

RECENZIJOS

doi: 10.15388/Baltistica.50.2.2258

Wolfgang Hock et al., **Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch**, 3 vols., Hamburg: Baar, 2015, 1643 pp.

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 dras-

tically, 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 *slēgti* 'to oppress' (ALEW 2, 940), *boginti* 'to drag, to take hurriedly' (ALEW 1, 126) from *bēgti* 'to run' (ALEW 1, 103), *snīēgas* 'snow' (ALEW 2, 951) from *snīgti* 'to snow' (ALEW 2, 951), whereas, for example, *ėsti* 'to eat' and *ėdis* 'feed' are put together (ALEW 1, 269), cf. also *tamsà* 'darkness' and *tamsiūs* 'dark' (ALEW 2, 1070). It is striking that *gēras* 'good' (ALEW 1, 312) and *gēris* '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. *iñti*, pret. *ėmė* 'to take' and *ėmimas* 'the act of taking' (ALEW 1, 395), sometimes separated, e.g. *likti*, pres. *liēka* 'to leave' (ALEW 1, 587–589) and *liēkas* '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, *laūkas* 'field' and *laūkas* '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 trans-

lated 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, *liēčyti* 'to heal' (ALEW 1, 578) is obviously a Slavism, but does it go back to Polish (*leczyć*) or to the (East) Slavic chancellery language (лѣчити)? Both possibilities are put by Skardžius (1931, 120) on an equal footing. The ALEW repeats the same uncertainty, but points out that Old Lithuanian *išliēčyti* (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-liēčyti*). Moreover, in the case of Daukša, a spontaneous formation is even more likely (*if3waišteti arba if3liēciti*, 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* (109_{r7}) 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 *duoklė* 1941, 18), *krait’* ‘basket, dowry paid by the brides’ family’ (*kraitis* 1941, 57, which, by the way, also appears in Sirvydas, *Dictionarium trium linguarum* I 61, III 222, the *Lexicon Lithuanicum* 19a, 62 and the *Clavis Germanico-Lithuana* I 392, III 73), *kudra* ‘pond’ (*kūdra* 1941, 61), *ontrinik* ‘auxiliary, servant’ (*antrininkas* 1941, 93), *pilekoln* ‘mount’ (*piliakalnis* 1941, 114), *pur* ‘wheat’ (*pūras* 1941, 131), *rynklionva* ‘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 **k^ureih₂-*, cf. Old Russian крити, Gr. κρίασθαι, Sanskrit *kriṇāti* ‘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. 15₉); *blezdinga* ‘swallow’ (Bretkūnas, *Biblia* Num. 14₁₈); *kanklės* ‘stringed instrument’ (*Knyga Nobažnystės* 120, 10); *kaukolė* ‘skull’ (*Ewangelie polskie y litewskie*, 1674, 215₄); *keksė* ‘bitch’ (Bretkūnas, *Biblia* Lev. 21₁₄, *Postilla* I 179₇, Daukša, *Postilla* 505₄₅); *klegėti* ‘to cackle, to make noise’ (*Zemczuga Theologischka* 31a, 26); *klėtis* ‘granary’ (Petkevičius, *Katechismas* 46₁₉); *kuinas* ‘old nag’ (Daukša, *Postilla* 16₁₆); *lėbauti* ‘to debauch’ (Bretkūnas, *Postilla* I 24₁₀); *liaukos* ‘epidemy’ (Sirvydas, *Dictionarium trium linguarum* III 157); *luomas* ‘estate’ (Daukša, *Postilla* 39₁₁); *luotas* ‘boat’ (Daukša, *Postilla* 79₉, 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); *strėnos* ‘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* Ech 17, 7 < Beloruss. бот or Old Pol. bot); *blynai* ‘pancake’ (Bretkūnas, *Biblia* Lev. 8₂₆ < Beloruss. блины); *kalėdos* ‘Christmas’ (Mažvydas

¹ Selection based on Palionis 1967, 214f.

179₁, etc. < Beloruss. коляды); *kaminas* ‘chimney’ (Daukša, *Postilla* 85₃₆ < Beloruss. комин or Pol. *komin*); *lelija* ‘lily’ (Mažvydas 72₇ < Pol. *lelija*); *pulkas* ‘flock, regiment’ (Mažvydas 181₄, etc. < ORuss. пълкъ). Other, less widely used loanwords that are omitted in the ALEW are for example: *sparas* ‘quarrell’ (Morkūnas, *Postilla* 210₄₀ < Pol. *spór*); *trūna* ‘coffin’ (Chyliński, *Biblia* Luc. 7, 14 < Belor. труна); *ziegarius* or *ziegorius* ‘laikrodis’ (Bretkūnas, *Postilla* I 233₁ < Pol. *zegar*).

