

UDC 811.16-112

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2024-39.1>

MISCELLANEA ETYMOLOGICA: SLAVICA. IV¹

Alexander I. Iliadi

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor at the Chair of Translation,
Theoretical and Applied Linguistics
State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky»,
Odessa, Ukraine
e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

SUMMARY

*The paper deals with the results of etymological analysis of a group of lexemes in the vocabulary of Eastern and Western (Polish) Slavonic languages. The aims of this study: a) to give the etymological explanation of several Slavonic lexemes, which hitherto have not been the object of linguistic analysis or examined as «not entirely clear» in the special literature; b) to clarify the etymological relations and the structure of the words which have already got a preliminary assessment in the investigations of the paper author predecessors. The treatment of these words enables not only to clarify their genetic relations to the cognates and determine the details of their structure, but also substantiate their Proto-Slavonic age, having supposed the areal limitation of corresponding Proto-Slavonic prototypes. It is about the following words: *balogъ or *bolologъ (along with Lith. Láng-a-balė, where inversion of the components is presented), *xomila, *obxobъje, *termъkъ or *tъrmъkъ, *tyr'а, *vorma (the dialectal morphological innovation to the original *verma), *vъrgo-lykъ. Proto-Slav. *xomila, *termъkъ, *tyr'а, evidently, belonged to the terminological (hunting, fishing and agricultural) vocabulary.*

Keywords: *etymology, comparative-historical method, prototype, derivative, Slavonic languages.*

¹ Previous articles of this series: *Paradigm of Knowledge*. 2019. № 4 (36), pp. 81–102 (I); *Paradigm of Knowledge*. 2020. № 2 (40), pp. 95–113 (II); *Paradigm of Knowledge*. 2020. № 5 (43), pp. 116–137 (III).

Introduction. The empirical base of etymology as a special brunch of linguistics is formed with the sum of facts i.e. etymological versions, put forward according to results of applying of the methods of etymological and comparative-historical analysis to the words and the separate morphemes, lexico-semantic groups, genetical clusters. This base is permanently extended, furthermore time after time the existing etymological versions are clarified or radically revised, that implies the genetical reorientation of all cognates or a reexamination of their structure. As in other areas in linguistics, here the process of improving of the technique of work with word morphology takes place because of introduced new data into scientific usage. Any etymological study is always **relevant**, if one suggests new ways to solve old tasks (regarding the genesis and structure of the lexemes) with taking into account a previously unknown material.

The aims of the proposed paper are: a) to give the etymological explanation of several Slavonic lexemes, which hitherto have not been the object of linguistic analysis or examined as «not entirely clear» in the special literature; b) to clarify the etymological relations and the structure of the words which have already got a preliminary assessment in the investigations of my predecessors.

Research methods, applied in the study: *etymological, comparative-historical, method of dictionary entries analysis.*

The research material is the data of the entries of the etymological and dialect dictionaries of Slavonic and some other languages of Indo-European language family. The main sources of data: 1) Etymological Dictionary of Slavonic Languages: Proto-Slavonic Lexical Stratum [eds O. N. Trubačev, A. F. Zhuravlev, J. J. Varbot]. 1974–2021. Vol. 1–42 (further – EDSL); 2) Anikin A. È. Russian Etymological Dictionary. 2007–2024. Vol. 1–18 (further – Anikin); 3) Dictionary of Russian Folk Dialects [eds F. P. Filin, F. P. Sorokoletov, S. A. Myznikov]. 1965–2021. Vol. 1–52 (further – DRFD); 4) An Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Language [ed. O. S. Mel'nyčuk]. 1982–2012 (further – Mel'nyčuk).

