

Steven YOUNG

*University of Maryland Baltimore County***SLAVIC *gǫrdь : LITH. (pa)girtas**

Vaillant states simply, in regard to the etymology of Slavic *gǫrdь (OCS *грьдъ* ‘arrogant’, Ru. *зордый* ‘proud’), “inexpliqué” (1950–77 IV 263). Indeed, previous attempts at etymologies remain unconvincing, among them a proposed connection with Lat. *gurdus* ‘тупой, глупый’ (Vasmer I 440); Brückner’s connection between *gǫrdь and *gǫrbь, rejected on semantic grounds by ESSJa (VII 207); and Pokorny’s attempt to relate *gǫrdь to the set of Balto-Slavic *grūdīō ‘I stamp’, Slavic *grustь* ‘sorrow, grief’, *gruda* ‘clod of earth’ (IEW 460f.: *ghrēu-* : *ghrēu-* : *ghrū-* ‘scharf darüber reiben, zerreiben’), rejected by ESSJa this time on phonetic grounds (**grud-* cannot serve as the basis of **gurd-*). ESSJa (loc. cit.) also rejects proposed connections with Lat. *grossus* ‘fat’, Lat. *grandis* ‘large’, and Gk. *βρένθος* ‘arrogance’. Since the semantics of *gǫrdь in South Slavic reflects the (negative) range “terrible, ugly, repulsive,” alongside “proud, haughty” elsewhere¹, ESSJa (loc. cit.) finds in *gǫrdь an “expressive-innovative” element, and proposes (comparing Lith. *gurdūs* ‘feeble, weak’, Latv. *guīds* ‘weary’, Gr. *βραδύς* [**g^urdus*] ‘slow’) a semantic development: “застывший > малоподвижный > чопорный, гордый,” but this seems no more convincing than the other proposals.

Since the closely-related meanings “proud” and “haughty, arrogant” are found in Old Church Slavic and are the basic meanings of *gǫrdь* across East and West Slavic (see ESSJa, loc. cit.), it seems natural to start from this semantic set and seek an appropriate formal comparandum. One possibility which has thus far been overlooked, undoubtedly because the phonetic correspondences are less than obvious, is a connection with the Baltic root *gír- ‘praise’ (Lith. *girti*, past participle/adjective *pagirtas*, Latv. *dziīrt*, OPr. *girtwei*), IEW 478 *g^{er}(ə)- ‘die Stimme erheben, bes. loben, preisen...’, Mallory-A dams 449 *g^{er}h_x- ‘praise’, also found in Slavic *žerti (OCS *žьrо, žrěti*) in the meaning of “sacrifice” (< “honor the gods [in time of sacrifice] vocally [in word or song]”: Mažulis 374 [s. v. *girtwei*]).

In this light, Slavic *gǫrdь may be seen as referring to the sentiment of self-esteem that one feels upon receiving praise: one is proud, “praised.” This basic sense of “praised, proud” can easily acquire the more negative sense of overweening pride,

¹ Osten-Sacken 1911, 419 is undoubtedly right in suggesting that these are in fact two distinct bases, with the South Slavic forms belonging to the family of *grustь* ‘sorrow, grief’.

as it has in East and West Slavic where, alongside “proud,” recurrent meanings are “haughty, arrogant.” The reflexive forms of **gír-* in Baltic, Lith. *girtis*, Latv. *džir̃tiēs* (= *liel̃ties*) ‘to boast, brag, swagger’, literally “praise oneself,” approach this sense of “superbus” and thereby provide additional support for a comparison of **gír-* with the Slavic adjective in question. The same semantic extension of a base “praise” is found in other derivations: Lith. *pagyrà* ‘praise’, but *pagyru puodas*, *pagyru maišas* ‘braggart’ (LKŽe), *pagyrūnas* ‘boaster, swaggerer, braggart’. Indeed the Russian deadjectival reflexive verb *горд́иться* ‘be proud of, pride oneself on’ can also take on the same sense of “boast, strut, swagger”: Dal’ I 933: *горд́иться* “быть гордым, кичиться, зазнаваться, чваниться, спесивиться, хвалиться чем-либо, тщеславиться.”

Turning now to the phonetics of the proposed equation Slavic **gǫrdь* : Lith. (*pa*)*girtas*, there are two structure points that require comment: Baltic **gír-* shows an *-i-* vocalism, while Slavic **gǫrdь* has *-u-*; and (*pa*)*girtas* shows a regular *-t-* participial formation, while **gǫrdь* presents a *-d-* suffix of uncertain origin.

