Four Latin Etymologies:
volgus, laedo, paedor, merx

Ranko Matasović
Razred za filološke znanosti HAZU

New etymologies of four Latin words are proposed: 1. Lat.[1] *volgus* 'common people, crowd' is derived from PIE $*wog^{wh}lo$- by metathesis (from the same proto-form as Gr. *ókhlos* 'crowd, multitude', from the root $*weg^{wh}$- 'to drive'). 2. Lat. *laedo* 'slay' is derived from PIE $*slad$- 'slay, strike' (OIr. *slaidid*) with *-ae-* by analogy with *caedo* 'cut, hew'. 3. Lat. *paedor* 'filth' is derived from PIE $*h_2pe$-h_2eyd-$ōs$, with the prefix $*h_2pe$- 'away, from' and the root $*h_2eyd$- 'swell' (Arm. *aytnum*, OCS *jadъ* 'poison'). 4. Lat. *merx* 'merchandise' is derived from PIE $*merg'$- 'divide' (Hitt. *mārk-^{i}* 'divide, separate'), from which we also have Lat. *margō, marginis* 'border, limit'.

Keywords: Latin etymology, Proto-Indo-European, volgus, laedo, paedor, merx

1. *volgus*

Lat. *volgus* 'common people, crowd' (later *vulgus*) is attested since Terence. Its derivatives include *volgō* 'publicly, commonly' (since Plautus), *vulgāre* 'to make available to all' (since Plautus), *vulgāris, vulgārius* 'ordinary' (since Afranius), *dīvulgāre* 'to make public' (since Lucretius), etc. The noun *volgus* is usually neuter, which is unexpected for an o-stem with the Nom. sg. in *-us*, but this can be explained by assuming that an original neuter $*welgos$ / $*welgesos$ was conflated with a masculine thematic stem in $*$-o- $*wolgos$ / $*wolgī$ (Weiss 2010: 226, cf. also Leumann 1977: 450), the trace of which is preserved in the Acc. sg. *vulgum* (Acc. *Trag.* 288).

The noun *volgus* is without a plausible etymology. De Vaan does not propose any etymology for this noun (DV 686), while Ernout and Meillet (EM 749) say "*sans correspondant connu*". Walde and Hofmann (WH II: 826f.) connect *volgus*

---

with Skt. *várga-* m. 'division, group', which is implausible semantically, and rejected by both EM and Mayrhofer (EWA II: 516f.); the original meaning of *várga-* is 'one who excludes or removes', and it is obviously a derivative of the root *varj-* 'to divert, withhold, bend' < PIE *h_2werg-* 'turn' (Lat. *vergō* 'to slope down, sink', Hitt. *hurki-* 'wheel', OE *wrencan* 'turn'). A new etymology for *volgus* would therefore certainly be welcome.

We suggest that Lat. *volgus* is not only the semantic equivalent of Gr. *ókhlos* 'crowd, multitude, throng', but also that it is derivable from the same PIE proto-form, *$wog^{'h}lo$-* (from the root *$weg^{'h}$-* 'drive', reflected in Lat. *vehō* 'drive', Skt. *váhati,* Lith. *vežù,* OCS *vezṛ,* IEW 1118-20).[2] In both Latin and Greek (Beekes 1137f.) we have to assume the semantic development from 'a driving, a drive' to 'stirred mass, mob'. The same proto-form *$wog^{'h}lo$-* is reflected in ON *vagl* 'tiebeam, roost' (from the original meaning 'carrier').

The apparent problem with this etymology for *volgus* is that it presupposes a metathesis in Latin, i.e. the development from *$wog^{'h}lo$-* to *$wolg^{'h}o$-* and hence regularly to *volgus*. This assumption might appear *ad hoc*, but in the rest of this paper we will attempt to show that the development is perfectly regular, i.e. that the sequence *$-g^{('g)h}l$-* was regularly metathesized to *$-lg^h$-* in Latin, and then reflected as Lat. *-lg-*.

