



Old Czech *anděl* 'angel': a Loanword from Old Church Slavonic or from Latin?

Vít Boček

Czech Language Institute, Czech
Academy of Sciences,
Brno, Czech Republic

Старочешское *anděl* 'ангел': заимствование из старославянского языка или из латыни?

Вит Бочек

Институт чешского языка,
Академия наук Чешской Республики,
Брно, Чешская Республика

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss the existing theories of the origin of the Old Czech word *anděl* 'angel', whose *-d-* may be explained as reflecting influence from Old Church Slavonic *ангѣль*, containing a palatalised sound, or from Medieval Latin *angelus* [anjelus]. New supporting arguments in favour of the latter view are presented, and, in particular, further evidence of Old Czech [d] in place of earlier [j], the possible secondary influence of antonymous Old Czech *diábel/dábel* 'devil' in the modification of original Old Czech *anjel* to *anděl*, and the form of words for 'angel' in other West and western South Slavonic languages. Also considered is the possibility that the origin of *anděl* is to be found in a spoken Early Romance dialect.

Keywords

etymology, language contact, Czech, Old Church Slavonic, Latin, 'angel', 'devil'

Citation: Boček V. (2021) Old Czech *anděl* 'angel': a Loanword from Old Church Slavonic or from Latin? *Slověne*, Vol. 10, № 2, p. 7–21.

Цитирование: Бочек В. Старочешское *anděl* 'ангел': заимствование из старославянского языка или из латыни? // *Slověne*. 2021. Vol. 10, № 2. С. 7–21.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2021.10.2.1



Резюме

Цель статьи — обсудить существующие гипотезы относительно происхождения старочешского слова *anděl* 'ангел': -*d-* в этом слове можно объяснить как отражение влияния либо старославянского *ангѣль*, содержащего палатализованный согласный, либо среднелатинского *angelus* [anjelus]. В статье приведены новые аргументы в пользу второго толкования, а именно иные случаи появления старочешского [d] на месте более раннего [j], возможное вторичное влияние старочешского антонима *diábel* / *d'ábel* 'дьявол' на изменение первоначального старочешского *anjel* в *anděl* и форма слов со значением 'ангел' в других западнославянских и в западных южнославянских языках. Обсуждается также возможность возведения старочешского *anděl* к устному раннероманскому диалекту.

Ключевые слова

этимология, языковой контакт, чешский язык, старославянский язык, латинский язык, 'ангел', 'дьявол'

In the Old Czech language, two different forms with the meaning 'angel' are attested: *anjel* and *anděl* [see Gebauer 1970, 1: 12–13]. The variation between -*j-* and -*d-* is also reflected in other pairs of Old Czech words. First, there are derivatives of the mentioned forms: the diminutives *anjelík* : *andělík* [Ibid.: 13], the adjectives *anjelský* : *andělský* [Ibid.], the possessive adjectives *anjelón* : *andělón* [AStčS], and the adverbs *anjelsky* : *andělsky* [ESStč]. Second, there is the borrowing of Latin *angelica* 'garden angelica, *Archangelica officinalis*': Old Czech *anjelika* : *andělka* (and their diminutives *anjelička* : *andělička* [Gebauer 1970, 1: 13]). Third, there are other Old Czech words containing the segment -*anjel-* / -*anděl-*, and corresponding to Latin and Greek words with the same meanings: Old Czech *archanjel* : *archanděl* (and their derivatives: the adjectives *archanjelský* : *archandělský* and the possessive adjectives *archanjelón* : *archandělón* [Ibid.: 16]) ~ Latin *archangelus* 'archangel', Greek ἀρχάγγελος 'archangel, a chief angel'; Old Czech *evanjelium* : *evandělium* [ESStč] ~ Latin *euangelium* 'gospel', Greek εὐαγγέλιον 'gospel; good news'; Old Czech *evanjelista* : *evandělista* [Gebauer 1970, 1: 377] ~ Latin *euangelista*, Greek εὐαγγελιστής 'evangelist; a bringer of good news'.¹

In reference to the Old Czech *anjel* (and, *mutatis mutandis*, for the other mentioned forms with -*j-*), it is generally agreed that its source was a Medieval Latin word, in which written <g> before <e> was, at the time, pronounced as

¹ The symmetry of forms with -*j-* and -*d-* is not absolute. Only *andělíček* and *andělóv* are attested, but not **anjelíček* and **anjelový* [ESStč], and, inversely, *evanjelista* and *evanjelistský* are attested, but not **evandělista* and **evandělistský* [ESStč]. In addition, the words for 'gospel' and 'evangelist' also have variants with -*g-*: *evangelium*, *evangelista* (on these forms, cf. also below).

[j] [see Gebauer 1894: 406, 458; Machek 1968: 36; Holub, Kopečný 1952: 61; cf. Klich 1927: 125; Urbańczyk 1952: 127–129]; in the Czech lands, the Latin forms *angelus*, *angellus* ‘angel’ are attested [cf. SSLČ s.v. *angelus*]. The Latin word is a borrowing of Greek ἄγγελος ‘angel’, originally ‘messenger’.

By contrast, the Old Czech form *anděl* with *-ḍ-*, that is, the voiced palatal plosive [j], has been treated differently by various scholars. Essentially, two explanations exist.

