

Ranko Matasović. *Slavic nominal word-formation: Proto-Indo-European origins and historical development*. [Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft, 3]. Heidelberg: Winter, 2014. 221 pp. ISBN 9783825363352.

Reviewed by Marek Majer*

1. Introduction

The publication of a treatment of Slavic nominal word formation by Ranko Matasović (RM) is an important and welcome event for Slavicists and Indo-Europeanists alike. Among numerous other works spanning Slavic, Indo-European, and non-Indo-European linguistics, RM has authored the *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika* (Matasović 2008), still the only historical grammar of a Slavic language significantly engaging the Proto-Indo-European background and compatible with the current state of knowledge about the latter (the importance of the connection with Indo-European linguistics is also emphasized in the extended title of the work under review). The current synthesis of historical Sl word formation—as we learn from the opening paragraphs (15)—grew out of RM's work on the new, coauthored etymological dictionary of Croatian, the first volume of which has since appeared (ERHJ 1).

The book has already been the subject of three quite extensive reviews: by M. Mihaljević (2014), Ž. Ž. Varbot (2015), and Th. Olander and B. Nielsen Whitehead (2015).¹ In order not to duplicate the effort of the aforementioned competent reviewers, every so often I shall refer the interested reader to their conclusions, particularly as regards those areas which they have dealt with at some length;² in the present review, I concentrate on those aspects of the work regarding which more discussion is in order.

* I am grateful to Wayles Browne for helpful suggestions.

¹ Cf. also two shorter reviews in *Wekvos* 2 (2016): 302–03 and in *Incontri Linguistici* 38 (2015): 192–93.

² Referred to as “Mihaljević,” “Varbot,” and “Olander & Whitehead” followed by page number. All other page numbers refer to the book under review.

2. Context and Relation to Earlier Works

In the initial passages of the book (15–17), RM states how he intends to position his new synthesis vis-à-vis the existing treatments of nominal word formation in Sl (Vondrák 1906,³ Sławski ZSP, Vaillant 1974, etc.), arguing that in spite of such considerable coverage of the field, a new study is still desirable.

RM's judgment on this issue is fully reasonable. Besides being dated to some extent (and universally very conservative at the IE end), the above-mentioned classic works are often less than ideal for scholars interested in PSI for comparative IE purposes rather than in the study of the Sl languages themselves. Vondrák 1924 and especially Vaillant 1974 are extremely rich in data drawn from the modern Sl languages which are less relevant from the PSI (or especially the IE) viewpoint; it is at times challenging to extract the securely old material from these sources. Sławski ZSP makes a stronger effort to isolate genuinely PSI derivational morphology, clearly separating it from processes occurring in later Sl languages (sometimes closely paralleling each other). However, the work is written in Polish and split among several volumes of SP. This and its lack of a table of contents and an index makes it rather unwieldy and relatively unknown among Indo-Europeanists. Besides, Sławski's treatment of word formation was to be illustrated by material amassed in the ambitious lexicographical work it was to accompany; but only a small part of the latter was ever completed, so that many of the PSI reconstructions found in Sławski ZSP are left with little illustrational evidence.

In the light of all this, RM's aim was to produce a book that would be more concise and focus on the indisputably PSI material, taking advantage of the data gathered in dictionaries such as *ÈSSJa*, *SP*, and *Derksen EDSIL*, while at the same time being up to date with regard to the present knowledge about PIE. All in all, the author has succeeded in creating such a work, and it will no doubt be perceived as a major contribution to the field.

3. Structure, Notation, and Presentation

The book is organized in a fashion typical of a basic diachronic treatment of derivational morphology of an IE language. Following an introduction (15–20), the chapter on suffixation comprises the bulk of the work (21–169), divided into sections grouping suffixes into various classes based on their segmental shape (on the principles of subdivision, see below). It should be noted that reduplication is also handled in this chapter (79–80). Next, there are much shorter chapters on prefixation (170–82) and compounding (183–90), and the book is closed by an index of PSI and PIE forms (203–21). In keeping with the conception of the work, there are no separate chapters on previous research,

³ It is admittedly unclear why the revised 2nd edition (Vondrák 1924) was not used.

theoretical background, or general analysis. (Some remarks of a typological or methodological nature are found in passing throughout the book, e.g., in the chapter on compounding and in the introduction. They are largely theory-neutral, and the work is not committed to any particular school or theoretical framework of derivational morphology.)

It should be emphasized that the word “nominal” in the title of the book is used in the narrow sense: the volume only covers nouns, i.e., substantives. The derivational morphology of adjectives is not included.

The layout is simple and transparent. Each affix (or compound type, etc.) is briefly discussed and illustrated with examples (see below on the choice of the material), including comments on the degree of its productivity and sometimes with remarks on developments in the individual Sl languages. Presented in a plain manner, the etymological and morphological discussion is kept concise and to the point; there are no complex digressions or lengthy footnotes diverting attention from the main topic. All this makes the book easy to consult for the purpose of looking up a given derivational problem; but it also reads equally well in its entirety.

Certain nonobvious choices (some praiseworthy, some problematic) regarding structure and notation have been made by the author, and it is useful to note them here.

Unlike in the classic treatments of PSI word formation, suffixes are generally grouped according to their constituent vowels (e.g., **-slb* together with **-nb* and **-slo* together with **-no*) as opposed to their consonants (e.g., **-slb* together with **-slo* and **-nb* together with **-no*). However, I cannot agree here with Varbot (227–28) that this is by default a flawed approach. Both strategies have their advantages, particularly in the domain of disyllabic suffixes. RM’s grouping sometimes enables him to unite items that do (or at least may) belong together in their derivational history, e.g., various (potential) extensions of former *u*-stems (**-vkv*, **-vr̥v*, **-vl̥v*), which have to be kept separate under the traditional consonant-centered approach. In fact, it will be beneficial for scholars to have at their disposal different treatments sorting suffixes in these complementary ways.

More problematic is the fact, likewise pointed out by Varbot (391), that—despite the otherwise lucid structuring of the segments—the historical/etymological commentary is positioned sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end of the section, and occasionally both. It may be added that in at least one instance the latter situation results in a rather incongruous analysis for the same suffix.⁴

⁴ Regarding the fem. stems in **-uh₂*: “Often they represent feminine counterparts to masculines in **-u*, since **-h₂* was a suffix of feminine motion” (58); “In PIE, feminines were formed from masculine *u*-stems by adding **-ih₂* rather than **-h₂*, but in some cases it appears that Slavic has an *ū*-stem derived from a PIE *u*-stem” (59).

