

Marek Stachowski

Uniwersytet Jagielloński
Kraków

The problem of a Turkic etymology of the Slavonic word **baranь* ‘ram’

1. Introductory remarks

More than ten years ago I presented my opinion and my doubts concerning the Turkic origin of the Slavonic word **baranь* ‘ram’. They constituted part of a longer study (Stachowski 2005: 438–441) in which other words were also discussed but none of them appeared in the title of the paper. Consequently those remarks may have escaped the attention of interested scholars which is why I have felt impelled to explain my position in a special, more detailed paper.

The present article is divided into two parts, the first of them being an overview of some important publications (though by far not all – it is highly recommended that this list be complemented by data adduced in Leschber 2017), mostly dictionaries which have influenced our understanding of Slavonic etymology to a considerable extent. My aim is not to present all etymologists’ views and all types of published suggestions (the more so as they often are actually identical conjectures rewritten in various constellations). I am rather going to show the place of Turkic etymology among other etymological proposals, that is to indicate in which influential publications a Turkic etymology was accepted or omitted, as well as to present at least one generally unknown article (Novikova 1979) that, however, is likely to arouse some interest among Slavonic etymologists. In the second part of my paper I present my comments on some formulations encountered in various studies published up to the moment of writing.

2. An overview

1880

I want to heartily thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing out that, even before F. Miklosich, the origin of the word *baran* was discussed by A. Matzenauer (1880: 5) who compared it with Gr. βύτιον ‘sheep’ (~ Hesychius βαρεῖον), as well as with „skand. *fær*, švéd. *får*, dán. *faar* ovce; skand. *for* aries, vervex, qui gregem ducit”.

1886

Franz Miklosich (1886: 7b) could not explain the origin of **baranъ* but suggested a possible comparison with Mordvinian *boran* ‘wether’. This thread was not to be continued into the future. Nevertheless, it was, as it seems, for the first time that Slavonic **baranъ* was suggested to have been borrowed from an Eastern language.

1908–1913

E. Berneker compares the Slavonic word to its semantic equivalents in Greek and Albanian but is not sure about the character of this comparison and he says: “Wie weit diese Übereinstimmungen auf Urverwandtschaft, wie weit auf Entlehnung beruhen, ist kaum zu sagen” (Berneker 1908–1913: 43).

1909

In his review of Berneker’s dictionary, A. Meillet is more decisive in that he says: “L’extension des mots auxquels le nom sl. *baranŭ* [...] est apparenté montre qu’il s’agit d’un vieux mot du centre de l’Europe, qui a été admis par le vocabulaire des langues indo-européennes substituées à l’ancien idiome local inconnu [...]” (Meillet 1909: 69sq.). The idea of a borrowing as well as that of a non-Indo-European etymon are not new but that of a substrate source *is.*– Cf. “1952”.

1910

M. Vasmer, in his review article of then newly published etymological investigations, tends to couple together Berneker and Miklosich rather than to accept Meillet’s substrate. He writes: “Ich habe die frage nach den nicht-idg. bestandteilen hier deswegen aufgeworfen, weil sie allmählich eine prinzipielle bedeutung erlangt. Man sieht es so recht, wenn man die deutungen vornimmt, die der weitverbreiteten sippe von *baranъ* [...] zuteil geworden sind. Meillet sieht hier nämlich eine entlehnung aus einer unbekanntem voridg. sprache Europas. Ich kann diese meinung nicht widerlegen, ebenso wenig, wie Meillet die seinige beweisen kann. Nur scheint mir, dass dies problem sich doch nicht so leicht lösen lässt, wie Meillet es

will. Sollte man hier nicht doch noch versuchen die etymologie im osten zu finden?" (Vasmer 1910: 256). Having read the first sentence in that passage, a reader might expect Vasmer to propose some non-Indo-European words that could, at least partially, change the traditional understanding of the etymology of **baranь*. However, Vasmer only adduces, in the further part of his study, Greek, Persian and Kurdish words, which is a somewhat disappointing ending. – Cf. "1952".

1927

Two important observations were made in this year. A. Brückner claimed the word could not be of Alpine origin even though it sometimes was compared to some words in Greek, Albanian or Northern Italian, that indeed were phonetically similar but shorter as they did not display the word-final syllable *-an* (Brückner 1927: 15a). Simultaneously Brückner thought of a connection of **baranь* with Proto-Slavonic **borwъ*, a word whose reflexes were in use in Czech, Serbian and Russian to denote 'swine, hog' (ibidem). He seems not to have noticed that **borwъ* has no *-an* either.

