The role of the Lithuanian language in Indo-European linguistics contains a very real paradox. On the one hand, Lithuanian is often held in high regard as being the most archaic living Indo-European language, but, on the other hand, the average Indo-Europeanist had for a long time only limited access to its data. The first Lithuanian etymological dictionary, published by Harold Bender in 1921, was a mere list of cognates based on Brugmann’s *Grundriss* and other standard works, by no means a primary source providing detailed information about the history of the Lithuanian lexemes. Ernst Fraenkel’s *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1962–1965) was better informed and of superior philological quality, but was written in the last years of its author’s life, so that Fraenkel was not able to put the final touch on what still remains, nevertheless, his masterpiece. In addition, it dates from a period in which Indo-European linguistics was only at the beginning of a major revolution which resulted in the final acceptance of the laryngeal theory. In the last ten years, the situation has changed drastically, and the Lithuanian data have now become widely accessible to the scholarly world. This is not only due to all the editorial work that has been done in recent times both in Lithuania and abroad, with the result, for example, that a significant number of Old Lithuanian texts from the 16th to the 18th centuries has now been rescued from oblivion and made accessible to the majority of the Indo-Europeanists. This is also due to the publication of major standard works presenting the current state of research. Since 2007, three new etymological dictionaries have been published, Wojciech Smoczyński’s *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* (SEJL, Vilnius, 2007), Rick Derksen’s *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic Inherited lexicon* (EDBIL, Leiden, 2015) and, most recently, Wolfgang Hock and others’ *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (ALEW, Hamburg, 2015). Let us not deprive ourselves of this pleasure: this is a thriving period for Baltic linguistics, in marked contrast to what is going on elsewhere with the decline and even withdrawal of the humanities in Europe and in other parts of the world.
It would not make any sense to compare the three recently published etymological dictionaries: each of them has its own characteristics and personality. Whereas the SEJL is more personal and the EDBIL more Leiden-style (i.e. with a strong focus on accentology and historical phonology), the ALEW combines a philological approach and a solid Indo-European background. It is based on a research project that was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft between 2007 and 2013 at the Humboldt-University of Berlin, under the direction of Wolfgang Hock with the collaboration of Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė, Christiane Schiller, Rainer Fecht, Anna Helene Feulner, Eugen Hill and Dagmar S. Wodtko. The result is very impressive: with the ALEW we now have a valuable tool for the study of the Lithuanian lexicon for a time span running from the beginning of the Lithuanian written tradition to ca 1700. It thus covers a significant portion of the history of the Lithuanian language: the sources consulted (cf. the list given in ALEW 3, 1345–1386) include not only the major Old Lithuanian authors (Mažvydas, Bretkūnas, Daukša, Sirvydas, Klein, etc.), but also many minor or little-known sources (e.g. Lasicius’ De Diis Samagitarum from 1580, Hophner’s poem from 1634, some legal texts from the 16th and 17th centuries, etc.). For every Old Lithuanian word we have detailed information about its attestations in Old Lithuanian literature, including its equivalents in other languages in case of translated texts. This is incredibly precious for any etymological or philological study, and we learn a lot from a careful reading of the ALEW.

