

Henry Leeming
London

Early Slovene Pioneers of Comparative Slavonic Philology

Članek obravnava prispevek Žige Popoviča in Marka Pohlina k primerjalnemu jezikoslovju. Prikazuje etimološka načela in prakso, kot se izkazujejo v njihovih delih.

The article considers the contribution to comparative philology of Žiga Popovič and Marko Pohlín, it examines the etymological principles and practice revealed in their work.

The contribution to Slavonic studies of the eighteenth-century predecessors of Kopitar and Miklošič tends to be overlooked, and this is understandable, given the limited horizon and the distorted perspectives of their period. The study of Sanskrit had not revealed to them the affinities of the Indo-European language family; the methodology of comparative and historical grammar had not as yet been formulated and developed. None the less, in spite of these handicaps, significant advances were made by Žiga Popovič and Marko Pohlín, whom we might dub the Daedalus and Icarus of Slovene etymology. The former collected materials for an etymological dictionary; the latter made use of these in compiling his *Glossarium Slavicum*, Vienna, 1792, published as a supplement to his trilingual Slovene-German-Latin dictionary, *Tu malu besedishe treh jezikov*, Ljubljana, 1782.

From the early eighteenth century the importance of the Slavonic languages for comparative philology attracted growing recognition. Leibniz published parallel texts in Church Slavonic, Serbo-Croat, Slovene, Czech, Polish and Russian supplied by the Swedish lexicographer, J. G. Sparwenfeld, and an account of Lüneburg Wendish by G. F. Mithof, with etymological notes on words occurring in the Wendish *Our Father*.¹ J. G. Wachter's *Glossarium germanicum*, Leipzig, 1727 (first) and 1737 (second edition), made use of Slavonic material from Hieronymus Megiser, *Thesaurus polyglottus*, Frankfurt am Main, 1603, and Abraham Frenzelius [Frenzel], *De originibus linguae sorabicae*, Budyšin, 1693. For Wachter etymology was a noble quest, enhancing those gifts of reason and language which raise man above the beasts and enabling him to understand the true meaning of the words he utters; false etymologies based on mistaken affinities were a waste of time. The Slovene pioneers joined the quest with enthusiasm. Unfortunately, lacking the systematic guidelines of historical and comparative grammar, they were unable to distinguish valid from spurious phonetic and semantic alignments.

Janez Žiga Valentin Popovič (1705–1774),² third and youngest son of Anton Popovič, manager of an estate at Arclin, near Celje in Lower Styria, rose by his

¹ Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Collectanea etymologica*, Hannover, 1717, 335–360.

² Biographical data are drawn from: Anton Slodnjak (ed.), *Pisma Matija Čopa*, vol. II, Ljubljana, 1986; *Fortsetzung und Ergänzungen zu Christian Gottlieb Jöchers allgemeinem Gelehrten-Lexikon*, vol. VI, Bremen, 1819, 641–642; *Biographie universelle*, nouvelle édition, vol. XXXIV, Pa-

own efforts to the eminence of a chair in German at the University of Vienna as the foremost authority in Austria on the subject. His schooling by the Jesuits in Graz from the age of ten to twenty three embraced philosophy (1721–24?) and theology (1724–28?) but did not lead to ordination. Tradition has imputed this to an inability to take wine but Kidrič suggests that the Jesuit school had stifled any urge in that direction. He spent three years travelling in Italy (1728–31), visiting Naples, Apulia, Sicily and Malta. On his return to Austria he worked for several years as a private tutor. Having failed to secure material support for his scientific researches in geography and natural history he was eventually forced to accept a post as history teacher at a newly established school for young gentlemen at the Benedictine abbey of Kremsmünster. There he remained from 1744 to spring, 1747, devoting the latter part of his stay to the study of fungi, a truly scholastic response to the appearance of lichens on the ceiling and mould on his belongings in the dark cellar which was his lodging. In the spring of 1747 he left for Germany, staying in Regensburg till the autumn of 1749, in Nuremberg for the first months of 1750, and in Leipzig from early 1750 till autumn, 1753. Here his scholarly talents were recognised and encouraged. These were amply deployed in his first published book entitled *Untersuchungen vom Meere*, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1750, a wide-ranging investigation into questions of natural history, ethnography, economy, and philology. In 1753 he was invited to take over the recently established chair of German language and rhetoric at the University of Vienna and remained in this post till his retirement in 1766 and withdrawal to a property he purchased outside Vienna, south of the Danube, where he devoted the last eight years of his life to viticulture, which left him three months of the year for his books. According to Pohlin: “supra sepulcrum lapidem vulgarem sibi poni jussit cum simplici Illyrica littera” – ‘he ordered an ordinary stone to be placed on his grave with the simple Illyrian writing’. As the gravestone does not survive, this may mean no more than the use of one of his own characters for the final letter of his name. He left his savings to fund scholarships for poor students from Styria.

