

Translating the Form: *sk-* and *b-r* as Historical Root Complexes of Form-Production, State, and Community

Dmitry Pasechnyuk-Vilensky

1 April 2026

Introduction

This essay compares two historical lexical formations that rise from low material action into higher vocabularies of creation, condition, and relation. The Indo-European field gathered here under *sk-* begins among acts of scraping, shaving, digging, splitting, hollowing, clipping, and shaping. The Semitic field gathered here under *b-r* begins among acts of paring, delimiting, clearing, making sound, and binding. In both cases the real question is not the existence of a single root in the strictest reconstructive sense, but the historical coherence of a lexical complex: a field broad enough to survive branch division, yet tight enough to rise toward the same upper semantic zones. The lower Indo-European dossier can be tracked across the root groups **(s)kep-*, **(s)kop-*, and **(s)kab-* [1]. The Semitic dossier is best read against branch distribution rather than a single lexical slot [9].

The comparison becomes strongest when one asks how each complex climbs. In the *sk-* material, the lower world is a world of worked matter. Wood is scraped, a surface is shaved, an object is split or hollowed out. In the *b-r* material, the lower world is one of finishing and valid condition. Something is pared, cleared, made sound, released from defect, set into force. From there both fields rise: the one toward shaping, creating, constitution, and structured state, as seen especially in *gesceap* [je'fæ:ap] [4]; the other toward creation, soundness, acquittal, covenant, and alliance, as seen in *𐤁𐤓𐤁* [ba:'ra:ʔ] [10], *𐤁𐤓𐤁* [ba:'ra:ʔa] [11], and the Aramaic-Syriac *bry* cluster [13].

The pages that follow reconstruct the two complexes on their own terms, trace the textual and institutional regimes in which they thicken, and then ask where their upper results can in fact be translated into one another. The comparison is therefore philological in the strict sense: rooted in branch distribution, textual use, semantic stratification, chronological thickening, and the exact points at which different lexical histories begin to touch.

The *sk-* Complex

The lowest layer of the *sk-* field is the world of worked matter. Gothic *SKΛBΛN* ['skaβan], “to scrape”, [3] Old Norse *skafa* ['ska.va], “to shave, scrape, or plane”, [5] Old English *sceafan* ['fæa.van], “to shave, scrape, plane away”, [4] and Old High German *scaban* ['ska.ban], “to scrape”, [2] all inhabit the same tactile scene. Roughness is taken off. A surface is worked toward use. An object acquires contour because something has

been removed from it.

Greek and Latin preserve the same lower pressure. Greek σκάπτω ['skap.tɔ:], “to dig” or “cut into the ground”, [1] and σκέπαρον ['ske.par.non], “axe, adze”, [1] keep visible the incising and instrumental side of the field. Latin *scabō* ['ska.bo:], “to scratch, roughen, abrade”, [1] preserves its abrasive face. Germanic, then, is not a local accident; it is simply the branch in which the whole vertical span is most transparent.

Baltic and Slavic make the lower material dossier both broader and harder. Lithuanian *skobti* ['skɔbtʲi], “to scrape, hollow out”, [7] *skabyti* [skɐ'bʲi:tʲi], “to pluck, pick, tear away”, [7] *skopti* ['skɔptʲi], “to cut out”, [7] and *skapóti* [skɐ'po:tʲi], “to chop, snip repeatedly”, [7] show that the field is not one single action but a family of subtractive procedures. The Slavic evidence is equally broad. Russian скоблить [skɔb'litʲ], “to scrape”, [8] Russian скобель ['skɔbʲɪʲ], “scraper, drawknife”, [8] Russian скрести [skrɪ'stʲi], “to scrape, scratch”, [8] Polish *skrobać* ['skrɔbatɕ], “to scrape”, [6] Serbo-Croatian *škrabati* [ʃkra'bati], “to scratch”, [6] Russian щепить [ɕɪ'pʲitʲ], “to split, cleave”, [6] Polish *szczepić* [ʃɕɛpʲitɕ] [6], Czech *štěpit* [ʃɕɛpɪt] [6], and Russian скопец [skɔpʲets], “castrate, eunuch”, [8] all preserve a world in which contour or separation emerges by scraping, shaving, clipping, splitting, or cutting off. The complex is therefore not merely “about shape”. It is about the production of form through the working away of resistance.