The lemmas are presented in a uniform way: the standard form, with its basic morphological information, comes first, printed in bold, followed by a list of attestations in Old Lithuanian literature, then there are the various derivatives that occur in the texts, likewise printed in bold, and finally, in a smaller font, comes the discussion on the etymological cognates found in Latvian, Old Prussian, Slavic and the other Indo-European languages; bibliographical references are added at the end of the notice. The merit of this presentation is that it puts in a clear light the structure of the notice and helps the reader navigate through the wealth of material provided for each word. As is well known, lemmatisation is never a blank operation: it conveys strategic choices of analysis and philological decisions that may be judged or evaluated in terms of morphological and/or semantic proximity. In order to show how difficult this choice turns out to be, we may observe, for example, that the verb klóti ‘to spread, to lay’ (ALEW 1, 508) is assigned a distinct lemma from klúonas ‘threshing floor, barn’ (ALEW 1, 510), whereas plóti ‘to flatten, to laminate’ is put together with its derivative plónas ‘threshing floor’ (ALEW 2, 801), probably on account of the presence of ablaut in the former case, vs. its absence in the latter. In a similar way, slogà ‘oppression,
burden’ (ALEW 2, 942) is separated from slėgti ‘to oppress’ (ALEW 2, 940), boginti ‘to drag, to take hurriedly’ (ALEW 1, 126) from bėgti ‘to run’ (ALEW 1, 103), sniégas ‘snow’ (ALEW 2, 951) from snigti ‘to snow’ (ALEW 2, 951), whereas, for example, ėsti ‘to eat’ and ėdis ‘feed’ are put together (ALEW 1, 269), cf. also tam-sà ‘darkness’ and tamsìus ‘dark’ (ALEW 2, 1070). It is striking that gėras ‘good’ (ALEW 1, 312) and gèris ‘goodness, kindness’ (ALEW 1, 315) are treated as two distinct lemmas. Ablaut is thus the criterion used to separate immediate from distant derivational relationships. The problem is when the heading word itself is characterised by paradigmatic ablaut: in this case, ablauting derivatives are sometimes put under the same lemma, e.g. iṁti, pret. ėmè ‘to take’ and ėmìmas ‘the act of taking’ (ALEW 1, 395), sometimes separated, e.g. lìkti, pres. liẽka ‘to leave’ (ALEW 1, 587–589) and liẽkas ‘remaining’ (ALEW 1, 578). In relation to this difficulty of lemmatisation, semantic factors may also play a role. Even if there is no ablaut discrepancy between them, laũkas ‘field’ and laũkas ‘with a white spot on the forehead’ are treated as two distinct lexical items (ALEW 1, 561 and 562); this is fully justified because of their diverging meanings.

Not surprisingly, the inherited vocabulary occupies a central position in the ALEW, but loanwords are well represented as well, and we know how much borrowed lexicon is developed in the Old Lithuanian texts mostly translated from Polish, German or Latin. In many cases, the source is correctly identified, but there are delicate cases in which it is difficult to be definitive. For example, lièčyti ‘to heal’ (ALEW 1, 578) is obviously a Slavism, but does it go back to Polish (lećzyć) or to the (East) Slavic chancellery language (лѣчить)? Both possibilities are put by Skardžius (1931, 120) on an equal footing. The ALEW repeats the same uncertainty, but points out that Old Lithuanian išlièčyti (Daukša, Postilla, 509₃₄) is certainly built on an East Slavic model (Old Russian излѣчити). One may note, however, that a Polish source is equally possible (wy-leczyć, loantranslated as iš-lièčyti). Moreover, in the case of Daukša, a spontaneous formation is even more likely (ifʒwaifteti arba ifʒlieczìti, 509₃₄) and the same holds true for the only other occurrence in Old Lithuanian (Morkūnas’ Postilla, 317). Another example where a clear decision is difficult to make is Old Lithuanian rinka ‘market’ (ALEW 2, 867): it is attested once in Morkūnas’ Postilla (109r₇) and traced back to Polish rynek possibly through East Slavic (Old Russ. рынокъ); the ultimate source is said to go back to Middle High German rinc. However, a direct borrowing from Middle Low German rinc cannot be completely ruled out (see Lexer, Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch, s.v. for the meaning).