Popovič was a scholar of unusually wide horizons. His early training had given him a taste for classical archeology and topography. These were his main preoccupations when he toured Italy in his twenties. His interest in natural history developed later; we are told that he was thirty years of age before he heard from an apothecary the word ‘botany’. For present purposes we need not concern ourselves with the substantial works on the German language published during his days as a professor at the University of Vienna. However, before proceeding to an account of the materials he collected for an etymological dictionary, we may examine some of his ideas on the subject, as expressed in *Untersuchungen vom Meere*. Here Popovič puts forward his ambitious plans for a complete survey of the South Slavonic dialects, discusses in great detail the origins of various place-names and geographical terms and, furthermore, delivers a scathing attack on the orthographical shortcomings of various European languages, questioning the value of the Roman legacy and attrib-

ris–Leipzig, sine anno, 100; Alfonz Gspan, “Razsvetljenje”, in *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva*, vol. I, Ljubljana, 1956, 352–353; and the exhaustive and thoroughly researched article by France Kidrič in *Slovenski biografski leksikon*, vol. II, Ljubljana, 1933–52, 443–455.

uting the seeds of confusion to the Latin adaptation of the Greek alphabet. One of his particular targets was the misuse of what we might call the 'rogue letter' *h*, which marked palatalisation and assibilation in German but the absence thereof in Italian. He contrasted the sound practice of Slavonic, which like Hebrew employed a single character, where German used three (*sch*) or four (*tsch*). He perceived and indicated other problems, such as the varying phonetic value of the digraph *ch* in German, Italian and Welsh, and the inability of Italian to transcribe satisfactorily such names as *Gleditsch* or *Scheuchzer*.

In the section of his book addressed to the members of the Nuremberg cosmographical society he strongly argues for recognition of the importance of the Slavonic languages: Slavonic and Wendish are spoken in a large part of Europe.³ Maps of these areas are wildly inaccurate; their inhabitants have been more concerned with war than applying themselves to scientific pursuits. Here geographers and writers on natural history will find, as it were, a new world, whose description will enable them to correct many false impressions which have been engrained in our thinking; they will make new discoveries and win great renown.

Given time and opportunity Popovič himself would gladly undertake research in that part of Europe which stretches from Austria to the Black Sea on the one hand and the Adriatic Gulf on the other. Nothing would please him more than to be able to travel with an assistant, if some rich benefactor could subsidize such annual expeditions. First, however, in order to make a deeper assessment of the languages and dialects he would encounter, he should acquire a knowledge of Arabic, ignorance of which had up till now been a constant stumbling block in his etymological researches. With that innate talent of the Slavs and Wends for the speedy acquisition of fluency in foreign languages, and with his knowledge of Hebrew to help him, he expected to take no more than half a year over this task. Then he would tour the regions mentioned with the primary aim of research into the spoken Slavonic dialects, while also pursuing investigations into Roman, Greek and Slavonic antiquities and collecting information about the local flora and fauna and other aspects of natural history. For the purposes of Slavonic philology he would wish to make a longer stay in Bosnia than elsewhere, for he himself had found that the experts were right to consider Bosnian the purest, sweetest and most graceful of all the Slavonic and Wendish dialects, just as on the other hand Bulgarian is the coarsest. The elegance and charm of Bosnian and Serbian pronunciation compared with the boorishness of Bulgarian recalled the similar contrast between Anglo-Saxon and Gothic. Among the Slavonic dialects Bosnian had the same status as Attic in Ancient Greek.