Our proposal is confirmed by the etymology of Lat. *algeō* 'to be cold, freeze' (attested since Plautus); LIV hesitatingly reconstructs the PIE root ?*$h_2elg^{('g)h}$-* only on the basis of *algeō* and Modern Icelandic *elgur* 'frozen snow', and this is justly doubted by de Vaan (DV 33). The Icelandic word does not have any cognates in Germanic and is unattested in the ON corpus, so it does not provide a solid base for comparison with Lat. *algeō* and for the reconstruction of a PIE root. However, *algeō* may have been formed from the noun *algor* 'cold' by analogy with the pairs *frigor* 'cold' vs. *frigeō* 'freeze, be cold', and perhaps *rigor* 'stiffness' vs. *rigeō* 'to be stiff'. The root *alg-* was abstracted from the u-stem *algus* 'cold' and the adjective *algidus* 'cold',[3] which are, in turn, derivable from an unattested thematic adjective *$algus$,[4] from earlier *$ag-lo$-* (with an adjectival "Caland-suffix" *-lo-*) by metathesis. If that is the case, we can derive these Latin words from the PIE root *h_2eg^h-* (Goth. *ōg* 'fear', OE *ege,* OIr. *ágor*, Gr. *ákhnymai* 'lament', *ákhos* 'sadness, pain', probably also Skt. *aghá-* 'evil, bad, dangerous', IEW 7-8) with the suffix *-lo-*,

---

[2] Note that in Homer, *ókhlos* does not have the word initial *w-* (digamma), but digamma is also lacking in other derivatives from the root *$weg^{'h}$-*, e.g in *ókhea* 'chariot' (Chantraine 1942: 125).

[3] Garnier (2016: 348) believes algor and algus are derived from the verb algeō, but does not give any etymology.

[4] Thematic nouns and adjectives in *-o-* are often coupled with neuter s-stems – indeed, *vulgus* was an example of this connection. However, in the case of *vulgus*, the two were conflated, as we saw above, but in the case of *algor* only the neuter s-stem survived (the o-stem *algus*, *algī* may have been ousted by the synonymous u-stem *algus*, *algūs*).

which is also reflected in Goth. *agls* 'disgraceful' (via 'painful'), *aglus* 'difficult, toilsome', OE *egle* 'difficult' (EDPG 4-5), Skt. *aghrā-* 'evil, distress', W *aeled* 'pain, grief' and MIr. *álad* 'wound' (< *$h_2egʰlo-tu-$*, EDPC 27). Words for physical states (such as 'hot' and 'cold') are often related etymologically to words expressing emotions, so the meaning 'cold' for Proto-Lat. **algos* could have developed from 'stirring' or 'painful'. For a similar semantic connection cf. OCS *studenъ* 'cold' and *styděti sę* 'be ashamed', from the root **stewd-* (IEW 1035), or between the various meanings of Gr. *stýks* (Gen. sg. *stygós*) 'well of fatal coldness, hatred, abhorrence' (pl.) 'piercing chill', cf. also *stygéō* 'hate, detest', *stýgios* 'detestable' (Beekes 1416). Likewise, OCS *straxъ* 'fear' (< **strog-so-*) can be related to Lith. *stregti, stregiu* 'stiffen, freeze' (Vasmer III: 23), while Croat. *mŕzjeti* 'feel disgust', OCS *mrъzěti* 'be loathsome' and Sln. *mŕziti* 'hate, detest, be angry with' are derived from the same Proto-Slavic root as OCS *pomrъznǫti* 'freeze' and Russ. *mérznut'* 'freeze' and *moróz* 'frost' < PIE **morg'o-* 'frost' (Alb. *mardhë* 'frost', Derksen 326, 342). Thus, Lat. *algor* 'cold' can easily be derivable from a PIE root with the original meaning 'stirring', 'dangerous', or 'painful'. Alternatively, the original meaning 'cold' may have been preserved in Latin, while the other languages innovated and changed the meanings of the reflexes of PIE **$h_2egʰ$-* metaphorically.

