UDK 811.16'373.45:811.511
Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak
Uniwersytet Łódzki / Univerza v Lodžu
krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl

ARE THERE TRACES OF A FINNO-UGRIC SUBSTRATUM
IN PROTO-SLAVIC?[1]

The author discusses the problem of possible Uralic borrowings in Proto-Slavic, hypothesizing that the Proto-Slavs in their homeland (presumably located in Eastern Europe) were neighbours of some unknown Finno-Ugric tribes. Moreover, he suggests that Proto-Slavic loanwords of Uralic origin refer not only to plants (e.g., oak, tinder fungus) and the natural environment (e.g., PSl. *kǫpa f. 'a hillock or an island overgrown with trees'), but also to some basic social terms (e.g., PSl. *čьlověkъ m. 'human being, man, husband, serf, servant'; *mǫ̂žь m. 'man, husband'). Language contacts between the Proto-Slavs and a Finno-Ugric substratum must have been exceptionally intensive, as the Proto-Slavs borrowed some verbs—e.g., PSl. *kǫpati 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash', PSl. *ličiti 'to count, reckon, calculate'.

Keywords: borrowings, language contacts, Proto-Slavic, substratum, Uralic influence

Avtor obravnava vprašanje morebitnih uralskih izposojenk v praslovanščini, izhajajoč iz domneve, da so Praslovani v svoji pradomovini (ki je bila verjetno v vzhodni Evropi) živeli v soseščini z neznanimi ugrofinskimi plemeni. Naposled ugotavlja, da se praslovanske izposojenke uralskega (ugrofinskega) izvora niso nanašale le na rastline (npr. hrast, kresilno gobo) in naravno okolje (npr. psl. *kǫpa f. 'z drevjem poraščena vzpetina na močvirnatem svetu'), pač pa tudi na osnovne socialne termine (npr. psl. *čьlověkъ m. 'človek, moški, hlapec'; *mǫ̂žь m. 'mož, moški'). Praslovansko-ugrofinski stiki so morali biti nadvse intenzivni, saj so Praslovani iz uralskega vira prevzeli tudi nekatere glagole (npr. psl. *kǫpati 'kopati se', psl. *ličiti 'šteti, računati').

Ključne besede: izposojenke, jezikovni stiki, praslovanščina, substrat, uralski vpliv

1 Introduction

It is widely believed that Uralic tribes, especially the Finno-Ugrians, represent the oldest language layer in Eastern Europe (Kallio 2015: 77; 2017: 187). Five thousand years ago vast East-European areas, once occupied by tribes of Uralic origin, were dominated by Indo-European people speaking Indo-Iranian, Germanic, Baltic and Slavic languages.

The first language contacts between the Finno-Ugric and Balto-Slavic populations have begun in the third millennium BC. We can distinguish numerous Late Indo-European borrowings in some Uralic (especially Finno-Ugric) languages. They are

---

taken mainly from Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic or Germanic (Bednarczuk 1999: 7–15; Napoľskich 2002: 265–271). The number of borrowings in the opposite direction seems to be relatively modest, which is probably related to the higher level of material culture of the Indo-European peoples. Even if Uralic borrowings were less frequent in Indo-European languages[2], I would still believe that a number of ancient Finno-Ugric borrowings can be distinguished in the Proto-Slavic language.

My aim is to discuss selected proposals previously submitted by other researchers (e.g. Polák 1964: 568–588; Bednarczuk 1976: 39–64), as well as to offer further suggestions, which have not been taken into account in the literature on the subject. The following Proto-Slavic terms of Finno-Ugric origin are being reviewed in my paper:

(1) PSl. *čьlověkъ m. 'human being, man, husband, serf, servant' (← FU. *kilan pojka 'country boy; boy of the village, servant');

(2) PSl. *dǫbъ m. 'oak, Quercus' (← FU. *toma-puwe 'oak; oak wood');

(3) PSl. *gǫba f. 'mushroom, fungus; polypore, bracket fungus' (← FU. *kampV 'mushroom, fungus');

(4) PSl. *kǫpati 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash' (← Ur. *kumpa 'wave; to float on the water, to swim causing waves, to splash (about fish)');

(5) PSl. *kǫpa f. 'a hillock or an island overgrown with trees and surrounded by a river or marsh; a group of trees or shrubs' (← FU. *kumpa 'small hillock in the marsh area');

(6) PSl. *likъ m. 'number', *ličiti 'to count, reckon, calculate' (← Ur. *luke 'number; to count, reckon, calculate');

(7) PSl. *mǫžь m. 'husband, man' (← FU. *mänće 'husband, man, human being');

(8) PSl. *polъ m. 'half, side; sex' (← Ur. *pälä 'half, side');

(9) PSl. *šьja f. 'neck, nape' (← FU. *śepä 'neck, nape').

The discussion on the etymology of the above-mentioned Proto-Slavic words is carried out in a uniform form. Each heading is created as a Proto-Slavic archetype, reconstructed in Slavic comparative and etymological dictionaries. Selected lexical material, attested in South, West and East Slavic languages, is given after each heading, and then the Slavic forms are compared with their possible Baltic equivalents and their Indo-European counterparts are carefully considered. Furthermore, the existing etymologies of the Slavic words are referred to. In order to justify the Finno-Ugric origin of the individual Proto-Slavic words, the Uralic lexical data are presented. Additionally, the hypothesis of each Finno-Ugricism in the Proto-Slavic language is substantiated in my own commentary.

---

[2] I believe that the Late Indo-European word *bulis f. 'ass, backside, anus, vulva' (cf. Lith. bulìs, bùlė, bulė̃ f. 'ass, backside, anus'; OInd. buliḥ, buriḥ f. 'vulva, anus'; European Gypsy bul, buľ 'backside, anus, vulva', Armenian Gypsy bul 'posterior', Maithili būri 'vulva', Hindi bul, bur, buṛ f. 'id.', perhaps also Marathi bulī f. 'penis puerilis') is a borrowing of Fenno-Ugric (Finno-Permian to be more precise) origin, cf. Zyr. puli 'Schulterblatt', Cher. pulâš 'Schulter', dial. pulš 'Achselgelenk' < FP. *pola 'some back part of the body (back, shoulder, nape, buttocks, tail) / irgendein hinterer Körperteil (Rücken, Schulter, Genick, Hinterteil, Schwanz)' (Rédei 1986: 734).

2 PSl. *dǫ̂bъ, -a m. 'oak, *Quercus*'

Lexical material: OCS. *дѫбъ* m. 'tree; oak'; Sln. *dộb* 'oak, *Quercus*'; Mac. *даб* 'dąb, *Quercus*'; Pol. *dąb* m. 'oak; oak wood; oak bark used for tanning hides'; Polab. *dǫb* 'oak, tree'; LSorb. *dub* 'oak, *Quercus*'; Cz. *dub*, Slk. *dub* m. 'oak; oak wood; oak bark used fot tanning hides'; Russ. *дуб* 'tree, oak'; BRus. *дуб* 'oak' etc. (Трубачев 1978: V 95–97; Sławski 1981: IV 185–188; Derksen 2008: 114).

Baltic equivalents: There is a separate term for 'oak, *Quercus*' in Common Baltic: Lith. *ǎžuolas* m. 'common oak, *Quercus robur* L.', Latv. *uôzuõls* m. 'id.', OPrus. *ansonis* m. 'oak' (Smoczyński 2007: 39). The Old Prussian word *dumpbis* m. 'oak bark used for tanning hides' represents a borrowing from Polish, whereas Lith. *dũbai* m. pl. derives from an East Slavonic source (Sławski 1981: IV 186).