In order to carry out his researches into Slavonic philology Popovič would furthermore appreciate the help of a kind patron, who would order the casting of certain characters to supplement the Latin alphabet, which in itself was inadequate

³ *Untersuchungen*, xvi–xvii; it is in this appeal (pp. i–lxxvi) and in his review of Christian Gottlieb Schwarz, *De columnis Herculis* (pp. 1–38) that Popovič expresses the ideas commented on in this article. Most of the work is devoted to problems of oceanography.

for the orthography of the modern European languages.⁴ He argues for innovation in a lengthy polemic on the shortcomings of the German alphabet, which he characterises as a slavish imitation of Latin.⁵

Some idea of the possible scope and method of his etymological research may be gleaned from his treatment of the origin of the name *Cadiz*, from Punic *Gadir* 'fence'.⁶ A connection between the Punic word, Hebrew *gādar* 'be fenced', Greek *χόρτος*, Gothic *gards*, German *garten* and Icelandic *gard* had already been proposed by Wachter, who furthermore brought Slavonic cognates into the discussion.⁷ However, Popovič's treatment is much fuller. He points out that *Dunum*, *Gard* and *Grad* in Celtic, German and Slavonic place-names have the same meaning as Punic *Gadir* – a fence or a place enclosed by a fence, as Pliny, Solinus and Festus Avienus testify. *Gard* and *grad* come from a verb meaning 'to fence', either Wendish *gradīm* or Hebrew *gādar*. Anglo-Saxon *tun*, Scandinavian *gard*, Slavonic *grad* likewise mean 'a fence' or 'an enclosed place' such as a garden, park, house, palace or even a city. As the second element in place-names Popovič notes *Augustodunum*, *Carrodunum*, *Lugdunum*; *Stutgard*, *Belgard* and *Stargard*. *Zarigrad*, which means 'Kaiserstadt', is a name given to Constantinople by the Slavonic peoples; according to Wachter it is a name used by Slavonic-speaking European Turks. *Mycklegard*, the Scandinavian name for the city employs a root meaning 'great', related to Greek *μέγας*, *μεγαλειος*. A similar name is *Mecklenburg*, in Latin *Megalopolis*, once a large city with pretensions to be considered a Northern Constantinople. *Novigrad*, a name for some castles and towns in lands where Slavonic is spoken, in Dalmatia, Croatia and Hungary, corresponds to German *Neustadt*, *Neuschloss* and Latin *Neapolis*. *Belgrad* in Serbia has a Slavonic name, corresponding to German *Weissenburg*, Latin *Alba* and Hungarian *Fehérvár* (for *Fehérvár* H. L.). Not far from Orşova on the left bank of the Danube is a place called in Serbian *Zernigrad* and in modern Greek Mauron Kastron, or in the vernacular *Mauro Kastro* according to information received from an old Macedonian merchant. Not far away is the town of Tschernez, whose name may be connected.

On the use of *grad* or *gard* as the second component of place-names Popovič refers his readers to the second article on *Gard* in Wachter's *Glossarium Germanicum*.⁸ However, while Wachter had presented the Slavonic variants in an unsatisfactory manner as Russian *gorod* or *grad*, and Sorbian and other *grad* or *gard*, Popovič correctly differentiates Polish *grad* from Russian *gorod* "mit einer Epenthesis". Sorbian, Bohemian and Moravian, dubbed by him 'the aspirating dialects' (die hauchenden Mundarten), in their disagreeable way⁹ substitute *h* for *g*, giving Lusatian Sorbian *hrod*, based on Polish *grad*. Bohemian and Moravian with their ill-sounding guttural manner of speech¹⁰ produce *hrad* instead of the correct Slavonic *grad*. Popovič gives examples of these variants in place-names from Bohemia, Moravia, Poland and Russia with geographical and etymological comments and foreign equival-

⁴ *Ibidem*, xviii.

⁵ *Ibidem*, xviii–xxi.

⁶ *Ibidem*, 27–29.

⁷ J. G. Wachter, *Glossarium germanicum*, Leipzig, 1727, 146.

⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁹ "nach ihrer unangenehmen Weife."

¹⁰ "nach ihrer übellautenden, und aus dem Halfe weggehauchten Sprechart."

ents: Bohemian *Wischihrad*, Moravian *Welehrad* and *Hradisch*, Polish *Grodeck*, Russian [!] *Nowogrodeck*. For the meaning of Russian *Bielogorod*, *Donkagorod*, *Mikhailogorod*, *Mirogorod*, *Novogorod*, *Wasilogorod* and others the reader is referred to Abraham Frenzel's above-mentioned work on the origins of the Sorbian language.