Less central to the overall enterprise, but sometimes bothersome, are the numerous inconsistencies in the transcription of almost all languages from which forms are cited. The nonconsistency of prosodic marks in Slovenian⁵ and Latvian⁶ is particularly unfortunate because it adds further complexity to the already notoriously large burden carried by assorted diacritics in BSL accentology (it may be noted that RM emphasizes—and rightly so—the importance of providing accentological information for his PSl reconstructions; 18–20). As for OCS—although, as expected, standardized orthography is used (i.e., not following spellings from particular texts)—we still find reflexes of *-bj- notated as in *kopije* vs. *kamenvje* (both 145) or *pvjan-* vs. *pijan-* (both 151). Outside of BSL, irregularities are quickly noticed in the Latin,⁷ Greek,⁸ or Gothic⁹ forms, for example. Finally, one encounters unorthodox notational decisions in non-IE languages too, e.g., in the Ottoman Turkish form *dilmač* ‘interpreter’ (120), which (labeled “Osman”) seems to owe its č to a source where the Turkish word had been rendered in a Slavic alphabet. These and a number of other petty issues, although not diminishing the scholarly value of the work, combine to reach a level of salience that some readers will find genuinely distracting.

On a similar note, the book regrettably suffers from an unusually high number of errors resulting from simple oversight. Almost on every page one encounters typographical slips (of the sort “si found” [101] or “suffiy” [109]), and one repeatedly gets the impression that a single additional round of proofreading would have eliminated a great number of them. Not overly bothersome in the prose, these issues also happen to affect names of authors

⁵ E.g., different diacritic choices for stressed short vowels (*vodīč* 120 vs. *krpèlj* 125), among other similar issues.

⁶ E.g., noninitial non-broken-tone syllables sometimes notated with no diacritic (last vowel of *pērkons*, 166), sometimes with the tilde (last vowel of *dziêdâtâjs*, 158). The non-standard diacritic $\hat{\text{~}}$ is also sometimes used instead of $\hat{\text{^}}$ in Latv forms, cf. *kûsât* (68), even though the author generally prefers $\hat{\text{^}}$ even for the Sl circumflex.

⁷ Macrons indicating vowel length are sometimes used and sometimes omitted. This is of no particular relevance for word-formation issues (although it is customary in Indo-Europeanist works to indicate length consistently), but in some cases this does result in presentations that may be misleading. Thus, for example, the formulation “Lat. *edō*, *edōnis* ‘eater, glutton’ ← *edo* ‘eat’” (127) may create an impression that the nominal derivative differs by the length of the vowel, whereas in reality the forms are identical (*edō*).

⁸ Gr γ before velar consonants is sometimes transliterated as *g* (*ógkos*; 174), sometimes transcribed as *n* (*ánkhō*; 94).

⁹ Cf. *ḍaúrnum* (99) vs. *kaur̥n* (100), or *bōka* (60) vs. *hrot* (74), where *aú/au* and *ō/o* are equivalents owing their difference to varying depth of transcription. The capital *Ḃ* is also used in free variation with *ḃ* in Goth words.

and titles in bibliographical references, which may conceivably impede locating a source.¹⁰ But they are also visible in the cited material, i.e., in forms cited from various languages, which is still more problematic (not least because one may expect the forms affected to be cited and carried over to further works); a tentative errata list is provided here, certainly far from complete.¹¹

Errata	Page	Correct Form
(Russ.) <i>uxý</i>	(19)	<i>uxí</i>
(PSL.) <i>ágnę</i>	(32)	* <i>ágnę</i>
(Croat.) <i>nebésa</i>	(34)	<i>nebèsa</i>
PSL. * <i>lŭčb</i> (b)	(38)	* <i>lŭčb</i> ¹²
Pol. <i>louč</i>	(38)	Cz. <i>louč</i>
Pol. <i>ludzi</i>	(38)	<i>ludzie</i>
(PSL.) * <i>o-butja</i>	(49)	* <i>ob-utja</i>
(OCS) * <i>lakviti</i>	(53)	* <i>lakviti</i> etc. ¹³
CSL. <i>lovŋčbiji</i>	(55)	(various possibilities)
Croat. <i>milóstinja</i>	(55)	<i>milòstinja</i>
Russ. <i>gníti</i>	(65)	<i>gnit'</i>
Skr. <i>sakřt</i>	(65)	<i>sakřt</i>
Russ. <i>kýslyj</i>	(68)	<i>kíslyj</i>
Lith. <i>stregti, stregiu</i>	(85)	<i>strégti, strégiu</i>
OCS <i>velmoža</i>	(87)	<i>velbmoža</i>
Lith. <i>šviēsti</i>	(90)	<i>šviēsti</i>
Skr. <i>pr̥thú-</i>	(91)	<i>pr̥thú-</i> (or <i>pr̥thú-</i>)
OCS <i>zbrěti, irjā</i>	(92)	<i>zbrěti, zbrjā</i>
Croat. Čak. <i>jáčmyk</i>	(92)	<i>jáčmik</i> etc.

¹⁰ For example, Maria Wojtyła-Świerzowska's surname, besides its correct form (e.g., 39), also appears as "Wojtyła-Świerzowska" (29), "Wojtyła-Świerzewska" (158) and "Wojtyła Świerzowska" (200); the surname Skardžius appears as "Skerdžius" on a number of pages (e.g., 95, 116), etc. Titles in the bibliography suffer from similar issues.

¹¹ Missing diacritic signs are only supplied where they are obligatory in standard orthography (e.g., Czech), as well as in several Cr and Sln forms that are found with only partial accentuation in the text (numerous other Cr and Sln forms, even commonplace words from the standard languages, are not accented at all in the book). The author's conventions of using $\hat{}$ for the Slavic circumflex and $\grave{}$ for the PSL and OCS back nasal vowel are retained.

¹² In accordance with the convention of notating accent paradigm b nouns adopted in the book (20).

¹³ A hypothetical regular *i*-stem gen. pl. devised *argumenti causa* by the author.

Croat. <i>bykъ</i>	(92)	<i>bìk</i>
Gr. <i>kyriyaké</i>	(93)	<i>kyriaké</i>
Pol. <i>węzeł</i>	(94)	<i>węzeł</i>
OCS <i>stol</i>	(94)	<i>stolъ</i>
Pol. <i>osła</i>	(95)	<i>osła</i>
Russ. dial. <i>glumъ</i>	(96)	<i>glum</i>
PSl. <i>*jъgo</i>	(73)	<i>*jъgo</i> ¹⁴
Pol. <i>kłac</i>	(109)	<i>kłuc</i> (or hist. <i>kłóc</i>)
Pool. <i>ovies</i>	(110)	Pol <i>owies</i>
(Pol.) <i>*-wielki</i>	(110)	<i>wielki</i>
Russ. <i>čistij</i>	(114)	<i>čistyj</i>
ORuss. <i>jetva</i>	(116)	<i>jatva</i>
Cz. <i>kovač</i>	(119)	<i>kovač</i>
Ukr. <i>bagáč</i>	(119)	<i>baháč</i>
Ukr. <i>bobrava</i>	(123)	<i>Bobrava</i>
Slov. <i>čmêlj</i>	(125)	<i>čmêlj</i>
(Lith.) pol. <i>žmónes</i>	(127)	pl. <i>žmónes</i>
Slov. <i>jerêb</i>	(131)	<i>jerêb</i>
Russ. <i>býstrij</i>	(135)	<i>býstryj</i>
(Pol.) <i>wól</i>	(136)	<i>wól</i>
Goth. <i>berizeins</i>	(136)	<i>barizeins</i>
Pol. <i>ludzi</i>	(137)	<i>ludzie</i>
Ukr. <i>bolotíšče</i>	(138)	<i>bolotýšče</i>
Ukr. <i>ognisko</i>	(138)	<i>ohnys'ko</i> (or better <i>vohnys'ko</i>) ¹⁵
(PSl.) <i>*korlevitjъ</i>	(139)	<i>*korljevitjъ</i>
Lith. <i>mélžu</i>	(140)	<i>mélžiu</i>
Russ. <i>koniéc</i>	(142)	<i>konéc</i>
Croat. <i>dijête</i>	(143)	<i>dijête</i> (or <i>dijete</i> , etc.)
Goth. <i>ga-raihīpa</i>	(144)	<i>ga-raihtīpa</i>
Latv. <i>alvus</i>	(144)	Lat. <i>alvus</i>
Russ. <i>zelënyj</i>	(145)	<i>zelënyj</i>
Pol. <i>perze</i>	(145)	<i>pierze</i>
Ukr. <i>kopno</i>	(149)	Ukr. dial. <i>kípno</i>