The Celtic edge is consistent with the same lower band. Old Irish *scerdaid* ['sʲkʲɛrðaðʲ], “peels, scrapes off”, Middle Irish *scripaid* ['sʲkʲɪrʲɪbədʲ], “scratches”, and the **skolta* ['skolta] material behind Middle Irish *scóilt* [sʲkoiltʲ], “splitting”, widen the subtractive dossier further [18]. Celtic does not preserve the same upper architecture with equal transparency, but it thickens the lower and medial spread of the field.

The Germanic branch matters because it carries that same material field upward with unusual semantic clarity. Old English *scieppan* ['ʃiep.pan] and *scyppan* ['ʃyp.pan], “to shape, appoint, create”, [4] together with Gothic ΓΑΣΚΛΠΓΑΝ [gas'kapjan], “to create, form”, [2] show the transition from worked matter to made object, and from making to creating. Bosworth–Toller’s examples make the ascent concrete rather than schematic: *Ælmihtig fæder þe ða scíran gesceaft sceópe and worhtest* and *God gesceóp ealle gesceafta* both place the creation verb directly in theological use [4]. In Cædmon’s Hymn, *heofon to hrofe, halig Scyppend* names the Creator in a poem whose very force depends on the continuity between shaper and maker [17].

The noun *gesceap* [je'ʃæ:ap] completes the ascent. Bosworth–Toller gives not only “shape” and “form”, but also “creation”, “nature”, “condition”, “constitution”, and “fate”. [4] In that upper zone, form has ceased to be a surface alone. It has become what a being is, how it is disposed, and what kind of state belongs to it. The lower material gesture has not disappeared; it has been transformed into a language of constitution.

At the highest level, the same field becomes overtly morphological. Proto-Germanic *-*skapiz* ['ska.piz] [2], Old Norse *-skapr* ['skapr] [5], English *-ship* [ʃɪp], German *-schaft* [ʃaft], Swedish *-skap* [ska:p], Norwegian *-skap* [ska:p], and Danish *-skab* [skæ:b] continue the upper formative force of the field as state-forming suffixes. The stems to which they attach are irrelevant here. What matters is the suffixal operation itself. Across the Germanic languages this morphology yields constituted condition, office, rank, relation, and mode of being. This is the upper consequence of the *sk-* complex: relation itself is cast as constituted state.

The *b-r* Complex

The *b-r* field begins from another kind of material act. Its lower logic lies in paring, delimiting, clearing, finishing, and bringing something into proper condition. Hebrew בָּרָא [ba:'ra:], “to create”, stands at the

classical creation pole of the field [10]. In Priestly usage that verb becomes highly concentrated and theologically marked [14]. Arabic بَرَى [ba'ra:], by contrast, means “to pare”, “to sharpen”, “to fashion by cutting away”. [11] The two words do not need to be identical in order to matter for one another. What unites them is a shared formative logic: a thing is brought properly into being by a finishing act that separates, trims, or defines it.

Arabic preserves that lower act with exceptional clarity. بُرَايَةٌ [bu'ra:ja], “shavings” or “parings”, names what falls away in the act of shaping [11]. The Cairo Academy’s modern lexical dossier on the same family keeps the whole neighborhood visible: بَرَاءَةُ الْاِخْتِرَاعِ، الْبَرَاءَةُ، الْبَارِيُّ، أَبْرَأُ، بَرَأْتُ، بَرَأْتُ، بَرَأْتُ، بَرَأْتُ [ba'raʔa, ba'riʔa, ba'ruʔa, ʔab'raʔa, al'ba:riʔu, alba'ra:ʔatu, ba'ra:ʔat alix't'ira:ʕ] are grouped together [27]; الْبُرَاءَةُ [albu'ra:ʔ] is defined there as مَا تَسَاقَطَ مِنْ كُلِّ مَا بُرِيَ أَوْ نُحِتَ [ma: tasa:qat'a min kull ma: buriya ʔaw nuhita], what falls away from anything pared or carved [27]. The lower material logic of the *b-r* complex is therefore not conjectural. It is lexically explicit.

