З Б О Р Н И К
МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ
LXI/2

МАТИЦА СРПСКА
ОДЕЉЕЊЕ ЗА КЊИЖЕВНОСТ И ЈЕЗИК
ЗБОРНИК
МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ

MATICA SERBICA
CLASSIS LITTERARUM
ARCHIVUM PHILOLOGICUM ET LINGUISTICUM

Покренут 1957. године
До XXVI књиге (1983) излазио под називом *Зборник за филологију и лингвистику*

LXI/2

ISSN-0352-5724 | UDK 80/81(082)

З Б О Р Н И К

МАТИЦЕ СРПСКЕ
ЗА ФИЛОЛОГИЈУ И ЛИНГВИСТИКУ

LXI/2

НОВИ САД
2018

UDC 811.1'37
Изворни научни рад

Aljoša Milenković

SCR. *KRD*(*O*) 'HERD'*

Initial **k* in SCr. *krd*(*o*) 'herd' < PIE **ḱr̥dʰ*- is a result of the PIE depalatalization before **r̥*, while BSl. **k* which underlies PSl. **č*- in **čerda* and **čerdъ* is analogical, originating either from the zero-grade root **ḱr̥dʰ*- or from the *e*-grade root with the *s*-mobile, where PIE **k* yields PIE **k* regularly.

Key words: Indo-European, Balto-Slavic, depalatalization, analogy.

Иницијално *к* у сх. *крȍ*(*о*) < пие. **ḱr̥dʰ*- настаје пие. депалатализацијом палатовелара испред **r̥*, док је бсл. **k* на које се своди **č*- у псл. **čerda* и **čerdъ* аналошког порекла, из нултог превојног степена корена и(ли) из *e*-степена са мобилним **s*, где пие. **ḱ* даје пие. **k* по правилу.

Кључне речи: индоевропски, балтословенски, депалатализација, аналогија.

1. Introduction. SCr. *krdo* 'herd' has, with related words, drawn a lot of attention from the researchers so far. Still, certain questions remain unanswered. In this article, we seek to explain its origin, focusing on its most controversial problem: the question of the initial velar stop. The rise of the plain velar in the Balto-Slavic root underlying SCr. *kȓdo* is completely regular, while it was expected, though not phonemically regular in some BSl. cognates, which is going to be elaborated in what follows.

2. Data. The variants found in SCr. are *kȓdo* and *kr̂do*, besides *kȓd*/*kr̂d* (Vuk 1852: 300, RJA V: 497–498). Derived terms include: *krdášce* 'little herd' (RJA V: 498, RSA X: 473), *krdéljak* 'id.' (RSA X: 473, RMS III: 48), *kŕdak* 'id.' (RSA X: 473, RMS III: 48), *kȑdār*[1] 'herdsman' (RJA V: 498, RSA X: 473), *kȑdāš* 'id.' (RSA X: 473), *kȑdōvnīk* 'id.' (RSA X: 474), *krdàrica* 'female herdsman' (RJA V: 498, RSA X: 473), *krdàšica* 'name of the sheep' (RSA X: 473), *kȑdōvnica* 'sheep' (RSA X: 474) *krdelo* 'herd' (RJA V: 498), *krdnica*[2] 'sow' (RJA V: 498), *kŕditi*, praes 1sg *kr̂dīm* 'gather in a herd' (RJA V: 498, RSA X: 474), adjective *kr̂dskī*/*kȓdskī* (RSA X: 474) and adverb *kȑdimicē* 'like a herd' (RSA X: 474). Some of the Slavic cognates are:

* I owe a great debt of gratitude to Professor Orsat Ligorio, who read the draft of this paper and helped me with his useful comments. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers, whose comments were highly influential on the final look of the text, having led to its considerable extension at some points. I take full responsibility for what is claimed in the article.

[1] In RMS (III: 48) one finds *kŕdār*, which does not seem to have the correct accent.

[2] Words *krdelo* and *krdnica* are unstressed in RJA (loc. cit.) and unattested in other sources.

Sln. *krdẹ̑lọ*[3] 'herd' (Pleteršnik 1894: 460–461; *krdȩ̄lo* Snoj 2009: 320); Mcd. *крдар* 'id.', verb *крди* (ESSJa XIII: 213); Cz. dial. *kŕdel'* 'herd' (Machek 1968: 291), Kash. *karno* 'id.'[4] (< PSl. **kъrdьno*) and so on.

They all descended from PSl. **kъrd-*, the zero-grade of **kerd-* (> **čerd-*). The full grade **čerd-* is attested in SCr. *čréda* (Vuk 1818: 906), *črijèda* 'turn' (RJA II: 78–79), *črêd, črédo* 'id.' (RJA II: 77), *črèdār* 'herdsman' (RJA II: 77), Čak. *črēdȁ* (Novi), *črīdȁ* (Vrgada) 'flock of sheep', Sln. *črẹ́da* 'id.' (Pleteršnik 1894: 109), Rus. *чередá* 'sequence', OPl. *czrzoda* 'herd' (Pl. *trzoda* 'id.'), Cz. *třída* 'row', Slov. *črieda* 'herd' etc. (Derksen 2008: 81–82, ESSJa IV: 60–63, SP II: 150–151).

On the other hand, P. Skok was inclined to think that the jekavian word *črijèda*, found in RJA, was constructed by the authors of RJA on the basis of the corresponding form *čréda* and unattested in SCr. dialects (ERHSJ I: 337). It is also claimed (loc. cit.) that *čréda* (Vuk 1818: 906) is not the expected Neo-Štokavian correspondence of Čak. *črēdȁ*, but a loanword from Church Slavonic. The other indicator that NŠtok. *čréda* is in fact a loanword from Church Slavonic is the preservation of the initial cluster *čr-*. For late PSl. **čr-*, one would expect Štok. *cr-* (Ivić 2001: 23, Carlton 1991: 330), as in PSl. **čer̂vo* >> NŠtok. *crévo/crijèvo* 'intestine' (with unexpected accent, unlike Čak. *črîvo* [Jurišić 1973: 38]); PSl. **čer̂pъ* > NŠtok. *crêp/cȑjep* 'tile'. If so, the only reliable dialectal attestations in Serbo-Croatian are the above-mentioned Čakavian forms.