As far as I can see, the coverage of the Old Lithuanian vocabulary is generally accurate, but by no means com-
plete. That there are omissions comes as no surprise; no reproach can be made to the authors for this, given the scale of the task. To begin with, it is well known that there are Old Lithuanian words that are attested in ancient documents from Prussia or the Grand Duchy of Lithuania written in other languages (German, Latin, Polish or East Slavic); they have been collected by K. Jablonskis (1941). Many of these words are known from Lithuanian sources as well (e.g. doi-lida ‘carpenter’ for *dailyda 1941, 22, nom ‘house’ for *namas 1941, 88, *upel’ ‘river’ from *upelis 1941, 183), but some of them are unique and should have found a place in the ALEW. This includes *chren ‘bride-price, purchase price for a bride’ (*krienas 1941, 13), *diaklo, dakla ‘tribute, contribution’ (*dēkla or duoklē 1941, 18), *krain ‘basket, dowry paid by the brides’ family’ (*kraitis 1941, 57, which, by the way, also appears in Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum I 61, II 222, the Lexicon Lithuanicum 19a, 62 and the Clavis Germanico–Lithuana I 392, III 73), *kudra ‘pond’ (*küdra 1941, 61), *ontrinik ‘auxiliary, servant’ (*a-trininkas 1941, 93), *pilekoln ‘mount’ (*piliakalnis 1941, 114), *pur ‘wheat’ (*pūras 1941, 131), *rynki-va ‘ levy, duty’ (*rinkliava 1941, 140). It would have been advisable to take these words into account, considering their cultural resonance and, sometimes, their Indo-European antiquity (e.g. *chren, *krienas ‘bride-price’ < PIE *kʰreijh₂, cf. Old Russian кρινίти, Gr. πριάσθαι, Sanskrit krīnāti ‘to buy’).

Other omissions can be detected even from more accessible sources. Examples¹: *atuoriečiai ‘spring rye’ (Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum III 85); *balgnas ‘saddle’ (Bretkūnas, Biblia Lev. 15₆); blezdinga ‘swallow’ (Bretkūnas, Biblia Num. 14₁₈); *kanklēs ‘stringed instrument’ (Knyga Nobažnystės 120, 10); *kaukolė ‘skull’ (Ewangelie polskie y litewske, 1674, 215₄); *keksė ‘bitch’ (Bretkūnas, Biblia Lev. 21₁₄, Postilla I 17₇₇, Daukša, Postilla 5₅₅₄); *klegėti ‘to cackle, to make noise’ (Zemczuga Theologischka 31, 26); *kлетis ‘granary’ (Petkevičius, Katechismas 4₆₁₉); *kuinas ‘old nag’ (Daukša, Postilla 1₆₁₆); *lébauti ‘to debauch’ (Bretkūnas, Postilla I 2₄₁₀); *liaukos ‘epidemy’ (Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum III 1₅₇); *luomas ‘estate’ (Daukša, Postilla 3₉₁₁); *luotas ‘boat’ (Daukša, Postilla 7₉₉₃, Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum III 8); *mandagus ‘quick, active’ (Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum I 2₈); *meleta ‘woodpecker’ (Sirvydas, Dictionarium trium linguarum III 5₅₁); *skepeta ‘kerchief’ (Bretkūnas, Postilla I 3₉₄₂₂, 2₃); *strēnos ‘loins, the small of the back’ (Vilentas, Euangelias bei Epistolas 1₂₉₈); *volioti(s) ‘to roll’ (Chyliński, Biblia Mrc. 9, 2₀). Many loanwords are omitted, even such that have enjoyed wide circulation in the language: *batas ‘shoe’ (Bretkūnas, Biblia Ec 1₇, 7 < Beloruss. бот or Old Pol. bot); *blynai ‘pancake’ (Bretkūnas, Biblia Lev. ₂₆, 8₂₆ < Beloruss. блины); *kalėdos ‘Christmas’ (Mažvydas

¹Selection based on Palionis 1967, 2₁₄f.
179, etc. < Beloruss. коляды); kami-
nas ‘chimney’ (Daukša, Postilla 85,36 < Beloruss. комин or Pol. komin); lelija
‘lily’ (Mažvydas 72 < Pol. lelija); pul-
kas ‘flock, regiment’ (Mažvydas 181,4, etc. < ORuss. пълкъ). Other, less widely
used loanwords that are omitted in the
ALEW are for example: sparas ‘quarrell’
(Morkūnas, Postilla 210 < Pol. spór);
trūna ‘coffin’ (Chyliński, Biblia Luc. 7,
14 < Belor. труна); ziegarius or ziegorius
‘laikrodis’ (Breitkūnas, Postilla I 233 <
Pol. zegar).