The next layer of the field turns that logic toward soundness and intact condition. Hebrew בְּרִיאָה [ba'ri:ʔ], “healthy, sound”, [10] and בְּרִיאָהּ [bæʔi'ʔu:t], “health”, [10] move the cluster toward bodily and social integrity. Modern Hebrew retains the field not only in technical health vocabulary but even in ordinary benediction: the Academy’s page on לְבִרְיָהּ [livæi'ʔu:t] explains the modern expression and notes that it is an established blessing said to a person who sneezes [26]. Arabic بَرِيءٌ [ba'ri:ʔ], “free, clear, innocent”, [11] and بَرَاءَةٌ [ba'ra:ʔa], “freedom from guilt, liability, or claim”, [11] carry the same field into juridical and moral clearance. In the Cairo Academy’s entry, الْبَرَاءَةُ [alba'ra:ʔa] explicitly extends into modern legal-administrative use through phrases such as بَرَاءَةُ الْاِخْتِرَاعِ [ba'ra:ʔat alix't'ira:ʕ] [27]. The movement is exact: finishing and delimiting become soundness, acquittal, and valid standing.

Aramaic and Syriac make the internal architecture of the field much richer than a simple Hebrew-Arabic contrast. The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon records within the *bry* cluster not only *bārē*, *bāryā* “creator”, but also *biryāṯā* / *brūtā* “creation, creature”, *brūrū*, *brūrūtā* “cleanness, purity”, *bāryū*, *bāryūtā* “strength”, and *bryt* “covenant”. [13] This matters because the article no longer needs to say vaguely that creation, purity, soundness, and covenant “belong together”. In the Aramaic-Syriac material they are present inside one branch-distributed lexical neighborhood. Syriac strengthens the case further. Payne Smith records ܒܪܝܝܐ [bar'ja:], “creator”, [12] and Syriac Genesis opens with ܒܪܝܝܐ ܕܥܠܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܝܢܐ [bære:'ji:t bra: ʔa'la:ha: ja:t [maj'ja: wəja:t ʔar'ʕa:], “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth”. [24]

The highest institutional register of the field appears in Hebrew בְּרִית [bæ'ri:t], “covenant”. [15] Here the field culminates not in a shape produced by labor, but in a bond placed in force, recognized, and maintained. Genesis 17:10–11 articulates that force in ritual form: זֹאת בְּרִיתִי אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמְרוּ ... וְהָיָה לְאוֹת בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם [zo:ʔt bæʔi'ti: ʔa'ʃer tiʃmə'xu: ... wəha'ja: lə'ʔot bæ'ri:t be:'ni: uve:ne'χem], “This is My covenant ... and it shall be the sign of the covenant between Me and you”. [22] Modern Hebrew keeps the same institutional line active. The Hebrew Academy’s diplomacy resource records בְּרִית [bæ'ri:t] as both *covenant* and *alliance* [26]; it records בְּרִית בְּעַל [bəʕal bæ'xi:t] as *ally* [26].

At the wider Northwest Semitic edge, the picture is suggestive but must remain disciplined. The SAHD on בְּרִית [bæ'ri:t] notes possible *bryt* material in Ugaritic and, more importantly, points to wider Semitic associations between the cluster and purity, honesty, and freedom from obligation [25]. That evidence is best treated as peripheral thickening rather than as the center of the argument. Its value lies in widening the horizon of the field without forcing the article to pretend that every Semitic branch preserves the cluster equally.

The trajectory of the *b-r* complex can therefore be stated with confidence. It begins in paring, delimiting,

and finishing; it rises into creation; it moves into soundness, purity, strength, acquittal, and valid standing; and it culminates in covenant and alliance. If the *sk*- field produces form as fabrication, the *b-r* field produces form as integrity.

Institution, Rite, and Poetic Elevation

The difference between the two complexes becomes much sharper when one asks not only what their words mean, but in what textual regimes they thicken. In the *sk*- field, the decisive thickening is poetic and morphological. In Cædmon's Hymn the creator appears as *halig Scyppend* [17], and the poem's force depends on the fact that the creator is lexically still the shaper. The same is true in the Bosworth-Toller examples under *scyppan* ['jyp.pan], where the verb ranges from making to divine creation [4]. The later nominal layer — **-skapiz* ['ska.piz], *-skapr* ['skapr], *-ship* [ʃip], *-schaft* [ʃaft], *-skap* [ska:p], *-skab* [skæ:b] — then fixes the same force morphologically as constituted state. Proto-Germanic **-skapiz* ['ska.piz] is the historical pivot here [2]. Old Norse *-skapr* ['skapr] shows the same upper layer within the medieval North [5].