¹⁴ PSl **jъ > *jъ* is reflected in other PSl forms in the book.

¹⁵ I am grateful to Rafał Szeptyński (IJP PAN, Kraków) for pointing out the latter circumstance to me.

Croat. <i>pròšnja</i>	(151)	<i>pròšnja</i>
(OCS) <i>čuvbstvje</i>	(151)	<i>čuvbstvo</i> ¹⁶
(OCS) <i>pbjanstvo</i>	(151)	<i>pbjanbstvo</i> (or <i>pijanbstvo</i> , etc.)
Russ. <i>óčestvo</i>	(151)	<i>ótčestvo</i>
(Pol.) <i>lebeda</i>	(153)	<i>lebioda</i>
ORuss. <i>osmęgnuti</i>	(155)	<i>osmjagnuti</i>
PSl. <i>*vixъr</i>	(155)	<i>*vixъrb</i>
PSl. <i>*dъlgota, *dъlgrъ</i>	(156)	<i>*dъlgota, *dъlgrъ</i>
OCS <i>dъlgota</i>	(156)	<i>dlъgota</i>
Russ. <i>dólgyj</i>	(156)	<i>dólgij</i>
(Gr.) <i>neós</i>	(158)	<i>néos</i>
Ukr. <i>bitka</i>	(162)	<i>býtka</i>
Ukr. <i>beregulja</i>	(165)	<i>berehulja</i>
Ukr. <i>krivúlja</i>	(165)	<i>kryvúlja</i>
Croat. <i>dragūlj</i>	(165)	<i>drågūlj</i>
Slov. <i>véha</i>	(167)	<i>věha</i>
PSl. <i>*sekyra</i>	(168)	<i>*šěkyra</i>
Croat. <i>ishod</i>	(171)	<i>ishod</i>
(PSl.) <i>*vьlkti</i>	(172)	<i>*velkti</i>
Cz. <i>pro</i> 'because'	(176)	'for, because of'
Croat. <i>vijèst</i>	(178)	<i>vijèst</i> (or <i>vijest</i> , etc.)

Many of the above recur in the index, e.g., “dъlgotá” and “dъlgrъ” (206) or “vixъr” (214).

Correcting the issues signaled in the above paragraphs would no doubt be a welcome improvement in potential future editions of this valuable work.

4. Sources, Methods, Analyses

The etymological analyses employed by the author are generally reliable.¹⁷ For the most part, the authority of etymological dictionaries is relied on in support of the analyses; various specialist monographs or articles are also cited, though only in a minority of entries. Some additions to the bibliography have

¹⁶ Apparently intended, judging from the context (discussed next to *čuvbstvje* in a section on doublets in *-bstvo* ~ *-bstvje*).

¹⁷ A few problematic decisions have been pointed out by Varbot; cf. especially her apt remarks on PSl. **gumьno, *runo, *mętežъ* (391), as well as Cz. *vodně* (393). A few further reservations are added in the next section.

been recommended by previous reviewers.¹⁸ It must be admitted that, given the copious amount of scholarship available in the field of Sl word formation and etymology, distilling the essence for inclusion in a treatment like the one under review is no easy task; that certain valuable works will have to be left unmentioned is expected. Therefore, one observation only will be made here. For a work on Sl word formation treating the intermediate BSl level seriously and often prioritizing Balt material in the discussion, the absence of the work of Saulius Ambrazas in the bibliography is a severe deficiency. This author's monographs on nominal word formation in Lith (1993, 2000) and dozens of articles devoted to individual suffixes largely supersede the treatment in earlier classic works such as Skardžius 1943, on which RM tends to rely for the Balt data. Ambrazas—besides having at his disposal more advanced material collections and paying painstaking attention to isolating OLith attestations—frequently addresses the issues of cognacy of certain Balt and Sl suffixes as well as their PIE background in great detail. Although certain particular views on PIE and the question of Balto-Slavic would have been incompatible with RM's framework, the discussion of numerous suffixes in the work under review would have benefitted from consulting Ambrazas's analysis of the Balt material instead of relying on Skardžius.

References to Derksen EDSIL are quite numerous, and in some cases RM's wording seems to attribute widely accepted, time-honored analyses to that dictionary. See, for example, the comment on **nevěsta* 'bride' (114): "the identity of the verbal root is disputed: Derksen (351) thinks that it is PIE **woyd-* 'to know' (...)." A statement like "the standard analysis, cf. Derksen (351), holds that..." would have been clearer in such cases, especially because the book also features references to original solutions stemming from Derksen EDSIL, and the two types of references are usually impossible to tell apart.

A number of valuable novel analyses are presented; some of them for the first time, taken from articles recently published by RM. See, for example, the analysis of PSI **mqžb* 'man, husband' as a contamination of the cognates of Lith *žmuõ* and Goth *magus* (127), certainly a viable possibility for explaining this difficult item. Also noteworthy are, e.g., **město* 'place, town' < **med-to-* 'measured out' (113), **jǫverb* 'splinter, chip' < **iw-ero-* cf. the root of Ved. *yáva-* 'grain, barley' (128; credited to T. Pronk), the discussion on the interplay of root and suffix in items such as **měšecb* 'moon, month', **zajecb* 'hare', **erebvo*/**erebv* 'partridge' (131–32) or **grqdb* 'bosom' (43), etc. A few of the new proposals are rather audacious, but they relate to morphologically difficult and/or etymologically unclear items, where an innovative approach is most welcome. In general, every Slavicist and Indo-Europeanist will encounter thought-provoking new ideas here, whether consulting the book on particular items or especially when reading it in its entirety.

¹⁸ Mihaljević (221), Varbot (190), Olander & Whitehead (549).

As a rule, RM only grants PSI status to—and therefore includes in the book—those lexemes that have reflexes in three or more daughter languages, preferably including SSI, ESI, and WSI. This approach can be called practical, because it limits the material to securely old formations, which are the ones of most relevance for readers interested in the deeper, IE-level connections. However, it also inevitably excludes items that are quite certainly equally old but happen to be limited to OCS (and/or ChS),¹⁹ or to be peripheral dialectal retentions.²⁰ It is not to be doubted that RM reckoned with this, since certain items with more restricted Sl-internal attestation are indeed included and labeled PSI, such as **brutv* ‘nail’ (attestation limited to SSI, but cf. Lith *braūktas* ‘wooden knife’; 112). Certain important peripheral archaisms with IE pedigree (e.g., PSI **ova* ‘grandmother’, preserved only in USor *wowa*, *wowka*)²¹ or with derivational features pointing to considerable age (PSI **namv* > ONovg *namv* ‘interest’)²² were not included, however.