There is, firstly, the assumption of an Old Church Slavonic source for Old Czech *anděl*. Jagić [1913: 275–276] was the first to pose the question of whether *-ḍ-* in Old Czech *anděl* could be a result of a “southern”, Old Church Slavonic pronunciation of the word for ‘angel’, that is, ἀγγελъ (recorded also as ἀγγεъъ, ἀγγελъ and ἀγγελъ), in Glagolitic script ꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗꙗ ‘angel’ [cf. SJS 1: 36–37], a borrowing of Greek ἄγγελος [ESJS 1: 49]. Cyrillic ꙗ and Glagolitic ꙗ (the letter whose name is generally spelled as *đerv*, *ǰerv* or *djerv* [cf. Lunt 2000: 280; Idem 2001: 20]) were used to record the Slavonic reflex of Greek [j], which was a palatal allophone of the velar voiced fricative [ɣ], occurring before the front vowels *e*, *i* [cf. Holton et al. 2019: 115–116, 193–194].²

Jagić’s reference to the possible Old Church Slavonic origin of Old Czech *anděl* was taken for granted and further developed by Frinta [1918: 1–2, 22], who interpreted Czech *archanděl* and *evandělium* as borrowings of Church Slavonic ἀρχαγγελъ and εβανγγελιѡ as well, cf.: [SJS 1: 54, 557–558; ESJS 1: 50; 3: 168] for these words and their written variants. According to Frinta, the Old Czech forms with *-ḍ-* are the earliest attested and most archaic ones, whereas those with *-j-* occur only later and reflect the above-mentioned Medieval Latin pronunciation. This view was accepted without further discussion by Младенова [1999: 123], who, however, cited only Old Czech *anděl* and *evandělium*, but not *archanděl*. In later works, only Czech *anděl* was listed as an Old Church Slavonic borrowing: by Klich [1927: 125], again by Frinta

² Basically, there are two approaches to how exactly the Old Church Slavonic reflex of borrowed Greek [j] might have been pronounced, or, seen from the graphophonemic point of view, what sound might have been transcribed by Glagolitic ꙗ. Some scholars [cf. Margulíes 1927: 90–91; Diels 1963: 22, 48–49; Trunte 2003: 18] assume a Slavonic palatal fricative [j], that is, the precise equivalent of the Greek sound. Others [cf. Vasmer 1927: 163–164; Kurz 1969: 22; Mareš 2000: 95–96; Večerka 2006: 124] postulate a Slavonic palatal plosive [j], using *ǰ* and/or *đ* to express this sound graphically. It is very difficult to reconcile these views, above all due to the possibility that *djerv* may have been used to record different sounds in different periods of development of the (Old) Church Slavonic language and the Glagolitic script (the original Thessalonian, the Great Moravian, or the Bulgarian variant and so on, cf. also footnote 9 below). I tend to prefer the second alternative, which tacitly presumes a substitution or adaptation of the foreign sound from a fricative to a plosive. After all, the same substitution/adaptation most likely took place in the analogical case of the Greek velar fricative [ɣ], which was present in positions other than before *e*, *i* and yielded an Old Church Slavonic plosive [g] in such words as πηγανъ ‘rue, Ruta graveolens’ < πήγανον, λογοφетъ ‘logothete (administrative title)’ < λογοθέτης, ηγουμενъ ‘master; head of the monastery’ < ηγουμένος, δογματѡ ‘doctrine, dogma’ < δόγμα, -τος, etc. Having a velar counterpart [g], the palatal plosive [j] would also have a more stable position in the Slavonic sound system than the palatal fricative [j], which would not be paired with an exact velar counterpart (the velar fricative [x] was voiceless).

[1959: 190], by Machek [1968: 36], and more recently by Bańkowski [2000, 1: 12].

However, other researchers think that the Old Czech form *anděl* is a secondary, later modification of *anjel*, an original Old Czech borrowing from Latin (cf. above): consequently, *d'* would be the result of a sporadic change of the approximant *j*, independent of the source-language form of the word. The cause of such a change was most often seen to lie in the preceding *-n-*, whose plosive pronunciation would be prolonged in speech and transmitted onto the following sound [cf. Kořínek 1885; Gebauer 1894: 529; Janko 1926: 225; Trávníček 1935: 136; Holub, Kopečný 1952: 61]. A similar case – occurring even across a word boundary – may be attested in solitary Old Czech *wen dyety* < **ven jěti* 'go out'. Besides that, there may be instances, although again isolated, of a change of *j* to *d'* in positions other than after *-n-*: Old Czech *y dednoho* < **i jednoho* 'also one (gen./acc.)'; *ti, deřto* < **ti, jeřto* 'those who'; *deřtu* (< **jest*) *bliz Eufrates řěka* 'the river Euphrates is near' [Gebauer 1894: 529; 1970, 1: 637, 639].

Reconciling these two explanations seems to be a difficult task, but I would like to discuss at least some points and offer some new observations that can eventually lead to the conclusion that the scenario of a secondary origin of *-d'* is more plausible.

First of all, Frinta's assertion that the forms with *-d'* are earlier than those with *-j-* is not accurate. In ESStč, it is correctly, although, unfortunately, too laconically, stated that the forms with *-d'* are later (cf. the records given by Gebauer [1970, 1: 12–13] and the excerpts in AStčS). On the other hand, it is not quite clear whether the age of the attestations should play a significant role in reconciling the two theories of the origin of *anděl*, since for both of them the time of borrowing (and adaptation) can be conceived of as being much earlier than the appearance of the first attestations.