In the *b-r* field, the decisive thickening is scriptural, juridical, and ritual. Genesis 1:1 places בָּרָא [ba:'ra:ʔ] at the head of creation discourse: בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים [bəʔe:ʔ'ʃi:t ba:'ʁa:ʔ ʔelo'hi:m], “In the beginning God created” [22]. Psalm 51:12 turns the same verb inward and poetic: לֵב טָהוֹר בָּרָא לִי אֱלֹהִים [le:v t'a:'ho:ʁ ba:'ʁa:ʔ li: ʔelo'hi:m], “Create for me a pure heart, O God” [22]. Qur'an 9:1 places بَرَاءَةٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ [ba'ra:ʔatun mina_ʔ'ʔa:hi wara'su:lihi:] in a legal-declarative frame [23]. Genesis 17 ritualizes בְּרִית [bə'ri:t] as a sign-bearing covenant in the body [22]. Syriac Genesis carries the creation line into another branch of the same tradition [24].

The result is more than lexical. One field rises most clearly through shaping, making, and the morphology of constituted state. The other rises most clearly through creation texts, legal declarations, covenantal rites, and branch-distributed scriptural usage. That is why the two fields continue to differ even where they reach comparable semantic heights.

Zones of Convergence and Translation

Placed beside one another, the two complexes remain distinct, but they meet at several decisive semantic heights. The clearest meeting-point is creation language. Old English *scyppan* ['jyp.pan] and especially the poetic title *Scyppend* ['jyp.pend] name the creator in a native shaping vocabulary [4]. Hebrew בּוֹרֵא [bo:'ʁe:ʔ] names the creator from the *b-r* side [10]. Syriac ܒܪܝܐ [bar'ja:] carries the same height into another branch of the Semitic scriptural tradition [12]. The lower histories differ sharply, but the upper result is close enough to sustain direct translation at the theological level.

A second meeting-point lies in subtractive shaping. Gothic SKΛΒΛN ['skaβan] names scraping [3]. Old Norse *skafa* ['ska.va] retains shaving and planing [5]. Polish *skrobać* ['skrɔbaʦ] keeps the same band in a living Slavic verb [6]. Lithuanian *skobti* ['skɔbtʲi] adds the hollowing and gouging side of the field [7]. Finnish *kaapia* ['ka:pia] shows the same tactile operation inside the northern contact layer [21]. Arabic بَرَى [ba'ra:] occupies the neighboring office on the Semitic side: it is the act by which an edge, reed, or object is brought into form by paring away what is excess [11].

A third meeting-point lies in condition. Old English *gesceap* [je'ʃæ:ap] can mean constitution, condition,

or nature [4]. Hebrew בְּרִיאָה [bə'ri:ʔa:t] names health [10]. Arabic بَرَاءة [ba'ra:ʔa] names cleared standing or freedom from liability [11]. Modern Hebrew לְבִרְיָה [liv'ri:ʔa:t] keeps the same upper zone alive in ordinary benediction [26]. Modern English *be in good shape* preserves the old crossing from contour into condition [28]. In both complexes, form has become a state that may be inhabited, repaired, improved, or recognized as valid.

The fourth meeting-point lies in relation and standing. The Germanic upper morphology of *-ship* [ʃɪp], *-schaft* [ʃaft], *-skap* [ska:p], and *-skab* [skæ:b] casts a base into constituted state, office, rank, or relation. Proto-Germanic **-skapiz* ['ska.piz] is the historical hinge of that operation [2]. Hebrew בְּרִית [bə'ri:t] reaches the neighboring height as covenant or alliance [26]. Hebrew בְּעַל בְּרִית [baʕal bə'vi:t] names the ally as the bearer of that bond [26]. Ottoman *berat* [be'rat] thickens the same upper domain on the juridical side, where standing is no longer merely lived but formally recognized [31].

These correspondences do not erase the difference between the two histories. The *sk-* side continues to imagine higher form as shaped or constituted state. The *b-r* side continues to imagine it as soundness, clearance, covenant, and valid force. The point of translation is not identity, but exact neighboring function at the upper semantic levels.

