

DOI 10.57589/srl.v70i2.4029

UDK 811.1/.2:81.37

Krzysztof Tomasz Witeczak

Uniwersytet Łódzki (Univerza v Lodžu)

krzysztof.witeczak@uni.lodz.pl

Grażyna Habrajska

Uniwersytet Łódzki (Univerza v Lodžu)

grazyna.habrajska@uni.lodz.pl

Mikołaj Rychło

Uniwersytet Gdański (Univerza v Gdansku)

mikolaj.rychlo@ug.edu.pl

PROTO-SLAVIC COLLECTIVES IN *-*BJE*

FROM A HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE¹

The aim of this article is to conduct a diachronic analysis of Proto-Slavic collective nouns ending in *-*bje* with a view to gathering comparative evidence for postulating its Indo-European origin. The formation at issue exhibits exact counterparts not only in Germanic, but also in Indo-Aryan and Tocharian—e.g., PSI. **berzbje* n. coll. 'birch woods, birch forest' (= ON. *birki* n. 'birch forest' < PG. **berkijan* n. coll.), PSI. **bratrbje* n. coll. 'brothers, brotherhood' (= Ved. *bhrātryám* n. coll. 'brotherhood', Toch. A *pratri* 'brothers'), PSI. **govbje* n. coll. 'horned cattle' (= Ved. *gávyam*, *gavyám* n. coll. 'herd of cows'); PSI. **vbrmbje* n. coll. 'worms' (= ON. *yirmi* n. coll. 'id.' < PG. **wurmijan* n. coll. 'swarm of worms'). The authors polemicize against Ranko Matasović (2005), who assumes a secondary origin of the collective *-*bje*, and argues that the suffix stems from the Indo-European collective nouns in *-*i-* (whence PSI. *-*b*).

Keywords: archaism, collectives, etymology, Germanic-Balto-Slavic relations, Proto-Indo-European, Slavic languages

Namen članka je zgodovinsko primerjalna analiza praslovanskih kolektivnih (zbirnih) samostalnikov na *-*bje* z dokumentacijo indoevropskega primerjalnega gradiva, ki bi kazalo na indoevropski izvor teh tvorjenk. Slednje imajo namreč natančne vzporednice ne le v germanščini, temveč tudi v stari indijsščini in toharščini, npr. psl. **berzbje* s kol. 'brezov gozd, brezje' (= stnord. *birki* n. 'brezov gozd, brezje' < pgerm. **berkijan* s kol.), psl. **bratrbje* s kol. 'bratje, bratovščina' (= ved. *bhrātryám* s kol. 'bratovščina', toh. A *pratri* 'bratje'), psl. **govbje* s kol. 'rogata živina' (= ved. *gávyam*, *gavyám* s kol. 'čreda krav'); psl. **vbrmbje* s kol. '*črvad*' (= stnord. *yirmi* s kol. 'isto' < pgerm. **wurmijan* s kol. 'množica črvov'). Avtorja polemizirata z interpretacijo Ranka Matasovića iz leta 2005, ki predpostavlja drugotni izvor kolektivne (zbirne) pripone *-*bje*, domnevno nastale pod vplivom indoevropskih kolektivov na *-*i-* (od koder je psl. *-*b*).

¹ The present article is part of a research project entitled *Collective nouns in the Slavic and Germanic languages*, financed by the scholarly development fund of the Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz. We are indebted to Penny Shefton for proofreading the whole text and making several stylistic improvements, Silvo Torkar for translating the English abstract into Slovenian, as well as to anonymous reviewers for useful remarks. The full responsibility for all opinions and errors that still remain lies solely with us.

Ključne besede: arhaizem, kolektivni (zbirni) samostalniki, etimologija, germansko-balt-sko-slovanski odnosi, praindoevropsčina, slovanski jeziki

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to argue that Slavic collective nouns in **-bje* are much older than assumed so far. Researchers that have investigated this collective formation (e.g. Vaillant 1964: 208; Sławski 1974: 85–86; Matasović 2005: 35–38) conclude that it arose in Proto-Slavic, though they agree that the Proto-Slavic suffix **-bje* and the abstract nouns in **-bje* are probably of Indo-European origin². The present paper attempts to disprove some of their assumptions and to present new evidence supporting the Indo-European origin of the collectives in **-bje*, suggested originally in two earlier works (Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 31–39; Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 261–83). After a brief introduction, the findings of the previous research are reported: Franciszek Sławski's (1974) in the second section and Ranko Matasović's (2005) in the next one. The fourth section presents selected comparative material coming from Indo-Aryan languages, Hellenic and Tocharian. The fifth section offers additional evidence by juxtaposing the Slavic collective nouns at issue with arboreal collectives attested mainly in North Germanic languages. The sixth section demonstrates further evidence coming from East and West Germanic. The seventh section discusses a possible relationship between Slavic collectives in **-bje* and those in **-b*. In the eighth section, we postulate an Indo-European origin of the Slavic collective nouns in **-bje* by outlining their development with four phases of derivation. The final section presents the conclusion.

From a descriptive point of view, collective nouns (*nomina collectiva*) are denominal derivatives with a singular form and a collective function revealing the sense 'multiplicity, collectivity of what is specified in the base' (Habrajska 1995: 313–16), e.g. Pol. *brzezie* n. 'a group of birches; a birch forest' ← Pol. *brzoza* 'birch (a deciduous tree), *Betula* L.'. Within collective nouns, the derivational type in **-bje* deserves closer attention, as Borek (1988: 94) put it, "because of its pre-Slavic past as well as its chronologically diverse vitality" (in Polish; our translation). The evidence coming from the oldest Slavic manuscripts allows us to believe that this derivational type gained special productivity in the lexicon related to the plant world (Bernstein 1985: 362). The Old Church Slavonic examples include: *bylije* 'grass', *vr̃bije* 'willow', *dobije* 'trees' etc. Likewise, in Old Russian texts, one can find numerous plant collectives e.g. ORu. *derevije* 'trees', *kropivije* 'nettle', *kustovije* 'bushes, shrub thickets', *smokvije* 'fig trees'. Undoubtedly, one should agree with Franciszek Sławski (1974: I 86; 2011: 61), who recognized the suffix **-bje*, as "the most productive derivational affix forming collectives primarily from the names of inanimate objects, especially from the names of trees, shrubs, berries" (in Polish; our translation).

² Cf. Sławski (1974: 86): "Przyrostek *-bje* jest dziedzictwem ie., kontynuuje ie. **-i̯jo-*" [The suffix *-bje* is an Indo-European heritage; it continues IE. **-i̯jo-*]; Matasović (2005: 37): "The suffix [...] **-bje* was presumably inherited in some words, and then spread analogically to others, thus becoming productive".

Collectives in **-bje* denoting a group of trees appear frequently in the Serbo-Croatian lexicon (Frančić 1961: 36–40) and toponymy (Mianowicz 1976: 55–66), as well as in the Slovenian language (Bajec 1950: 117); they are less extensively attested in Czech and Slovak, as well as in the Lachian dialects (Laskowski 1996: 71–73).