Another possible (but, admittedly, less compelling) instance of the metathesis of **-$gʰl$-* to **-$lgʰ$- > -lg-* in Latin is *alga* 'sea-weed' (attested since Turpilius). As de Vaan (DV 33) frankly admits, this word has no etymology. The connection with Norw. *ul* 'mouldy', dial. also 'disgusted', Dutch *uilig* 'mouldy (of wood)' is semantically and formally difficult. However, if we assume that the metathesis of **-$gʰl$-* to **-$lgʰ$- (> lg)* is regular in Latin, we can derive *alga* from the root **$h_2egʰ$-l-* 'dark, misty' (Gr. *akhlýs* 'mist, darkness', OPr. *aglo* 'rain', perhaps also Arm. *ałǰa-m-uľǰkᶜ* 'darkness', Beekes 184). The meaning 'sea-weed' may have developed in Latin via 'dark aquatic plant' vel. sim. However, due to the lack of exact semantic parallels,[5] this must remain a rather speculative etymology.

Word-initially, the reflex of PIE **$gʰl$-* in Latin is an unsettled matter. If the development from **$gʰlh_2dʰ$-ro-* to Lat. *glaber* 'smooth' (cf. OHG *glat* < **$gʰlh_2dʰ$-o-*, Lith. *glodùs* 'smooth' < **$gʰleh_2dʰu$-*, Russ. *gládkyj* < **$gʰleh_2dʰ$-uko-*) is straightforward (with shortening of **lā > la* perhaps by Dybo's law), then the regular reflex is *gl-*; however, it is also possible that *glaber* is the result of dissimilation of aspirates, i.e. that we have to start with Proto-Latin **gladʰro-* (Weiss 2010: 156, cf. also Weiss 2018). In that case, a better example for the word-initial reflex of PIE **$gʰl$-* may be found in Lat. *lārva* 'evil spirit, demon', which may be from PIE **$gʰlh_3$-swo-*, from

---

[5] The closest parallel we could find is Lith. *jūros dumbliai* 'sea-weed', lit. 'mud (dumbliai) of the sea (jūros)', cf. also Latv. *dumbla* 'mud, dirt'. Note that Gr. *phŷkos* 'sea-weed' is also a colour term originally – it is identical to *phŷkos* 'red make-up' (a Semitic loanword, cf. Hebr. *pūk* 'eye-rouge', Beekes 1594f.; Lat. *fūcus* 'red' has the same origin).

the root *$g^h elh_3$- 'green' (OCS *zelenъ*, Gr. *khlōrós* 'pale green, greenish yellow', cf. also Lat. *helvus* 'dun, yellow' < $g^h elh_3$-i-wo-. The semantic connection would be in the putrid, greenish colour of the dead bodies, as Larvae were identified with the evil spirits of the dead. In any case, whichever of the two rules for the development of word-initial *$g^h l$- in Latin is correct, it is not relevant for the metathesis rule we posited for the word-medial development of that cluster.

As far as we know, the metathesis rule we proposed in this paper does not have any counter-examples. De Vaan (DV 221) and Meiser (1998: 104) derive *figulus* 'potter' from *$d^h ig^h$-lo-, but -g- (instead of -h-) in that word has to be due to the analogy with the present *fingō* 'form, fashion' (< PIE *$d^h eyg^h$-/*$d^h ig^h$-, cf. Skr. *dehī̆*- 'embankment, dam', OCS *zidъ* 'wall', Gr. *teĩkhos* 'wall', IEW 244f.), as it is in *figūra* 'form, appearance' and *effigia* 'statue, portrait' (instead of **fihūra, *effihia*). Therefore, *figulus* should be derived from *$d^h ig^h$-elo-, with the same suffix as, e.g., in *bibulus* 'fond of drinking, drunkard' (from *bibō* 'drink'), or *famulus* 'servant' (from *famelos, cf. *familia* 'household' < *famelia).[6]

