kr-y* ‘blood’ < **kr-y* vs. loc.sg *kr-w-i* << **kr-ɔv-e*).

3.3. The Archetype **cěťviti* ‘to respect’

3.3.1. Middle Polish Data

Somewhat better attested is the derived verb *catwić* ‘to esteem, to respect, to revere’, the evidence for which is sourced not only from Polish, but from a single Middle Czech record as well. Three of the four Middle Polish attestations come from the text already mentioned above (see SPXVI 3: 134; exx. 6–8). The remaining attestation, in (9), is one year older—it is found in the ecclesiastical document *Ustawa albo porządek kościelny w Księstwie Pruskim*, translated from German by Hieronim Malecki and printed in Królewiec in 1560 (see SPXVI 3: 134):

²⁵ Hypothetically, we could also be dealing with the preservation of the original consonant-stem PSI loc.sg **-e*, but the probability of such an archaism is not high.

²⁶ Determined on the basis of the reverse index for SStp (Eder and Twardzik 2007). In fact, even for the 16th century the evidence for *-wia* is extremely meager, as can be gleaned from a query for word-final *-wia* in SPXVI.

- (6) przykazaniem Bożym/ ktore słuźnie **więcey ćatwic**²⁷ a waźić
 naliefzy niźly obyczay/ pobudzeni y przymufzeni iefteśmy
 zmienienie takowe dopuścić (ConfRad: F3v)
 durch Gottes gepot, welches billich **höher zuachten** denn alle
 gewonheit, gedrunge[n] sein, solch enderung zugestatten (BSLK: 132)
 the command of God, whose commands should justly be **esteemed**
higher than all customs (CBC: 119)
 (Art. XXI)
- (7) abyfmy zasłuźenie Kryřtufowe **wielce** łobie **catwili**/ a wiedzieli/ źe
 wiara w Pana Kryřtufa/ daleko nad vczynky wřzytki/ przedkładana
 być ma (ConfRad: I)
 das man den verdienst Christi **hoch und theuer achte** und wisse, das
 gleuben an Christum hoch und weit uber alle werck zu setzen sey
 (BSLK: 152)
 that the merits of Christ should be **highly and dearly esteemed**, and
 that it should be known that faith in Christ is to be placed far above
 all works (CBC: 126)
 (Art. XXVI)
- (8) gdy łtany od Boga vřtawione **leħce catwią** źe ie za grzeźzne poczitaią
 (ConfRad: L2v)
 und dagegen stende, von Gott gebotten, **geringer macht**, das mans
 dafur halt, als sein sie sundlich (BSLK: 176)
 while they hold the estates ordained by God in **lower esteem**, in that
 they deem them sinful²⁸
 (Art. XXVII)
- (9) **mniei** Teřtament ten pana Chriřtufow łobie **catwią**/ niźeli by był
 Teřtament człowieka niektorego (UstKo: 65v)
verschonen sie mit sölcher Zertrennung des Herrn Christi
 Testaments **weniger** denn ob es eines Menschen Testament were
 (KirchOrd: 40–40v)
 ‘they **value** the testament of Lord Christ **less** than if it were a
 testament of some man’

²⁷ The initial ć-, found only in this one example, is clearly a misspelling for c-.

²⁸ This fragment is not found in the version of the text underlying the English edition in CBC.

Although the verb cannot provide any clues as to the original form of the basic noun (whose stem would be *catw-* in any case, whether from nom.sg **caty*, **cateń*, or **catwa*), it is still worth analyzing from the semantic point of view. It is noteworthy that objects of the verb *catwić* as well as subjects described as being *w wielkiej catwi* are consistently abstract notions connected to legal, social, and religious institutions. For the verb, we have ‘command of God’ and ‘custom’ (6), ‘merits of Christ’ (7), ‘estates ordained by God’ (8), and ‘testament of Lord Christ’ (9); for the noun, we have ‘matrimony’ (3) and ‘absolution’ (4). This points to a highly conventionalized use, which—sparsely attested though it is—would appear characteristic of Polish-speaking bookmen at Albert of Prussia’s court.²⁹

3.3.2. Dialectal Polish Data

Again, the dialectal material differs from the Middle Polish testimony regarding the sphere of usage, pointing to an “interpersonal” semantic domain. This could be noticed already in the case of the noun, cf. ‘heiresses’ (5), and it is evident for the verb too, despite the semantic changes. The form *catwić* is attested with the meanings ‘propitiate’ (‘jednać sobie’; near Siedlce and Łuków, Eastern Poland, cf. Pleszczyński 1893: 724) and ‘host, receive cordially’ (‘gościć, przyjmować gościnnie’; Jakusze near Łuków, cf. Łopaciński 1899: 705), while the reflexive *catwić się* is recorded as meaning ‘be a nuisance; bother’³⁰ (‘naprzykrzać się, drażnić’; Kociewie, Northern Poland, cf. Pobłocki 1897: 27).³¹ In our opin-

²⁹ The fact that both texts were published within two years in Królewiec by Jan (Hans) Daubmann on Albert of Prussia’s command, as well as their similar character and content, may certainly arouse suspicion that they are not independent of each other linguistically. No definite claims as to the idio- or dialectal attribution of the words under discussion can be made on this basis, however.

³⁰ Regrettably, the syntactic and pragmatic contexts of this usage (e.g., the presence or absence of an additional argument denoting the person exposed to the annoyance) have not been transmitted, so that it is difficult to reconstruct the trajectory of this curious semantic development. It is imaginable—just to name one of the many possibilities—that the reflexive *catwić się* originally conveyed the meaning assured for *catwić* (‘to respect, to esteem’) directed towards oneself, i.e., **‘to esteem oneself (excessively highly)’*, from which ‘to be annoying’.

³¹ All of these data come from older, 19th-century descriptions. However, it is possible that the verb *catwić się* or its derivatives in fact survive to this day in modern regional varieties of Polish, although the dialectological treatments known to us do not register this fact. For what it is worth, a Google search for several relevant keywords returned two occurrences of the verbal noun *catwienie się*; the context suggests the meaning ‘mess about, tussle with’ (close to the glossing of *catwić się* as discussed above). Interestingly, both instances are enclosed within quotation marks, perhaps suggesting the respective authors’ awareness of the particularly colloquial or otherwise marked

ion, the geographical range of the “interpersonal” use of the residual words in question speaks in favor of this reflecting the original state of affairs (in spite of the far later documentation), as opposed to the abstract usage attested only among the intellectual circles of the Middle Polish period.

3.3.3. Middle Czech Data

The single Czech attestation is somewhat problematic. It is located in the unpublished manuscript of the dictionary entitled *Thesaurus linguae Bohemicae*, compiled by Václav Jan Rosa in the late 18th century on the basis of older materials by Comenius (cf. Stankiewicz 1984: 19). Among the entries based on the apparent root *cet-*, Rosa includes several synonymous verbs, viz. *cetovati*, *cetiti*, *cetviti*, all of which are glossed as ‘drive, incite, invite, call, etc.’ (for the full range of Czech, Latin, and German glosses see below). Also listed are some prefixed derivatives of these items, with similar or predictably obtainable meanings (e.g., *scetovati*, *scetiti*, *scetviti* ‘call together, convoke’). All of these items are hapax legomena, aside from the fact that they are later repeated in the 19th century by Jungmann (SČN 1: 228–29) and Kott (ČNS: 129):

- (10) Cetugi, cetował, cetowati, *Sing. Imp. act.* (pohánjm, obfýlám) *citare, vocare, Befchicken, Laden.*
 Cetjrm, *l.* **cetwjrm**, cetiř, **cetwiř**, cetiti, **cetwiti**. *idem* cetowati.
 Cetnu, cetnuř, *l.* cetř, cetnauti, *est perf.*
 Cetowávám, cetjwám, **cetwjwám**, *Freq. Composita ex ijs sunt perfecta.*
 Pocetowati, pocetiti, **pocetwiti**, (pohnati, obeřlati) *est perfectum Simplicis.*
 Scetowati, **Scetwiti**, Scetiti (Swořlati, obeřlati) *convocare.*
 Zusammenberuffen.

(TLB: s.v. the respective entries)

Since some members of the alleged word family in question might be treated as loanwords or even artificial creations (see 4.2.2 for details), the fact that

status of the term. The examples are as follows: *Po co te ceregiele i ‘catwienie się’ z bestią?* ‘Why all this fuss and “messing around” with the beast?’ (<https://www.dziennikwschodni.pl/forum/region/lublin/wyzywala-szarpala-grozila-ze-rozbierze-do-naga-przemoc-w-pogotowiu-opiekunczym,t,179105.html>, comment written in December 2017, website of a daily based in Lublin, accessed July 2020); *w Niemczech nie było żadnego odgórno-nakazowo-urzędowego ‘catwienia’ się z czwartą siecią* ‘in Germany there was no top-down/prescriptive/official “messing around” with the fourth network’ (<https://www.telix.pl/operatorzy/t-mobile/2013/04/gruszka-albo-sie-je-ma-albo-polemiki-o-mtr-ach-ciag-dalszy/>, comment written in April 2013, accessed July 2020).

cetviti is attested as part of this set casts doubt on the verb's etymological connection to the Polish items discussed above. It is, however, more than possible that the quasi-homogenous group of words subsumed by Rosa under the root *cet-* is the effect of a contamination of two or even three originally independent families (see, again, 4.2.2). At any rate, it would be difficult to derive *cetviti*, with its *-v-*, from any other of Rosa's problematic items; the most plausible solution is, therefore, to acknowledge it as inherited from a source common with Polish *catwić*. Incidentally, this would also provide the first and only piece of evidence regarding the prosodic features of the putative Proto-Slavic archetype (see 6.3.2). In view of the assumed contamination, far less safe inferences can be made regarding the semantics of the verb. The most important and credible piece of information in this regard—and in general—is that the meaning remains within the “interpersonal” domain.

3.4. Preliminary Evaluation

To sum up, the Polish historical and dialectal data adduced above suggest that there once existed a noun **caty/*catew* meaning ‘respect, esteem, reverence’. Since the unusual structure of the word practically excludes a recent, inner-Polish creation, and since the derivative *catwić* is corroborated by one Czech historical record,³² it follows that the noun is indeed most likely a reflex of a Proto-Slavic (or at least Common Slavic) lexeme reconstructible as **cěty *-vve*. The next sections will deal with the latter's etymology and derivational background.

4. The Family of **čbt-*, **čit-*, **cět-* in Slavic

4.1. The Allomorphs **čbt-* and **čit-*

In this section, we aim to identify the root of PSI **cěty* as well as describe its derivational family, paying special attention to formations containing the same allomorph (4.2) and possible traces of an *s*-stem (4.3) in the Slavic material.

³² Additional evidence could perhaps be drawn from proper names. Bańkowski (ESJP 1: 109) mentions the Polish family name *Catwiński/Cetwiński*. However, we have not been able to confirm the former variant in any reliable source; thus, the surname is likely to be of Czech origin. Specifically, the source could be sought in the Czech toponym *Cetvín* (MJČ 1: 246). Note that the personal name **Cetva*, the derivational base surmised by Profous in MJČ, is unattested. A link to the appellative **cěty *-vve* is certainly thinkable, although the formal and functional aspects of the derivation would not be clear. In view of the uncertainty of the connection as a whole, the matter is not worth pursuing here.

The word under discussion has rarely been analyzed in the existing etymological literature, and mainly in a strictly Polish context if at all. Scholars agree in linking it with the family of the Slavic verb **čisti* ‘count; respect; consider (something as something)’ (SP 2: 208; ESJP 1: 109; Loma 2004: 34–36; cf. also recently Kardas 2019). In the present study, we uphold and develop this interpretation, endorsing its credibility on the basis of both form and meaning. The semantic connection is transparent—cf. the use of the verb **čisti* with the meaning ‘to respect’ already in the OCS canon, e.g., *čbtī otca i materb* ‘honor your father and your mother’ (SJS 4: 870), as well as the derived abstract noun **čbstb* ‘honor, respect’ (SJS 4: 902). The formal aspect may appear less self-evident, since the verb **čisti* (1sg.prs **čbtŏ*) as well as its even better attested frequentative **čitati* diverge from the noun **čěty* both with regard to the initial consonant and the vocalism.³³ This is, of course, a superficial difference: setting aside the issue of the PIE root, particularly the number and quality of the consonants in the onset (cf. section 5.1), we may ascertain that the form **čbt-* represents the apophonic zero-grade of the underlying root (i.e., a former **kīt-*),³⁴ whereas **čit-* may continue the full *e*-grade (**keīt-*) as well as the lengthened zero-grade (**kīt-*). Conversely, the form **čět-* would constitute the regular reflex of the full *o*-grade of the root (**koīt-*), expected e.g., in the causative/iterative formation (cf. at length Kardas 2019, esp. 354–59).

4.2. The Allomorph **čět-*

4.2.1. Introduction

In the previous paragraph, we presented a broad outline of the Proto-Slavic apophonic relationships in the word family to which the noun **čěty* can be linked. Crucially, the robustness of the derivational mechanisms generating such arrays of allomorphs was undoubtedly in decline by the Common Slavic period. We do, of course, observe the persistence of some of these processes in the historical period; however, the change **oĭ > *ě* (and subsequently **kě > *čě* etc.) made the relevant alternations far less transparent and rendered the productive fashioning of such “*ě*-grades” practically impossible (except, perhaps, for immediate analogical models). Hence, it is evident that the crucial allomorph **čět-* must have arisen far earlier than in the Polish or West Slavic era. Nevertheless, establishing this early date should not force us to

³³ The verbal allomorphs **čit-*, **čbt-* also display the secondary variants **čis-*, **čbs-* (preceding suffix-initial *-t-*, cf. OCS inf. *čis-ti* and the noun *čbs-tb*) and **či-* (preceding the *-s-* of the sigmatic aorist, e.g., 3pl *či-s-ŕ*). On the potential relevance of this cf. fn 65.

³⁴ Our pre-Proto-Slavic reconstructions, used sparsely and only to indicate the original ablaut configurations, are notated in pre-monophthongization and prepalatalization phonology (but already “satemized”).

consider all formations containing it as necessarily archaic. Specifically, we must reckon with the possibility that—as the old apophonic processes were becoming ever less productive and transparent—a given allomorph could spread beyond its original domain (even if the latter was originally limited to a single formation) in derivational processes. Thus, in the ensuing sections, we will review the lexemes which may be linked to an inherited allomorph **cět-*. The mechanical transpositions of these items would yield the following archetypes: nominal (substantival and/or adjectival) **cětъ*; verbal **cětiti*, **cětati* (*se*), **cětovati*, and **cětŋoti*; adposition **cětja*. Part of the relevant material (from Polish, Czech, and Ukrainian) bears various specific traits—hapax legomenon status, potential contaminations, borrowings, or generalizations of dialectal forms—that decrease its value for etymological purposes. However, important evidence is also furnished by personal names—and toponyms based on them—that appear to be linked to the above-mentioned reconstructions **cětъ* (adjectival) and **cětiti*. All these data are reviewed below.

4.2.2. **cětъ*

We organize the discussion of the material in three points, (i–iii).