In the ALEW, semantics is usually treated adequately. The translations provided 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. *girià* ‘forest’ (ALEW 1, 332) displays in Biblical contexts a specific meaning ‘desert’ (corresponding to German *Wüste* or Latin *desertum*). This meaning is restricted to Old Lithuanian Biblical literature, cf. the famous phrase (*Jn* 1, 23): *Efch efmi balsas ūchaukius girrai* (in the *Wolfenbüttel Postilla* 20₂₀₋₂₁) corresponding to German *Ich bin eine Stimme eines Predigers in der Wüsten* (Luther), Latin *Ego vox clamantis in deserto* (Vulgata) or Polish *Jam jest głos wołającego na puszczy* (Biblia Brzeska). The source of the polysemy of Lith. *girià* 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 Lithuanian adjective *patogùs* (ALEW 2, 742), which means ‘convenient, comfortable’ in the modern language, could have a slightly different meaning in Old Lithuanian ‘decent’ (cf. Mažvydas 38₁₂, corresponding 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 specialisation is old, as proved by Tocharian A *tāśši* ‘military leader’. Note, however, that Lith. *atogùs* ‘courageous, bold, daring’ (Kurschat) seems to provide a stronger basis for a comparison with the Greek lexemes (the relationship to Lith. *sutógti* ‘to befriend’ is, at any rate, unclear). As a third example, let us mention the adjective *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: *ūmagly / Flexilis, flexibilis, ad caedendum aptus, ūmagus*); 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 *smagùs* to the verb *smōgti* ‘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 etidai* (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 *galėti* ‘to be able’ see Rikov 1995; on *gulbis* ‘swan’ see Derksen 1999; on *mėsà* ‘meat’ see Derksen 1998; on *nařvas* ‘cage’ see Temčín 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. **b^harsd^hó-* for Lith. *barzdà* ‘beard’ (ALEW 1, 97) or **ġ^halg-* 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. *žąsis* ‘goose’ (ALEW 2, 1292f.) and we do not learn whether **ġ^hans-* or **ġ^hh₂ens-* 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. *màlti* ‘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. *bėgti* ‘to run’ (ALEW 1, 103f.), *ėsti* ‘to eat’ (ALEW 1,

270) or *údra* ‘otter’ (ALEW 2, 1144), but honestly mentions the concurring opinion that traces them back to acrostatic or *vṛddhi* 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 **dъnъ* ‘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 **deǵ-n-*, vs. zero grade **di-n-*), but, in other cases, the Balto-Slavic stage is left in the background: for Lith. *vanduō* ‘water’ (ALEW 2, 1186), for example, the reconstruction of a Proto-Baltic ablaut based on Lith. *vanduō*, vs. Latv. *ūdens* and OPr. *wundan* is incomplete without the Slavic data (Old Church Slavic вода, etc.). Similarly, Lith. *nósis* ‘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 ab-

laut, whatever its origin and precise shape might have been (Lith. **nās-*, vs. Slav. **nās-* are pre-laryngealistic notations). Note also that Lith. *dantis* ‘tooth’ (ALEW 1, 174f.) has a full grade **h₁d-ont-*, whereas Slavic (Russ. дeснa ‘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^uer(H)- d^heh₁-* ‘to give information’ > ‘to make somebody hear’, and the same procedure is applied to Lith. *giedóti* ‘to sing’ (ALEW 1, 320) from **geH(i)- d^heh₁-* or **geH(i)- deh₃-*. 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. *saldùs* ‘sweet’ is explained (ALEW 2, 887) along the same lines as deriving from a collocation **sal-dh₃-* (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 **sueh₂du-* (Gr. ἡδύς, Sanskrit *svādú-*) via suffix transfer, cf. Le Feuvre 2008[2009]. Note that the reconstructions proposed by the ALEW **sald-* ‘sweet’ (from **sal-dh₃-*) and **sal-* ‘salt’ do not explain the long vowel of Latv. *sàls* ‘salt’ (see ALEW 2, 888). New roots (*Neowurzeln*) can also arise from the reanalysis of compound forms as radical formations: in Lithuanian the pronoun *kìtas* ‘other’ (ALEW 1, 498f., from **k^ui-* + **to-*) is the source of a new verbal root **/keit-* found in *kēĩsti* ‘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. *vāsara* ‘summer’ (ALEW 2, 1200) is traced back to a substantivized adjective **h₂uoseró-* ‘shining in the morning’. I have some doubt about the reconstruction of an initial laryngeal **h₂-*, which is posited only to make a comparison with the PIE root **h₂ues-* ‘to shine’ possible; but there is no prothetic vowel in Hom. Gr. ἔαϱ ‘spring’ (< PIE **ues-*), compare Gr. ἄεσα ‘to sleep, to spend the night’ (**ἄφεσ-* from PIE **h₂ues*). In addition, an *o*-grade formation **h₂uoseró-* has nothing to recommend it (cf. its position within the Caland-system). For PIE, it seems reasonable to reconstruct an acrostic formation **uēs̄r-* / **uēs̄n-*, whose *membra disjecta* are reflected in the individual languages (e.g. Lat. *uēr*, OIcel. *vár*, Gr. ἔαϱ, Sanskrit *vasantá-*). In Balto-Slavic, however, there was a strong tendency to introduce *o*-grade in heteroclitic nouns, so that **uosr̄-* / **ues-n-* is likely to have replaced **uēs̄r-* / **uēs̄n-* by analogy to other heteroclitic nouns (e.g. **uodr̄-* / **ued-n-* / **ud-en-*). The same replacement is found in **(H)iek̄^ur̄-* / **(H)iek̄^ur̄-* ‘liver’ (Gr. ἥπαϱ, Sanskrit *yákṛt*, Lat. *iecur*), where Baltic has reflexes of **(H)io^uk̄^ur̄-* / **(H)iek̄^ur̄-* (Latv. *aknas*, OLith. *jeknos*), see the ALEW (1, 413f.). It is thus likely that Baltic **vas-* goes back to this new ablaut grade **uos-*, whereas Slavic **ves-* (Old Church Slavic