2.1. The accent of the examined words seems to be straightforward (in terms of the Proto-Slavic and Balto-Slavic reconstruction). A majority of the Slavic descendants point to the stress pattern B for both PSl. **čerdà* and **čer̃dъ*, cf. Rus. *чередá*, acc sg *чередý*; NŠtok. *čréda*, acc sg *črédu* (however, Skok's objection on this form should be born in mind), Sln. *črẹ́da*; as well as Cz. *třída*, Slov. *črieda*, US *črjóda* and Kash. *strzóda* 'herd', with preserved pretonic length, which is completely expected in the stress pattern B. For Kashubian, cf. *strzóda* 'herd' (B) vs. *strzoda* 'Wednesday', the latter being derived from PSl. **serdà*, acc sg **ser̂dǫ*, cf. NŠtok. *sréda/srijèda*, acc sg *srêdu/sȑjedu* (Daničić 1925: 4). The length was obviously preserved in Slc. *střṓu̯dă* 'herd' (SW: 1113) as well,[5] since late PSl. **o* yielded Slc. *ȯu̯* only if long ("in der Langstufe"), Lorentz 1903: 78, but was reflected as *u̶o̶* (if stressed) or *o̶* (if unstressed) "in der Kurzstufe", cf. therefore the difference between *střṓu̯dă* (< PSl. [?] **čerdà*, s.p. B)[6] and *střù̶o̶dă* 'Wednesday' (SW: 1114) < PSl. **serdȁ*, s.p. C. Only a few forms belong to the stress pattern C, like Čak. *črēdȁ*, acc sg *črêdu* (Belić 1909: 238) and Pol. *trzoda*, which was observed by K. Bogatyrev (1995: 70). In Polish, words of the stress pattern B whose

[3] From a derivational point of view, Sln. *krdẹ̑l* 'herd' (which points to s.p. B, see below the discussion on the accent) seems quite odd, since the *-ělь*-suffixation was a productive model of deriving deverbative *nomina abstracta* in Proto-Slavic (Vaillant 1974: 559–560). However, Sln. *krdẹ̑l* was neither *nomen abstractum* nor deverbative. Therefore, Vaillant concluded that Sln. *krdẹ̑l* did not belong with other **-ělь*-derivates ("est à part de la série des abstraits et sûrement d'autre origine"; 1974: 560).

[4] Kashubian examples are taken mostly from KSR.

[5] However, the variant with short stem-vowel has also been recorded (Stankiewicz 1993: 295). This is comparable with Pl. *trzoda*.

[6] F. Lorentz (loc. cit.) considered it to be a descendant of PSl. **čerda*. For detailed analysis, see the section 5.4.

underlying forms contained the diphthongs **ol* and **or* in the stem have preserved the vowel length from an earlier stage, cf. Pol. *bruzda* < PSl. **borzdȁ* 'burrow' (B). Čak. *črīdȁ*, *-ẽ* (Jurišić 1973: 38) is inconclusive, as the acc sg form was not recorded. As for PSl. **čeřdъ* (B), cf. Rus. *черёд*, gen sg *череда́*. The word was also attested with mobile accent (s.p. C), cf. Ukr. and Rus. dial. *чéред*, gen sg *чéреда*, which is obviously secondary (Illič-Svityč 1963: 127). The more archaic pattern (Rus. *черёд*) is comparable with Skt. *śárdham*, both of which are derived from the PIE neuter noun **ḱérdʰ-o-m*, since PIE stem-stressed neutra yielded masculine nouns in Balto-Slavic (Illič-Svityč 1963: 123–133). Moreover, PIE barytone masculines with no laryngeal in the stem all acquired mobile accent in Slavic, cf. NŠtok. *zûb*, gen sg *zûba* (C) vs. Gr. γόμφος (Illič-Svityč op.cit.; Kortlandt 1994: 10). This is usually referred to as Illič-Svityč's law and it may serve as another indicator that PSl. **čeřdъ* (B) must go back to a neuter noun in PIE.

Their Baltic (Lithuanian) cognates almost regularly belong to the stress pattern 2, which is the expected counterpart of the PSl. s.p. B: Lith. *(s)keřdžius* (2), *skeřdis* (2, but also 4), Derksen 2015: 238–239; Lith. *kerdis* is unstressed loc. cit. The sustained tone in Latvian *ķẽrdzis* (= Lith. *kerdis*) does not correspond to the Lithuanian circumflex, since the Baltic non-acute vowels were reflected as the falling tone in Latvian, cf. Latv. *rùoka* = Lith. *rankà*, gen sg *rañkos* (Olander 2009: 118; Derksen 1996: 14–15). The said discrepancy is easily explained by assuming a Lith. borrowing in Latvian (Derksen 2015: 238).[7] The Old Prussian cognate *kērdan* is found in the Third Catechism (PEŽ s.v. *kērdan*), in which the tone of a stressed diphthong is indicated with a macron or tilde-like diacritic, as already established by Fortunatov (Rinkevičius 2009: 7; Olander 2009: 121–122). In this case, the diacritic is placed on the first part of the diphthong, indicating the falling tone in OPr. *kērdan*, which regularly corresponds to the circumflex in Lithuanian *(s)keřdžius*.[8]

While the accent of PSl. **čerdȁ*, **čeřdъ* was inherited from Balto-Slavic, NŠtok. *krd* and *krdo* do not appear to be so archaic when it comes to accent. What one finds in Neo-Štokavian is the concurrent use of two patterns in both a masculine and a neuter noun: *kȓd*, *kȓdo* vs. *kr̂d*, *kr̂do*. As they are derived from PSl. **kъrdъ*, **kъrdo*, the short falling accent in Neo-Štokavian could only reflect Proto-Slavic acute, as if there has ever been a pattern **kъr̋dъ*/**kъr̋do*. If even existed in Proto-Slavic, **kъr̋dъ*/**kъr̋do* could not have been inherited from Balto-Slavic and Indo-European, since a laryngeal cannot be reconstructed in the PIE root that the word is derived from (see below). On the contrary, the mobility one finds in NŠtok. *kr̂d*, *kr̂do* < PSl. s.p. C (< PIE oxytona), might be a consequence of the zero-grade root **ḱr̥dʰ-*, in which case this pattern might represent a Balto-Slavic inheritance. The desinential stress in the reconstructed PIE paradigm would account for the fact that the noun remained neuter in Slavic (Illič-Svityč loc. cit.; Kortlandt 1989: 44).[9]

2.2. It is notable that the aforementioned forms are Indo-European in origin, since their cognates have been found in most IE languages, including: Lith. *(s)keřdžius* 'shepherd' (→ Pl. *skierdź*, Rus. *kierd'*, Fraenkel 1962: 242), *skeřdis*, *kerdis* (Derksen

[7] "Latv. *ķẽrdzis* 'stableman at a manor' (probably from Lithuanian)", Derksen 2015: 238.

[8] As a reverse case, cf. OPr. acc pl *geīwans*, Lith. *gývas* (Olander 2009: 118).