In the ALEW, semantics is usually
treated adequately. The translations pro-
vided at the beginning of each lemma
are accurate and can often be checked on
the original words of the other languages
from which the Lithuanian lexemes are
translated. In some cases, one could add
a couple of details. It is, for example,
striking that Lith. girìà ‘forest’ (ALEW 1,
332) displays in Biblical contexts a spe-
cific meaning ‘desert’ (corresponding to
German Wüste or Latin desertum). This
meaning is restricted to Old Lithuanian
Biblical literature, cf. the famous phrase
(In 1, 23): Eʃch eʃmi balfas čchaukìus girrai
(in the Wolfenbüettel Postilla 2020-21) corre-
sponding to German Ich bin eine Stimme
eines Predigers in der Wüsten (Luther),
Latin Ego vox clamantis in deserto (Vul-
gata) or Polish Jam jest głos wołającego
na puszczy (Biblia Brzeska). The source
of the polysemy of Lith. girìà could have
been identified more precisely by the
ALEW: it is obviously Polish puszcza,
which means both ‘forest’ and ‘desert’
(cf. Brückner 1927, 448). Another
example: from a semantic point of view,
it is interesting to note that the Lithu-
anian adjective patogiūs (ALEW 2, 742),
which means ‘convenient, comfortable’
in the modern language, could have a
slightly different meaning in Old Lithu-
anian ‘decent’ (cf. Mažvydas 38,12, cor-
responding to Lat. honestum); in some
modern dialects, this has led to a broader
meaning ‘handsome, beautiful’ (patogi
merga ‘beautiful girl’ in Dusetos). This
semantic discrepancy could eventually
cast some doubt upon the connection to
Greek τάσσω ‘to place in a certain order’,
still advocated in the ALEW, since the
Greek words are usually specialised in a
military (‘to draw up in order of battle’) or
in an administrative (‘to set the rate of
a tax’) meaning; the military specialisa-
tion is old, as proved by Tocharian A tāsśi
‘military leader’. Note, however, that
Lith. atogūs ‘courageous, bold, daring’
(Kurschat) seems to provide a stronger
basis for a comparison with the Greek
lexemes (the relationship to Lith. sutōgti
‘to befriend’ is, at any rate, unclear). As a
third example, let us mention the adject-
ive smagus, which is unfortunately not
recorded in the ALEW. In Old Lithuanian,
smagus displays a very specific meaning
‘flexible’ (cf. Sirvydas, Dictionarium
trium linguarum III 411: ſmagły / Flexilis,
flexibilis, ad caedendum aptus, ſmagus); in
the modern language, it means ‘pleasant,
cheerful, merry’. In Latvian and in the
Low Lithuanian dialects, smags means
‘heavy, difficult’, which is precisely the
opposite. The semantic evolution is difficult to account for depending on how to interpret the relationship of the adjective *smagús* to the verb *smôgti* ‘to strike, to hit’ (cf. SEJL, 579).

The secondary literature is generally referred to in a satisfactory way. Of course, here and there, one could add a few references. To take just one example, many Lithuanian words have been etymologised by Vincas Urbutis in a series of contributions that have been collected in his *Baltų etimologijos etiudai* (vol. 1, 1981, and vol. 2, 2009). They should have been mentioned in the ALEW in due place. For example, a reference to Urbutis’ etymological notices should appear in the ALEW for Lith. *atpetuoti* ‘to take vengeance’ (ALEW 1, 66; cf. Urbutis 2009, 21–33), *gurti* ‘to crumble’ (ALEW 1, 382; cf. Urbutis 2009, 166–185), *žugara* ‘heron’ (ALEW 2, 1327; cf. Urbutis 1981, 34) or *žvirgždas* ‘sand’ (ALEW 2, 1340; cf. Urbutis 2009, 67–92). One should also refer to two important contributions by Urbutis about rare words found in Sirvydas’ dictionary (1981, 110f.) and about Slavisms in Old Lithuanian (2009, 413f.). Other missing references are Sabaliauskas 1990, Smoczyński 2006, Rosinas 2009, and a few articles, e.g. on *anksti* ‘early’ see Petit 2005; on *galéti* ‘to be able’ see Rikov 1995; on *gulbis* ‘swan’ see Derksen 1999; on *mêsà* ‘meat’ see Derksen 1998; on *nařvas* ‘cage’ see Temčin 2000; on *viešnià* ‘female guest’ see Petit 2004, etc.