Material of analysis and results

Pol. *Bałq*

The name of lake *Bałq* attested in the areal of Polish hydronymy, namely among the water nomenclature of the Wisla basin (Szulowska, Wolnicz-Pawłowska, 2001: 43). To the best of my

knowledge, this limnonym has not yet been under consideration in the etymological studies, although its structure deserves a special parsing against the background of other water names with conditionally singled out root base *Bal-*, cf. *Balaty Staw*, *Batek* – pond (Szulowska, Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Ibid.). Strictly speaking, mentioned root is surely singled out only in *Batek* ~ Pol. dial. *balka* ‘little lake in the valley; dry ravine in steppe’ along with Croat. dial. *bala* ‘feather grass’ (EDSL, 1974 (1: 149)). Name *Balaty* with its clear adjective morphology with suff. *-at-* rather raises doubts as a derivative from *bal-*, because as for the area of the hydrographic terms it would be expected the derivation of the adjectives with suff. *-av-*, *-ov-* (cf. **bělava*, **rudava*, **rudova*) or *-ьн-* from Proto-Slavonic color designation **bala* ‘light, white’. I presuppose the modern form to be the result of rethinking the nomen, which became little understood to the native speakers.

Pol. *Balqg* has the structure like in rare archaic derivatives with suff. *-qg-*, motivated with the coloratives, cf. **p̥str-qg̃*, **mor-qg̃* : **mar-qg̃* etc. (see about them: Sławski, 1974: 67–68). On this basis *Balqg* could be attributed to the mentioned group of derivatives (**bal-qg̃*, cf. suffixless Croat. *bala*), but there is one more way of assessment its etymological composition, namely as the old composite **bolo-lqg̃* with syncope of the syllable *lo*. The first part here is Slavonic counterpart of Lith. *balà*, Latv. *bala*, *balas*, Old Pruss. *balas* ‘swamp’, ‘wet lowland’, ‘puddle’, the second part is Proto-Slav. **lqg̃* ‘water meadow’, ‘flood plain’. As a whole Proto-Slav. **bolo-lqg̃* is the whole-lexical equivalent of Lith. hydronym *Láng-a-balė* (Vanagas, 1981: 180: to *lángas* ‘free of vegetation place on a swamp’, ‘abyss in a quagmire’ ~ Proto-Slav. **lqg̃*, **lęg̃*; see also: Smoczyński, 2019: 871) with the reverse order of the parts. Thus, sound *a* in the place of primordial *o* is secondary, which should not be surprising, because the word underwent deetymologisation after syncope.

Ukr. dial. *вѣрґлик*

Ukr. dial. *вѣрґлик* ‘tool for weaving of postols (peasant footwear)’ (without localization) in ЕСУМ is defined as «not entirely clear; perhaps, a derivative from **вѣрґти*, i.e. unattested phonetic variant

of the verb *верзті* *‘to weave, knit’» (Мельничук, 1982 (1: 352)). The version about variant forms **верзти* : *верзти* is quite possible with taking into account a similar correlation in Ukr. *вѣргати(ся)* ‘to throw’, Russ. *вѣргать* ‘to throw, sling’, Old Russ. *вѣргать* ‘to throw, toss’ (*с каменем верзаху*, XVII) : Old Russ. *верзати* ‘the same’ (*от лука верзати стрѣлы* ‘to shoot a bow’, XVI), Russ. *вѣрзить* ‘to throw’, Old Belarus. *верзти* ‘the same’, *верзтися* ‘to throw’ (Anikin, 2012 (6: 269, 308): *вѣрзить* I). However, it is not enough just to single out the base *верг-* in *вѣрглик* without clarifying the details his morphology (*-л-ик* or *-лик?*), since the way of derivation remains unclear. I assume in this word the composite **верго-лик* (**вьрго-лыкѣ*) with the reflex of Proto-Slav. **лыкѣ* ‘bast’ (: Serb., Croat. *лик*; EDSL, 1990 (17: 33)). Thus this technical term is derived according to the model of composition «stem + word» with subsequent loss of the connecting vowel, that is frequent phenomenon in the dialects, and rethinking the second part, where outcome *-ик* was perceived as unstressed suffix. Its semantics ‘лыковяз’ (‘knitter of bast’) impels to think about *вѣрглик* as a tool, that primordial was used for knitting *личаків* – peasant footwear made of *лыка* (bast) (Ukr. *ліко*).

It is interesting to note the fact of saving masculine form of Proto-Slav. **лыкѣ* in the composite; this grammatical variant is unknown as freely using unite in Ukrainian dialect areal, where only **лыко* is attested.