The suffix *-iz* or *-itsch* in German toponyms is explained as an adaptation of the Slavonic *-ica*, a sure sign that the locality once had a Slavonic population.¹¹ *Leibniz* is from the Slavonic *Lipnica*, and means 'Lindenstadt'; *Bistrice*, a name frequently met in Styria and Carniola, is a derivative of *bistro* 'shallow', which assumes various forms in German: *Bistriz*, *Wistriz*, *Weistriz*, *Veistriz*, *Feistriz*. There is a town near Celje called by the Germans *Windisch Feistriz* to distinguish it from two other castles called *Feistriz* in Styria, a relic of the days when the whole area around Graz belonged to the Slavs before they were driven back across the Drava under Bavarian pressure. Popovič himself knows from documentary evidence of fifty occurrences of the word referring to small streams in Styria and Carniola.

The claims of Slavonic to be admitted as comparative material for the early history of related languages are emphatically stated in the article on Polish *województwo*.¹² This is explained as a derivative of *wojewoda*, itself a compound corresponding literally to Latin *bellidux* or German *Heerführer*. The first element of the compound noun is *woj*, a dialectal variant of *boj* 'militia, bellum'; the second is seen in the verbal root *wod-* which has arisen by a weaker pronunciation of the original aspirate, a disagreeable feature of certain Slavonic dialects including Lusatian.¹³ The earlier form is seen in Ancient Greek *hodos*, so that the verb *wodim* is related to a Greek *hodein*. Modern convention would have enabled Popovič to present this as a starred form. Instead, he goes on to explain his apparent solecism. "I have to say this, because my gentle readers are probably still not convinced of the antiquity of the Wendish language. When they become aware that root-words lost in Greek survive in Wendish, and that the Greeks themselves must refer to Wendish in order to find the explanation of some of their own words, my derivation of Greek *hodos* from what is now Wendish but was probably once Japhetic *hod* or *chod* 'iter' will sound a little less incredible". He goes on to propose a Slavonic origin for the name of the god Woden, from *wodim* 'duco', for as *dux itineris* he was the equivalent of Mercurius *hodēgos*, hence the name of the third day of the week in English and Dutch. Such a simple answer had evaded scholars who had been racking their brains for a solution in ignorance of the Wendish evidence.

The materials gathered by Popovič for an etymological dictionary of Slovene are now held by the National and University Library (Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica), Ljubljana, under shelf-mark MS 423. They consist of four hundred and eighty cards measuring 11.5 by 8.5 centimetres. Notes from the librarians explain that the cards were alphabetically arranged and numbered by Janez Logar and describe the item as: "Popovič Prof. Beitrag zum slovenischen Wörterbuch Vodniks".

¹¹ *Untersuchungen*, lxiii–lxv.

¹² *Ibidem*, lxviii–lxix.

¹³ "eine Verwandlung des Hauches in eine weichere Aussprache (deren unmäßiger Gebrauch bei einigen Wendischen Völkern, als bei den Laufizern, ein Häßlicher Idiotismus wird)."

This erroneous description¹⁴ probably arose by a misunderstanding of information given on the first card (no. 1 recto).¹⁵ This no doubt once served as a marker in Popovič's card index. It bears the capital letters *M N O P* in the author's own hand. On the same card is a note by Valentin Vodnik, describing how the material came into his hands from Modest Schrey,¹⁶ who had himself received it from Marko Pohlin.

In scholarly literature the work is now referred to as *Specimen vocabularii Vindo-Carniolicum*, a title first met in Pohlin's bibliography of Slovene literature, *Bibliotheca Carnioliae*. It is interesting that Matija Čop in his essay *Literatura der Winden* does not seem to identify Popovič's etymological notes with the *Specimen*. While registering this as the title of one of five works left in manuscript, he laments in a later paragraph the loss of the various grammatical notes which had been in the possession of Vodnik.¹⁷