(i) Such a reconstruction is admitted by Bańkowski for Pol arch. and dial. *cet* ‘even number’ (ESJP 1: 118), though the author does not offer sufficient justification for the unexpected vocalism (*-e-* for anticipated *-a-*). The word seems to be first attested in the year 1779 (DykcStar: 188) as part of the formula *cet czyli lichy* ‘odd or even’, connected with the widespread folk game of odds and evens (“*ludere par impar*”). Bańkowski’s preferred explanation here—correct in our view—is that the phrase is a reduced variant of the earlier *cetno czy lichy*, attested in this form already in the 16th century (SPXVI 3: 171). In any case, were the form *cet* to continue a Proto-Slavic form more or less directly, the latter would presumably have to be reconstructed as **čbtъ* (SP 2: 320).³⁵ Then, as also in the case of *cetno*, one would only have to assume the generalization of a dialectal form with the change *č > c* (**čbtno > czetno > cetno*, SP 2: 321; differently ESJP 1: 118), which is by all means plausible given the folk game context. This well-known phonetic process, known as *mazurzenie* and familiar to grammarians already in the 16th century (cf. Zwoliński 1952), is primarily associated with the Lesser Polish and Masovian dialects—the ones which

³⁵ Certainly not **cětъ* (pace ÈSSJa 4: 96). This reconstruction is inferior to **čbtъ* in view of: (i) the material cited in SP and ignored in ÈSSJa, (ii) the fact that all potentially problematic issues (such as the lack of jer alternations in the oblique cases—cf. Ru *čēt čēta*—or the presence of reflexes pointing to **e* such as Ukr *čit* or Pol *cot*) can be explained as due to the renewal of oblique case forms after the loss of the radical **b*, (iii) the non-compliance with the apophonic scheme presented in 4.1. Another option is to assume a contamination with the family of OCS *svčētati* ‘join, unite’ (cf. **četa* in SP 2: 178).

exerted the strongest influence on the formation of the standard language in the modern era. We may note that the variant with *c-* is also known from late dialectal sources in Slovak (ÈSSJa 4: 96), Ukrainian (ESUM 6: 261; pace ÈSSJa 3: 189),³⁶ and Belarusian (SP 2: 320), generally regarded as having spread to these languages from Polish.

(ii) MCz *cet* 'word, utterance, command, letter, etc.'³⁷ is listed in Rosa's dictionary as part of the set of hapax legomena that includes the verb *cetviti* (recall section 3.3.3). Curiously, Rosa himself includes these items in the lemma headed by the interjection *Ck!* 'hush!'. Taking note of this fact, Jungmann (SČN: 228) argues that the noun *cet* should rather be connected with *cedule/cetule*, a borrowing from Germ *Zettel* 'note, message, piece of paper'. Machek (1968: 88), in turn, connects *cet* with the verb *citovati*, a borrowing from Lat *citāre* 'urge, summon, call'; he considers the Czech verb to have meant 'to call to court, office, etc.; to summon as witness' from the outset, which would have provided the semantic basis for the noun. In view of the non-attestation of the verb *citovati* either in Old Czech or in *TLB* itself, as well as the difficulties posed by the change *i > e* in a learned borrowing, the role of the Latin verb is far from certain. However, if the *cit-* of Lat *citāre* was indeed the model here, it seems that Rosa may have modified the root intentionally so as to make it look like a purported base, i.e., effectively a back-formation (cf. the succinct characteristic of the *TLB* in Stankiewicz 1984: 19). We can name several factors that may have encouraged the modification of the vocalism: (i) the native alternation *í : e* (to the extent that *í* is historically justified here), (ii) the influence of the other loanwords included by Rosa under the lemma in question (cf. Jungmann's note on *cedule/cetule* above), (iii) the association with OCz *ceťkovati/ceťkovati* 'to skirmish, to clash',³⁸ (iv) the originally onomatopoeic verb *c(e)-knouti* 'utter the sound *c*, i.e., [čs]' > 'make a sound' (Machek 1968: 88 s.v. *ckáti*),

³⁶ As a matter of fact, it is the Ukrainian form *cit* that could be claimed to descend regularly from **cěťv*, which, however, is not taken into account by the authors of ÈSSJa s.v. **cěťv* (ÈSSJa 3: 190). The verbs *citáty*, *cituvátysja* 'play the game of odds and evens' (HrinSUM 4: 434) are clearly derived from this noun and cannot be linked with the similar items discussed in 4.2.4–4.2.5.

³⁷ "(řknutj, ceknutj pfané neb auftnj) *dictio, promissio, verbum*, ein Wort, Zufage. mám od něho cet. (t. řlowo řpřipowěd) 2 *do* (přanj) *literæ*, Brief. pořlať mu takowý cet. 3 *tio* (Obřylka, obefřanj) *citatio*, Beřchickung. 4 *to* (Saudnj Přřlaha) *allegatum*, Beylage. jakž to cet pod známkau A. pñněgi Swědčj" (*TLB* s.v. the respective entries).

³⁸ Borrowed from OHG *zecketzen* (cf. Machek 1968: 82). The chronology of the transformations can be illustrated by the material and comments provided by Gebauer: *cekc-* (early 14th century) > *cekt-* (ca. 1400) > *ceťk-* (1472) (SStč 1: 135). The borrowing also reached Polish, where it is first attested in the mid-15th century (with the root developing into the form *cet-* already in the second half of the 15th century, cf. SStp 1: 217). Alternative etymological explanations of the Polish item are hardly compelling (Brückner 1927: 57; ESJP 1: 111).

in fact included by Rosa in the definition of the word *cet* in the form of the derived noun *ceknutj* and related to the superordinate lemma *Ck!*, (v) conceivable back-derivation from *cetiti* (see 4.2.3 (i) below). In any case, the word has all the markings of being one of Rosa's neologisms, which would also be in line with the metalinguistic comment found beside the textual attestations—apparently the only ones in existence—in the newspaper *Pražské České Nowiny* in 1782: “Cety, Cet dle Doktora Wáclava Rozy to wyznamenáwá co wyznamenáwá Gméno Slowo, což patrně widěti geft to w geho Slowaři [...]” ‘To Dr. Václav Rosa, *cety*, *cet* means what the noun *slovo* means [i.e., ‘word’], which is evident from his dictionary’ (PCŽN 1782, no. 1, p. 1–2; another occurrence of the word in no. 11, p. 6; cf. Kamiš 1974: 49). Thus, it clearly cannot lend support to the reconstruction of any Proto-Slavic lexical unit.³⁹

(iii) Much more promising are the clearly archaic personal names containing the element **Cěto-*, partially transmitted via derived toponyms (cf. Liewehr 1970: 671–73; ÈSSJa 3: 190).⁴⁰ It is worth pointing out—following Loma—that one such toponym is attested in both Serbian (*Cetoljubi*, Loma 1998: 152) and Czech (*Citoliby*, MJČ 1: 251), which makes it plausible that the name **Cětoljubv* is of Proto-Slavic pedigree.⁴¹ For further Old Czech material (esp. *Cětohněv*, *Cětorad*) see Svoboda 1964 (esp. 73).⁴² These items may be efficiently explained if it is assumed that, as evident dithematic names, they rely on an adjective **cětv* connected etymologically and semantically with the material discussed in the present study.⁴³ Of course, onomastic material does not allow

³⁹ This verdict has to be upheld even in spite of the extra-Slavic evidence for a substantive **koyt-o-*, which would have yielded PSI **cětv*; cf. 5.2.1.

⁴⁰ A unique example of a bipartite name with the root **cět-* as the second member could be OPol <Milochat> (1136), sometimes read *Miloczat* (ESJP 1: 218; cf. the cross-reference in SSNO 1: 409; ultimately, however, under the lemma *Milodziad* in SSNO 3: 512). Cf. the discussion of some other Old Polish names in fn 45, where the reading [c] is less problematic.

⁴¹ *Cetoljubi* is identified by Loma with Constantine VII's <Ζετληβη> (ca. 950; cf. Loma 1999/2000: 110). According to MJČ, the toponym *Citoliby* dates back to 1325 (<Ceth-leub>).

⁴² The OPol toponym <Czathom> [1317–1341], <Czatome> (1325), now *Cotoń* (NMPol 2: 158), also appears to be a possessive derivative of a truncated personal name of this type: **Catom* ← **Cat-o-myst* or similar. On the mechanism of truncation and a parallel name with a different linking vowel see 4.2.3 (iii) and fn 51.

⁴³ Liewehr rightly dismisses earlier explanations referring to the borrowing **cęta* ‘coin’ (probably from Goth *kintus* and further from Latin, though with certain unclear details, cf. ESJS 2: 95) as unattractive semantically and inadequate phonologically, especially with regard to the Lekhitic names discussed in 4.2.3 (iii) below. Liewehr rightly concludes that the names in question must have contained *-ě-*, but his own solution—ingenious though it may be—appears rather far-fetched (thus also ÈSSJa 2:

for the direct reconstruction of the semantics. The most probable meaning can only be inferred from the semantics of other members of the word family in question, taking into account the wishing character (mostly positive) of similar anthroponyms; thus, we may presume the semantics ‘respectable, noteworthy’ or similar. It is not out of the question that monopartite names such as OCz *Cět*, *Cěta*, *Cietek* (MJČ 5: 589),⁴⁴ OPol *Cat*, **Catek* derive from the adjective directly,⁴⁵ although it is more likely that they arose as hypocoristics from original bipartite forms (similarly Liewehr 1970: 673). Further apparent traces of the adjective survive in the Serbian and Polish toponyms <Necieć> (15th century, Loma 1998: 152) and *Nieczatów* <Nieczethow> (1392), <Nyeczathow> (1470–1480) (NMPol 7: 385), in all likelihood derived from a name **NecětŃ* (appellatively **not cětŃ*; i.e., a negative formation recalling the type of **NemojŃ* ‘not mine’ or **NeljubŃ* ‘not loved / not dear’⁴⁶).

We may conclude from the above that the most reliable basis for the reconstruction of a nominal formation **cětŃ*—as an adjective—may in fact be sought in the bipartite names in **Cět-o-* (section iii).⁴⁷ As regards verbal formations that could lend further support to the reconstruction of the nominal **cětŃ*, cf. the following sections.

4.2.3. **cětiti*

We organize the discussion of the material in three points, (i–iii).

(i) As mentioned before—recall 3.3.3 and 4.2.2 (ii) for the material and discussion—Rosa’s extended entry featuring the verb *cetviti* also includes the

190). He notes that many bipartite names with **CětŃ-* display counterparts with **Vbse-* (West Slavic **Vbše-*), cf. pairs such as **CětogněŃŃ* : **VbsegněŃŃ*. Since **vbsŃ* means ‘all, whole’, he concludes that the meaning of the underlying adjective **cětŃ* was likely similar, although there is otherwise no evidence for such an item. Liewehr considers it an ablaut variant (“idg. **kojto-* oder **kaĭto-*”) of the adjective **čit(av)Ń* ‘entire, unscathed, whole’ (SP 2: 217–18; ĚSSJa 4: 123–25), most often connected with Lith *kietas*, Latv *ciēts* ‘hard, resistant’.

⁴⁴ Probably some of them reconstructed on the basis of toponyms. Cf. *Cět*, *Cětata* in Svoboda 1964: 164, 199, 621.

⁴⁵ Cf. the personal name <Czat> (1392) (SSNO 1: 409) and, e.g., the derived place name *Czatkowice* <Czatkowicze> (14th century) (NMPol 2: 202). Although this ambiguous material has traditionally been ‘standardized’ with initial Cz-, i.e., [č] (cf. ESJP 1: 218), it is now easier to etymologize it by reading [c] instead.

⁴⁶ Such formations could arise as tabooistic apotropaic names, malevolent or humorous nicknames, etc.

⁴⁷ Here we may once again allude to the extra-Slavic evidence for **koyt-o-* (cf. 5.2.1), which may be historically identical if the Vedic substantive reflex is analyzed as a substantivized adjective.

synonymous *cetiti* ‘drive, incite, invite, call, etc.’. Like its two synonyms, the form is unknown from any other Czech sources. If the lexeme is taken as a real and correctly transmitted form, it would appear to be related to the above-discussed Middle Czech noun *cet* ‘word, utterance, command, letter, etc.’. On the basis of the form alone, both directions of potential derivation would be admissible; given that there is more circumstantial evidence for an inherited verb **čētiti* (as also discussed in (ii) and (iii) below) than for a noun **čēt̥v*, one might lean towards MCz *cet* as a potential deverbal noun of **čētiti*. We must note, however, that Rosa’s set as a whole is in many ways problematic (recall 4.2.2 (ii)) and that *cet* is in all likelihood historically spurious. Incidentally, the semantics of Rosa’s *cetiti* are not easy to reconcile with the expected Proto-Slavic point of departure centered around ‘count, respect, consider’; the late attestation and the influence of borrowings infiltrating the whole word family would have to be invoked as a possible reason. Overall, the material does not inspire much confidence.

(ii) Ukr *čityty* ‘make stiff’ (“starr, erstarrt machen”; ŽelMNS 2: 1056), yet another hapax legomenon, is attested in the material noted down by Yevhen Zharsky. In the absence of any additional information, it is not even possible to determine whether the verb denoted a physical action (applied to objects) or a mental one (applied to people). In consequence, no safe conclusions regarding the item’s etymological connections are possible. We may note that if Ukr *čityty* is taken at face value, it is in fact far easier to explain as related to PSI **čit(av)v* ‘entire, unscathed, whole’⁴⁸ and its generally accepted Baltic cognates meaning ‘hard, resistant’ (Lith *kietas*, Latv *ciēts*), where—just like in the word family under discussion in this study—a causative formation to the root **čit-* (< **kejt-*) would be expected to display the shape **čētiti* (< **kojt-*). However, in view of the isolated status of the item, it is necessary to exercise extreme caution here; unless independent corroborating evidence for a PSI **čētiti* ‘harden, stiffen’ is found, an ad hoc explanation may be the most plausible one. In particular, the existence of the well-documented Ukr *čipyty* ‘squeeze tightly’ (cf. also *cipenity* ‘become motionless, stiffen (intr.)’) makes one wonder whether the transmitted form *čityty* is not some sort of emanation thereof—be it a sporadic transformation or an error in transmission, perhaps purely graphic.

(iii) A notable form stands out in the above-discussed (4.2.2 (iii)) corpus of personal names with the element **Cēt-o-*, viz. the name given to a rock formerly serving as a boundary marker in Kashubia. The form, no doubt a possessive derivative of an anthroponym, is attested as <Sessognu> (1277), <Zcecionovo> (1342), and <Cetigneue> (1342) (Treder 1979: 37; Górniewicz 1984:

⁴⁸ This analysis could perhaps be supported by a further unclear hapax found in this source—the noun *čityna* in the expression *do čityny* ‘entirely, completely’ (“vollends, gänzlich”). Cf. also Liewehr’s (in this case, unconvincing) account of personal names with **Cētō-* discussed in fn 43.

11; Liewehr 1970: 672; ÈSSJa 3: 190). Although the earliest attestation—whose overall form shows that the underlying phonology is not represented accurately—might be compared directly with OCz *Cět-o-hněv* (Svoboda 1964: 73), the two 14th-century spellings point to the linking vowel *-i-*, typical of dithe-matic names with a verbal first member (cf. e.g., **Vold-i-slav-ъ* ‘ruling/owning glory’).⁴⁹ Accordingly, the first part of the name would attest an element *Cět-i-*. The reading *Ciecięgniew*—with purported first member *ciecie* dat.sg ‘aunt’ (cf. Górniewicz 1984: 110; implicitly also Treder 1979: 37)—is incomparably less probable here. Such an analysis has been put forth for the personal name *Cecirad* or *Ciecierad* (Taszycki 1932; SSNO 1: 364–65), construed as ‘*glad dening to the aunt’,⁵⁰ but the attestations—setting aside the graphic ambiguity regarding the consonants—rather point toward the linking vowel *-i-*, cf. (Lat abl.sg) <*Cecirado*> (1231), <*Cecirad*>, <*Cecerad*> (1232), etc. Here, the parallelism with OCz *Cět-o-rad* (Svoboda 1964: 73) is again suggestive, save for the quality of the linking vowel. Another attestation of the interfix *-i-* can be identified in the place name <*Cetim*> of Polabian origin (1257, 1274; Trautmann 1950: 39), i.e., a possible toponomastic relic (**Cětīm-j-ъ*) of a truncated variant (**Cětīm-ъ*) of the name **Cět-i-mysl-ъ* or similar.⁵¹ The Lechitic material makes the reconstruction of personal names in **Cět-i-* and the corresponding verbal base **cětiti* rather probable.

Thus, the Proto-Slavic verb **cětiti*—the existence of which has so far been surmised based on extra-Slavic comparative evidence only (cf. Kardas 2019: 358; see also 5.1 below)—can in fact be supported by tangible material, although the best evidence (by far) is of an indirect character. Admittedly, it

⁴⁹ Admittedly, it cannot be excluded that the linking vowel **-i-* was used with a strictly adjectival first member of a dithe-matic name; cf. examples such as Serb. *Milivoj* or Cz *Milislava*. The question how old such usage is—and whether it is indeed necessarily secondary—requires further research.