In the same year K. Lokotsch (1927: 19b) allows, with some uncertainty, for the Persian origin of Slavonic **baranь*. The intermediary language between Persian *bār(r)ä* 'Lamm' and the Slavonic word could have been, he thinks, Kurdish. – See "1974" below.

1949

C. D. Buck (1949: 158a) is not very much concerned with etymology. Nevertheless he puts the Slavonic word into one group with its Greek and Albanian synonyms. The author's final remark: "ultimate source dub.[ious]" is of course true (unfortunately, even today) but, what is much more important, it prompts the reader to think that there *is* one source for all of these words, regardless of whether known or unknown, Indo-European or non-Indo-European, and so on.

1951–1956

Because of an unstable vowel sequence and an unclear structure the Slavonic word should be interpreted as an old loan word, says F. Sławski (1952–1956: 27). He thus joins various predecessors, although almost every one of them seems to have had some other language in mind. Sławski's formulation is in fact so cautious that it actually cannot be considered a step forward.

1952

Two Czech etymologists have recourse to a Proto-European substrate (Holub/Kopečný 1952: 67b), an idea that still cannot be either confirmed or rebutted. – Cf. "1909" and "1910".

1958

A Turkic etymon of the Slavonic **baranъ* is first given by a Russian Turkologist N.K. Dmitriev in his 1958 article (reprinted 1962) on Turkic elements in Russian. The author has no doubt that the Volga-Kipchak word, as attested in Tatar, Bashkir *bārān* ‘lamb’ and Kazakh *beren* ‘sheep’ is the etymon of the Slavonic word. His way of informing the reader does not allow of doubts and discussions; instead it resembles a top-down directive rather than a scholarly debate: “Русское заимствование восходит к тюркским языкам Поволжья (венгерское *bárányu* здесь едва ли можно учитывать). Этимологию Бернекера, возводящего это слово к греческому, албанскому и шведскому языкам, надо отвергнуть” (Dmitriev 1958 [1962]: 526). In addition, Dmitriev, dividing his examples into several lists according to the grade of reliability of the specific etymology, puts **baranъ*, although not underpinned by any argument, into the first list “Тюркизмы, подтвержденные фактами” that only includes the most reliable cases. – For an assessment of the correctness of citing Tatar, Bashkir and Kazakh see “1980” below.

1960

O.N. Trubačev (1960: 73–76) is certainly one of the most salient publications as far as the origin of **baranъ* is concerned. Interestingly enough, Trubačev starts his considerations with stressing the lack of this word in South Slavonic (ibid. 73 sq.; literally: “Трудно не считать знаменательным факт наличия слова только в западных и восточных славянских языках [...]”) which is actually not true, and the problem will be variously treated by Trubačev in the future (see below “1974” and “1986”). In 1960, however, he accepts the conjecture that the word cannot be of Slavonic origin because its structure is entirely unclear as well as that it cannot possibly have been borrowed from the south of Europe because it is missing from South Slavonic. Rather, he says, it should be interpreted as a Turkic loan word, albeit its etymon is not the Volga Turkic word *bārān* ‘lamb’ because this is probably itself a Slavonic loan into Kipchak. Our word should more likely be viewed as an original participle characterized by the author as “Old Turkic **baran* ‘going, marching’, later *bargan*, Turkmen *baran*” (ibid. 76). In his eyes, “it is but natural that that word was used in conversations concerning sheep because sheep, the livestock of nomads, are perfectly suitable for long wanderings” (ibidem; translation mine – M.S.; the original says: “Употребление этого слова в разговоре об овцах вполне естественно: овца – это скот кочевника, она идеально приспособлена к дальним переходам”). Finally Trubačev admits that venue and time of the borrowing process cannot possibly be ascertained.

1962

For N.K. Dmitriev’s article see “1958”.

1968

V. Machek does not mention Trubačev's Turkic possibility in his dictionary, perhaps because he also adduces the Serbo-Croatian word *baran*. He is rather inclined to continue championing the idea of a pre-Indo-European substrate summoning call for sheep (Machek 1968: 51a), cf. above "1952" where, however, the character of the substrate word is not settled. A special difficulty of that explanation is that it should presumably have been a call for rams only, rather than for both male and female sheep.