Russ. dial. *варгун* : Ukr. dial. *вергун*

Russ. dial. (Voronezh) *варгун* ‘currant wheat flatbread’ in the РЭС is provided with the follow comment: «Not clear. Geographically and semantically is difficult to identify with *варгун*° II». This last is attributed to *вѣргать* ‘to angrily mumble, showing displeasure; to grumb, cuss’ (Anikin, 2012 (6: 80): *варгун* I). However, Russian word is not isolated, since it has the exact equivalent in Ukr. *вергун* ‘sweet biscuits’. The authors of ЕСУМ treat this word as «perhaps, a derivative formation from **верзти*, i.e. unattested variant of the verb *верзті* *‘knit’» (Мельничук, 1982 (1: 352)) out of relation to Russ. *варгун*, which, evidently, was unknown to them. The difference in the root vocalism does not prevent historical-phonetic identifying of both lexemes in view of the fact that

vowel *a* in *варгун* is secondary to *e*, cf. development *e* (from **ь*) > *a* also in other dialectal words, formed after the pattern *тыт*, for example, *варлеока* ‘one-eyed fabulous creature’ along *верлиока* ‘the same’ < Proto-Slav. **vьrlookъ(jь)* (Anikin, 2012 (6: 312–213)). So, Russ. *варгун* is from older **вергун* = Ukr. *вергун*.

Eastern Slavonic *вергун* is the deverbative with suff. *-ун-* from **верети*, cf. Russ. dial. *дерун* ‘flatbread cooked from grated potatoes’ < *деру*, *драть*, formed after the same model (EDSL, 1977 (4: 209)). About phonetic variance of the stem *верг-* : *верз-* see above. As regards to semantics of the lexeme, one, probably, originally denoted pastry from sweet dough in the shape of «plaiting», cf. Ukr. dial. *переплітонок* ‘pretzel, which is baked on Christmas for cow’ ~ *плéстї* ‘to knit’ (Мельничук, 2003 (4: 440–441)).

Inclusion Ukr. *вѣрчик* ‘braided loaf’ in one entry together with Ukr. *вергун* in ЕСУМ is the result of confusion, because in a few pages afterwards the same word quite rightly is attributed to the derivatives from *вертіти* ‘to turn, twiddle’ (Мельничук, 1982 (1: 359)).

In light of all the above identifying Russ. *варгун* with Belarus. dial. *вургун* ‘bump, tumor’ as the reflexes of common Proto-Slav. **vьrgunъ* in (Шульгач, 1998: 184) seems to be incorrectly.

Russ. dial. *ворлыга*

Rus. dial. (Pskovian) *ворлыга* folklore epithet of thief (cf. *вор-ворлыга* in the example «*Жил-был барин, а у барина был мужик, его барин звал вор-ворлыга*») and clearly derivative (Vologda) *ворлыхан* ‘thieving person’, 1902 (DRFD, 1970 (5: 101)) from **ворлыган* require the phonetic comment to correct assessment of details their morphology. With taking into account dial. (Ryazan) *ворыга* ‘cunning man, deceiver’, (Pskovian) *Вор-Ворыга* (name of fairy tale), 1870 (DRFD, 1970 (5: 129)) the lexemes *ворлыга* and *ворлыхан* are the examples of emergence of epenthetic *л* as a mean of the expressive variant formation, i.e.: *ворыга* > *ворлыга*, **ворыган* > **ворлыган* > *ворлыхан*, as in the case with Russ. *Чурлило* (modern surname) – dialectal variant of the name *Чурило*. An interesting case is presented with Russ. dial. *мосторлыга* ‘cartillage in a piece of beef’ alongside with *мостолога* ‘large bone with meat’ (DRFD, 1982 (18: 294)), where, conversely, the epenthetic *р* developed, i.e. **мостолыга* > *мосторлыга*. Consequently

the problem of correlation of *ворлыга* : *ворыга* is solved not on the level of word-formation, but in the plane of phonetics.

Concerning the examples of the extension of a stem by suffix with supporting *-z-* with the formant *-ан-* in the expressive function cf. Ukr. *дідуз-а́н* ‘old man’ (with the similar moving of stressing at *-ан-*).