The metathesis of word-internal *-$g^h l$- to *-lg^h- (> -lg-) in Latin must have preceded the regular anaptyxis of -u- between *-g- (from PIE *g and *g') and *l, because of the examples such as Lat. *tēgula* 'tile' < *tēg-lā (from the root of *tegō* 'cover') and *iugulum* 'throat' < *yug-lo- (from the root of *iugum* 'yoke').[7] Otherwise, we would have expected the development *$wog^h lo$- > **wohulo- > **vohulus (rather than *volgus*).

To conclude: we have presented some evidence that the regular development of the cluster *-$g^h l$- in Latin was -lg- (by metathesis); this enables us to provide a formally regular and semantically plausible etymology for Lat. *volgus* (from PIE *$wog^h lo$-) and *algor* (from PIE *$h_2 eg^h lo$-). However, even if one does not accept that the metathesis rule is general, one can still accept that the metathesis occurred in PIE *$wog^h lo$- > *$wolg^h o$-, and that therefore our etymology of *volgus* is correct.

2. *laedo*

Latin verb *laedo* 'injure, damage' is attested since Plautus. Its derivatives include *ēlīdere* 'to crush', *illīdere* 'to injure by crushing, beat', etc. No plausible Indo-European etymology of this verb has been proposed so far. IEW (652) connected it to Latv. *lîdu, lîst* 'to clear (land)' and Lith. *lýdimas, lydìmas* 'clearance'. That is

---

[6] If *trāgula* 'spear, sledge' is derived from the same root as *trahō* 'pull', it can also have the suffix *-elo- rather than *-lo-. Note, however, that long -ā- is unexpected in that noun, as well as -g- rather than *-h-. Perhaps both the vowel length and -g- are due to the analogy with *tēgula* 'tile' (from *tegō* 'cover') and *rēgula* 'rule' (from *regō* 'rule'). Another possible source for the vowel length is the perfect, if the spelling TRÁXI (CIL X 2311.18) is to be trusted (Meiser 1998: 208).

[7] As an anonymous reviewer of this article reminds me, both *tēgula* and *iugulum* can be derived with the suffix *-elo- from *tēg-elā and *yug-elo- respectively, in which case the formal problem does not arise. The same is true if the derivatives *tēgula* and iugulum were formed after the metathesis of *-ghl- to *-lg-.

semantically unconvincing and formally impossible, since the Baltic forms can be plausibly derived from PIE *$leyd$- 'to let' (Lith. *léisti*; the acute intonation and long *-$\bar{\imath}$- in Baltic are the result of Winter's law). DV (323), EM (337) and WH (I: 749) all leave Lat. *laedo* without an etymology. Romain Garnier (p.c.) suggests that *laedo* might be a derivative from the PIE word for 'stone', which A. Nikolaev (2010: 237) reconstructs as *leh_2-, from which we also have Gr. *lāas* 'stone' (< *leh_2-es-) and, perhaps, Hitt. *lahhura-* 'table' (if its meaning developed from 'stone altar' or something similar).[8] The original meaning of *laedo* would have been 'to stone' (cf. Gr. *léuō* 'to stone', which may be from the same root, despite formal difficulties). We might, in principle, posit a PIE compound *leh_2i-d^hh_1o- (with the second root *d^heh_1- 'do, make', as in Lat. *facio*) to account for *laedo*, but the formal and semantic developments one would need to assume make this etymology unconvincing to me. The root *leh_2- appears to build verbal derivatives in *-w- (Skr. *lunā́ti* 'cuts') rather than *-i-, and the compound *leh_2i-d^hh_1o- could only have meant 'to make a stone' or 'to carve a stone' rather than 'to stone (someone)'. Hence, a new etymological proposal for *laedo* would be welcome.