In other Slavic languages, among others in Polish, the collectives in **-bje* have almost completely lost their vitality, becoming an unproductive formation. In relation to the Polish language, it can be observed that this old derivational type of collectives in the language of the 16th–17th centuries becomes less productive, especially in the case of collectives denoting a group of trees (Rykiel-Kempf 1985: 21). According to Stanisław Rospond (1971: 197), what contributed to the decline in use of Old Polish singular collective names was their partial identification with plural forms of the type as exemplified in Pol. *węgłe* m. pl. ‘coals’ (from *węgiel* ‘coal’) and *liście* m. pl. ‘leaves’ (from *liść* ‘leaf’). It should be noted, however, that the traces of collective nouns derived from the names of trees have been preserved in a rich repertoire of Polish toponymy (Bańkowski 1972: 281–86; Borek 1988: 87–96; Kreja 1988: 41–82; Różycka 1989: 53–99; Lech-Kirstein 2015: 223–39).

2 Franciszek Sławski (1974) on the origin of Slavic collectives in **-bje*

The origin of Slavic collective nouns in **-bje* remains without explanation. It is usually argued that the derivational type in **-bje* is not uniform either in origin or in semantics. Furthermore, apart from (a) singular collectives in **-bje*, we can also distinguish: (b) deadjectival abstract nouns of the type **obilbje* ‘abundance’ (: **obilb* ‘abundant’) and (c) formations from prepositional expressions that perform a relational-localizing role, e.g. Pol. *poddasze* ‘room under the roof’ (← Pol. *dach* ‘roof’), *zarzecze* ‘area behind the river’ (← Pol. *rzeka* ‘river’), *zawodzie* ‘area behind the water’ (← Pol. *woda* ‘water’) (Borek 1988: 94). There are a few Proto-Slavic abstract nouns derived from other nouns, e.g. PSl. **sъnbje* n. ‘dream’ ← **sъnb* m. ‘sleep’; PSl. **ustbje* n. ‘mouth of the river’ ← **usta* n. pl. ‘mouth’; PSl. **znamenbje* n. ‘sign’ ← **znamę* n. ‘id.’.

Franciszek Sławski traces the collective function of the suffix **-bje* to the primary adjectival abstract formations of the type **obilbje* ‘abundance’, which, when they became concrete, gave rise to later collectives derived from the names of inanimate objects, especially the names of trees and shrubs. Moreover, when considering the suffix as a case of Indo-European heritage, Sławski derives PSl. **-bje* from IE. **-ijō-m*, and also supposes that it could originally be a substantivized neutrum of adjectives in **-ijō-* (Sławski 1974: I 86; 2011: 61). All in all, the development of the Slavic collectives in **-bje*, according to Sławski, looks as follows: (A) a specific nominal formation ⇒ (B) denominal adjective formed from the noun in question ⇒ (C) adjectival abstractum in **-bje* ⇒ (D) collective noun in **-bje*.

Although Sławski did not formulate his view explicitly, it seems that in his approach, the singular collective nouns in **-bje* represent a typically Slavic formation which probably evolved in the early Proto-Slavic era.

3 Matasović on Slavic collectives in **-bje*

The Croatian linguist Ranko Matasović (2005) stresses (like Sławski) that the Proto-Slavic nominal suffix **-bje* is commonly used for deriving neuter nouns with abstract or collective meaning. The basic difference consists in the process of their derivation. According to Matasović (2005), the Proto-Slavic abstract nouns derive from adjectives (e.g. PS. **veselbje* n. abstr. ‘joy’ ← **veselb* adj. ‘merry, gay’), whereas the Proto-Slavic collectives are formed from other nouns (e.g. PS. **kamenbje* n. coll. ‘a heap of stones’ ← **kamy*, gen. sg. **kamene* m. ‘stone’). Unfortunately, he ignores the fact that numerous abstract nouns, attested in the Slavic and other Indo-European languages, derive not only from adjectives, but also from simple nouns. It is worth emphasizing that most Slavists and Indo-Europeanists suggest the Indo-European origin of the suffix **-bje* on the basis of the following correspondences: PS. **ustbje* n. ‘mouth of the river’ = Lat. *ōstium* n. ‘id.’; PS. **sъnbje* n. ‘dream’ = Lat. *somnium* n. ‘id.’, Gk. ἐνύπνιον n. ‘vision (during sleep); dream’ (Brugmann, Delbrück 1906: 187–89; Meillet, Vaillant 1934: 357–58; Sławski 1974: I 86; 2011: 61; Jurišić 1992: 52–4). The two comparisons (which do not represent collective nouns but derive from nouns, i.e. PS. **usta* and PS. **sъnb*, respectively) seem to demonstrate the same neuter suffix **-ijom* (Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 32–8), which could be treated as a variant of the adjectival morpheme **-ijō-*.

According to Ranko Matasović, the “putative” suffix **-ijō-* (or **-iyo-* in Matasović’s notation) should be rejected for two reasons. First, “there was never a suffix **-iyo-* in PIE. [...] Only in Old Indic do we find the disyllabic form *-iya-*; however, this form of the suffix is regular in nouns derived from the feminine stems in *-ī-* < **-iH-* (Burrow 1973: 186), but it was extended analogically to other stems as well. Thus, OInd. *-iya-* is actually derivable from **-iHo-*” (Matasović 2005: 35–6³).

This argument can be valid, if we accept that the feminine gender existed in the oldest phase of Proto-Indo-European. The feminine gender is not commonly reconstructed in the Indo-European linguistics. Some historical linguists believe that the Anatolian languages preserve the original distinction of two genders only, namely the commune (or animate) gender and the neuter (or inanimate) one. The adjectival suffix **-ijō-* is clearly attested in most Indo-European languages (Krahe, Meid 1967: 71; Fritz, Meier-Brügger 2021: 284). Of course, it is observed that the Old Indic forms frequently demonstrate the analyzed suffix in two cognate forms *-ya-* and *-iya-*. However, the simplified (monosyllabic) version *-ya-* clearly derives from an earlier disyllabic archetype *-iya-*. This phenomenon cannot be treated as an argument for deriving of the suffix **-ijō-* from the feminine suffix **-ih₂-*.

Matasović’s argument devoted to the “putative” suffix **-ijō-* seems doubtful for two reasons. Firstly, there are no obvious Proto-Indo-European adjectives in **-ijō-* or **-ih₂-* derived from feminine *ih₂-* stem nouns. For example, Greek πότνια f. ‘mistress, lady’ (< PIE. **pótنيh₂* f. ‘id.’, cf. Ved. *pátnī* f. ‘female possessor, mistress; wife’)

³ There is an added page (p. 186) in the quotation.

demonstrates only the feminine adjective belonging to the *d*-stem (cf. Gk. *ποτνιαός, -άδος* adj. ‘venerable, august, powerful’). Moreover, no Indo-Aryan adjective derived directly from *pátnī* is attested.

Secondly, Proto-Indo-European adjectives in *-i̯o- frequently derive from nouns of the masculine or neuter gender, cf.

3.1 Gk. *ἄγριος* adj. ‘of the fields, wild, savage (of animals), uncultivated (of lands); savage, violent, cruel (of persons)’, Ved. *ajryáh* adj. ‘being in or connected with a field or plain’ < PIE. **h₂eǵrijós* adj. ‘id.’ ← PIE. **h₂eǵros* m. ‘field’, cf. Lat. *ager* m. ‘field’, Gk. *ἀγρός* m. ‘field, land, farm’, Ved. *ájra-* m. ‘field, plain’.