[9] It is striking that the form with the long falling accent is the only one attested in Vuk's Dictionary.

2015: 238–239), OPr. *kērdan* ‘time’, Go. *haírda* ‘herd’, *haírdeis* ‘shepherd’ (< PGm. **hirdiyaz* < PIE **ḱerd^h-yo-s*, ie.**ḱerd^h-y-o-s*, Kroonen 2013: 221), Gr. κόρθυς ‘heap’, κορθύνω ‘lift up, raise’, as well as (presumably) Skt. *śardha*(*s*)- ‘troop, host’, Av. *sarəδa-* ‘kind, nature’, OP *θard-* ‘kind’ (Bartholomae 1904: 1566, IEW II: 579), ‘year’ (Kent 1950: 188). MW *cordd* ‘tribe, clan’ is derived from PIE **koryo-* (Matasović 2009: 218), hence it does not belong here, as previously suggested in IEW (II: 579) and later adopted elsewhere (e.g. ERHSJ I: 337, ESJS II: 111, Dronova 2015: 185).

3. The problem. On the basis of such phonological resemblances, we may reconstruct PIE **skerd^h-* : **ḱerd^h-*.[10] The variants found in Lithuanian (*keřdžius* : *skeřdžius*, *kerdis* : *skeřdis*) indicate the presence of the *s*-mobile in the PIE root **(s)ḱerd^h-*, while the Indo-Iranian words point to PIE **ḱ-* in the variant without the *s*-mobile. The proof for PIE **d^h* is found in Skt. *dh*, Go. *d*, Gr. θ, and Balto-Slavic, due to the absence of Winter’s law, whose trace would be the acute stress in Lithuanian. As one finds the circumflex in Lith. (*s*)*keřdžius*, it represents a reflex of the PIE root with aspirated stop. *o*-grade root **ḱord^h-*, without **s-*, yielded Gr. κόρθυς (Beekes 2010: 753).

BSl. **kerd-* (> PSl. **čerd-*, Lith. *kerdž-*) and **kurd-* (> PSl. **kъrd* > SCr. *krdo*) cannot be directly traced back to the proposed PIE **ḱerd^h-* : **ḱr̥d^h-*. Since the expected satem reflexes (PSl. **s*, Lith. *š*) have not arisen, Derksen concludes that “on the basis of Balto-Slavic and Gothic we may reconstruct **(s)kerd^h-eh$_2$*” (2008; 2015: 82; 239).[11]

Bearing in mind what the regular Balto-Slavic reflexes of PIE **ḱ*, **k^w* and **k* are, we may temporarily exclude PIE **ḱ* from the discussion.[12] What can be immediately observed is that we are not dealing with a labiovelar in this case either, cf. Germanic cognates, such as Go. *haírda* and *haírdeis*. The labiovelar **k^w* is regularly reflected as Go. *hv*, cf. Go. *hvas* ‘who’ < PIE **k^{w}os* (OCS *kъ-to*, Skt. *kaḥ*, LAv. *kō*), Go. *leihvan* ‘lend’ < PIE **leik^w-* (Gr. *λείπω*, Lith. praes 3 sg *liẽka*).

On the other hand, Skt. *ś* in *śardha*(*s*)-, Av. *s* in *sarəδa-* and OP *θ* in *θard-* are usually derived from PIIr. **ć* (< PIE **ḱ*). Hence, if we assumed **ḱ* (not **k*) in this root, its expected outcomes would be IIr. **ćardh-* (> Skt. *śardh-*, Av. *sarəδ-*, OP *θard-*), and Lith. *skeřdžius*, where the plain velar would have arisen as the result of the PIE neutralization of velars after **s* (**sḱerd^h-* > **skerd^h-*, cf. Kortlandt 1989; 1994; 2005: 42; 2; 4). For centum languages, like Gothic and Greek, it is not relevant whether the initial velar was plain or palatal. PSl. **kъrd-* (> SCr. *krdo*) is also phonemically regular, as will be pointed out below. Unexpected outcomes include PSl. **čerd-* and Lith. *keřdžius* (< BSl. **kerd-*), which descended from PIE **ḱerd^h-*, without the *s*-mobile, in which there were no conditions for the neutralization of the velar series.

3.1. The other phonological problem regarding SCr. *krdo* is the origin of the root vocalism. Some researchers failed to explain the apophonic relation **kerd-* : **kъrd-* in Proto-Slavic and therefore considered PSl. **kъrd-* to be a borrowing

[10] Also Beekes 2010: 753 (see).
[11] This refers to PSl. **čerdȁ*. Thus one finds the suffix **-eh$_2$*.
[12] As it yielded BSl. **ś* (> Slav., Latv., OPr. *s*, Lith. *š*), cf. Matasović 2008: 86–87.

from Germanic (see ERHSJ I: 337–338). This view has now been abandoned, and PSl. **kъrd-* is believed to originate from the PIE zero-grade root **ḱr̥dʰ-*, which yields PSl. **kъrd-* regularly (see below).

However, one of the anonymous reviewers drew our attention to the fact that the geographic distribution of PSl. **kъrd-* may be indicative of an early borrowing (presumably from Germanic) rather than of an Indo-European inheritance and that, before proceeding to derive PSl. **kъrd-* from the PIE zero-grade root **ḱr̥dʰ-*, a more detailed analysis of the said possibility should be conducted.

It is known that there are two layers of Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic: the earlier – Gothic (before the end of the fifth century), and the later – West Germanic, which coincides with the period when the Proto-Slavs spread into central Europe (Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 6, 50–76; especially 72–74). Besides semantically related words, such as Go. *haírda* and OHG *herta*, our attention was drawn to PGm. **hurdi* (Kroonen 2013: 258). Go. *haúrds* '(lattice) door', a feminine *i*-stem noun, would not have been borrowed as Proto-Slavic **kъrd-*, neither would OHG *hurt*, *hurd* 'hurdle, grate, railing'. When it comes to the adaptation of Germanic fricatives, they "were taken over as such by Proto-Slavs only in those cases where the Proto-Slavic inventory possessed a corresponding fricative" (Pronk-Tiethoff 2013: 229). As the phoneme **x* was a part of the Proto-Slavic inventory, Germanic **h* was taken over as such (see the examples in Pronk-Tiethoff loc. cit). Thus, the idea about deriving PSl. **kъrd-* from (presumably) OHG *hurt*/*hurd* is not supported by the established phonological principles of adapting Germanic loanwords in Proto-Slavic. Furthermore, PSl. **kъrd-* was explicitly connected with PSl. **čerd-* in e.g. ESSJa (IV: 61, and XIII: 213,)[13] ERHJ (498) and Machek 1968: 291.