⁵⁰ This type of personal names is attested in examples such as *Babierad* ‘*gladden-ing to the grandmother’ or *Siestrzemil* ‘*dear to the sister’. Taszycki argued for the inclusion of the component *Ciecie-* into this set on the strength of examples such as *Ciecieniek* (1564; interpreted as **Ciecienieg*, connected with PSI **nēga* ‘care’). He further ingeniously inferred a hypothetical example **Ciecziemil*, which, as it turns out, may indeed be indirectly attested in toponomastic material. However, the case is far from certain—cf. the attested spellings of the relevant toponym: <*Tzczemil*> (ca. 1400), <*Tretzemil*>, <*Treczemil*> (1405), <*Czczemil*> (1470–80) (NMPol 2: 125).

⁵¹ A similar name appears to underlie certain Slavic toponyms in Styria and Bavaria; cf. respectively <*Zethmizel*> (1214; Lochner von Hüttenbach 2008: 38) and <*Zetmewsel*> (1398; Eichler 1965: 203). Needless to say, these attestations, which do not display a linking vowel anymore, cannot tell us anything about its original quality (**i* or **o*). Regarding the truncation, cf. examples such as Pol *Borzym* ← *Borzymir* (**Borim-ъ* ← **Bor-i-mir-ъ*). Trautmann himself (1950: 39) assumes the truncation of an underlying name in **Cět-o-* (specifically **Cětomir-ъ*), but such an approach is clearly more complex.

would require a leap of faith to consider the attested semantics of Cz *četiti* and Ukr *čityty* as a logical development from a causative or iterative of **čisti* ‘count, respect, consider’, although—putting aside the fact that both forms may in fact be unrelated or artificial—one cannot but take into account the hundreds of years of language change that would have passed between the Common Slavic point of departure and the verb’s potential residual attestation. On the other hand, to the extent that any semantic content may be inferred for **četiti* from the attested names in **Čěti-*, it would not be at odds with a causative or iterative of the verbal stem of **čisti*.

Altogether, in spite of the circumstantial nature of the evidence, we can conclude that there are at least some grounds to reconstruct Proto-Slavic **četiti* (additional mild support for this may come from the adposition **četja*, cf. 4.2.6). We may add that the derivation of the verb from a nominal **čětv* does not recommend itself in view of the chronology and sparse attestation. For further discussion of the derivational links of this verb, cf. 6.3.2.

4.2.4. **četati* (*se*)

The relevant data are limited to Ukr *čitátysja* ‘to hassle, to ponder for a long time’ (“Schererei machen, sich lange bedenken”; ŽelMNS 2: 1056). Thus, we are confronted with yet another hapax with a fairly loosely defined meaning. An analysis involving a direct semantic link with the verb **čisti* is precluded on formal grounds: if the Ukrainian verb continues the root **čět-*, it probably acquired it as a result of denominal derivation, since its structure (i.e., apophony and suffix) does not point toward a primary formation.⁵² Hence, the example might at best be considered as an indirect argument in favor of reconstructing the nominal **čětv* (recall 4.2.2; differently Kardas 2019: 358–59; cf. Zubatý 1894: 388;⁵³ ÈSSJa 3: 189; SP 2: 208 s.v. *čisti*). Again, the characteristics of this late attestation do not inspire faith in any ancient formation here.

4.2.5. **četovati*, **četnōti*

This part of the material relies on yet further hapax legomena from Rosa’s unpublished dictionary, viz. *četovati* and *četnauti*, again synonymous with the set already referred to above (recall 3.3.3). If the whole family of verbs in question is derived from the adjectival **čětv*, then *četnauti* certainly belongs to

⁵² Secondary imperfectives of the type **kupati* ← **kupiti* ‘buy’ seem largely limited to roots ending in labial and velar consonants. Note that some of the root vowels are still capable of reflecting the quantitative opposition within derivation (e.g., **skakati* ← **skočiti* ‘jump’).

⁵³ Contrary to the statement by Kardas (2019: 358), Zubatý does not refer to any putative OCS form of this verb.

the youngest layer here, since archaic denominative verbs in **-ne-* displayed the apophonic zero grade (which in the present case would amount to **čbt-*): cf. OCS *o-slbpnŋti* ‘to go blind’ ← *slěpъ* ‘blind’. The verb *cetowati*, in turn, may in principle have arisen at any given stage of development, considering the enduring productivity of the suffix.⁵⁴ Summing up, no feature of the material reviewed in this section betrays any qualities suggesting Proto-Slavic inheritance.

4.2.6. **cětja*

An interesting separate item likewise traditionally connected with the word family under discussion is the adposition **cětja* ‘in view of, due to’ (Kopečný 1973: 48–49, 96; RKSS 3: 456–57; RHSJ 1: 781–83; ÈSSJa 3: 189; SP 2: 84). This element—originally used as a postposition following a noun in the genitive, later also as a preposition governing the same case—is attested in Middle Bulgarian as well as Rusian Church Slavic texts in the form *cěšta/cěšča*, with traditional *št* (šć) < **tj*, as well as in historical B/C/S in the form *cěća* (13th century) or shortened *cěćb* (15th century) with the vernacular reflex of **tj*. Later attestations in the B/C/S area—including the modern dialects—are quite manifold due to the evolution of **š* and **tj* as well as secondary modifications of the final vowel:⁵⁵ thus, next to forms such as *cijeća* or *cića*, we also find *cijeće*, *cijeći*, or *ciću*. The word is often found forming compound items, be it with the conjunction (*j*)*er* to produce a compound conjunction ‘because’ (*cijeć er* etc.) or with other prepositions (*iz cijeć*, *za cić*, *krocjeć*, etc.).⁵⁶

It has also been surmised that a compound form involving **cětja*—or a closely related form—may be the etymon of the important Slovenian adverb *všěč* ‘fittingly, pleasantly, agreeably’ (attested since the 16th century in several variants), often found in predicative use in constructions meaning ‘to like something’. The scenario considered in BezLESSJ 4: 368–69 operates with a prepositional phrase **vъz cětjo*:⁵⁷ the latter element would represent the acc.

⁵⁴ See also fn 106 on the possible derivational relationships here.

⁵⁵ Variants of this type, attested late, are unlikely to preserve any archaic information such as alternative case forms of the underlying noun; rather, they appear to be secondary adaptations, mirroring developments found in other prepositions and grammaticalized elements (cf. Belić 1976: 97–98). Also clearly secondary are variants with a different initial consonant, such as *čića* or *siću*; Skok’s (1932) inverse scenario, assuming a pre-form **sětja*, is hardly realistic. It appears clear that the single inherited form was **cětja*.

⁵⁶ Sometimes with ensuing sporadic reductions of the final consonant, cf. *zāpocje* (Skok 1932: 140).

⁵⁷ In SnojSES3 s.v. *všěč*, the form is etymologized as **vъz cětjo* instead, presumably due to a different assumed structure of the underlying noun (see fn 55).

sg of a noun **cětja* ‘will’, which would also have given rise to the adposition. The hypothesis requires certain sporadic sound developments, however, such as **vsceč* > *vseč* (attested variant) > *všeč*. Alternative hypotheses regarding the origin of *všěč* are available too, though none of them free of problems. At any rate, we must conclude that Sln. *všěč* can hardly provide probative material for the etymologization of the adposition **cětja*.

Although it appears fairly likely that the adposition indeed belongs here etymologically and thus provides additional testimony for the existence of the *o*-grade stem (**kojt-* > **cět-*),⁵⁸ the makeup of the parent form is far from self-evident. By default, we would expect the grammaticalization of a paradigmatic verbal or nominal form that could be independently accounted for. No verbal form (e.g., of the verb **cětiti* **cětjō*) can be matched with the shape **cětja*—the grammaticalization of the present active participle, i.e., the type of Ru *xotjá*, Pol *chocia(ż)* ‘although’ ← **xotěti* **xotjō* ‘to want’, is of course excluded, as we would expect *†cětę* in South Slavic. Thus, one has mostly surmised a nominal formation, typically an underlying *īā*-stem noun **cětja*. Since the grammaticalization of a nom.sg form does not appear likely, the final **-a* has often been interpreted in terms of a more archaic layer of morphology—e.g., a direct reflex of the PIE instr.sg **-eh₂-(e)h₁*, identified with the synchronic Lith ending *-à*, which, however, would have to be a staggering archaism in Slavic.⁵⁹ It would, in fact, be easier to obtain an appropriate case form from a neuter or masculine *o*-stem, where the grammaticalization of case forms in **-a*—presumably the original instr.sg **-oh₁*, though the synchronically available gen.sg is also possible⁶⁰—is quite well-documented: cf. famous examples like **vbčera*

⁵⁸ Some scholars have maintained a less categorical stance regarding the inclusion of this item in the family of **čisti*, in view of the very fact that the ablaut variant **cět-* was not otherwise well-documented (e.g., Mikkola 1913: 105). This circumstance can be considered remedied to some extent, as shown in the preceding sections. Alternative accounts, invoking different roots, are generally less convincing. The connection with **cěsta* ‘road’ (cf. Germ *wegen* ‘because of’ ← *Weg* ‘road, way’) is formally difficult, as the B/C/S evidence points to **tj*, not **stj*; similarly, the comparison with OPr *quāits* ‘will’, Lith *kviēsti* *kviēčia* ‘invite’ runs into difficulties involving the segment **w* (for the history and discussion of these hypotheses cf. Kopečný 1973: 49; ÈSSJa 3: 189–90; SP 2: 84; BezI ESSJ 4: 368–69). One could also refer to the root of PSI **čit(av)ṽ* ‘entire’, Lith *kietas* ‘hard’ (cf. 4.2.3 (ii) and fn 43) and assume an evolution of meaning as in the phrase ‘on the strength of’—this approach has not, to our knowledge, been proposed so far, but it does not seem preferable to the one discussed in the main text.

⁵⁹ See Olander 2015 (esp. 163–66) on the complex picture of this ending in Balto-Slavic, specifically the early addition of a nasal element (possibly apocoped **-mi*), which makes the *īā*-stem instr.sg hypothesis even more cumbersome. The explanation is considered e.g., in ÈSSJa 3: 189.

⁶⁰ This is perhaps hinted at in ÈSSJa 3: 189, where a gen.sg is considered, without the specification of the stem class. SP (2: 84) points to the parallel of **dělja* ‘for’, itself bur-

‘yesterday’. Thus, the parent form would amount to a *īo*-stem neuter **cētje* or masculine **cētjb*. Whichever of the hypothesized substantives—**cētja*, **cētje*, or perhaps **cētjb*—is ultimately preferable, the noun would be best analyzed as a derivative of the verb **cētiti* (recall 4.2.3).⁶¹ The reconstruction of the semantics (‘*will?, *intention?, *view?’) would be sheer guesswork.⁶²

4.3. **čit-s-?*

In view of the potential diachronic links between the abstract type in **-y* **-ove* and certain types of *s*-stems (recall 2.3), it would be particularly interesting to discover forms documenting the existence of *s*-stem formations cognate with **cěty*. The extra-Slavic evidence for this will be reviewed in 5.2.2–5.2.3 below. As regards Slavic itself, although no *s*-stem like *†čito †-ese*, *†cěto †-ese*, or *†čbto †-ese* is attested, traces of a stem **čit-s-* can perhaps be surmised on the basis of the noun **čismę* **-ene* ‘number, digit’. The noun is securely—if not overly richly—documented in OCS and also occurs elsewhere in South and East Slavic (SerbCS *čisme*,⁶³ ORu *čismja*). Although the latter material is hardly independent of the Church Slavic tradition (ESJS 2: 108), the vernacular evidence of Bulgarian, B/C/S, and Russian dialects includes the derivatives **čismenica* and **čismenōka* ‘a unit of yarn’, which confirms the Proto-Slavic status of the item.⁶⁴ The analysis of **čismę* as deriving partly from an otherwise lost *s*-stem noun

dened with similar problems.

⁶¹ Cf. the types of **volja* ‘will’ ← **voliti* ‘want, prefer’, **větje* ‘council’ ← **větiti* ‘speak’, **nožb* ‘knife’ ← **noziti* ‘cut’, respectively (SP 1: 80–82; Vaillant 1974: 508); the masculine type offers by far the least support here, as it generally denotes agent nouns.

⁶² In case the base noun is reconstructed as **cětja*, it might also be treated as deadjectival, cf. the type of **suša* ‘dryness, drought, dry land’ ← **suxv* ‘dry’ (SP 1: 82). However, the path of grammaticalization would have been less smooth here in view of the above-mentioned difficulties concerning the identification of the case form as well as the typically concrete-leaning semantics of deadjectival nouns in **-ja*. In addition, we may mention that the adjectival formation is less grounded diachronically in comparison with the verbal one (see 5.1, 5.2.1).

⁶³ Often qualified as 13th-century in the literature (“u jednoga pisca XIII vijeka”, RHSJ 2: 40, similarly in SP 2: 206). However, we must bear in mind that this is in fact a form found in St. Sava’s *Studenica Typicon* (ST: 521), whose oldest copy dates back to the 17th century; thus, it appears more justified to refer to his *Hilandar Typicon* (cf. HT: 44), extant in a manuscript from the early 13th century. In addition, MiklLPGL: 1117 cites another Serbian Church Slavic attestation in the more evolved meaning ‘flock of hair’ (cf. the meanings of the type ‘unit of yarn’ listed further below in the main text).

⁶⁴ For this reason, the assertion that the word is an OCS-internal modification of **čislo* (MátI 1954: 146–48; followed by SP 1: 127, though not so clearly 2: 206) is difficult to accept, as also stressed in ESJS.

**čit-s-* < **kejt-s-* or similar (as surmised already by Arumaa 1985: 31) can be supported by the fact that—as opposed to certain other branches, including Baltic (cf. Brugmann 1906: 242–43)—an independent suffix **-smen-* > **-smę* is not otherwise known in Slavic; consequently, the occurrence of such a conglomerate in the function identical with the well-established **-men-* > **-mę* is likely due to the application of the latter onto a pre-existing *s*-stem. The nature of this latter derivational event can be construed in a number of ways. Arumaa (1985: 31) speaks of “contamination”; an actual derivational chain would be imaginable too, although it would admittedly require additional unattested steps (such as a derivative in **-s-o-*). Nonetheless, although the *s*-stem theory is indeed enticing here, it is difficult to demonstrate its superiority over the assumption that **čismę* **-ene* arose as a derivationally “incorrect” formation mimicking the semantically close **pismę* **-ene* ‘letter’ (originally no doubt ‘drawing, mark’), where the element **-s-* belongs historically to the root (PIE **peyk-*) and where the form is regularly derived with **-mę* < **-men-*. This latter solution is preferred in much of the modern literature, see e.g., ESJS 2: 108.⁶⁵

4.4. Conclusions

In the above sections, we attempted to review and evaluate all forms that provide the immediate inner-Slavic context for the noun **čěty*, with particular attention paid to other forms displaying the root allomorph **čět-*. Later in the study, we will utilize primarily those reconstructions that could potentially function as the basis of an inner-Slavic derivation of **čěty*, i.e., the adjective **čětv* (cf. 4.2.2 (iii)) and the verb **čětiti* (cf. 4.2.3 (iii)); this will be the focus of section 6.3, where we shall also deal with the interrelations among all these items. In order to determine the most probable source of the lexeme **čěty*, however, it is also necessary to examine the chronologically earlier—i.e., Proto-Balto-Slavic

⁶⁵ Some scholars also argue that the form with internal **-s-* replaced **čitmę* (< **kejt-men-*) for phonotactic reasons (cf. ÈSSJa 4: 118: “the fragility of the sequence *tm* provided the reason for the introduction of the element *-s-*” (непрочность сочетания *tm* послужила причиной введения элемента *-s-*), implying a recent insertion and also referring to morphophonemic variants, or Meillet 1905: 422–23: “Here, the suffix [**-men-*] has the form **-smen-* after a dental” (Le suffixe [**-men-*] a ici la forme **-smen-* après dentale), implying an assumed ancient distribution). This does not seem tenable. In other controllable cases (cf. **vermę* < **wert-men-* as well as far more material for **-dm-*, e.g., **plemę* ‘tribe’ < **pled-men-*) no such insertion takes place and the simple loss of the dental is observed instead; cf. Arumaa 1976: 75–76, 171. Note that the frequently encountered semi-direct comparison of this expected **čitmę* with Lith *skaitmuõ* -*eñs* m. ‘digit’ (e.g., ÈSSJa 4: 119) is erroneous—the formant *-muo* is highly productive in Lithuanian (Ambrasas 1993: 55, 88, 186) and the term *skaitmuõ* is a recent literary neologism (Skardžius 1943: 602; Smoczyński 2018: 1180), not deradical but built directly on the verbal stem of *skaitýti* (on which see 5.1). Incidentally, as regards the origin of **čismę*, some degree of influence from the aorist stem **čis-* is difficult to rule out too.

and Proto-Indo-European—connections of the root in question, particularly as regards its links to the nominal suffix **-s-* (a relic of which, as we saw in 4.3, might be sought in PSI **čismę*). This wider background will, hopefully, allow us to locate the origin of **čěty* in space and time. The analyses are presented in the upcoming section 5.