Indo-European etymology plays an important role in the ALEW. Globally speaking, the ALEW reflects the current state of Indo-European linguistics as it is represented in most German universities nowadays without being overly affected by specific doctrines that are striving to achieve a dominant market position (e.g. the ‘Leiden-school’, or Jasanoff’s theories). Unlike the Leiden school, the ALEW does not shy away from reconstructing a PIE vowel *a* if necessary, cf. *bʰarsdʰó-* for Lith. *barzdà* ‘beard’ (ALEW 1, 97) or *gʰalg-* for Lith. *žalgà* ‘perch, pole’ (ALEW 2, 1287); but most often it tries to avoid taking sides in this debate: no precise PIE etymon is given, for example, for Lith. *žąsìs* ‘goose’ (ALEW 2, 1292f.) and we do not learn whether *gʰans-* or *gʰh₂ens-* is to be posited. In a similar way, the ALEW does not adopt a clear position on the validity of Jasanoff’s *molō*-type: for Lith. *málti* ‘to grind’ the ALEW (1, 610f.) provides a list of cognates and refers to the state of the debate, but does not venture to propose a PIE reconstruction. This prudence is to be welcomed: the role of an etymological dictionary is to provide philological and comparative material, it is not the right place to elaborate (or to repeat) broad spectrum theories. Another issue that draws a demarcation line within the scholarly community is Winter’s law (acute lengthening before PIE voiced stops): the ALEW explains through this law the long vowel of Lith. *bëgti* ‘to run’ (ALEW 1, 103f.), *ḗsti* ‘to eat’ (ALEW 1,
270) or ádra ‘otter’ (ALEW 2, 1144), but honestly mentions the concurring opinion that traces them back to acrostatic or vrddhi formations. Even if Winter’s law is now gaining ground and most scholars (including myself) accept it as valid, I think that dissenting views are still part of the picture and should be mentioned with all the more respect since they are becoming increasingly outnumbered. As a rule, the ALEW has adopted a prudent position and gives a relatively ecumenical vision of Indo-European.

This approach has several advantages, but also some drawbacks. No clear position emerges from the ALEW about what the authors think of Balto-Slavic. It is true that Lith. dienà is rightfully compared to Slavic *dûnà ‘day’ (ALEW 1, 207) and that an attempt is made to lump them together as reflexes of paradigmatic ablaut in Balto-Slavic or even Indo-European (full grade *dej-n-, vs. zero grade *di-n-), but, in other cases, the Balto-Slavic stage is left in the background: for Lith. vanduô ‘water’ (ALEW 2, 1186), for example, the reconstruction of a Proto-Baltic ablaut based on Lith. vandûo, vs. Latv. ūdens and OPr. wundan is incomplete without the Slavic data (Old Church Slavic вода, etc.). Similarly, Lith. nòsis ‘nose’ (ALEW 2, 711) is compared to various cognates in other Indo-European languages (e.g. Lat. nārēs, nāsum), and the Slavic forms (Old Church Slavic носъ, etc.) are mentioned en passant, but it should be noted that the reconstruction of a Balto-Slavic stage seems to imply paradigmatic ablaut, whatever its origin and precise shape might have been (Lith. *nās-, vs. Slav. *nās- are pre-laryngealistic notations). Note also that Lith. dantsis ‘tooth’ (ALEW 1, 174f.) has a full grade *h₁d-ont-, whereas Slavic (Russ. ̀десна ‘gum’) has a zero grade *h₁d-nt-, which seems to imply that Balto-Slavic had an ablauting paradigm. On this matter, there can be three different approaches: one can consider Balto-Slavic to be a legally binding reality, with the result that every Baltic reconstruction has to be assessed on the basis of a Balto-Slavic comparison; another approach is to pay lip service to the issue but to treat Baltic independently without paying much attention to the Slavic counterparts; a third approach is to take Balto-Slavic seriously but to recognise that any given proto-language, like any natural language, can present a certain degree of variation, so that Baltic and Slavic do not necessarily need to be unified by force in each one of their details. One could make a similar claim regarding Proto-Baltic, whose internal contradictions are not such as to invalidate the reconstruction of a common source.