3.2 Ved. *divyáh* adj. ‘divine, heavenly, celestial’, Gk. *δῖος* adj. ‘celestial, divine, noble, magnificent; of Zeus’, Myc. Gk. *di-wi-jo* ‘(in the month) of Zeus’ (Burrow 1973: 185; Fritz, Meier-Brügger 2021: 285) < PIE. **diuijós* adj. ‘celestial; belonging to the Sky-god’ ← PIE. **diēu-s* m. ‘Sky-god’.

3.3 Gk. *πάτριος* adj. ‘of the father; paternal, traditional’, Lat. *patrius* adj. ‘belonging to the father; paternal’, Ved. *pítryah* adj. ‘derived from a father; relating to a father; paternal, patrimonial, ancestral’ (Burrow 1973: 185; Fritz, Meier-Brügger 2021: 285) < IE. **p₂triios* adj. ‘paternal’ < PIE. **ph₂triios* adj. ‘paternal’ ← PIE. **ph₂ter-s* m. ‘father’.

3.4 Ved. *rājyáh* adj. ‘kingly, princely, royal’, Lat. *rēgius* adj. ‘belonging to a king; kingly, royal, regal’ (Burrow 1973: 185) < PIE. **reh₂ǵiios* adj. ‘of a king; royal’ ← PIE. **reh₂ǵ-s* m. ‘king’.

Of course, we can find adjectives derived from nouns being categorized as either feminine or the common gender (i.e. both the feminine and the masculine). It is worth emphasizing that all the Anatolian languages preserved the commune, i.e. the animate gender.

3.5 Gk. *χθόνιος*, Ved. *kṣámyah* adj. (Burrow 1973: 185) < PIE. **d^hǵ^hómijos* adj. ← PIE. **d^hǵ^hóm-s* f. ‘earth’, cf. Gk. *χθών* f. ‘earth’; Ved. *kṣā-* f. ‘id.’; Hitt. *tekan-* n. (gen. sg. *taknaš*) ‘earth’, Luw. *tijammiš* n. ‘id.’, HLUw. *takam-* ‘id.’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 858–59).

3.6 Ved. *gávyaḥ* adj. ‘consisting of cattle or cows, coming from or belonging to a cow’ (Burrow 1973: 185; Monier-Williams 1999: 351) < IE. **g^uóuijos* adj. ← PIE. **g^uh₂éu-s* f./m. ‘cow; ox’, cf. Ved. *gáuh* f./m. ‘id.’; Gk. *βοῦς* f./m. ‘id.’, Luw. *uaua-* c. ‘cow’; HLUw. *wawa-* c. ‘id.’, Lyc. *wawā* acc. sg. ‘cow’ (Kloekhorst 2008: 507).

It is worth emphasizing that the abstract nouns in *-i̯om do not seem to derive from the Proto-Indo-European feminine *ih₂*-stems. For example, Lat. *somnium* n. ‘dream’ derives from Lat. *somnus* m. ‘sleep’ (< PIE. **súornos* m. ‘id.’), whereas PSi. **sъnъje* n. ‘dream’ and Gk. *ἐνύπνιον* n. ‘vision (during sleep); dream’ go back to the common archetype **súrnos* m. ‘sleep’, cf. PSi. **sъnъ* m. ‘id.’, Gk. *ὑπνος* m. ‘id.’.

Our conclusion is that the adjectival suffix **-ijō-*, attested in most Indo-European languages, has nothing to do with the feminine *ih₂*-stem nouns. In other words, there is no convincing reason for rejecting the neuter suffix **-ijom*, which creates both abstract and collective formations.

4 The Slavic collective nouns in **-bje* and *-bja*

In his paper Matasović introduces two arguments for the secondary origin of the Slavic collectives in **-bje*, assuming that “old PIE neuters with barytone accentuation became masculines in Proto-Slavic, as Illič-Svityč has shown (1963), e.g. **d^hwórom* »gate« (OInd. *dvāram*, L *forum*) > OCS *dvorъ*. Therefore, all of the putative cognates of Slavic derivatives in *-bje* would have to be oxytona, and in Old Indic we find that neuters in *-iya-* are, as a rule, never oxytona (Burrow 1973: 185)” (Matasović 2005: 36).

He refers to the Indo-Aryan lexical evidence, as well as the accentual argument. It is necessary to examine the correctness of Matasović’s words. There is a valuable pair of the related Slavic collectives in **-bja* and *-bje*, demonstrating exact cognates in other Indo-European languages:

4.1 PSI. **bratr₂bja* f. coll. ‘brothers; brotherhood’ (cf. OCS. *bratruja*, OSln. *bratria*, OČak. (15th c.) *bratrja*, ORu. *bratruja* f. coll., OPol. *bratrza* f. coll., LSorb. (obsolete) *bratša*, USorb. *bratřa* pl. ‘brothers’, Cz. *bratři* pl. ‘brothers’, Slovak *braträ* pl. ‘brothers’) = Lith. dial. (in Kurschat’s dictionary) *broti₂a*, *broti₂ä* gen. sg. *broti₂jos* f. ‘circle of the most faithful friends’ (< PBalt. **brātrijā* f. coll. ‘brotherhood, brothers’ by means of the progressive dissimilation of the liquid stops **r-r > *r-ø*)⁴; Gk. Att. *φᾶτρῖᾱ* f. coll. ‘family group; clan, phratry; a subdivision of the phyle in Athens’, dial. *φᾶτρῖᾱ* f. coll. ‘id.’ (Liddell, Scott 1996: 1953; Montanari 2018: 2307; Diggle 2021: 1477). The above-mentioned Slavic, Baltic and Greek forms go back to the collective noun **b^hreh₂trijeh₂* f. coll. ‘a group of brothers; brotherhood’ (← PIE. **b^hrēh₂ter-s* m. ‘brother’) (Pokorny 1959: 164; Derksen 2008: 60; Matasović 2014: 145). The Greek and Balto-Slavic accentual evidence seems to indicate the barytone or the paroxytone stress of primitive collectives of the feminine gender.

4.2 PSI. **bratr₂e* n. coll. ‘brothers; brotherhood’ (cf. Ru. dial. *братъĕ-тъя* coll., Bel. *братруя* n., Ukr. *браття* n. ‘id.’) = Ved. *bhrātryām* n. coll. ‘brotherhood, fraternity’. The East Slavic and Indo-Aryan forms derive from PIE. **b^hreh₂trijóm* n. coll. ‘a group of brothers; brotherhood’ (← PIE. **b^hrēh₂ter-s* m. ‘brother’). See also Ved. *bhrātrām* n. coll. ‘brotherhood, fraternity’ (Monier-Williams 1999: 770). The Slavic and Vedic accentual evidence seems to document the original oxytone stress in the neuter collective noun in question.

⁴ There is an analogous collective noun *broli₂ä*, gen. sg. *broli₂jos* f. ‘brothers and sisters, siblings; brotherhood, society’ in the literary Lithuanian language (Smoczyński 2018: 131). It derives from the diminutive noun *brólis*, gen. sg. *brólio* m. ‘brother’ (originally a shortened form of Lith. *broterėlis* m. ‘little brother’, cf. Žem. *brótis* m. ‘brother’, OPrus. *brote* ‘brother’).

