ROMAN JAKOBSON
SELECTED WRITINGS
VII

ROMAN JAKOBSON

SELECTED WRITINGS

VII

Contributions to Comparative Mythology. Studies in Linguistics and Philology, 1972–1982.

Edited by Stephen Rudy, with a preface by Linda R. Waugh

1985
MOUTON PUBLISHERS
BERLIN · NEW YORK · AMSTERDAM

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Jakobson, Roman:
Selected writings / Roman Jakobson. – Berlin ; New York ; Amsterdam : Mouton
NE: Jakobson, Roman: [Sammlung]
7. Jakobson, Roman: Contributions to comparative mythology. – 1985

Jakobson, Roman:
Contributions to comparative mythology. Studies in linguistics and philology, 1972–1982 / Roman Jakobson. Ed. by Stephen Rudy. With a pref. by Linda R. Waugh. – Berlin ; New York ; Amsterdam : Mouton, 1985.
(Selected writings / Roman Jakobson; 7)
ISBN 3-11-010617-5
NE: Jakobson, Roman: [Sammlung]

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Jakobson, Roman, 1896–1982
Contributions to comparative mythology.
(Selected writings / Roman Jakobson ; 7)
English, French, and Russian.
Includes bibliographies and indexes.
1. Linguistics – Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Philology – Addresses, essays, lectures. 3. Mythology, Indo-European – Addresses, essays, lectures. I. Rudy, Stephen. II. Jakobson, Roman, 1896–1982. Studies in linguistics and philology, 1972–1982. 1985. III. Title. IV. Title: Studies in linguistics and philology, 1972–1982. V. Series: Jakobson, Roman, 1896–1982. Selections. 1962 ; 7.
P217.J3 vol. 7 [P49] 410 84–20713
ISBN 0-89925-051-3

Printed on acid free paper

Typesetting: H Charlesworth & Co. Ltd., Huddersfield, England. — Printing: Druckerei Gerike GmbH, Berlin. — Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer Buchgewerbe GmbH, Berlin.
Printed in Germany.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I. Volume VII of Roman Jakobson's *Selected Writings: Contributions to Comparative Mythology; Studies in Linguistics and Philology, 1972–1982*, contains 33 studies, all written during Jakobson's American period. It incorporates 4 works on comparative mythology (Part One of the volume), 27 on linguistics, philology, and poetics (Part Two), and 2 of a more retrospective bent (Part Three). Two of the contributions are published here for the first time: "Očerednye zadači obščej lingvistiki" [Current tasks of general linguistics], and "Andrew Marvell's Poem *To His Coy Mistress*"; and three are available here for the first time in their original English version, having been published previously only in a translated version: "The Fundamental and Specific Characteristics of Human Language", "Communication and Society", and "My Favorite Topics". Five others were translated into English especially for this volume: "Linguistic Evidence in Comparative Mythology", "The Immediate Quests and Accomplishments of Comparative Linguistics", "When a Falcon has Molted", "Goroun's Urn", and "The Grammatical Buildup of Child Language".

This volume has been in preparation for several years. The author established the list of entries, and at the time of his death in July 1982 was working on the revision of various studies which were to have been included had he been able to finish them. Other than these omissions, the contents of the volume are as he envisaged them. However, the editor decided to establish for Part Two, not a chronological order as originally set out by Jakobson, but a breakdown into topical sections which correspond to previous volumes of his *Selected Writings*. Moreover, it was felt that "My Favorite Topics" and "On the Dialectics of Language", which originally figured in the chronological list, could, because of their nature as self-characterizations, serve in the guise of a retrospect, since the author had planned to write a retrospect, just as for the previous six volumes, but did not have the time to do so. These two essays have thus been established as Part Three by the editor.

Perhaps more than any other of Jakobson's *Selected Writings*, Volume *VII* must be viewed in conjunction with the previous volumes[1], since the extraordinarily broad range of topics presented here has ties with all the rest of his work. But what perhaps is even more Jakobsonian about this volume is that, just as Jakobson here continues his previous work in domains such as phonology, grammatical morphology, linguistic theory, comparative linguistics, history of linguistics, child language and aphasia, philology, poetics, mythology — at the same time he pushes this work further and he even ventures into new areas: Slavic gods and their counterparts in other Indo-European cultures, grammar and syntax in child language acquisition, adjectival lexical meaning, Russian pronominal morphology, metalanguage, the unconscious, anagrams, medieval linguistic theory, language and the brain, Einstein and linguistics, to name a few. And while all of these contributions are those of the mature Jakobson, always with an eye to future research[2], some, Janus-faced, mark a return to and a contextualization of his early Russian experience — Aljagrov (Jakobson's pseudonym as a young poet), the Moscow Linguistic Circle, Bogatyrëv, Trubetzkoy, and Majakovskij. We also find here a characteristic of Jakobson's later period: studies of a more autobiographical stamp, a tradition which began with his "Retrospects", continues here in "The Evasive Initial" and "From Aljagrov's Letters", and culminates in the *Dialogues* (1982, to be incorporated in *SW VIII*). This volume is, thus, an example of the "dynamic synchrony" — continuity with the past (a return to past themes) and preparation of the future (delineation of new topics) — which Jakobson was prone to point to as the necessary stamp of any system which will survive and which attests to the vitality of its creative potential.

* * *

Part One of this volume contains four of Jakobson's contributions to the study of comparative mythology. At the time of his death, he was working on the revision of other, unpublished materials intended to be included in this section, based on courses and lectures he had given in

[1] The *Selected Writings* (henceforth abbreviated as *SW*) contain the following volumes: *I, Phonological Studies* (1962; 2nd, expanded ed. 1971); *II, Word and Language* (1971); *III, Poetry of Grammar and Grammar of Poetry* (1981); *IV, Slavic Epic Studies* (1966); *V, On Verse, its Masters and Explorers* (1979); *VI, Early Slavic Pathways and Crossroads* (1985); *VIII, Major Works, 1976–1980* (in preparation).

[2] See Vjačeslav V. Ivanov, "Roman Jakobson: the Future", in *A Tribute to Roman Jakobson* (Berlin: Mouton, 1983).

the areas of Slavic and Indo-European mythology and paganism. But unfortunately, he was unable to finish them: thus, Part One is considerably shorter than Jakobson had envisaged[3].

While these mythological studies may be read as an integral whole, they also provide material which is germane to and is illuminated by an understanding of other parts of Jakobson's work, in particular his contributions to Slavic epic studies, including his masterful works on the Igor' Tale contained in *SW IV*, his studies on Slavic medieval questions reprinted in *SW VI*, and his articles on philological questions included in section C of the present volume and in the corresponding section of *SW II*.

Jakobson's contributions to comparative mythology are densely textured, reflecting the diversity of his interests and the breadth of his intellectual scope. As a whole, these writings may be characterized, as Riccardo Picchio has said of the third study reprinted here[4], as "outstanding example[s] of [Jakobson's] erudite versatility and masterly combination of the techniques of textual criticism, formal analysis, etymology, comparative philology and linguistics, as well as religious and literary history, all leading toward a new critical synthesis".

All of the articles given here show the results of Jakobson's fascination with Russian oral culture — proverbs, legends, riddles, children's counting-out rhymes, *byliny* (heroic epic verse), spoken verse, recitatives, sung verse, spirituals, fairy tales, folk tales, and the like — in addition to his interest in written culture and literature. And while his work in the mid to late 1940's on Russian fairy tales, the Igor' Tale, the Vseslav Epos, and Slavic epic verse[5] provided an obvious link to his interest in Slavic and more widely in Indo-European mythology, it was his concern with structural linguistics and especially his own apprenticeship in comparative linguistics which provided the methodological and theoretical underpinning. In fact, his characterization of comparative linguistics is particularly precise as a discussion of the methodology he followed in his comparative mythological work as well: "Comparative linguistics brings out 1) intrinsic typological parallels, 2) analogical

[3] They are, however, contained in the Roman Jakobson archive and are now part of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Archives and Special Collections, in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[4] Riccardo Picchio, "Roman Jakobson on Russian Epics and Old Russian Literature", in *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his Scholarship*", ed. by D. Armstrong and C. H. van Schooneveld (Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1977), p. 331.

[5] See, for example, "La Geste du Prince Igor'", *SW IV*: 106–300, "The Vseslav Epos" (with Marc Szeftel), *SW IV*: 301–368, "Slavic Epic Verse: Studies in Comparative Metrics", *SW IV*: 414–465.

developmental traits due to similar social and cultural preconditions, 3) correspondences based on common ancestry, and 4) points of likeness caused by diffusion. Finally etymologists trace the connection of the vocabulary and phraseology of a given language with historical events, morals and manners"[6]. This formulation could profitably be compared with "The Immediate Quests and Accomplishments of Comparative Linguistics", reprinted in section C of the present volume, which, though written as a preface to the book *Indoevropejskij jazyk i indoevropejcy* [Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans] by T. V. Gamkrelidze and V. V. Ivanov, is also a sketch of Jakobson's own attitude toward reconstruction and historical-typological analysis.

"Slavic Gods and Demons", the first of the studies in this volume, was originally published in 1950 as a contribution to the Funk and Wagnall's *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology, and Legend.* It is, in Calvert Watkins' characterization, "one of the most remarkable publications of Jakobson's entire career .... Perhaps never before or since has an entire field been so deftly and so surely delineated and defined, and so many fertile suggestions for future exploration been so lightly tossed out, in so few pages."[7] "Linguistic Evidence in Comparative Mythology", a more specific discussion and exemplification of Jakobson's linguistic technique in mythological work, "The Slavic God Velesъ and his Indo-European Cognates", which had received the characterization of Picchio cited above, and "Drevnearmjanskij Vaxagn v svete sravnitel'noj mifologii" ["Old Armenian Vahagn in the Light of Comparative Mythology"], drafted in April/May 1982 in the Massachusetts General Hospital and presented posthumously to the International Conference on Armenian Studies in Erevan in September 1982 by his widow Krystyna Pomorska — all provide eloquent testimony to Jakobson's skills as a comparatist and mythologist.

* * *

Part Two of this volume — "Studies in Linguistics and Philology, 1972–1982" — contains Jakobson's last, shorter works around the themes central to *SW I, II, III,* and *V.* The longer writings of this same period will be published in *SW VIII.* The first two articles in Part A, Phonological and Morphological Studies, expand upon Jakobson's

[6] "Retrospect", *SW IV*, p. 648.