Second, it is difficult to explain Old Czech *andělíka* 'garden angelica' other than as a borrowing from Latin, because there is no known (Old) Church Slavonic source for it, and the word is not a part of Christian vocabulary. Thus, here we have a clearer piece of evidence for a change of *j* > *d'*. The only argument against the possibility of a more broadly occurring change of *j* > *d'* would be that in *anjelíka* > *andělíka* it can have occurred simply under the influence of the formally similar word *anděl*, that is, by analogy. It is true that the additional, solitary examples of a *j* > *d'* change mentioned in the previous paragraph are not convincing enough to posit this change as a systemic tendency (cf. also: [Gebauer 1894: 529], who reckoned with the possibility that some of these instances could simply be the result of errors). However, there is another Czech loanword from Medieval Latin, which seems to have undergone the sporadic change under consideration: Old Czech *majorán* m., *majorána* f. [Idem 1970,

2: 303; ESStč], a borrowing of Medieval Latin *maiorana* ‘amaracus, marjoram’ [cf. SSLČ s.v. *maiorana]; cf. also the later forms *majoránka* f. (now standard Czech), *majoránek* m., and the *-e*-forms³ *majeránka* f., *majerán(ek)* m. These *-e*-forms further developed into *maděránka* f., *maděrán(ek)* m. [Machek 1954: 201; Kott 1890: 912]. Machek [1968: 348] even states that the sound development in this word, namely, *-j-* > *-ḍ-*, is the very same as in *anděl* and *evandělík*. At the same time (!), he is inclined to explain the forms *maděránka*, *maděrán(ek)* as being derived from a German form, without, however, mentioning which one that might be [Idem 1954: 201; 1968: 348]. All this can be interpreted as inconsistency on the part of this author, with respect to his interpretation of the origin of *anděl*, because he otherwise aligns with the first tradition, assuming an Old Church Slavonic influence on the Czech word (cf. above). In any case, it seems that the development of *-j-* into *-ḍ-* in *majerán-* > *maděrán-* was in fact language-internal. This example, together with the other Old Czech instances of *j* > *ḍ*, also shows that the sporadic change was more likely triggered by a following front vowel than by a preceding sound (the latter view being maintained by the advocates of this change as a general tendency, cf. above).

Furthermore, I wish to supplement the theory of the secondary development of *ḍ* in Old Czech *anděl* with another supporting argument. I believe that the development of *anjel* into *anděl* might have been affected by the initial sound in the first syllable of the Old Czech word *diábel*, *dábel* ‘devil’, a borrowing of Medieval Latin *diabolus* ‘devil’ [cf. SSLČ s.v. diabolus].⁴ The main rationale for the possible influence of *ḍiábel/ḍábel* on *anjel/anděl* relates to the fact that ‘angel’ and ‘devil’ can be understood as opposite or complementary notions.⁵ It is known that an association between opposites sometimes results in formal (phonological, morphological, or word-formational) rapproche-

³ Cf. also *maieranus* in Polish Medieval Latin: [SłSP 6: 43].

⁴ Orthographic variants of this word led Gebauer [1970, 1: 240] to propose several possible pronunciations of the initial syllable: [dyja-], [dija-], [djá-], [diá-], [diá-], and [dá-], which eventually prevailed.

⁵ Both words — *anjel/anděl* and *diábel/dábel* — are very often found close to each other in Old Czech texts. In the Old Czech Text Bank (a part of the web portal *Vokabulář webový*), I found 2574 instances of the segment *-anjel-* and 1678 instances of the segment *-anděl-*. In very close proximity — 50 positions to the left and 50 positions to the right —, the segments *diáb-* or *dáb-* were present many times; to be specific, *-anjel-* was close to *diáb-/dáb-* in 221 instances, while *-anděl-* was close in 90 instances. In sum, instances of close proximity of *-anjel-/anděl-* to *diáb-/dáb-* amount to 311 out of 4252 records, which is more than 7.3%. Unfortunately, the data do not allow us to confirm a specific tendency for the form *-anjel-* to be replaced by *-anděl-* over the course of time, if only instances with close proximity to *diáb-/dáb-* are taken into account. Given that the Old Czech Text Bank contains only a limited subset of Old Czech texts and that the search engine is seemingly not quite reliable (surprisingly, 1778 instances of *anděl-* were found by the search engine, which is a hundred more than in the case of *-anděl-*, even though logically the category *-anděl-* should be more extensive than its subcategory *anděl-*), I am inclined to see the contextual proximity of these forms as an *ex post* empirical corroboration of their close relation in the Old Czech lexical system rather than the very cause of the influence. Besides, the onset of the possible influence might have been considerably earlier than are the first Old Czech attestations.

ment of the members of a given pair in one or the other direction, cf. the following examples: Common Slavonic **glybokъ* 'deep' (as a secondary variant of original **glōbokъ*), developed under the influence of its opposite **vysokъ* 'high' [Hujer 1961: 83; ESJS 3: 179–180]; Old Czech *poslé* 'lately, after', abbreviated from primary *posléz(e)* on analogy to *dřeve* 'once (before)' and *prvé* 'formerly' [Němec 1962; Idem 1966: 76–77]; Czech dialectal *těžce* 'heavily' (instead of standard *těžce*) on analogy to *lehce* 'easily' [Hujer 1961: 163]; Slovak *lahký* 'light; easy' with *-a-* (instead of expected *-e-* from Common Slavonic **lǫgъkъ*) under the influence of its antonym *ťažký* 'heavy; difficult' [Ibid.: 60–61]. For further Slavonic examples, see: [Němec 1995]; for examples from various Indo-European languages, cf.: [Ducháček 1953: 124–125; e.g. Latin *voster* < *vester* 'your', the 2nd person pl. possessive pronoun, under the influence of *noster* 'our', 1st person; or Old English *māst* > *māst* adv. 'most' owing to *lāest* 'least'). All of these are examples of sporadic changes.