Historical, Areal, and Contact Profiles

The two complexes rise differently in time and in areal distribution. The *sk-* field is broadest in its lower zone and vertically most explicit in Germanic. Germanic alone preserves low tactile verbs, higher creation verbs, and upper state-forming morphology together in one visible chain. Proto-Germanic and its daughters show the vertical continuity most clearly [2]. Baltic and Slavic preserve the lower material field with remarkable width — scraping, scratching, splitting, clipping, hollowing, severing — but do not preserve the upper nominal layer with equal clarity [7]. Greek and Latin preserve harder relics of the incising and abrasive zone [1]. The historical picture is therefore asymmetrical by branch: the field survives most broadly below and rises most fully in Germanic.

That picture becomes sharper once chronology, territory, and contact are restored to the dossier. The lower *sk-* material belongs to an old Indo-European craft-language of scraping, cutting, and surface-working. What Germanic does with it is historically later and institutionally specific: it lifts a tactile shaping vocabulary into Christian creation-language and then fixes the resulting force morphologically. *Cædmon's Scyppend* belongs to a world in which vernacular poetic diction has already been recruited into Christian cosmology [17]. The Germanic ascent is therefore chronological, generic, and institutional at once: from worked matter into vernacular theology.

At the Celtic edge, Old Irish *scerdaid* ['s'k'j'ɛr'dað'] and Middle Irish *scripaid* ['s'k'j'ɪ'p'ɪ'bað'] keep the subtractive band active, while the **skolta* ['skolta] material behind Middle Irish *scoilt* [s'k'ɔilt'] widens the dossier toward splitting and fissure [18]. Celtic does not preserve the same upper architecture with equal transparency, but it thickens the lower and medial spread of the field.

North of the Baltic, the history of the *sk-* complex enters a contact zone. Kallio's survey of prehistoric Germanic loan strata in Finnic argues that Germanic and Finnic were both present in the Baltic Sea region during the Bronze Age [19]. One relevant case is the Finnic family represented by Finnish *kaapia* ['ka:pia], Estonian *kaapima* ['ka:pima], Karelian *koapie* ['koapie], Veps *kabita* ['kabita], and Livonian *kōpsõ* [kɔ:pfõ], which Finnish etymological resources compare with Germanic **skabaną* [21]. The point is not to move

the word-family out of Indo-European inheritance, but to register a historical transfer: the lower tactile and subtractive band of the *sk-* field proved portable across a real prehistoric contact regime. Aikio's work on Germanic-Saami contacts provides the wider northern frame by showing how deep and early Germanic lexical influence on Saami could be [20].

The *b-r* field distributes itself differently. Biblical Hebrew preserves the creation and covenant poles in unusually concentrated form. The creation verb is most sharply framed in priestly and biblical usage [14]. Covenant belongs to a larger treaty- and bond-language of the ancient Near East [15]. Arabic preserves with equal clarity the lower act of paring and the higher state of juridical clearance. بَرَى [ba'ra:] and بَرَاءة [ba'ra:ʔa] belong to that arc directly [11]. The Cairo Academy shows the same family still active in modern administrative usage [27]. Aramaic and Syriac are not decorative support but internal branches of the complex, because the CAL *bry* cluster holds creation, creaturehood, purity, strength, and covenant together [13]. At the Northwest Semitic edge, the possible Ugaritic witness remains peripheral and uncertain [25].

Chronology and institution sharpen that picture further. Hebrew בָּרָא [ba:'ra:ʔ] and בָּרִית [bə'ri:t] belong to a biblical and ancient Near Eastern world in which cosmogony, treaty, sign, oath, and covenant are already thick institutional categories [16]. Syriac carries the creation register into the late antique Christian scriptural sphere [24]. Arabic بَرَأَ [ba'ra:ʔa] thickens juridically in the Qur'an [23]. Later, in Imami theology, *barā'a* acquires a doctrinal life as dissociation from the enemies of the imams [30]. The history of the *b-r* complex therefore passes through scripture, law, rite, doctrinal identity, and alliance.

Beyond the Semitic family proper, the outer spread of the field is institutional rather than genealogical. Iranica's account of Arabic elements in Persian emphasizes that after the Muslim conquest Arabic became in Iran the language of religion and government administration, and that Arabic lexical influence in Persian became massive from the early Islamic centuries onward [29]. In that Persianate and later Ottoman documentary world, the *barā'a* / *barā'at* family enters the administrative language of privilege, appointment, and exemption. Ottoman *berat* [be'rat] functions as a patent, license, or concession document conferring recognized legal standing [31]. Here again the historical point lies in the regime of use. The field travels outward not as inherited cognacy but as legal and administrative force.