Indo-European parallels: No obvious connections.

Etymology: The Proto-Slavic word in question has neither an obvious native etymology nor any evident counterparts in other Indo-European languages. This is evidenced by consistent statements of researchers: "An unclear etymology, as for numerous names of ancient trees / Etymologia niepewna jak wielu nazw dawnych drzew" (Sławski 1953–1956: I 139); "The term has no exact Indo-European counterparts / Wyraz nie ma dokładnych odpowiedników indoeuropejskich" (Bednarczuk 1976: 55; 1993: 111); "Etymology unclear / Etimologija nejasna" (Bezlaj 1976: 105); "Etymology unclear. An old hypothesis is the connection with Gk. δέμω 'build', but this fails to convince me" (Derksen 2008: 114); "A very difficult word" (Orel 2001: I 326). Max Vasmer (Фасмер 1986: I 547–548) and Ilona Janyšková (cf. Havlová 1994: III 143–144, s.v. *dǫbъ*) give a comprehensive overview of existing etymologies[3].

Uralic data: FV. ***toma** 'oak, Quercus': Fi. *tammi* (gen. sg. *tammen*) 'oak', Est. *tamm* (gen. sg. *tamme*) 'oak', Liv. *tǟm* (gen. sg. *tam̄*) 'ts.'; Zyr. *tupu*, Udm. *ţipị* 'oak' (< PP. **tum-pu* < ***toma-puwe**); Mord. (Erza) *tumo*, (Moksha) *tumǎ* 'oak'; Cher. *tum*, dial. *tumo* 'oak / Eiche' (Itkonen, Joki 1979: 1218; Лыткин, Гуляев 1970: 286; Rédei 1986: 798).

Commentary: Numerous linguists are in favour of the Finno-Ugric origin of the Proto-Slavic ***dǫ̂bъ** 'oak' (Топоров, Трубачев 1962: 246; Polák 1964: 578; Machek 1968: 132; Bednarczuk 1976: 55; 1993: 111). Zyr. *tupu* and Udm. *ţipị* 'oak' (< PP. **tum-pu*) go back to the (Finno-Permian) compound ***toma-puwe** (literally 'oak-tree; oak wood'). The latter element of the compound represents Finno-Ugric ***puwe** 'tree; wood / Baum, Holz'[4], cf. Fi. *puu* 'tree, wood, firewood', Est. *puu* 'id.', Hung. *fa* 'tree,

---

[3] It is worth emphasizing that the Swedish linguist Knut-Olof Falk (Фальк 1958: 265–285) explains PSl. ***dǫ̂bъ** 'oak' as 'a tree with hollows' on the basis of Baltic lexical data, cf. Lith. *dumbė* f. 'hole, hollow', *dumbù*, *dùbti* 'to become hollow'. Blažek (2002: 23–24) follows Falk, suggesting a semantic model for similar designations of the oak. In my opinion, Falk's etymology is far from being certain.

[4] Perhaps from Uralic **pūγe* 'tree, wood' (Иллич-Свитыч 1971: 184).

wood', Kam. *på* 'tree; wood, firewood; forest', Koib. *pa* 'tree', *pä* 'forest' (Collinder 1977: 71; Rédei 1986: 410). It is possible that a substratal derivative form, similar to the Proto-Permian prototype **tum-pu*, was the basis for the borrowing in the case of the Proto-Slavic name for 'oak'. It should also be noted that the Hungarian (dialectal) appellative *domb* 'oak, Quercus' is not an inherited term but an old borrowing from a Slavonic source (Bezlaj 1976: 109), perhaps from Slovenian or Polish. In other words, the Hungarian appellative in question can be considered a back-borrowing.

3 PSl. **gǫ̀ba* f. 'mushroom, fungus; parasitic mushroom on a tree, polypore', secondarily also 'growth on the human body, convexity on the body, tumour'[5]

Lexical material: OCS. *ѫба* f. 'sponge'; Sln. *gǫ́ba* f. 'sponge; bracket fungus; tinder for striking fire'; SC. *gùba* f. 'parasitic mushroom on a tree; tinder'; Bulg. *гъба* 'tinder fungus; sponge; cork'; OPol. *gęba* f. 'sponge, *Euspongia officinalis* L.; summer truffle, *Tuber aestivum* Vittad', Pol. *gąbka* f. 'sponge, *Euspongia officinalis* L.', dial. *gąbka*, *gębka* f. 'a kind of mushroom, e.g. *Clavaria flava* Schaeff.; *Lycoperdon* Pers.; tinder fungus; tinder for striking fire'[6]; Cz. *houba* f. 'tinder fungus; sponge; washing sponge', Slk. *huba* 'mushroom, sponge'; Russ. *губá* f. 'polypore, fungus', dial. 'mushroom, a growth on the body', Ukr. *гýби* pl. 'mushrooms', BRus. *гýба* f. 'mushroom, tinder' itd. (Sławski 1953–1956: I 431–432; Bezlaj 1976: 154; Snoj 1997: 146–147).

Baltic equivalents: Latv. *gum̃ba* f. 'growth, tumor' and Lith. *gum̃bas* m. 'convexity, growth' (Sławski 2001: VIII 161; Orel 2011: I 272) seem to demonstrate only the secondary meaning.

Indo-European parallels: Without obvious counterparts. Nor Lat. *fungus* m. 'mushroom', neither Gk. σπόγγος, σφόγγος m. 'sponge' can be compared with PSl. ***gǫ̀ba** f. 'mushroom, tinder fungus'[7]. The opinion of linguists is the following: "Further relationship is unclear / Dalje nejasno" (Bezlaj 1976: 154); "The connection with Gk. σπόγγος, σφόγγος 'sponge' is formally very difficult" (Derksen 2008:182).

---

[5] Трубачев 1980: VII 78–80; Sławski 2001: VIII 159–161; Derksen 2008: 182. It should be emphasised that I consider the Proto-Slavic term **gǫba* f. 'lip, mouth, cheek, muzzle, mouth' to be homonymous to Psl. **gǫba* f. 'mushroom, fungus'.

[6] The Polish appellative *huba* f. 'parasitic mushroom on tree trunks' is not a native word. It represents a borrowing from Czech or Ukrainian.

[7] From the phonological point of view, it is easier to associate Lat. *fungus* m. 'mushroom, fungus' and Gk. σπόγγος, σφόγγος m. 'sponge' with the Uralic archetype ***paŋka** 'a mushroom species with narcotic properties, esp. fly agaric (*Amanita muscaria* Lam.)' (Rédei 1986: 355). It is usually believed that the above-mentioned Uralic word remains in a vague relation to the Indo-Iranian archetype **bhanga-* 'a narcotic plant, especially Indian hemp': OInd. *bhaṅgá-* m. 'Indian hemp', *bhaṅgā-* f. 'hemp; narcotic drink made from the hemp', Avest. *baŋha-*, *baŋgha-* m. 'name of a plant containing the drug; juice from the plant', MPers. *bang*, *manga* 'narcotic', Wakhi *bang* 'Indian hemp, narcotic, hashish' etc. The direction of possible borrowing is not certain. Some of the Finno-Ugricists (cf. Korenchy 1972: 64–65) assume borrowing(s) from an Iranian source into some Uralic languages. It seems, however, that in this case the opposite direction should be assumed.