весна ‘spring’) reflects **ues-*. Alternatively, Baltic *vas-* could result from the assimilation of **ves-* (**veserā* > *vasarā*). The suffixation *-er-* could originate from the PIE locative (cf. the same relation in Hom. Gr. ἡμαρ, vs. Gr. ἡμέρα ‘day’) and the feminine ending of Lith. *vāsara* could be due to the analogy of Lith. *žiemà* ‘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. *Menefes* in Mažvydas 1₉). The reconstruction of a sigmatic stem **meh₁ns-* (Vedic *mās-*) is obvious, but the full grade **meh₁nes-* is puzzling, not to speak of the nominative *mėnuo*, which is already Old Lithuanian. A reconstruction **meh₁nōt* is completely ad hoc. Note that the dialectal form *mėnas* ‘moon’ could reflect a sigmatic neuter **meh₁nos-* (beside the oblique stem **meh₁nes-*), but it could also be simply back-formed to the diminutive *mėnūlis*. The Slavic form **měšęcъ* 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. *kadà...*, *tadà...* ‘when..., then...’); there are unbalanced forms of correlation, with different endings, such as *kuĩ...*, *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*)*jo-*, later replaced by **k^ho-*. 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 *čià* ‘here’; note the absence of **ken* beside *kuĩ* ‘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.

LITERATURE

Bender, Harold H. 1921, *A Lithuanian etymological index*, Princeton, London: Princeton University Press.

Brückner, Alexander 1927, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza.

Derksen, Rick 1998, Lithuanian *mėsà*, *Res Balticae* 4, 131–137.

Derksen, Rick 1999, North European **KulP*- ‘beak, snout’, *Baltistica* 34(1), 69–76.

Derksen, Rick 2015, *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic inherited lexicon* (ED-BIL), Leiden.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (LEW), Heidelberg: Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Jablonskis, Konstantinas 1941, *Lietuviški žodžiai senosios Lietuvos raštinių kalboje*, Kaunas.

Le Feuvre, Claire 2008 [2009], Sur la formation de l’adjectif balto-slave *saldu-* (doux, sucré) et du germanique *salt* (sel), *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 245–253.

Lexer, Matthias ³⁴1976, *Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch*, Stuttgart: Hirzel.

Palionis, Jonas 1967, *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.*, Vilnius: Mintis.

Petit, Daniel 2004, Gastgebung und Suppletivismus: Litauisch *soėčias* / *viešnià*, *Res Balticae* 9, 121–146.

Petit, Daniel 2005, Das litauische Adverb *ankstì* ‘früh’, *Studia Etymologica Cra-coviensia* 10, 141–156.

Rikov, Georgi T. 1995, On Lithuanian *galėti*, *galiù* and congeners, *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 131–134.

Rosinas, Albertas 2009, *Baltų kalbų juardžių semantinė ir morfologinė struktūra*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Sabaliauskas, Algirdas 1990, *Lietuvių kalbos leksika*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

SEJL – Wojciech Smoczyński, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński, 2007.

Skardžius, Pranas 1931, *Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen*, Kaunas.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2006, *Laringalų teorija ir lietuvių kalba*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Temčín, Sergej Jur’evič 2000, O germanskom proisxoždennii lit. *nařvas* ‘kletka’, *Linguistica Baltica* 8, 189–198.

Urbutis, Vincas 1981, *Baltų etimologijos etudai* 1, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Urbutis, Vincas 2009, *Baltų etimologijos etudai* 2, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Wodtko, Dagmar S., Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider 2008, *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon* (NIL), Heidelberg: Winter.

Daniel PETIT
Ecole Normale Supérieure
Centre d’Etudes anciennes
45, rue d’Ulm
FR-75005 Paris
France
[daniel.petit@ens.fr]