An alternative treatment of *ворлыга* implies identifying this word with Russ. dial. (Tver, Vyatka) *варлыга* ‘lazy, leisure person’, (derivative) *варлыжник* ‘lazy man’, ‘deceiver’. Regarding both words the conclusion «unclear» is made, but while presence in these words the same stem **vьrl-* as in Ukr. *верло́* ‘drawbar’ is admitted (Anikin, 2012 (6: 93); 2014 (8: 238)). Proto-Slavonic etymon **vьrl-* is quite acceptable in Russ. *варлагáн* ‘giant’ (Kazan), ‘tall, clumsy and rude person’ (Saratov), *варлагáн, варлыгáн* ‘the same’ (Penza) (these lexemes are treated as the derivatives with *-ан-*; Anikin, 2012 (6: 93)), because people nicknames according to their high growth are often derived from designations of pole, club, cf. *жердь* ‘pole’ > *жердэй* ‘tall and thin person’. However, the semantics ‘deceiver’, ‘lazy’ in *варлыга* and ‘thief’ in *ворлыга* impels to consider them separate from *варлагáн, варлыгáн*, especially in the presence of clearly phonetically primordial *ворыга* ‘cunning man, deceiver’ without amplifying *л*.

Russ. dial. *ворóмина* : Belarus. dial. *верэ́ма, вярэ́ма*

Russ. (Vyatka) *ворóмина* ‘?’ in a child counting rhyme «Там дьякон пишет Черным огарком. Соломина-ворóмина. Шишел-вышел», 1903 (DRFD, 1970 (5: 111)). This is hardly just a rhyming, based on a random consonance, because *соломина* is rhymed with the word, which is, probably, not just similar in word-formation structure (model with suff. *-ин-*) and sequence of sounds, but also close in semantics. Dial. *ворóмина* could designate a rod, flexible branch, therefore the stem *вором-* is formally comparable to Belarus. dial. *вярэ́ма* ‘willow thickets’ (Мартынаў, 1980: 322 «unclear»), *верэ́ма* ‘willow bush’. Jeanne J. Varbot convincingly explains this last as a reflex of Proto-Slav. **ver-ma* < **verti*, **vьrŕ* with motivation of the name for willow bush on ground of flexibility (see: Varbot J. J. Review of the: *Кари Луукконен*.

Восточнославянские отглагольные существительные на *-m-*. I. Существительные на **-тъ/*-та/*-то*. Хельсинки, 1987 (Slavica Helsingiensia 5). In: *Etymology*. 1988–1990, p. 195: as a more probable alternative of etymology of *верэма* from **vert-ma* by K. Liukkonen).

Formal correlation of Belarus. dial. *верэма*, *вярэма* and Russ. dial. *вором-ина* is relationship in the pare «archaism VS innovation»: **verta* – the archaism with *e*-vocalism, as in the relevant verb, while **vorma* – the innovation, arose influenced by the vocalism of secondary **-voriti* ‘to bend, flex’, ‘to open’, ‘to close’. Absence of **ворома* in Russian dialectal areal indirectly speaks in favor of ancient age of the suffixal derivative.

Ukr. dial. *кунду́ня*

Ukr. dial. (Odessa) *кунду́ня* ‘short warm women’s coat’, *курду́нька* ‘short fur coat, coat’, (Cherkassy) *ханда́нька* ‘cape with hood’. In ЕСУМ: «Not entirely clear; evidently, related to *гуня*, *гунька* ‘outewear made of baize’» (Мельничук, 1989 (3: 142)). Such a wide spectrum of variability of the word structure indicates a far-reached process of rethinking of a certain original form, and I consider it to be Modern Greek *κοντογούνι* ‘little fur coat’, ‘a kind of katsaveika’. This name of outewear was taken in Odessa dialects (and in some other dialects) from the speech of Greek populations of Odessa, having saved the place of stressing in Slavonic usage. Sound *y* in the first syllable of *кунду́ня* and *курду́нька* emerged in Ukrainian pronunciation, which is characterized by increase the degree of labialization of *o* before syllable with *y*, cf. *ко^vжух* > *кужух*, *го^vлупка* > *гулупка*. Sonant *p* in *курду́нька* arose as the result of dissimilation of *н-н* > *р-н*.