Uralic lexical data: FU. ***kampV** 'mushroom': Lap. (in Norway) *guobbâr*, dial. (Kola) *kymbar* 'mushroom'; Zyr. *gob* 'mushroom', Udm. *gubi* 'mushroom' (< Proto-Permic **göbi*); it is suggested that Old Chuvash *gümbä* 'mushroom' represents a loanword from a Permic source or from Mari *gŭb* (< **kümbä*) (Иллич-Свитыч 1971: 291–292; Dolgopolsky 2008: 862).

Etymology: PSl. ***gǫ̀ba** (< BSl. **gumbā*) seems to resemble a Finno-Ugric substrate archetype **kümbä*, which is suggested e.g. for a Cheremis protoform. Lytkin-Gulaev's hypothesis according to which Russ. *губа* f. 'mushroom' derives from a Permic source (Лыткин, Гуляев 1970: 77) is hardly convincing. The borrowing was taken from a Finno-Ugric (substrate) source in the Balto-Slavic or Early Proto-Slavic period.

Commentary: Aleksandr Anikin rejects the Finno-Ugric origin of the Slavic words in 'mushroom, fungus, sponge'. He follows Vladislav M. Illič-Svityč, suggesting a remote Nostratic relationship (Иллич-Свитыч 1971: 291–292; Аникин 2000: 169). It should be stated that the reverse direction of borrowing (from Balto-Slavic to Finno-Ugric) cannot be upheld in the light of the Saami counterparts. What is more, there is no uniform name for 'mushroom, fungus' in Indo-European. It seems probable, then, that the Proto-Slavs took the term **gǫba* from a Finno-Ugric source, together with the habit of collecting mushrooms[8].

4   PSl. (northern) *kǫpa f. 'a tussock surrounded by a river or marsh; an island overgrown with trees; a group of trees or shrubs'

Lexical material: Pol. *kępa* f. 'low flat islet on the river, lake or swamp, covered with trees; tussock on a swamp overgrown with bushes or trees; small, compact cluster of shrubs or trees'; Kash. *kąpa* f. 'shoal on a lake with reeds'; LSorb. *kupa* f. 'islet on a river, covered with trees'; HSorb. *kupa* f. 'island, hillock, cluster of trees'; Russ., Ukr., BRus. *kýna* f. 'cluster of shrubs and trees' (Sławski 1958–1965: II 127–128; Трубачев 1985: XII 56–57). The term in question is completely lost in all South Slavic languages, including Slovenian.

Baltic equivalents: Lith. *kùmpa* f. 'thickening, swelling; growth, hump, tumour' (also 'staple') and Latv. *kumpa* f. 'hump, convexity' are two nouns derived from the verb *kum̃pti* 'to hunch, bend, win' (Smoczyński 2007: 323). The connection of both East Baltic appellatives with the Slavic words is possible on a phonological layer, although their semantics clearly differs.

Indo-European comparisons: Lat. *campus* m. 'plain, field' and Gk. καμπή f. 'curve, curvature', quoted as cognate terms in some etymological dictionaries (cf.

---

[8] It is worth emphasizing that the Baltic terms for 'mushrooms' (Latv. *sẽnes* 'mushrooms', Yatv. *ſini* 'id.') are obvious Finno-Ugricisms, cf. Fi. *sieni* 'mushroom, sponge / Pilz, Schwamm', dial. *siena* 'Erdschwamm', Est. *seen* (gen. *seene*) 'Pilz, Schwamm' < Ur. ***śöne** 'tinder fungus / Zunder, Baumschwamm' (Rédei 1986: 494). In turn, Lithuanian literary language prefers a Slavism, cf. Lith. *grỹbai* m. pl. 'mushrooms' (Zinkevičius 1992: 119).

Słaswki 1958–1965: II 127), seem to be etymologically independent from the Slavic words. The alleged relation of Proto-Slavic **kǫpa** to Ossetic (Iron) *k'ᵤypp*, (Digoron) *k'upp* 'hill, hump. bulginess' is impossible for phonetic reasons. No Ossetic word of native origin can begin with the phoneme *k'*.

Uralic lexical data: Ur. **kumpa** 'small hill in a swampy area', cf. Fi. *kumpu* 'Hügel, Anhöhe, Höhe'; Lap. (Lule) *kåbbå* 'Anhöhe oder kleinerer Berg ohne steile Abhänge; isolierter Hügel oder kleiner Berg in einem Moor oder in einem sumpfigen Gelände'; Mord. (Moksha) *komba* 'hummock, floating islet / кочка; плывучий островок', Erza (southern) 'small hillock on a meadow / kleiner Hügel auf der Wiese'; Udm. *gibed* 'humus, peat / перегной, торф'; Zyr. (Letka) *gibad*, (Prup) *gibad*, *gubad*, (Wyčegda) *gibẹd* 'Moorgrund (im Sumpf); Heumahd, Wiese; Bülte (im Sumpf)' (Rédei 1986: 203). It is worth noting that Björn Collinder separates words with the meaning 'to submerge, to swim (causing waves), to splash (of fish)' and 'wave' (Collinder 1977: 47–48), whereas Karoly Rédei combines the above-mentioned terms with the Uralic homonym denoting 'wave / Welle' (Rédei 1986: 203).

Etymology: The Slavic words in question are isolated on the Indo-European ground (the suggested Baltic counterparts are not certain) and therefore PSl. **kǫpa** should be treated as a substrate borrowing from FU. **kumpa** 'small hillock in a swampy area'.

Commentary: Some linguists point out the difficulty in distinguishing reflexes of two Proto-Slavic archetypes: **kǫpa** f. 'a tussock on a river or a swamp, an islet overgrown with trees; a group of trees or shrubs' and **kupa** f. 'heap, stack, a lot of things', also 'bunch of people, flock of animals' (Derksen 2008: 143; Orel 2011: II 169). Two homonymous roots **kumpa** are also attested in Uralic.

5 PSl. *kǫpati 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash'

Lexical material: Sln. *kópati (se)* 'to bath(e) / (sich) baden' (Pleteršnik 2006: I 430), also *kópa* f. 'bath tub'; SC. *kúpati (se)*, Bulg. *къпя (се)*; Pol. *kąpać (się)* 'to submerge in water to wash and refresh; to soak in water'; LSorb. *kupaś (sa)*; Cz. *koupati (se)*, Slk. *kúpať (sa)*; Russ. *купáть(ся)* etc. (Трубачев 1985: XII 58–61; Sławski 1958–1965: II 119–120).

Baltic equivalents: No known counterparts.

Indo-European parallels: There are no cognates in other Indo-European languages[9].

---

[9] The Indo-Iranian noun *k(h)apha-* m. 'foam, mucus' (cf. OInd. *kapha-* 'phlegm, foam'; Av. *kafa-* 'foam, mucus', Khot. *khavä* 'foam', pl. *khuī* 'waves', Oss. *xæfæ* 'pus'; Эдельман, 2011: 165–166) can hardly be related to the Slavic verb **kǫpati** 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash'. According to Lubotsky (2001: 311), the noun in question belongs to the Indo-Iranian isolates of substratal origin. It seems highly probable that Indo-Iranian *k(h)apha-* m. 'foam, mucus' (originally perhaps 'wave') represents a borrowing of Uralic origin, cf. Ur. **kumpa** 'wave', hence Hung. *hab* 'foam, white (of the egg); wave'.