We believe that Lat. *laedo* is etymologically cognate with OIr. *slaidid* 'hit, slay', OW *ledit*, MW *lladd* and OBret. *ladam* gl. *caedo* < PCelt. *$slad$-yo- (EDPC 345). Together with Lat. *laedo* these Celtic forms point to an Italo-Celtic, perhaps already PIE root *$slad$- 'strike, slay'. Of course, Latin -ae- cannot be the reflex of PIE *-a-, but the Latin vocalism may was probably analogically influenced by the similar-meaning verb *caedo* 'to cut, hew' < PIE *keh_2i-d- (Arm. *xait͑em* 'to stab', OHG *heia* 'wooden hammer', DV 79). Thus, we assume that an original pair of near-synonyms *$kayd\bar{o}$ / *$lad\bar{o}$ was analogically changed to *caedo* / *laedo*. The analogical change was probably facilitated by the need to avoid the homonymy of the participle *$lassus$ < *$slad$-tos 'wounded, injured' and the adjective *lassus* 'tired, weary' < *lh_1d-to- (related to Gr. *lēdeĩn* 'be tired' (Hesych.), Goth. *lats* 'slow', Alb. *lodhem* 'be tired', IEW 666).

The Italo-Celtic root *$slad$- 'to strike, slay' does not have any certain cognates in other IE languages. It appears possible to derive PGerm. *$slađan$ 'valley' (Norw. dial. *slad* 'valley', OE *slaēd* 'fat piece of grass, valley', HGE 448) from the same root, under the assumption that its original meaning was 'a hollowed out area, a hollow', but this is impossible to prove. Note also that there is at least one similar root with a similar meaning and reflexes in Celtic and Germanic: *$slak$- 'hit, slay' (Goth. *slahan*, OE *slēan*, MIr. *slachta* 'hit', *slacc* 'sword', EDPG 451). An onomatopoetic origin for both *$slad$- and *$slak$- cannot be excluded.

---

[8] The appurtenance of PCelt. *$l\bar{\imath}wank$- 'stone' (OIr. *lía*, Gen. sg. *líac*) is difficult, since it presupposes PCelt. *$\bar{\imath}$ < PIE *$eh1$ (EDPC 242). Positing a pre-form *$l\bar{e}h_2$- with the lengthened grade and invoking lex Eichner (the non-coloring of *$\bar{e}$ before *h_2), as Nikolaev does, appears ad hoc to me.

3. *paedor*

Latin *paedor, -ōris* m. 'filth, dirt, stench, nastiness' is attested since Accius. Its only derivative is *paedidus* 'dirty, nasty'. This word does not have an etymology. WH (II: 233) claim that *paedor* is "*ohne sichere Erklärung*" and reject the connection with ON *feitr* 'fat, thick', which is formally impossible. The lemma on *paedor* in DV (439) states simply "Etymology unknown". EM (474) also do not offer an etymology, but rather say that the word is rare and that it contains the diphthong *-ae-* typical of words signifying illnesses and deformities (such as *aeger* 'ill' and *caecus* 'blind'). All of this is not very helpful.

In his (1993) dissertation Michael Weiss showed that a number of Latin words can be derived from the PIE prefix $*h_2pe$-[9] and different verbal roots, e.g. Lat. *pēdis* 'louse' from PIE $*h_2pe$-$h_1\bar{e}d$-i (from the root $*h_1ed$- 'eat', cf. Lith. *úodas* 'louse' from the same root), Lat. *pālor* 'to wander, stray' from $*h_2pe$-h_2lh_2-, from the root of *ambulāre* 'walk' (cf. Gr. *aláomai* 'wander'); for more examples see Dunkel 2014, II: 74. We believe that *paedor* is also one of those words.