[7] Calvert Watkins, "Slavic Mythology and Folklore", in *Roman Jakobson: What He Taught Us*, ed. by M. Halle (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1983), p. 38 and in *A Tribute to Roman Jakobson*, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

work in phonology (see as well *SW I* and *SW VIII*). "An Instance of Interconnection between the Distinctive Features"[8], based on principles outlined in Jakobson and Waugh's *The Sound Shape of Language*[9] and written after the book was in press, explores further the questions of phonological opposition and markedness. In particular, it discusses the reversibility of markedness when a given feature is linked concurrently with other features and the relation of such reverses with universal and implicational laws as evidenced by phonological systems of the linguistic world.[10] In "Mutual Assimilation of Russian Voiced and Voiceless Consonants"[11], what is at issue is not only the question of markedness but also dynamic synchrony, the fact that a system or a subsystem (here, the relation between obstruents and sonorants of Russian coupled with that between voiced and voiceless pairs) may be characterized by intermediate units, borrowings and other foreignisms, as well as by closer vs. further correlations — *i.e.*, by different weightings of the units. Here is the specific application of Jakobson's tenet that no system can be seen as static or as the mechanical aggregate of its parts.

The two following studies in this section — one on syntax and the other on the lexicon — are particularly interesting because they contain a discussion of areas which Jakobson generally only alluded to in previous work and for the study of which one is obliged to peruse carefully *SW II* and *SW III* in particular. "The Primary Syntactic Split and its Corollary" continues Jakobson's concern with child language acquisition and would most profitably be read in

[8] Written in collaboration with L. R. Waugh. Interestingly, this is the only co-authored paper in the volume, in contrast with the other volumes of *Selected Writings*, which contain many co-authored works.

[9] Roman Jakobson and Linda R. Waugh, *The Sound Shape of Language* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press and Hassocks, England: Harvester Press, 1979. Second edition, Berlin: Mouton, forthcoming).

[10] This may profitably be read in conjunction with "Mark and Feature", incorporated in Part Two, Section B of this volume.

[11] An earlier discussion of similar questions may be found in "Die Verteilung der stimmhaften und stimmlosen Geräuschlaute im Russischen" (*SW I*: 505–509) and "K voprosu o gluxosti i zvonkosti russkix ščelinnyx gubnyx" [On the question of voicelessness and voicing in Russian labials] (*SW I*: 728–733).

[12] "Kindersprache, Aphasie, und allgemeine Lautgesetze", *SW I*: 328–401 (translated as *Child Language, Aphasia, and Phonological Universals*, the Hague: Mouton, 1968); "Les Lois phoniques du langage enfantin et leur place dans la phonologie générale", *SW I*: 317–327 (translated as "The Sound Laws of Child Language and their Place in General Phonology", *Studies in Child Language and Aphasia*, the Hague: Mouton, 1971: 7–20); "Anthony's Contribution to Linguistic Theory", *SW II*: 285–288 (*Studies* ...: 31–37); "Why 'Mama' and 'Papa'?" *SW II*: 21–30 (*Studies* ...: 21–30); "Phonology and Phonetics", *SW I*: 464–504, especially 491–504 (also published as the first part of *Fundamentals of Language*, the Hague: Mouton, 1956).

conjunction with his previous work on that topic[12], as well as with his study "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb" (*SW II*: 130–147), in addition to the various writings on child language included in this volume. What is particularly of interest here is his insistence on the importance of the syntactic notions of subject vs. predicate in correlation with the liberation of language from the *hic et nunc* of the speech event through the emergence of the verb vs. the noun and shifters vs. non-shifters.

"Spatial Relationships in Slavic Adjectives" contains one of the few synchronic studies of lexical meaning in Jakobson's published oeuvre, as against grammatical meaning, which received much of his scholarly attention[13]. Aside from his philological studies, contained in *SW II* and this volume, and various allusions to lexical meaning embedded in particular in Part B: Crucial Questions of Linguistic Theory (*SW II*) as well as in his writings on poetics (*SW III*), there is a fairly long discussion of lexical meaning to be found for example in *Aspects of the theories of Roman Jakobson*, based on lectures he gave at Louvain[14]; however, the latter volume was not approved by Jakobson since he was unable to correct the text. In addition, there are very suggestive remarks on lexical meaning in the unpublished notes contained in his "La Théorie saussurienne en rétrospection"[15]. While lexical meaning is, according to Jakobson, to be differentiated from grammatical meaning by its non-obligatoriness and its less tightly constrained structure[16], the same methodological and theoretical preliminaries are followed: the presence of various formal elements (here, derivational suffixes) is used as a means of delimiting the items to be studied, the pairs of adjectives are seen in relation one to another and in particular with respect to the concept of opposition and markedness, and data from child language acquisition is brought in to support the analysis.

"Notes on the Declension of Pronouns in Contemporary Russian" continues the tradition exemplified by Jakobson's work on the verbal

[13] See for example the works collected in *SW II*, Part A: Morphological Studies and *SW III*, Part One: Principles and Part Two: Readings.

[14] M. van Ballaer, *Aspects of the Theories of Roman Jakobson* (Memoir, Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, 1972).

[15] The first part of that article, which is a general discussion, will appear in *Linguistics Vol. 22* (1984), 161–196; the section dealing with lexical meaning was, however, too fragmentary for publication and will be included in the Jakobson archives.

[16] See "Boas' View of Grammatical Meaning" in *SW II*: 489–496. See also, Linda R. Waugh "Introduction", in Roman Jakobson, *Russian and Slavic Grammar, Studies 1931–1981*, ed. by L. R. Waugh and M. Halle (Berlin: Mouton, 1984), pp. ix–xvi.

and nominal systems of Russian.[17] This is a terse study aimed at showing the special place of pronouns in the grammatical system by correlating their meaning with their formal properties while establishing the invariants which underlie their declensional pattern.

Section B, Crucial Questions of Linguistic Theory, contains 12 articles which significantly expand upon themes found in the same-named part of *SW II*. "Verbal Communication", first written for a special issue of *Scientific American* on communication and thus destined for the wider public, is a new departure for Jakobson since it provides a synthetic, encyclopedic approach to the question of the nature of language: relational invariance vs. contextual variation, markedness and opposition, dynamic synchrony and diversity of codes, context-sensitivity, syntax as grammatical forms and processes, written vs. oral language, and the history of linguistics — especially the mutual relation between relativity theory and the growth of phonology. "The Fundamental and Specific Characteristics of Human Language", written for a Salk Institute Conference on the Biological Foundations of Language, provides an integrated discussion, highly accessible to the non-specialist, of Jakobson's views on child language acquisition and the importance of child language for our understanding of the nature of human language and its differentiation from animal communication. Both "Communication and Society" and "Language and Culture" — the only synthetic statements by Jakobson about the relation between linguistic and cultural systems[18] — envisage language as a communicative, a semiotic, and a cultural phenomenon and argue on the one hand for both nature and culture, both inheritance and acculturation as the foundations for language, and on the other hand for the importance that linguistic (especially grammatical) categories have for our cognitive and "mythological" patterns. Here, as elsewhere, Jakobson argues against the absolutization of our understanding of the nature and foundation of language and culture.

"Metalanguage as a Linguistic Problem", first presented at the Presidential Address to the Linguistic Society of America in 1956 but

[17] "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums" (*SW II*: 3–15), "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesambedeutungen der russischen Kasus" (*SW II*: 23–71), "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb" (*SW II*: 130–147), and "Morfologičeskie nabljudenija nad slavjanskim skloneniem" [Morphological Observations on Slavic Declension] (*SW II*: 154–183). These articles are also published in English translation (where relevant) in *Russian and Slavic Grammar, Studies 1931–1981*, *op. cit.* See also Igor Mel'čuk, "Three Main Features, Seven Basic Principles, and Eleven Most Important Results of Roman Jakobson's Morphological Research", in Roman Jakobson, *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, ed. by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1985).

[18] But see also "Language in Relation to other Communication Systems", *op. cit.*

not published until 1976, brought for the first time to the attention of modern linguistics the importance of metalanguage in our everyday linguistic life and in child language acquisition as well as its self-evident importance for linguistic methodology. The general schema for the study of metalanguage outlined in the first few pages was also the basis for Jakobson's path-breaking delineation of the poetic vs. other functions of language usage (in "Linguistics and Poetics" [*SW III*: 19–51]). "Mark and Feature", a terminological paper dealing with the differentiation of two technical terms, argues that any phonological or grammatical opposition (whatever may be the underlying feature) is to be seen as a correlation of a marked pole or mark (*n.b.*, 'pole' or 'mark', not 'feature') with an unmarked pole; however, which pole is the marked one may depend upon the simultaneous and sequential contexts which the feature is contained in[19]. "Structuralisme et téléologie" contains Jakobson's mature reflections on the fundamental components of the teleological nature of language in all its functions as intertwined with his concepts of structure, opposition and markedness, communicative value, and signification.[20]

The remaining five studies in this section: "On Aphasic Disorders from a Linguistic Angle", "The Grammatical Buildup of Child Language", "On the Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Consciousness and the Unconscious", "Brain and Language: Cerebral Hemispheres and Linguistic Structure in Mutual Light", and "The Evasive Initial" (in addition to the already mentioned "The Primary Syntactic Split and its Corollary" and "The Fundamental and Specific Characteristics of Human Language"), on the one hand expand on the discussion of themes contained in his studies of child language and aphasia[21] and on the other hand explore in depth new areas: language in relation to consciousness and the unconscious, and hemispheric specialization in the brain. What binds these studies together is their plea for the recognition that all of these questions must be approached from an

[19] See also "An Instance of Interconnection between the Distinctive Features", discussed above.

[20] See also his earlier sketches: "The Concept of the Sound Law and the Teleological Criterion" (*SW I*: 1–2); "Proposition au Premier Congrès International de Linguistes. Quelles sont les méthodes les mieux appropriées à un exposé complet et pratique de la phonolologie d'une langue quelconque?" (*SW I*: 3–6); "Retrospect" (*SW II*: 711–712).