Uralic lexical data: Ur. ***kumpa** 'wave; to float on water, to swim causing waves, to splash (of fish)' (Collinder 1977: 47–48; Rédei 1986: 203): Fi. *kumpua-* 'gush forth, foam (of water)'; Est. *kummu-* 'sich häufen, sich ansammeln'; Lap. (Lule) *kåppålti-* 'to float on water, to swim / auf der Wasser umhertreiben, schwimmen', (Norway) *gobbolaste-* 'in aqua dormire (de phoca)'; Mord. (Erza) *kumboldo-* 'to move with a wave-like motion, undulate', (Moksha) *komboldo-* 'to gush forth, surge, undulate, bubble up'; Zyr. *gib-* 'to swim in groups, so as to ruffle the water (of fish)', dial. (Prup) 'in scharen schwimmen, plätschern, spielen (Fische), wobei auf dem Wasser ein leichtes Wogen, kleine Wellen entstehen; auf das Wasser mit der Schwanz schlagen'; Yur. dial. (Ljamin) *kampĹe* 'es schaukelt (ein Boot auf den Wellen)'; Selk. dial. (Turuchan) *k̃ampęr-* 'obenauf schwimmen'. The meaning 'wave' is generally attested in the Ugric and Samoyed languages, cf. Ost. *kŏmp*, dial. *χump* 'wave'; Vog. (Lozva) *kump*, dial. (Sosva) *χump* 'ts.'; Hung. *hab* 'foam, white (of the egg); wave / Schaum; Schnee (Ei); Welle, Woge'; Yur. dial. (Obdorsk) *χāmpa* 'wave, tide'; Yen. *kaba* 'wave'; Tav. *koŋfu* (gen. *kombu*) 'id.'; Selk. dial. (Tas) *qãmpe*, (Tym) *qōmp*, (Ket) *k̨oombь*, *k̨ómbз* 'wave'. The meaning 'wave' seems very archaic, as it is also attested in Balto-Finnic, cf. Fi. dial. *kumpu* 'high, round wave on the water's edge / hohe, runde Welle in der Stromschnelle'.

Etymology: The Proto-Slavic verb ***kǫpati** cannot be explained as a native innovation or a term of Indo-European origin. This situation is clearly certified by the linguistic literature, see e.g. "Etymology uncertain / Etymologia niepewna" (Sławski 1958–1965: II 119); "It is etymologically difficult to explain, as the primary meaning remains in the sphere of hypotheses / trudne etymologicznie dlatego, że znaczenie pierwotne pozostaje w sferze hipotez" (Bańkowski 2000: I 654); "without a certain further etymology / bez pewnej dalszej etymologii" (Boryś 2005: 226).

Commentary: I agree with Bednarczuk (1976: 56; 1993: 112) that the hypothesis of a substrate borrowing of Uralic origin (PSl. ***kǫpati** 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash' ← Ur. ***kumpa** 'to float on water, to swim causing waves, to splash [of fish]') seems highly probable from both the phonological and the semantic point of view.

6 PSl. (northern) *likъ 'number', *ličiti 'to count, reckon, calculate'

Lexical material: Pol. *lik* m. 'number, large number, multitude', *bez liku* 'many', dial. (in Lithuania) 'number, counting; number three'; ORuss. *ликъ* m. 'number', Russ. dial. (Northern) *лик* m. 'bill, number', BRus. *лик* m. 'number, quantity' (Трубачев 1988: XV 82–83, 106–107; Sławski 1970–1974: IV 253). Bańkowski (2000: II 44) believes that OCS. *ликъ* m. 'procession, choir', as well as other South Slavic counterparts, should be added to the Northern Slavic terms, although many researchers reconstruct a separate Proto-Slavic term of Germanic origin (Трубачев 1988: XV 83; Erhart 1997: VII 424–425).

Baltic equivalents: OLith. *lyka* f. 'number', Lith. dial. 'odd number', także lit. *lykis* 'number, numeral'. The same word appears in Lithuanian numerals from 11 to 19,

e.g. *vienúolika* 'eleven', *dvýlika* 'twelve', *trýlika* 'thirteen', *keturiólika* 'fourteen' etc. The above noun is related to the Lithuanian verb *lykúoti* 'to make the account, to count'.

I n d o - E u r o p e a n   c o m p a r i s o n s : No obvious cognates.

U r a l i c   l e x i c a l   d a t a : Ur. ***luke** 'number; to count, reckon, calculate / Zahl, Anzahl; zählen, rechnen' (Rédei 1986: 253; Collinder 1977: 142), cf. Fi. *luku* 'to read, count', also 'number, figure, account, consideration, chapter', Est. *lugu* 'to read, count', Cher. *luδa-* 'to read, count', Udm. *ḷ̣id* 'number, quantity, sum', Zyr. *ḷ̣id*, Komi *ṿ̣id* 'number, counting'. The same term in Uralic languages means not only 'number', but also a specific (special) number, namely 'ten', see Lap. dial. (Kola) *lo ḳke* 'ten (at cards)', Cher. *lu* 'ten', Vog. *lov* 'ten' (Rédei 1986: 253; Honti 1993: 121; Blažek 1999: 97). What is more, this term is sometimes used to create numerals in some Samoyed languages. For example, Yurak (Northern) *jeluku*, (Southern) *ileku* 'four', a numeral derived from *ja-* 'three', seems to contain Ur. ***luke** as well (Blažek 1999: 97).

E t y m o l o g y : Björn Collinder (1977: 142) compares the Uralic verb in question with the Indo-European root **leĝ-* 'to gather, collect', secondary 'to read, speak', which in terms of phonology and semantics is not convincing. What is more, the Proto-Indo-European verbal root should be reconstructed as **sleĝ-* 'to gather, collect' and not **leĝ-* (Kaczyńska 2016: 147–168).

C o m m e n t a r y : The only plausible explanation is that the Proto-Slavic word **likъ* m. 'number, quantity, counting' was borrowed from a Finno-Ugric substrate, in which the change of **u* to *i* took place, see e.g, Udm. *ḷ̣id* 'number, quantity, sum', Zyr. *ḷ̣id*, Perm. *ṿ̣id* 'number, bill'.

7 PSl. ***mǫ̂žь** m. 'man, husband'

L e x i c a l   m a t e r i a l : OCS. мѫжь m. 'man, husband'; Sln. *mǫ̂ž* m. 'id.'; SC. *mûž* m. 'husband, (obs.) man'; Pol. *mą̇ż* m. 'man, husband', LSorb. *muž* 'id.', Cz., Slk. *muž* m.; Russ. муж m. 'husband, (obs.) man' (Трубачев 1994: XX 158–161; Derksen 2008: 330; Orel 2011: II 300).

B a l t i c   e q u i v a l e n t s : There are no related words in Common Baltic. Lith. *žmuõ* m. 'man' (also *žmogùs* m. 'id.') can hardly be treated as a cognate to PSl. ***mǫ̂žь** m. 'id.'. It evidently derives from PIE. **ĝʰĝʰmon-s* m. 'man' (← PIE. **ĝʰĝʰem-* f. 'earth').

I n d o - E u r o p e a n   p a r a l l e l s : PSl. ***mǫ̂žь** is usually combined with Germanic terms (cf. ON. *mannr*, Eng. *man*, OHG. *mann* m. 'man, husband' < Gmc. **mannaz* m. 'id.'), as well as Indo-Iranian ones (cf. OInd. *mánu-* m. 'man') (Pokorny 1959: 700;

Erhart 1998: VIII 498–450). However, the Germanic, Indo-Iranian and Slavic forms cannot go back to a uniform Indo-European archetype[10].