4. Previous solutions. In this section, we list and discuss some of the most representative previous propositions. Before we proceed, it should be noted that some researchers dealt with the prehistory of the concerned root, making a connection with PIE **(s)ker-* 'cut'[14] (Toporov 1980: 315–323)[15] or **ker-* : **ḱrē-* (sic!) 'feed, take care' (Dronova 2015), mostly on the semantic grounds. However, this question itself has not drawn our attention, as we intend to focus on the question of the anlaut velar.

4.1. *IIr. forms, which might be indicative of PIE *ḱ, and BSl. *(s)kerd- do not have the common origin.*

This explanation was originally suggested by Mayrhofer (KEWA III: 309–310, EWAia II: 619–620). He attributes the phonological discrepancy between the IIr. and BSl. forms to their different origin: BSl. **(s)kerd-* < PIE **(s)kerdʰ-*, while PIIr. **ćardh-* and **ćardha-* "sind ohne gesicherte idg. Verstufe" (EWAia II: 620). This was adopted in SP (II: 151). The author finds some semantic difficulties to connect them, which was dismissed in Lubotsky 2001: 50–51. Even if we reconstructed

[13] However, the possibility of a borrowing from Germanic was not completely abandoned there.

[14] For the root **(s)ker-*, see LIV 556–557.

[15] Since this solution would imply that the Gutturalwechsel has never appeared in the Balto-Slavic descendants of the concerned root (owing to the fact that they would have descended from PIE **(s)ker-* regularly), it was adopted by Lubotsky (2001: 51). As Toporov failed to explain IIr. forms, Lubotsky proposed a new solution (see below).

PIE root **ḱerdʰ*- apart from any form with the mobile **s*-, it would be a problematic solution in view of the phonological structure of PIE root, due to the fact that it would contain a sequence TVRDʰ-,[16] which would violate the rules of Proto-Indo-European phonotactics (Ringe 2006: 8; Kortlandt 2012: 11). However, a radical sequence **s*TV(R)Dʰ- is not only possible but abundantly attested (Lubotsky 2001: 50).

4.2. **ḱ in PIE *ḱerdʰ- lost its palatal feature in Balto-Slavic in order to be distinct from the outcome of PIE *ḱr̥d- (> BSl. *šird- > Lith. šird-ìs, Latv. sird-s, OCS sьrd-ьce 'heart').*

This solution was proposed by the autor(s) of the article *čerda* in ESSJa (IV: 62) and is advocated in Gluhak 1993: 347. It seems ad hoc, since it would account for a single case. It also seems that the assumption about Lith. *skeřdžius* having got its *s*- from semantically related words, such as *skeřsti* 'slaughter', *sérgėti* 'to guard', *sárgas* 'guard' (Fraenkel 1962: 242; Gluhak 1993: 347) is an ad hoc one. In IEW (II: 579) one finds only the root **ḱerdʰ*- and Lith. *skeřdžius* as one of its descendants, without dealing with the origin of *s*-.

4.3. *Skt. ś-, Av. s- and OP θ- point to PIE *skerdʰ- > PIIr. *sčardh-.*

The explanation, originally proposed by Lubotsky (2001: 50–51), implies that the concerned PIE root, which underlies SCr. *kȓd*(*o*)/*kr̂d*(*o*), contained **k*, not **ḱ*, which has previously been reconstructed only on the basis of the IIr. forms anyway. PIE **ske*- was most probably reflected as PIIr. **sča*-, which, if word-initial, yielded Skt. *cha*-, Av. *sa*- and OP *θa*- regularly, cf. Skt. *chadayati*, Av. *sadaiieiti*, OP *θadaya*- (Lubotsky 2001: 30). If so, for PIE **skerdʰ*-, one would expect Skt. **chardh*-, the absence of which is a result of Grassman's law, which operated in this word (PIIr. **sčardh*- > Skt. **chardh*- > Skt. **cardh*- > Skt. *śardh*-; Lubotsky 2001: 50).[17]

This proposition seems to be the most probable one, since it would even account for **k* in BSl. **kerd*-. Nevertheless, it has not gained general acceptance, cf. Beekes 2010: 753, where the palatovelar was reconstructed in the variant without the *s*-mobile (**ḱerdʰ*-). Besides that, PIIr. **sča*- requires *e*-grade PIE root **skerdʰ*-, while in the attested IIr. forms (Skt. *śardha*-, Av. *sarəδa*-, OP *θard*-) one does not find an unambiguous proof of PIE **e*, since Skt., Av., OP *a* could have arisen from both PIE **e* and **o*. IIr. *ā* for PIE **o* would not have arisen here, since the syllable containing it was closed. The *o*-grade root would not be unexpected, cf. the above-mentioned Greek descendants. If so, the only possible source of Skt. *ś*-, Av. *s*- and OP *θ*- could be PIE **ḱ*-.

5. Proposal. Despite the fact that the expected *s*- for the assumed PIE **ḱ*- is not found in the Proto-Slavic descendants, deriving them from PIE **ḱerdʰ*- should not be dismissed.

5.1. Germanic cognates. Go. *haírda*, and *haírdeis* could point out to both PIE **kerdʰ*- and **ḱerdʰ*-, since the regular reflex of PIE **k* and **ḱ* would be equally Go. *h*, cf. Go. *tiuhan* 'pull' < PIE **deuk*- (Lat. *dūcō*, Alb. *nduk*, Kroonen 2013: 515),

[16] T = voiceless stop, V = vowel, R = resonant, Dʰ = aspirated stop.

[17] An explanation such as that (PSl. **čerda* < PIE **kerdʰ-eh₂-ø*, not **ḱerdʰ-eh₂-ø*) was applied in ERHJ (s.v. *krdo*, 498), but without direct reference to Lubotsky 2001.

Go. *háils* 'whole' < PIE **koil-o-s* (OCS *cělъ* 'whole', Derksen 2008: 75),[18] as well as Go. *haírto*, ON *hjarta*, OE *heorte* 'heart', < PIE **ḱerd-* (OCS *sr̥ěda* 'middle', Arm. *sirt*), Go. *taíhun* 'ten' < PIE **dekm̥t* (Skt. *daśa*, Gr. δέκα, Lith. *dẽšimt*, OCS *desętь*).

5.2. Indo-European depalatalizations of palatovelars. The satem languages sometimes exhibit plain velars where palatovelars are reconstructed in their underlying etyma. These exceptions are systematic and some of them were common PIE innovations, while the others seem to have operated within the predecessors of the separate (satem) branches of the Indo-European family, presumably after the breakup of the unitary proto-language. For the sake of argument, we shall take a look at the previous scholarly treatment of the subject.