5. The Indo-European Background

5.1. Precise Reconstruction of the Root; Verbal Stems

The etymological analysis of the family of **čit-*, **čvt-*, **čět-* is quite unanimous in Slavic etymological dictionaries (Derksen 2008: 89; SP 2: 208; ÈSSJa 4: 119; ESJS 2: 108; ERHJ 1: 133; SnojSES3 s.v. *čâst*, etc.): it is universally thought to go back to a PIE verbal root **(s)keyt-* or similar⁶⁶ with the meaning ‘perceive, notice; be noticeable, appear’,⁶⁷ reflected in Balto-Slavic and Indo-Iranian. The material—including the above-discussed Slavic data—encompasses the following verbal formations, not all of which are necessarily of PIE age (LIV₂: 382–83; the material is arranged by categories assumed in LIV₂, though dissenting views on many of the formations exist):⁶⁸

Aorist stems:

- (11) root aorist **keyt-* ~ **kit-* (OAv 3sg.med *cistā* ‘recognized’, Ved 2pl.med *ácidhvam* ‘you decided’);
- (12) *s*-aorist **kěyt-s-* (Ved *acait* ‘recognized’); this might be an innovation, as the *s*-aorist is a highly productive formation. The synchronically sigmatic PSI **čisv* may continue either a root aorist or an inherited *s*-aorist.

Present stems:

- (13) *n*-infix present **ki-ne-t-* ~ **ki-n-t-* (OAv *fra-cinas* ‘recognizes’; the *n*-infix stem is also the basis for the derived iterative in Ved *cintayati* ‘ponders’);

⁶⁶ The *s*-mobile is only attested to by the Baltic material (where, conversely, no *s*-less forms are found). The PIE root is usually reconstructed without the initial *s*- (thus LIV₂: 382–83 etc.), and we will follow this convention for the sake of simplicity here. On the issue of the velar/labiovelar, cf. further below.

⁶⁷ Concerning this meaning, see further below.

⁶⁸ We generally only cite the earliest evidence from the respective branches; in many cases ample later material is also available (see e.g., Cheung 2007: 31 for Iranian).

- (14) R(Ø)-eye-⁶⁹ present **kit-eye-* (Ved 3pl *citáyanti*, med *citáyante* ‘shine’); this type of PIE present is somewhat controversial and other reconstructions have been offered, but the details are immaterial here;
- (15) R(e) simple thematic present **keyt-e-* (Ved *cétati* ‘appear; notice, be aware’, Latv *šķiet* [inf. *šķist*, pret. *šķīta*]⁷⁰ ‘think, seem’);
- (16) R(Ø) simple thematic present **kit-e-* (PSI **čvt̥* [inf. **čisti*]). It has been surmised that such simple thematic presents may have been innovated on the basis of the root aorist.

Causative stem:

- (17) R(o)-eye- causative **koyt-eye-* (>> Ved *cetáyati* ‘make recognize, show’, med *cetáyate* ‘appear, occur’; Lith *skaitýti*, *skaito* ‘read, count’; also ?PSI **cētiti* as discussed in 4.2.3).

Perfect stem:

- (18) reduplicated perfect **ke-koyt-* (Ved *cikéta*, YAv *cikaēθā*⁷¹ ‘pay attention, understand’; OAv 3pl.pluperf⁷² *cikōitərəš* ‘they reveal themselves’).

Other derived stems:

- (19) intensive **key-koyt-* (Ved med *cékite* ‘is constantly recognized’);
- (20) desiderative **ki-kit-s-* (Ved *cíkītsat* ‘ensure’).

This root is often analyzed as **k^wey-t-*, i.e., as an extended variant of the largely synonymous and more widely attested **k^wey-* (LIV₂: 377–78; cf. Ved *cáyati* ‘perceive’, AGr *tíō* ‘respect’, PSI **čajati* ‘await’, etc.). For example, in PokIEW 2: 636–47 the two roots are treated under a single entry “*k^wei-(t-)*”. The validity of this deeper analysis is not crucial for present purposes; however, it should be noted that it provides the only ground for reconstructing the labiovelar **k^w*- as opposed to the plain velar **k-* in the longer root (Kümmel 2000: 179). On the other hand, certain nominal derivatives apparently spanning Indo-Iranian and Germanic speak in favor of the reconstruction with **k-*: **kit-ro-*, **koyt-ro-* (Ved *citrá-*, OAv *ciθra-* ‘bright, shining’, PGmc **haidra-* ‘fair, clear’), **koyt-u-* (Ved *ketú-* ‘sign’, PGmc **haidu-* ‘manner’); additional material of this kind is

⁶⁹ The scheme R() denotes the apophonic grade of the root: *e*, *o*, or zero (Ø).

⁷⁰ The zero-grade preterite/infinitive stem *šķit-* might be linked directly to the old aorist stem **kit-*, although this particular apophonic setup is highly productive in Baltic, as is the full-grade present seen in Latv *šķiet* (see Villanueva Svensson 2017); thus, we may also be dealing with inner-Baltic innovations (thus also partly LIV₂).

⁷¹ A hapax legomenon transmitted in a corrupt form (cf. Kellens and Pirart 1995: 22), but cf. also the participle *cikiθβāh-* ‘knowing’.

⁷² On the interpretation of this unusual form cf. Jasanoff 2003: 39–43.

reviewed further below. Note that the Germanic evidence practically excludes $*k^w-$, from which one would expect $\dagger h^w aid-$.⁷³

The above facts have been approached in different ways in the recent literature. Some authorities—such as Gotō 1987: 139–41; EWAia 1: 547–49; LIV₂: 347 etc.—only consider a subset of the Indo-Iranian forms mentioned above (specifically those with the semantics ‘appear, shine’) to reflect a separate PIE root $*keyt-$ ‘be bright, shine’, while the majority of the material—displaying the semantics ‘recognize, perceive’—is assigned to PIE $*k^w eyt-$, i.e., a putative extension of $*k^w ey-$. Others opt for reconstructing $*k^w eyt-$ for the entirety of the verbal evidence (e.g., Jasanoff 2003: 39–43, 169), which unifies the latter, but makes the Germanic connection difficult. However, the issue can also be solved by assuming that all of the above material is to be separated from $*k^w ey-$ ‘perceive’ entirely and united under the form $*keyt-$ ‘perceive, notice; be noticeable, shine’, with plain velar $*k-$ (thus e.g., Kümmel 2000: 180). In the following, for the sake of simplicity, we operate with such a uniform reconstruction $*keyt-$, although it is to be borne in mind that some circumstances may speak for the choice of $*k^w ey-t-$ for at least part of the evidence. Of course, the roots $*keyt-$ ‘appear, shine’ and $*k^w eyt-$ ‘perceive, notice’ would not have been formally distinguishable in Indo-Iranian and would have easily blended together, given that their meanings could be subsumed under a unitary concept ‘appear’ and its diathetic emanations. This would have also happened in Balto-Slavic—where we do not find any evidence for the meaning ‘shine’, however.⁷⁴

The root does not appear to be preserved outside of Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, and Germanic. The old proposal to connect Lat *caelum* ‘sky’ here, as

⁷³ Unless one stipulates a pre-Germanic delabialization of $*k^w o-$ to $*ko-$, which, however, relies on thin evidence and is not a standardly assumed change (cf. Ringe 2017: 110–13; Casaretto 2004: 196). Kümmel (2000: 180) is likewise skeptical about this solution. In EWAhd 2: 913–15, the PIE root is specified as $*keyt-$.

⁷⁴ The problems concerning the above material have been much discussed in Indo-European studies, so that we were only able to cite a fraction of the existing literature in the above survey. For some further discussion cf. Neri 2003: 216–21. For a relatively recent overview with focus on the Slavic data—including, quite exceptionally, a mention of MPol *catew* and *catwić*—see Loma 2004: 34–36 (who uses the notation “ $*k^w ei-$ ” and “ $*k^w eit-$ ”). We may add that the newest etymological treatment of the Slavic word family in question—Kardas 2019—operates solely with the reconstruction with $*k^w-$; the study also provides a rich background of the attested and hypothetical (Proto-) Indo-European forms. In view of the considerations mentioned above, however, we do not find the connection with $*k^w ey-$ the most compelling choice. Incidentally, Weiss (2017) argues that the latter root was in fact $*k^w eh_1-(i-)$.

**kayt-slo-* or similar, is formally untenable in view of the vocalism *-a-* (de Vaan 2008: 80–81).⁷⁵

5.2. Nominal Stems

5.2.1. Introduction

Even more important for our topic—which, after all, concerns a substantive—are the nominal derivatives from the root. Next to the stems **koyt-ro-* and **koyt-u-*, already mentioned in 5.1 above, we may note the evidence for **koyt-o-* (EWAia 1: 399) found in Ved *kéta-* m. ‘desire, aspiration, will’ and probably also in YAv *-kaēta-* as part of a compound personal name. This item is important in that it would correspond structurally to PSI [?]**cēt̥v* and **Cēto-* (in personal names), as discussed in 4.2.2 (iii) above. Given that the best evidence for such a stem in Slavic appears to be adjectival, direct cognacy with the Indo-Iranian items is only possible if the latter continue substantivized adjectives.

5.2.2. S-Stem Connections: **keyt-es-* etc.

Still, our central task is to establish the origin of the formation **cěty* *-*ve*. Thus, in view of the potential connections between Slavic abstracts in *-*y* *-*ve* and Indo-European *s*-stems (recall 2.3), it would be especially interesting to find *s*-stem nouns in other branches that could provide a potential point of contact here—especially given that some indirect Slavic-internal residue may be detectable too (recall 4.3). Interestingly, such material is indeed available.

We find evidence for an *s*-stem in both of the non-Balto-Slavic branches that attest the root **keyt-* itself. It is particularly well-attested in Indo-Iranian, namely in Vedic, where the noun *cétas-* n. ‘brilliance, wisdom’ (pointing to PIE **keyt-es-*) is fairly widespread; it also frequently functions as the second member of adjectival compounds, such as *práčetas-* ‘observant, wise’ or *sucétas-* ‘having great intelligence’. The noun is no doubt synchronically connected with the verb \sqrt{cet} < **keyt-* and it is often considered a productive Vedic-internal creation (thus e.g., Stüber 2002: 40). This need not be the case, however, the more so because some evidence for an *s*-stem is also found in Germanic. Here, we may presume the existence of a PGmc noun **haidaz/ez-* n. ‘brightness, clarity’ (as though < PIE **koyt-es-*), reflected in the first member of

⁷⁵ Reconstructing the PIE root as **kayt-* ~ **kit-*, with *a* ~ \emptyset ablaut, would make the connection formally possible; it would also provide an explanation for what appears to be an *o*-grade in the *s*-stems discussed below (5.2.2–3). However, the palatalization in the full grades in both IIr and Sl (Ved *ce-*, PSI **či-*) would then have to be analogical to the zero-grade. This, in conjunction with the rarity of the *a*-pattern (Ringe 2017: 10–11), makes the hypothesis unattractive.

a compound noun interpretable as ‘bright runes’ or ‘clear runes’ in two Runic Norse inscriptions from the seventh century CE. Both attestations are in the genitive plural, in the phrase ‘sequence of bright runes’: *hAidzruno ronu* on the Björketorp stone and *hidezruno no* on the Stentofen stone (Antonsen 1975: 85–87; EWAhd 4: 913; Neri 2003: 216).⁷⁶ Besides, it is likely that PGmc **haidaz/ez-* is continued directly in OE *hādor* n. ‘clarity, clear sky’; however, since Old English does not distinguish PGmc **z* and **r*, the latter item may also represent the substantivization of the above-mentioned adjective **haidra-* ‘fair, clear’, itself also preserved in Old English in the form *hādor* (EWAhd 4: 913).⁷⁷

The *s*-stems seen clearly in Vedic and less directly in Germanic are not formally identical with one another and neither is superimposable on the proto-form that could potentially be made responsible for PSI **cěty*. The latter would—provided the mechanism concerning **ljuby* (2.3) proposed in Majer 2020 is valid—mechanically transpose into an animate nom.sg **koyt-ōs* (the *o*-grade of the root is unexpected here and presumably points to the influence of another derived stem; cf. 5.2.3 below). Conversely, Vedic *cetas-* reconstructs as **keyt-os*, obl **keyt-es-*, i.e., the productive neuter *s*-stem type with the apophonic *e*-grade in the root expected for this class (Stüber 2002: 19–22).⁷⁸ Finally, Germanic **haidaz/ez-* would continue a virtual **koyt-os*, obl **koyt-es-*, i.e., the same type as the latter, but with the less expected *o*-grade in the root.⁷⁹

In the case of Germanic, it is fairly obvious that the *s*-stem—if old—was morphologically adapted to fit the adjective **haidra-*. This is clear not only from the apophonic grade of the root (**-ey-* >> **-oy-*), but also from the reflex of the dental. Namely, in the adjective **koyt-ró-*, the operation of Verner’s Law—responsible for the voicing of the obstruent—was regular in pretonic position: thus, **haidra-* (as opposed to **haidra-*) is the expected outcome. In a neuter *s*-stem, however, we would expect the stress to be on the root, at least from a late PIE standpoint (Stüber 2002: 19–22); thus, **kéyt-es-* or innovated **kóyt-es-* would have yielded **hēiþez/az-* or **hāiþez/az-* as opposed to the ac-

⁷⁶ The latter word no doubt also for intended *ronu* ‘sequence’. As for the spelling *hid-*, it is generally emended to *hAid-* here (thus Antonsen 1975; Neri 2003; EWAhd).

⁷⁷ On the development of PIE neuter *s*-stems in Germanic, including in Old English, see recently Harðarson 2014.

⁷⁸ We may point out that an *s*-stem with *o*-grade in the root (as though **koyt-es-*) has also been sought in the second member of the post-Rigvedic personal name *Náciketas-*, occurring side by side with the thematic *Náciketa-*. The analysis of the name is most uncertain, however (EWAia 1: 399), so that this form has little comparative value.

⁷⁹ Note that the isolated instances of *o*-grades in neuter *s*-stems, found especially in Latin (*foedus* ‘alliance’, *pondus* ‘weight’, etc.), are in all probability secondary (Vine 1999: 302).

tually reconstructible **haidēz/az-*.⁸⁰ In short, it is evident that the *s*-stem was either remodeled to match the adjective **haidra-* or simply created within Germanic rather than inherited.