Uralic lexical data: Ug. ***mańćɜ** 'man, person, human being' is attested in Ost. (Vach) *mańť*, (Irtyš) *mońť*, (Obdorsk) *maś* 'member of an Ostyak male team'; Vog. (Tavda) *mäńćī*, dial. (Sosva) *mańśi* 'Vogul; an unbaptized child'; Hung. *magyar* 'Hungarian' (Honti 1982: 164–165; Rédei 1986: 866). The Ugric word in question may be part of the Finno-Ugric heritage if Fi. *mies* (gen. sg. *miehen*) 'man, person' goes back to BF. **mēće* and FU. ***mäńće**, as suggested by V. M. Illich-Svitych (Иллич-Свитыч 1976: 58–59). Numerous cognate words are perfectly attested in Balto-Finnic languages, cf. Kar. *mies* (pl. *miehet*) 'man, person'; Lud. *miež* (pl. *miehed*) 'id.'; Veps. *meź* (pl. *mehed*) 'man, husband'; Ingr. *mēz* (gen. sg. *mēhen*) 'man'; Vot. *mēz* (gen. sg. *mehē*) 'id.'; Est. *mees* (gen. sg. *mehe*) 'id.'; Liv. *mìeZ* (pl. *mi'eD*) 'man, person'.

Etymology: The Ugric words are usually treated as borrowings from Indo-Iranian **manuš(a)-* 'man, husband' (Jacobsohn 1922: 192; Korenchy 1982: 60; Rédei 1986: 866), cf. OInd. *mánuṣa-* m. 'man, husband', Av. *Manuš* 'divine progenitor of (the Iranian) people', *Manuš.čiθra-* 'vom Stammvater der Mennschen abstammend'. The motivation for this direction of borrowing is a partial isolation of the Ugric words within the Uralic vocabulary, as well as the very early attestations of the relevant appellatives in the Indo-Iranian languages.

Commentary: The Proto-Slavic word for 'man, husband' is hardly explicable from the point of view of a purely Slavic word-formation. A borrowing from a Finno-Ugric source (PSl. ***mǫžь** m. 'man, husband' ← FU. ***mäńće** 'man, person, human being') seems to be an attractive possibility. The change of the Finno-Ugric phoneme **ć* in the position after a nasal consonant to a voiced one is a common phenomenon (cf. Hung. *gy* [ɟ]). It is a typical example of the Finno-Ugric lenition.

8 PSl. *polъ m. 'half, side'

Lexical material: OCS. *polъ* m. 'sex; half'; SC. *pô* m.; Sln. *pòl* m. 'side, half'; Russ. *пол* m. 'sex, half'; Cz. *půl* m., Slk. *pol* m. 'half', Pol. *pół* m. 'half' (Erhart 2002: XI 678-679; Derksen 2008: 412).

Baltic equivalents: No obvious cognates. It is not convincing to derive Lith. *páltis* f. 'flitch, lard from the whole side of porcine' from the East Baltic archetype **palutis* (see PSl. **polъtь* f. 'flitch'), though the syncope of *-u-* is theoretically possible. The Lithuanian word was probably borrowed from an East Slavic source, cf. BRus. *nóлomь* f. 'flitch' (Smoczyński 2007, 437).

---

[10] The Slavic word ***mǫžь** m. 'man, husband' is sometimes explained as a cross of PSl. **monъ* and PSl. **žmy*, gen. sg. *žmene* (cf. OLith. *žmuo*, Lith. *žmogùs* m. 'man', pl. *žmónes* 'men'), the alleged reflexes of IE. **manus* m. 'man' and PIE. **dʰ ǵʰ ṃHōn* m. 'id.' (Erhart 1998: VIII 499). The hypothesis of a substratum borrowing from an unknown Finno-Ugric source seems more probable from the phonological and morphological point of view.

Indo-European parallels: There are no obvious cognates. Alb. *palë* f. 'pair, fold, group, class, party', quoted by Bednarczuk (1976: 58) as a possible equivalent of the Slavic words, seems to represent a Slavism[11]. Neither a derivation from the Proto-Indo-European root *spel-* 'to split into two parts, to separate' (Bańkowski 2000: II 689, s.v. *poła*; Wade 2002: 163) nor from PIE. *pel-/*pol-* 'to split into two parts' (Bańkowski 2000, II 751, s.v. *pół*) is acceptable. Generally, I agree with Černyh's opinion that "cognates in non-Slavic Indo-European languages are not very convincing / Сопоствления в неславянских и.-е. языках не очень убедительны" (Черных 1999: II 51).

Uralic lexical data: Ur. **pälä** 'half, side / halb, Hälfte; Seite' is preserved in a number of Finno-Ugric languages, cf. Lap. (Lule) *pielle* 'side, half ', (Norway) *bælle* 'side; half (of a thing divided lengthways); one of a pair'; Mord. (Erza) *peľ*, (Moksha) *päľ* 'side', (Erza) *peľe*, (Moksha) *päľä* 'halb, Hälfte'; Hung. *fél* 'half; one of two parts'. It is also attested in most Samoyed languages, see Yur. (dial. Obdorsk) *peľe* 'Hälfte, Stück'; Yen. (Chantaika) *feðe*, (Baicha) *ferie* 'halb, verwandt'; Tav. *fealea* 'halb, Verwandter'; Selk. dial. (Tas) *paläl*, (Ket) *pilāŋ* 'halb, Hälfte', (Tym) *päläk* 'Hälfte; Seite'; Kam. *pjel*, *pil*, *pēl* 'half, side'; Koib. *пелдой* 'half / половина'; Mot. *холя* 'id.' (Collinder 1977: 67; Rédei 1986: 362–363).

Etymology: According to Rozwadowski (1913: 52, 1961: 86), the Proto-Slavic word in question represents a Proto-Slavic borrowing of Uralic (Finno-Ugric) origin. Numerous researchers also advocate the old hypothesis of a Finno-Ugric borrowing in Proto-Slavic (e.g. Топоров, Трубачев 1962: 246; Polák 1964: 577; Machek 1968: 499; Bednarczuk 1976: 114–115).

Commentary: The phonetic and semantic agreement between Ur. **pälä** 'half, side' and PSl. **polъ** m. 'half, side' is so striking that the hypothesis of a Finno-Ugric borrowing in Proto-Slavic seems to be the most probable one[12].

9 PSl. *šьja f. 'neck, nape'

Lexical material: OCS. *šija* f. 'neck, nape'; Sln. *šíja* f. 'neck / der Nacken; das Genick; der Hals' (Pleteršnik 2006: II 620); SC. *šȉja* f. 'id.'; Bulg. *шѝя* 'id.'; Pol. *szyja* f. 'neck', dial. 'throat'; LSorb. *šyja* f. 'neck'; Cz. *šíje* f. 'neck', Slk. *šija* f. 'id.'; ORuss. *шья*, *шия* f. 'neck, shoulders, back'; Russ. *шéя* f. 'neck'; BRus. *шыя* f. 'neck', Ukr. *шúя* f. 'id.' (< PSl. **šьja** f. 'neck, nape') (Boryś 2005: 610; Mańczak 2017: 193).

Baltic equivalents: No cognates are known.

---

[11] A different etymology is given by Orel (2011: III 69).