Formally, Lat. *paedor* can be derived from PIE $*h_2pe$-h_2eyd-$\bar{o}s$,[10] from the root $*h_2eyd$- 'to swell' (Arm. *aytnum* 'swell', Gr. *oidéō* 'swell', with secondary o-, cf. LIV s. v. $*h_2eyd$-, IEW 774). The same PIE root is reflected in OCS *jadъ* 'poison', OHG *eiz* 'pustule, purulent abscess', Icelandic *eitill* 'gland', OHG *eitar* 'poison'.[11] Possible cognates are also Icelandic *eiti* Lett. *idra* 'a putrid tree mark' and Russ. *jadró* 'kernel, core' (see Matasović 2018: 401ff. for other possible cognates). These parallels provide us with an explanation of the semantic development of Lat. *paedor* < $*h_2pe$-h_2eyd-$\bar{o}s$: its original meaning was probably 'pus, purulent fluid (secreted from a pustule)', whence the attested meaning 'filth, dirt'. Semantically, this scenario fits very well with the attested meanings of *paedor*, which seems often to refer to filth on the body,[12] in contrast to its near synonyms such as *spurcitia* and *pollutio*, which tend to denote other types of filth (e.g. dirt on clothes, filth as excrements etc.).

---

[9] PIE $*h_2pe$- is originally the same adposition turned into a prefix as PIE $*h_2po$- 'away, from' (Gr. *ápo*, OCS *po*, Lat. *po-* in *pōno* 'put' < $*po$-$sin\bar{o}$, etc.), with a different Ablaut grade. It is sometimes (incorrectly) reconstructed as $*pe$-.

[10] Latin final *-r* is, of course, the result of the generalization of the stem in the oblique cases where rhotacism was regular.

[11] Lith. *jedrà* 'measles' is probably unrelated, although it is often connected with these words (cf. also the variant *adra*, which shows that the root could not have been PIE $*h_2eyd$-).

[12] Cf. *Membra videres horrida paedore et pannis cooperta* "You saw limbs covered in horrible filth and rags", Lucr. VI, 1269); for more examples see OLD s. v. *paedor*.

4. *merx*

By almost general consensus (DV 376, WH II: 74, EM 400), Lat. *merx* f. (Gen. sg. *mercis*) 'commodity, goods, merchandise' has no PIE etymology. Its derivatives include *mercārī* 'to buy, trade', *mercātus* 'market', *mercātor* 'merchant', *commers* 'friendly intercourse', *commercium* 'trade, relationship, sexual intercourse', *mercēs, mercēdis* 'payment' and *mercēnārius* 'working for pay, hired worker'. All of these derivatives, just like the base root-noun itself, *merx,* are attested since Plautus. In other Italic languages we find cognates of these words, such as Oscan *amirikum* (Acc. sg.) 'commerce', Osc. *amiricatud* 'sold' (perhaps a Latin loanword). If *merx* and the name of the god *Mercurius* are derived from the same root, then the Faliscan theonym *Mercui* (Dat. sg.) and Oscan *Mirikui* (Dat. sg.) are also related. However, when it comes to extra-Italic correspondences of *merx*, we seem to be in the dark.

It is true that words relating to commerce are often borrowed from one language into another, cf., e.g., Lat. *caupo* 'shopkeeper, innkeeper' and Gr. *kápēlos* 'huckster, innkeeper' which are both loanwords from some unknown "Mediterranean" sources. Lat. *caupo* was itself borrowed into Germanic, and is the ultimate source of Germ. *kaufen* 'buy' (and PSl. **kupьcь* 'merchant' > OCS *kupьcь,* Russ. arch. *kupéc,* Croat. *kúpac,* Pol. *kupiec* were derived from **kupiti* 'buy', which was borrowed from Germanic **kaupōn*).