In another way about these words see: (Iliadi, 2019: 88–89), where Iranian etymology is suggested. It is doubtful.

Ukr. dial. *охоб’я*

Ukr. dial. *охоб’я* ‘dry branches’ (Матвіяс, 1998: 119) is absent in the entries of etymological dictionaries. The lexeme reproduces Proto-Slavonic form **ob-xob-ъje* with root *o*-vocalism, which is variant to **xabъje* (: Czech dial. *chábí* ‘brushwood, sticks’, Pol. dial. *chabie* ‘brushwood, branches’) and **o(b)xaba/*o(b)xabъ*

(: Ukr. dial. *охаба* ‘thick log’, *охаб* ‘crooked tree with knots’) etc. with long $\bar{o} > a$ (EDSL, 1981 (8: 9); 2000 (27: 61)). Analyzed form is missed in EDSL.

Ukr. dial. *теремок*

A technical term *теремок*, *-мкá* ‘trap from the fishing net for catching of birds’ (Аркушин, 2000: 196), attested in the areal of Western Polesie dialects, has clear word-building structure, being the derivative with suff. *-ок-* from the stem *терем-*, cf. Russian synonym *силók* ‘loop for catching of birds’ < dial. *силó* ‘the same’, formed similarly. It is harder to define the etymological relations of the base *терем-*, which is probably to interpret twofold.

Let’s look at the first way. Fullvoice form of the stem prompts reconstruction its original look as **term-* as a part of the noun ***termъ*, which is correlative to the verb **tьrmati* ‘to pull’, ‘to weave’, ‘to tangle’, cf. such its reflexes as Russ., Ukr. dial. *тáрмати* ‘to tear, tangle’, Ukr. *тérмати* ‘to tear, pinch’, Sloven. dial. (Carinthian) *termati* ‘to weave’ (about the verb see: Kurkina L. V. Etymological Notes. In: *Etymology*. 1974, pp. 44–45 (with references); Мельничук, 2006 (5: 554): Slovenian reflex is not mentioned). The nature of the correlation of the root vocalism «full *e*-grade (noun) : grade of reduction (verb)» in ***termъ*, **term-ъкъ* : **tьrmati* is the same as in the pares **verteno*, **vertel’ь* : **vьrtati*, **vьrtěti*, **vьrtиtи* (see, for example, in: Varbot J. J. Proto-Slavonic Morphology, Word-Formation and Etymology. 1984, p. 92).

The second way of the stem *терем-* explanation enables not to recede from proposed etymology; combination *epe* is just treated not as a result of development of Proto-Slav. *tert*, but as a phonetic innovation — a case of the second Eastern Slavonic fullvoice *tьrt* > *tьrbt*, i.e. Old Russ. **търьмѣкъ* > Ukr. *теремок*. As a whole it is talking about the deverbal Nomen Instrumenti **tьrm-ѣкъ* ‘net (= what tangles)’ < **tьrmati* ‘to pull, yank’, ‘to tangle’, cf. *смичók* < *смíкати*.

Regardless of details of the etymology we are dealing with the obvious Proto-Slavonic lexeme **termъкъ* or **tьrmъкъ* ‘net (for catching of birds)’ (= ‘what is woven’), saved in the archaic dialects. Its antiquity as a suffixal derivative is highly probable, since word-formative suffixless stem has not survived.

Ukr. dial. *ті́ра*

Ukr. dial. *ті́ра* ‘big reed fence in the form of almost enclosed circle, which set in the water for fishing’, *ті́ря* ‘fence made of reed panels for fishing’ (in the dialects along the low course of the Dniester). In «An Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Language» one is given as «unklear» (Мельничук, 2006 (5: 571)). Vowel *u* here is etymologically ambiguous, because one may go back to Proto-Slav. *i* or *y*. If seeing here primordial **y*, then may be this technical term reproduces a Proto-Slavonic dialectal word **тыр(ъ)а* ‘enclosure’ as the etymological parallel to such Iranian lexemes as Saka *ttaura-*, *ttora-* ‘woll’ (in a translated text of Buddhist topic this word corresponds to Sanskrit *куद्या-* ‘the same’; Bailey, 1960: 33–34: here see also about Indo-European relations of Saka word).