As regards forms cited from the modern Sl languages, the reviewers have already noted (Varbot 391, Olander & Whitehead 545) that Croatian material is represented at a disproportionately high rate. In some instances this is beneficial, because to the extent that the Cr forms are cited with accent marks (not consistently the case), they usually shed more light on the prosodic structure of the PSI lexemes than reflexes from other Sl languages. However, as a rule standard Cr comparanda are used rather than forms from dialects preserving more prosodic contrasts. Serbian Štokavian forms are also cited on a few occasions. There are also numerous footnotes discussing issues pertinent mainly or entirely to Cr (or at most the neighboring languages of the continuum). Many of these notes are interesting to read, inasmuch as they discuss forms and suffixes that rarely make an appearance in literature on PSI (let alone Indo-European). However, one is still led to wonder if some of this space could not have been used to discuss issues more central to the topic of the book. For example, given the decision to take into account accentologi-

¹⁹ See, for example PSI **spodv* ‘group of people’, only in OCS *spodv* ‘id.’; probably inherited in view of cognates in Iranian (Old Avestan *spāda-* ‘army’) and possibly elsewhere; see Weiss 1991.

²⁰ Cf. Varbot (395): “[T]akoj podxod predstavljajetsja čisto formal’nym i protivorečaiščim rezul’tatom sovremennyx issledovanij po praslavjanskoj leksikologii i osobenno po ètimologii.”

²¹ Fem. motion of PIE **h₂ewh₂-o-* ‘grandfather’ > Lat *avus* ‘id.’, Hitt *huhha-* ‘id.’ etc. (similar formation with different fem. suffix: Goth *awo* ‘grandmother’). On the Sorbian word, see Schuster-Šewc HEW: 1683.

²² With lengthened *o*-grade from the root **nem-* ‘take’; cf. Lith *núoma* ‘rent’. See Patri 2003 for one diachronic analysis.

cal issues, broader coverage of the accentuation of compounds would be one desideratum.²³

5. Discussion of Particular Issues

Although, as said above, the analyses are generally well-grounded, there are some points that can be considered problematic. What follows is a review of a number of cases where discussion or additions are necessary.

(25) For PS1 **jbmę* ‘name’ (**bmę* in RM’s notation), the straightforward Pol reflex is *imię*, whereas the form *miano* ‘name, denomination, etc.’ chosen instead by RM is at best a highly modified variant, although the opinion has also been expressed that it is etymologically unrelated (cf. PS1 **měniti* ‘think, assume, imagine, name’).

(28) Regarding the agent noun formant **-tel-(jb)*: “originally an athematic suffix (...) reinterpreted as an *i*-stem (...). Like most masculine *i*-stems, words with this suffix became *jo*-stems in individual Slavic languages (a process which certainly began already in Proto-Slavic).” There is, however, no evidence for *i*-stem inflection (such as gen. sg. or voc. sg. ***-teli*) in this type. What we have are thematic *jo*-stem forms in the singular (and dual) and partly preserved consonantal forms in the plural. Thus, there is probably no reason to doubt that “[l]e suffixe *-tel-* du slave (...) a été élargi au moyen du suffixe secondaire *-je-* (ancien **-yo-*)” (Meillet 1905: 311), in a manner similar to other extensions limited to the singular, as, for example, in the type sg. **-jan-in-ǔ* vs. pl. **-jan-e*. There are no tangible grounds for assuming an intermediary *i*-stem stage (at any rate, all evidence for it would have been lost by the PS1 period).

(33): “As in PIE, the neuter stems in **-o* < **-os* are abstract nouns.” This statement is an overgeneralization for PIE,²⁴ and for Sl it is quite indefensible: only one Sl *s*-stem neuter is actually attested with abstract meaning (the rare OCS and OR *ljuto ljutese* ‘evil’, cf. **ljutǔ* ‘fierce, evil’); a few others may be assumed to have had this meaning earlier,²⁵ but this assumption is largely

²³ The issue is only addressed in one sentence (189); a modernized and condensed summary of the types listed by Garde (1976: 95–104), for example, would have been helpful.

²⁴ Many of the *es*-stems securely reconstructible for PIE are nouns with concrete meaning not derivable from any adjectival abstract or any verbal root, cf. Stüber 2002: 189–198, 260 (also duly noted by RM on p. 34). Some of them are inherited in PS1, e.g., **uxo *ušese* ‘ear’ < **h₂ews-es-*.

²⁵ E.g., **tęgo *tęžese*, attested with the meaning ‘strap, thong’ (ChS inst. sg. *tęžesemb*; SJS 4, 557), perhaps originally an abstract noun meaning ‘*weight’ formed directly from the underlying root (i.e., according to the old ‘Caland System’ principle; see fn. 31 below). Cf. the adjectives **tęgǔkbǔ ~ *tęžǔkbǔ* as well as **tęželǔ* ‘heavy’ and other derivatives from this root in Sl.

driven by the fact that we know the suffix **-es-* often formed abstracts in PIE. By contrast, the semantic areas in which the type enjoyed (limited) productivity in early Sl include those of material culture and body parts.

(36) Regarding *i*-stem nouns, RM recognizes two original inflectional types for PIE, hysterodynamic and proterodynamic, of which it is argued only the latter remained in BSl. This is a complicated issue, and views of different scholars will inevitably be connected with their general convictions regarding PIE morphology. However, in view of the far-reaching consequences for issues of historical word formation, it would be interesting to see a stance on the claim that certain traces of PIE acrostatic behavior are visible in some Slavic *i*-stems (thus **kostb* ‘bone’ shows reflexes of jotation in some derived words: Sln *koščica* ‘bone (dimin.)’ < **kost’ica* < **kost-ĭ-*; see Furlan 2013 with lit.).

(39) On the nonequivalence of the types Lith *ilgis ilgio* ‘length’ (masc.) ← *ilgas* ‘long’ and PSI **tvbrdb *tvbrdi* (fem.) ‘strength, hardness’ ← **tvbrdb* ‘hard’ see now Olander & Whitehead 551. It is of course possible that a deeper connection exists here, but no argumentation is offered to back it up.

(42) On **dbnb* ‘day’: “The *n*-stem is assured for Slavic by the (archaic) genitive singular *dnè* < **dbne* in Croatian”—this form (*dbne*) is of course also well attested directly in OCS (as well as other Sl languages).

(43) “with the methatesis [sic] of **-dn-* > **-nd-*, which is common in PIE”; a reference or example would be in order here, since the phenomenon does not figure in the consensus on PIE phonology. (References to such processes are not infrequently found in the literature, but more usually in the prehistories of the individual branches rather than PIE itself.)