Michiel De Vaan (DV 376) mentions the possibility that the stem *merc-* was borrowed from Etruscan, just like the name of the god of trade, *Mercurius*, which is often derived from the name of an Etruscan gens (**Mercura,* WH II: 74). However, *merx* does not seem to be a loanword. Rather, it has the shape of an archaic root-noun of the type *nex, necis* 'violent death, murder' or *lēx, lēgis* 'law', both of which are easily derivable from PIE roots. The problem is, there is no PIE root **merk⁽ʷ⁾-* with a meaning from which *merx* could be derived. The root from which Lat. *marceo* 'to be withered, droop' is derived (cf. also Lith. *mir̃kti* 'to become weak', *mer̃kti* 'soak', DV 364) clearly has nothing to do with *merx.*

However, in a paper published a while ago (Matasović 2010) we argued that Latin, like some other IE languages, had a number of words with unexpected voiceless stop which had been due to devoicing before word-final **-s*. A nice example of this is Lat. *pāx, pācis* 'peace' which is derived from PIE **peh₂ǵ-* 'fix', where the regularly de-voiced **-k-* in the Nominative was extended to the whole paradigm (i.e. we have [pa:ks, pa:kis] rather than [pa:ks, pa:gis]. We now submit that the same process shaped the paradigm of *merx, mercis*, which can be derived from the root **merǵ-* 'divide' (Hitt. *mārk-ⁱ* 'divide, separate, distribute'), from which we also have *margō, marginis* 'border, limit' (cf. also OIr. *mruig* 'area' < **mrogi-*, Modern Persian *marz* 'region', Goth. *marka* 'area, border', IEW 738).

Thus **merg-s* 'was originally an abstract root noun meaning 'a division, a sharing', just as its formal parallels such as *pāx, lēx, nex,* etc. The semantic development was from 'what is divided, a share' to 'goods, merchandise'. In archaic societies, before money was invented, trading was in fact a form of sharing, or dividing the goods that involved parties brought with them for exchange. Indeed, one of the meanings of the Hittite verb *mārk-ⁱ* was 'distribute' (also 'cut up, butcher animals'), cf. Kloekhorst 558-9.[13]

A semantic parallel to the etymology of *merx* is found in Slavic. PSl. **tъrgъ* 'market' (OCS *trъgъ,* Russ. *torg,* Croat. *tȓg,* Cz. *trh,* Pol. *targ,* etc., cf. Vasmer III: 123) has possible correspondences only in Baltic, where we find Lith. *tur̃gus* 'market' and Latv. *tìrgus* 'id.' The connection of these Balto-Slavic words with the placename *Tergeste* 'Trieste' and *Opitergium* (in the Venetian area) is spurious, like most etymologies of place names, and Alb. *treg* 'market, commerce' can easily be an early Slavic loanword.

In ERHJ (II: s. v. *trg*) we proposed to derive PSl. **tъrgъ* from the root of **tъrgati* 'tear' (Russ. *rastorgát'* 'cancel, annul', Cz. *trhati* 'tear, pull', Pol. *targać* 'tear, pull', Croat. *tȑgati* 'tear', Čak. *tȓgat* 'pick', Slov. *tŕgati* 'tear, pull', Derksen 502). If the original meaning 'to tear' developed from 'cut into pieces' we can assume that the deverbal abstract noun built from this verb was **tъrgъ* 'piece, share' which could easily develop into 'merchandise' and (by metonymy) 'market', the attested meaning.

If this is correct, then the etymologies of PSl. **tъrgъ* and Lat. *merx* support each other, as they exhibit similar semantic developments.

References

Beekes = Beekes, Robert S. P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden: Brill.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1942. *Grammaire homérique, Tome I: Phonétique et morphologie,* Paris: Klinksieck.

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

DV = De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden: Brill.