Etymologically, the ALEW keeps away from speculation as much as possible; nevertheless, one sometimes encounters controversial or even risky assumptions that raise some doubts. It is often argued that new roots emerged in Lithuanian from the reanalysis of archaic collocations. For example, the Baltic root */gird-/ ‘to hear’ of Lith. girdėti
(ALEW 1, 331f.) is traced back to a collocation \(^*g^\text{er}(H)-d^\text{eh}_1\) ‘to give information’ > ‘to make somebody hear’, and the same procedure is applied to Lith. giedòti ‘to sing’ (ALEW 1, 320) from \(^*geH(i)-d^\text{eh}_1\) or \(^*geH(j)-deh_3\). This is quite possible, but one still has to elaborate a more precise scenario in order to account for the syntax of the original collocation (in terms of ‘light verb construction’) and for its univerbation as a new root (Neowurzel). Lith. saldūs ‘sweet’ is explained (ALEW 2, 887) along the same lines as deriving from a collocation \(^*sal-dh_3\) (see Wodtko, Irslinger, Schneider 2008, 586 and 589 for the data), but I think it is preferable to regard the ending \(^*-d-u-\) as copied from the synonym \(^*s\text{gh}_{2}du-\) (Gr. ἡδύς, Sanskrit svādú-) via suffix transfer, cf. Le Feuvre 2008[2009]. Note that the reconstructions proposed by the ALEW *sald- ‘sweet’ (from \(^*sal-dh_3\) and \(^*sal-‘salt’ do not explain the long vowel of Latv. sâls ‘salt’ (see ALEW 2, 888). New roots (Neowurzeln) can also arise from the reanalysis of compound forms as radical formations: in Lithuanian the pronoun kitas ‘other’ (ALEW 1, 498f., from \(^*k^\text{i}-\) + \(^*to-\)) is the source of a new verbal root */keišt-/ found in keiści ‘to change, to alter’ (ALEW 1, 472).