[21] For child language, see the studies listed in footnote 12 above. For aphasia, see "Aphasia as a Linguistic Topic" (*SW II*: 229–238); "Two Types of Aphasia and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances" (*SW II*: 239–259); "Toward a Linguistic Classification of Aphasic Impairments" (*SW II*: 289–306); "Linguistic Types of Aphasia" (*SW II*: 307–333). (These are all reprinted as well in *Studies on Child Language and Aphasia*, *op. cit.*)

eminently linguistic point of view since they concern language, that the search for general laws must underlie any discussion of data, and that neither in the analysis of specific data nor in questions of interdisciplinary work should there be isolationism, i.e., the divorcing of the phenomena from their context, or colonialism, i.e., the unwarranted mixing of various domains, but rather autonomy and integration.

"On Aphasic Disorders from a Linguistic Angle" provides a retrospective and prospective view by Jakobson of his own and other's work on aphasia and thus may serve as a general introduction to this area. "The Grammatical Buildup of Child Language" affords for the first time a synthesis of Jakobson's work on the child's learning of grammar, since most of his previous studies on child language were centered on phonology. "On the Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Consciousness and the Unconscious" provides Jakobson's first general discussion of this question[22]. The historical point of view in this study centers on the early work of J. Baudouin de Courtenay and M. Kruszewski[23] (stressing in particular the question of "unconscious generalization" or "apperception"), as well as on the later work of F. de Saussure, F. Boas, and E. Sapir ("unconscious patterning"), in the light of recent research concerning metalanguage and child language, in addition to the hitherto unknown concept of "set" in the process of development by the Georgian school of psychology.

"Brain and Language", first published as a pamphlet in 1980, grew out of corresponding material in *The Sound Shape of Language* (pp. 28–36) and represents one of Jakobson's preoccupations in the last period of his life. In fact he confessed once that if he were to be a young linguist now he would study language and the brain, and language and schizophrenia; moreover, one of my last conversations with him had to do with the latest research on the relation between distinctive features and the brain. Jakobson saw that the work on hemispheric specialization and on the localization of various functions within the hemispheres

[22] The role of the unconscious was already alluded to in previous work — see for example "Subliminal Verbal Patterning in Poetry", *SW III*: 136–147, and "La Théorie saussurienne en rétrospection", *op. cit.* See in addition, Elmar Holenstein, *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press, 1976), 64–69.

[23] For further discussion of these two scholars, see "Jan Baudouin de Courtenay" (*SW II*: 389–393), "The Kazan' School of Polish Linguistics and its Place in the International Development of Phonology" (*SW II*: 394–428), "Značenie Kruševskogo v razvitii nauki o jazyke" [The Significance of Kruszewski for the Development of the Science of Language] (*SW II*: 429–450), and "Polish–Russian Cooperation in the Science of Language" (*SW II*: 451–455). And for an appraisal of Jakobson's work in this area, see Edward Stankiewicz, "Roman Jakobson's Work on the History of Linguistics", in Armstrong & van Schooneveld, *op. cit.*, pp. 435–452.

correlated with findings in linguistics. In particular, it has corroborated the differentiation of linguistic from other auditory phenomena, including music. Furthermore, Jakobson felt vindicated that, in the investigation of the localization of linguistic phenomena, the division between on the one hand the phonemic, especially the distinctive (and their ancillary redundant) features — *i.e.*, those features which exhibit mediacy, an indirect tie with meaning — and on the other hand the expressive and physiognomic features and intonations — *i.e.*, those which exhibit immediacy, a direct tie with meaning — was reflected in hemispheric specialization.[24] Those features which evidence mediacy seem to be associated with the left hemisphere and those evidencing immediacy with the right hemisphere. In addition, the propensity of the left hemisphere for future time and abstract cognition as against that of the right hemisphere for past time and sensitive/sensible cognition (pertaining to the senses and thus concrete) is correlated with the work of the great semiotician C. S. Peirce.

"The Evasive Initial" is an unusual event in Jakobson's publishing life, comprising his keen and playful observations of his own disabilities after suffering a mild stroke. It is uncharacteristic of Jakobson that the discussion should be couched in the form of a report in the first person[25] about some other unnamed person (who happens to be himself), a self-observation differentiating the scholar from the man. What *is* characteristic is that he used the occasion to make further generalizations on the dichotomies: reading/writing, left-/right-handedness, and left-to-right/-right-to-left systems of writing (in view of their relation to hemispheric specialization).

Section C, Toward a Nomothetic Science of Language, the longest section of the volume, centers on questions of the history of linguistics and of semiotics. Jakobson's interest in the history of linguistics dates from his earliest writings and indeed references to this topic are at the core of his scholarly oeuvre[26]. It is typical of his approach that, as Edward Stankiewicz has said, "Jakobson's historical interests are far from antiquarian: he probes the past for its relevance to the present and traces the growth of the ideas which have made linguistics into a pivotal

[24] See *The Sound Shape of Language*, *op. cit.*, 13–18, 36–47.

[25] Jakobson seldom used the first person, except in his more autobiographical writings: Roman Jakobson and Krystyna Pomorska, *Dialogues* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1983); "Retrospect" (in all the *Selected Writings*); and interviews. For a discussion, see Krystyna Pomorska, "The Autobiography of a Scholar", *Proceedings of the First Roman Jakobson Colloquium, 1984* (Berlin: Mouton, forthcoming).

[26] The bulk of his work in the history of linguistics is contained in the section, Toward a Nomothetic Science of Language, in *SW II*: 369–602.

science of man, a science which now bears the decisive imprint of his thought."[27] In "Glosses on the Medieval Insight into the Science of Language" — in a departure from the tendency evidenced by *SW II* to focus on 19th and 20th century figures and schools — Jakobson restores, for the linguistic community, the nearly forgotten but highly original theory *de modi significandi* and demonstrates its validity for current inquiry into the nature of grammatical and lexical meaning and into *ars poetica*.

"Glance at the Development of Semiotics", written in 1975, is Jakobson's first truly synthetic study of semiotics, *sensu stricto*[28]. In fact, one can say that he was never as devoted to semiotics as in the last period of his life. Here, he rehabilitates the lost thinking of Jean Henri Lambert, Joseph Marie Hoene-Wronski, and Bernard Bolzano, and treats as well the semiotic contributions of Edmund Husserl, Charles Sanders Peirce, and Ferdinand de Saussure. The article closes with Jakobson's own characterization of vital questions of semiotic (and hence, linguistic) inquiry.

"La première lettre de Ferdinand de Saussure à Antoine Meillet sur les anagrammes" is a contribution to the history of poetics, linguistics, and semiotics, since it is here that Jakobson endorses Saussure's interest in anagrams, judged by Jakobson (in contradistinction to many other scholars) to be among Saussure's most interesting insights. In Jakobson's estimation, it is this work which allowed Saussure to overcome his own formulation of the strict linearity of the *signifiant* (against the absolute definition of which in the *Cours de linguistique générale* Jakobson was to argue in a variety of different publications[29]), and at the same time to explore the nature of the poetic text as exhibiting inner laws of structure in its own right.

"Einstein and the Science of Language" explores in greater depth issues already hinted elsewhere: the influence of relativity theory on Jakobson's own development (see "Retrospect", *SW I*: 632), the development of Einstein's thoughts on relativity theory in conjunction with his stay in the household of the linguist Jost Winteler (also discussed in "Verbal Communication"), and the importance of relations and equivalence for modern linguistics. In addition, what emerges here for the first time is a discussion of thinking as a semiotic, but not necessarily

[27] See Edward Stankiewicz, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

[28] Cf. his general discussions: "Linguistics in Relation to Other Sciences" (*SW II*: 655–696), "Language in Relation to Other Communication Systems" (*SW II*: 697–710), and "Retrospect" (*SW II*: 711–724).

[29] See for example the "Retrospects" to *SW I* and *SW II*.

linguistic, activity: thinking can take place in other than linguistic symbols.

Three of the studies in this section — "The World Response to Whitney's Principles of Linguistic Science", "A Few Remarks on Peirce, Pathfinder in the Science of Language", and "The Twentieth Century in European and American Linguistics: Movements and Continuity" — attest to those late 19th and 20th century American figures who most influenced Jakobson's thinking in linguistics and semiotics since his arrival in America in 1941. The first study underlines Whitney's influence upon and strong reputation in European linguistic circles, and explores especially Saussure's unpublished reflections on the American's work. Both the article on Peirce — whom Jakobson had virtually rediscovered for the American linguistic and semiotic community not long after his arrival in America and who was to have a decisive impact on Jakobson's work — and the pages devoted to the semiotician in "A Glance at the Development of Semiotics" (and elsewhere[30]) center on those areas which bind his own work to that of the semiotician: duality and dyads, translation and interpretation as semiotic questions, invariance and structure, iconicity as a counterpart to the arbitrariness of the sign, and time in relation to signs.[31] Perhaps most notably, his commentary on Peirce contains a binarization of Peirce's tripartite division of the sign (icon, index, and symbol): Jakobson adds a fourth sign, the 'artifice' (in which imputed similarity, such as parallelism[32], plays a chief role) and analyses this four-fold system with two dichotomies: similarity/contiguity (already known through Jakobson's work on aphasia and on poetics[33]), and factual/imputed. Jakobson also speaks, tellingly and knowingly, of Peirce's heroic and painful struggle to have his ideas accepted or even known. This is but one of several examples of Jakobson's interest in the lives of innovative scholars who were misunderstood and thus, like himself, had met with various difficulties and often even hostility. "The Twentieth Century in European and American Linguistics: Movements and Continuity" includes Jakobson's

[30] See "A Glance at the Development of Semiotics", discussed above, as well as "Linguistics in Relation to Other Sciences", *op. cit.*, and "Language in Relation to Other Communication Systems", *op. cit.*

[31] The question of the unity of time and of its semiotic/conceptual nature was always of concern to Jakobson. Cf. his discussion of Einstein's concept of relativity alluded to above. See also Krystyna Pomorska, "The Autobiography of a Scholar", *op. cit.*

[32] See also "Grammatical Parallelism and its Russian Facet", *SW III*: 98–135.

[33] See his seminal work, "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances", *SW II*: 239–259.

own evaluation of the importance of such American linguistic figures as Leonard Bloomfield, Franz Boas[34], and Edward Sapir[35].