Moreover, Toch. *A pratri* ‘brothers’ has to represent a collective noun, derived from the East Tocharian noun *pracar* m. ‘brother’, cf. Toch. B *procer* m. ‘id.’ (Witczak 2016: 126–30). It is uncertain, however, whether Toch. *A pratri* ‘brothers’ should be derived from the former Proto-Indo-European archetype (4.1) or the latter (4.2).

The Vedic language demonstrates also two further collectives in **(i)yā* (f. coll.) and **(i)yam* (n. coll.), related to each other:

4.3 Ved. (only in Pāṇini) *gāvya* f. coll. ‘cow-herd’ = Lith. *gauja* f. coll. ‘flock, pack, herd, bunch, band, gang’; Latv. *gauja* f. ‘crowd’, Gk. Lac. βούα f. coll. ‘a band of young Spartan boys’ (as if from PGk. *βόφυα) (Kaczyńska 2019). These forms derive from the collective noun (IE.) **gʷóuijeh*₂ f. ‘a group of cows’ (← IE. **gʷóuijos* adj. ← PIE. **gʷh₃éu-s* f./m. ‘cow; ox’).

4.4 Ved. *gavyam*, also *gavyám* n. coll. ‘herd of cows’, attested six times in hymns of RigVeda, e.g. *RV* I 140.13; V 34.8; VII 18.7; IX 62.23 (Monier-Williams 1999: 351), shows also a number of reflexes in modern Indo-Aryan languages, e.g. Oriya *gāba* ‘cattle’, also ‘a cow’ as the effect of reducing the old collective form to the singular (Turner 1966: 219). The Indo-Aryan collective noun in question points undoubtedly to an original oxytonesis. The barytone variant *gāvyaḥ* adj. ‘consisting of cattle or cows, coming from or belonging to a cow’ (3.6) or from the feminine collective *gāvya* ‘cow-herd’ (4.3). The exact equivalent of the Vedic collective noun is attested in Proto-Slavic **govbje* n. coll. ‘cattle, pecus’, attested exclusively in BRus. dial. *zōŷe, zaŷǎ* n. coll. ‘horned cattle, cows; a generic term for cattle’ (Борысь 1979: 47–48; Boryś 2007: 275–76; Sławski 2001: VIII 158).

Three Vedic collective nouns of the neuter gender, namely *bhratryám*, *bhratrám* (4.2) and *gavyám* (4.4), clearly demonstrate an original oxytone stress. It is obvious, that the same primitive accent should be suggested for two Proto-Slavic collectives **bratrbje* (4.2) and **govbje* (4.4). This is why we have to conclude that Matasović’s words, quoted at the beginning of the fourth section, are misguided.

Moreover, the original oxytonesis also has to be reconstructed in some Germanic collectives in *-ijan*, e.g.

4.5 PG. **imbijan* n. coll. ‘swarm of bees’ is confirmed by the following lexical items: OE. *imbe* n. ‘swarm of bees’; MDu. *imme* f. ‘bee’, OHG. *impi* m. ‘swarm of bees’, also ‘bee’, MHG. *imbe, imme* m. ‘swarm of bees’. Guus Kroonen (2013: 117) suggests that “[t]he neuter OE. *imbe* continues a collective **imbja-*, but OHG. *impi* and MDu. *imme* in the sense of ‘bee’ probably represent different formations, i.e. **imbja-* and **imbjō-*”. The Proto-Germanic collective noun **imbijan* (neuter *o*-stem) ‘swarm of bees’ seems to be related to Greek ἐπιίς (gen. sg. ἐπιίδος) f. (secondary *d*-stem) ‘gnat’ (Pokorny 1959: 311). The primitive oxytone stress of PG. **imbijan* (earlier **imfiján*) documents

the Proto-Indo-European archetype **h₁empijóm* n. coll. ‘swarm of insects (esp. gnats or bees)’. The place of accent is clearly indicated by Verner’s law.

For further examples of the original oxytonesis in Germanic collective nouns in **-ijan*, see the examples quoted below: 5.3 (PG. **alizijan* n. coll. ‘alder grove’, as if from **alisiján*), 5.5 (PG. **lindijan* n. coll. ‘lime forest, lime wood’ < **linbiján*), 6.2 (PG. **fergunijan* n. coll. ‘the range of mountains’ < **ferh^wuniján*). These Proto-Germanic formations unanimously demonstrate Verner’s effect caused by the primitive stress inherited from the Indo-European protolanguage. It cannot be questioned that the Indo-European stress was placed in the final (oxytone) position at least in these four Proto-Germanic collectives. In other words, Matasović’s accentual argument seems hardly conclusive.

5 Collective nouns in Germanic languages

Ranko Matasović introduces an additional argument for the alleged secondary origin of the Slavic collectives in **-bje*.

“Thirdly, the suffix **(i)yo-* is not used to form collectives in any other Indo-European language. If OCS *сънѣ* is indeed derivable from the same proto-form as L *somnium*, the specialization of collective meaning in Slavic would have to be accounted for.” (Matasović 2005: 36).

Unfortunately, the above argument, so strongly pointed out in Matasović’s paper, is completely incorrect as well. As it was demonstrated above, there are at least two collective nouns in **-ijom* in Indo-Aryan, which were mentioned in the preceding section (see 4.2: Ved. *bhrātryám* n. coll. = PS1. **bratr̥bje* n. coll. ‘brothers; brotherhood’; 4.4: Ved. *gavyám* n. coll. = PS1. **gov̥bje* n. coll. ‘cows; herd of cows’). Moreover, we are able to quote numerous collective formations in **-ijan* in the Germanic languages (see 4.5 and examples quoted in Sections 5 and 6). Some of them must be treated as exact equivalents of the Slavic collectives (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 271–74). Below we quote six Germanic collective formations (5.1–6) having exact or relatively close Slavic cognates (see 5.1a–6a).

5.1 PG. **berkijan* n. coll. ‘birch forest, birch grove’ is clearly reflected in the Nordic languages: ON. *birki* n. ‘birch forest’, Icel. *birki* ‘birch forest; birch’, Norw. *birki* ‘birch forest’, Sw. *björke* ‘birch forest, birch grove’ (Falk, Torp 1910: 74–75, s.v. *Birk*; Jóhannesson 1956: 623; de Vries 1977: 37). The tree collective undeniably derives from the Proto-Germanic arboreal term **berkō* f. ‘birch’, cf. ON. *björk* f. ‘birch’, Norw. *björk* ‘id.’, Sw. *björk* ‘id.’; OE. *beorc* f., Du. *berk* c.; OHG. *biricha*, G. *Birke* f. ‘id.’ (Kroonen 2013: 61), by means of the Proto-Germanic suffix **-ijan*.

5.1.A PS1. **berzbje* n. coll. ‘birch grove, birch forest’ (Трубачев 1974: I 208; Sławski 1974: I 213) demonstrates an extensive attestation and a large distribution in the Slavic languages, cf. Ru. *берёзье* n. ‘birch forest, birch twigs’; OPol. *brzezje* n.