1970

The manuscript of a Russian etymological dictionary by P. Ja. Černych was ready in 1970 but the editing process was stopped when the author died in that year. Ultimately, the dictionary was published only in 1993.

An especially baffling fact is that Černych neither specifies Trubačev's 1960 book in his list of references nor mentions the Turkic etymology of Russian *baran* (Černych 1993: 72b).

1971

Also P. Skok (1971: 110b) reckons with either Alpine or Iranian origin of the Slavonic term without mentioning the Turkic possibility or citing Trubačev's study.

1974

ÈSSJa certainly belongs to publications of paramount importance for Slavonic etymology. Because Trubačev was its chief editor for many years he also influenced what was written about **baranъ* and, thus, one is a little astonished to see that Trubačev must have entirely changed his opinion on the geography and etymology of that word in the period between his own monograph (1960) and the publication of ÈSSJa 1 (1974).

He now says reflexes of Proto-Slavonic **baranъ* are also known in all the South Slavonic languages except in Slovene, nevertheless the Alpine etymology cannot satisfy us since it does not allow for the suffix *-an*. The role of Turkic is reduced to intermediation between an etymon **bārān*, corresponding to the Iranian protoform **varan* and the Proto-Slavonic **baranъ* (ÈSSJa 1: 158). The phonetic discrepancies between the intermediary form **bārān* and the ultimate etymon **varan* are not discussed and a reason for casting off the idea of a Turkic etymon is not explained. Trubačev rather confines himself to criticising those who speak of the Alpine possibility as well as the Czech etymologists who feel happy with their vague hints on a substrate source, although as many as three pages are devoted to this word in ÈSSJa so that a reader might expect something more than "we now see advisable to assign only the role of an intermediary to the Turkic languages" (cf. the whole

context: “Раньше высказывалась гипотеза о тюрк. происхождении праслав. **baranь* < др.-тюрк. **baran* ‘идуший’ [...], которую мы сейчас считаем целесообразным видоизменить, отведя тюрк. языкам лишь роль посредника при передаче вероятного средне-иранского заимствования **bārān* ‘баран, овца’ < ир. **varan*” [ibid. 158]). – In this respect cf. “1927” (Lokotsch).

In the Polish *Słownik prasłowiański* B. Szewczyková (1974), only repeats what F. Sławski wrote in his etymological dictionary (see above “1952–1956”).

1976

E. N. Šipova’s (1976: 59sq.) most essential statements can be summarized as follows: [1] Nikolaj K. Dmitriev’s suggestion of the Volga Turkic origin of the Slavonic word **baranь* seems to be correct, cf. Tatar and Bashkir *bārān* ‘lamb’, Kazakh *beren* ‘sheep’; [2] In Bashkir and Tatar also a diminutive variant *bārās* ‘little ram, lamb’ is known; [3] Cf. also the words attested in W. Radloff’s comparative dictionary: Chagatai and Bashkir *bārān* < Russian *baran*; Shor *marāš* (< *marā+š*) ‘sheep’; Turkish *marya* ‘sheep, goat’; [4] it is also possible that the word *borān* ~ *barān*, originally borrowed from Turkic into Russian, was then reborrowed into Turkic, exclusively as *baran* (ibid. 60: “Возможно, что слово *борāн* || *барāн*, проникшее в древний период в русский язык из языков тюркских, было настолько освоено русскими в этой форме, что позднее усваивалось тюрками только как *баран*”).

1979

An article by K. A. Novikova whose fragments are summarized below has never been well known to Slavicists because it principally concerns Tungusic and was published in a collection of Altaistic papers. The author starts with a discussion of the origin of Lamut and Evenk words: *bēru* ~ *bēraŋkī* ‘sheep’, *bore* ‘ram’ whose etymology has not been ultimately settled. They are generally considered to be derivatives from stems imitating sheep bleating: *be* ~ *bē*. On the other hand, however, they might equally well be reflexes of some migratory word, she says. Novikova also mentions a few non-Tungusic words like Slavonic *baran* ‘ram’, Albanian *berr* ‘sheep, ram, goat’, Dagestanian *bura* ‘lamb’, Dumaki *beḍa* (*-ḍ- < -r-*) ‘sheep’ but she admits the similarity may be nothing but pure coincidence. A connection between the Tungus and the Slavonic word does not appear realistic because no historical contacts of these language groups are known (Novikova 1979: 129).