The next four articles in this section mark a return by the mature Jakobson to his Russian roots and in particular to his very early growth as a scholar. "Toward the History of the Moscow Linguistic Circle", is a precious document, informed by his own, central activity in this group. "Očerednye zadači obščej lingvistiki" [Current Tasks for General Linguistics], the last public lecture (in 1979) that he delivered at Moscow University where he himself had heard lectures about the same subjects as a student, is a summing up of the Russian contributions to linguistics, and a delineation of those pressing tasks which remain on the agenda for world linguistic science and which were already anticipated by the Moscow Linguistic Circle. "Pëtr Bogatyrëv (29.I.93–18.VIII.71): Expert in Transfiguration" is an affectionate appraisal of Jakobson's first collaborator, with whom he conducted field work during his undergraduate days (see "Preface", *SW IV*: vii–viii and "Retrospect", *SW IV*: 635–706) and then later wrote two fundamental studies on the question of folk poetry and literature[36], in which they argued that folklore is a collective, social phenomenon, and thus is analogous to the linguistic concept of *langue*, while literature is an individual, personal phenomenon, and thus is analogous to the linguistic concept of *parole*. Jakobson's appraisal of Bogatyrëv's work delineates, in a few lines, the structuralist and semiotic elements in the latter's studies of folk theatre, religious ritual, and folklore. "Po povodu knigi N. S. Trubeckogo 'Evropa i Celovečestvo'" [About N. S. Trubetskoy's book *Europe and Mankind*], written as a preface, presents the consistency and continuation of Trubetzkoy's thoughts concerning fundamental anthropological issues[37].

Section D., Philological Gleanings, adding to his earlier contributions in this same area, provides an eloquent example of Jakobson's breadth and depth of scholarly range, and brings together his own knowledge of

[34] Also explored in his "Franz Boas' Approach to Language" (*SW II*: 477–488) and "Boas' View of Grammatical Meaning", *op. cit.*

[35] It is curious, as Edward Stankiewicz has pointed out (*op. cit.*, p. 448ff), that despite Jakobson's deep admiration for Sapir and despite the evident influence of Sapir's work on his own, Jakobson never published a full-scale study of Sapir's work, although there are, in these three contributions, in his studies on the history of linguistics, and in other work (see e.g., *The Sound Shape of Language*), many highly positive references to Sapir.

[36] "Die Folklore als eine Besondere Form des Schaffens", *SW IV*: 1–15, "K probleme razmeževanija fol'kloristiki i literaturovedenija" [On the problem of the differentiation of folkloristics and literary analysis], *SW IV*: 16–18.

[37] See also Roman Jakobson, ed., *N. S. Trubetzkoy's Letters and Notes* (the Hague: Mouton, 1975).

Russian language and culture, cultural history, comparative philology and linguistics, etymology, textual analysis, poetic analysis, and the history of word meaning. "When a Falcon has Molted" continues his in-depth study of certain verses in the *Igor' Tale*, while "Goroun's Urn" unravels a 10th century Eastern Slavic inscription. "The Etymology of *Grib* (E. Sl. Fungus, W. Sl. Boletus)" conforms brilliantly to the principles set forth above for the study of etymology.

Section E, Poetics, is a continuation of Jakobson's life-work, specifically his later preoccupation with the poetry of grammar and grammar of poetry (*SW III*; see also *SW V*). Significantly, "Deržavin's Last Poem and M. Halle's First Literary Essay", written in 1982, is very different in its conception from the very early (1959) study, "Andrew Marvell's Poem *To his Coy Mistress*": one can see here the development of Jakobson's own technique in this area, which he himself created. "Igra v Adu u Puškina i Xlebnikova" [A Game in Hell in Puškin and Xlebnikov] discusses the relation between the literary text and the illustrated subtext in the popular edition of Puškin which was an inspiration to Xlebnikov. It thus provides, as does indeed Jakobson's work on poetics as a whole, a methodology for further intertextual analysis. "Iz kommentarija k stixam Majakovskogo 'Tovarišču Nette — paroxodu i čeloveku'" [From the commentary on Majakovsky's poem "To Comrad Nette — steamship and man"], a recounting of the factual background to the poem[38], has an autobiographical admixture, since it touches on Jakobson's own role in introducing Nette to Majakovskij and since he himself is alluded to in the poem. "From Aljagrov's Letters" is even more notably autobiographical, for it is, like "The Evasive Initial" mentioned above, a playful allusion to Jakobson himself; but unlike that other article, "I" here is only allowed when he quotes his own letter to the experimental poet, A. E. Kručenyx. Far from being the ailing octogenarian of that other study, he is here the seventeen-year-old supraconscious poet, full of energy, writing his theoretical musings about the ultimate goal of poetry. Linked with the earlier studies on poetics contained in *SW III* and *SW V*, it gives valuable insight into Jakobson's own development as a poet and poetician.

* * *

Part Three, Retrospections, contains two remarkable documents: "My Favorite Topics", presented in January 1981 by Jakobson on the

[38] For more discussion the reader is referred to Krystyna Pomorska, "A Semiotic Approach to the 'Literature of Fact': Majakovskij's Poem 'To Comrade Nette'", *American Journal of Semiotics* 2: 71–88, 1983.

occasion of his having been awarded the Premio Internazionale per la Filologia e Linguistica, and "On the Dialectics of Language", written shortly before his death, on the occasion of his having been awarded the Hegel-Preis of the city of Stuttgart. These are both retrospects which serve to give a global overview by Jakobson not only of the writings contained in this volume, but also of his scholarly method and ideology. They are a sort of supercommentary meant to encapsulate all of his Retrospects to *SW I* through *VI*. It is characteristic that here recurs the topic which Jakobson already announced in his first "Retrospect": "The RETROSPECT ... is focused upon the constants which unify the writer's inquiry. Thus the concluding essay recurs to the same principle of invariance which is the keystone of the entire volume"[39]. Twenty years later, in these meta-retrospects, Jakobson asserts again that the common denominator of his work is the relation between and "interplay of invariance and variation" since, in his view, "the inseparability between invariance and variability [is] the *conditio sine qua non* of scientific analysis".

III. The editorial work for this volume, including the excellent indexes, was done by Stephen Rudy of New York University. He was aided by Dr. Brent Vine, who during his tenure as Assistant to the Estate of Roman Jakobson helped prepare the entire manuscript for typesetting. Professor Calvert Watkins of Harvard University was kind enough to check the mythological part. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology contributed both indirectly and directly to the final preparation of the volume by supporting the Jakobson Archives and Publications Project and by facilitating the editor's work there as a research associate in spring 1983. We are all indebted to the editor himself for his enormous and sustained work on the *Selected Writings* project as a whole; his dedication and skill have been essential to the publication of the oeuvre of Roman Jakobson.

Linda R. Waugh
Cornell University

[39] *SW I*, finished Feb. 1962, p. 658. See also Elmar Holenstein, *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language*, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–103; and Linda R. Waugh, *Roman Jakobson's Science of Language* (Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press, 1976), pp. 68–89, for a further discussion of the role of invariance in Jakobson's work.

PART ONE

CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY

SLAVIC GODS AND DEMONS

The Christianization of the Slavs expanded gradually from the 8th until the 13th century, now and then provoking local pagan revolts (in Bohemia soon after its baptism, which dates from the late 9th century, and among the Poles and Eastern Slavs throughout the 11th century), or creating those whimsical combinations of paganism and Christianity labeled in Church Slavonic vocabulary as "double faith" (*dvoevěrie*).

The conversion of the Kievan court belongs to the end of the 10th century and the pagan tradition is still fresh in the minds of the earliest Russian annalists. Both the *Primary Russian Chronicle*, compiled about 1111, and the *First Novgorod Chronicle* reproduce many records of the 11th century which contain a detailed report on the annihilation of the official paganism in Kiev and Novgorod and various reflections of the subsequent double faith. Moreover, the *Primary Chronicle* includes the authentic text of Russian-Greek treaties (945, 971) with native pagan oaths. From the 11th century many allusions to the old deities and pre-Christian beliefs occur also in the various Russian writings against the pagan survivals. Former Russian gods are occasionally interpolated into translated literary works (*Malalas Chronicle*; *Alexandreis*) or in accord with the Byzantine pattern, appear as rhetorical adornments in the original epos (*Igor' Tale*).

The Northwestern (Maritime) Slavs from the Vistula to the Elbe stubbornly resisted German crusades, and the history of this struggle is told (a) in the Latin Chronicles of three German clergymen — two from the 11th century (Thietmar of Merseburg; Adam of Bremen), and one from the 12th century (Helmold); (b) in three biographies of Otto of Bamberg compiled in the 12th century; (c) in the *Gesta Danorum* by Saxo Grammaticus (about 1188). These sources, supplemented by some less important German documents and by the Icelandic *Knytlinga Saga* (around 1265), exhibit a rich picture of the Northwestern Slavic idolatry; and their authors, in spite of their Roman bias and insufficient acquaintance with the Slavic people and language, have proved to be, in the light

of recent archeological research, noticeably more accurate in their reports than was usually assumed.

The literary data on the beliefs of the other Slavs are much scantier, partly because of their early Christianization (particularly in the case of Czechs and Bulgars) or because of the late origin of documents relating to the pagan past (e.g., most of the mythological testimonies in the *Polish Chronicle* of the 15th century have been found to be mere inventions). Marginal residues of Slavic heathenism as recorded in 1331 from the Slovenes on the Isonzo are rather exceptional, but the folklore of all the Slavic peoples — notwithstanding the various superstrata, borrowings from abroad, and modifications — offers to the careful investigator many striking survivals, especially in demonology and in calendrical and family rites. From the times preceding the Christianization of the Western and Southern Slavs, a few Greek and Latin writings give scrappy indications of single Slavic religious concepts or terms; in the 6th century the Byzantine historian Prokopios briefly refers to the Slavic faith and the Gothic chronicler Jordanes cites the Slavic *strava* (funeral meal); a Latin document of the 8th century mentions *treba* (sacrifice).

The relative linguistic unity and negligible dialectal differentiation of the Slavic world until the end of the first millennium A.D., and particularly the considerable lexical uniformity of Slavic pre-Christian beliefs, corroborate the supposition of a substantial unity for the cult of the Primitive Slavs. In the vocabulary originally connected with worship, the Slavs and partly the Baltic peoples, their closest linguistic neighbors, present striking similarities with Indo-Iranian as well as with Thraco-Phrygian nomenclature. The fund linking the Primitive Slavs with the Iranians is particularly important. The proximity in the religious pattern and terminology finds its expression both in the features which they preserved jointly from the Indo-European heritage or which they modified in one and the same way. In some cases where we are authorized to presume a direct borrowing, the direction is from Iranian to Slavic. These Slavic-Iranian affinities are all the more indicative in that Indo-European languages are mostly divergent in their religious vocabulary.