I am aware that the examples mentioned above show the shift of a sound in one member of an antonymous pair at precisely the same place in the word as that of the corresponding, 'governing' sound in the other member, whereas in *anjel/anděl* and *diábel/dábel* the respective sounds are in different syllables. However, there is further possible evidence for a close association of Old Czech *diábel/dábel* and *anjel/anděl*. In fact, the influence might not have been merely unidirectional, but rather bidirectional. The *-e-* in the second syllable of Old Czech *diábel/dábel* is difficult to explain as a direct substitution for the *-o-* in its source Latin *diabolus*; consequently, it must be considered secondary. Interestingly, Klich [1927: 128–129], and after him Brückner [1927: 146] and Karpluk [2001: 27–28], maintained that there was a change of *-o-* to *-e-* in Proto-Czech **diabol* > *diábel* under the influence of *anjel* with its *-e-*. This would be a classic case of the formal influence of a word on its antonym, since the position of the 'governing' sound and the 'changing' sound in these antonyms is the very same. Klich [1927: 128–129] and Brückner [1927: 146] also assumed — in order to explain the loss of *-e-* in indirect cases of *diábel* — the further influence of Common Slavic **posъlъ* > Old Czech *posel* 'messenger', gen./acc. *posla* on Old Czech *diábel*: gen./acc. Proto-Czech **diábela* > Old Czech *diábla*. Later, Schuster-Šewc [1978–1996, 1: 151] explained *-e-* in West Slavonic *-e-* forms of the word for 'devil' as possibly being the result of influence from continuants of Common Slavonic suffix **-ъlъ*, and mentioned **posъlъ* > Polish *posel* as an example. The old assumption of the influence of *anjel* on *diábel* now seems to have been forgotten, at least to the extent that no Czech etymological dictionary even mentions it.⁶ Nevertheless, the influence

⁶ The authors were much more interested in later developments of Czech *dábel*, giving rise to such forms as Old Czech *dias* > *das*, or Czech *d'ach*, *d'ách*, probably for taboo reasons [cf. Holub 1937: 39; Holub, Kopečný 1952: 96; Machek 1957: 79; Idem 1968:

of the word for ‘angel’ on the word for ‘devil’ would be strong evidence for their closeness. In general, two processes can be posited, either as two chronological stages or as two simultaneous components of a single process:

- 1) *anjel* → **diábol*/**ďábol* > *diábel*/*ďábel*
 2) *diábel*/*ďábel* → *anjel* > *anděl*

In the final analysis, I suggest the influence of the antonym *diábel*/*ďábel* at least as an additional or supporting factor if not as the very cause of the change of *-j-* > *-ď-* in *anjel*/*anděl*. In assuming this influence, one can also readily explain why in other Czech words the change of *j* > *ď* did not occur, though the necessary conditions (being positioned before a front vowel) were met. More importantly, it could help us explain why in the words in which the change *-j-* > *-ď-* did occur, the *-ď-* variants gradually gave way to the original *-j-* variants or, more often, to the variants with <g>, now pronounced [g], reflecting the so-called restored pronunciation of Latin [on this, cf. Urbańczyk 1952]. The latter would seem to be the case for Old Czech *evandĕlium* ‘gospel’ and *evandĕlista* ‘evangelist’: they did not receive any reinforcement through the presence of antonyms and hence were slowly replaced by *evanĕgium*/*evanĕgium*, *evanĕlista*/*evanĕlista*.⁷

Turning back to the general problem of the origin of *-ď-* in Old Czech *anděl*, a broader context should also be discussed, that is, the origin of words for ‘angel’ in other Slavonic languages, because some of these forms also contain a palatal plosive or a similar sound in the position in question. West Slavonic, western South Slavonic and dialectal Russian words are especially significant here.

Slovak *anjel* was taken from Medieval Latin [Králík 2015: 46], but the older forms *andel*, *andzel* [HSSJ 1: 89] can be explained differently: they are either borrowings from Czech or serve as evidence of an independent change of *-j-* to *-ď-* in the Slovak word that did not persist (for another possibility, see below).⁸

109; Holub, Lyer 1967: 120; Rejzek 2015: 131]. — The origin of other West Slavonic forms for ‘devil’ can be sketched as follows: Slovak *diabol* and Upper and Lower Sorbian *djabol* were probably borrowed directly from Latin *diabolus* [Klich 1927: 128; Králík 2015: 120; Schuster-Šewc 1978–1996, 1: 151], whereas eastern Lower Sorbian *diabel* might have been mediated by Czech [Ibid.; Frinta 1954: 7]. The Old Slovak forms *diabel*, *ďábel* [HSSJ 1: 249–250] are probably borrowings from Czech. Old Polish *diabel* is a borrowing from Czech [Boryś 2005: 113; Basaj, Siatkowski 2006: 47–48], but Old Polish *diabol* was probably taken directly from Latin. A parallel influence of antonymous Slovak *anjel*, earlier also *andel*, *andzel*, on Slovak *diabol* > *diabel*/*ďábel*, and of antonymous Old Polish *aniel*/*angiel* on Old Polish *diabol* > *diabel* cannot be excluded but is not very probable [cf. Klich 1927: 129 for Polish].

⁷ The forms *evandĕlium*, *evandĕlista*, and also *evandĕlĭk* ‘a confessorist’ and the adjective *evandĕlický* are now attested only in Czech dialects [cf. Frinta 1918: 22–23; PSJČ 1: 673–674].

⁸ Analogically, both of these explanations are possible also for dialectal Slovak *maderán*, *maderán*, *maderáneĕ*, *maderániĕ*, *maďaránka*, attested by Kálal, Kálal [1923: 318] and SSN [2: 112]. Standard Slovak is *majorán* < Latin *maiorana* [Králík 2015: 340].