The two complexes therefore differ not only in semantic structure but in historical mode. The *sk-* field spreads broadly at the lower material level, rises most fully in Germanic, and shows prehistoric territorial transfer through the North Baltic contact zone. The *b-r* field concentrates early in scriptural and covenantal institutions, preserves an internal network across Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic, and later diffuses outward through the juridical and administrative languages of the Islamic and Ottoman worlds.

Conclusion

The comparison of *sk-* and *b-r* brings into view two durable lexical strategies for producing form. One works outward from abrasion, incision, splitting, hollowing, shaping, and making. The other works outward from paring, delimitation, soundness, clearance, and covenantal force. Both rise into creation, condition, and relation; they do so by different routes and with different upper textures.

That difference helps explain why languages do not imagine state and community in one uniform way. One lexical history gives relation contour. Another gives it validity. One makes form by fabrication. Another makes form by integrity. Those higher outcomes are historical products of specific semantic machines.

Appendix A. Expanded Inventory of the *sk-* Field

Zone / branch	Forms	Dominant semantic band
Germanic, lower	Gothic SKΛBΛN ['skaβan]; Old Norse <i>skafa</i> ['ska.va]; Old English <i>sceafan</i> ['fæa.van]; Old High German <i>scaban</i> ['ska.ban]	scrape, shave, remove a layer
Greek	σκάπτω ['skap.tɔ:]; σκέπαρονον ['ske.par.non]	cut into, dig, hew, axe/adze field
Latin	<i>scabō</i> ['ska.bo:]	scratch, roughen, abrade
Baltic	Lithuanian <i>skobti</i> ['skɔbtʲɪ], <i>skabyti</i> [skɐ'bʲi:tʲɪ], <i>skopti</i> ['skɔptʲɪ], <i>skapóti</i> [skɐ'po:tʲɪ]	scrape, tear away, clip, cut out
Slavic, * <i>skob-</i>	Russian скоблить [skɐ'blʲitʲ]; Russian скобель ['skobʲlʲ]	scrape, plane, drawknife field
Slavic, * <i>skreb-</i>	Russian скрести [skrʲi'sʲtʲɪ]; Polish <i>skrobać</i> ['skrɔbatɕ]; Serbo-Croatian <i>škrabati</i> [ʃkra'bati]	scratch, scrape, abrade
Slavic, * <i>ščep-</i>	Russian шепить [ɕɪ'pʲitʲ]; Polish <i>szczepić</i> [ʃtʂɛpʲitɕ]; Czech <i>štěpit</i> [ʃɛpit]	split, cleave, chip
Slavic, * <i>skop-</i>	Russian скопец [skɐ'pʲets]	severing, cutting off
Celtic edge	Old Irish <i>scerdaid</i> ['sʲkʲerðaðʲ]; Middle Irish <i>scripaid</i> ['sʲkʲrʲi:pʲaðʲ]; Middle Irish <i>scoil</i> [sʲkoilʲ] / Proto-Celtic * <i>skolta</i> ['skolta]	scrape off, scratch, split, fissure
Finnic, contact layer	Finnish <i>kaapia</i> ['ka:piɑ]; Estonian <i>kaapima</i> ['ka:pimɑ]; Karelian <i>koapie</i> ['koapie]; Veps <i>kabita</i> ['kabita]; Livonian <i>kõpšõ</i> [kɔ:pʃɕ]	scrape, hollow, work a surface by removal; early Germanic contact transfer
Germanic, upper verbs	Old English <i>scieppan</i> ['ʃiep.pan], <i>scyppan</i> ['ʃyp.pan]; Gothic ΓΛSKΛΠΓΛN [gas'kapjan]	shape, appoint, create
Germanic, upper nouns	Old English <i>gesceap</i> [je'fæ:ap]; Proto-Germanic * <i>-skapiz</i> ['ska.piz]; Old Norse <i>-skapr</i> ['skapr]; English <i>-ship</i> [ʃɪp]; German <i>-schaft</i> [ʃaft]; Swedish <i>-skap</i> [ska:p]; Norwegian <i>-skap</i> [ska:p]; Danish <i>-skab</i> [skæ:b]	constitution, condition, constituted state