(51) On the origin of the abstract suffix **-ostb* from neuters in **-es-*: “there is not a single example of a *s*-stem in Slavic, from which a stem in **-ostb* would have been derived.” Strictly speaking one can point to **teghostb* (cf. OR *tjagostb* ‘weight, trouble’) and **tego *težese* ‘*weight?’ (cf. fn. 25 above).

When discussing the origin of the type in **-ostb*, RM mentions the example “OCS *qzostb* ‘narrowness’” (plausibly based on PIE **h₂emǵ^h-es-* ‘narrowness’, cf. Av *qzah-* ‘narrowness, trouble’; → Lat *angustus* ‘narrow’). Though often appearing in Indo-Europeanist literature on this topic, and frequently labeled OCS, this form is actually only attested in later texts (it is absent from SJS or Cejtlin SS). Still, it is conceivable that it is inherited (especially if OHG *angust* ‘fear’ is a real cognate, though the details here are murky; cf. EWA 1: 254–55).

If the theory is adopted that PSI nouns in **-ostb* were originally abstract derivatives in **-i-* (type **zelenb* ‘green’ → **zelenb *zeleni* fem. ‘the color green’) built to adjectives in **-os-to-* (corresponding to Lat *angustus*), then the missing link in the form of such adjectival/nominal derivatives (PSI **-ostb*) may be attested directly in personal names of the type OPol *Milost*, *Jarost* (Taszycki 1925: 57) and ONovg **Milostb* (birchbark letters 706 and 709 *otb Milosta* ‘from Milost’; Zaloznjak 2004: 479–80). In this case, the isolated noun **starosta* (masc.)

‘elder, chief’ could be analyzed as derived from an original adj. **starostv* rather than a modification of the abstract **starostv*, as assumed by RM.

However, RM also provides an interesting alternative account of this type, starting from second compound members with a *ti*-abstract from PIE **h₁es-* ‘to be’ (Av *parō-asti-* ‘otherworld existence’). The other alternative suggestion provided by RM, concerning the accretion of **-ot-* and **-ti-* (**-ot-ti-* > **-ostv*), has been posited before in the literature (e.g., Vondrák 1924: 649).

Still, it must be pointed out that this suffix cannot be discussed properly without simultaneously addressing the cognate Balt formations (Lith *-astis* etc.; see Ambrazas 2000: 31–33 with literature), which, as is now quite evident, cannot be considered borrowed from Sl. I shall return to the issue of Sl **-ostv* and **-ostv* elsewhere.

(57) On the inadequacy of using the (modern) Pol gen. sg. *-u* for supporting a reconstruction of PSI *u*-stems, has already been noted by Olander & Whitehead 551. Conversely, Pol *wół* ‘ox’, cited here as a regular *o*-stem with any evidence in this regard, exceptionally does attest a unique retention of autonomous *u*-stem inflection (gen. and acc. sg. *wółu*, despite being animate), confirming PSI **volv* **volu*.

(58) On PSI abstracts in **-y* **-vve*: “In PIE, stems in **-uh₂* were feminine nouns, often built as abstract nouns from adjective stems in **-u*, e.g., Gr *ithýs* ‘direct’ vs. *ithýs* ‘direction.’” The qualification “often” is too strong a statement here. The cited example is isolated within Gr, as it is within IE: very few parallels are found (Ved *tanú-* ‘body, self’ next to *tanú-* ‘thin, slender’ is usually mentioned) except for the very Sl abstracts in **-y* **-vve*, which are indeed generally explained as derived from **-u-h₂* based on adjectives in **-u-*. It has to be admitted, however, that clear examples of adjectives in **-v-kv* coupled with abstracts in **-y* **-vve* (other than extended to **-yni*) are actually lacking. (It has been claimed that **cěl_v* is an old *u*-stem adjective connected with the abstract **cěl_y* **cěl_{vve}*; see discussion in Eckert 1963: 113–18.)

Thus, the IE abstract formations in **-u-h₂* corresponding to adjectives in **-u-* may either be scattered archaisms or parallel innovations based on productive relationships like adjective in **-o-* : abstract in **-e-h₂*.

(61) The form *ljudv* ‘people’ is not attested in OCS (it does occur in later ChS and elsewhere in Sl, and the question of its antiquity has been widely discussed, cf. the summary in ESJS 7: 432). OHG *liut* is an *i*-stem, not an *o*-stem (Gmc *a*-stem), and therefore directly cognate with PSI **ljudvje* (cf. also first compound member **ljudv-*) rather than **ljudv*.

(61) “Thus, in Homeric Greek, we still have *ho híppos* ‘horse’ vs. *hē híppos* ‘mare’, corresponding to Classical Greek *híppos* and *híppē*.” In fact, the word for ‘mare’ remains *hē híppos* in post-Homeric Gr too (*Híppē* is only attested—marginally—as a personal name). In modern Gr, the word was replaced with a different item. See Chantraine DELG: 468.

(66) “PSl. **slūxv* (c) ‘hearing’ (...) from a thematized *s*-stem (see **slawa*- > **slovo* ‘word’), NIIL 432.” This analysis is not very likely and not implied by NIIL: 432, where the item is derived from a simple thematic derivative from the extended verbal root **klews*-. As a matter of fact, within BSl, the old meaning ‘hear, listen’ was taken over exclusively by the extended **klew-s*- (prominently including the Narten formation **klōws-eye*-; see Villanueva Svensson 2014: 244–45), while the nonextended **klew*- is limited to the semantic fields of ‘fame, narrative, word’, etc.

(67) It is not clear why PSl **sqdv* is stated to derive from **kom-d^hh₁-o*- (implying a prefix etymologically identical with Lat *com*-, OIr *com*-, Goth *ga*-, etc.) rather than **s(o)m-d^hh₁-o*-. Compare with p. 177, where the prefix **sq-/*sv-* is analyzed in this latter, traditional way (cf. Lith *sq-*, Ved *sām* ‘with, together’).

(74) “PSl. **doba* ‘time’ (Russ. *doba*, Pol. *doba*, Croat. *dōba*, ESSJa V: 38–39). Inherited, cf. Lith. *dabà* ‘nature’ (...).” On Sl-internal grounds, it is most doubtful that this item represents an inherited *ā*-stem, cf. the neuter gender of Serb and Cr *dōba* (*dōba*), OCz syntagmas like *v ta doba* or *v ta doby*, or the USor (regularized neuter) reflex *dobo*. The word is typically explained as from **d^hob^hōr* or similar, cf. the Lith adverb *dabař* ‘now’—thus, e.g., ESSJa, which RM cites; also, he rightly points out a similar origin of **voda* ‘water’ on p. 75. In fact, PSl **doba* is discussed (although briefly) in RM’s own insightful study on BSl reflexes of PIE *r-/m*-stems (Matasović 1998: 125).