As far as the etymology of the Slavonic *baran* ~ *beran* is concerned Novikova considers their possible connection with Turkic rather contestable. Her argument is new in the discussion: An early participle form of the verb *bar-* ‘to go, wander, march’ was *baragan*, she claims, whereas *bargan* is a secondary shortened variant so that the Slavonic etymology, based on a secondary Old Turkic form,

is very uncertain. At the same time she thinks Slavonic *baran* is the secondary result of vowel-harmonical assimilation of the vowel sequence of the original Slavonic *beran* (Novikova 1979: 130) which flatly contradicts the opinion of Holub/Kopečný (1952: 67b) and ÈSSJa (1: 157) where the dissimilation of **a–a* into the Czech *e–a* is promoted.

One can easily understand Novikova's point of view now: If the original Slavonic form was *beran*, and the Turkic participle primarily had the form *baragan*, their connection is rather disputable.

1980

Z. Gołąb finished his monograph on *The origins of the Slavs* approximately in 1980 but, for unknown reasons, it remained unpublished till 1992. Thus, Gołąb's views represent the state of the art around 1980 although they could influence the Slavistic milieu only from 1992 on. This means that Gołąb could be inspired by ÈSSJa (1974) and Šipova (1976) but remained unknown to Trubačev during his work on the Russian edition of Vasmer's dictionary published in 1986. I decided to present *The origins* at this place of my essay because doing otherwise could probably suggest to some readers that Gołąb ignored even very important works published in the 1980's.

Gołąb's views are not innovative. He only says **baranъ* is "quite a disputable word, but most probably borrowed from Altaic" (Gołąb 1992: 401). His use of the term "Altaic" is somewhat light-hearted and nobody can exactly say what he actually meant. In any event, he adduces only what he calls "forms from the Turkic languages of the Volga region, e.g. Tatar and Bashkir *bärän* 'lamb', Kazakh *beren* 'ewe,' etc. [...]" (ibidem), that is, he just repeats the examples from Dmitriev 1958 (and ignores Trubačev 1960). In reality, Kazakh is better not linked to the Volga region, while Tatar and Bashkir are, in both the geographical and linguistic sense of the word, as close to each other as, for instance, Czech and Slovak. Calling these three Kipchak languages Altaic is no more and no less accurate than calling a word Indo-European because it is attested in Slovak, Czech and Sorbian.

1982

The Ukrainian etymological dictionary considers the idea of the "Tatar (Kazakh)" [= ?] etymon (*bärän* 'lamb') of the Slavonic word to be unsubstantiated (ÈSUM 1: 138sq.). Trubačev's Turkic **baran* is also presented as well as non-Turkic suggestions but none is expressly favoured.

1986

Although O. N. Trubačev translated and completed M. Vasmer's Russian etymological dictionary, commenting in the process on some of the etymological ideas,

in the case of Russian *baran* he confined himself to repeating Vasmer's opinion regarding an Alpine origin primarily connected with a call for sheep, and to dismissing Tatar *bārān* 'lamb' as a possible etymon. True, he indicated there was an alternative etymology in his 1960 monograph, albeit without adducing it or mentioning that he had rejected it in ÈSSJa (Vasmer 1986: 123sq.).

1992

For Gołąb 1992 see "1980".

1993

The posthumous edition of Černych's 1970 dictionary made his views available for etymological readers. See "1970" above.

2001

Rejzek (2001: 76a) partially abandons the Czech tradition and does not draw on the substrate explanation. He rather points to the importance of the suffix *-an* that probably signals an Indo-Iranian etymon. – Cf. "2015" below.

2005

Just like his teacher F. Sławski, W. Boryś (2005: 21) speaks out in favour of an old loan word from an unknown source. He enumerates also the Albanian and the Italian dialectal words but he does not mention the Turkic or Indo-Iranian possibility.

2006

The Serbian school accepts the idea of foreign origin of the Slavonic word and suggests Iranian to be a thinkable source whereas Turkic may or may not have been an intermediary link (ERSJ 2: 186).

2008

One cannot much infer from the fact that **baranъ* is missing from Derksen's (2008) dictionary. Should it be understood as a signal of Derksen's denying the existence of the word already in Proto-Slavonic?

2015

In 2015, Rejzek repeats his opinions of 2001 and merely modifies the Proto-Indo-European forms (Rejzek 2015: 81b).