Slavs and Iranians nearly eliminated the Indo-European name of the worshipped sky (**dyēus*). They agree 1) in substituting the name of the cloud (Slavic *nebo*) for that of the sky, 2) in converting the derivative "celestial" (**deiwos*), used by Indo-Europeans to denote gods, into the word for "hostile demonic being" (compare the term *divъ* attested in the demonology of various Slavic peoples and the corresponding she-demon

divii, diva, divožena), 3) in assigning the general meaning "god" to a term which originally signified both wealth and its giver (*bogъ*). Thus the Slavs participated in the Iranian evolution into a clear-cut dualism and, according to Helmold's accurate testimony, they were wont to worship divinities of good and those of evil, "being convinced that happiness comes from the god of good while misfortune is dispensed by the deity of evil". And the Slavic term for faith (*věra*) coincides with the Iranian term for religious choice between good and evil. The Slavs (and the Balts too) share with the Iranians the use of the same term for holy (originally "provided by supernatural beneficial power", Slavic *svętъ*). The Slavic term for "peace agreement" and for "community agreeing" (*mirъ*) is connected with the Iranian Mithra. In Slavic and Iranian similar verbs express the various processes originally pertaining to the religious pattern, as: worshipping (*žrěti*), wailing (*vъpiti*), invocation (*zъvati*), divination (*gatati*), proclamation (*věštati*), drawing (*pьsati*), chastising (*kajati*), fearing (*bojati sę*), protecting (*xraniti*), etc. Such fundamental spiritual terms as word (*slovo*) and deed (*dělo*) are common to Slavic and Iranian, as are also such designations of the basic ritual implements as "fire" (*vatra*), "chalice" (*čaša*), "burial (literally 'magian') mound" (*mogyla*), and such curative terms as "cure" (*goiti*), "healthy" (*sъdravъ*), and "sick" (*xvorъ*). There are several common expressions for ill-omened concepts: "evil" (*zъlo*), "shame" (*sramъ*), "guilt" (*vina*), "sinister" (*šui*); moreover the Slavic stem **kostjun-* (literally "osseous"), denoting "profane, temporal", seems to be a loan translation. The Common Slavic *rai* "paradise" has been acknowledged as a direct borrowing from Iranian *rāy-* "heavenly radiance, beatitude".

Like the religious terminology, the pantheon of the Slavs offers more Common Slavic than tribal features and partly points to Indo-European roots, or at least shows Indo-Iranian, especially Iranian, and perhaps Thraco-Phrygian, connections. It was hinted by Prokopios, and six centuries later observed by Helmold, that among the multiform divine powers worshipped by the Slavs, one is believed to rule over the others in heaven and to care for celestial things, "whereas the rest, obeying the duties assigned them, have sprung from his blood and enjoy distinction in proportion to their nearness to that god of gods". The scattered data we possess on the Slavic deities, and in particular on their mutual kinship and hierarchy, do not permit us to reconstruct this whole system. Nevertheless there are indications arguing for kinship and hierarchy.

The storm god Perunъ is closely connected by name and functions with the Vedic Parjánya, with the Lithuanian (as a matter of fact,

Common Baltic) Perkũnas (replaceable under tabu by Perũnas), with the Norse Fjǫrgynn (supposed to be the archaic designation for the Thunderer) and with the Albanian Perëndi, now denoting both "god" and "sky". It is probable that Greek *Keraunós* "thunderbolt" (used also in epithets of the thunder-god) is a rhyme-word substituted for a tabued *Peraunós. The Indo-European name for this hypostasis of a sky divinity contains, beside a nasal suffix, the alternating verbal root *per-/perk*^{w}- (or *perg*-), signifying "to strike, to splinter", and used particularly of lightning. This root appears, e.g. in Latin and Germanic, as a substitute name for the oak, a tree favored by the thunderstorm and devoted to the thunder god; and in the Indo-European tradition the same root with a nasal suffix denotes the "oak-wooded hill" — Celtic-Latin *Hercynia* (*Silva*), Gothic *fairguni*, Slavic **pergynja* (Old Church Slavonic *pręgynja*, Old Russian *peregynja*, Polish *przeginia*). The leading role of Perun in Russian heathenism, the connection of the oak with this god, and the veneration of the *peregynja* are clearly attested by Russian sources. Perun was identified with Thor by the Varangians, with Zeus by the Russian bookmen, and with Elijah in Christianized folklore. Outside Russia, the god Perun, distorted to Prone and worshipped in oak-groves, appears in Helmold's *Chronicle*; Perun's son Porenutius figures in the mythological records of Saxo Grammaticus; Perun's name is echoed in Slovak maledictions (Peron, Parom), in the Polabian word for Thursday (*peründan*), in such appellatives for thunder and lightning as the Polish *piorun* and the Bulgarian folklore form *perušan*, as well as in West and South Slavic proper names, both personal and local, these mostly linked with oak-forest or hill. The ritual of the rain charm, widespread among Bulgars and Serbs and thence in Greece and Rumania, assigns the paramount role to a vigorously chaste girl (as yet unable to conceive and born of a mother who since has become unable to conceive). Nude and draped with flowers, she whirls ecstatically in the middle of a ring, invoking in song the sky or Elijah to moisten and fructify the earth. She bears the reduplicated name of Perun, either unchanged (Perperuna) or with hypocoristic modifications. This couple Perunъ-Perperuna recalls the Germanic Fjǫrgynn-Fjǫrgyn and the Lithuanian Perkũnas-Percuna tete. In another variant of the South Slavic ritual, the main role was performed by a boy assuming Perun's name, reduplicated and altered: the people, whirling and drinking, besought him for rain. To the same cycle refer the old Russian reminiscences of Pereplut, worshipped by whirling and libations, as well as the Magdeburg epistle of 1008 damning the "impudent" god Pripegala. In some areas of Serbia and Bulgaria the name Perperuna is

replaced by Dodola or Dudula, and a similar form *du(n)dulis* (tied with an onomatopœic verb for thunder) is currently substituted by Lithuanians for the tabued Perkunas. Thus, in the Balkan Slavic rain charms, one not only finds archaic features reminiscent of Jupiter Elicius and *aquælicium*, of Zeus, Naios and Dodona, as well as of the Vedic hymns to Parjánya, but even the tabu name itself, together with its substitute, reveals a prehistoric origin.

The Slavic Svarogъ is recorded and identified with Hephaistos by an old Russian glossator of the *Malalas Chronicle*. Svarogъ's son was venerated by Russians as Svarožičь and by the Northwestern Slavs as Svarožicь. The name survives in Rumanian *sfaróg* "torrid", and in the names of hills along the Slavic-German border (Kashubian Swarożyn, elsewhere with a tabu substitution Tvarog, Tvarožic, etc.). Under another substitute name (Rarog, further modified to Rarach, Jarog) this spirit continues to live in Western Slavic (particularly Czech and Slovak) demonology as a supernatural falcon and fiery dwarf who beams and turns into a whirlwind and various animals. The name and the characteristic traits of this Slavic deity are obviously connected with the Iranian Vrthragna and his main incarnation Vāragna, the supernatural falcon, and with the cognate figures in Indic (Indra Vṛtrahan) and Armenian mythology (Vahagn). The other incarnations of Vrthragna — wind, gold-horned aurochs, horse, boar — as well as his close ties with fire and smithery are reflected by Slavic tradition as well. Indra, the virility epithet of this deity, lost its mythological connotation in the Slavic adjective *jędrъ* "virile, vigorous, fast" (in the same way as Slavic secularizes the adjective *svobodъ* "free", corresponding to the Phrygian Sabadios). But the various aspects of this divine virility find their expression in the conjoined names recorded from the Northwestern Slavs, Svętovitъ (overlapped by St. Vitus after Christianization but still figuring in toponymy), Jarovitъ (surviving as Jarilo in the folk-Russian phallic spring ritual), Porovitъ (with the same first root as Perunъ), and Ruevitъ. These four manifestations of the military deity were apparently symbolized by the polycephalic form of the Northwestern Slavic idols, and could be compared to the Iranian four-faced warrior god Vrthragna, with such attributes as "making bright" and "making virile". At least two of the mentioned designations had a calendrical connotation: 1) *jaro* ("spring") is connected with *jarъ* ("young, ardent, bright, rash"), and Jarovitъ's priest proclaims in his name, "I am your god who covers the plains with grass and the woods with leaves"; 2) *ruenъ* is the autumnal month named for the ruts and mating calls of newly matured animals. The whole ritual, focusing upon the annual

cycle and on predestination, displays associations with Vrthragna's cult. The prophetic role of the horse in the divination ceremonies of the Northwestern Slavs is confirmed by its magic functions in Russian popular tradition, particularly by the traditional horse epithet — *věščij* "seer" — which has an exact correspondence in the *Avesta*. And the Common Slavic term for "time" (**vermę*) conceives of it as a wheel-track (compare Old Indic *vartman-*).

Like the Vedic Vṛtrahan, the Slavic Svarogъ generated the sun, Хърсъ Dažьbogъ, according to the Old Russian records. These designations survive among old personal names, Dadzbog in Polish, Hrs in Serbian. Helmold's "ydolum *** Podaga" is perhaps a distortion of Dabog. For the bookmen, Dažьbogъ was identical with Helios. In old Russian tradition both celestial fire and the fire of the hearth are said to be Svarogъ's son. Хърсъ is an obvious borrowing from the Iranian expression for the personified radiant sun (*Xursīd* in Persian). Dažьbogъ means "the giver of wealth", like the Vedic Bhaga. Stribogъ, the neighbor of Dažьbogъ on the Kievan hill before Russia's conversion, means literally "the apportioner of wealth", like Bhaga's partner Aṁśa, and Palmer detects a striking parallel to this couple in the mythological references of the oldest Greek poets. Větrъ "wind", personified in Primitive Slavic (compare Indo-Iranian Vāta-), is quite naturally termed "Stribogъ's descendant" in the *Igor' Tale*.