(75) “PSl. **bāba* (a) ‘old woman’ (...) Inherited, cf. Lith. *bóba* ‘old woman’, cf. also MHG *bābe* ‘old woman’ < **b^heh₂b^heh₂-*, IEW 91. Here a derivation from **b^hoh₂b^heh₂-* (with *o*-grade) would also be possible.” The word is also used on p. 78 as an example of an item with an old laryngeal in the coda of the first syllable (alongside PSl **sōlma* ‘hay’ coupled with Gr *kalámē* ‘stalk’ < PIE **kolh₂meh₂*, where the evidence for the laryngeal is indeed unassailable). I am personally convinced that the likeliest explanation of BSl **bābā* lies in the ubiquitous children’s speech syllable [ba:], as paralleled by many other unrelated languages (cf. Turk *baba* ‘father’). If the accentological framework employed requires the presence of a laryngeal,²⁶ a reconstruction like **b^heh₂b^heh₂-* is of course impossible to rule out, so that the word cannot be used to prove or disprove any theory; but **baba* is hardly the word of choice for exemplifying old ablaut grades or coda-final laryngeals. Incidentally, the wording above may be understood as implying that MHG *bābe* ‘old woman’ can derive from **b^heh₂b^heh₂-* or **b^hoh₂b^heh₂-* too, which it cannot (in both cases the result would be MHG ***buobe*); it is either a Sl loanword or an independent creation from [ba:].

²⁶ Most instances of the acute are ascribed to laryngeals or Winter’s Law environments in the book. Cf., however, PSl **běrmę* (ap. a) ‘burden’, for which RM at least considers derivation from a nonlaryngeal preform, with an apophonically lengthened vowel (PIE **b^hēr-men-*) (25). See also Olander & Whitehead (550).

(88) It is not explained why PSI **žeravjъ* ‘crane’ should derive “probably from an original *ū*-stem.” The reconstruction preferred in the book (“PIE **gerHōw-s / *grHw-os*”) is certainly one of the workable possibilities, but hardly warrants a classification as an *ū*-stem—especially from a Sl point of view, where this label is associated with the declensional type in **-y *-vve*. For a different take on the reconstruction of this famously difficult PIE word, see recently Gašiorowski 2013, wherein the author argues for **gerh₂-o-h₂ewi-* ‘loud-bird’, alongside **gerh₂-n-o-* ‘loud(voiced)’ (Gr *géranos* ‘crane’ etc.).

(92) “**ęčbmyкъ* ‘barley’ (...), from the root of **ęčbmy* ‘barley.’” The frequent use of the phrase “from the root of” in the book has already been harshly criticized by Varbot (392); indeed, while such parlance is admissible in etymological side notes, it is less so in a work on word formation, where exact representations of derivational mechanisms are expected. It may be added that the case at hand is particularly striking because the derivation **ęčbmy, *ęčbmene* → **ęčbmyкъ* specifically does *not* operate on the root: rather, the derivational base is the nom. sg. form of the original word, which exemplifies a rather curious (though not unparalleled) development. See, for example, Polański 1976 on the different strategies of converting athematic items into more productive types in PSI and early Sl, including derivation from case forms.

(95) The word for ‘whetstone’ is handled in the book twice, once as **osla* (95) and again as **osbla* (147); OCS reflexes identical to the two PSI reconstructions are provided, and the Sln reflex *ósla* listed under both headings. However, in canonical OCS only *osla* is attested (hapax in Supr); the spelling *osbla* is found in later ChS transmission. All in all, it does not seem an economical assumption to posit both **osbla* and **osla* for PSI as the phrasing suggests “**osbla* (...) besides **osla*” (147). It appears far more probable that a choice between them has to be made based on how one judges the spelling in Supr and the etymological reality of the ostensible jer reflexes in derivatives like Rus *osělok* or Pol *osełka*. See the discussion in Meillet 1905: 419 or in Snoj SES: 480: “Pslovan. **osblā* (ali **oslā*) je izpeljanka (tipa **metvblā* ali **teslā*)...”

(105) The PSI reconstructions **ikra* ‘roe’, **iskra* ‘spark’ are untenable; only **jvkra, *jvskra* (in RM’s notation, **vkra, *vskra*) are possible; cf. the variation Rus *ikrá ~ kra*, Cz *jikra ~ kra*, Pol *iskra ~ skra* etc. The same applies to **igvla* ‘needle’ (164), where only **jvgvla* (RM’s **vgvla*) is correct.

(109) It is doubtful whether the suffix **-to-* could indeed be used instead of **-so-* to derive PSI **qsv* ‘moustache’ if the word is cognate with the set of MlR *find* ‘hair’, OHG *wint-brāwa* ‘eyelash’, since PIE **-tt-* yields **-st-* in BSl (issues related to Bartholomae’s Law left aside). Perhaps the remark refers to Lith *uōstai* ‘moustache’ and not the Sl word, but this is not what the wording suggests.

(109) “PSI. **bēsъ* (c) ‘demon’ (...); inherited, perhaps originally an *u*-stem adjective, cf. Lith *baisūs* ‘terrible’ < **b^hoyd^(h)-s-o*, Lat. *foedus* ‘terrible, repulsive.’” The description is somewhat blurred (if an old *u*-stem and not a typically Lith-internal replacement of an old thematic adjective, why is a thematic pre-

form posited?). But in any case, it is most unlikely that the *u*-stem is of BSI age. Rather, Lith *baisūs* appears to be a *u*-stem adjective productively derived at the EBalt level from *baisà* ‘fear’ and/or *baĩsas* ‘demon’, an exact counterpart of PSI **b̥s̥v* (cf. Otrębski 1965: 218, and similar examples like *tamsà* ‘darkness’ → *tamsūs* ‘dark’). Concerning the IE etymology, it seems certain that the PIE root **b^heyh₂-* ‘fear’ is the ultimate source, but the details are rather entangled. As demonstrated by Nussbaum (1999: 390–91), Lat *foedus* ‘repulsive’ derives entirely unproblematically from **b^hoyh₂-i-d^ho-*, i.e., the root **b^heyh₂-* ‘fear’ in its customary shape²⁷ combined with the conglomerate **-i-d^h(h₁)o-*, which in usual (i.e., noncontraction) circumstances yields the productive Lat adj. suffix *-idus* (cf. *timidus* ‘fearful’, *pallidus* ‘pale’ etc.). Therefore, the alleged root variant **b^hoyd^h-* or similar, often marshalled in support of the reconstruction of the BSI forms with *-d^h-s-*, is now deprived of any basis. (Cf. also RM’s comments in fn. 27 on the same page, where he points out that the *-d^h-* looks suffixal.)

In principle, it is tempting to explain BSI **boĩsos* as a thematic derivative of the animate *s*-stem **b^h(e)yh₂-es-* seen in Ved *bhīyās-* (masc.) ‘fear’. However, the issues of ablaut (spread of productive *o*-grade?), the broken tone of the Latv cognate *baĩss*, and especially the nonoperation of the RUKI rule (expected PSI **b̥x̥v* and perhaps Lith. ***baišas*) remain enigmatic. Maybe one could think of an analogical restoration of non-RUKI-affected **-s-o-*, provided that enough *s*-stem abstracts and their thematic derivatives were still present in the BSI era. I shall discuss these issues in greater depth in a future work.