[12] More than fifty years ago, Vladimir M. Illich-Svitych suggested a prehistoric connection between the Indo-European (in fact, Proto-Slavic) and Uralic lexical data, reconstructing tentatively the Nostratic archetype *pälV* 'half / половина' (Иллич-Свитыч 1967: 356). In my opinion, the hypothesis of a Finno-Ugric borrowing in Proto-Slavic seems to be better founded.

Indo-European parallels: There is no evident cognate. Alb. (Gheg) *shî* 'occiput' is a borrowing from Lat. *sīnus* m. 'womb, belly' (Orel 1998: 414) and has nothing to do with the Slavic term for 'neck, nape'.

Uralic lexical data: Lap. (Norway) *čæbet* 'neck', dial. (Lule) *čæppe* 'id.'; Fi. *sepä, sepi* 'the front part of a sleigh'; Mord. *sive, sivä* 'shirt collar'; Udm. *śil* 'nape', *śiäs* 'hame', Zyr. *śi, śily* 'neck'; Cher. *šü, šüj* 'neck, occiput'; Vog. *šəplo* 'neck', *šəp* 'collar'; Ost. *säwəl* 'neck' < FU. **śepä** 'neck, nape / Hals, Nacken' (Collinder 1977: 127; Rédei 1986: 473–474).

Etymology: The Proto-Slavic word has no Indo-European cognate or a native motivation, since the association with the Proto-Slavic verb *šiti* 'to sew'[13] is semantically questionable. Researchers agree unambiguously on the origin of the Proto-Slavic term *šьja*: "A word without clear etymology / Wyraz bez jasnej etymologii" (Bednarczuk 1976: 59; 1993: 115); "without established etymology / bez pewnej etymologii" (Boryś 2005: 610); "Etymologically difficult" (Orel 2011: III 247). Many linguists opt for the Finno-Ugric origin of the Slavic words for 'neck, nape' (Polák 1964: 578; Machek 1968: 608; Bednarczuk 1976: 59).

Commentary: The Proto-Slavic word for 'neck, nape' was borrowed from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate. It is worth emphasising that the Uralic phoneme *ś* changed to *š* in a substrate language (see e.g. Cher. *šüj, šü* 'neck', Vog. *šəplo* 'neck'), whereas the intervocalic stop *p* transformed into *v*, and then into *j* (this process is attested in some Finno-Ugric languages, see for example Zyr. *śi*, Cher. *šüj* 'neck').

10 Proto-Slavic *čelověkъ / *čьlověkъ m. 'a human being; man; husband, servant'

Lexical material: OCS. *чловѣкъ* m. 'homo'; Sln. *člóvęk* m. 'a human being; man'; Bulg. *човék* 'id.'; Pol. *człowiek* m. 'a human being; man; husband', earlier also 'subject, servant, peasant, slave', HSorb. *člowjek* m. 'homo', Cz. *člověk* m. 'a human being; man', earlier also 'subject, slave'; Slk. *človek* m. 'a human being; man'; ORuss. *человѣкъ, чоловѣкъ, чловѣкъ* m. 'a human being; man; subject, servant', Russ. *человек* m. 'a human being, man', also 'courtier, servant, waiter', Ukr. *чоловík* m. 'a human being; man; husband', BRus. *чалавéк* m. 'a human being; man; husband' (Трубачев 1977: IV 48–50; Sławski 1976: II 131–132; Derksen 2008: 80–81).

Baltic equivalents: There are no exact cognates, as Latv. *cìlvęks* m. 'human being' is undoubtedly a borrowing from an Old Russian source. The second part of the compound (PSl. **-věkъ**) is to be identified with Baltic *vaikas* m. 'child, boy', cf. Lith. *vaĩkas* m. 'child, son, boy'; OPruss. *waix* 'farmhand' (Brückner 1985: 79; Sławski 1976: II 132; Фасмер 1987: IV 327). In my opinion, the Baltic (or Balto-Slavic) item is a borrowing from an unknown Finno-Ugric substrate (BSl. *vaikas ← substratal *vojka < FU. **pojka** 'chłopiec').

---

[13] This native derivation is given or preferred in some etymological dictionaries of the Russian language (Фасмер 1987: IV 434–435; Черных 1999: II 411; Wade 2002: 251–252; Orel 2011: III 247).

I n d o - E u r o p e a n   c o m p a r i s o n : No obvious parallels.

U r a l i c   l e x i c a l   d a t a : FU. ***kilan pojka** 'country boy', cf. FU. ***kilä** 'settlement, village': Fi. *kylä* 'village', dial. 'flat, house / Wohnung, Haus'; Est. *küla* 'ts.'; Lap. (Lule) *kille* 'village', (Norway) *gille* 'cluster of houses or farms; hamlet'; Vog. (Sosva) *kol* 'house' (Rédei 1986, 155); FU. ***pojka** 'son, boy / Sohn, Knabe': Fi. *poika* 'boy, son, cub'; Est. *poeg* 'son, youngster'; Lap. (Lule) *påihka* 'Junge; Bursche'; Mord. (Erza) *bujo*, *pijo* 'grandchild'; Udm. *pi* 'child, cub; son, boy, young man'; Zyr. *pi* 'boy, son, child, cub'; Ost. *păɣ*, *păχ* 'boy, son'; Vog. *püw*, dial. (Sosva) *piɣ* 'son, boy, child'; OHung. *fió*, Hung. *fiú*, *fi* 'son, boy, child; young of an animal' (Collinder 1977: 122; Rédei 1986: 390).

E t y m o l o g y : The Proto-Slavic word ***čelověkъ / *čьlověkъ** seems to continue a purely substrate formation **kilavojka*, which ultimately goes back to the Finno-Ugric archetype ***kilan pojka** 'country boy'.

C o m m e n t a r y : A regular change is assumed for the substrate origin of the Balto-Slavic word: FU. ***pojka** 'boy, son' > substratal **vojka* → BSl. **vaikas* m. 'boy, young man'. A Finno-Ugric (substrate) borrowing in Balto-Slavic is not surprising. It is enough to notice that in the Middle Ages the Swedes borrowed the etymologically identical word 'boy' from a Finnish source (Swed. *pojke* 'boy' ← Fi. *poika*). It is recorded in Swedish for the first time in 1600 (Wessen 1997: 336). The Finno-Ugric term in question was borrowed by the Balto-Slavic people not only in prehistorical times (as BSl. **vaikas*), but also in modern ones[14]. It is more important to clarify in which socio-economic conditions the Proto-Slavic word in question was borrowed from an unknown substrate of Finno-Ugric origin (PSl. ***čьlověkъ** ← FU. ***kilan pojka** 'country boy'). I suppose that the prehistoric contacts of Indo-European and Finno-Ugric people were inseparable from the fairly regular exchange of women (young girls). Numerous Balto-Slavic words (of Indo-European origin) transferred to geographically distant Finno-Ugric languages, and vice versa – some Finno-Ugric languages entered the Balto-Slavic lexicon thanks to the women (wives) of foreign origin. The Proto-Slavs adopted the Finno-Ugric names for 'husband' and 'man' probably from their wives (women) of Finno-Ugric origin. It seems therefore that the Proto-Slavic term ***čьlověkъ** was taken over when the Finno-Ugric population was still following a half-migratory gatherer-hunting lifestyle, and the Proto-Slavic population engaged in farming and breeding domesticated animals, concentrated in permanent settlements, usually in villages. From the point of view of Finno-Ugric women or young girls, every young man of the Proto-Slavic population perceived as a potential life partner could undoubtedly be regarded as a 'country boy', just like other male persons living in the same village. In this way the foreign substrate term of Finno-Ugric origin was introduced into the Proto-Slavic language (thanks to foreign women, obtained from outside of the native rural community). It not only became the general term for every adult male (a member of a Proto-Slavic rural community), but for a slave or a servant as well. The exchange of women in prehistoric times