The materials for what would have been the first etymological dictionary of a Slavonic language consist of short articles mostly confined to a single page of from one to twelve lines, but occasionally extending overleaf and sometimes running on to a second or even third card. The comments are partly in Latin, partly in German. The Gothic script employed for the Germanic material and the German expository text poses difficulties for those unfamiliar with this hand. Greek, Latin and Hebrew words are clearly written, as are most examples quoted from other languages. In his spelling of Slovene words Popovič was able to put into practice his proposed orthographic reforms, thus anticipating most of the changes introduced by Metelko.¹⁸ He removed four of the digraphs of the Bohorič alphabet, namely *nj*, *fh*, *sh*, *zh*; dropped another entirely: *lj*; employed special shapes for the letters *h*, *s*, *v*; carefully distinguished two forms of *z*. Reduced vowels are underlined: *a*, *e*; accents are used to indicate close *e*: *è*, and open *o*: *ô*. He even used his new characters to show the pronunciation of Hungarian *kis asszony*: *kiIIIasoñi* (269 v.). The following table presents the relevant letters in the alphabets of Bohorič, Popovič, Metelko and modern Slovene.

Bohorič	Popovič	Metelko	Modern Slovene
é	è	ε	é
h	ħ	h	h
i, u, e	<u>e</u>	z	è
lj	l	l	lj
nj	ñ	n	nj
ò	ô	o	ô
f	ƒ	s	s
fh	ff	ψ	š

¹⁴ "Beitrag" gives a misleading impression; Popovič's materials were a source for Vodnik but not a contribution from their author, with whom Vodnik had no contact.

¹⁵ References henceforth will be by card number only.

¹⁶ In Slovene orthography Šraj, (1754–1821) Augustinian monk, later parish priest, biblical translator.

¹⁷ A. Slodnjak (ed.), *Pisma Matija Čopa*, vol. II, Ljubljana, 1986, 85.

¹⁸ F. Metelko, *Lehrgebäude der slowenischen Sprache im Königreiche Illyrien und in den benachbarten Provinzen*, Ljubljana, 1825.

Bohorič	Popovič	Metelko	Modern Slovene
s	z	z	z
sh	ш	æ	ž
v	w	v	v
z	z	η	c
zh	ω	ч	č

Like most scholars of his era Popovič knew the classical languages and Hebrew; these were central in his studies and thought. Because of the special respect and regard in which they were held any chance resemblance between a Slavonic word and Latin, Greek or Hebrew was gladly interpreted as a genetic relationship. This hankering after ancient roots still persists in etymological circles and presumably will always be with us, since such distant affinities can help to bolster a nation's self-respect. We can therefore pardon Popovič's errors in proposing Greek origins for *da*, *děž*, *hlev*, *hrast*, *knez*, *letos*; or Hebrew derivations for *hom*, *jevša*, *jelen*, *letal*, *mol*, *ozirati*, while our own dictionaries contain similar examples of etymological nostalgia, with Indo-European pedigrees lending a spurious respectability to loan-words of a less noble origin.

Principles of etymology implicit or explicit in Popovič's materials include onomatopoeia, seen in *bučela*: "in Oberkrain apis, die Biene, von bučit..." (39), or *ja-reb*: "vox per onomatopoeiam efficta, perdix mas, fic enim conclamat gregem" (115); diachrony: "*miza*, menfa. Prior vox hac antiquior quia hæc epenthesi aucta" (230) – an invalid example;¹⁹ and contradiction: *brèja* 'pregnant' is associated with French *brehaigne* 'sterile' (29). Great ingenuity is shown in the provision of logical or common-sense explanations, for example the oak tree is called *dob* with the root of the adjective *dobr* because it was the good tree: "Bona arbor, quia primum victum dedit mortalibus." (45=46) The ultimate source is, appropriately, Hebrew *tov* 'good'.

Several of his articles show that, within the limitations of his period, Popovič was capable of sound analysis, even though this may have occasionally led him to mistaken conclusions. His treatment of the names of the hoopoe in Slovene and Croat distinguish a primary and a secondary prothesis: "*dèb* Croatis *upupa*, Wiedehopf, *odáb* Carniolis per prothefin. smerdi kaku odab, foetet infstar upupæ. *wodèb* Vindis per novam prothefin." (56). Morphological analysis is combined with valid comparative observation in the article on the verb *najti* 'to find'; "*naidem*, vox difsyllaba, *invenio*, *reperio*; compofita ex particula *na* et *idem*, venio; ἀναλόγως cum Itiriaco *ankommen* ejusdem fenfus. Etiam latini utuntur τῶ *incurrere* in aliquem, pro *obviare*". (40) Finally, well before the formulation of Grimm's Law or the first Slavonic palatalisation Popovič managed to align Slavonic *žena* with a Germanic cognate; this had been anticipated by Wachter, who saw a similar relationship for Sorbian *žona*.²⁰