Old Polish *anjeł* [SS 1: 38–39] is most probably a borrowing of Old Czech *anjel* [cf. Klich 1927: 124–127; Boryś 2005: 18; Basaj, Siatkowski 2006: 22], while Old Polish *anjoł*, *anioł* with *-o-* are secondary modifications of *anjeł* reflecting Old Polish metaphony [cf. Stieber 1973: 37–38; Siatkowski 1996: 16, 55, 65, 125, 220, 222]. Only Bańkowski [2000: 1, 12] maintains, quite vaguely, that all the Old Polish forms just mentioned are borrowings from Old Church Slavonic. Old Polish forms with *-g-* – *angieł* and *angioł* [SS 1: 38–39] – reflect a restored Latin pronunciation.

Upper Sorbian *jandžel* and Lower Sorbian *janžel* were explained by Frinta [1954: 7] as borrowings from Old Church Slavonic, perhaps via Old Czech. Their origin being in Czech is now accepted by most scholars apart from Schuster-Šewc. He, at first, proposed that the Sorbian – and in parallel also Old Czech (!) – words might have been borrowed from Old High German [Schuster-Šewc 1957: 267], and later, in his etymological dictionary, considered two possibilities: their origin being either in Latin *angelus* or in Old High German *angil* [Idem 1978–1996, 1: 426]. For West Slavonic forms, he assumed either a somewhat enigmatic change of *-ng-* > *-nd-* or a change of *-j-* > *-d'*- triggered by the preceding *-n-*. Thus, in the case of the latter possibility, Schuster-Šewc would be in agreement with those aforementioned scholars who have posited a prolongation of the plosive pronunciation of *-n-*, or, in other words, he would be counted among those advocating the hypothesis of a secondary origin of *-d'*-. The same development would then probably also apply to another, early Lower Sorbian word for 'angel' with *-e-* in the first syllable, which is, according to Schuster-Šewc, a borrowing of Middle or New High German *Engel* 'angel'. The precise form of this early Lower Sorbian word is not entirely clear, since when declaring its German origin, the author introduces *jendžel*, but earlier in the entry he refers to *jenžel*. The correct form is probably *jenžel*, recorded in a Lower Sorbian source as *jensel*, *jenschel*.⁹

As for the Polabian word for 'angel', Lehr-Splawiński and Polański [2: 145] as well as Polański and Sehnert [1967: 60] refer to *end'eł*, a borrowing from German *Engel*. Thus, *-d'*- would be secondary here. However, Olesch [1983, 1: 236] warns that *end'eł* is only a conjecture of the mentioned authors, whereas the only recorded form in the sources is <Engill>. It is, therefore, by no means clear whether *-g-* actually changed to *-d'*- in this word.¹⁰

Standard Slovenian *ánel* is a borrowing of Latin *angelus* [Snoj 2016: 46–47], but several Slovenian dialectal forms have different origins. Furlan [2019: 12–13 and in NESSJ, s.vv. *angel*, *anjel*, *anjul*, *anžel*, *anžul*] offers the following explanation: 1) *ánjel* < Romance **ān'elū*; 2) *ánuł*, *ànjul* < Friulian

⁹ I am indebted to Roland Marti for this interpretation in his editorial comment. He considers *jendžel* to be a typo.

¹⁰ I thank Roland Marti for calling attention to Olesch's view.

agnul; 3) *àndžel*, *àngel* < Italian *angelo*; 4) *ànġjul* < Friulian *ànzul*. The author considers the reconstructed Romance form **ān'elǔ* to be the source also for Old Czech *anjel* and Polish *anioł*. Thus, it seems that she does not assume a literary Medieval Latin source for these words, but rather a spoken Romance vernacular variant, whose *-n'* could be reconstructed on the basis of Friulian *agnul*. Interestingly, Ramovš [1927], as well as Šturm [1927: 65] posited that Romance **ān'elǔ* had developed from an earlier **ānd'elu* with *-d'*.

Croatian and Serbian *āndĕo*, dialectal *āndĕl*, is usually considered to be borrowed directly from Greek ἄγγελος [Skok 1: 43]. Moreover, the authors of ERSJ [1: 165] and ERHJ [1: 17] mention that in Western dialectal forms some influence from Italian *angelo* is possible. Quite surprisingly, they do not consider any possible influence from Church Slavonic. Kajkavian *angel* with *-g-* is probably borrowed from Latin *angelus* [Ibid.], whereas *-j-* in Čakavian *ōnjel* remains unexplained. I would not exclude its Romance origin (cf. the interpretation of Slovenian *j*-forms in the previous paragraph).

Dialectal Russian *áндель*, attested over a vast territory [CPHG 1: 256–257; cf. also diminutive *анделёнок*, Ibid.: 258, and Russian dialectal *áндел* in the function of an affectionate salutation, Аникин 1: 213–214], exhibits [d'], which is probably a result of the secondary development of original [g'] [see Касаткин 1999: 119–120] present in standard Russian *áнгел*.

This survey of Slavonic forms and their potential sources allows us to reach two conclusions: (1) some West Slavonic forms (Old Slovak *andel*, *andzel*, Sorbian *jan(d)žel*, Lower Sorbian *jenžel*) and Russian dialectal *áндель* can be regarded as evidence for the secondary nature of *-d'*, independent of the source language form; (2) the western South Slavonic words bring us to the possibility of considering reconstructed Early Romance forms for 'angel' as possible sources for the Slavonic words, specifically Romance **ān'elǔ* as a source for Slavonic forms containing *-j-* and Romance **ānd'elu* as a source for Slavonic forms containing *-d'* or *-dž-*. Ramovš's and Šturm's reconstruction of Romance **ānd'elu* is basically correct, except that by *-d'* they must have had in mind a sound which is usually represented as *ǵ* in standard works of Romance historical linguistics and is considered a voiced palatal semi-plosive (in IPA it is [j̞]). It was a continuant of Latin *g* before front vowels and later developed into various sounds in different Romance areas, mostly into *dž*, *ž*, *dz*, *z*, and *j* [cf. Rohlfs 1949: 264–265, 423–424; Lausberg 1967: 14–15, 17, 26, 40–41]. Given that there is no commonly accepted chronology of Romance sound changes in the various Romance areas (and therefore the form **ānd'elu* might have survived in some territories for quite a long time) and that our knowledge of the sound development of Medieval Latin is mostly inferred from the historical phonetics of Vulgar Latin (cf. the approach practiced by [Stotz 1996]), it is safe to conclude that Romance/Latin **ān'ǵelu* could represent a source for