5.2.3. S-Stem Connections: **keyt-ōs*?

As mentioned in the preceding section, the Slavic form—were it to reflect Indo-European inheritance—would have to rely on an animate nom.sg in **-ōs*. In this case, we would have to assume the existence of an animate, amphikinetic form **keyt-ōs* ‘perception, respect’, perhaps existing side by side (and possibly in a derivational relationship) with the above-mentioned neuter **keyt-es-*. We may note that an abstract noun **keyt-ōs* would conform to the model described in 2.3 fairly well: the semantics are related to a mental state and the root attests primary middle formations (recall the Indo-Iranian verbal material adduced in 5.1). Such a parent form would have yielded *†čity* rather than **čěty*, however. Thus, it would be necessary to assume that—on the way to Proto-Slavic—the form **keyt-ōs* underwent the modification to **koyt-ōs*, presumably based on some other derived stem displaying the *o*-grade in the root. The precise identification of this stem is not easy. One candidate is the causative **koyt-eye-*, which is unambiguously preserved in Baltic and Indo-Iranian and perhaps reflected in Slavic too (recall 5.1, 4.2.3). Alternatively, or additionally, the source of the secondary *o*-grade could be sought in the nominal domain, i.e., in derivatives such as the adjective **koyt-ro-* or the noun **koyt-u-* referred to above. These, however, are not otherwise known from Slavic (we have no evidence for *†čětrv* or *†čětv †-u*), so that the influence would have to be considerably early. Finally, a possible source of a secondary *o*-grade would be a simple thematic adjective in the form **koyt-o-* (i.e., a virtual PSI **čětv*), perhaps with the semantics ‘noteworthy, respectable’ or similar; as we saw in 4.2.2 (iii) and 4.2.4, its erstwhile existence in Slavic can be surmised based on some indirect evidence (names with first compound member **Cěto-*, possibly derived verb **čětati*).⁸¹

⁸⁰ It would clearly be a stretch to argue that the spelling *hidezruno* in the Stentofthen inscription (recall fn 76) might preserve a genuine **hidez-* < **kit-es-Ŵ-* here, which could be compared directly—albeit not without analogical levelings—with the apophonic setup of an original amphikinetic animate *s*-stem (cf. Ved *bhiyās-*, *bhīṣā* << **b^héyH-os-*, **b^hiH-és-*, **bhiH-s-Ŵ*; EWAia 2: 246). On the possibility of such a stem, cf. the ensuing section 5.2.3.

⁸¹ We may note that no such secondary modification of the root vocalism is observed in **ljuby* (if analyzed as **lewb^h-ōs*); the reason for this could be sought in the fact that, very much unlike the case of **keyt-*, the root **lewb^h-* displays no apophonic variants at all within Balto-Slavic (recall 2.3). As a side note, it may be mentioned that a stem **čět-* in Slavic could also hypothetically arise from the dereduplication of the PIE perfect stem **ke-koyt-*, discussed in section 5.1; the well-known stative/resultative semantics

In short, the extra-Slavic indications for a potential animate *s*-stem built from the root **keyt-* are far from conclusive, but certainly not negative (it should be borne in mind that, as far as such rare formations are concerned, we seldom have anything more than circumstantial evidence at our disposal). Thus, assuming a pre-form **keyt-ōs* >> **koyt-ōs*⁸² is certainly a viable option for a diachronic explanation of PSI **cěty* **-bve*.

5.2.4. U-Stem Connections

Finally, we may mention that the Vedic and Germanic evidence also provides some grounds for considering a more traditional explanation of **cěty*, i.e., as an extension of an original *u*-stem (recall 2.2). As we saw, both branches attest a *u*-stem which can be reconstructed as **koyt-u-* ‘recognition’.⁸³ The extension of this item with **-h₂* would result in the form **koyt-u-h₂*, which would yield PSI **cěty* **-bve* directly. Certainly attractive on the surface, this account runs into similar difficulties as the connections of Slavic abstract nouns in **-y* **-bve* with PIE *u*-stems in general (again, recall 2.2). Here, we may note, these complications are even graver than in the other postulated cases: since the parent *u*-stem **koyt-u-* was an abstract noun already, the rationale for its suffixation with **-h₂* would be even less clear than in the case of an underlying adjective.⁸⁴

of this PIE formation (cf. Jasanoff 2003: 30; Meier-Brügger 2010: 390–91) would suit the meaning of **cěty* relatively well. This connection would require a series of difficult assumptions, however, so that it will not be pursued further here. (The survival of dederuplicated PIE perfect stems in Balto-Slavic is quite commonly assumed for certain verbal types, e.g., PSI **gorěti* ‘burn’ and its kin, but a sole vestige inside a nominal derivative would be truly remarkable. For an alternative interpretation of the vocalism in the type **gorěti* as a reflex of the zero-grade, see Szeptyński 2017: 191).

⁸² We may add that if the noun **čismę* (recall 4.3) is really built upon the old *s*-stem, then it did not share this vocalism modification (preserving **čis-* < **kejt-s-* and not **čs-* < **kojt-s-*). Presumably, this would have been the formal corollary of the differentiation in meaning, reflecting various shades of the underlying root’s semantics (**‘perception’* > **‘counting’* > *‘number’* vs. **‘perception’* > *‘respect’*) as instantiated in the various verbal stems.

⁸³ Incidentally, the status of the *o*-grade in this item has also been the object of much discussion, which the present study cannot accommodate; see Vijūnas 2016 and Neri 2003: 216–21 with rich further references.

⁸⁴ Starting from an adjectival **koyt-u-* would admittedly be easier, but there is no evidence for such an item (except if one assumes its existence on the basis of the corresponding abstract).

5.2.5. Conclusions

Be that as it may, the above sections have shown that the Indo-European context at least offers some tangible points of departure for the diachronic explanation of PSI **cěty*—viable, though of course far from entirely straightforward. Thus, it is now worth checking whether the various perspectives developed in the preceding sections do not open up the possibilities of an inner-Slavic explanation as an alternative. This will be the task for the next part of our study.

6. Prospects of an Inner-Slavic Explanation: A Productive Model for Abstracts in **-y*?

6.1. Introduction

In order to substantiate the claim for a later, i.e., Proto- or Common Slavic origin of **cěty*, one would need to identify a viable model seen at work in the etymological families of the remaining abstracts in **-y* **-vve*. As signalled in 2.2, only two lexemes other than **cěty* will be truly relevant here: **ljuby* and **cěly*. Given that the cases of **cěty* and **ljuby* have already been discussed quite broadly in our study, it is necessary to examine the third of the lexemes in question in more detail before proceeding to the general analysis. This will be the task of the ensuing section.

6.2. **cěly*

PSI **cěly* has traditionally been reconstructed based on the well-known Old Church Slavic and Rusian Church Slavic material (SP 2: 75; ĚSSJa 3: 181). The issue of the precise provenance of the word has not attracted the attention of scholars so far. However, it has been pointed out that it is only found in a single text of the canon (cf. Cejtin 1977: 37). In view of the fact that the attestations in **Euch**⁸⁵ as listed in SJS 4: 837 do not have any known Greek (or other) textual equivalents,⁸⁶ it is worth investigating the remainder of the available material. Curiously, the sources in question all turn out to be linked either to the Czech lands as the locus of translation (**Bes**, **VencNik**; SJS 1: LXVII, LX-IX)⁸⁷ or to Novgorod as the place of the writing of—or at least the former loca-

⁸⁵ The abbreviations in this section follow those used in SJS and SreznMat and are faithfully reproduced in bold and italics, respectively.

⁸⁶ In this text, a Latin or Old High German source would also be a possibility.

⁸⁷ Interestingly, the lexical links of **Euch** with **Bes** and **VencNik** have been independently noticed by Sobolevskij (1910: 95, 104), who does not mention *cěly* in this context (cf., however, Sobolevskij 1900: 172). He further demonstrates a certain textual

tion of—the oldest Russian copies (**Nicod Novg**⁸⁸—SJS 1: LXIV; *Ier. (Upry.)*, *Iez. (tolk. Upry.)*,⁸⁹ *Gr. Naz. XI v.*⁹⁰—SreznMat 1: 8; 23'). Thus, it appears that—contrary to the potential first guess—the material indicates North Slavic rather than strictly South Slavic associations of the word in sacred writings.⁹¹

Most of the attestations display the verbally-oriented meaning 'healing (subst.)' (SJS 4: 837; SreznMat 3: 1456). As regards equivalents in Greek and Latin originals, particularly interesting are Lat *salus* (**VencNik**, SJS 4: 838) and MGr *sōteria* (*Gr. Naz XI v.* and *XIV v.*, SreznMat 3: 1456). As a result of a rather intricate textological situation, it turns out that either of them may be the equivalent of Slavic *cěly* in the Gospel of Nicodemus, exceptionally glossed as 'health' in SJS (**Nicod Novg**, SJS 4: 838). Although it would be unjustified to attach too much weight to this single passage, its testimony regarding the potential basis for further semantic evolution—as reflected in secular sources—nevertheless deserves consideration. In particular, clearly worthy of detailed discussion is the development towards a greeting formula and/or a noun denoting a 'kiss'.⁹² In what follows, we organize the discussion of the material in three points, (i–iii).

relationship between exactly those parts of **Bes** and **Euch** in which the word under discussion is found (Sobolevskij 1910: 100).

⁸⁸ Other, less clear relationships to the Gospel of Nicodemus as regards lexis reminiscent of **Bes** (Sobolevskij 1910: 99; also 1900: 171–72) would require further research. The position of **Novg** in our deliberations can therefore be regarded as ambiguous, representing either a Novgorod-based manuscript or a translation of Czech provenance (thus SJS 1: LXIV). The latter line of reasoning may be erroneous, however, as other scholars point to **Novg** being dependent on the Serbian tradition and to the Serbian or Moravian origin of the translation itself (SIKniž 1: 121; the age of the manuscript is also evaluated differently, with SJS arguing for the 14th and SIKniž for the 15th century). Unfortunately, the earliest Serbian copy (13th century) happens to lack the relevant fragment (SAE: 106), while the 15th-century Serbian copy treated as basic by SJS displays the instr.sg *zdravijemo* here (SJS 4: 838). We may add that another Russian copy of the 15th century contains the form *po cěl'vi* (RGB304I/145: 202v).

⁸⁹ The abbreviations with initial "*Upry.*" refer to late manuscripts based on the 1047 copies authored by Upry' Lixoj of Novgorod (cf. Sreznvskij 1865: 34).

⁹⁰ The known part of the history of this 11th-century manuscript begins in the year 1276 in Novgorod (XIIISGB: IV). The fragment of *Gr. Naz. XIV v.* cited by Sreznvskij coincides with *Gr. Naz. XI v.* (save for the inflectional form of the noun).

⁹¹ In the case of the Russian texts one must also reckon with the South Slavic origin of the translations themselves. That being said, currently we are not aware of any positive indices of the word's presence in South Slavic copies (excluding, of course, **Euch**).

⁹² Etymologically, the root of **cěl-* denotes the concept of 'wholeness, health, unscathedness'; the association with the physical act of 'kissing' must have arisen via the attested intermediate stage of 'greeting', i.e., wishing health (cf. ERHJ 1: 111).

(i) Thus, Novgorod birchbark letter 849 (mid-12th century—Zaliznjak 2004: 318–19) opens with the greeting *čělvov o(t) Petra kv Dьmъšě* ‘greeting from Petr to Demša’, with an apparent reflex of **čěly* in the acc.sg.⁹³ Such a greeting formula is unusual for this corpus and is only found in this letter; Zaliznjak notes that it resembles the use of Lat *salutem*, likewise in the accusative and in an elliptic construction lacking an overt verb. It would also be possible to interpret the form as a remodelled nom.sg, however. As for the meaning, it may have been influenced by the verb **čělovati* ‘greet’.⁹⁴ Although the text is generally written in dialect (cf. forms like gen.sg.f *u Mareně*), it displays certain adjustments to “standard” Old Russian, which the form *čělvov* must also reflect. As stressed by Zaliznjak, the phonology of both this item and the verb *čěluju* ‘I kiss’ found in the same inscription excludes fully native Novgorodian origin, where the root would display the shape *kěl-* (cf. the famous phrase *a zamъke kěle* ‘and the lock is intact’ in letter 247). We may only speculate that the uniqueness of this attestation reflects the strictly oral character of the greeting formula—“bookish” origin is improbable here in view of the non-occurrence in written sources.⁹⁵ Still, a connection with the fact that the Novgorod milieu may have been one of the sources of Church Slavic *čěly* (cf. above) is at least alluring.

(ii) Data from modern dialects, viz. the unpublished materials of AOS,⁹⁶ offer an apparently isolated direct reflex of PSI **čěly* >> **čělvov*: *Bes colóvi kaka l’ubóf!* ‘what kind of love is it without a kiss!’ (Dolgoshchelye, Mezensky District). Note that the reflex of **ě* participates in the change *e > o* (*ěkan’e*) here, which is unexpected in the Pomor variety.⁹⁷

⁹³ The hardening of the final [v] is due to a phonetic development already commonly found in this period (Zaliznjak 2004: 79). Since the text does not otherwise show the confusion of < ѣ > and < о > (a hallmark feature of many Novgorod letters), it does not seem warranted to interpret this form as belonging to the masculine type **čělovъ*, discussed in (iii) further below.

⁹⁴ Cf. Eng *greeting* as both an action noun of the verb *greet* and as an abstract gesture that can be passed from one person to another.

⁹⁵ Gippius (2009: 294–95) offers arguments against treating the form as a Church Slavicism and analyzes it as a native East Slavic item, though belonging to “Standard Old Russian” rather than to the Novgorod vernacular; he also directs attention to the occurrence of the verb *čělovati* in the same letter (in fact, as part of the complimentary closing).

⁹⁶ Card index of the Arkhangelsk Regional Dictionary (= AOS), Lomonosov Moscow State University, Faculty of Philology, Department of Russian Language.

⁹⁷ This unique phrase has also been recorded with a neuter variant of the noun for ‘kiss’: *Bes celóvja kaká l’ubóf!* (note also the difference between *kaka* and *kaká*, perhaps insignificant). Accordingly, the lemmata *celóv’* and *celóv’e* have been proposed in Gecova 2006. When viewed in isolation, the feminine form **colóf’* appears to be the *lectio*

(iii) The most precarious set of data potentially related to **cěly* is furnished by the masculine nouns reflecting the archetypes **cělovъ* and **cělyvъ* ‘kiss’ (exceptionally in the 14th century also ‘sign of peace’, cf. Pavić 1875: 121) attested in historical B/C/S and in the Church Slavic recensions of the area. Both variants are attested in later copies of the SerbCS *Hilandar Typicon* and *Studenica Typicon* (see below for the material). The texts in question were translated by St. Sava from Greek in the early 13th century (to be precise, 1200–1201 and 1208 respectively) and share large parts of the text.

As to the earliest direct attestations, the former variant may be dated to the 13th century independently of the situation in the typicons, although not without controversy, since the instance of the nom.sg *celovъ* from the Žiča monastery inscription (1222–1228; MiklMS: 14) has also been interpreted as a defective notation of part.praet.act *celovavъ* ‘having kissed’ (cf. RKSS 3: 455). The next record in terms of chronology would apparently be that in the *Typicon of Monk Roman* (1331; MiklPGL: 1107).⁹⁸ Interestingly, the earliest attestations, including the ones in St. Sava’s typicons, refer exclusively to rituals connected with taking up duties within monastic communities.⁹⁹ This points to a deeply conventionalized use, possibly deriving from a single source—presumably St. Sava’s typicons themselves. If we agreed that *cělovъ* is the older variant here, one way in which such a masculine form could have arisen is via the reinterpretation of the feminine *cělovъ* < **cělъvъ* (acc.sg of **cěly*): note that Serbian texts of this period often used the “Macedonian” spelling < ov > for suffixal *-vъ-,¹⁰⁰ while in general **vъ* and **vъ* (including graphically in final position) were of course conflated as < ѡ >. It would be difficult to attribute this change to the written language, however, given that the meaning ‘kiss’ has not been documented in texts for the reflexes of **cěly*. Might we be dealing with a form **celov* taken over from the vernacular dialects of Macedonia of the time? Or might St. Sava have acquired the noun in East Slavic-influenced form (likewise **vъ* > o) at the St. Panteleimon Monastery on Mount Athos, so that it would have spread to Serbian and later Croatian texts from his writings? Needless to say, all such questions are bound to remain pure speculation.

difficilior in terms of phonology and morphology. However, in the context in which it is attested, it is impossible to exclude morphological attraction to the noun *l’ubof’*.