Králík's etymological dictionary of Slovak was published at the same time but that fact did not change much in our context. Králík (2015: 62ab) cited three possibilities: Alpine origin, an Indo-Iranian etymon or summoning calls for animals. The Turkic thread was omitted.

2016

A new Croatian etymological dictionary accepts the unclear status of the etymology of **baranъ* but, at the same time, it points to Turkic (e.g., Kazakh *bārān* ‘lamb’) as a very probable source of borrowing (ERHJ 1: 43b).

2017

C. Leschber’s aim is to discuss Albanian *berr* rather than Slavonic *baran*. She accepts Stachowski’s (2005) opinions (also that of the need of a much wider look at the geography of the word material) but does not adduce and discuss them because that is beyond the scope of her research.

3. Comments

In the following part of this study only the Turkic etymology will be commented on – or rather two Turkic etymologies.

The first ever suggested Turkic etymons of the Slavonic word **baranъ* were Tatar, Bashkir *bārān* ‘lamb’ and Kazakh *beren* ‘sheep’ (Dmitriev 1958 [1962]: 526). Dmitriev did not enumerate his sources. One can hardly believe that he did not use the most popular comparative dictionary of Turkic by W. Radloff. Nevertheless, Radloff’s opinion, expressed in volume 4, part 1 (1911), s.v. Tatar, Bashkir *bāpān* ‘lamb’ is unambiguous: “aus dem russ. баранъ” (R IV 1597a). It remains unclear why Dmitriev omitted to mention this.

Besides, the source of Dmitriev’s «Kazakh *beren* ‘sheep’» is also unknown. In Radloff’s dictionary we find several words of similar sound but none of them fits our context. They are:

Chagatai, Kirghiz *berān* ‘1. der beste Sammet; 2. der beste Stahl’ (R IV 1596);

Kirghiz *berān*, nur in: *berān kal!* ‘stirb!’ (R IV 1597);

Kazakh [“aus dem Russ.”] *berān* ‘das Pfühl’ (R IV 1596);

Ottoman *baran* ‘1. reichlicher Regen; 2. eine grosse Menge von Weinreben im Garten’ (R IV 1477);

Kazakh *baran* ‘dunkelfarben (von Pferden)’ (R IV 1477);

Kirghiz *barān* ‘die Kraft, die Macht’ (R IV 1477);

Kirghiz *barān* ‘die Flinte, das Gewehr’ (R IV 1477).

In modern Kirghiz one can also encounter *barān* ‘a sort of fine cloth/fabric’, as well as some phonetic or semantic variants of the above words. But no *beren* ‘sheep’ could be identified in Kazakh or Kirghiz.

Trubačev dismissed Dmitriev’s etymology but not because of the shortcomings listed above. His argument was methodologically weak: Tatar and Bashkir *bārān* cannot be a source of the Slavonic word because it is probably itself a bor-

rowing from Slavonic. First, words like “probably” noticeably sap the power of any claim. Second, because the phenomenon of *Rückwanderer* has for a long time been well known to etymologists Trubačev’s reasoning is rather thin.

Much more important is what Trubačev proposed on his own. His etymology says that the Slavonic word **baranъ* is a reflex of an Old Turkic word *baran*, later *bargan*, attested in Turkmen *baran* today, that primarily was a participle meaning ‘marching, going’ which very well fits the main characteristic of sheep.

A factual and a semantic doubt should be presented first. The ‘ram’ has not been called *bar(g)an* in any Turkic language, living or dead, either in the past or nowadays. Next, female sheep have been marching equally well; why, then, should the term meaning ‘(a) marching (one)’ have been limited to ‘rams’, that is ‘male sheep’ only?

Let us move on now to the structure of that Old Turkic word. The first question is: Why is it written with an asterisk by Trubačev (ibidem: “др.-тюрк. **baran*”) when Old Turkic texts and their lexis are well known to Turkologists? The problem is: that word is not.

Trubačev’s notation “Old Turkic *baran* > *bargan*, Turkmen *baran*” is unclear and certainly incorrect. The modern Kipchak suffix *-gan* seems to have its counterpart in Oguz *-an* but the original form was undoubtedly *-gan*; thus, only the change of *bargan* > *baran* was possible. In Kipchak, *-gan* is a past participle suffix, in the Oguz languages it creates past or present participles (cf. Turkmen *yazan* ‘(a person) who wrote’; Turkish *yaz-an* ‘(a person) who writes’; Turkmen and Turkish *geç-en hafta* ‘the last week’, lit. ‘the week that passed’).