Slavonic forms with *-d-* or *-dž-* to at least the same extent as Greek ἄγγελος can for Croatian and Serbian *ânđeo*, or as Old Church Slavonic ан҃гелъ can for Old Czech *anděl*. It seems likely that the Greek, Latin, and Old Church Slavonic words for 'angel' contained very similar sounds.¹¹ To continue along this line of thinking, the Romance/Latin word could have spread from western South Slavonic areas to the North, possibly reaching the Czech and Slovak territories. Thus, the difference between Old Czech *anjel* and *anděl* (and between Slovak *anjel* and *andel*, *andzel*) could be interpreted as a result of variation in the pronunciation of the Latin word for 'angel': Old Czech (and Slovak) *anjel* would reflect a 'Western' pronunciation of Latin, whereas Old Czech *anděl* (and Slovak *andel*, *andzel*) would represent a trace of 'Eastern' (or 'Balkan') Latin influence.¹² Thus, concerning the origin of *anděl*, a third scenario is at our disposal.

To conclude, I hope to have shown, firstly, that the origin of Old Czech *anděl* in Balkan Latin/Romance can be at least as well substantiated as can the often-maintained assumption of its origin being in Old Church Slavonic, and, secondly, that the most probable scenario may still remain the interpretation that *anděl* was a secondary form developed from *anjel*, possibly under the influence of its conceptually opposed counterpart *diábel*/*dábel*.

Acknowledgement

This paper was written with the support of the grant *Old Church Slavonic heritage in Old Czech*, financed by the Czech Science Foundation (No. 18-02702S). I thank Kateřina Bočková Loudová, Bohumil Výkypěl, Aleš Bičan (all from Brno), and Nicolas Jansens (Heidelberg) for useful comments on earlier drafts of the paper, the latter two also for improving my English. Special thanks go to Roman Krivko (Moscow) and Roland Marti (Saarbrücken) for their editorial suggestions.

Bibliography

ASTčS

Archive of the Old Czech Dictionary of the Czech Language Institute of CAS in Prague (<http://bara.ujc.cas.cz>).

Bańkowski 2000

Bańkowski A., *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego*, 1–2 (A–P), Warszawa, 2000.

¹¹ Roman Krivko, in an editor's comment, posed the question of whether the Glagolitic letter *djerv* might not have been used to record the Romance voiced semi-plosive *dž* [dʒ] (cf. Italian *angelo* 'angel', (*e*) *vangelo* 'gospel') during the Pannonian-Moravian period of Old Church Slavonic, given that Slavonic-Romance contact occurred, especially due to the activity of the Patriarchate of Aquileia. This possibility cannot be excluded. Note that the voiced semi-plosive *dž* [dʒ] would also be a good candidate to fill a gap in the Old Church Slavonic subsystem of postalveolar semi-plosives, which otherwise had only the voiceless member *č* [tʃ]. For the sound system of Old Church Slavonic, see e.g. Večerka [2006: 126–131].

¹² On the question of the dissemination of Romance borrowings in Slavonic languages, see: [Boček 2010: 19–20, 24–25] with more references.

- Basaj, Siatkowski 2006
Basaj M., Siatkowski J., *Bohemizmy w języku polskim. Słownik*, Warszawa, 2006.
- Boček 2010
Boček V., *Studie k nejstarším romanismům ve slovanských jazycích*, Praha, 2010.
- Boryś 2005
Boryś W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków, 2005.
- Brückner 1927
Brückner A., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków, 1927.
- Diels 1963
Diels P., *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*, 1–2, Heidelberg, 1963.
- Ducháček 1953
Ducháček O., *O vzájemném vlivu tvaru a významu slov*, Praha, 1953.
- ERHJ
Matasović R., Pronk T., Ivšić D., Brozović Rončević D., *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, 1. svezak (A–Nj), Zagreb, 2016.
- ERSJ 1–3–
Etimološki rečnik srpskog jezika, 1–3–, Beograd, 2003.
- ESJS 1–19–
Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského, 1–19–, Praha, Brno 1989–2018–.
- ESStč
Elektronický slovník staré češtiny (<http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz>).
- Frinta 1918
Frinta A., *Náboženské názvosloví československé*, Praha, 1918.
- 1954
Frinta A., *Bohemismy a paleoslovenismy v lužickosrbské terminologii křesťanské a jejich dějepisný význam*, Praha, 1954.
- 1959
Frinta A., Zur Frage der Bohemismen und Paläoslavismen in der lausitz-sorbischen christlichen Terminologie, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 4, 1959, 181–196.
- Furlan 2019
Furlan M., Novi etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika kot rastoči spletni slovar 2017–: dodatek 2019, *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 25/2, 2019, 7–32.
- Gebauer 1894
Gebauer J., *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého*, I, Praha, Vídeň, 1894.
- 1970
Gebauer J., *Slovník staročeský*, I–II, Praha, 1970.
- Holton et al. 2019
Holton D., Horrocks G., Janssen M., Lendari T., Manolissou I., Toufexis N., *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek. Vol. 1. General Introduction and Phonology*, Cambridge, 2019.
- Holub 1937
Holub J., *Stručný slovník etymologický jazyka československého*, Praha, 1937.
- Holub, Kopečný 1952
Holub J., Kopečný F., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha, 1952.
- Holub, Lyer 1967
Holub J., Lyer S., *Stručný etymologický slovník jazyka českého se zvláštním zřetelem k slovům kulturním a cizím*, Praha, 1967.