The *-ur-* of Slavic **gǫrdь* is in fact the expected Balto-Slavic outcome of a syllabic liquid after an Indo-European labiovelar (Vaillant 1950-77 I 171ff.)²; the *-ur-* reflex is found for example in Slavic **gǫrdlo* ‘throat’ ≅ Lith. *gurkl̃ys*, from a root formally similar to the “praise” base: **g^wer(h₃)-* ‘swallow’ (Mallory-Adams 175; Slavic **žerti* of OCS *po-žrěti* ‘swallow’, Lith. *gerti* ‘drink’), with the reduced grade *-i-* of a regular ablaut series introduced in Lith. *girtas* ‘drunk’ (homonymous with “praised”)³.⁴ In our case, **gǫrdь*, semantically isolated from its original base (Slavic has introduced the denominals **xvaliti*, **slaviti* for “praise”), preserves the original phonetic development unaffected by a regular ablaut series (as does the Old Indic cognate *gūrtá-* ‘pleasant’: Mažiulis 374: OInd. *gūr-táh* ‘malonus’ < **“pagirt(in)as”* = Balt. **gír-tas* “pagirtas, gelobt” > Lith. *girtas* ‘id.’). Baltic **gír-*, on the other hand, shows a refashioned reduced grade of an ablaut series in which the connection with the full grade (cf. Lith. *geras* ‘good’, from the same base: Mažiulis 374: “gut, tüchtig < **giriamas*, *pagirtas*”) was still felt.

The *-d-* of Slavic **gǫrdь* vis-à-vis the *-t-* participle of Baltic is less amenable to explanation. Vaillant 1950-77 IV 489 points to a number of Slavic adjectives in

² For a discussion of theories of *-iR-* and *-uR-* reflexes of Balto-Slavic syllabic resonants—the “alternation theory” of Baudouin de Courtenay, Mikkola, and Endzelin on the one hand, and the “phonetic environment theory” of Fortunatov, Vaillant, and Kurylowicz on the other – see Shevelov 1964, 86-90, who argues in favor of the latter.

³ Thus promoting word-play such as “Girtas — nepagirtas” (LKŽe, s. v. *pagirti*).

⁴ Another well-known example of this sort is found in the various Balto-Slavic outcomes of IE **g^when-* ‘strike’: Slavic inf. *gъnati* ‘drive cattle’ (also OPr. *guntwei*) : full-grade present *ženō*, but Lith. inf. *giñti* ‘drive cattle’, which shows regularized reduced grade introduced from the ablaut series *-i- ~ -e- ~ -o-*.

-dъ, among them **gǫrdъ*, of various obscure origins. It is also possible that the Slavic *-d-* element is identical to the one found in the Baltic word for “hear” (Lith. *girdėti* (*gĩrdĩ*), Latv. *dzirdēt*, Latv. *dzirde* ‘hearing’), which Fraenkel I 153 links to the “praise” root (but we then must account for metatony in the circumflex base of “hear”). Toporov 1979 248 likewise notes a *-d-* element in the Celtic word for “bard,” traceable to the “praise” root: “Значение ‘петь’, ‘славить’ имплицитно содержится в др.-ирл. *bard*, кимр. *bardd* (**gʷr̥-d/h/o-s*), галльск.–латинск. *bardus* ‘бард’, ‘певец.’” Finally, Mallory-Adams 436 tentatively suggests a phrase: **gʷr̥h̥_x-dheh₁* ‘put praise’ on the basis of Av. *garām dā-*, OInd. *giraṃ dā* ‘give praise’. One of these possibilities may conceivably account for the *-d-* element in **gǫrdъ*.

Be that as it may, there is one incontrovertible parallel to our *(pa)girtas* : **gǫrdъ* equation, which also shows a Baltic *t* and a Slavic *d*: the adjectival (resp. participial) pair Lith. *tvirtas* ‘strong, firm’ (cf. *tvėrti* ‘seize, snatch; fence, enclose’), Latv. *tvirts* ‘firm, solid’ (cf. *tvērt* ‘seize, grasp’) : Slavic **tvǫrdъ* (Ru. *твёрдый*) ‘hard, firm’, where the Slavic form is (like **gǫrdъ*) isolated both in formation and meaning: there is no directly corresponding verb, as there is in Baltic. The parallelism continues through derived forms: OCS *tvrbъdъni* ‘Bollwerk, Befestigung’, ORu. *tvrbъdъnja* ‘Gefängnis, Festung, Schutz’ (glosses cited after Holzer 1989 150): **gǫrdъni* in OCS *grъdъni*, Ru. *гордыня* ‘arrogance’.