The word *baran* exists in Turkmen, that is true, but it means ‘(a person) who went’. In Turkish additional changes took place, one phonetic and one semantic, so that the Turkish form is *varan* ‘(a person) who (has) arrived/reached’. None of these variants means ‘ram’.

In addition, the suffix *-gan* that seems to have formed designations expressing the results of an action or personal names characterized by an action is rather poorly represented in Old Turkic texts, and its connection with the Kipchak *-gan* and the Oguz *-an* is not really understood. Actually, only two Old Turkic derivatives with *-gan* come readily to mind: one is *kapgan* ‘title of a ruler’ (< Old Turkic *kap-* ‘to catch’ ~ [?] ‘to conquer’), presumably literally, ‘(a person) who caught/conquered’; the other is the appellative *kurgan* ‘fortress’, which is either derived from Old Turkic *kur-* ‘to build, erect’ (Kononov 1980: 91, § 112) or corrected into *korigan* and then derived from *kori-* ‘to save, protect’ (Tekin 1968: 112; Tekin 2000: 91). As we see, *kurgan* is not very certain (even though Slavonic *kurgan* ‘kurgan, barrow, tumulus’ points to the correctness of the traditional reading and etymology of Old Turkic *kurgan* ‘fortress’; cf. also English *building* ‘1. participle (a person/the one) who builds; 2. (something) built, edifice, construction’). And

if *kapgan* remains in our discussion as the only Old Turkic *-gan*-derivative it will not be certain either.

I am not going to discuss these Turkological questions in detail here. I am only trying to show that the Old Turkic noun under discussion could have sounded **bargan*, but decidedly not **baran*, that neither **baran* nor **bargan* is attested and both are very problematical because they should have meant **(a person/the one) who has gone (away)*. A present participle *‘(a person/the one) who goes/is going’* is attested in Old Turkic with another suffix, namely *-ūr ~ -ȳr*, i.e. *bar-ūr ~ bar-ȳr* (Tekin 1968: 177).

In addition one cannot but ask why the Slavs who conducted conversations on sheep with their Old Turkic fellow shepherds did not just borrow a word which has been generally used by the latter to designate a ‘ram’, namely **koč*, but, instead, preferred to take a word that has never been attested with that meaning.

Turning on now to Šipova’s dictionary, I first of all have to say that it is handy and convenient but these two features exhaust its advantages. Let us try to analyze her information in a systematic way.

Šipova repeats the Tatar, Bashkir and Kazakh words as they were cited by Dmitriev and says she accepts Dmitriev’s etymology (*“Нам представляется правильным утверждение Дмитриева, что «русское заимствование восходит к тюркским языкам Поволжья»”* [Šipova 1976: 59]). If one bears in mind that Dmitriev did not present a single argument in support one may wonder why his claim “seems correct” to Šipova who, nota bene, does not put forth any reason for her choice either.

Šipova says she adduces some words after Radloff’s comparative dictionary: *“Ср. У Радлова бәрән (чаг., башк. из рус. баран)”* (Šipova 1976: 60). I fear I fail to see how this passage should underpin her and Dmitriev’s opinion that Russian *баран* is a reflex of the Kipchak etymon *бәрән*. However, another problem seems to be much more important here. The term “Chagatai” has been used by some Slavonic philologists from time to time. This fact deserves to be commented on.

Chagatai is a collective name for various Turkic dialects spoken in Transoxania most parts of which today belong to Uzbekistan. Secondly, the term came into being in the 15th century. The question how a 15th century word from Uzbekistan could have been borrowed into Proto-Slavonic is a tough nut indeed. Besides, Chagatai was in essence a group of spoken dialects of Turkic rather than a stable and normed literary language (even though Ali-Shir Navai wrote his poems in that language). It was chiefly a specific feature of the Arabic alphabet that allowed of writing down what could be called a “consonantic symbol” of a given word. Then this “symbol” was read differently by different readers, according to their native pronunciation habits. A Slavonic philologist can imagine a writing system in which an “umbrella symbol”, say, «d’n’» is introduced to denote Polish *dzień*, Czech *den*, Slovak *deň*,

Lower Sorbian *žen* and Upper Sorbian *džen* ‘day’. But one must not claim that «d’n’» is a West Slavonic etymon of any specific word in the world because that symbol is only written, never exactly pronounced in any West Slavonic language in the way suggested by its notation. That is approximately how the writing system of Chagatai compared with the phonetic habits of its speakers.