¹⁹ *Bučela* 'bee', here tagged as Upper Carniolan, is an archaic form, closer than standard Slovene *čebela* to Common Slavonic **bščela*; the connection with *bučit* (standard Slovene *bučati* 'to boom') is accepted by some etymologists. *Jerab* (standard *jereb*) 'partridge' is here said to have an onomatopoeic name, based on the cock bird's cry, summoning his brood. The suggestion that Slovene *miza* is older than Latin *mensa*, and that the epenthesis of *n* is a secondary development is in line with Popovič's ideas on the antiquity of Slavonic; however, the example is ill chosen.

²⁰ "Mulier Francis *quena*, Sorabis *zona*" in *Glossarium germanicum* (1737), Prolegomena, Sectio III, cited as an example of the permutation of *q* and *z*.

To sum up, Popovič did what he could to bring the Slavonic languages, in particular the Carniolan, Styrian and other dialects of Slovene with which he was familiar, into focus as congeners of the Greek, Latin, Germanic and Celtic siblings, whose relationships were already under scientific scrutiny. Even though he was still under the spell of classical and biblical cultural predominance, his suggested Greek and Hebrew cognates were kept in fairly reasonable bounds; there is no attempt to explain the whole of the Slavonic vocabulary as deriving from Hebrew.

Marko Pohlin (1735–1801; baptismal name: Anton), son of a Ljubljana innkeeper, after schooling at the Franciscan gymnasium in Novo mesto and the Jesuit college in Ljubljana, joined the order of the discalced Augustinians in which he remained until the end of his life, working as preacher and teacher, rising to the rank of subprior at monasteries in Ljubljana, Maria-Brunn and Vienna, serving at one stage as secretary of his native province.²¹ Contact with Czech members of the order fostered in him that ambition to raise the dignity of his own language which gave him the leading role in the first stage of the Slovene cultural revival. From his vast output of devotional and educational literature, numbering over forty published books and around twenty which remained in manuscript, the most significant for our present purpose are his dictionaries and his grammar of Slovene, written in German for foreigners and for Slovenes educated with German as the language of instruction. In this work Pohlin insists that Slovene is as ancient and honourable as other civilised languages; it was once taught at court; it was earlier used in church services; it is spoken over a vast territory.

Pohlin made use of Popovič's card index in compiling the etymological dictionary, to which, in apparent emulation of Wachter's *Glossarium germanicum*, he gave the title *Glossarium slavicum*, or more precisely, in the heading to his preface, *Glossarium slavico-carniolicum*. In this preface Pohlin states his own attitude to the etymologist's quest.²² At the outset he disclaims any desire to prove that all other languages have derived or borrowed their vocabulary from Illyrian, or from Slavonic, the later, more refined stage of that language. He would not follow the example of those numerous fierce champions of the integrity of their native tongue by asserting that Carniolan had such a rich vocabulary that it had no need of alien plumage. He asks if there is any language on earth which could honestly claim that all its words were its own, neither related to nor shared with others, nor borrowed from them, the unique heritage of one single society. He is aware that some of the most learned scholars have taken it for granted that their own beloved language was the source of all others, relying on the prattle of so many chronographers, who strive to establish the close links of their nation with the patriarchs and other ancients. Fr. Marko declares that he intends to avoid such quicksands and whirlpools; he is not so much concerned with precise definitions of origin as with proclaiming the concord, affinity, mutuality and inter-relationships of languages. Original and genuine Slovene words are frequently of Greek origin; on the other hand, as Popovič has shown, many words lost in Greek are of Illyrian origin. The most famous lexicographers do not dispute the fact that their languages have borrowed many words from Illyrian. And this in no way belittles the worth and honour of any language. "Holy and sacred be the accord of the common, universal Race in all things righteous!"

²¹ Biographical details are from Gspan, *op. cit.*, 353–361 and Slodnjak, *op. cit.*, 61–68.

²² *Glossarium slavicum* (henceforth *Glossarium*), 3–6.