It was Meillet (1894) who first claimed that PIE **ḱ* > **k* after **s* (Meillet 1894: 194 ff.). This was adopted by Kortlandt (especially 1989 = 1994, 2005), since he believes that "opposition between the velar series was neutralized after *s*" yet in the PIE period (1994: 2), and the conclusions were similar in Villanueva Svensson 2009. In his attempt to establish a relative chronology of the earliest sound changes in Balto-Slavic, Matasović (2005: 148) proposes two depalatalizations in this branch of Indo-European, one of which is the aforementioned obligatory realization of PIE **ḱ* as **k* after **s*. The author (loc. cit.) believes that its result is notable in OCS compound noun *laskrъdь* 'desire', the second part of which (*-krъdь*) can be traced back to PIE **ḱr̥d-* 'heart'. The other one occurred if a palatovelar was succeeded by a resonant and a back vowel (Matasović 2005: 148; also Kortlandt 1978: 239–241). The exact conditions of this sound law are still disputable, since these authors disagree on whether the depalatalization had operated before all resonants (Kortlandt 1978, 2013 passim), or before PIE **m*, **r* and **l* exclusively (Matasović loc. cit.). Some unquestionable examples of the development in discussion are: OCS *svekry* 'mother-in-law' < PIE **swekruh*$_2$ (Skt. *śvaśrū* 'id.', Lat. *socrus* 'id.', Derksen 2008: 475), PIE **h*$_2$*ekm-on-s* (?) > PIE **h*$_2$*ekm-ōn* > OCS *kamy* 'stone', Lith. *akmuõ* 'id.' (Gr. ἄκμων 'anvil').

Still, Balto-Slavic data betray one more depalatalization which, like Meillet's neutralization of velars after **s*, was a common Indo-European development. Palatovelars yielded plain velars in front of syllabic liquids (**r̥* and **l̥*), which allows us to explain Rus. *жёлтый* 'yellow', *зóлото* 'gold' and *зелёный* 'green' as descendants of the same PIE root **ǵ*^{h}*el-*, in different apophonic grades (Kortlandt 2013: 13). The results of this change have been obscured by later analogical leveling, as in OCS *sьrd-ьce* 'heart' << PIE **ḱr̥d-*, which would be expected to have yielded OCS **čьrd-ьce*, but the initial **s-* was taken from the full grade **serd-* (OCS *sr̥ěda*), where the depalatalization did not take place (Kortlandt 1978; 2013: 239; 13). Thus, Matasović's example of depalatalization after **s* (OCS *laskrъdь*) could easily be explained as an instance of **ḱ* > **k* before **r̥*. It is additionally questionable whether the Slavic compound itself was inherited from Proto-Indo-European, namely whether it even existed when the depalatalization after **s* had operated. Otherwise, it would only exhibit the preservation of the expected BSl. outcome of PIE **ḱr̥d-*, which was not influenced by the full-grade root **ḱerd-* being

[18] On the other hand, Meillet (1894: 279) argued that Go. *háils* exhibited the loss of the labial feature in front of a round vowel in Germanic. However, this has to do with his hypothesis about only two velar series in the proto-language.

a part of a compound, unlike the simple noun *sъrdьce*.[19] This kind of depalatalization was indeed Proto-Indo-European, as its traces have been found elsewhere, e.g. in Indo-Iranian, cf. Skt. *ghr̥ṣu-* 'cheerful, happy' vs. *harṣ-* 'to be delighted, to be excited', from PIE **ǵʰr̥rs-* and **ǵʰers-*, respectively (Kloekhorst 2011: 268–269). The author considers it to be a case of Weise's law in Sanskrit, according to which PIE **ḱ*, **ǵ* and **ǵʰ* lost their palatal feature before **r*, both syllabic and non-syllabic (Kloekhorst op. cit.). This is not to be confused with BSl. depalatalization before non-syllabic **r* (and other resonants), which appeared only if the sequence was succeeded by a back vowel, and was presumably an exclusive pre-Balto-Slavic innovation.

5.3. The solution. The Balto-Slavic descendants of the PIE root **(s)ḱ(e)rdʰ-* are derived from one of the following root variants:

a) the *e*-grade with the *s*-mobile: PIE **sḱerdʰ-* > Lith. *skeřdžius*, *skeřdis* (for Slc. *střóu̯dă*, Kash. *strzóda* and Cz. *střída*, see the next section);

b) the *e*-grade without the *s*-mobile: PIE **ḱerdʰ-* >> PSl. **čerda* and **čerdъ, Lith. keřdžius*, *kerdis*, OPr. *kērdan*;

c) the zero grade without the *s*-mobile: PIE **ḱr̥dʰ-* > PSl. **kъrd-* > SCr. *krdo*, Sln. *krdẹ́lọ*, Kash. *karno* and so on.

Given the rules of PIE depalatalizations we presented in the previous section, it is obvious that the cases a) and c) provide the appropriate phonological environment for depalatalization of palatovelars. Thus, PIE **sḱerdʰ-* > PIE **skerdʰ-* expectedly and such was the outcome of the zero-grade root **ḱr̥dʰ-* (> **kr̥dʰ-*) which, as far as we are concerned, underlies PSl. **kъrd-*. Nevertheless, the shift of **ḱ* to **k* in PIE **ḱerdʰ-*, without the *s*-mobile, was not likely to happen. Therefore, one would expect BSl. **śerd-* (> PSl. **serd-*, Lith. **šerd-*) as its regular outcome. Instead of that, its descendants occur with anlaut *k-*, which forces us to reconstruct BSl. **kerd-*. We believe this **k-* to be analogical, either from the variant with **s-* or from the zero-grade root, where it arose regularly. Accordingly, PIE **sḱerdʰ-* > PIE **skerdʰ-* (> Lith. *skeřdžius*) and PIE **ḱr̥dʰ-* > PIE **kr̥dʰ-*, due to which one finds **k* in BSl. **kerd* (> PSl. **čerd-*, Lith. *keřdžius*), cf. Meillet 1894: 294–297; Kortlandt 1978: 238; Villanueva Svensson 2009: 11.