(110) RM hesitantly includes the word for ‘deep place in a river’, ‘pond’ etc.—“Russ. *plěso*, Cz. *pleso*, Croat. *plěso* (in toponyms)” —in the section on the suffixes **-so-*, **-sā-*, and embraces the etymology linking it to PIE **pleth₂-es-* ‘broadness’ (Ved *práthas-* ‘id.’ etc.). He recognizes the problematic status of “ORuss. *plēs̥v* ‘wide part of a river’, which is masculine.” The existence of this latter variant (also attested in WSI toponymy) is indeed puzzling and cannot be dismissed. Still more odd, however, is the fact that in OPol²⁸ and modern Pol dialects²⁹ what seems to be the same word is attested as *płō*, which points to the existence of (post-yer shift) variants **plo* and **pleso*. As recognized, for example, by Sławski ZSP 2: 30, this may be best explained by assuming an old *s*-stem neuter **p̥bl-o-* **p̥bl-es-*, originally an abstract noun³⁰ corresponding to

²⁷ The reconstruction **b^heyh₂-* used here follows LIV₂: 72–73 (credited to I. Hajnal), with root-final **h₂* based on the nominal reflexes Cuneiform Luwian *pīha-*, Lycian *pīxe-/pige-* ‘fear’. Nussbaum and RM leave the laryngeal unspecified, with the reconstruction amounting to **b^heyh-*. The difference is of little relevance here.

²⁸ Cf. Brückner SEJP: 421.

²⁹ Cf. SGP 4: 138. These attestations are important because they confirm the gender and form of the nom./acc. sg. *płō* (the OPol attestations are limited to oblique cases).

³⁰ Cf. the earlier remarks on *s*-stem neuters (33), on the suffix **-ostb* (55), and on **b̥s̥v* (109).

the adj. **pbl-nv* ‘full’. Such an item would be extremely interesting from the IE point of view because on the one hand no *s*-stem abstract is attested from the root **pleh₁-* ‘(be) full’ in other IE languages and on the other hand the formation looks like an archaic adjective abstract created according to the old IE “Caland System”³¹ pattern. I shall treat this issue as well as other questions concerning the reflexes of Caland System phenomena in (B)Sl in more detail elsewhere. (RM’s book mentions the Caland System in several places, e.g., 95, 97, 102.)

(126) It is not argued persuasively why a BSl *n*-stem **kalēn-* should be reconstructed for the word for ‘knee’, since the material adduced—except for divergent formations with no *-n-* in the suffix—consists solely of items derived with the apophonically stable thematic **-ēno-* (PSl **kolēno*, Lith *kelėnas*).³² Besides, it is unclear why the word is treated in the section on **-env*, **-eno*, and no separate suffix **-ėnv*, **-ėno* is recognized (with items such as **polėno* ‘billet, log’); cf. Sławski ZSP 1: 128–29.

(138) It is unclear why **ležiško* is apparently granted PSl status as a variant of **ležišče* even though RM observes in this section (following Vaillant and others) that the variant **-isko* is most probably an innovation limited to part of the NSl area.

(139) It is not made explicit why the name of Charlemagne, the source of PSl **korljv* ‘king’, is given as “Germ. **Karlu-*.” The OHG word underlying this name is *kar(a)l*, and it inflects according to the *a*-stem (PIE *o*-stem) paradigm. For a more detailed account of this celebrated borrowing, cf. Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 111–12 with further lit. (especially the recent contributions by G. Holzer).

(155) The innovative analysis of the suffix **-vrv* (exemplified by **vixvrv* ‘whirlwind’) as an apophonic zero-grade of **-orv* and **-erv* is perhaps not unimaginable. However, leaving aside the issue of why the reflex would have been **-vrv* rather than **-rv*, this disconnects PSl **vrv* from structures of the type **-uro-* in the other IE languages (except for those that happen to share the (possibility of the) development **R₃ > *uR*, like Gmc). Thus, it is a challenge to demonstrate the superiority of this analysis over the traditional ones such as the accretion of **-ro-* onto **-u-* (in particular—perhaps—the derivation of

³¹ See Rau 2009. One of the key characteristics is derivation directly from the root, omitting the formant used to build the adj. form (in this case, the suffix **-no-* in **pblnv* < **p!h₁-no-*).

³² Perhaps RM had in mind the apparent Lith variant *kelenā* (LKŽ, Smoczyński SEJL₂: 492), on which it is difficult to say anything with certainty without the necessary context. However, it is unlikely to be significant in view of its absence in Skardžius 1943: 239 and Ambrazas 2000: 168–69. It is quite possible that the lexeme (or suffix) in question has ties with PIE *n*-stems, but the BSl reconstruction in question appears unfounded.

adjectives in **-ro-* from old abstracts in **-u-*, though this must remain speculative) or thematic derivatives from nouns in **-wŕ-*, etc.

(170–89) As regards the chapters on nominal prefixes and compounding, see the important observations by Olander & Whitehead (547–49) concerning methodology, classification, and some of the examples chosen.

It may be added that these chapters are both very short, so that it is here in particular that one misses a slightly broader selection of the existing literature—the more so because numerous analyses (bold though they may be) postulating the preservation of opaque compounds in PSI have recently been put forth. See, for example, Snoj 1992 on **drozdŕb* ‘thrush’ and **strŕbnadb* ‘bunting’ or Loma 2003 on numerous other items; see also above regarding p. 88 on Gašiorowski’s hypothesis on the word for ‘crane’.

(172) Regarding **orz-*: “This prefix cannot be derived from any preposition in Slavic.” In fact, *raz* occurs as a preposition in Sln (Kopečný SGZ 1: 145–49), which may well be an archaism.

(179) Regarding **vy-*: “This prefix is found only in East and West Slavic (and marginally in Croatian and Slovene dialects).” It also has a more significant SSL attestation, namely in canonical OCS texts (though not in all of them; see discussion in Kopečný SGZ 1: 267–69). In any case, it is probably not necessary to rely on external cognates like Goth *ūt* ‘out of’ to establish its PSI status.

(185) “PSl. **drŕkolŕb* ‘stick, club’ (OCS *drŕkolŕb*, Russ. dial. *drekol’*, Slov. *dŕkol*, Cz. *drkolí* (...)), from the root of **dbrati* ‘tear, stab’ and **kolŕb* ‘stick’ (Vaillant 1928). Note that there is the wrong yer in both OCS and Russ. (*ŕ* is expected).” In point of fact, the wrong jer problem only arises under the traditional etymology (not mentioned by RM), according to which the first compound member is **dru-*, i.e., the apophonically reduced PIE word for ‘wood, tree’ (cf. Ved *dru-šád-* ‘sitting on a tree’). In the work cited by RM, Vaillant still supports this idea, arguing for a secondary modification of the original **drŕkolŕb* to **drŕkolŕb*; he does not mention a connection to the root **der-* ‘tear, flay’ (seen in the verbs **derti* ‘id.’, **dbrati* ‘id.’). The latter idea, which RM endorses, is found, for example, in Machek 1926: 421–22 (but expressed “ovšem jen zcela nesměle” and not included in the same author’s later etymological dictionary). However, it has generally been rejected (cf. SP 5: 34); it is formally rather difficult (for example, why **drŕb-* and not **dbr-?*). There are also noncompositional variants of the theory starting from the root **der-* (see the literature SP 5: *ibid.*), equally problematic.