Etymology is not just the identification of a common root, but also implies a morphological analysis, providing detailed information about how the lexemes have acquired their actual form. On this matter, there can be diverging scenarios, and it comes as no surprise that I do not always agree with some reconstructions proposed in the ALEW. As an example, let us consider the fate of heteroclitic \(^-r-/\)-\(n\)-neuters in Baltic. Lith. vâsara ‘summer’ (ALEW 2, 1200) is traced back to a substantivized adjective \(^*h_{2}\text{yoseró-} ‘shining in the morning’. I have some doubt about the reconstruction of an initial laryngeal \(^*h_{2}\), which is posited only to make a comparison with the PIE root \(^*h_{\text{yes}}-\) ‘to shine’ possible; but there is no prothetic vowel in Hom. Gr. ἐαq ‘spring’ (< PIE \(^*\text{yes}-\)), compare Gr. ἄεσα ‘to sleep, to spend the night’ (*ἀϝεσ- from PIE \(^*\text{h}_{2}\text{es}-\)). In addition, an o-grade formation \(^*h_{2}\text{yoseró-} has nothing to recommend it (cf. its position within the Caland-system). For PIE, it seems reasonable to reconstruct an acrostatic formation \(^*\text{yēs}- / *\text{yēs}-n-\), whose membra disjecta are reflected in the individual languages (e.g. Lat. uēr, OIcel. vár, Gr. ἐαq, Sanskrit vasantā-). In Balto-Slavic, however, there was a strong tendency to introduce o-grade in heteroclitic nouns, so that \(^*\text{yosr-} / *\text{yes}-n-\) is likely to have replaced \(^*\text{yēs}- / *\text{yēs}-n-\) by analogy to other heteroclitic nouns (e.g. \(^*yodr- / *\text{yed}-n- / *\text{ud}-en-\)). The same replacement is found in \(^*(H)jēk^9t- / *(H)jēk^9t- ‘liver’ (Gr. ἵπας, Sanskrit yāktṛ, Lat. iecur), where Baltic has reflexes of \(^*(H)jok^9t- / *(H)jek^9t- (Latv. aknas, OLith. jeknos), see the ALEW (1, 413f.). It is thus likely that Baltic \(^*vas-\) goes back to this new ablaut grade \(^*\text{yos-}, whereas Slavic \(^*ves-\) (Old Church Slavic
The suffixation -er- could originate from the PIE locative (cf. the same relation in Hom. Gr. ήμαρ, vs. Gr. ήμερα ‘day’) and the feminine ending of Lith. vāsara could be due to the analogy of Lith. žiemā ‘winter’. In any case, the precise scenario proposed by the ALEW is not the only one possible.

Another example that requires a broader discussion is Lith. mėnuo ‘month, moon’ (ALEW 1, 634f.). In the modern language, it presents an irregular paradigm (with a gen.sg. mėnesio, as if from a nominative mėnesis), but, in Old Lithuanian, it still had remnants of athematic declension (gen.sg. Mėnesės in Mažvydas 1s). The reconstruction of a sigmatic stem *mēh₁ns- (Vedic mā́s-) is obvious, but the full grade *mēh₁nes- is puzzling, not to speak of the nominative mėnuo, which is already Old Lithuanian. A reconstruction *mēh₁nōt is completely ad hoc. Note that the dialectal form mėnas ‘moon’ could reflect a sigmatic neuter *mēh₁nos- (beside the oblique stem *mēh₁nes-), but it could also be simply back-formed to the diminutive mėnūlis. The Slavic form *mēsęcь can reflect a metathesis of *mēns-iko- > *mēs-inko- according to the SEJL (p. 388). I have no miracle solution to explain the origin of mėnuo, but I suspect a secondary process.

Another example that draws attention is Old Lithuanian jen ‘where’ (ALEW 1, 414). The PIE correlative system is usually realised in Lithuanian as the opposition of a conjunction beginning with k- and a demonstrative beginning with t- (e.g. kadā..., tadā... ‘when..., then...’); there are unbalanced forms of correlation, with different endings, such as kuŗ..., teĩ... ‘where..., there...’ (compare Latvian kur..., tur...), but, in any case, the pattern k-...t- is predominant. Now, there is a trace in Old Lithuanian of a conjunction jen ‘where’, which reveals a different kind of correlation jen..., ten... with the archaic stem *(H)âo-, later replaced by *kâo-. The distribution of the ending -en in Old Lithuanian is likewise very interesting: we have not only teĩ ‘there’, but also traces of šeĩ ‘here’ in Bretkūnas (ALEW 2, 1036), beside čiā ‘here’; note the absence of *ken beside kuŗ ‘where’. The etymology of OLith. jen should be placed in the more general framework of the fate of the PIE correlative system in Baltic.

To conclude, we now have with the ALEW an exceptional tool that will certainly have a great impact on any further etymological analysis of the Lithuanian lexicon. It marks a significant milestone in the development of Lithuanian studies within Indo-European linguistics and opens up new prospects for the future. It demonstrates that collaborative work can produce results of incomparable quality. Our German colleagues are to be congratulated for this excellent book which has already become a major reference work.
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