Numerous examples of this analogical extension have already been recognized, like PSl. **ščirъ* (Rus. *цырый* 'genuine', Pl. *szczery*[20] 'honest, sincere'), Go. *skeirs* 'clear, evident, plain', ON *skírr* 'clear' (Icel. *skír* 'bright, pure'), but Cz. *čirý* 'pure', Slov. *číry* 'id.'; PSl. **sьjati* 'shine', **sinǫti* 'flash' (SCr. *sjȁti*, *sínuti*), all from the (post)IE root **(s)ḱe(H)i-* (Villanueva Svensson 2009: 7). Matasović assumes that "In Croat. *sinuti* 'flash' we do not have a reflex of PIE *skeHy* […] but rather of *ḱeHy*, without s-mobile" (2005: 148). Villanueva Svensson states the same: "Slavic *sinǫti*, *sьjati* must then continue a variant without s-mobile" (op. cit. 8). Consequently, the Slavic descendants of IE **(s)ḱe(H)i-* could be divided into three

[19] Cf. also what was claimed for OCS *laskrъdь* in ESSJa XV: 40, s.v. **laskosьrdъ(-jь)*. The existence of another variant (OCS *laskosrъdъ*) could be important for the discussion and should not be neglected, as it was claimed in ESSJa (loc. cit.) that OCS *laskrъdь* resulted from haplological shortening of the earlier **laskosьrdъ*. In ESJS (403–404, s.v. *laskrъdь*), both options were taken into consideration.

[20] PSl. **ir/*yr* yielded Pl. *er* regularly, cf. PSl. **širokъjь* 'wide' > Pl. *szeroki*, Psl. *syrъ* 'cheese' > Pl. *ser*, PSl. **sekyra* 'axe' > Pl. *siekiera*.

groups: 1) Rus. *щурый*, Pl. *szczery* (< PSl. **ščirъ-jь*) < IE **skei-*, 2) SCr. *sjȁti*, *sínuti* (< PSl. **sьjati*, **sinǫti*) < IE **ḱei-*, where **ḱ* was preserved, 3) Cz. *čirý*, Slov. *číry* (< PSl. **čirъ-jь*) < IE **kei-*, where anlaut **k* is analogical, originating from the variant with the *s*-mobile, like we assumed for BSl. **kerd-* << PIE **ḱerdʰ-*.[21]

Similar development should also account for PSl. **cěvь* 'pipe' : Lith. *šeivà* 'bobbin' (Kortlandt 1978: 238). The *s*-mobile, which is the key for understanding such a phonological relation in Balto-Slavic, is found in OE *scīa* 'shin, leg' (Lubotsky 2002: 322–323). For more examples, see Kortlandt 1978 and Villanueva Svensson 2009.

5.4. s-mobile in Slavic? So far we have not tried to explain the origin of *s*- in northern Lekhitic forms (Slc. *stř̀ȍu̯dă* and Kash. *strzóda*)[22] and in the Czech variant *stříd*a. Since all other Slavic cognates are derived from the PIE root variant without the *s*-mobile, the said forms could potentially be the only confirmation of the PIE initial **s* in Slavic (see also the discussion in SP II: 151). Let us now see what the regular reflex of PIE **skerdʰ-eh₂-ø* (< PIE **sḱerdʰ-eh₂-ø*) in Proto-Slavic, Kashubian/Slovincian and Czech would be. As a result of the first PSl. palatalization, **sk* would have yielded **šč*, as in PSl. **ščitъ* 'shield' < PIE **skei-to-* (Derksen 2008: 486), or PSl. **ščenę* 'puppy' < PIE **sken-n̥*[23] (Derksen 2008: 88, 486). Thus, from IE **skérdʰ-eh₂-ø* one would expect PSl. **ščerdȁ*. The development of PSl. **šč* has split the Slavic area in two groups. While the cluster was kept unchanged in some Slavic languages, the others exhibit its simplification to *št*. Polish is one of the members of the former group (cf. Pl. *szczery* < PSl. **ščiry*, Pl. *szczenię* < PSl. **ščenę*), whereas Czech belongs to the latter group (cf. Cz. *štít* < PSl. **ščitъ*, Cz. *štěně* < PSl. **ščenę*).

Like in Polish, PSl. **šč* remained unchanged in Kashubian, cf Kash. *szczeniã* < PSl. **ščenę*, Kash. *szczëri*, *szczërosc* < PSl. **ščiry* (< PSl. **ščirъjь*), **ščirostь*, and Slovincian, cf. Slc. *šči̯ę́ną* < PSl. **ščenę* (Lorentz 1903: 63), or *ščirʹ́*, *ščĩrɵsc* (SW: 1152) < PSl. **ščiry*, **ščirostь*; *ščʉ̃kă* (SW: 1154) < PSl. **ščuka* 'pike'; *ščĩpăc* (SW: 1150) < PSl. **ščipati* 'pinch'.

Therefore, *szcz*- would be expected in the Kashubian descendant and *šč*- in Slovincian. Nonetheless, situation gets more complicated here owing to the fact that the liquid metathesis would have operated in this instance, which would, with subsequent Lekhitic *przegłos*, have given rise to Lekh. **šč̌rōda*. It would not be so difficult to imagine that the expected **šč̌rōda* was dissimilated to **strōda* (> Slc. *stř̀ȍu̯dă*, Kash. *strzóda*). However, it seems that the initial cluster **čř-* was reflected as Slc. *stř*, cf. Slc. *stř̀ȍu̯nk* < PSl **černъkъ*, and Slc. *stř̀ȍu̯nʉ̀ɵvï* < PSl. **černovy* (< PSl. **černovьjь*); Lorentz 1903: 78, 139–140,[24] and that it is therefore unnecessary to reconstruct **šč̌erdȁ* for Proto-Slavic.[25]

---

[21] This is supported by Kortlandt (1978: 238): "The neutralization after initial *s [...] can hardly be doubted. It accounts for such correspondences as [...] Lith. (*s*)*keřdžius*, OCS *črěda*, Go. *haírda*". It is not, however, explicitly claimed that the plain velar is analogical in the *s*-less forms.

[22] Cf. also Pl. dial. *strzoda* (ESSJa IV: 61)

[23] For PIE *-n̥ > BSl. *-in > PSl. *-ę*, see Olander 2010.

[24] The other possible outcome of **čř* in Slovincian is *tř*, cf. Slc. *třì̯ęvɵ* < PSl. **červo*; Lorentz loc. cit. To our knowledge, principles of their distribution have not been clarified yet.

[25] It appears that R. Derksen (2008: 81) tacitly agreed with this, since he listed Slc. *stř̀ȍu̯dă* as one of the descendants of PSl. **čerdȁ*.

Initial **čř-* yielded *tř* or *stř* in Czech, which is akin to the Slovincian state of affairs, cf. Cz. *střep*/*třep* 'broken piece of pottery' < PSl. **čerpъ*, Cz. *střevo*/*třevo* 'intestine' < PSl. **červo*, Cz. *střemcha* 'bird cherry', OCz. *třemcha* 'id.' < PSl. **čermъxa* (Derksen 2008: 82–86). Accordingly, Cz. *střída*, "z nagłosowym *s*-" (SP II: 150) and *třída* both go back to PSl. **čerda*.