---

[14] Note that Latv. *puika* 'boy', Lith. dial. *púika* 'colleague' and Russ. dial. *nóйɡa* 'boy, child' represent secondary reborrowings of Finno-Ugric origin.

was the most probable cause of some mixed anthropological types. The Proto-Slavs acquired a significant addition of the laponoid type, while the Finno-Ugric population, originally representing the laponoid type, succumbed to the proliferation of thorough Europeanisation in many areas. Today the Finns, the Estonians and the Hungarians do not differ in the anatomical features of their bodies from neighbouring nations. The purely laponoid type within the peoples who speak Uralic languages has been preserved only by the Saamis (Laponians) and the Samoyeds.

11 Conclusions

The paper discusses the origin and etymology of nine Proto-Slavic words. After a scrupulous analysis of the Slavic and Uralic lexical material I demonstrate that the following Proto-Slavic terms should be treated as Finno-Ugric borrowings: PSl. *čьlověkъ m. 'human being, man, husband, serf, servant' (← FU. *kilan pojka 'country boy; boy of the village, servant'); PSl. *dǫbъ m. 'id.' (← PP. *tum-pu < FU. *toma-puwe 'oak; oak wood'); PSl. *gǫba f. 'mushroom, fungus; polypore, bracket fungus' (← FU. *kampV 'mushroom, fungus'); PSl. *kǫpati 'to immerse in water, to bathe, to wash' (← Ur. *kumpa 'wave; to float on water, to swim causing waves, to splash (about the fish)'); PSl. *kǫpa f. 'a tussock surrounded by a river or marsh; an island overgrown with trees; a group of trees or shrubs' (← FU. *kumpa 'small hillock in a marsh area'); PSl. *likъ m. 'number', *ličiti 'to count, reckon, calculate' (← Ur. *luke 'number; to count, reckon, calculate'); PSl. *mǫ̂žь m. 'id.' (← FU. *mäńće 'husband, man, human being'); PSl. *polъ m. 'half, side; sex' (← Ur. *pälä 'half, side'); PSl. *šьja f. 'neck, nape' (← FU. *śepä 'neck, nape').

ABBREVIATIONS

Av. – Avestan; Balt. – Baltic; BF. – Balto-Finnic; BSl. – Balto-Slavic; BRus. – Belorussian; Bulg. – Bulgarian; Cher. – Cheremis (Mari); Cz. – Czech; dial. – dialektal; E. – English; Est. – Estonian; Fi. – Finnish; FP. – Finno-Permic; FU. – Finno-Ugric; FV. – Finno-Volgian; Gmc. – Proto-Germanic; HSorb. – High Sorbian; Hung. – Hungarian; Gk. – Greek; Ingr. – Ingrian; Kam. – Kamassian Samoyed; Kar. – Karelian; Kash. – Kashubian; Koib. – Koibal Samoyed; Khot. – Khotan Saka; Lap. – Lappish (Saami); Lat. – Latin; Latv. – Latvian; Lith. – Lithuanian; Liv. – Livonian; LSorb. – Low Sorbian; Lud. – Ludic; Mac. – Macedonian (South Slavic); MPers. – Middle Persian; Mord. – Mordvin; Mot. – Motor Samoyed; OChuv. – Old Chuvash; OCS. – Old Church Slavonic; OHG. – Old High German; OHung. – Old Hungarian; OInd. – Old Indian; OLith. – Old Lithuanian; ON. – Old Norse; OPrus. – Old Prussian; ORuss. – Old Russian; Oss. – Ossetic; Ost. – Ostyak; PP. – Proto-Permic (Komi-Permic); PIE. – Proto-Indo-European; Pol. – Polish; Polab. – Polabian; PSl. – Proto-Slavic; Russ. – Russian; SC. – Serbo-Croatian; Selk. – Selkup Samoyed; Slk. – Slovak; Sln. – Slovenian; Tav. – Tavgi Samoyed; Udm. – Udmurt (Votyak); Ur. – Uralic; Ug. – Proto-Ugric; Ukr. – Ukrainian;

Veps. – Vepsian; Vog. – Vogul; Vot. – Votic; Yatv. – Yatvingian; Yen. – Yenisei Samoyed; Yur. – Yurak Samoyed (Nenets); Zyr. – Zyriene (Komi).

References

Andrzej Bańkowski, 2000: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Tom I–II. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo PWN.

Leszek Bednarczuk, 1976: Zapożyczenia ugrofińskie w językach bałtosłowiańskich. *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 9. 39–64.

Leszek Bednarczuk, 1993: *Języki Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego na tle porównawczym*. Wilno: Uniwersytet Polski w Wilnie.

Leszek Bednarczuk, 1999: *Stosunki językowe na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza EDUKACJA.

France Bezlaj, 1976: *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Vol. I. Ljubljana: SAZU.

Václav Blažek, 1999: *Numerals. Comparative-Etymological Analyses of Numeral Systems and Their Implications*. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita v Brně.

Václav Blažek, 2002: A Baltic key to the etymology of Germanic *aikō* 'oak'. *Baltistica* 37/1. 23–24.

Wiesław Boryś, 2005: *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Aleksander Brückner, 1985: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Björn Collinder, 1977: *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

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

Aaron Dolgopolsky, 2008: *Nostratic Dictionary*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research. URL: http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/196512.

Adolf Erhart (ed.), 1997, 1998, 2002: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Fasc. VII. Praha 1997; Fasc. VIII. Praha 1998; Fasc. XI. Praha 2002: Československá akademie věd. Ústav slavistiky.

Eva Havlová (ed.), 1994: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*. Fasc. III. Praha: Československá akademie věd. Ústav slavistiky.

László Honti, 1982: *Geschichte des obugrischen Vokalismus der ersten Silbe*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

László Honti, 1993: *Die Grundzahlwörter der uralischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Erkki Itkonen, Aulis J. Joki, 1979: *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirija*. Vol. IV. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen seura.

Hermann Jacobsohn, 1922: *Arier und Ugrofinnen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Elwira Kaczyńska, 2016: Two Indo-European Verbal Roots *leĝ-* and *sleĝ-* in the Light of Old and New Lexical Data. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 44/1–2. 147–168.

Petri Kallio, 2015: The Language Contact Situation in Prehistoric Northeastern Europe. *The Linguistic Roots of Europe: Origin and Development of European Languages*. Eds. R. Mailhammer, T. Vennemann, B. Anette Olsen. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press. 77–102.

Petri Kallio, 2017: The Indo-Europeans and the Non-Indo-Europeans in Prehistoric Northern Europe. *Language and Prehistory of the Indo-European Peoples: A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective*. Eds. A. Hyllested, B. Nielsen Whitehead, T. Olander, B. Anette Olsen. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press. 187–203.

Éva Korenchy, 1972: *Iranische Lehnwörter in der obugrischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Alexander Lubotsky, 2001: The Indo-Iranian Substratum. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European*: *Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations. Papers Presented at an International Symposium held at the Tvärminne Research Station of the University of Helsinki 8-10 January, 1999*. Eds. C. Carpelan, A. Parpola, P. Koskikallio. Helsinki 2001: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 301–317.