‘birch forest’, Pol. *brzezie* n. ‘birch grove or forest’; Cz. *březí* n. ‘small birch-grove’, also *břízí* n. ‘birch twigs, birch-wood’; Sla. *brezie* n. ‘small birch-forest, birch-grove’; SC. *brêzje* n. ‘birch forest’, Sln. *brêzje* n. ‘id.’ (Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 35).

The Proto-Slavic collective noun **berzbje* ‘birch forest, birch grove’ is identical to PG. **berkijan* n. coll. ‘id.’ from the point of view of the semantics and Indo-European word-formation. The Germanic and Slavic formations regularly go back to the Proto-Indo-European archetype **b^herh₂ǵijom* n. coll. ‘birch grove, birch forest’, originally ‘a group of birch trees’ (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 271, 278).

5.2 PG. **alizijan* n. coll. ‘alder grove’ can easily be reconstructed on the basis of ON. *elri* n. ‘alder grove’ and Icel. *elri* n. ‘alder-tree’ (de Vries 1977: 101; Kroonen 2013: 22). It derives from PG. **alisō* / **alizō* f. ‘alder’, cf. Sp. *aliso* m. ‘alder tree’ (a Gothic loanword); Du. *els* c., OE. *alor*, E. *alder*; OHG. *elira*, also *erila*, G. *Erle* ‘alder’ (Kroonen 2013: 22).

5.2.A PSI. **olbšbje* / **jelšbje* n. coll. ‘alder grove, alder forest’ is attested in East Slavic (cf. Ru. dial. *олѣшье* n. ‘alder grove’, *алѣшье* n. ‘alder-tree’; Bel. *алешня* n. ‘alder grove’), West Slavic (cf. OPol. *olsze* n. coll. ‘alder grove’; OCz. *olšie* n., Cz. *olší* n. ‘alder grove’, Sla. *olšie* n. ‘id.’; Rykiel-Kempf 1985: 21; Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 34), as well as in South Slavic (cf. Sln. *ôlšje* n. ‘alder forest / Erlenwald’; SC. *jôšje* n. coll., also *jêlâšje*, *jelšje* n. coll. ‘alder grove, alder forest’), cf. Pol. *olsza* f. ‘alder, *Alnus* L.’; Ru. *ольха* f. ‘id.’; SC. dial. *jêlša* f. ‘id.’ (Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 34; Трубачев, Журавлев 2005: XXXII 83).

It should be emphasized that the Proto-Slavic collective noun **olbšbje* ‘alder grove, alder forest’ represents an exact equivalent of PG. **alizijan* n. coll. ‘alder grove’ (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 272, 278).

5.3 ON. *espi* n. ‘aspen / Espe’, OSw. *æspe-* (attested in toponymy) and Sw. dial. *äspe* ‘Eспенwäldchen / aspen grove’ represent a collective noun **aspijan* denoting originally ‘aspen forest, aspen grove’ (Falk, Torp 1910: 25, s.v. *Asp*; de Vries 1977: 106). It is evidently related to ON. *ǫsp* f. ‘aspen’, OE. *æsp*, E. *aspen*; Du. *esp*, OHG. *aspa* f. ‘aspen’, G. *Espe* f. ‘id.’ (< PG. **aspō*, earlier **apsō* f. ‘aspen, *Populus tremula* L.’) (Kroonen 2013: 39).

5.3.A PSI. **opsbje* n. coll. ‘aspen forest, aspen grove’ (Трубачев, Журавлев 2005: XXXII 98) > Ru. dial. *освьѣ* n. ‘aspen forest, aspen grove / осиновый лес, осинник’, also ‘aspen-tree’ and ‘aspen-wood; aspen twigs’. The Proto-Slavic lexical item is also attested in Czech and Polish place names, cf. Cz. *Vůsí, Osí, Vosí*; Pol. *Osie* (Borek 1988: 90; Bańkowski 2000: 434). The basic dendronym **opsa* is reflected in USorb. *wosa* f. ‘aspen, *Populus tremula* L.’, LSorb. *wósa* f. ‘id.’; Pol. dial. *osa* f. ‘aspen’; Bel. *acá* f. ‘id.’⁵.

⁵ There are many derivatives, especially diminutive formations in Proto-Slavic, e.g. PSI. **opsica* f. ‘aspen’, PSI. **opsičina* f. ‘id.’, PSI. **opsika* f. ‘id.’ and PSI. **opsina* f. ‘id.’ (Трубачев, Журавлев 2005: XXXII 93–6).

PSl. **opsa* f. ‘aspen’ resembles PG. **aspō* f. ‘id.’ not only semantically, but also phonologically (Непокупный 1998: 35–43), though a metathesis of consonants (**ps* > **sp*) must be suggested for the Proto-Germanic language. By analogy, PG. **aspijan* n. coll. ‘aspen forest, aspen grove’ may represent a metathesized variant of PSl. **opsъje* n. coll. ‘id.’ (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 272, 278).

5.4 PG. **lindijan* n. coll. ‘lime forest’, reflected exclusively in ON. *lindi* n. ‘Lindenwald, Lindenholz’ (Pokorny 1959: 677; de Vries 1977: 357), represents a collective noun derived from PG. **lindō* f. ‘lime-tree, *Tilia* L.’, cf. ON. *lind* f. ‘lime-tree’, OSax. *linda* f. ‘lime-tree’, Du. *linde* c. ‘id.’; OHG. *linta* f., G. *Linde* f. ‘id.’ (Непокупный 1998: 170–71). The Proto-Germanic dendronym goes back to the Indo-European archetype **lentā* f. ‘a kind of tree or wood’ (< PIE. **lent-éh₂*), cf. Lith. *lentā* f. ‘board, plank’, Latv. *leņīta* f. ‘id.’ (Kroonen 2013: 338; Smoczyński, 2018: 688–89). The Proto-Germanic voiced stop **d* (< IE. **t*) clearly documents the effect of Verner’s law. In other words, both the basic term for ‘lime-tree’ and the related collective noun demonstrate an original oxytone stress (PG. **lindijan* n. coll. < **linþiján* n. coll. < PIE. **lentiǵóm*).

5.4.A PSl. **lotъje* n. coll. ‘young lime grove’ (Трубачев 1990: XVI 162) > Ru. *лутъѣ* n. ‘young lime trees to be stripped of their bark’, dial. ‘young lime grove / молодой липняк’; Ukr. *луття* n. ‘young lime trees; twigs of a willow’; OCz. *lútie* n. ‘young lime tree; twigs’ (Фасмер 1986: 536; Habrajska, Witczak 1994: 35–6).

It is obvious that the Proto-Slavic tree collective **lotъje* ‘young lime grove’ cannot be separated from PG. **lindijan* n. coll. ‘lime forest’.

5.5 PG. **terwijan* n. coll. ‘pine trees’ can be reconstructed on the basis of the following forms: ON. *tyrvi* n. ‘pinewood’, Norw. *tyri* ‘id.’, Sw. *tyre, töre* ‘dry wood, brushwood’. The Proto-Germanic tree collective in question is related to MHG. *zirben* m. ‘pine’ (< PG. **terwjan-*). See also ON. *tjara* f. ‘tar’, OE. *tierwe* f. ‘tar’, E. *tar*; Du. *teer* n./c. ‘tar’ (Kroonen 2013: 514).