The Shor language knows *māraš* ‘sheep’ rather than ***marāš*, unlike Šipova’s claim. A small difference but *māraš* can be derived from the Shor verb *māra-* ‘to bleat’ while ***marāš* cannot. This etymology was already given by Radloff in 1911 (R 4: 2026) but this fact is not mentioned by Šipova. NB, the Kipchak diminutive *bārās* ‘lamb’ possibly features the same **-š* suffix.

Turkish *marya* ‘1. sheep; 2. female goat’, too, is instanced in Šipova’s dictionary. However, the truth of the matter is that this word must not by any means be included in our discussion. First of all, it does not designate a ‘ram’ or any other male animal, but semantic differences are more often than not plainly ignored in this discussion (although one can hardly imagine a conversation of a Slavonic shepherd with a Turkic one in which no difference between a ram, a sheep and a female goat is made; interestingly enough, no male goat seems to have appeared in their colloquy). Secondly, there is no suffix *-ya* in Turkish so that no structural connection between *marya* and other *bar*-words can be shown. Thirdly, the *b-* > *m-* change is possible in Turkic but it only extremely seldom appears in words without a nasal consonant in the second syllable. The fourth doubt is the most important one: The penultimate stress of a Turkish noun with a vocalic coda (and this word is always pronounced [ˈmarja], not *[maˈrja]) is only typical of loanwords. And indeed, Turkish *marya* goes back to Greek *μαργιά* ‘sheep after the climacterium’ (that original meaning understandably excludes the Greek word from the list of candidates for being an etymon of a designation of a male sheep, i.e. ‘ram’). The Greek ultima accent was subject to an automatic change into the Turkish penultima because the word was (rightly) perceived as foreign.

Finally, a short explanation of Novikova’s (1979) opinion that Slavonic *baran* is a secondary variant of the original *beran* should be given. It is an Altaicist’s second nature to believe that all vowels in a word should be harmonically matched. If a word shows a palatal-velar vowel sequence (as is the case with *beran*) it will of course be “corrected” into a palatal-palatal or velar-velar sequence. Thus, *beran* > *baran*; the other way round principally makes no sense, at least in an Altaicist’s eyes.

The question why Novikova thought that a *-gan* derivative of the verbal stem *bar-* should necessarily have sounded *bar-a-gan* at the beginning and was only later changed into *bar-gan* is not really clear to me. Nevertheless, her opinion has not influenced Slavonic etymology in any way. Therefore I think it need not embarrass us here.

* * *

To conclude, I would like to repeat what I said in my previous article (Stachowski 2005: 441). There exist no good reasons to derive the Slavonic word **baranь* ‘ram’ from Turkic. No Turkic form or proto-form suggested until now can be accepted as an etymon. I have myself been inclined to understand the word **baranь* as one of numerous reflexes of an old migratory word whose other reflexes are, for instance, Catalanian *marrà* ‘ram’ (Sławomirski 1995: 70) and Spanish *marrano* ‘male pig, boar’ (cf. also Malkiel 1948: 179sq., although I cannot accept every word in this work). We cannot really hope the etymology of **baranь* will soon be properly understood but at least mistakes like Old Turkic ***bar(g)an* ‘ram’ can successfully be removed.

References

- Berneker E., 1908–1913, *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1, Heidelberg.
- Boryś W., 2005, *Słownik etymologiczne języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Brückner A., 1927, *Słownik etymologiczne języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- Buck C. D., 1949, *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages. A contribution to the history of ideas*, Chicago : London.
- Černych 1993: Черных П. Я., *Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка*, т. 1, Москва.
- Derksen R., 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*, Leiden : Boston.
- Dmitriev 1958: Дмитриев Н. К., *О тюркских элементах русского словаря*, „Лексикографический сборник” 3 (here cited after the reprint in: Дмитриев, Н. К. 1962: 503–569).
- Dmitriev 1962: Дмитриев Н. К., *Строй тюркских языков*, Москва.
- ERHJ, 2016: Matasović R., Pronk T., Ivšić D., Brozović Rončević D., *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, sv. 1: A–Nj, Zagreb.
- ERSJ, 2006: *Этимолошки речник српског језика*, св. 2, уред. А. Лома, Београд.
- ÈSSJa, 1974: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, ред. О. Н. Трубачев, т. 1, Москва.
- ÈSUM, 1982: *Етимологічний словник української мови*, ред. О. С. Мельничук, т. 1, Київ.
- Gołąb Z., 1992, *The origins of the Slavs. A linguist's view*, Columbus.
- Hoľub/Кореčнý 1952: Hoľub J., Кореčнý F., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha.
- Кононов 1980: Кононов А. Н., *Грамматика языка тюркских рунических памятников (VII–IX вв.)*, Ленинград.
- Králik Ľ., 2015, *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*, Bratislava.