Václav Machek, 1968: *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia.

Witold Mańczak, 2017: *Polski słownik etymologiczny*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

Wladimir Napoľskich, 2002: Zu den ältesten Beziehungen zwischen Finno-Ugriern und zentraleuropäischen Indogermanen. *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: linguistic and literary contacts. Proceedings of the Symposium at the University of Groningen*, *November 22–24, 2001*. Eds. R. Blokland, C. Hasselblatt. Maastricht: Shaker Publishing. 265–271.

Vladimir Orel, 1998: *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Vladimir Orel, 2011: *Russian Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. I–IV. Calgary: Octavia & Company Press.

Maks Pleteršnik, 2006: *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. Vol. I–II. Ur. M. Furlan. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.

Julius Pokorny, 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, München: Francke Verlag.

Václav Polák, 1964: Les éléments finno-ougriens en slave. *Orbis* 13/2. 568–588.

Károly Rédei, 1986: *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Jan Michał Rozwadowski, 1913: Kilka uwag do przedhistorycznych stosunków wschodniej Europy i praojczyzny indoeuropejskiej na podstawie nazw wód. *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 6. 39–58.

Jan Michał Rozwadowski, 1961: *Wybór pism*. Tom II. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Franciszek Sławski, 1953–1956, 1958–1965, 1970–1974: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Tom I. Kraków 1953–1956; Tom II. Kraków 1958–1965; Tom IV. Kraków 1970–1974: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Języka Polskiego.

Franciszek Sławski (ed.), 1976, 1981, 2001: *Słownik prasłowiański*. Tom II. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk 1976; Tom IV. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź 1981; Tom VIII. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków 2001: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN.

Wojciech Smoczyński, 2007: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński.

Marko Snoj, 1997: *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Založba Mladinska Knjiga.

Terence Wade, 2002: *Russian Etymological Dictionary*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Elias Wessen, 1997: *Våra ord. Kortfattad etymologisk ordbok*. Stockholm: Norstedts Akademiska Förlag.

Zigmas Zinkevičius, 1992: A Polish-Yatvingian Vocabulary? *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań* 1. 99–133.

Владислав Маркович Иллич-Свитыч, 1967: Материалы к сравнительному словарю ностратических языков. *Этимология 1965. Материалы и исследования по индоевропейским языкам*. Ред. О. Н. Трубачев. Москва: Издательство "Наука".

[Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč, 1967: Materialy k sravnitel'nomu slovarju nostra-tičeskih jazykov. *Ètimologija 1965. Materialy i issledovanija po indoevropejskim jazykam*. Red. O. N. Trubačev. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".]

Владислав Маркович Иллич-Свитыч, 1971: *Опыт сравнения ностратических языков*. Т. I. Москва: Издательство "Наука".

[Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč, 1971: *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskih jazykov*. T. I. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".]

Владислав Маркович Иллич-Свитыч, 1976: *Опыт сравнения ностратических языков*. Т. II. Москва: Издательство "Наука".

[Vladislav Markovič Illič-Svityč, 1976: *Opyt sravnenija nostratičeskih jazykov*. T. II. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".]

Василий Ильич Лыткин, Евгений Семенович Гуляев, 1970: *Краткий этимологический словарь коми языка*. Москва: Издательство "Наука".

[Vasilij Il'ič Lytkin, Evgenij Semenovič Guljaev, 1970: *Kratkij ètimologičeskij slovar' komi jazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".]

Владимир Николаевич Топоров, Олег Николаевич Трубачев, 1962: *Лингвистический анализ гидронимов Верхнего Поднепровья*. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР.

[Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov, Oleg Nikolaevič Trubačev, 1962: *Lingvističeskij analiz gidronimov Verhnego Podneprov'ja*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.]

Олег Николаевич Трубачев (ed.), 1977, 1978, 1980, 1985, 1988, 1994: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Том IV. Москва 1977; Том V. Москва 1978; Том VII. Москва 1980; Том XII. Москва 1985; Том XV. Москва 1988; Том XX. Москва 1994: Издательство "Наука".

[Oleg Nikolaevič Trubačev (ed.), 1977, 1978, 1980, 1985, 1988, 1994: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskih jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Tom IV. Moskva 1977; Tom V. Moskva 1978; Tom VII. Moskva 1980; Tom XII. Moskva 1985; Tom XV. Moskva 1988; Tom XX. Moskva 1994: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka".]

Кнут-Олоф Фальк, 1958: Славянское название дуба. *Scando-Slavica* 4. 265–285.

[Knut-Olof Fal'k, 1958: Slavjanskoe nazvanie duba. *Scando-Slavica* 4. 265–285.]

Макс Фасмер [= Max Vasmer], 1986–1987: *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Т. I–IV. Москва: "Прогрес".

[Maks Fasmer [= Max Vasmer], 1986–1987: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. T. I–IV. Moskva: "Progres".]

Павел Яковлевич Черных, 1999: *Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка*. Т. I–II. Москва: Издательство "Русский язык".

[Pavel Jakovlevič Černyh, 1999: *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. T. I–II. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Russkij jazyk".]

Джой Иосифовна Эдельман, 2011: *Этимологический словарь иранских языков*. Т. IV. Москва: Издательская Фирма «Восточная Литература».

[Džoj Iosifovna Edel'man, 2011: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' iranskih jazykov*. T. IV. Moskva: Izdatel'skaja Firma «Vostočnaja Literatura».]

Povzetek

Prispevek predstavlja etimološke razlage devetih praslovanskih besed, ki so se večinoma ohranile tudi v slovenskem jeziku. Natančna analiza slovanskega in uralskega besednega gradiva kaže, da bi morali v nadaljevanju naštete slovenske in praslovanske besede obravnavati kot ugrofinske izposojenke: sln. *člóvęk* < psl. **čьlověkъ* m. 'človek, mož, moški, hlapec' (← ugrofin. **kilan pojka* 'vaški fant, hlapec'); sln. db 'Quercus' < psl. **dǫ̂bъ* m. 'hrast' (← perm. **tum-pu* < ugrofin. **toma-puwe* 'hrast; hrastov les'); sln. *góba* < psl. **gǫ̀ba* f. 'goba, gliva; luknjarka, kresilna goba' (← ugrofin. **kampV* 'goba, gliva'); sln. *kǫ́pati (se)* < psl. **kǫpati* 'kopati (se), umivati (se)' (← ural. **kumpa* 'val; plavati, ustvarjati valove, pljuskati (za ribe)'); psl. **kǫpa* f. 'travni šop, obkrožen z reko ali močvirjem; otok, preraščen z drevjem; skupina dreves ali grmov' (← ugrofin. **kumpa* 'manjša vzpetina v močvirnatem svetu'); psl. **likъ* m. 'število', **ličiti* 'šteti, računati' (← ural. **luke* 'število; šteti, računati'); sln. *mǫ̂ž* < psl. **mǫ̂žь* m. 'moški, mož' (← ugrofin. **mäńće* 'mož, moški, človek'); sln. *pǫ̂l* < psl. **polъ* m. 'polovica, stran; spol' (← ural. **pälä* 'polovica, stran'); sln. *šíja* < psl. **šьja* f. 'vrat, tilnik' (← ugrofin. **šepä* 'vrat, tilnik').