Appendix B. Expanded Inventory of the *b-r* Field

Zone / branch	Forms	Dominant semantic band
Hebrew, creation	בָּרָא [ba:'ra:ʔ]; בּוֹרֵא [bo:'be:ʔ]	create; creator
Arabic, lower act	بَرَى [ba'ra:]; بَرَأَى [bu'ra:ja]; البراء [albu'ra:ʔ]	pare, sharpen, shape by removal; shavings
Hebrew, condition	בָּרִיא [ba'ri:ʔ]; בְּרִיאוּת [bɛʁi'ʔu:t]; לְבִרְיָא [livɛi'ʔu:t]	healthy, sound; health; blessing toward health
Arabic, juridical state	بَرِيء [ba'ri:ʔ]; بَرَاءة [ba'ra:ʔa]; براءة الاختراع [ba'ra:ʔat alix'tʃi:ra:ʔ]	innocent, free, exempt; clearance; patent certificate
Aramaic / Syriac cluster	<i>bārē</i> , <i>bāryā</i> ; <i>biryatā</i> / <i>brūtā</i> ; <i>brūrū</i> / <i>brūrūtā</i> ; <i>bāryū</i> / <i>bāryūtā</i> ; <i>bryt</i> ; Syriac ܒܪܝܐ [bar'ja:]	creator, creation, purity, strength, covenant
Hebrew, upper relation	בְּרִיָּה [bɛ'ri:t]; בְּעַל בְּרִיָּה [baʕal bɛ'vi:t]	covenant, alliance, ally

Zone / branch	Forms	Dominant semantic band
Persian / Ottoman diffusion	Persian administrative <i>barā'at</i> -type legal vocabulary; Ottoman <i>berat</i> [be'rat]	juridical authorization, privilege, concession, valid standing
Northwest Semitic edge	possible Ugaritic <i>bri</i> material	peripheral covenantal horizon

Appendix C. Textual Usage by Genre

Genre / zone	Example	Function
Old English poetry	<i>heofon to hrofe, halig Scyppend</i> in <i>Cædmon's Hymn</i> .	poetic elevation of the <i>sk</i> -field
Old English lexicographic example	<i>Ælmihtig fæder þe ða scíran gesceaft sceópe and worhtest.</i>	creation register formed out of the shaping field
Old English lexicographic example	<i>God gesceóp ealle gesceafta.</i>	explicit theological use of the same field
Hebrew Bible, cosmogony	בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים [bəʔe:?'fi:t ba:'ka:? ʔelo'hi:m], Genesis 1:1.	concentrated creation language
Hebrew Bible, lyric / prayer	לֵב טָהוֹר בָּרָא לִי אֱלֹהִים [le:v t'a:'ho:ʔ ba:'ka:? li: ʔelo'hi:m], Psalm 51:12.	creation applied to inward state
Hebrew Bible, ritual covenant	וַתְּהַיֵּאֱמַר אֱלֹהִים לְאֹת בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם ... זֹאת בְּרִיתִי [zō't bəʔrít ... wəhāyā lə'ô't bəʔrít bēnî ûvênêkəm], Genesis 17:10–11.	institutional and ritual thickening of <i>b-r</i>
Arabic lexicographic usage	بَرَى الْقَلَمَ [ba'ra: alqalam], “he sharpened the pen”.	shaping by cutting away
Qur'anic legal-declarative usage	بَرَاءَةٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ [ba'ra:ʔatun mina ʔ'ħa:hi wara'su:lihi:], Qur'an 9:1.	juridical and declarative clearance
Syriac scriptural prose	ܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ [bəre:'fi:t bra: ʔa'la:ha: ja:t fma:j'ja: wəja:t ʔar'ʕa:].	Syriac creation register
Aramaic / Syriac lexical cluster	creator, creation, purity, strength, covenant within the CAL <i>bry</i> cluster.	branch-distributed internal architecture of <i>b-r</i>
Imami theological usage	بَرَاءة [ba'ra:ʔa] as dissociation from the enemies of the imams.	doctrinal thickening of juridical separation into confessional identity
Ottoman administrative usage	<i>berat</i> [be'rat] as patent, license, or concession document.	documentary and legal extension of valid standing beyond Semitic inheritance