5.5.A PSl. **dervъje* n. coll. ‘growing trees; wood’ (Трубачев 1977: IV 213; Sławski 1979: III 59–60) is clearly attested in most Slavic languages: ORu. *дєревѣ* n. ‘trees’; Ru. dial. *дєрвьѣ* n. ‘growing trees’, also ‘large, thick tree’; Bel. dial. *дзєрэвье* n. ‘trees’; OUkr. *дєрєвьє* n. ‘id.’; OPol. *drzewie* n. coll. ‘growing trees’, also ‘wood’ (Habrajska 1995: 139); OCz. *dřevie, dřěvie* n. ‘growing trees, forest; (fire)wood, a certain amount of wood’, Cz. *dříví* n. ‘(fire)wood, a certain amount of wood’, dial. ‘growing trees, forest’; Sla. *drievie*, dial. *drevie* n. (fire)wood OCS. *дрѣвѣ* n. ‘trees, wood’; MBulg. *дрѣвѣ* n. coll. ‘(growing) trees’; Sln. *drévjé* n. coll. ‘trees / die Bäume’; SC. *drijevjlje, drêvlje* n. ‘growing trees; wood’ (Frančić 1961: 38).

It can easily be argued that the Proto-Slavic collective noun **dervъje* n. coll. ‘growing trees; wood’ corresponds to PG. **terwijan* n. coll. ‘pine trees; pinewood’ and goes back to IE. **deruǵjom* ‘a group of trees, esp. pine trees’ (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 271–72, 278).

5.6 ON. *yrmi* n. coll. ‘vermin’ < PG. **wurmijan* n. coll. ‘swarm of worms or snakes’ (Kroonen 2013: 600), cf. ON. *ormr* m. ‘snake’, G. *Wurm* ‘worm’, E. *worm* ‘id.’;⁶

5.6.A OCS. *врѣмиѣ* n. coll. ‘insects’ and ORu. *вѣрмиѣ* n. coll. ‘vermin; insects / Gewürm, Insekten’ (Фасмер 1986: 299) clearly derive from PSl. **vьrmьje* n. coll. ‘insects, vermin’.

According to Kroonen (2013: 600), the Old Norse collective noun *yrmi* “is formally identical” to the Old Church Slavic one. Theoretically, the Germanic and Slavic pair represents an Indo-European heritage, deriving from PIE. **ur̥mijom* n. coll. ‘vermin; swarm of worms or insects’.

6 Other Proto-Germanic collectives

Two further collectives in **-ijan* are attested in the East and West Germanic languages. It may clearly be seen that they are not productive formations and they rarely refer to tree terminology. Generally, they seem to originate from the Proto-Germanic or perhaps even the Proto-Indo-European language. Some of them may illustrate traces of a Northern Indo-European vocabulary.

6.1 PG. **fanijan* n. ‘fen, swamp’ is safely attested in most Germanic languages: Go. *fani* n. ‘mud’, ON. *fen* n. ‘fen, bog’, OE. *fen* n. (also m.) ‘marsh, mud’, E. *fen*; OSax. *feni* n. ‘fen’, MDu. *veen*, *vene* n. ‘bog’, Du. *veen* n. ‘bog’, *ven* n. ‘small lake’; OHG. *fenni* n. ‘swamp’, G. *Fenn* n. ‘id.’. The Proto-Germanic term in question represents, as Guus Kroonen (2013: 128) correctly stresses, a collective noun “potentially identical” to OPrus. *pannean* n. ‘ditch’ (< Proto-Baltic **panijan* n.). The Germanic and West Baltic forms in question seem to go back to IE. **ponijom* (Habrajska, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 268).

6.2 PG. **fergunijan* n. coll. ‘the range of mountains’ can be reconstructed on the basis of Go. *fairguni* n. ‘mountain range’ and OE. *firgen* n. ‘mountain’ (Kroonen 2013: 136). It cannot be excluded that a related collective noun (of the feminine gender) additionally appears in OHG. *Firgunnea* f. ‘Ore Mountains’ (< PG. **ferguniō* f. coll.). Note that a Proto-Germanic singulative seems to be attested in ON. *fjörgyn* f. ‘Mother Earth’ (< PG. **fergunī-* f.).

7 The Slavic collectives in **-bje* and **-b*

Matasović (2005: 37) indicates that the Slavic languages demonstrate some neuter collectives in **-bje* which alternate with the feminine ones in **-b* or are related to an *i*-stem collective attested in other Indo-European languages, cf. Hitt. *tuzziš* c. *i*-stem ‘people; army’ (< PIE. **teut-i-s*); Latv. *birzis* f. *i*-stem ‘birch grove’, Lith. *biržė* f.

⁶ It is worth emphasizing that Germanists additionally reconstruct “Kollektivbildungen mit dem Prefix *ga-*” (Krahe, Meid 1967: 72), e.g. G. *Gewürm* n. ‘vermin’ < PG. **ga-wurmijan* n. coll. ‘vermin; a swarm of worms’.

coll. ‘birch wood, birch grove’ (← Lith. *bėržas* m. ‘birch, *Betula* L.’, Latv. *bērzs* m., *bērze* f. ‘id.’, OPrus. *berse* f. ‘birch’); PSi. **čędb* f. coll. *i*-stem ‘offspring, children’ (← PSi. **čędo* n. ‘descendant, child’) (Matasović 2014: 39). He finally concludes that most Slavic collectives in **-bje* (of the neuter gender) derive from the feminine *i*-stem nouns with the collective sense, though “[i]n many cases there is no evidence for an *i*-stem outside of Slavic” (Matasović 2014: 38). In other words, he agrees with his predecessors that the collective nouns in **-bje* attested in the Slavic languages represent a purely Proto-Slavic innovation.

Matasović’s system of derivation of the Proto-Slavic collectives in **-bje* is supported by one example:

7.1 PSi. **ljudbje* n. coll. ‘people’: OCS. *ljudbje*, Cr. *ljūdi*, Pol. *ludzie*, now pl. ‘id.’ (Matasović 2014: 38).

7.2 Lith. *liáudis* f. ‘rural people, simple people, peasants, a mob, a great crowd of people’, Latv. *lāudis* f. coll. ‘people’; OE. *lēod* f. ‘id.’ (< PIE. **h₁leud^his* f. coll. ‘people’). The Proto-Slavic evidence for an *i*-stem collective noun seems scarce and uncertain. Note that PSi. **ljudb* f. ‘id.’ is attested only in Ru. dial. *люды, -у* f. coll. ‘people, a lot of people’.

Of course, the relatedness of the feminine *i*-stem nouns with the collective meaning to the neuter collectives in **-ijom* is perfectly acceptable on the basis of Indo-European morphology. It is worth emphasizing, however, that such a derivation is connected with an unexpected change in the original gender. From the derivational point of view, it is possible to suggest that the original *i*-stem collective nouns (demonstrating the feminine gender in most Indo-European languages) should be easier to transform into the feminine collective nouns in **-ijeh₂*.