- HSSJ 1–7
Historický slovník slovenského jazyka, 1–7, Bratislava, 1991–2008.
- Hujer 1961
Hujer O., *Příspěvky k historii a dialektologii českého jazyka*, Praha, 1961.
- Jagić 1913
Jagić V., *Entstehungsgeschichte der kirchenslavischen Sprache*, Berlin, 1913.
- Janko 1926
Janko J., Poznámky a příspěvky k českému slovníku etymologickému (Řada IV., 16. pokrač.), *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 12, 1926, 222–231.
- Kálal, Kálal 1923
Kálal K., Kálal M., *Slovenský slovník z literatury aj nářečí*, Banská Bystrica, 1923.
- Karpluk 2001
Karpluk M., *Słownik staropolskiej terminologii chrześcijańskiej*, Kraków, 2001.
- Klich 1927
Klich E., *Polska terminologia chrześcijańska*, Poznań, 1927.
- Kořínek 1885
Kořínek A., Příspěvky ke kritice a výkladu textů staročeských (Alexandreidy): AlxB 7, 31, *Listy filologické*, 12, 1885, 284–285.
- Kott 1890
Kott F. Š., *Česko-německý slovník zvláště grammaticko-fraseologický. Díl šestý. Dodatky. D–N*, Praha, 1890.
- Králik 2015
Králik L., *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*, Bratislava, 2015.
- Kurz 1969
Kurz J., *Učebnice jazyka staroslověnského*, Praha, 1969.
- Lausberg 1967
Lausberg H., *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. II. Konsonantismus*, Berlin, 1967.
- Lehr-Splawiński, Polański 1–2
Lehr-Splawiński T., Polański K., *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich*, 1–2, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, 1962–1994.
- Lunt 2000
Lunt H. G., Thoughts, Suggestions, and Questions about the Earliest Slavic Writing Systems, *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 46, 2000, 271–286.
- 2001
Lunt H. G., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, 7th rev. ed., Berlin, New York, 2001.
- Machek 1954
Machek V., *Česká a slovenská jména rostlin*, Praha, 1954.
- 1957
Machek V., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského*, Praha, 1957.
- 1968
Machek V., *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha, 1968.
- Mareš 2000
Mareš F. V., *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*, Praha, 2000.
- Marguliés 1927
Marguliés A., Zum Lautwert der Glagolica, *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 41, 1927, 87–115.
- Němec 1962
Němec I., Staročeský příspěvek k výkladu slovanského adverbia *posle*, *Listy filologické*, 85, 1962, 330–333.

- 1966
Němec I., Antonymní vztah jako činitel lexikálních změn, *Listy filologické*, 89, 1966, 75–81.
- 1995
Němec I., Systémovost antonymie jako vývojový faktor, *Naše řeč*, 78, 1995, 136–137.
- NESSJ
Furlan M., *Novi etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika 2017–* (www.fran.si).
- Olesch 1–4
Olesch R., *Thesaurus Linguae Dravaenopolabicae*, 1–4, Köln, Wien, 1983–1987.
- Polański, Sehnert 1967
Polański K., Sehnert J. A., *Polabian–English Dictionary*, The Hague, Paris, 1967.
- PSJČ 1–8
Příruční slovník jazyka českého, 1–8, Praha, 1937–1957.
- Ramovš 1927
Ramovš F., O kajk.-čak. prehodu *d' > j*, *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino*, 6, 1927, 86–90.
- Rejzek 2015
Rejzek J., *Český etymologický slovník*, Praha, 2015.
- Rohlf's 1949
Rohlf's G., *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache. I. Lautlehre*, Bern, 1949.
- Schuster-Šewc 1957
Schuster-Šewc H., Antonín Frinta: „Bohemismy a paleoslovenismy v lužickosrbské terminologii křesťanské a jejich dějepisný význam“. *Acta Universitatis carolinae*, 5. Philologica, Praha 1954, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 2, 1957, 263–270.
- 1978–1996
Schuster-Šewc H., *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache*, 1–5, Bautzen, 1978–1996.
- Siatkowski 1996
Siatkowski J., *Czesko-polskie kontakty językowe*, Warszawa, 1996.
- SJS 1–4
Slovník jazyka staroslověnského, 1–4, Praha, 1966–1997.
- Skok 1–4
Skok P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1–4, Zagreb, 1971–1974.
- SŁŚP 1–14–
Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce, 1–14–, Warszawa, 1953–2014–.
- Snoj 2016
Snoj M., *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana, 2016.
- SS 1–11
Slovník staropolski, 1–11, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, 1953–2002.
- SSLČ
Slovník středověké latiny v českých zemích (<http://lb.ics.cas.cz>).
- SSN 1–2
Slovník slovenských nářečí, 1–2, Bratislava, 1994–2006.
- Stieber 1973
Stieber Z., *A historical phonology of the Polish language*, Heidelberg, 1973.
- Stotz 1996
Stotz P., *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters, 3, Lautlehre*, München, 1996.

Šturm 1927

Šturm F., Refleksi romanskih palataliziranih konzonantov v slovenskih izposojenkah, *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino*, 6, 1927, 45–85.