The Russian peace treaties with the Greeks do not mention Svarogъ probably because of his bellicose connotation, but after the sovereign Perunъ, the oath of 971 invoked Volosъ as "the god of cattle". Also, another Russian form, Velesъ, is attested, and the Czech tradition of the 15th and 16th centuries remembers a demon Veles. The alternation of the two variants **velesъ* and **velsъ* (whence Volosъ), seems to stem from Primitive Slavic. (The etymology is still controversial.) Volosъ was identified with Apollo in the Old Russian literary pattern and replaced by St. Blasius (Vlas) in Christianized folklore. Beside Volosъ, Russian tradition knows another god of the cultivators, with the characteristic name Rodъ (literally "kin"), thus corresponding to such deities as the Celtic Teutates, Latin Quirinus, Umbrian Vofionus. Among the Kievan court idols neither Volosъ nor Rodъ was admitted, although the Old Russian literary tradition presents the latter as the primordial god. His feminine counterpart Rožanica (in Serbocroatian and Slovenian popular tradition Rodjenica, Rojenica), literally meaning "genitrix" and mostly named in the plural, was identified by Russian bookmen with Artemis. The only goddess of the Kievan official pantheon, Mokošь, literally "moist", and represented by some vestiges in Russian folklore and in

Slavic toponymy, is probably nothing but another name for the slightly personified "Mother moist earth" (*Mati syra zemlja*), still adored in Slavic, chiefly Russian, popular tradition, and closely related to similar female deities in Baltic, Phrygian, and Indo-Iranian mythology. The Iranian Ardvī ("moist") Sūrā Anāhitā is particularly close to Mokošь: both of them protect semen, child-bearing, and sheep-breeding.

It is noteworthy that one of the Iranian demonic beings, the winged monster Sīmorg, was adopted under the name Simarglъ in the Kievan official pantheon on the eve of Russia's Christianization, and that the Persian poet Khaqani at the end of the 12th century symbolizes the Russian intruders precisely as Sīmorgs. However the whole of Slavic demonology still awaits an attentive comparative analysis both of its peculiarities and of the multifarious ties linking it with its environment.

Originally published in *Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*, volume II (New York, 1950), under the title "Slavic Mythology".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For a survey and reproduction of the medieval records on Slavic mythology see:

Mansikka, V. J., *Die Religion der Ostslaven* 1, *FFC* 43 (1922);

Gal'kovskij, N., "Drevnerusskie slova i poučenija, napravlennye protiv ostatkov jazyčestva v narode", *Moscow Archaeological Institute, Zapiski* 18 (1913);

Meyer, K. H., *Fontes historiae religionis slavicae* (Berlin, 1931);

Zíbrt, Č., *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* (Prague, 1894);

Brückner, A. *Mitologia Polska* (Warsaw, 1924);

Beševliev, I., "Gr"cki i latinski izvori za vjarata na prab"lgarite", National Museum of Ethnography of Sofia, *Bulletin* 8–9 (1929);

Leicht, P.-S., "Tracce di paganesimo fra gli Sclavi dell' Isonzo nel secolo XIV", *Studi e materiali di storia della religioni* 1 (1925).

The best summary work is still:

Niederle, L., *Život starých Slovanů*, part II, vol. I, first edition 1916, second edition 1924 (condensed in *Manuel de l'antiquité slave* 2, Paris, 1926).

Some corrections and supplements:

Sobolevskij, A., "Zametki po slavjanskoj mifologii", *Slavia* 7 (1928);

Brückner, A., *Mitologia slava* (Bologna, 1923);

Urbańczyk, S., *Religia pogańskich Słowian* (Cracow, 1947).

Archeological additions:

Palm, T., *Wendische Kultstätten* (Lund, 1937);

Albrecht, C. "Slavische Bildwerke", *Mainzer Zeitschrift* 23 (1928).

Valuable but in many respects antiquated is the latest English survey:

Máchal, J., "Slavic Mythology", *Mythology of All Races* 3 (Boston, 1918; abstract of his Czech outline of 1891).

Dilettantic and chauvinistic:

Wienecke, E., *Untersuchungen zur Religion der Westslaven* (Leipzig, 1940).

Insufficient material used and avoidance of comparative method harm the newest compilation:

Unbegaun, B., "La religion des anciens Slaves", *Mana*, tome 2, no. 3 (Paris, 1948).

Most stimulating linguistic contributions are offered by:

Rozwadowski, J., in *Rocznik oryentalistyczny* 1 (1914);

Meillet, A., in *Revue des Études Slaves* 6 (1926);

Máchek, V., in *Linguistica Slovaca* 3 (1941).

On Slavic popular beliefs see particularly:

Moszyński, K., *Kultura lodowa Słowian* 2, no. 1 (Cracow, 1934);

Bystron, J., *Słowiańskie obrzędy rodzinne* (Cracow, 1916).

For single Slavic peoples:

Haase, F., *Volksglaube und Brauchtum der Ostslaven* (Breslau, 1939);

Zelenin, D., *Očerki slavjanskij mifologii* (Petersburg, 1916);

Bogatyrev, P., *Actes magiques, rites et croyances en Russie Subcarpathique* (Paris, 1929);

Seržputovskij, A., *Prymxi i zababoni belarusaw paljašukow* (Minsk, 1930);

Nikol'skij, N., *Živëly w zvyčajax, abradax i verannjax belaruskaha sjalanstva* (Minsk, 1933);
Biegeleisen, H., *Matka i dziecko w obrzędach, wierzeniach i zwyczajach ludu polskiego* (Lwow, 1927);
idem, *Wesele* (Lwow, 1928);
idem, *U kolebki — przed ołtarzem — nad mogiłą* (Lwow, 1929);
Bystroń, J., *Słowiańskie zwyczaje żniwiarskie w Polsce* (Cracow, 1916);
Schneeweis, E., *Feste und Volksbräuche der Lausitzer Wenden* (Leipzig, 1931);
Zíbrt, Č., *Staročeské výroční obyčeje, pověry, slavnosti a zábavy prostonárodni* (Prague, 1889);
Schneeweis, E., *Grundriss des Volksglaubens und Volksbrauches der Serbokroaten* (Celje, 1935);
Marinov, D., *Narodna vjara i religiozni narodni običai* (Sofia, 1914);
Kemp, P., *Healing Ritual: Studies in the Technique and Tradition of the Southern Slavs* (London, 1935).

On mythological motives in folk art, see:

Gorodcov, V., "Dako-Sarmatskie religioznye èlementy v russkom narodnom tvorčestve", *Trudy Gos. Ist. Muzeja* 1 (Moscow, 1926).

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE IN COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY

I. STATE AND PROGRAM OF COMPARATIVE SLAVIC MYTHOLOGY

Although the steady growth of comparative Indo-European linguistics during the last century was accompanied by parallel efforts at the elaboration of comparative mythology, the development of the latter was retarded by several factors. The methodological shortcomings of the new discipline had a pernicious effect on its concrete results. The shakiness and doubtfulness of its conclusions naturally provoked a negative reaction, but the sound criticism of dubious hypotheses threatened to degenerate into a devastating, even more unfounded hypercriticism, a doctrine of fruitless skepticism. Side by side with the brilliant and promising ventures into the domain of comparative Indo-European mythology that have been made over the past few decades in international (especially French and Italian) science and that developed in close association with contemporary linguistic thought, there continue to appear influential works on the mythology of diverse Indo-European peoples that deliberately reject the comparative method and the use of linguistic comparison and reconstruction in the study of ancient religions. As a result, the facts under study are forcibly taken out of context and thus become meaningless. The historical perspective disappears, and the image of the whole is lost behind the scattered and isolated fragments.

Let us examine the theses that are consistently defended in several characteristic postwar outlines of Slavic mythology.[1] We shall answer their a priori skepticism by presenting a few clear illustrations of the application of linguistic devices and criteria in examining the available evidence about the native Slavic gods.

We find particularly unacceptable in the works under discussion the

[1] Typical "skeptical" surveys include: B. Unbegaun, "La religion des anciens Slaves", *Mana: Introduction à l'histoire des religions* 2 (Paris, 1948), 387–445; A. Schmaus, "Zur altslavischen Religionsgeschichte", *Saeculum* 4 (1953), 206–230; A. Stender-Petersen, "Russian Paganism", in his *Russian Studies = Acta Jutlandica* 28, 2 (Copenhagen, 1956), 44–53; Z. R. Dittrich, "Zur religiösen Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Slaven", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, N.F. 9 (1961); F. Vyncke, *De Godsdienst der Slaven* (Roermond, 1969).

refusal to use the allegedly bankrupt etymological method. In actuality, prominent international linguists of several generations have done a great deal for the comparative analysis of the roots of Indo-European, and particularly Slavic, mythological names. These successful experiments demand a systematic continuation. The shakiness of certain etymologies demands greater precision, but certainly not the termination of the inquiry.

The fruitful investigations on the part of Zelenin, Bonfante, Havers, Specht, Èrdedi, and others into the role of verbal interdictions eloquently discredit the skeptics' warnings against references to taboo in etymological comparisons.[2] It suffices to recollect such substitutes for religious names in American English as "gosh" (<god), "golly" (<holy), "gee" (<Jesus), "tarnal" (<eternal), "goldarned" (<god-damned), "great Scott" (<great god),[3] or in Serbian *bora mi*, *broda mi*, *gloga mi* (in place of *boga mi* "my God"), in order to pay proper attention to sound replacements and metatheses, as well as to morphological and lexical changes, in ancient sacral nomenclature.

The doubts of the skeptics concerning toponymic vestiges of mythological names are no less arbitrary. The place of worship often stubbornly preserves its name despite the disappearance of the cult itself. One cannot artificially divorce observations about the names of the gods either from pagan relics in toponymics or from ancient religious terminology. However deep are the divergences in this sort of vocabulary among the Indo-European peoples, the Slavs nevertheless retained a number of strikingly archaic elements. Correspondingly, we can reasonably expect to find ancient survivals in mythology and in mythological names. The richness of the pre-Christian layer in Common Slavic religious terminology, especially the presence of a series of terms relating to a highly developed sacrificial worship, decisively refutes the assertions that there is no evidence of the existence of liturgical ritual in the Slavic pagan tradition; cf. the pre-Christian Church Sl. term *žьrьcь* "priest" (lit. "sacrificer"; cf. *žrьtva* "sacrificial offering, victim"), inherited from Common Slavic.

[2] D. Zelenin, "Tabu slov u narodov vostočnoj Evropy i severnoj Azii", 1–2, *Sbornik Muzeja Antropologii i Ètnografii* 8–9 (1929–1930); G. Bonfante, "Études sur le tabou dans les langues indo-européennes", *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally* (Geneva, 1939); W. Havers, "Neuere Literatur zum Sprachtabu", *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte*, 223, no. 5 (1946); I. Èrdedi, "Jazykovye tabu v ural'skix jazykax", *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae*, Sectio Philologica 5 (1964), 95–117.