8 Indo-European derivation of the Slavic collectives

The lexical evidence presented in Section 5 and 7 clearly demonstrates that the Northern Germanic and Common Slavic collectives denoting ‘a group of trees’ or ‘a swarm of insects’ represent a purely Indo-European formation, the derivation of which can be simply explained from the point of view of the Indo-European word-formation. Among various derivational functions of the Proto-Slavic suffix **-bje*, which are mentioned by Sławski (1974: I 86; 2011: 61), we would like to concentrate on the four which, we believe, can be arranged into the following phases of derivation:

8.1 PIE. **b^hréh₂ters* m. ‘brother’ (> IE. **b^hrātēr* m. ‘id.’), e.g. Ved. *bhrātā* m. ‘brother’; Lat. *frāter* m. ‘id.’; Go. *brōþar* m. ‘id.’; Gk. φράτηρ, Ion. φρήτηρ m. ‘member of the same phratry (i.e. a political and religious subdivision of the tribe)’; Pol. *brat* m. ‘brother’ (< PSi. **bratrъ*);

8.2 PIE. **b^hréh₂trijōs* adj. ‘pertaining to the brother’ (> IE. **b^hrātrijōs* adj. ‘id.’), e.g. Gk. φράτριος, Ion. φρήτριος adj. ‘belonging to the phratry; protecting the phratry’;

8.3 PIE. **b^hréh₂trijōm* n. abstr. ‘a quality or a state connected with the brothers, brotherhood, fraternity (in an abstract sense)’ (> IE. **b^hrātrijōm* n. ‘id.’), e.g. Gk. Φράτριον n. ‘temple used by a phratry’;

8.4 PIE. **b^hreh₂trijóm* n. coll. ‘a group of brothers, brotherhood, fraternity’ (> IE. **b^hrātrijóm* n. ‘id.’); Ved. *bhrātryám* n. coll. ‘brotherhood, fraternity’; Ru. dial. *братьё*, *братья* coll. ‘brothers, brotherhood’, Bel. *братрыя* n., Ukr. *браття* n. ‘id.’ (< PSI. **bratr₂je* n. coll. ‘brothers, brotherhood’).

The derivational processes which must have been in play in this sequence can be reconstructed in the following way: starting from the final stage, PIE. **b^hreh₂trijóm*, as a collective noun, is derived from the nomen abstractum **b^hréh₂trijōm* by a change of stress. It seems to be highly probable that the collective nouns in **-ijóm* were derived from the related barytone abstracts in **-ijōm* (see 8.3) by an opposition of the original Indo-European stress.

This abstract noun, in turn, is derived from the adjective **b^hréh₂trijōs* by conversion (the stem remains intact, only the inflectional endings change). The earliest stage of derivation consisted in adjective formation, i.e. **b^hréh₂trijōs* from **b^hréh₂ters*.

An alternative way of creating collective nouns in Proto-Indo-European relies on the following feminine variant:

8.5 PIE. **b^hreh₂trijeh₂* f. coll. ‘a group of brothers, brotherhood’ (> IE. **b^hrātrijā* f. coll. ‘id.’), e.g. Gk. Att. φράτριά f. coll. ‘brotherhood; tribe, clan; a subdivision of the phyle in Athens’; Lith. dial. *brotiĵa*, *brotiĵà* f. ‘circle of the most faithful friends’; OCS. *братрѣя*, OSln. *bratria*, OČak. (XV w.) *bratrja*, ORu. *братрѣя* f. coll., OPol. *bratrza* f. coll., LSorb. (dated) *bratša*, USorb. *bratřa* pl. ‘brothers’, Cz. *bratři* pl. ‘brothers’, Sla. *braträ* pl. ‘brothers’ (< BSl. **brātrijā* f. coll. ‘brotherhood, brothers’).

The feminine collectives in question seem to demonstrate the paroxytone stress falling on the short vowel *-ĭ-*, as documented by lexical data given above (8.5). In other words, the feminine collectives derived by means of the suffix **-ĭeh₂* were in accentual opposition not only to the adjectives and abstract nouns in **-ijō-* demonstrating barytone stress (see 8.2 & 8.3) but also to the neuter collectives in **-ijóm* showing original oxytonesis (8.4).

9 Conclusions

Collective nouns in **-bje*, once productive in most Slavic languages, cannot be treated as a purely Proto-Slavic innovation. Like the feminine collectives in **-bja*, they seem to represent an Indo-European heritage. In fact, there are numerous exact

or parallel formations in the Germanic and Indo-Aryan languages, as well as in the Hellenic and Tocharian subgroups.

ABBREVIATIONS LANGUAGES & DIALECTS

Att. – Attic; Bel. – Belorussian; BSl. – Balto-Slavic; Cz. – Czech; Du. – Dutch; E. – English; Elfd. – Elfdalian (Övdalian); Far. – Faroese; G. – German; Gk. – Greek; Go. – Gothic; Hitt. – Hittite; HLuw. – Hieroglyphic Luwian; Icel. – Icelandic; IE. – Indo-European; Ion. – Ionic; Lac. – Laconian; Lat. – Latin; Latv. – Latvian; Lith. – Lithuanian; LSorb. – Low Sorbian; Luw. – Luwian; Lyc. – Lycian; MBulg. – Middle Bulgarian; MDu. – Middle Dutch; MHG. – Middle High German; Norw. – Norwegian; OČak. – Old Čakavian; OCS. – Old Church Slavic; OCz. – Old Czech; OE. – Old English; OHG. – Old High German; ON. – Old Norse; OPol. – Old Polish; OPrus. – Old Prussian; ORu. – Old Russian; OSax. – Old Saxonian; OSln. – Old Slovenian; OSw. – Old Swedish; PG. – Proto-Germanic; PIE. – Proto-Indo-European; Pol. – Polish; PSl. – Proto-Slavic; Ru. – Russian; SC. – Serbo-Croatian; Sla. – Slovak; Sln. – Slovenian; Sp. – Spanish; Sw. – Swedish; Ukr. – Ukrainian; USorb. – Upper Sorbian; Ved. – Vedic.

GLOSSES

abstr. – abstract; adj. – adjective; c. – genus commune; coll. – collective; dial. – dialectal; e.g. – exempli gratia; f. – feminine; gen. – genitive; id. – idem / the same meaning; i.e. – id est / that is; m. – masculine; n. – neuter; pl. – plural; sg. – singular; s.v. – sub voce.

REFERENCES

- Anton BAJEC, 1950: *Besodotvorje slovenskoga jezika*. Vol. I. Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Andrzej BAŃKOWSKI, 1972: Rzeczowniki zbiorowe od nazw drzew w toponimii polskiej. *Język Polski* 52. 281–286.
- Andrzej BAŃKOWSKI, 2000: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Vol. II. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Samuil Borisovič BERNSTEIN, 1985: *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich. Alternacje. Tematy imienne*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Henryk BOREK, 1988: Górnośląskie nazwy miejscowe typu *Bucze, Turze, Zawodzie*. *Wokół języka. Rozprawy i studia poświęcone pamięci profesora Mieczysława Szymczaka*. Ed. Mieczysław Basaj. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. 87–96.
- Wiesław BORYŚ, 2007: *Etymologie słowiańskie i polskie. Wybór studiów z okazji 45-lecia pracy naukowej*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