He goes on to present fifteen general rules of 'glossology', most of which are quite sound in principle. Rule I contains the valid point that materials from a wide range of languages may be legitimately quoted, since these demonstrate convergent tendencies (*convenientia*); presented in this way they are more easily stamped on the memory. Rule II acknowledges that full agreement is not necessary: anyone can see that Latin *Vulcanus* is from *Tubalcain* and *antrum* from Greek *antron*. Rule III emphasises the role of logic and reason in etymology and gives examples of derivation *ex materia*: *homo* 'man' from *humus* 'earth'; *ab adjuncto*: *ales* 'bird' from *ala* 'wing'; *ex dissentaneis*: *lucus* 'grove', so-called *quod minime luceat* 'because it gives little light'. Rule IV acknowledges the importance of analogy, which helps us to realise that *rostrum* 'beak' is from *rodo* 'gnaw'; *rastrum* 'hoe' from *rado* 'scratch'; Slovene *šivanka* 'needle' is from *šivam* 'sew'; by metathesis Latin *forma* comes from Greek *morphē* 'shape', and German *kurz* 'short' from Hebrew *qātsar* 'curtail'. Rule V on the frequent permutability of vowels brings us to the threshold of the laws of Indo-European vocalic gradation with examples from Slovene: *pes* 'dog', *pasje* 'doggish'; *dolg* 'long', *dalej* 'further'. Rule VI gives examples of the permutation of consonants which have the same point of articulation: Latin *scribo*, *scripsi*; Latin *macer* 'lean', German *mager* 'id.'; Greek *pous* 'foot', German *Fuß* 'id.'. The alignment of Slovene *bos* 'barefoot' with *pes* in Latin *nudipes* is unfortunate but without Verner's Law Fr. Marko could not know that he had a cognate to hand in German *barfuß*. Rule VII declares that the letters of the root are of essential importance compared with those others which are accidental or formative: in Latin *pater* *pat* is the essence, while suffixal *ter*, *trem*, *tris*, *ernus* are accidental. The accompanying etymology, deriving Greek *patēr* from Hebrew *'āb* by metathesis (*āb* to *pā*), though erroneous, is of interest since it allots *t* to the suffix; in the Latin example this consonant is regarded as part of the root. Rule VIII gives examples of grammatical derivation which seem to consist in shedding an inflection: nominative *kozl* 'goat' from oblique *kozla*; masculine *lubil* from feminine *lubila*; *ženem* 'married' from *ženem* 'I marry' seems to go counter to the stated principle deriving present from preterite. Rule IX perceives but misinterprets the relationship between initial *h* in Greek and *s* in Latin, deriving the latter from the former, e.g. *sylva* from *hulē* 'wood'; Fr. Marko attempts without success to apply the rule to Slovene. Rule X recognises the need to take dialectal variants into account. Rule XI concerns aspiration which occurs before initial vowels as a result of emphasis or for ease of articulation; the example from Slovene: *hovca* for *ovca* 'sheep' is valid.

Rule XII points out that the same word may have not only diverse but even contradictory meanings in various languages. Fr. Marko quotes the paradoxical Greek *lōbē* 'contumely' against German *Lobe* 'praise', and the polysemic *sus*, in Latin 'pig' but 'horse' in Hebrew and 'silence' in Dutch. He reports the theory that such confusion results from divine intervention at the building of the tower of Babel, without indicating whether he himself believes this. Rule XIII tolerates the coexistence of rival etymologies and admits that sometimes the same word may be derived with equal felicity from Greek, Hebrew, Latin, German and so on. Rule XIV states that the graphic evidence is often confirmed by meaning; his other examples are possible but the alignment of Slovene *žito* 'corn' with Greek *sitos* 'bread' is invalid although semantically attractive. Rule XV counsels restraint: we should not strive with the Stoics to find a solution for every word. Finally, an etymological dictionary

is not required to list all derivatives; it is enough to give the root words and omit such categories as *composita*, *decomposita*, *comparatives*, *negatives*, *frequentatives*, whose formation may be learnt with the aid of a grammar.