[3] Cf. H. L. Mencken, *The American Language* (New York, 1937, 4th ed.), 316f.; E. C. Hills, "Exclamations in American English", *Dialect Notes* 5, 7 (1924).

Among the books published under Hitler during the years of his offensive against the Slavs were the chauvinistic publications of Erwin Wienecke and Leonhard Franz.[4] These works employed all possible contrivances in an effort to convince readers that Common Slavic beliefs remained on the level of primitive demonology and did not evolve into a faith in individual gods — "die arteigene Kultur der Slawen war so unentwickelt"[5] — until, according to the authors, the Slavic peoples on the threshhold of their historical existence finally underwent the religious influence of the Germans. Unfortunately, both of these theses — the first a naive notion of a barbaric state of "godless" faith in demons which ignores worldwide anthropological research, the second a blind confidence in the Germanic importation of worship of gods to the Baltic and Eastern Slavs — have filtered into several works of scholarship in the postwar period as well. Everything that Wienecke and Franz ascribed to Germanic influence — for example, the sanctuaries, the sculptural images of gods, and the cult of a sacred, prophesying horse at Retra, Szczecin, and Arkona, — all are found to have ever new and convincing correspondences in archeological finds and folkloric survivals throughout the entire Slavic world.

Were the beliefs of the Slavs to have undergone a Germanic influence, this would naturally be reflected in the religious vocabulary of Slavic paganism as well. Yet, whereas the material culture of the Slavs absorbed numerous lexical Germanisms, such phenomena are totally absent from the language of the primitive Slavs' spiritual culture. Moreover, a series of studies, beginning with the fundamental writings of Jan Rozwadowski and Antoine Meillet,[6] brought to light the numerous Iranian reflections in the ethico-religious terminology of the early Slavs. These consist partly of direct borrowings and partly of primordial Indo-European words that underwent an Iranian modification in their meanings. Thus, for instance, even the distinctive religious revolution reflected in the Iranian lexical pattern expanded to Common Slavic, which, together with Iranian, changed the original designation of the heavenly deity (**deiwos*) into the name of the evil demon hostile to gods (Av. *daēva-*, Church Slav. *divъ*); on the other hand, the general meaning of "deity" was assigned to the term "giver" (Av. *baga-*, Church

[4] E. Wienecke, *Untersuchungen zur Religion der Westslaven* (Leipzig, 1940), Leonhard Franz, *Falsche Slawengötter* (Brno, 1943, 2nd ed.).

[5] L. Franz, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[6] J. Rozwadowski, "Stosunki leksikalne między językami słowiańskimi a irańskimi", *Wybór pism* 2 (Warsaw, 1961); A. Meillet, "Le vocabulaire slave et le vocabulaire indo-iranien", *Revue des Études Slaves* 6 (1926).

Slav. *bogъ*). Furthermore, the original noun for the worshipped heaven (**dyēus*) was replaced by the original word for "cloud" (Av. *nabah-*, Church Slav. *nebo*). Finally, according to the observation of Vittore Pisani, the Indo-European term **ĝhemōn* "human being", closely linked to the noun for earth, **ĝhōm*, was eliminated.[7] The closeness of the Slavic religious vocabulary to the Iranian, exposing the communality of both faith and ritual, also finds a striking parallel in the names and functions of individual gods. Yet the skeptics either ignore this connection or construct unsubstantiated surmises about purely literary secular borrowings, proper merely to a narrow social elite.

Hostility toward the comparative method, that effective instrument of historical linguistics, inevitably leads investigators of Slavic pagan antiquity to an impoverishment and distortion of the mythological data. Despite the vital continuity of the Slavic oral tradition, the skeptics put in doubt the historical instructiveness of the folk rituals, legends, and beliefs of the recent past. When separated from the folkloric names and motifs, the written sources inevitably lose their informative value. The fruitful slogan of the perspicacious builder of comparative mythology, Georges Dumézil — "Il faut étudier les dieux les uns par rapport aux autres"[8] — is obstinately opposed by the skeptics, who instead promote a devastating isolationism: each god is studied exclusively in isolation, without taking into account ancient testimony concerning his place in the divine hierarchy, such as the instructive order of the list of Kievan idols found in the early chronicles (cf. the Russian *Primary Chronicle* for the year 980). The genealogy of the gods is denied, in spite of their traditional patronymics and the genealogical indications in the Old Russian texts. The local cult is examined without considering its connections with tribal gods, and the tribal gods are viewed as unconnected with those of the other Slavs; in particular, the gods of the Baltic Slavs are artificially isolated from the Russian deities. Finally, the kinship between the gods of the Slavic peoples and those of other Indo-European groups is denied. Naturally, when all comparison is forbidden the literary documents of the eleventh and twelfth centuries lose their value as evidence, and in the end — with all sorts of deliberate motivations — even their exactness and veracity are thrown into doubt. As a matter of fact, the comparison of written and folkloric sources and the collation of the information of contemporaries about the gods of the

[7] V. Pisani, "Il paganesimo Balto-Slavo", in *Storia delle Religioni*, ed. P. T. Venturi (Turin, 1949), p. 63.
[8] G. Dumézil, *Tarpeia* (Paris, 1947), p. 11.

Slavic East and Northwest, combined with a widening of the framework of Slavic mythology so as to include a constant regard for the linguistic data, confirm the authenticity of the bookish sources on the pre-Christian beliefs of Old Russia and the Polabian-Pomeranian region and make it possible to fill in many of the gaps. Attempts at viewing the responses of the Old Russian bookmen to the eradicated pagan religion and its survivals as mere prejudiced fabrications prove unwarranted. Their accounts can be verified by comparison with reliable evidence contained in the work of the Germans who fought West Slavic polytheism. The basis of the latter's reports are by no means the stereotyped *interpretatio ecclesiastica*, as the German scholars of the World War II period would have one believe, but a completely realistic informational account.

In order to show by means of concrete examples the applicability of the techniques of comparative linguistics to the Slavic mythological data, it is necessary to revise, complete, summarize, and reinterpret the observations and notions that have been accumulated in the scholarship on the subject.

II. RUSSIAN PERUNЪ AND HIS SLAVIC AND INDO-EUROPEAN KIN

In scholarly surveys of Slavic paganism, efforts continue to be made to explain the worship of Perun as a local Russian innovation, a late mythological personification of the "roaring thunder" referred to as "Perun" in the Common Slavic language.[9] Meanwhile, the suffix *-unъ* undoubtedly designated from the earliest times precisely an agent or subject. Next to ancient personal names known among the Western and Baltic Slavs (*Perun*, *Peruničić*, etc.), the names of South Slavic heights, villages, forests, and streams are also highly significative. These names, attested since the early Middle Ages and collected by Iordan Ivanov, S. Trojanović, and M. S. Filipović, include *Perun*, *Perunac*, *Perunovac*, *Perunike*, *Perunička Glava*, *Peruni Vrx*, *Perunja Ves*, *Peruna Dubrava* (the possessive form **Perunjь* is particularly indicative here).[10] In Istria by the slope of the mountain *Perun* there is a natural boundary which goes by the ancient ritual name of *Trebišče* (the Slavic pagan term *treba*

[9] E.g., A. Stender-Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 49f.

[10] I. Ivanov, "Kul't Peruna u južnyx slavjan", *Izvestia Otdelenija slov. i jazyka Akademii Nauk* 8, No. 4 (1903), 140–174; M. S. Filipović, "Tragovi Perunova kul'ta kod Južnih Slovena", *Glasnik Zemaljshog Muzeja u Sarajevu*, Nova Serija, 3 (1948), 63–80; S. Trojanović, "Glavni srpski žrtveni običaji", *Srpski Etnografski Zbornik* 17 (1911), 114f.; cf., more recently, I. Duridanov, "Urslaw. *Perynъ und seine Spuren in der Toponymie", *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 12 (1966), 99–102.

"sacrifice" is mentioned as early as a Latin manuscript of 758).[11] Among these geographic names, such folkloric formations as *Perunuša*, *Peruščice*, *Perudina*, *Peratobac* should be juxtaposed to emotional and god-fearing substitutions of phonemes and entire suffixes in sacred tabooed names: cf. the following formula, full of paronomasias, ascribed to the potter Pidьbljanin, a participant in the "drowning" of the idol of Perun in the first Novgorod Chronicle (989) — "Ty, reče, *Pe*rušice, dosyti esi *pilъ* i ja*ls*, a nyne *po*plovi *pro*cь" "Thou, Perušice," he said, "thou hast eaten and drunk thy fill, and now swim away!"[12] The form *Porunъ* replaced the name of Zeus in the Old Russian manuscript of the *Alexandreis*.[13] In the incantatory formulae and songs of Slovakia and Moravia the name *Parom*, contaminated with *hrom*, and the Slovak variant *Peron* still serve as a substitute for Perun, according to the testimony of A. Václavík.[14] The Bulgarian folk riddle, the answer to which is "thunder" (*gъrmotevica*), reads: "Skokna *perušan*, podskokna, vsičkata zemja potъrsi" "*Perušan* jumped and jumped again and shook the whole world".[15] These substitutions show the god of the Baltic Slavs, attested by Saxo Grammaticus as *Porenutius*, to be a Lekhitic affective variant, possibly a designation of Perun's descendant: *Poruniec*, *Pioruniec*, or rather *Piorunic*.

Helmold's "Chronicon Slavorum" tells about the holy oaks near Stargard dedicated to the god *Prone* (with a distorted variant *Prove*).[16] This is clearly connected with Perun Dubnjak. Perun's oak figures in the Galician *gramota* of 1302 as well.[17] To the form *Prone* correspond the names of the Pomeranian villages *Prohn* and *Pronstorf*, with the variants *Pyron*, *Peron*, and *Perone* (cf. the noun for thunder in one of its Slovak alterations, *Peron*).[18]

In the pantheon of the Baltic Slavs names with the attributive suffix *-ovit/-evit* were epithets,[19] and each of them designated one of the forms

[11] Filipović, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[12] *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov*, ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), p. 160.