⁹⁸ Miklosich does not supply the full form. Unfortunately, the edition of the text (TMR) was not available to us. For some early information on the manuscript cf. Jagić 1873: 3–7. Irrespective of the often similar nomenclature (*Typicon chilandar(i)ense*, *Hilandarski tipik monaha Romana*, etc.), this work should be carefully distinguished from St. Sava’s *Hilandar Typicon*.

⁹⁹ As noted in the previous footnote, we have no information on the specific context in the *Typicon of Monk Roman*. Still, the type of document remains the same.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. in MiklMS: *ljubovnym* (p. 2; with inverted digraph < ju >), *ljubovnii* (p. 3; with inverted digraph < ju >), *luboviju* (p. 3), *ljuboviju* (p. 9), *crkovnomu* (p. 14).

What adds to the complexity of the situation is the existence of the aforementioned other variant of the masculine noun, with *-yv-*. Unfortunately, we cannot be content with a 13th-century date (cf. RHSJ 1: 805) as ascribed to it based solely on a 17th-century copy of the *Studenica Typicon*, where we find nom.sg *celyvb* (ST: 458), acc.sg *celyvb*, and loc.sg *celyv(ě)* (ST: 458, 463). More conclusive data could be drawn from the earlier *Hilandar Typicon*, which should contain the latter two occurrences.¹⁰¹ Regrettably, the oldest copy—which dates back to the first half of the 13th century—lacks the relevant folios (HT: 28); we are only able to locate the forms in copies dated to the third quarter of the 14th century,¹⁰² where, however, the acc.sg instance appears as *-ovb* and the loc.sg as *-yvě* (Stojanović 1890: 169; Dimitrije 1898: 55). All in all, it appears that St. Sava's texts written in the 1200s contained at least one masculine form (cf. the loc.sg in *-ě*) with suffixal *-y-*; thus, these non-extant records would have provided the presumed earliest material for the issue under discussion.¹⁰³ In the light of the above, it is difficult to uphold the interpretation of SerbCS and CrCS (14th century onwards, cf. MikILPGL: 1107;¹⁰⁴ Pavić 1875: 121) masculine *čelovb* and *čelyvb* as remodelled reflexes of PSI **čěly*. Rather, as indicated in passing already by Skok (ERHSJ 1: 268; cf. also ERHJ 1: 112), the masculine nouns are likely to stand in some relation to the respective stems of the verbs *čelovati*, *čelyvati* 'greet, kiss', both attested since OCS (SJS 4: 834, 838). This is probable in view of the nouns' specialized meaning, which uncontroversially developed in the verbal domain,¹⁰⁵ as well as from their otherwise unusual derivational structure. The simplest analysis would entail a back-formation of the nouns from the respective verbs, in accordance with the common relationship [verb = nominal stem + *-ati*] (*dělo* : *dělati* etc.). Admittedly, it is difficult to find exact parallels for such a process—verbs in *-ovati/-yvati* do not usually yield back-formations in *-ovb/-yvb*. Still, the case with *čelovati* and *čelyvati* may have been special in two ways: firstly in view of the relatively early stage of the creation of the noun(s), predating the later sprawl of *-ovati* and especially *-yvati*, and secondly in view of the accumulated semantic distance between

¹⁰¹ The expected lack of the nom.sg form results from textual differences.

¹⁰² Namely the so-called *Odessa copy* or *Copy of Monk Miha* (included in Stojanović 1890) from the third quarter of the 14th century and the *Copy of Monk Marko* (included in Dimitrije 1898) from 1370–75. For their dating, see HT: 125–26.

¹⁰³ Interestingly, the variant with *-i-* < *-y-* only surfaces again in the 16th century (Vetranović) and its attestation remains rather sparse in later times too (cf. RHSJ 1: 806), in stark contrast to the amply represented form with *-o-*. The vernacular forms predictably assume the shapes *c(j)elov* and *c(j)eliv*.

¹⁰⁴ If "nov." (s.v. *čelovb*) = "miss.-nov." (cf. MikILPGL: XIV).

¹⁰⁵ Recall fn 92.

čělovati/čělyvati in the meaning ‘greet, kiss’ and the base adjective **čělv*.¹⁰⁶ The latter fact would have “freed up” a presumed nominal basis for the verbs *čělovati/čělyvati*, which could be filled with a newly-formed **čělovb/*čělyvb*. This novel verbal noun may in fact have been a technical neologism crafted so as to dissociate the meaning from the notion of romantic kissing. In any case, no truly satisfactory formal alternatives are available. The structurally closest old noun in **-ovb* with clear etymological ties to the class in **-y *-vve* is **žbrnovb* m. ‘millstone’ (Ru *žěrnov* etc.), attested side by side with the synonymous **žbrny **-vve f. Here, however, we are almost certainly dealing with a substantivized adjective in **-ovb* (Snoj 1994: 494; ESJS 19: 1161).¹⁰⁷ Admittedly, a similar adjectival formation in **-ovb* has also been postulated for the family of **čěl-* (**čělovb* ‘whole, unscathed’; SP 2: 73), but the basis for this is rather thin and the substantivization of such an adjective would hardly have yielded a noun for ‘kiss’ in any case.¹⁰⁸ Still, some degree of contamination or influence

¹⁰⁶ A separate interesting issue is the structure of these verbal formations in **-ovati* and **-yvati* themselves, especially the question whether they may be derived from or influenced by **čěly* (on the formant **-yvati* in the context of **čělyvati* cf. Ěkkert 1963: 114, fn 262). It bears pointing out that the reverse index for SJS does not reveal a single other formation with suffixal *-yvati* (Ribarova 2003: 136), perhaps with the exception of the “intermediate” *osnyvati* ← *osnovati* (where *-ov-* belongs to the root). Given that the present article focuses on the derivation of the abstracts themselves, not on their own derivatives, we are unable to delve into this discussion here. We may note that the verbs **čělovati* (ĚSSJa 3: 179; SP 2: 72–73) and **ljubovati* (ĚSSJa 15: 179–80; additional Old Czech material in SStč 2: 280) appear to be old, while the reconstruction of **čětovati* is highly questionable (4.2.5). Finally, we may add that **čělyvati* also attests the intransitive and passive meanings ‘recover, be cured; be saved’; we cannot discuss the potential reasons for this here.

¹⁰⁷ As recently observed by Janczulewicz (forthcoming), the derivation of adjectives in **-ovb* from nouns in **-y *-vve* was a productive process. ESJS, following Machek 1968, also entertains the significantly less attractive possibility of stem class shift based on an ambiguous nom.pl form.

¹⁰⁸ The reconstruction of **čělovb* in SP is clearly motivated by the analysis of **čělv* as a former *u*-stem adjective, a view which we consider entirely unfounded; cf. the doubts voiced by Majer (2020: 90) concerning such an interpretation (including on the isolated OPr form *kailüstiskan*). This argumentation may be supplemented with the critique of the purported attestation of a fossilized gen.sg in *-u* as an alleged relic of *u*-stem declension. The OCz expression *z čělu* ‘fully’, to which Eckert attaches a great deal of importance (Ěkkert 1963: 113–14), is but a hapax contradicting the clearly regular use of *čěla* both with *z* and with other prepositions (Gebauer 1896: 326–27). What is more, the exceptional form under discussion is likely to represent an ad hoc creation crafted for poetic purposes, as it occurs rhyming with *tělu*. The concomitant interpretation of the alleged expression *za čělu* as a contamination of *z čělu* and *za čělo* ‘really’ (Gebauer 1896: 327; Ěkkert 1963: 114) relies on a subjective reading of one of the textual variants. The variant accepted as the basis for the edition of the relevant text has *za čělo* (SZSO: 330): < Tohot zacyelo niewiem > ‘this I really do not know’. More to the point, the other

from the items **čělovъ* and/or **čěly *-vve* may have of course facilitated the deverbal processes described above.

To sum up, the earliest and most securely attested meaning of **čěly* is the deverbal ‘healing’. Still, we must also reckon with the existence of material displaying connections to the meanings ‘greet, kiss’ known from other verbs belonging to the set of **čěl-*.¹⁰⁹

6.3. Possible Derivational Bases of Abstracts in **-y*

6.3.1. Abstracts in **-y* as Deadjectival Derivatives

In view of the (moderate) productivity of deadjectival formations continuing the type in **-y *-vve* in the historical era (cf. 2.2; see also Wojtyła-Świerzowska 1992: 52–55), an analysis of the lexemes **čěly*, **čěty*, and **ljuby* linking them with qualitative adjectives would appear natural. While the existence of PSI **čělъ* ‘whole, healthy’ (ÈSSJa 3: 179; SP 2: 73; Derksen 2008: 75) and **ljubъ* ‘nice, dear’ (ÈSSJa 15: 181; Derksen 2008: 281) is of course beyond any doubt, the reconstruction of the adjective **čětvъ* ‘respectable, noteworthy’, as suggested in 4.2.2, relies primarily on onomastic data and perhaps also on derived verbs. Semantically, **ljubъ* and **čětvъ* would appear to be particularly close, denoting a person’s positive “social qualities”; the meaning ‘healthy’ of the adjective **čělъ* is also related, though somewhat more distant. This latter word also stands out formally, at least at a deeper level of analysis, as it contains a reflex of the suffix **-lo-*. The most difficult to analyze are the prosodic features of the adjectives; although **čělъ* is uncontroversially reconstructed as belonging to accent paradigm *c*, determining the accent paradigm of **ljubъ* (*c* or *b*) is a

manuscript family attests a feminine noun in the acc.sg here: < prawdu > ‘truth’, so that the adjective displays regular concord with it: < za czelu prawdu >. We may compare the identical phrase found in another text: *já toho neviem za celú prawdu* ‘I do not know this with full certainty’ (StčS 19: 1086). Meanwhile—based on one manuscript only—Gebauer reads gen.sg *pravdy* here, which disrupts the meaning (as though *toho za celu pravdy nevieme* ‘this we do not really know the truth’) and obscures the link between the presence of the noun and the adjectival form in *-u* in a whole family of manuscripts. On a curiously similar instance of variation in another text (< za celw prawdw > vs. < za czyelo >), cf. Vondrák 1889: 23, 35.

¹⁰⁹ Appellative origin—thus presumably identical in form with **čěly *-vve*—is vaguely suggested for the Old Polish personal name *Całwa* < Czałwa > (1396—SSNO 1: 298) by Kucała (1968: 181); even if correct, the analysis does not, of course, make it possible to extract any semantic value from the underlying noun.

matter of contention,¹¹⁰ while the case of **cělv* does not of course provide any direct data.

Now, as regards the derivation of abstracts, the comparison of their meanings does not lead to any definite conclusions. The derivation **cěl̥v* → **cěl̥y* is transparent with regard to the (poorly attested) meaning ‘health’ and less so with regard to ‘healing (subst.)’. As regards **ljub̥v* → **ljuby* ‘love’, the drift toward a term denoting a feeling can be easily compared with certain parallels (e.g., **mil̥v* → **milost̥v*). Needless to say, any semantic analysis of **cěty* in the context of the supposed basic adjective would be circular: after all, the meaning of the adjective is inferred chiefly from that of **cěty* itself (‘respect’). As regards the accentological aspect of the derivations involved, this is, again, quite complex. The only pair for which we possess relevant data is **ljub̥v* → **ljuby*,¹¹¹ although even this example remains unclear. Firstly, as remarked above, the accentological profile of the base adjective is not known with certainty;¹¹² secondly, the uncontroversial reconstruction of ap *b* for the abstract noun may turn out utterly irrelevant if one interprets the attestations in the respective languages as Church Slavisms (cf. 2.2).¹¹³

All in all, we possess no viable arguments to confirm or to rule out the interpretation of the set of abstracts under discussion as deadjectival at the Common Slavic level. This has to be regarded as one of the conceivable scenarios, although many issues remain unanswered.

6.3.2. Abstracts in *-y as Deverbal Derivatives

The notion of the derivation of the above-mentioned abstracts from verbs in **-i-ti* in the Proto- or Common Slavic era is bedeviled by the fact that the latter type involved both deverbal (causative, iterative) and denominal items. The purely denominal character of the verb is obvious in the case of **cěl̥iti* ‘make whole, heal’, cf. the presence of *-l-* as the reflex of the nominal suffix **-lo-* (6.3.1).

¹¹⁰ On the ap *c* of **cěl̥v* cf. Skljarenko 1998: 141 (with further references to older literature); Derksen 2008: 75; Zaliznjak 2019: 440. As regards **ljub̥v*, the attribution to ap *b* is found in e.g., Dybo 1981: 108; Skljarenko 1998: 140, and to ap *c* e.g., in Zaliznjak 2019: 408 (but “traces of *b*” are mentioned in Zaliznjak 1985: 138). No paradigm is assigned in Derksen 2008: 281.

¹¹¹ On the ap *b* of **ljuby* cf. Skljarenko 1998: 136 (with further references); Zaliznjak 2019: 630. See also Snoj 1994: 502–03, though operating within a different framework than assumed here.

¹¹² The derivation of an ap *b* abstract noun from an ap *c* adjective would require a special justification for the metatony.

¹¹³ The apparent isolated attestation of a reflex of **cěl̥y* in a modern variety of the Arkhangelsk area (recall 6.2 (ii)) would be a feeble basis for reconstructing the original accent properties of the noun.

A similar analysis suggests itself for **ljubiti* ‘love’, where the apophonic *e*-grade (as though < **lewb^h-eye-*) corresponds to that of the adjective **ljubъ* (**lewb^h-o-*) while differing from the *o*-grade expected in the deverbal type in **-eye-* (recall 2.3). Compared with **čěliti* and **ljubiti*, the verb **čětiti*—with its clear *o*-grade and fairly exact Indo-European comparanda (recall 5.1)—would indeed be a far better candidate for the derivational basis of the corresponding abstract **čěty*; that being said, we need to bear in mind that the indices for the reconstruction of this verb in Slavic itself are indirect, relying on the personal names in **Čěti-* and the adposition **čětja* (recall 4.2.3, 4.2.6). The meaning of the verb **čěliti* generally matches its nominal point of departure, while **ljubiti* attests to a semantic drift toward denoting an emotion (paralleling the abstract, see below; cf. also **milъ* → **milovati*). The semantics of **čětiti* cannot be reconstructed based on the actual Slavic material in view of the discrepancies among the potential direct appellative reflexes and of the purely onomastic character of the attested derivatives (cf. 4.2.3). As far as accentology is concerned, the ap *c* of **čěliti* again agrees with the adjectival basis, while **ljubiti* clearly belongs to ap *b*, with the accentological status of **ljubъ* uncertain (6.3.1).¹¹⁴ For what it is worth, the potential attestations of **čětiti*, i.e., the hapax legomena MCz *cetiti* and Ukr *čityty* (4.2.3), jointly indicate ap *c*; no accentological data can of course be adduced for the adjective.

Semantically speaking, the derivations **čěliti* ‘make whole, heal’ → **čěly* ‘healing (subst.); health; greeting’ and **ljubiti* ‘to love’ → **ljuby* ‘love’ are credible. In the former pair, the reference to the verb is even necessary to account for the basic meaning of the derivative; in the latter pair, the semantic shift observed jointly in the verb and the abstract noun vis-à-vis the adjective is quite notable. In view of the uncertain status of the verb itself—let alone the semantic differences among the potential reflexes—no workable analysis of the semantic relationship between **čětiti* and **čěty* can be offered. The reconstruction of prosodic rapport is possible for the pair **ljubiti* → **ljuby* (as long as Church Slavic influence is not assumed); their common ap *b* strengthens the impression of the close relationship between the two items in view of the controversies regarding the prosodic features of the adjective (6.3.1).¹¹⁵ Indirect data regarding **čěty* might be sourced from the derivative seen in MCz *cetwiti* (3.3.3); the short vowel would appear to correspond to the one in *četiti* (ap *c*? cf. above), although the single, shared attestation of both verbs by no means warrants the reliability of this finding.