---

[13] Kloekhorst (559) points out that Jaan Puhvel (HED 6: 74) also suggested an etymological connection between Lat. *merx* and Hitt. *mārk-*, but he derives both from a PIE root **merk-*, which is clearly less economical than our suggestion presented here; cf. also the parallel collocations of Hitt. *-kan mārkai* 'distribute (victuals of a slaughtered animal)' and Lat. *commercor* 'to trade, traffic together', *commercium* 'trade intercourse, commerce'.

Dunkel, George. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikel und Pronominalstämme.* Heidelberg: Winter.

EDPC = Matasović, Ranko. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden: Brill.

EDPG = Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden: Brill.

EM = Ernout, Alfred & Meillet, Antoine. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris.

ERHJ = Matasović, Ranko et al. 2016-2021. *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika, I-II*, Zagreb: IHJJ.

EWA = Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindoarischen,* Heidelberg.

Garnier, Romain. 2016. *La dérivation inverse en latin*, Innsbruck: IBS.

HED = Puhvel, Jaan. 2004. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 6: Words Beginning with M*, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

HGE = Orel, Vladimir. 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*, Leiden: Brill.

IEW = Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.

Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*, München: Beck.

LIV = Rix, Helmut et alii. 2003. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Matasović, Ranko. 2010. The etymology of Latin *focus* and the devoicing of root-final stops before *s in PIE", *Historische Sprachforschung* 123: 212-216.

Matasović, Ranko. 2014. *Slavic Nominal Word-Formation. Proto-Indo-European Origins and Historical Development*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Matasović, Ranko. 2018. "Proto-Slavic *ędro 'kernel, core' and *ĕdro 'bosom'", in: Košutar, Petra & Kovačić, Mislav (eds.). *Od dvojbe do razdvojbe. Zbornik radova u čast profesorici Branki Tafri.* Zagreb: Ibis.

Meiser, Gerhard. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache,* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

NIIL = Wodtko, Dagmar S. et al. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Nikolaev, Aleksandr S. 2010. "Dr.-gr. *lãas* i indoevropejskoe oboznačenie kamnja", in: A. S. Nikolaev, *Issledovanija po praindoevropejskoj imennoj morfologii*, Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 208-237.

OLD = Glare, P. W. (ed.). 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon.

Snoj = Snoj, Marko. 2003. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*, Ljubljana: Modrijan.

Vasmer = Vasmer, Max. 1959. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Weiss, Michael. 1993. *Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Cornell University.

Weiss, Michael. 2010. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

Weiss, Michael. 2018. "Limited Latin Grassmann's Law: do we need it?", in: Gunkel, Dieter et al. (es.) *Vina Diem Celebrent: Studies in Linguistics and Philology in Honor of Brent Vine,* Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 438-447.

WH = Walde, Alois & J. B. Hofmann. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Četiri latinske etimologije: *volgus, laedo, paedor, merx*

Sažetak

U radu se predlažu četiri nove etimologije latinskih riječi: 1. lat. *volgus* 'narod, puk' se izvodi iz ie. *$wog^{wh}lo$-* metatezom (isti je praoblik odražen u gr. *ókhlos* 'mnoštvo, rulja', iz korijena *weg^{wh}-* 'voziti'). 2. Lat. *laedo* 'ubiti' se izvodi iz ie. *$slad$-* 'ubiti, udariti' (stir. *slaidid*) s dvoglasom *-ae-* analogijom prema *caedo* 'sjeći'. 3. Lat. *paedor* 'prljavština' se izvodi iz ie. složenice *h_2pe-h_2eyd-$ōs$*, od prefiksa *h_2pe-* 'od, iz' i korijena *h_2eyd-* 'bujati' (arm. *aytnum*, stsl. *jadъ* 'otrov'). 4. Lat. *merx* 'roba, trgovina' se izvodi iz ie. *$merg$'-* 'dijeliti' (het. *mārk-*[i] 'dijeliti, odvajati'), iz istoga korijena koji je i u lat. *margō, marginis* 'granica'.

Ključne riječi: latinski jezik, indoeuropski, etimologija, volgus, paedor, merx, laedo