It can not be ruled out that when analyzing we should proceed from not secondary cultural meaning ‘enclosure’, but from ‘reed’, ‘cane’ and further – ‘shield made of reed, cane’. However, the name of reed/cane, which is phonetically close to *тир*, is absent for both Slavonians and in the languages of peoples, which had cultural contacts with them.

Ukr. dial. *хумилá*

Ukr. dial. *хумилá* ‘chopped straw, chaff, parts of ears and straw etc., which mixed in cattle food’ (Курило, 1928: 93). Suggested in ЕСУМ treatment of this word as the expressive formation based on onomatopoeia **хум* for imitation of act of chewing appears to be doubtful. It is not just a matter that **хум* as a phonetic modification of the interjection *хам* (this is how see in: Мельничук, 2012 (6: 221): «not entirely clear») is unknown, but also that the semantics of *хумилá* here is given generally, unspecifically as ‘cattle food’, i.e. with the omission of details, essential to etymology, because they indicate the search vector of cognates. It is important, that it is about the chopped stalks of cereal plants (straw) or their chopped parts (chaff), therefore in *хумилá* we may confidently single out the root *мил-*, common with **mil-* in the iterativum **-milati* ‘to grind’, cf. Old Russ. *съмилати* (in «Nikon Chronicle»: *смилашеся яко пшеница*), Sloven. *mil* ‘marl soil’ (to learn more about **-milati* < ***тылѣ*, **melti* see: Varbot J. J. Studies on Russian and Slavonic Etymology, 2011, pp. 603–605). Vocalism of noun

**мила* is the evidence its deverbal nature as in case with Sloven. *mil*. The morphological component *ху-*, preceding the root, is logically explained as wide spread in Eastern languages and their dialects the archaic prefix *хо-/ха-*, taking here the form *ху-* too (see for example: Petleva I. P. The Archaic Prefixes in Russian Dialects in: *Etymological Studies*. 1996. Vol. 6, p. 32).

Losing in the local dialects of the reflexes of Proto-Slav. **-milati* and also its nominal derivatives speaks in favor of a significant age of *хумилá*: the lexeme may reproduce even Proto-Slav. **хо-мила*. With taking into account the cases of isofunctionality of *хо-/ха-/ху-* with respect to prefixes of pronominal origin *ко-/ка-/ку-* and *че-/ча-/чи-/чу-*, which give the words semantics ‘what a’, it is permissible to suppose, that the meaning of Proto-Slav. **хо-мила* was assessive ‘what a straw/chaff’.

Ukr. dial. *чур, чурлó*

Following two dialectal geographical words are interesting not so much in etymological but rather in structural-typological term. Being derived from onomatopoeic verbs, they have close analogues in Baltic water nomenclature, also derived from verba onomatopoeica. Cf.:

Ukr. (Carpathian) *чур* ‘waterfall’ (Матвіяс, 1998: 103) and also the derivatives with suff. *-к-*, *-ок-*, cf. dial. (Eastern Slovakia) *чурка* (as a part of microtoponym *Гу Чурки*) < *чурітми* ‘to flow’ (Дуйчак, 1995: 348: *Гу* – preposition with the prosthetic consonant, cf. *Гу Потóку*), South-Western *чурок* ‘small waterfall’, ‘place, where water gushes’. The motivative verbs *чурітми* ‘to flow’, ‘to gurgle’, ‘to beat the jets’, *чурітми* ‘the same’ are derived from onomatopoeia *чур* ‘murmur’, conveying the sound impression of noise of flowing water (Мельничук, 2012 (6: 357)). The equivalent of mentioned Slavonic lexemes in Baltic vocabulary is Latv. *čura* ‘puddle’, ‘small stream’, ‘rain stream’ < *čurēt* ‘to flow with noise’ ~ Lith. *čīurėnti* ‘to flow, murmur (of water)’ from onomatopoeia *čīur̃* ‘imitation of the sound of running water’ (Fraenkel, 1962: 76–77; Smoczyński, 2019: 260);