- Leschber C., 2017, *Alban. berr aus der Perspektive des neolithischen landwirtschaftlichen Substrats*, „Linguistique Balkanique” 56/1, pp. 42–53.
- Lokotsch K., 1927, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*, Heidelberg.
- Machek V., 1968, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha.
- Malkiel Y., 1948, *Hispano-Arabic marrano and its Hispano-Latin homophone*, „Journal of the American Oriental Society”, vol. 68, No 4, pp. 175–184.
- Matzenauer A., 1880, *Príspevky ke slovanskému jazykozpytu*, „Listy filologické a paedagogické” 7, pp. 1–48.
- Meillet A., 1909, [Review of:] Berneker E., 1908–1909, *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Lfg. 1–3, Heidelberg, „Rocznik Slawistyczny” 2, pp. 57–71.
- Miklosich F., 1886, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*, Wien.
- Novikova 1979: Новикова К. А., *Названия домашних животных в тунгусо-маньчжурских языках*, [in:] *Исследования в области этимологии алтайских языков*, ред. В. И. Цинциус, Ленинград, pp. 53–134.
- R, 1893–1911: Радловъ В. В., *Опытъ словаря тюркскихъ нарѣчій*, т. 1–4 // Radloff W., *Versuch eines Wörterbuchs der Türk-Dialecte*, vol. 1–4, St. Petersburg.
- Rejzek J., 2001, *Český etymologický slovník*, Voznice.
- Rejzek J., 2015, *Český etymologický slovník*, Voznice.
- Skok P., 1971, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, vol. 1, Zagreb.
- Sławomirski J., 1995, *Wprowadzenie do języka katalońskiego*, Kraków.
- Sławski F., 1952–1956, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków.
- SP, 1974: Sławski F. et al. *Słownik prasłowiański*, t. 1, Kraków.
- Stachowski M., 2005, *Uwagi o zapożyczeniach altajskich w języku prasłowiańskim i kwestie pokrewne*, „Studia Turcologica Cracoviensia” 10, pp. 437–454.
- Szewczykówna B., 1974, *Baran*, [in:] *Słownik prasłowiański*, ed. F. Sławski et al., t. 1, Kraków, pp. 191–192.
- Širova 1976: Шипова Е. Н., *Словарь тюркизмов в русском языке*, Алма-Ата.
- Tekin T., 1968, *A grammar of Orkhon Turkic*, Bloomington.
- Tekin T., 2000, *Orhon Türkçesi grameri*, Ankara.
- Trubačev 1960: Трубачев О. Н., *Происхождение названий домашних животных в славянских языках*, Москва.
- Vasmer M., 1910, *Kritisches und Antikritisches zur neueren slavischen Etymologie*, „Rocznik Slawistyczny” 3, S. 244–283.
- Vasmer 1986: Фасмер М., *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, т. 1, Москва.

Streszczenie

Problem turkijskiej etymologii słowiańskiego **baranь* ‘baran’

Studium niniejsze przynosi rozbudowaną i bardziej szczegółową prezentację moich argumentów przeciwko turkijskiej etymologii słowiańskiej nazwy barana, które po raz pierwszy ukazały się w artykule Stachowski 2005. Etymologia ta została w dwóch odmiennych postaciach stworzona w Rosji (Dmitriev 1958; Trubačev 1960) – obie są błędne, ale każda w inny sposób. Choć żadna z nich nie zdominowała wszystkich słowiańskich słowników etymologicznych, pojawiają się one jednak naprzemiennie w opiniotwórczych publikacjach slawistycznych, toteż pokazanie ich słabości wydaje się być jak najbardziej pożądane.

Słowa kluczowe: etymologia, języki słowiańskie, języki turkijskie, zapożyczenia, język prasłowiański, zoonimy.