Trávníček 1935

Trávníček F., *Historická mluvnice československá*, Praha, 1935.

Trunte 2003

Trunte N. H., *Slovjan'sk"i jezyk. Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenlavischen in 30 Lektionen. Zugleich eine Einführung in die slavische Philologie, 1: Altkirchenlavisch*, München, 2003.

Urbańczyk 1952

Urbańczyk S., Z zagadnień staropolskich, *Język Polski*, 32, 1952, 119–129.

Vasmer 1927

Vasmer M., Altbulgarisches, *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 1, 1925, 156–164.

Večerka 2006

Večerka R., *Staroslověňština v kontextu slovanských jazyků*, Olomouc, Praha, 2006.

Vokabulář webový

Vokabulář webový: Webové hnízdo k poznání pramenů historické češtiny (<https://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/default.aspx>).

Аникин 1–13–

Аникин А. Е., *Русский этимологический словарь*, 1–13–, Москва, 2007–2019–.

Касаткин 1999

Касаткин Л. Л., *Современная русская диалектная и литературная фонетика как источник для истории русского языка*, Москва, 1999.

Младенова 1999

Младенова М., *Кирило-Методиева география и езикова история или западните славяни, Кирил и Методий и какво е (о) станало после*, София, 1999.

СРНГ 1–51–

Словарь русских народных говоров, 1–51–, Москва, Ленинград/Санкт-Петербург, 1966–2019–.

References

Boček V., *Studie k nejstarším romanismům ve slovanských jazycích*, Praha, 2010.

Ducháček O., *O vzájemném vlivu tvaru a významu slov*, Praha, 1953.

Frinta A., *Bohemismy a paleoslovenismy v lužicko-srbské terminologii křesťanské a jejich dějepisný význam*, Praha, 1954.

Frinta A., *Náboženské názvosloví československé*, Praha, 1918.

Frinta A., Zur Frage der Bohemismen und Paläoslavismen in der lausitz-sorbischen christlichen Terminologie, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 4, 1959, 181–196.

Furlan M., Novi etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika kot rastoči spletni slovar 2017–: dodatek 2019, *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 25/2, 2019, 7–32.

Holton D., Horrocks G., Janssen M., Lendari T., Manolessou I., Toufexis N., *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek. Vol. 1. General Introduction and Phonology*, Cambridge, 2019.

Hujer O., *Příspěvky k historii a dialektologii českého jazyka*, Praha, 1961.

Janko J., Poznámky a příspěvky k českému slovníku etymologickému (Řada IV., 16. pokrač.), *Časopis pro moderní filologii*, 12, 1926, 222–231.

Kasatkin L. L., *Sovremennaja russkaia dialektnaia i literaturnaia fonetika kak istočnik dlja istorii ruskogo iazyka*, Moscow, 1999.

Kurz J., *Učebnice jazyka staroslověnského*, Praha, 1969.

Lausberg H., *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft. II. Konsonantismus*, Berlin, 1967.

Lunt H. G., *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, 7th rev. ed., Berlin, New York, 2001.

Lunt H. G., Thoughts, Suggestions, and Questions about the Earliest Slavic Writing Systems, *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 46, 2000, 271–286.

Machek V., *Česká a slovenská jména rostlin*, Praha, 1954.

Mareš F. V., *Cyrlometodějská tradice a slavistika*, Praha, 2000.

Marguliés A., Zum Lautwert der Glagolica, *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 41, 1927, 87–115.

Mladenova M., *Kirilo-Metodieva geografiâ i ezikova istoriâ ili zapadnite slavâni, Kiril i Metodij i kakvo e (o)stanalo posle*, Sofia, 1999.

Němec I., Antonymní vztah jako činitel lexikálních změn, *Listy filologické*, 89, 1966, 75–81.

Němec I., Staročeský příspěvek k výkladu slovenského adverbia *posle*, *Listy filologické*, 85, 1962, 330–333.

Němec I., Systémovost antonymie jako vývojový faktor, *Naše řeč*, 78, 1995, 136–137.

Ramovš F., O kajk.-čak. prehodu *d' > j*, *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino*, 6, 1927, 86–90.

Rohlf's G., *Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache. I. Lautlehre*, Bern, 1949.

Schuster-Šewc H., Antonín Frinta: „Bohemismy a paleoslovenismy v lužickosrbské terminologii křesťanské a jejich dějepisný význam“. *Acta Universita-*

tis carolinae, 5. Philologica, Praha 1954, *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 2, 1957, 263–270.

Stieber Z., *A historical phonology of the Polish language*, Heidelberg, 1973.

Stotz P., *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, 3. *Lautlehre*, München, 1996.

Šturm F., Refleksi romanskih palataliziranih konzonantov v slovenskih izposojenkah, *Časopis za slovenski jezik, književnost in zgodovino*, 6, 1927, 45–85.

Trávníček F., *Historická mluvnice československá*, Praha, 1935.

Trunte N. H., *Slovjan'sk"i język. Ein praktisches Lehrbuch des Kirchenslavischen in 30 Lektionen. Zugleich eine Einführung in die slavische Philologie*, 1: *Altkirchenslavisch*, München, 2003.

Urbańczyk S., Z zagadnień staropolskich, *Język Polski*, 32, 1952, 119–129.

Vasmer M., Altbulgarisches, *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 1, 1925, 156–164.

Večerka R., *Staroslověština v kontextu slovanských jazyků*, Olomouc, Praha, 2006.

Vít Boček, doc.

Ústav pro jazyk český AV ČR

Etymologické oddělení

60200, Brno, Veveří 97,

Česká republika / Czech Republic

vitbocek@gmail.com

Received April 4, 2020