Ukr. dial. (Carpathian) *чурлó* ‘water source’, ‘flow, stream’ (Ономастичний архів) < *чурітми/чурітми* along with Lith. *čīurlys* ‘flow’, ‘water jet’ (Fraenkel, 1962: 76), *čīur̃las* ‘the same’ ~ *čīurėnti* (Smoczyński, 2019: 260);

So, both lexical families with similar onomatopoeic complexes in the stem demonstrate general regularities of word-formation and morphology:

Slav. чур (onomat.) : чуріми, чуріму : чур (subst.) VS Lith. čiuř (onomat.) : Latv. čurēt, Lith. čiurėnti : Latv. čura (subst.);

Slav. чуріми, чуріму : чурлó VS Lith. čiurėnti : čiurlỹs, čiuřlas.

Resemblance is complemented by close similarity of verb structure: Ukr. dial. чуркату ‘to flow’, ‘to murmur’, ‘to beat the jets’ (Мельничук, Ibid.) VS Lith. čiuřkšti ‘to flow’, ‘to pour (about rane)’ (Smoczyński, Ibid.).

The mentioned lexical-semantic and word-formative parallels are devoid of the attention in ЕСУМ.

Conclusions. As we can see, linguistic elaboration even a small list of Slavonic words can give the important results for etymology. Suggested analysis with high probability enables to uncover their very complex, occasionally ambiguous relations, and reconstruct several Proto-Slavonic dialectal words, saved in Eastern and Western Slavonic areals, namely: *balqǫ or *bololqǫ (cf. Lith. *Láng-a-balė* with inversion of the parts), *xomila, *obxobъje, *termǫkǫ or *tǫrmǫkǫ, *tʏr^(ʷ)a, *vorma (a morphological innovation to *verma), *vьrgo-lykǫ.

REFERENCES

- Arkušyn G. L. (2000). Slovnyk zakhidnopolis'kykh govirok [Dictionary of Western Polesye Dialects]. T. 2: О–Я. Lutsk: Vezha.
- Bailey H. (1960). Arya II. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 13–39.
- Duičak M. (1995). Slovnyk mikrotoponimiv ukrayins'kykh sil Skhidnoyi Slovaččyny [Dictionary of Microtoponyms of Ukrainian Villages of Eastern Slovakia]. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Derzhavnogo muzeyu ukrayins'ko-rus'koyi kul'tury u Svydnyku* [Scientific Collection of State Museum of Ukrainian-Russian Culture in Svidnyk]. Pr'ashiv. Kn. 20, pp. 321–447.
- Fraenkel E. (1965). *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 2*, Heidelberg, Göttingen: Carl Winter and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Iliadi A. I. (2019). Miscellanea etymologica: Slavica. *Paradigm of knowledge*. № 4 (36), pp. 81–102.
- Kurylo O. (1928). Materialy do ukrayins'koyi dialektologiyi ta fol'klorystyky [Materials for Ukrainian Dialectology and Folkloristics]. Kyiv: VAN.

Martynaw V. U. (ed.) (1980). *Ètymalagičny slownik belaruskay movy* [Etymological Dictionary of Belarusian Languages]. Minsk: Navuka i tèkhnika. T. 2.

Matviyas I. (1998). *Varianty ukrayins'koyi literaturnoyi movy* [Variants of Ukrainian Literary Language]. Kyiv: Instytut ukrayins'koyi movy NANU.

Mel'nyčuk O. S. (ed.). (1982–2012). *Ètymologičnyi slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy* [An Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Language]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. T. 1–6.

Onomastic Archive of IUL NASU.

Sławski F. (1974). *Zarys słowotwórstwa prastowiańskiego. Słownik prastowiański I: A–B* / [pod red. Franciszka Sławskiego]. Wrocław; Warszawa etc. : Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk. S. 43–141.

Smoczyński W. (2019). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. 2019. Available at: www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf*.