(185) “Pol. *Kazimierz* (**kazati* ‘show’ + **mirŕ*)”: this name is conventionally analyzed as containing **kaziti* ‘destroy’, which is formally easier in view of the stem formation of the relevant verbs.

6. Conclusions

The above remarks are intended to show that there is room for discussion or improvement in some parts in the work. As has been said above, most of the etymological and derivational analyses either follow reliable findings by earlier scholars or offer stimulating new possibilities, and the result is satisfactory both as a reference work and as a piece of original scholarship. Thus, RM's effort successfully codifies and often enhances our knowledge of the Indo-European origins of Slavic nominal word formation and manages to present it in an accessible, modern fashion (albeit sometimes marred by typographical errors). For certain issues that fall outside of the scope of this book (particularly less securely attested lexemes or affixes or processes postdating the PSI period), preexisting works like Vaillant 1974 will remain indispensable. However, for fundamental information about the prehistory of a given PSI suffix, or to get a general idea of Sl diachronic word formation, this book will now be the best place to start.

References

- Ambrazas, Saulius. (1993) *Daiktavardžių darybos raida: Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodiniai vediniai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- . (2000) *Daiktavardžių darybos raida II: Lietuvių kalbos vardažodiniai vediniai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Brückner SEJP = Aleksander Brückner. (1985) *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. 2nd ed. Warsaw: Wiedza powszechna.
- Chantraine DELG = Pierre Chantraine. (2009) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. 3rd ed. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Derksen EDSIL = Rick Derksen. (2008) *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Eckert, Rainer [Ėkkert, R.]. (1963) "Osnovy na -u- v praslavjanskom jazyke." *Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija* 27: 3–133.
- ERHJ = Ranko Matasović, Tijmen Pronk, Dubravka Ivšić, and Dunja Brozović Rončević. (2016–) *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*. Vol. 1–. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- ESJS = Eva Havlová et al. (1989–) *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Vol. 1–. Prague: Academia.
- ÈSSJa = Oleg N. Trubačev et al. (1974–) *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov: Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Vol. 1–. Moscow: Nauka.
- EWA = Albert Lloyd et al. (1988–). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Vol. 1–. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Furlan, Metka. (2013) "K identifikaciji zgodnjepraslovske akrostatične deklinacije ijevskih samostalnikov." *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 19: 51–70.
- Gašiorowski, Piotr. (2013) "Gruit grus: The Indo-European names of the crane." *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 18: 51–68.
- Kopečný SGZ 1 = František Kopečný et al. (1973) *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků: Slova gramatická a zájmena*, Vol. 1: *Předložky: Koncové partikule*. Prague: Academia.
- LIV₂ = Helmut Rix et al. (2001) *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- LKŽ = Juozas Balčikonis et al. (1968–2002) *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. 20 vols. Vilnius: Mintis. Available at: <http://lkzd.lki.lt>.
- Loma, Aleksandar. (2003) "Zur frühslavischen Nominalkomposition und ihren indogermanischen Grundlagen." *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 2: 267–77.
- Machek, Václav. (1926) "Slovanská jména uzdy." *MNHMA: Sborník vydaný na paměť čtyřicetiletého učitelského působení prof. Josefa Zubatého na Univerzitě Karlově, 1885–1925*. Prague: Tiskem státní tiskárny, 413–27.
- Matasović, Ranko. (1998) "The Proto-Indo-European heteroclita in Balto-Slavic." *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 44: 121–127.
- . (2008) *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Meillet, Antoine. (1905) *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*. Vol. 2. Paris: Bouillon.
- Mihaljević, Milan. (2014) Review of Matasović 2014. *Suvremena lingvistika* 78: 225–31.
- NIIL = Dagmar S. Wodtke, Britta Irslinger, and Carolin Schneider. (2008) *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Nussbaum, Alan. (1999) "Jocidus: An account on the Latin adjectives in *-idus*." Heiner Eichner, Hans Christian Luschützky, and Velizar Sadovski, eds. *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: Enigma, 377–419.
- Olander, Thomas and Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead. (2015) Review of Matasović 2014. *Journal of Indo-European studies* 43: 544–53.
- Otrębski, Jan. (1965) *Gramatyka języka litewskiego*, Vol. 2: *Nauka o budowie wyrazów*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Patri, Sylvain. (2003) "Намъ: Novaja slavjano-iranskaja leksičeskaja izoglossa." *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 2003(4): 19–28.
- Polański, Kazimierz. (1976) "Uwagi o rozwoju prasłowiańskiej deklinacji atematycznej." Jan Safarewicz et al., eds. *Opuscula polono-slavica: Munera linguistica Stanislaw Urbańczyk dedicata*. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 291–95.
- Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia. (2013) *The Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Rau, Jeremy. (2009) *Indo-European nominal morphology: The decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schuster-Šewc HEW = Heinz Schuster-Šewc. (1978–94) *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*. 5 vols. Bautzen: Domowina-Verlag.
- SGP = Jan Karłowicz et al. (1900–11) *Słownik gwar polskich*. 6 vols. Cracow: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności.
- SJS = Josef Kurz et al. (1958–97) *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského: Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*. 4 vols. Prague: Československá Akademie Věd (and others).
- Skardžius, Pranas. (1943) *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*. Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademija.
- Sławski ZSP = Franciszek Sławski. (1974–79) *Zarys słowotwórstwa prastowiańskiego*. 3 vols. [= introductory chapters in the first three volumes of SP]
- Smoczyński SEJL₂ = Wojciech Smoczyński. (forthcoming) *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. 2nd ed. [Ms. shared by author at [https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21280621/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21280621/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf)]
- Snoj, Marko. (1992) “K preučevanju starejših nominalnih kompozit: psl. *drozdъ' in *strъnadъ.” Jože Toporišič et al., eds. *Miklošičev zbornik: Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani od 26. do 28. junija 1991*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti, 193–200.
- Snoj SES = Marko Snoj. (2003) *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. 2nd ed. Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- SP = Franciszek Sławski et al. (1974–2001) *Słownik prastowiański*. 8 vols. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Taszycki, Witold. (1925) *Najdawniejsze polskie imiona osobowe*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Vaillant, André. (1928) “Vieux slave *drikolī* « bâton ».” *Revue des études slaves* 8: 88–90.
- . (1974) *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, Vol. 4: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Varbot, Žana Ž. (2015) Review of Matasović 2014. *Journal of language relationship / Voprosy jazykovogo rodstva* 13: 390–93.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. (2014) “Tone variation in the Baltic *ia*-presents.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119: 227–49.
- Vondrák, Václav. (1906) *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik*, Vol. 1: *Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . (1924) *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik*, Vol. 1: *Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

-
- Weiss, Michael. (1991) "Old Church Slavonic *spodъ* and Avestan *spāda-*." *Die Sprache* 35: 125–28.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. (2004) *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Department of Linguistics, Harvard University
Boylston Hall, 3rd floor
Cambridge, MA 02138 USA
marekmajer@fas.harvard.edu

Received: March 2017