Still, the phonological explanation we tried to subscribe to does not seem to hold for Kashubian, in which, for Lekh. **čř*, we failed to find *strz-*, cf. Kash. *trzón*, *trzónk* < PSl. **černъ*, **černъkъ* 'stem'.[26] It is, however, of utmost importance to emphasize that the variant without *s-* was found in Kash. (*tŕöda* [sic!]), as well (SP II: 150).

If one hence did not accept the phonological explanation for *s-* in Kash. *strzóda*, it may still be possible to account for its origin by assuming a derivate from the prefixed verb **sъ-čerditi*. This explanation cannot be completely proven right, though, as no descendants of PSl. **sъčerditi* (which would presumably be reflected as Kash. **strzodzëc* [?]) are found in Kashubian.

Since the evidence seems to be insufficient, we would rather conclude that there are no Slavic reflexes of the Indo-European root with **s-*.

6. Relative chronology. If our assumption is correct, the root underlying SCr. *krd*(*o*) got its initial **k* already in the IE period, when the depalatalization in the variant with **r̥* had taken place. Besides the fact that its results are found outside of Balto-Slavic, **ḱ* > **k* before **r̥* must have been an early innovation from the point of view of the well-known BSl. sound developments. Ultimately, it must have appeared before BSl. shift of **R̥* to ***i*R/***u*R. Namely, if the palatalization had been retained in this root, it would have precluded the rise of BSl. **ur* from PIE **r̥* (Shevelov 1964: 87). Moreover, if PIE **R̥* was preceded by a velar stop, the ***u*-reflex in Balto-Slavic appears more frequently than ***i*R (Vaillant 1950: 171). The problem has more recently been dealt with by Matasović (2004), who reached the conclusion that the **u*-reflex was in fact expected after velars (op. cit. 340).

From BSl. **kurd-*, one would expect PSl. **kъrd-*, which explains the absence of palatalization in SCr. *krd*(*o*). If the palatalization had operated, it would have yielded SCr. **crd*(*o*), cf. SCr. *cŕv* 'worm' < PSl. **čьrvь*, SCr. *cŕta* 'line' < PSl. **čьrta*.

7. Conclusion. Given the presented arguments, we propose that *k* in SCr. *krdo*, *krdar*, *krdarica*, *krdnica*, *krditi*, *krdelo*, Sln. *krdẹ́lọ*, Mcd. *крдар*, Cz. dial. *kŕdel'*, OCS *kъrdělъ* (and so on) is a result of PIE depalatalization of palatovelars before **r̥*. In PSl. **čerda* and **čerdъ*, we are dealing with an analogical plain velar. It is not really difficult to see the motivation for this leveling, since two out of three outcomes of the root under discussion regularly acquired the initial plain velar. The said analogy eliminated the alternation between anlaut consonants in a group of semantically related words.

According to this view, not all reflexes in Balto-Slavic are phonemically regular, but none of them are unexpected. Such development was confirmed in Kortlandt 1978 and, more recently, in Villanueva Svensson 2009, where the author emphasizes the importance of the *s*-mobile for reshaping consonant alternations with the descendants of PIE velars in Balto-Slavic. However, BSl. **(*s*)*k*(*e*)*rd-* has not been taken into account there. This solution is alternative to the one presented by Lubotsky (2001).

[26] Cf. Rus. *чёрен* (ESSJa IV: 69) and Sln. *črẹ̑n* (Pleteršnik 1894: 110).

Symbols

* unattested form
> *regularly yields*
< *regularly descended from*
>> *irregularly yields*
<< *irregularly descended from*
→ *yields by borrowing*

Abbreviations

Alb. Albanian
Arm. Armenian
Av. Avestan
BSl. Balto-Slavic
Cz. Czech
Čak. Čakavian
dial. dialectal
Go. Gothic
Gr. Greek
Icel. Icelandic
IE Indo-European
IIr. Indo-Iranian
Kash. Kashubian
Lat. Latin
Latv. Latvian
LAv. Late Avestan
Lekh. Lekhitic
Lith. Lithuanian
Mcd. Macedonian
MW Middle Welsh
NŠtok. Neo-Štokavian
OCS Old Church Slavonic
OCz. Old Czech
OE Old English
OHG Old High German
ON Old Norse
OP Old Persian
OPl. Old Polish
OPr. Old Prussian
PGm. Proto-Germanic
PIE Proto-Indo-European
PIIr. Proto-Indo-Iranian
PSl. Proto-Slavic
Pl. Polish
Rus. Russian
SCr. Serbo-Croatian
Skt. Sanskrit
Slav. Slavic
Slc. Slovincian
Sln. Slovene
Slov. Slovak
Štok. Štokavian
US Upper Sorbian

SOURCES

Bartholomae, Christian. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1904.

Beekes, Robert. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2010.

Belić, A. Zamětki po čakavskim govoram. *Izvěstija Otděljenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti* 14/2 (1909): 181–266.

Daničić, Đuro. *Srpski akcenti*. Beograd–Zemun: Grafički zavod *Makarije* a.d., 1925.

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

Derksen, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2015.

ERHJ: *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika* (ur. Ranko Matasović), 1–. Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2016–.

ERHSJ: Petar Skok. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: JAZU, 1971–1974.

ESJS: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslovenského* (red. Eva Havlová), 1–. Praha: Academia, 1989–.

ESSJa: *Etimologičeskij slovar' slovjanskix jazykov* (pod red. O. N. Trubačeva), 1–. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka. 1974–.

EWAia: Manfred Mayrhofer. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (I–II). Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992–1996.

Fraenkel, Ernst. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (I–II). Heidelberg – Götingen: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962–1965.

Gluhak, Alemko. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec, 1993.

IEW: Julius Pokorny. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (I–II). Bern – München: Francke Verlag 1959–1969.

Jurišić, Blaž. *Rječnik govora otoka Vrgade uspoređen s nekim čakavskim i zapadnoštokavskim govorima. II dio: Rječnik*. Zagreb: JAZU, 1973.

Kent, Roland G. *Old Persian. Grammar. Texts. Lexicon*. New Haven – Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1950.

KEWA: Manfred Mayrhofer. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (I–IV). Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag 1956–1980.

Kroonen, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2013.

KSR: Dušan-Vladislav Pažderski, Hana Makurat. *Kašupsko-srpski rečnik*. Beograd – Gdanjsk: Alma – Pracownia Leksikografii i Normalizacji Językowej, 2017.

LIV: Helmuth Rix, Martin Kümmel et al. *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurtzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001.

Machek, Václav. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Druhé, opravené a doplněné vydání. Praha: Academia, 1968.