Szulowska W., Wolnicz-Pawłowska E. (2001). *Nazwy wód w Polsce*. Warszawa: PAŃ DIT. Cz. I: Układ alfabetyczny.

Šul'gač V. P. (1998). *Zametki po dons'koj gidronimii: Bapzoł* [Notes on the Don Hydronymy]. *Vostočnoukrajinskij lingvističeskij sbornik* [Eastern Ukrainian Linguistic Collection]. Donetsk: Doneččina. Vol. 4, pp. 182–187.

Vanagas A. (1981). *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslas.

MISCELLANEA ETYMOLOGICA: SLAVICA. IV

Олександр І. Іліаді

доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри перекладу
і теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики
Державного закладу «Південноукраїнський національний
педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»,
Одеса, Україна

e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті викладено результати етимологічного аналізу групи лексем зі словника східно- та західнослов'янських мов (польської). Завдання студії: а) дати етимологічне пояснення деяким слов'янським лексемам, які досі не були об'єктом аналізу або ж оцінювалися як «не зовсім ясні» у профільній літературі; б) уточнити етимологічні зв'язки та структуру слів, які вже дістали попередньої оцінки у працях попередників автора статті. Трактатування цих вокабул дозволяє не лише з'ясувати їхні генетичні зв'язки зі спорідненими формами й установити деталі їхньої структури, але й обґрунтувати їхній праслов'янський вік,

припустивши ареальну обмеженість відповідних праслов'янських прототипів. Ідеться про такі слова: **balogъ* чи **bolologъ* (поряд із лит. *Láng-a-balė*, де представлена інверсія компонентів), **хотила*, **обхобъје*, **тертѣкъ* чи **търтѣкъ*, **тур'а*, **vorma* (діалектна морфологічна інновація до первісного **verta*), **vьrgo-lykъ*. Псл. **хотила*, **тертѣкъ*, **тур'а*, імовірно, належали до термінологічного (промислового та сільськогосподарського) словника.

Ключові слова: етимологія, порівняльно-історичний метод, прототип, дериват, слов'янські мови.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

- Аркушин Г. Л. Словник західнополіських говірок. У 2 т. Т. 2. О–Я. Луцьк : Вежа, 2000. 458 с.
- Дуйчак М. Словник мікротопонімів українських сіл Східної Словаччини. Науковий збірник Державного музею українсько-руської культури у Свиднику. Пряшів, 1995. Кн. 20. С. 321–447.
- Курило О. Матеріали до української діалектології та фольклористики. Київ : ВАН, 1928. 135 с.
- Мартынаў В. У. (ред.). Этымалагічны слоўнік беларускай мовы. Мінск : Навука і тэхніка, 1980. Т. 2. 344 с.
- Матвіяс І. Варіанти української літературної мови. Київ : Інститут української мови НАНУ, 1998. 162 с.
- Мельничук О. С. (ред.). Етимологічний словник української мови. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982–2012. Т. 1–6.
- Ономастичний архів ІУМ НАНУ.
- Шульгач В. П. Заметки подонской гидронимии: *Варгол. Восточноукраинский лингвистический сборник*. Донецк : Донеччина, 1998. Вып. 4. С. 182–187.
- Bailey H. Arya II. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*. 1960. Vol. 23, No. 1. P. 13–39.
- Fraenkel E. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg; Göttingen : Carl Winter and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965. Band 2. 1560 S.
- Piadi A. I. *Miscellanea etymologica: Slavica. Paradigm of knowledge*. 2019. № 4 (36). P. 81–102.
- Ślawski F. *Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. Słownik prasłowiański 1: A–B / [pod red. Franciszka Ślawskiego]*. Wrocław ; Warszawa etc. : Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk, 1974. S. 43–141.
- Smoczyński W. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]*. 2019. Retrieved from: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf). 2239 s.
- Szulowska W., Wolnicz-Pawłowska E. *Nazwy wód w Polsce*. Warszawa : PAN DIT. Cz. I: Układ alfabetyczny, 2001. 337 s.
- Vanagas A. *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius : Mokslas, 1981. 408 p.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 07.11.2024