Holzer 1989 (150f.) includes Slavic *tvǫrdъ* in the material he uses to demonstrate a set of otherwise unexpected sound correspondences in (Balto-)Slavic, which allegedly reflect borrowings from an unknown, perhaps Cimmerian, adstratum. In the language of this adstratum, Indo-European voiced aspirated stops were devoiced and voiceless stops merge with voiced, which do not change. Additionally, *TeRT* clusters result in an acute *TiRT*. Slavic *tvǫrdъ* represents, then, according to Holzer, an adstratum **tuĩrdo-* from IE **dhuerto-* ‘provided with doors or gates’ (although Holzer does not mention it, the acute of the root is not demonstrable in Slavic, which has a mobile accent paradigm). He also sees the Baltic cognates, Lith. *tvirtas*, Latv. *tvirts*, as products of this adstratum, although formed with a different suffix: **tuĩrto-* < IE **dhuerdho-*, with the same meaning. He thus treats at least the Baltic forms as independently derived words with original full grade, rather than participial forms of a verb (the latter is found in Lith. *tvėrtas* ‘ergriffen’: Fraenkel II 1155).

While this approach is intriguing, and for some of the material even persuasive, in these cases it means dismissing regular ablaut alternations in which the *-t-* participle shows reduced grade, which seems too radical a step. Also, this approach would presumably not account for Slavic *gǫrdъ*, with its *-u-* vocalism. We are left with the more traditional possibilities for *-t-* vis-à-vis *-d-* presented above, and the fact of

**tvǫrdь* : *tvirtas*, formally parallel to **gǫrdь* : (*pa*)*girtas*. Slavic **gǫrdь* ‘proud’ in this view represents a semantic and formal isolate in comparison with the Baltic **gír-* base, a situation which is not a typical (recall Slavic **rǫka* ‘hand’ : Lith. *rankà* : *riñkti* ‘gather’).

SLAVU **gǫrdь* : LIE. (*pa*)*girtas*

Santrauka

Sl. **gǫrdь* gali būti aiškinamas kaip priesagos *-d-* vedinys iš šaknies, baltų kalbose reiškiančios ‘girti’ (lie. *girti*, la. *dziřt*, pr. *girtwei*).

REFERENCES

Dal’ – В. И. Даль, И. А. Бодуэн–де–Куртенэ, Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка, 3-ье издание, С.–Петербург, 1903–1909.

Fraenkel – E. Fraenkel, Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I–II, Heidelberg, 1962–1965.

ESSJa – О. Н. Трубачев (ред.), Этимологический словарь славянских языков, I–, Москва, 1974–.

Holzer G., 1989, Entlehnungen aus einer bisher unbekanntem indogermanischen Sprache im Urslavischen und Urbaltischen, Wien.

IEW – J. Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Bern–München, 1958.

LKŽe – J. Kruopas, et al., Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, I–XX, Vilnius, 1968–2002. Electronic version: <http://www.lkz.lt>.

Mallory-Adams – J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams (eds.), Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture, London and Chicago, 1997.

Mažiulis – V. Mažiulis, Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas, I. A–H, Vilnius, 1988.

Osten-Sacken W., 1911, Die Bedeutungssphäre der Eigenschaftsabstrakta auf slav. *-oba*, – Indogermanische Forschungen, XXVIII, 416–24.

Shevelov G. Y., 1964, A prehistory of common Slavic. The historical phonology of common Slavic, Heidelberg.

Топоров – В. Н. Топоров, Прусский язык. Словарь, Е–Н, Москва, 1979.

Vaillant A., Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, I–V, Paris, 1950–77.

Vasmer – М. Фасмер, Этимологический словарь русского языка. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения члена–корреспондента АН СССР О. Н. Трубачева, I–IV, Москва, 1986–87.

Steven YOUNG

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics

University of Maryland Baltimore County

1000 Hilltop Circle

Baltimore, MD 21250 USA

[young@umbc.edu]