Although Fr. Marko may have wished to submit to the discipline of these principles, he had no means of checking the validity of derivational relationships based on the evidence of graphic or phonetic similarities. Forced to search for logical explanations for the resultant alignments, he shows great ingenuity. In some associations we see etymology used to serve male suspicion and prejudice. “*Žena...ženem eiusdem sunt originis a verbo ženem, jam passive, jam active sumpta: Syr[iace] zena, fornicatus est*” (*Glossarium*, 90): *žena* contains the same root as the present stem of *gnati: ženem* ‘I chase’; she is caught as passive or active victim after the chase she may have herself provoked; the Syriac evidence stresses her carnal proclivities. Popovič, on the other hand, aligns the word with Gothic *kuni* ‘generation, tribe’ and takes the underlying meaning to be ‘the child-bearing sex’: “*žena, ist verwandt mit geno, is, ere, gebähren, quasi pariens sexus. Das Gothische kun, generatio...*” (354). The association of *dekle* ‘girl’ and *delo* ‘work’ with Greek *doulē* (*Glossarium*, 17) seems to assert the subservient role of woman in society; linguistically *doulos* ‘male slave’ would have served equally well as a cognate for *delo*. Or was Fr. Marko applying Rule VIII and the primacy of feminine forms? *Hlepim* ‘I crave’ is derived in accordance with Rule VI from *hleb* ‘bread’, “*litera leni in asperam mutata*” (*Glossarium*, 32). The semantic development is explained as follows: “a certain kind of woman craves the odour of freshly baked bread; hence the metaphorical sense of *hle-pim*”. For his frivolous alter ego, author of a collection of light-hearted riddles (*Kratkočasne uganke*, Ljubljana, 1788) Pater Markus chose the anagrammatical pseudonym, Peter Kumras. Perhaps Markus did not find it easy to bar Kumras from the scriptorium when his advice was inopportune. Although Pohlin has the reputation of an arrant egoist, the epigraph he chose for his *Glossarium* claims only modest success in his etymological endeavours:

“Qui legis ista, tuam reprehendo, si mea laudas
Omnia, stultitiam; si nihil? Invidiam.”

Prispelo aprila 2000, sprejeto oktobra 2000
Received April 200, accepted October 2000

Slovenska začetnika primerjalnega slovanskega jezikoslovja

Žiga Popovič (1705–1774) je bil vsestranski učenjak in nenavadno nadarjen jezikoslovec. Eno težišč njegovega zanimanja je bilo primerjalno slovansko jezikoslovje, njegova neizpolnjena želja pa izdelati popoln pregled slovanskih narečij od Jadranskega do Črnega morja. Zagovarjal je pomembnost slovanskega dokaznega gradiva pri primerjalnih in zgodovinskih študijah: v grščini pozabljena beseda je utegnila preživeti v slovanščini. To načelo je upravičeno, vendar so navedeni primeri delno dvomljivi. Popovič je zbiral gradivo za slovenski etimološki slovar in pri tem mimo-grede uporabil nove črkovne znake, kar je privedlo do črkopisne reforme. Čeprav ga

je včasih zavedlo tradicionalno izvajanje grščine iz hebrejščine, se je izkazal za sposobnega uporabiti jasna etimološka načela.

Zaradi sklicevanja na glasovno podobnost in dopuščanja več različnih rešitev je večina etimoloških podatkov v *Glossarium Slavicum* Marka Pohlina (1735–1801) napačna, čeprav ne nezanimiva, predvsem zaradi njegovih razumskih in celo moralizirajočih teženj. Veliki učitelj sam priznava, da je v etimologiji šibek.

Early Slovene Pioneers of Comparative Slavonic Philology

Žiga Popovič (1705–1774) was a dedicated polymath and unusually gifted linguist, with a particular interest in comparative Slavonic philology, and an unfulfilled ambition to make a complete survey of Slavonic dialects from the Adriatic to the Black Sea. He insisted on the importance for comparative and historical studies of the Slavonic evidence: a word, lost in Greek, might survive in Slavonic. The principle is sound, although the examples offered may be suspect. Popovič gathered materials for an etymological dictionary of Slovene, incidentally employing new characters in what amounted to a reform of the alphabet. Although occasionally misled into traditional derivations from Greek or Hebrew, he showed himself capable of applying sound etymological principles.

Suggested by phonetic resemblance and tolerant of multiple solutions, much of the etymological information in Marko Pohlina's (1735–1801) *Glossarium Slavicum* is invalid, though not without interest for its rationalising and even moralising tendencies. The great pedagogue himself admits his shortcomings as an etymologist.