[13] Cf. L. Niederle, *Život starých slovanů. Základy kulturních starožitností slovanských = Slovanské starožitnosti. Oddíl kulturní* vol. 2, part 1 (Prague, 1924, 2nd ed.), p. 99, fn. 4.

[14] A. Václavík, "Slovanské prvky v české lidové kultuře", *Slovanství v české národné životě*, ed. J. Macůrek (Brno, 1947), p. 197.

[15] S. Mladenov, *Etimologičeski i pravopisen rečnik na b''lgarskija knižoven ezik* (Sofia, 1941), p. 419.

[16] Cf. P. Diels, "*Prove*", *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 40 (1925), p. 156.

[17] Cf. L. Bulaxovskij, Review of L. P. Jakubinskij's *Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka*, in *Izvestija AN SSSR, Otdel literatury i jazyka* 12, 6 (1953), p. 558.

[18] Cf. V. Pisani, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[19] Cf. A. Sobolevskij, "Zametki po slavjanskoj mifologii. Po povodu truda prof. L. Niederle: *Slovanské starožitnosti*", *Slavia* 7 (1920), p. 17.

or phases of the masculine force, one of the seasons of the year and, correspondingly, one of the hypostases of the multifaceted deity, or perhaps one of a close-knit group of gods. The names mentioned include: *Porovit* (in the sources *Porevith*, *Puruvit*); *Rjujevit* (*Rugievith*, *Riuvit*; cf. Old Russian *rjuti* "to roar, howl", the fall month *rjuenъ* "September"); *Svętovit* (*Zvantevith*, *Sventevic*), worshipped, according to Helmold's testimony, as the "most powerful in foretelling the future" of all the Slavic gods (cf. **svęt-* in the original pagan meaning "endowed with a miraculous and beneficial power" and *svjatki*, the winter festival that features ritual fortune-telling); *Jarovit* (*Gerovit*, *Herovith*; cf. Russ. *jaryj*, *jarkij* "bright", Ch. Sl. *jarъ* "violent", Russ. *jarovoj* "spring, summer (adj.)", and in the Russian and Serbian spring rituals *Jarilo*).[20] The root **por-/per-*, which links Porovit with Perun, appears in Slavic with the meaning of an aggressive, robust and strong power and ripe, stormy summertime (cf. Russian *porá* "the appointed time", *pórnyj* "virile, ripe, strong, in one's prime", *poráto* "strongly", Church Slavonic *pora* "strength").[21]

The stubbornly repeated conjecture that the Russian Perun might be the Slavic name for the Varangian Thor, which arose through a "mechanical transfer of Nordic ideas to the Slavic lands", lacks any foundation.[22] First, the erection of Perun's idols in Kiev and Novgorod in 980 is expressed in the Russian Primary Chronicle as the immediate result of the prince's victory over the Varangian warriors — "se gradъ našь i my prijaxomъ i" "This city is ours and we took it over"; just after having overcome the foreigners, "nača knjažiti Volodimirъ vъ Kievě odinъ i postavi kumiry na xolmu vně dvora teremnogo — Peruna derevjana *** Posadi Dobrynju uja svoego vъ Nověgorodě, i prišedъ Dobrynja Novugorodu postavi Peruna kumirъ nadъ rěkoju Volxovomъ" "Vladimir began to rule solely in Kiev and set up idols on a hill outside the palace — one of Perun, made of wood *** Vladimir had appointed his uncle Dobrynja to rule over Novgorod and after coming to Novgorod he set up an idol of Perun overlooking the river Volxov."[23] Secondly, in the testimonies on Perun there is nothing decisive that links

[20] A. Brückner, *Mitologia Slava* (Bologna, 1923); *idem*, *Mitologja polska* (Warsaw, 1924).

[21] Cf. V. Dal', *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka* 3 (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 2nd ed., 1882), 310f.

[22] A. Stender-Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[23] *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, izdavaemoe postojannoju istoriko-arxeografičeskoj komissieju Akademii Nauk SSSR* 1: *Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*; vyp. 1: *Povest' vremennyx let* (Leningrad, 2nd ed., 1926), col. 78f.; cf. *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, trans. and ed. S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 93f.

him specifically with Thor: the image of the thunder-god belongs to the pantheon of almost all Indo-European peoples,[24] and more importantly, linguists have explicitly uncovered, step by step, the link between the name and functions of Perun and the names and functions of a whole series of gods of other tribes. It is true that even the evident kinship of the Slavic Perun and the Lithuanian *Perkūnas* and Latvian *Pę̀rkuôns* (in both cases the name refers at once to the god and to thunder) has been put in doubt more than once, since a Slavic *-yn-* should have corresponded to the Baltic suffix *-ūn-* and, moreover, a final *k* is missing in the root of the Slavic name. However, A. Meillet convincingly showed the unusual alternation of the root **per-* with the velar enlargement in the present tense of the Armenian verb *harkanem* "I beat, I cut, I chop wood, I kill" (cf. Old Irish *orgaid* "he kills", both based on a stem **per-g-*), and without enlargement the aorist *hari* (cf. Old Church Slavonic *perǫ*, Lithuanian *periù*, *peřti* "strike").[25] This verb is closely linked to the terms for thunderstorms and storms in Armenian, where it often signifies a clap of thunder (cf. also *orot* "thunder", *orotam* "I rumble", < I-E **por-*),[26] and likewise in Slavic lexical use (I. Ivanov cites the Bulgarian expression "Dъždьt peré li peré" "The rain pours and pours").[27] The Lithuanian ethnographer Jonas Balys, in a list of indigenous substantives, cites the peculiar form *Perūnas*, with omitted enlargement, in place of the prohibited form *Perkūnas*.[28] As for the vowel in the suffix, the Slavic linguistic world displays a characteristic tendency to separate the masculine suffix *-un-ъ* from the feminine *-yn-ь*: *Xot-un-ъ* — *Xot-yn-ь*, *Gor-un-ъ* — *Gor-yn-ь*, *Pol-un-ъ* — *Pol-yn-ь*. Correspondingly, the Novgorod pagan temple of Perun was called *Perynь*, and the same basic form is preserved in Balto-Slavic toponymy: *Perin* (< *Perynь*) *planina*.[29] Compare also the dialectal alternation *perínь-perunika* or *peruníga* in the Bulgarian name for the plant *Iris germanica* (Serbian *perùnika* and *bògiša*).[30]

Perunъ and *Perkūnas* belong, as is especially clearly shown in the remarks of V. V. Ivanov, to the family of mythological names endowed

[24] Cf., *i.a.*, H. M. Chadwick, "The Oak and the Thunder-God", *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 30, New Series 3 (1900), p. 38.
[25] A. Meillet, *op. cit.*
[26] E. Lidén, *Armenische Studien* (Göteborg, 1906), p. 88.
[27] I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 145.
[28] J. Balys, "Perkūnas lietuvių liaudies tikėjmuose" ("Der Donner im litauischen Volksglauben"), *Tautosakos Darbai* 3 (Kaunas, 1937), 149–238.
[29] Cf. H. Máchal, *Nákres slovanského bájeslovi* (Prague, 1891), p. 22f.
[30] N. Gerov, *Rečnik na b''lgarskyj jazyk*, supplementary volume (Plovdiv, 1908), p. 249.

with regular reflexes of the same root **per-* and an *-n-* suffix.[31] This suffix, low-pitched or high-pitched, adheres either directly to the root or to the root extended by a voiced or voiceless velar enlargement (a variation natural to mythological onomastics). One finds the unenlarged root in the Albanian complex form *Perëndi, Perudi* "god, heaven", in the Hittite name for the deity and the holy cliff *Peruna-*, in the name of a god of war *Perun* among the Pamirian Kafirs, cognate with the name for the Pleiades in Pashto, *Pērūne* (cf. Av. *paoiriiaēinī-*), and finally, in Ancient Greek κεραυνός "thunderbolt", which also appears as an epithet of Zeus, and in Hesiod's *Theogony* as the name of a separate deity, where it may have served as a synonymic substitution for the prohibited form *περαυνός.[32] Velar enlargements occur in the Old Indic form *Parjánya-*, which figures in the *Rigveda* as the name of the god of storm and rain and as the word for a storm cloud and likewise in the name of the similar Norse god *Fjǫrgynn.*[33] These gods are viewed by Indologists and Germanists as archaic survivals which were thrust into the background in the Indian and Scandinavian worlds when the classical pantheons were elaborated.

In the Indo-European languages taboo supplants the ancient names for the oak tree and necessitates a whole series of consistent substitutes. One of these substitutes preserves the meaning "oak" but has apparently undergone a change in the initial consonant, again as a result of taboo: Latin *quercus* originates in the root *$perk^{w}$- and, as was shown by J. Vendryes,[34] belongs to "the ancient stock of religious concepts" and is related by a primary or secondary connection to the extended alternant of the above-mentioned root **per-*. The name of the deity is simultaneously tied to the splintering thunder and the splintered oak (cf. the alternating epithets of Zeus Κεραυνός and Φηγωναῖος; for the latter,

[31] V. V. Ivanov, "K ètimologii baltijskogo i slavjanskogo nazvanij boga groma", *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija* 8 (Moscow, 1958).

[32] Cf. V. Ivanov, *op. cit.*; C. Bartholomae, "Der indogermanische Name der Plejaden", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 31 (1912/13), 35–48; A. Walde and J. Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* 2 (Berlin-Leipzig, 1927), p. 42f.

[33] Cf. G. Bühler, "Zur Mythologie des Rig-Veda, I. Parjanya", *Orient und Occident* 1 (1862), 214–229; L. von Schroeder, "Der siebente Âditya", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 31 (1912/13); G. Kleinschmidt, "Perkūnas und Parjanya", *Zeitschrift der Altertumsgesellschaft Insterburg* 2 (1888), 163–185; A. Ludwig, *Die Mantralitteratur und das alte Indien = Der Rigveda oder die heiligen Hymnen der Brāhmana* 3 (Prague, 1878), 322f.; A. Kaegi, *Der Rigveda* (Leipzig, 2nd ed., 1881), p. 57 and fn. 139; J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* 1: *Lautlehre* (Göttingen, 1896), §52a (p. 57); A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* (Strassburg, 1897), pp. 84f., 127 (with references to J. Schmidt and Leskien); H. Hirt, "Die Urheimat der Indogermanen", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892), p. 480f.

[34] J. Vendryes, "Sur un nom ancien de l'arbre", *Revue celtique* 44 (1927), p. 313ff.