Appendix D. Modern Translational Matrix

Semantic office	<i>sk-</i> side	<i>b-r</i> side
Creator-title	Old English <i>Scyppend</i> ['ʃyp.pend]; Old English <i>scyppan</i> ['ʃyp.pan]	Hebrew בִּזְרָא [bo:'ze:ʔ]; Syriac ܒܪܝܐ [bar'ja:]
Shaping by removal	Gothic SKΛBΛN ['skaβan]; Old Norse <i>skafa</i> ['ska.va]; Polish <i>skrobać</i> ['skrɔ-batɕ]; Finnish <i>kaapia</i> ['ka:piɑ]	Arabic بَرَى [ba'ra:]
Worked remainder	Baltic-Slavic verbs of scraping, hollowing, clipping, and shaving	Arabic بُرَايَة [bu'ra:ja]; Arabic البُرَاء [albu'ra:ʔ]
Condition / sound state	Old English <i>gesceap</i> [je'ʃæ:ap]; English <i>be in good shape</i>	Hebrew בְּרִיאָה [bə'ri'ʔu:t]; Hebrew לְבִרְיָה [liv'ri'ʔu:t]; Arabic بَرَاءَة [ba'ra:ʔa]
Constituted relation	Germanic state-forming morphology: <i>-ship</i> [ʃɪp], <i>-schaft</i> [ʃaft], <i>-skap</i> [ska:p], <i>-skab</i> [skæ:b]	Hebrew בְּרִיָּה [bə'ri:t]; Hebrew בְּרִיָּה [baʕal bə'ri:t]
Recognized standing	Upper Germanic morphology as formalized condition or rank	Arabic بَرَاءَة [ba'ra:ʔa]; Ottoman <i>berat</i> [be'rat]

References

- [1] Pokorny, Julius. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern: Francke, 1959.
- [2] Kroonen, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2013.
- [3] Orel, Vladimir E. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003.
- [4] Bosworth, Joseph, and T. Northcote Toller. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- [5] Cleasby, Richard, and Gudbrand Vigfusson. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- [6] Derksen, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008.
- [7] Derksen, Rick. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.
- [8] Vasmer, Max. *Etimologičeskii slovar' russkogo iazyka*. 4 vols. Moscow: Progress, 1964–1973.
- [9] Huehnergard, John, Aaron D. Rubin, and Na'ama Pat-El, eds. *The Semitic Languages*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.
- [10] Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
- [11] Lane, Edward William. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. 8 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1863–1893.
- [12] Payne Smith, Jessie. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903.
- [13] *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon*. Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion. Online database.

- [14] Garr, W. Randall. "God's Creation: Hebrew *bārā'* in the Priestly Source". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125, no. 4 (2006): 669–688.
- [15] Weinfeld, Moshe. "*bərît*". In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975–.
- [16] Taggar-Cohen, Ada. "The Hebrew Biblical *Bərît* in Light of Ancient Near Eastern Covenants and Treaties". *Canon & Culture* 14, no. 2 (2020): 1–46.
- [17] Marsden, Richard, ed. *The Cambridge Old English Reader*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [18] Matasović, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009.
- [19] Kallio, Petri. "The Prehistoric Germanic Loanword Strata in Finnic". In *A Linguistic Map of Prehistoric Northern Europe*, edited by Riho Grünthal and Petri Kallio, 225–238. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seura, 2012.
- [20] Aikio, Ante. "On Germanic-Saami Contacts and Saami Prehistory". *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Aikakauskirja* 91 (2006): 9–55.
- [21] *Suomen etymologinen sanakirja*. Kotimaisten kielten keskus. Online etymological dictionary.
- [22] *Sefaria Library*. Online biblical text resource.
- [23] Qur'an 9:1, Arabic text and transliteration. Online text resource.
- [24] Syriac Genesis text, digital Syriac text resource.
- [25] *Semantics of Ancient Hebrew Database*. Online database.
- [26] Academy of the Hebrew Language. Online terminology and usage resources.
- [27] Academy of the Arabic Language in Cairo. Online dictionary resource.
- [28] Cambridge Dictionary. Online dictionary.
- [29] Sadeghi, Ali Ashraf. "ARABIC LANGUAGE i. Arabic Elements in Persian". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. II, Fasc. 3 (1986): 229–243; updated 2013.
- [30] Kohlberg, Etan. "BARĀ'A". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Online article.
- [31] Artunç, Cihan. "The Price of Legal Institutions: The Beratlı Merchants in the Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Empire". *The Journal of Economic History* 75, no. 3 (2015): 720–748.