- Karl BRUGMANN, Berthold DELBRÜCK, 1906: *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. I. Teil. 1. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Thomas BURROW, 1973: *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Rick DERKSEN, 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- James DIGGLE (ed.), 2021: *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hjalmar S. FALK, Alf TORP, 1910–1911: *Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. I–II. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Vilim FRANČIĆ, 1961: *Budowa słowotwórcza serbochorwackich kolektywów*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- Matthias FRITZ, Michael MEIER-BRÜGGER, 2021: *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Grażyna HABRAJSKA, 1995: *Collectiva w języku polskim*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Grażyna HABRAJSKA, Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK, 1994: Słowiańskie kolektywa drzewne na -bje i ich indoeuropejska geneza. *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 49/1. 31–39.
- Grażyna HABRAJSKA, Mikołaj RYCHŁO, Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK, 2020: Collective Nouns Denoting Trees in the Scandinavian Languages. *Scandinavian Philology* 18/2. 261–83.
- Alexander JÓHANNESON, 1956: *Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Blaž JURIŠIĆ, 1992: *Nacrt hrvatske slovnice II. Tvorba imenica u povijesnom razvoju*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Elwira KACZYŃSKA, 2019: Laconian βοῦα ‘Band of Boys’ as a Collective Noun. *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 14/1. 93–103.
- Alwin KLOEKHORST, 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Hans KRAHE, Wolfgang MEID, 1967: *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Vol. III: *Wortbildungslehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bogusław KREJA, 1988: Zagadnienie polskich kolektywnych nazw miejscowych typu *Brzezie, Pustkowie*. *Gdańskie Studia Językoznawcze* 4. 41–82.
- Guus KROONEN, 2013: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Roman, LASKOWSKI, 1996: *Derywacja rzeczowników w dialektach laskich. Vol. I: Abstracta, collectiva, deminutiva, augmentativa*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Danuta LECH-KIRSTEIN, 2015: Nazwy drzew w śląskiej toponimii. *Onomastica* 59. 223–39.
- Henry George LIDDELL, Robert SCOTT, 1996: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Ranko MATASOVIĆ, 2005: Collectives in -bje in Slavic. *Suvremena Lingvistika* 59–60/1–2. 35–38.
- Ranko MATASOVIĆ, 2014: *Slavic Nominal Word-Formation. Proto-Indo-European Origins and Historical Development*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Antoine MEILLET, André VAILLANT. 1934: *Le slave commun*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion.

- Ewa MIANOWICZ, 1975. Formant *-bje* w serbochorwackich toponimicznych kolektywach od nazw drzew. *Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego. Filologia Rosyjska* 5. 55–66.
- Franco MONTANARI, 2018: *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Julius POKORNY, 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern, München: Francke Verlag.
- Stanisław ROSPOND, 1971: *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Izabela RÓŻYCKA, 1989: Nazwy buk (*Fagus sylvatica*), cis (*Taxus baccata*), jawor (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), modrzew (*Larix polonica*) i pochodne w toponimii polskiej. *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica* 20. 53–99.
- Barbara RYKIEL-KEMPF, 1985: *Budowa słowotwórcza nazw zbiorowych w języku polskim XVII wieku*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Franciszek SŁAWSKI (ed.), 1974, 1979, 2001: *Słownik prasłowiański*. Tom I. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk 1974; Tom III. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk 1979; Tom VIII. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków 2001: Zakład Narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo PAN.
- Franciszek SŁAWSKI, 2011: *Słowotwórstwo, słownictwo i etymologia słowiańska*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Wojciech SMOCZYŃSKI, 2018: *Lithuanian Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. I–V. Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Ralph Lilley TURNER, 1966: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- André VAILLANT, 1964: *Manuel du vieux slave*. Vol. I: *Grammaire*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- Jan DE VRIES, 1977: *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Krzysztof Tomasz WITCZAK, 2016: Nierozpoznane collectivum w językach tocharskich: toch. A *pratri* 'bracia'. *Roczniki Humanistyczne* 64/9. 119–33.
- Веслав БОРЫСЬ, 1979: Аб некаторых беларускіх лексічных архаізмах. *Беларуская лінгвістыка* 15. 47–53.
- [Wiesław BORYŚ, 1979: Ab nekatoryh belaruskich leksičnyh arhaizmah. *Belaruskaja linhvistika* 15. 47–53.]
- Анатолій Павлович НЕПОКУПНИЙ (ed.), 1998: *Общая лексика германских и балто-славянских языков*. Киев: Наукова думка.
- [Anatolij Pavlovič NEPOKUPNYJ (ed.), 1998: *Obščaja leksika germanskih i balto-slavjanskih jazykov*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.]
- Олег Николаевич ТРУБАЧЕВ (ed.), 1974, 1977, 1990: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Том I. Москва 1974; Том IV. Москва 1977; Том XVI. Москва 1990: Наука.
- [Oleg Nikolaevič TRUBAČEV (ed.), 1974, 1977, 1990: *Étimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskih jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Tom I. Moskva 1974; Tom IV. Moskva 1977; Tom XVI. Moskva 1990: Nauka.]

- Олег Николаевич ТРУБАЧЕВ, Анатолий Федорович ЖУРАВЛЕВ (eds.), 2005: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*. Том XXXII. Москва: Наука.
- [Oleg Nikolaevič TRUBAČEV, Anatolij Fedorovič ŽURAVLEV (eds.), 2005: *Ětimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskih jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Tom XXXII. Moskva: Nauka.]
- Макс ФАСМЕР, 1986: *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Т. II. Москва: Прогрес.
- [Maks VASMER, 1986: *Ětimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Т. II. Moskva: Progres.]

POVZETEK

V prispevku je postavljena hipoteza o indoevropskem izvoru slovanskih kolektivnih (zbirnih) samostalnikov na **-bje*, pri čemer je v dveh točkah v kritični pretres vzeta in nadgrajena interpretacija Ranka Matasovića o tej problematiki iz leta 2005. Indoevropski jeziki izkazujejo dva sorodna tipa kolektivov, in sicer na **-iġom* in **-iġeh₂*, prim. psl. **bratrbje* s kol. 'bratje, bratovščina', ved. *bhrātryām* s kol. 'bratovščina', toh. A *pratri* 'bratje' vs. psl. **bratrbja* ž kol. 'bratje, bratovščina', at. gr. φράτριά ž kol. 'pleme, rod, rodbina; fratrija, bratovščina'. Navedeni skupini tvorjenk morata biti obravnavani v medsebojni zvezi. Kolektivi srednjega spola so nedvomno izpričani v germanščini: stnord. *birki* s 'brezov gozd, brezje' (< pgerm. **berkijan*) in so v zvezi s psl. **berzbje* s 'brezov gozd, brezje'. Pojavljajo se tudi na zahodnobaltskem prostoru (prim. stprus. *pannean* s 'jarek, rov' = pgerm. **fanijan* s kol. 'močvirje, barje'). Poleg tega je tovrstno gradivo znano iz stare indijsčine, grščine in toharščine. Sklepna ugotovitev je, da praslovanski kolektivi na **-bje* niso besedotvorna inovacija (nastali niso niti iz praslovanskih abstraktnih samostalnikov na **-bje* niti iz indoevropskih samostalniških *i*-jevskih osnov). Povedano drugače, praslovanski kolektivi na **-bje* so indoevropska dediščina. Sklenemo torej lahko, da se je v severni kot tudi indijski indoevropsčini pripona **-iġom* (s) uporabljala v kolektivnem (zbirnem) pomenu.