¹¹⁴ On the ap *c* of **čěliti* cf. Skljarenko 1998: 160 (with further references); Zaliznjak 2019: 349. On the ap *b* of **ljubiti* cf. Skljarenko 1998: 158–59; Zaliznjak 2019: 335.

¹¹⁵ Were it to be demonstrated that the base adjective belonged to the same prosodic type, this impression would of course be nullified. Still, it is highly unlikely that new data should tip the scales in this particular direction. We leave aside the apparent (though unexpected) prosodic mismatch between the adjective and the verb.

If we try to evaluate the three abstracts as a whole, it is difficult to rule out either direct deverbal origin or double motivation from both the corresponding adjectives and the corresponding verbs (themselves potentially deadjectival). However, the semantic drift observed within the etymological families of **cěly* and **ljuby* attests to a closer link between the abstracts and the verbs. Thus, although certain objective difficulties remain—mostly doubts regarding the reconstruction of the verb **cětiti* itself—the verbal connection would in principle appear more promising than the adjectival one. Note that this would also offer an explanation of the root shape seen in **cěty*, as the noun would simply copy it from the verb **cětiti* directly (cf. the apophonic identity of **ljuby* and **ljubiti*).

6.4. Conclusions

The above analyses do not permit us to determine with any certainty whether **cěty* could be a late creation following a coherent derivational pattern of abstracts in **-y* **-vve*. Neither are we able to answer the question which of the reviewed models (denominal, deverbal, or mixed) would best account for the form and semantics of the lexeme. This is, of course, primarily due to the scarce and almost exclusively indirect evidence for both the adjective **cětv* and the verb **cětiti* (4.2.2–4.2.3). That being said, the abstract nouns **cěly* and **ljuby* appear to be associated somewhat more closely with the corresponding verbs than with the adjectives; thus, for what it is worth, a similar relationship might theoretically be expected for **cěty*.

7. Summary and Conclusions

Conducting the above study required engaging diverse kinds of material and confronting research problems across different domains, ranging from relatively obscure dialectal data and little-known written sources to central questions of word-formation in Slavic and Indo-European. It is now time to summarize the chief findings and the remaining questions.

As our point of departure, we mentioned recent research concerning the Slavic nouns in **-y* **-vve* (Section 1). Specifically, we pointed to the unclear diachronic origins of the compact group of abstract nouns belonging to this formal type, outlining the problems concerning the traditional explanation, which posits PIE **-u-H* derived from *u*-stem adjectives (2.1–2.2). We reported the recent novel account offered in Majer 2020, where the word **ljuby* **-vve* ‘love, desire’ is derived from a pre-form **lewb^h-ōs*, invoking a type of PIE animate *s*-stems which could serve as abstract nouns correlated with certain types of verbs and adjectives (2.3). We reviewed the strengths and weaknesses

of this hypothesis, observing that additional Slavic data—i.e., items of similar structure and function—could help test it or develop it further.

In this connection, we pointed to the poorly-known PSI noun **čěty* **-bve* ‘respect’ (3.2). We conducted a review—to our knowledge exhaustive—of the data that enable its reconstruction, including its verbal derivative **čětviti* ‘to respect’ (3.3). We concluded that the reconstruction is rather secure in spite of the local and sparse attestation, and that the item must be considerably old (quite possibly predating Proto-Slavic) given its synchronically unusual structure (3.4), which clearly calls for an explanation in the context of other nouns in **-y* **-bve* and of other forms derived from the same root.

In the search for such an explanation, we reviewed the remaining Slavic-internal material related to the root in question, covering the allomorphs **čbt-* and **čit-* (4.1) and especially the allomorph **čēt-* (4.2); while discussing the latter, we devoted a lot of space to the uncertain, indirect material for the nominal **čětv* (4.2.2) as well as the verbs **čětiti*, **čětati* (4.2.3–4.2.4). We concluded that the most promising evidence is in fact found in personal names with **Čěto/i-*, which may be based on an adjective **čětv* and/or a verb **čětiti*; the latter item in particular may also receive some support from the adposition **čětja* (4.2.6). The presumed direct appellative reflexes of both **čětv* and **čětiti* are extremely doubtful, however. Finally, in view of the potential *s*-stem connections of nouns in **-y* **-bve*, we pointed out the noun **čisme*, which might preserve a trace of a stem in *-s-* built on the relevant root (4.3).

We then proceeded to review the Indo-European background of the problem—again first presenting the root **keyt-* in general (5.1) and subsequently focusing on the material related to *s*-stems (5.2.2–5.2.3). Here, we observed that the reconstruction of PIE forms like neuter **keyt-es-* and animate **keyt-ōs* would be consistent with the data and that the transformation of the latter form into PSI **čěty* **-bve*, though requiring certain morphological adjustments (including in root apophony), would have been possible.

We then evaluated an alternative approach to the problem, investigating whether the existing models of Slavic abstract nouns in **-y* **-bve*, inherited from earlier times (from whatever source) and specialized in the semantic domain of “social qualities”, could not have led to the creation of **čěty* **-bve* within Slavic. In order to explore the relevant contexts, we first directed our attention to **čěly* **-bve*, yet another abstract noun with a somewhat unclear derivational status (6.2); here, we pointed out certain novel philological facts and also ventured to explain the rise of the innovative masculine forms **čělovb* and **čělyvb* in historical B/C/S and in the corresponding Church Slavic recensions. Subsequently, taking into account both this and a few other related items, we reviewed the possibilities of limited but productive inner-Slavic derivation of abstracts in **-y* **-bve* from adjectives (6.3.1) and verbs (6.3.2); we concluded that the latter origin would be somewhat more plausible for **čěty* **-bve*.

Therefore, our final judgment is that **čěty* could indeed be another example of an inherited archaic *s*-stem noun with a nom.sg in *-*ōs* (**keyt-ōs* >> **koyt-ōs*); its shift to the productive declension in *-*y* *-*ove* would have paralleled that of **ljuby*. The (inevitably circumstantial) support for such a solution mostly comes from two considerations: 1) potential traces of *s*-stem morphology in the root **keyt-* within Slavic (**čisme*) as well as elsewhere in Indo-European; 2) the apparently more robust correlation of abstracts in *-*y* *-*ove* with verbal material, paralleling the pairing of items in *-*ōs* with verbs in Ancient Greek and Indo-Iranian. The alignment with the verb **čětiti* would also explain the *o*-grade of the root (**koyt-* > **čět-*) in the noun **čěty*, otherwise not easy to account for (note the apophonic identity of **ljuby* and **ljubiti*). The latter facts, however, may also be interpreted as speaking for a Slavic-internal creation of the item **čěty* following the available model of **ljuby* or **čěly* (whatever their own prehistories) or by direct deverbal derivation. Ultimately, it must be borne in mind that the two modes of analysis—the Indo-European, “sigmatic”, one and the inner-Slavic one—are not mutually exclusive. They are based on comparative data of very different kinds and may be said to complement each other depending on what point on the timeline one approaches the problem; and the correct point to approach is at present unknowable.

Needless to say, the above assessment is merely the best we can do given the available indices, which force us to choose from among a few complex scenarios—all requiring a number of stipulations. Perhaps future discoveries of new data will allow us to illuminate the past of **čěty*—and abstract nouns in *-*y* *-*ove* in general—with significantly greater clarity. Still, we believe that our study of this little-known Slavic word for ‘respect’ has considerably clarified its position within its type and contributed somewhat to the elucidation of the type itself.

References

- Ambrasas, Saulius. (1993) *Daiktavardžių darybos raida: Lietuvių kalbos veiksmožodiniai vediniai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Antonsen, Elmer H. (1975) *A concise grammar of the older runic inscriptions*. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Arumaa, Peeter. (1976) *Urslavische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen*. II. Band: *Konsonantismus*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- . (1985) *Urslavische Grammatik: Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der slavischen Sprachen*. III. Band: *Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Babik, Zbigniew. (2001) *Najstarsza warstwa nazewnictwa na ziemiach polskich*. Cracow: Universitas.
- Belić, Aleksandar. (1976) *Osnovi istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika*. I. *Fonetika*. 4th edition. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.

- Bernštejn, Samuil B. (1974) *Očerok sravnitel'noj grammatiki slavjanskix jazykov: Čeredovanija. Imennye osnovy*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Birnbaum, Henrik and Jos Schaeken. (1997) *Das altkirchenslavische Wort: Bildung—Bedeutung—Herleitung*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Boryś, Wiesław. (1995) "Z historii prasłowiańskich przymiotnikowych tematów na -u-: Oboczność *plytvъ : *plytvъbъ : *plytvъkъ". Franciszek Sławski and Halina Mieczkowska, eds. *Studia z językoznawstwa słowiańskiego*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 35–39.
- Bräuer, Herbert. (1969) *Slavische Sprachwissenschaft*. II. Formenlehre. 1. Teil. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Brückner, Aleksander. (1927) *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Cracow: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza.
- Brugmann, Karl. (1906) *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweiter Band: *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*. Erster Teil: *Allgemeines. Zusammensetzung (Komposita). Nominalstämme*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Casaretto, Antje. (2004) *Nominale Wortbildung der gotischen Sprache: Die Derivation der Substantive*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Cejtlin, Ralja M. (1977) *Leksika staroslavjanskogo jazyka: Opyt analiza motivirovannyx slov po dannym drevnebolgarskix rukopisej X–XI vv*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Cheung, Johnny. (2007) *Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- de Lamberterie, Charles. (1990) *Les adjectifs grecs en -υς: Sémantique et comparaison*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- de Vaan, Michiel. (2008) *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Derksen, Rick. (2008) *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Dimitrije, [Episkop]. (1898) "Tipik Hilendarski". *Spomenik* 3: 37–69.
- Dworakowski, Stanisław. (1935) *Zwyczaje rodzinne w powiecie wysokomazowieckim*. Warsaw: Nakł. Towarzystwa Naukowego Warszawskiego.
- Dybo, Vladimir A. (1981) *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Eder, Maciej and Waclaw Twardzik. (2007) *Indeksy do Słownika staropolskiego*. Cracow: Lexis.
- Eichler, Ernst. (1965) *Studien zur Frühgeschichte slawischer Mundarten zwischen Saale und Neisse*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Èkkert [Eckert], Rajner. (1963) "Imena suščestvitel'nye s osnovoj na -ŭ-". *Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija* 27: 3–133.
- Furlan, Metka. (2011) "O slovenskem narečnem kri, kr(i)vesa 'kri, krvi' ali o prvotnem sklanjatvenem vzorcu praslovanskega *kry 'kri'". *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 17(1): 7–22.
- Gebauer, Jan. (1896) *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého*. Díl III: *Tvarosloví (I. Skloňování)*. Prague and Vienna: Nákladem Fr. Tempského.

- Gecova, Oksana G., ed. (2006) *Obratnyj slovar' arxangel'skix govorov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gippius, Aleksej A. (2009) "Nabljudenija nad ètiketnymi formulami berest-janyx pisem". Ljudmila L. Fedorova, ed. *Stereotipy v jazyke, komunikacii i kul'ture: Sbornik statej*. Moscow: Rossijskij gosudarstvennyj gumanitarnyj universitet, 279–300.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. (1987) *Die "I. Präsensklasse" im Vedischen*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Górniewicz, Hubert. (1984) "Nazwy geograficzne typu *Stoisław, Golubie* na Pomorzu Gdańskim (przyczynek do „Słowiańskiego atlasu onomastycznego”)”. *Onomastica Slavogermanica* 14: 105–38.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel. (2014) "Zur Entwicklung der neutralen *s*-Stämme im Germanischen". H. Craig Melchert, Elisabeth Rieken, and Thomas Steer, eds. *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*. Ann Arbor and New York: Beech Stave Press, 46–63.
- Hirt, Hermann. (1898) "Grammatisches und Etymologisches". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 23: 288–357.
- Jagić, Vatroslav. (1873) "Opisi i izvodi iz nekoliko južnoslovenskih rukopisa". *Starine* 5: 1–108.
- Janczulewicz, Paweł. (2020) "Identyfikacja tematów na **(j)ū* w materiale polskim i słowiańskim". *LingVaria* 1(29): 201–12.
- . (2021) "Proto-Slavic **ū*-stems and the Polabian language". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 66(2): 208–28.
- . (forthcoming) "O pewnym archaizmie derywacyjnym: Dystrybucja sufiksów **-bje* i **-ov-bje* w collectiwach (na podstawie polskiego materiału toponomastycznego)". To appear in *Język Polski*.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. (2003) *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kamiš, Adolf. (1974) *Slovní zásoba české publicistiky 18. století*. Prague: Univerzita Karlova.
- Kardas, Kacper. (2019) "Krótka historia 'czytania' (cz. I): Protoforma i ścieżki derywacji". *Linguistica Copernicana* 16: 337–62.
- Kellens, Jean and Éric Pirart. (1995) *Liste du verbe avestique: Avec un appendice sur l'orthographe des racines avestiques*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kim, Ronald I. (2019) "North Slavic *-ě* vs. South Slavic *-ę*: A problem of forward reconstruction". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 27(1): 1–26.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. (1992) "Die lateinische Nominalflexion". Oswald Panagl and Thomas Krisch, eds. *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 89–135.
- Kopečný, František, ed. (1973) *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků: Slova gramatická a zájmena*. Sv. 1. *Předložky, koncové partikule*. Prague: Academia.
- Kucała, Marian. (1968) "Odbicie słownictwa pospolitego w staropolskich nazwach osobowych". *Język Polski* 48(3): 168–86.

- Kümmel, Martin. (2000) *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Liewehr, Ferdinand. (1970) "Schwierige slawische Eigennamen". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 15(1): 659–75.
- Lochner von Hüttenbach, Fritz Frhr. (2008) *Zum Namengut des Frühmittelalters in der Steiermark*. Vienna: Böhlau. [*Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereines für Steiermark*, 99.]
- Loma, Aleksandar. (1998) "Mundartliche Gliederung des späten Urslavischen und frühe slavische Stammesbildungen: Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die sorbisch-serbischen Isolexen". Jerzy Rusek and Wiesław Boryś, eds. *Prasłowiańszczyzna i jej rozpad*. Warsaw: Energeia, 143–60.
- . (1999/2000) "Serbisches und kroatisches Sprachgut bei Konstantin Porphyrogenetos". *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 38: 87–161.
- . (2004) "Praslovenska leksika i kultura u indoevropskom kontekstu". Ljiljana Subotić, Vera Vasić, and Slobodan Pavlović, eds. *Lingvističke soveske 4: Predavanja iz istorije jezika*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, Odsek za srpski jezik i lingvistiku, 15–42.
- Łopaciński, Hieronim. (1899) "Przyczynki do nowego słownika języka polskiego II". *Prace Filologiczne* 5: 681–976.
- Machek, Václav. (1968) *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. 2nd edition. Prague: Academia.
- Majer, Marek. (2017) "Review of Matasović 2014". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 25(1): 147–67.
- . (2020) "Slavic *ljuby and the heterogeneity of the inflectional class in *-y". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 125: 79–104.
- Matasović, Ranko. (2014) *Slavic nominal word-formation: Proto-Indo-European origins and historical development*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Mátl, Antonín. (1954) "Abstraktní význam u nejstarších vrstev slovanských substantiv (kmenů souhlaskových)". *Studie a práce lingvistické I: K šedesátým narozeninám akademika Bohuslava Havránka*, Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 131–51.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael. (2010) *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 9th edition. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine. (1905) *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. Seconde partie. Paris: Librairie Émile Bouillon.
- Mikkola, Jooseppi J. (1913) *Urslavische Grammatik*. I. Teil: *Lautlehre, Vokalismus, Betonung*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Neri, Sergio. (2003) *I sostantivi in -u del gotico: Morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen, Abteilung Sprachwissenschaft.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. (1998) "Severe problems". Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver, eds. *Mír curad: Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 521–38.