Matasović, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2009.

PEŽ: Mažiulis, Vytautas. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*. <http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/paieska/paieska/> 30.6.2018.

Pleteršnik, Maks. *Slovensko-nemški slovar*. I–II. V Ljubljani: Založilo in na svetlo dalo Knezoško-fijstvo, 1894–1895.

RJA: *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–XXIII. Zagreb: JAZU, 1880–1976.

RMS: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskoga književnog jezika*, I–VI. Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1967–1976.

RSA: *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika*, 1–. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU, 1959–.

Snoj, M. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Druga, pregledana in dopolnjena izdaja. Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2009.

SP: *Słownik prasłowiański* (pod red. Franciszeka Sławskiego), 1–. Wrocław etc. 1974–.

SW: Friedrich Lorentz. *Slovintzisches Wörterbuch*, I–II. St. Petersburg: Buchdrucherei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1908–1912.

Toporov, V. N. *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' I–K*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Nauka, 1980.

Vuk 1818: Vuk Stefanović. *Srpski rječnik istolkovan njemačkim i latinskim riječma*. Wien: bei den P. P. Armeniern,1818.

Vuk 1852: Vuk Stef. Karadžić. *Srpski rječnik istumačen njemačkijem i latinskijem riječima*. U Beču: u štampariji jermenskoga namastira, 1852.

REFERENCES

Bogaryrev, Konstantin K. *Akcentuacija severolexitskix govorov s istoričeskoj točki zrenija*. München: Verlag Otto Sanger.

Carlton, Terence. *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1991.

Derksen, Rick. *Metatony in Baltic*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 1996.

Dronova, L. P. Genetičeskie svjazi slav. *čerda: semantičeskaja rekonstrukcija. *Rusin* № 3, 41 (2015), 183–190.

Illič-Svityč, Vladislav M. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963.

Ivić, Pavle. *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika. Uvod i štokavsko narečje*. Celokupna dela Pavla Ivića, tom II. Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 2001.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. Weise's Law: Depalatalization of Palatovelars before **r* in Sanskrit. *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog.* Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2011.

Kortlandt, F. H. H. *Slavic Accentuation. A Study in Relative Chronology.* Lisse/Netherlands: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1975.

Kortlandt, Frederik. I.-E. Palatovelars before Resonants in Balto-Slavic. Jacek Fisiak (ed.). *Recent Developments in Historical Phonology.* The Hague – New York: Mouton, 1978. <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/1853> 13.12.2017.

Kortlandt, Frederik. Three Problems of Balto-Slavic Phonology. *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 22/2 (1979): 57–63.

Kortlandt, Frederik. Od praindoevropskog jezika do slovenskog (fonološki razvoj). [translated by Pavle Ivić] *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* 32/2 (1989): 41–58.

Kortlandt, Frederik. From Proto-Indo-European to Slavic. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22 (1994). <www.kortlandt.nl> 13.12.2017.

Kortlandt, Frederik. From Serbo-Croatian to Indo-European. *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 51 (2005). <www.kortlandt.nl> 13.12.2017.

Kortlandt, Frederik. On Derksen's Law and Related Issues. *Baltistica* XLVII/1 (2012): 5–14.

Kortlandt, Frederik. Palatovelars before Syllabic Resonants: Another Look. *Baltistica* XLVII/1 (2013): 13–17.

Lorentz, Friedrich. *Slovinzische Grammatik*. St. Peterburg: Buchdrucherei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1903.

Lubotsky, Alexander. Reflexes of Proto-Indo-European *sk in Indo-Iranian. *Incontri linguistici* 24 (2001): 25–57.

Lubotsky, Alexander. The Indo-Iranian Word for 'Shank, Shin'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 122, No. 2, Indic and Iranian Studies in Honor of Stanley Insler on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Apr. – Jun., 2002): 318–324.

Matasović, Ranko. The Proto-Indo-European Syllabic Resonants in Balto-Slavic. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 109 (2004): 337–354.

Matasović, Ranko. Toward a Relative Chronology of the Earliest Balto-Slavic Sound Changes. *Baltistica* XL/2 (2005): 147–157.

Matasović, Ranko. *Poredbenopovijesna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2008.

Meillet, Antoine. De quelques difficultés de la théorie des gutturales indo-européennes. *Memoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 8 (1894): 279–304.

Olander, Thomas. *Balto-Slavic Accentual Mobility*. Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009.

Olander, Thomas. Proto-Indo-European Final Nasals in Slavic. *Scando-Slavica* 56/1 (2010): 84–98.

Pronk-Tiethoff, Saskia. *The Germanic Loanwords in Proto-Slavic*. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 2013.

Ringe, Donald. *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic. A Linguistic History of English, Volume 1*. Oxford: University Press, 2006.

Rinkevičius, Vytautas. *Prūsų kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*. Daktaro disertacija. Vilnius: Universitetas Vilniaus, 2009.

Shevelov, George. *A Prehistory of Slavic. The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1964.

Stankiewicz, Edward. *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Vaillant, André. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome I, Phonétique*. Lyon: IAC, 1950.
Vaillant, André. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome IV, La formation des noms*. Paris: Éditons Klincksieck, 1974.
Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. Indo-European *sḱ in Balto-Slavic. *Baltistica* XLIV/1 (2009): 5–24.

Аљоша Миленковић

СХ. *КРД*(*О*)

Р е з и м е

Сх. *крд*(*о*) обично се изводи из пие. *$ḱr̥d^h$-, варијанте корена*$sḱerd^h$- без мобилног **s*-, у нултом превоју. Одсуство сатем рефлекса у овом примеру објашњава се депалатализацијом пред слоготворном ликвидом. Пие. корен *$ḱerd^h$-, на који се своде псл. **čerda* и **čerdъ*, не испуњава ни један познати услов за губитак палаталности, те је за велар у овој коренској варијанти неопходно претпоставити да је аналошког порекла, што би додатно могло бити поткрепљено чињеницом да је трећа коренска варијанта посведочена у балтословенском – **skerd*- (< пие. *$skerd^h$-), одражена у лит. *skeřdžius*, *skeřdis*, такође била по правилу изложена депалатализацији. Оваква аналошка уопштавања посведочена су многим другим примерима из балтословенског. Алтернативно решење би могла представљати теза о непостојању палатовелара у овом корену, предложена на основу одраза у индоиранском.

Универзитет у Београду
Филолошки факултет
Катедра за српски језик са јужнословенским језицима
(студент основних студија)
Студентски трг 3, 11000 Београд, Србија
aljosa97milenkovic@gmail.com

(примљено: 21. марта 2018;
прихваћено: 26. октобра 2018)