- Nussbaum, Alan J. (2017) "Agentive and other derivatives of 'τόμος-type' nouns". Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit, and Georges-Jean Pinault, eds. *Verbal adjectives and participles in Indo-European languages*. Bremen: Hempen, 233–66.
- Olander, Thomas. (2015) *Proto-Slavic inflectional morphology: A comparative handbook*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Patera, Adolf O. and Sreznevskij, Izmail I. (1878) *Češskija glossy v Mater verborum*. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- Pavić, Armin. (1875) "Regule sv. Benedikta". *Starine* 7: 57–129.
- Pleszczyński, Adolf. (1893) "Wochoy i Koziary". *Wisła* 7(4): 719–35.
- Pobłocki, Gustaw. (1897) "Kilka wyrazów kaszubskich, kociewskich i chełmińskich". *Roczniki Towarzystwa naukowego w Toruniu* 4: 26–27.
- Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia. (2013) *The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- . (2014) "The productivity of the feminine *ū*-stems in Proto-Slavic". *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 59(1): 22–45.
- Repanšek, Luka. (2016) "Dial. Slovene *krvês-* and the accentual history of Proto-Slavic **kry* 'blood'". *Annales: Anali za istrske in mediteranske študije. Series historia et sociologia* 26: 639–46.
- Ribarova, Zdenka. (2003) *Indeksy k staroslověnskému slovníku*. Prague: Slovanský ústav AV ČR, Euroslavica.
- Ringe, Don. (2017) *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. Vol. I. *A linguistic history of English*. 2nd ed. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Šekli, Matej. (2019) "Izvor pridevnikov tipov bukovi in lipovi/češnjevi v slovenščini". *Slavistična revija* 67(2): 281–89.
- Skardžius, Pranas. (1943) *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*. Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademija.
- Skljarenko, Vitalij H. (1998) *Praslovjans'ka akcentolohija*. Kyiv: Ukraïns'ka knyha.
- Skok, Petar. (1932) "Nachtrag zu skr. cijec". *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 9(1/2): 138–40.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech. (2018) *Lithuanian etymological dictionary*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Snoj, Marko. (1994) "Naglaševanje praslovanskih -y/-v- osnov ženskega spola". *Slavistična revija* 42(4): 491–528.
- Sobolevskij, Aleksej I. (1900) "Cerkovno-slavjanskije teksty moravskago proisxoždenija". *Russkij filologičeskij věstnik* 43: 150–217.
- . (1910) *Materialy i izslėdovanija v oblasti slavjanskoj filologii i arxeologii*. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- Sreznevskij, Izmail I. (1865) *Drevnie pamjatniki pis'ma i jazyka jugozapadnyx Slavjan (IX–XII vv.): Obščee povremennoe obozrėnie s zamėtkami o pamjatnikax, doselė byvošix neizvoštynymi*. St. Petersburg: V tipografii Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.

- Stankiewicz, Edward. (1984) *Grammars and dictionaries of the Slavic languages from the Middle Ages up to 1850: An annotated bibliography*. Berlin, New York, and Amsterdam: Mouton.
- Stojanović, Ljubomir. (1890) "IV. Tipici". *Spomenik* 3: 158–64.
- Stüber, Karin. (2002) *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Svoboda, Jan. (1964) *Staročeská osobní jména a naše příjmení*. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
- Szeptyński, Rafał. (2017) "Vocalic elements and prosody in Slavic comparatives". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 122: 189–205.
- Szeptyński, Rafał. (2018) "Reguła Vaillantowa w świetle kanonu staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego". *Jezikoslovní zapiski* 24(2): 143–59.
- Taszycki, Witold. (1932) "Ze studjów nad polskim imiennictwem osobowem IV. *Ciecierad* i t. zw. imiona rodzinne". *Język Polski* 17(1): 4–8.
- Townsend, Charles E. and Laura Janda. (1996) *Common and comparative Slavic: Phonology and inflection, with special attention to Russian, Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian*. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers.
- Trautmann, Reinhold. (1950) *Die slavischen Ortsnamen Mecklenburgs und Holsteins*. 2nd edition. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Treder, Jerzy. (1979) "Nazwy ponowione wśród nazw przeniesionych". *Onomastica* 24: 19–43.
- Vaillant, André. (1958) *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome II: *Morphologie*. Première partie: *Flexion nominale*. Deuxième partie: *Flexion pronominale*. Lyon: Editions IAC.
- . (1974) *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome IV: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Vijūnas, Aurelijus. (2016) "Ved *ketú-* 'brightness' revisited: Some additional considerations". Dieter Gunkel, Joshua T. Katz, Brent Vine, and Michael Weiss, eds. *Sahasram ati srajas: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*. Ann Arbor, MI: Beech Stave Press, 444–54.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. (2017) "Lith *risti*, *rita* 'roll', OCS *-rěsti*, *-reštō* 'find' and the PIE root **ret-* in Balto-Slavic". *Baltistica* 52(2): 265–85.
- Vine, Brent. (1999) "A note on the Duenos inscription". Vyacheslav Ivanov and Brent Vine, eds. *UCLA Indo-European Studies*. Vol. 1. Los Angeles: Program in Indo-European Studies, 293–305.
- Vondrák, Václav. (1889) "Kremsmünsterská legenda o 10.000 rytířích". *Listy filologické* 16(1): 21–45.
- Weiss, Michael. (2017) "Gk. τίω 'I honor' and τιμή 'honor'". Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan, and Katharina Zipser, eds. *Miscellanea indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 869–80.

- Witczak, Krzysztof T. (1998) "Dwa terminy prasłowiańskie w ujęciu diachronicznym (1. *zъly > *zъlyva 'siostra męża, szwagierka', 2. *plo 'otwarta przestrzeń wodna')". *Slavia Occidentalis* 55: 133–38.
- Wojtyła-Świerżowska, Maria. (1992) *Prasłowiańskie abstractum: Słototwórstwo. Semantyka. I. Formacje tematyczne*. Warsaw: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. (1985) *Ot praslavjanskoj akcentuacii k russkoj*. Moscow: Nauka.
- . (2004) *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. 2nd edition. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- . (2019) *Drevnerusskoe udarenie: Obščie svedenija i slovar'*. 2nd edition. Moscow: Izdatel'skij dom JaSK.
- Zubaty, Josef. (1894) "Slavische Etymologien". *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 16: 385–425.
- Zwołński, Przemysław. (1952) "Wypowiedzi gramatyków 16 i 17 wieku o dialektyzmach w ówczesnej polszczyźnie". *Pamiętnik Literacki: Czasopismo kwartalne poświęcone historii i krytyce literatury polskiej* 43(1/2): 375–407.
- [AOS] (1980–) *Arxangel'skij oblastnoj slovar'*. Vol. 1–. Natal'ja A. Artamonova et al., eds. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- [BezIESSJ] (1977–2007) *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Vol. 1–5. France Bezlaj et al. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, Inštitut za slovenski jezik.
- [BSLK] (2014) *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche: Vollständige Neuedition*. Irene Dingel et al., eds. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- [CBC] (1854) *The Christian Book of Concord, or symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. 2nd edition. Newmarket: Solomon D. Henkel and Brs.
- [ČNS] (1878–93) *Česko-německý slovník zvláště grammaticko-fraseologický*. Vol. 1–7. František Štěpán Kott. Prague: Tiskem a nákladem knihtiskárny Josefa Koláře.
- [ConfRad] (1561) *Confessio Augustana, to iest Wyznanie wiary niektórych xiążąt y miast niemieckich, podane cesarzowi Carolusowi V na seymie augsburskiem roku M.D.XXX (...)* *Przełożono w ięzyk polski przez Jana Radomskiego*. Cited after the online version available at: <https://www.sbc.org.pl/publication/11826>.
- [DykcStar] (1779) *Dykcyonarz starożytności dla szkół narodowych*. Grzegorz Piramowicz. Warsaw: W Drukarni J. K. Mci y Rzeczypospolitey uprzywileiowanej Gröllowskiej.
- [ERHJ] (2016–) *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Vol. 1–. Ranko Matasović, Tijmen Pronk, Dubravka Ivšić, and Dunja Brozović Rončević. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- [ERHSJ] (1971–1973) *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Vol. 1–4. Petar Skok. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

- [ESJP] (2000–2014) *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 1–3 (vol. 3 published under the title *Etymologiczny słownik mowy polskiej*). Andrzej Bańkowski. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.
- [ESJS] (1989–2018) *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Vol. 1–19. Eva Havlová et al., eds. Prague: Academia.
- [ÈSSJa] (1974–) *Ètimologièeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov: Praslavjanskij leksièeskij fond*. Vol. 1–. Oleg N. Trubačëv et al., eds. Moscow: Nauka.
- [ESUM] (1982–2012) *Etymolohičnyj slovnyk Ukraïns'koï movy*. Vol. 1–6. Oleksandr S. Mel'nyčuk et al., eds. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- [EWAhd] (1988–) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Vol. 1–. Albert Lloyd et al., eds. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- [EWAia] (1986–2001) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Vol. 1–3. Manfred Mayrhofer. Heidelberg: Winter.
- [HEWONS] (1978–1994) *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*. Vol. 1–5. Heinz Schuster-Šewc. Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag.
- [HrinSUM] (1907–1909) *Slovar' Ukraïns'koï movy*. Vol. 1–4. Borys Hrinčenko. Kyiv: Kievskaja starina.
- [HT] (1995) *Hilandarski tipik: Rukopis CHIL AS 156*. Dimitrije Bogdanović, ed. Belgrade: Narodna biblioteka Srbije / Zavod za međunarodnu naučnu, prosvetnu, kulturnu i tehničku saradnju Srbije.
- [KirchOrd] (1558) *Kirchen Ordnung Wie es im Hertzogthumb Preussen, beydes mit Lehr vnd Ceremonien, sampt andern, so zu Fürderung vnd Erhaltung des Predigampts, Christlicher Zucht vnd guter Ordnung, von nöten gehalten wird*. Cited after the online version available at: <https://pbc.gda.pl/dlibra/publication/14198/>.
- [LIV₂] (2001) *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd edition. Helmut Rix et al. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- [MiklLPL] (1862–1865) *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*. Franz von Miklosich. Vienna: Guilelmus Braumueller.
- [MiklMS] (1858) *Monumenta serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*. Franz von Miklosich. Vienna: Guilelmus Braumueller.
- [MJČ] (1947–1960) *Místní jména v Čechách: Jejich vznik, původní význam a změny*. Vol. 1–5. Antonín Profous, Jan Svoboda, Vladimír Šmilauer et al. Prague: Česká akademie věd.
- [NMPol] (1996–) *Nazwy miejscowe Polski: Historia, pochodzenie, zmiany*. Vol. 1–. Kazimierz Rymut et al., eds. Cracow: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- [PCžN] (1719–1819) *Prazské České Nowiny*. Cited after the online version available at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=-zNfAAAAcAAJ>.
- [PletSNS] (2014) *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. Maks Pleteršnik. Originally published 1894/1895. Transliterated edition: Metka Furlan, ed. Cited after the online version available at: <https://fran.si/136/maks-pletersnik-slovensko-nemski-slovar>.
- [PokIEW] (1959–1969) *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1–3. Julius Pokorny. Bern and Munich: Francke.

- [RGB304I/145] Manuscript F.304/I, №145, Russian State Library. Contains sermons by John Chrysostomos and several short texts including the Gospel of Nicodemus. Cited after the online version available at: <https://lib-fond.ru/lib-rgb/304-i/f-304i-145/>.
- [RHSJ] (1880–1976) *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Vol. 1–23. Đura Daničić et al., eds. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- [RKSS] (1863–1864) *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih*. Vol. 1–3. Đura Daničić. Belgrade: U Državnoj štampariji.
- [SAE] (1895) *Slavjanskija apokrifičeskija evangelija (obščij obzor)*. Mixail N. Speranskij, ed. Moscow: Tovariščestvo tipografii A. I. Mamontova.
- [SČN] (1835–1839) *Slownik česko-německý*. Vol. 1–5. Josef Jungmann. Prague: W kněžec arcibiskupské knihtiskárně, u Josefy wdowy Fetterlowé, řzenjm Wáclawa Špinky.
- [SEJDP] (1962–1994) *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich*. Vol. 1–6. Kazimierz Polański. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich (and others).
- [SJS] (1966–1997) *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského / Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. Vol. 1–4. Josef Kurz et al., eds. Prague: Academia.
- [SIKniž] (1987–2012) *Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi*. Vol. 1–2. Dmitrij S. Lixačev et al., eds. Leningrad and St. Petersburg: Nauka / Institut russoj literatury (Puškinskij dom) RAN.
- [SNLJa] (1921–1928) *Slovar' nižne-lužickago jazyka*. Vol. 1–2. Èrnest Muka, ed. Petrograd and Prague: Akademičeskaja dvěnadcataja gosudarstvennaja tipografija / Nákladem České akademie věd a umění.
- [SnojSES3] (2016) *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. 3rd edition. Marko Snoj. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU. Cited after the online version available at: <https://fran.si/193/marko-snoj-slovenski-etimoloski-slovar>.
- [SP] (1974–2001) *Słownik prasłowiański*. Vol. 1–8. Franciszek Sławski et al., eds. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- [SPXVI] (1966–) *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Vol. 1–. Maria Renata Mayenowa et al., eds. Online search tool available at: <http://spxvi.edu.pl/index/>.
- [SreznMat] (1893–1912) *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskago jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. Vol. 1–3. Izmail I. Sreznevskij. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- [SSNO] (1965–1987) *Słownik staropolskich nazw osobowych*. Vol. 1–7. Witold Taszycki, ed. Wrocław, Warsaw, and Cracow: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- [SStč] (1970) *Slovník staročeský*. 2nd edition. Vol. 1–2. Jan Gebauer. Prague: Academia.
- [SStp] (1953–2014) *Słownik staropolski*. Vol. 1–11 + suppl. Kazimierz Nitsch et al., eds. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich (and others).

- [ST] (2018) *Sveti Sava: Studenički tipik*. Maja Anđelković and Tihon Rakićević, eds. Brezova: Manastir Studenica.
- [StčS] (1968–2008) *Staročeský slovník*. Vol. 1–26. Igor Němec and Jaroslava Pečírková, eds. Prague: Academia. Online search tool available at: <https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx>.
- [ŠŽSO] (1909) *Staročeské životy svatých otců*. Emil Smetánka, ed. Prague: Nákladem České akademie císaře Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění.
- [TLB] *Thesaurus linguae Bohemicae*. Václav Jan Rosa. Cited after the online version available at: https://bara.ujc.cas.cz/slovniky/rosa/rosa_uvod.html.
- [TMR] (2010) *Hilandarski tipik monaha Romana: 1331. g*. Pribislav B. Simić, ed. Kraljevo: Eparhijski upravni odbor Eparhije žičke.
- [UstKo] (1560) *Vstava albo porząd koscielny, iako się w Xięstwie Pruskiem snauczaniem y Coeremoniami, y s inemi rzeczmi, ktore ku pomnoszeniu y zachowaniu vrzędu kosnodzieiskiego, y porządku dobrego potrzebne, zachowawa*. Cited after the online version available at: <https://kpbc.umk.pl/dlibra/publication/214905/>.
- [XIIISGB] (1875) *XIII slov Grigorija Bogoslova v drevneslavjanskom perevodě po rukopisi Imperatorskoj publichnoj biblioteki XI věka: Kritiko-paleografičeskij trud*. Anton S. Budilovič. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- [ŽelMNS] (1886) *Malorusko-německyj slovar*. Vol. 1–2. Jevhenyj Želešovskij and Sofron Nedil'skij. Lviv: Z drukarni tov. im. Ševčenka.

Rafał Szeptyński

Institut Języka Polskiego Polskiej Akademii Nauk
al. Adama Mickiewicza 31
31-120 Kraków (Poland)
rafal.szeptynski@ijp.pan.pl

Marek Majer

Katedra Filologii Słowiańskiej, Uniwersytet Łódzki
ul. Pomorska 171/173
90-236 Łódź (Poland)
marek.majer@uni.lodz.pl