RECENZIJOS


On opening to p. 2 of volume II one notes immediately a difference between this book and its predecessor, volume I. On p. 2 of volume I one finds the title translated both into Russian and into German, but on p. 2 of volume 2, the title is translated only into German, the Russian version having mysteriously vanished. For general comments I would refer the reader to my review of volume 1 which appeared in Baltistika XXVII (1) 70–72. I will therefore proceed immediately to details.

On p. 16 Mažiulis (further M.) writes that the noun *ida* ‘Essen, food’ nom. sg. fem. derives from *idai < *idā < *ēdā attested both in Baltic and Slavic (cf. Lith. dial. ėda, Latv. ēda, Rus. eda), which has its origin in an *olā*-stem adjective. The Old Prussian form in question derives then from the addition of the definite pronoun -i < *- fjā or -fi. Similarly M. writes that *istai* ‘Essen, food’ presupposes an earlier *ista < *istā < *ēstā with a morphological development of the final syllable similar to that of *ida*. M. notes also that *istai* occurs in the expression: Kawidai wirsdai ast sirsdau stesmn [for stesnu] kēmeneniskan istan bhe poitun ‘Welche Wort sind neben dem leiblichen Essen und Trinken, which words are beside the corporal food and drink.’ The final is to be explained, in M’s view, in the same way as is *ida* above. M. then writes (p. 52) it seems to him that *istai* is a nom. sg. fem. *a*-stem form and he writes in brackets that in the Old Prussian catechisms the nominative form is rather frequently (neretai) used instead of the expected (correct) accusative or some other form. In 1974, 49, I followed Trautmann, 1910, 348, who analyzed this as a dat. sg. neuter of *istan derived from a proposed reconstruction *ēd-tom. I am now prepared to agree with M. that this might be a nom. sg. fem. *a*-stem form, primarily because I believe that there are many mistakes and misunderstandings in the Old Prussian catechisms.

On the other hand one might consider Smoczyński’s (1992, 154–155) proposal that *istai* derives from *istān. Smoczyński writes that the number of case forms ending in -ai and -ei is so great that the notion that final -i is a misprint for -n should be set aside, and that here we have to do with a phonological rather than a graphic matter. He suggests then a weakening of the final nasal resonance and an option change of the sequences -an and -en into the diphthongs -ati and -ei respectively. An argument in favor of this view is the existence of a somewhat similar phenomenon in some Lithuanian dialects. Thus Zinkevičius, 1966, 137, reports in the area of Vilkaviškis an acc. pl. fem. baltaišės for standard baltaišias. I would no longer defend very strongly my view (1974, 64) that kanxrisko ‘Zucht, discipline’ is a dative singular. It might well be as M. writes (p. 112–113) a nominative singular form. He writes that in the Old Prussian catechisms there is more than one translation error of that kind.

Of course, if one followed the dictum of Levin (1982) that the only determiner of correctness is to be found in the text itself one would be forced to the conclusion that there are either no very mistakes in the text (the few existing mistakes [if there are any at all] being established on the basis of some kind of statistical norm derived from the analysis of the text itself). I would be inclined here to agree with M. rather than Levin and to assume that on the basis of our knowledge of Lithuanian, Latvian and other Indo-European languages we might expect, for example, an accusative rather than a nominative as a direct object of a finite verb. If one relies solely on the evidence of the text and if it could be established in some way or other that the nominative case is more frequent as the direct object of a finite verb, then we would have to consider the nominative here as being correct. Or perhaps we would have to change our view of morphology and consider forms with apparent final -a < *-ā as renderings of the accusative case. One might go even further and, for example, deny that Old Prussian is a Bal-
tic language at all, in which case the use of parallels from other Baltic and/or Indo-European languages would be irrelevant. Although one would be able to analyze the data without reference to criteria from outside, this would seem to me (and I think, to most specialists) to be odd.

M. (p. 63) derives Old Prussian kadan ‘when’ from *kadān which in turn derives from *kadā + n which is compared to Slavic *koda (later remodeled into *kogoda > Russ. kogda). I would agree with all of the steps here, except that it seems simpler to me to assume a proto-form *kadan (short vowel plus nasal) which in word final sandhi position could become *kadā (with loss of the nasal and lengthening of the preceding vowel) if the following word began with a consonant or the retention of the original vowel plus resonant sequence if the following word began with a vowel (S c h m a l s t i e g, 1980, 31–34). In making such assumptions one deals with forms which are actually attested, viz., kadan (cf. Lith. kądągi ‘since’) and Old Indic kadā ‘when’. Furthermore such a development would seem to be quite consistent with the somewhat similar phenomenon in Lithuanian where short vowel plus resonant is retained in some positions, but passes to a long vowel with loss of the preceding resonant if there is a following spirant, cf., e.g., sūn-taka ‘confluence’ vs. sū-skaita ‘bill’. Compare also Old Indic acc. sg. devam ‘god’ (short vowel plus resonant) with Lith. Diēv–q.

M. writes (p. 99) that the form kaltā ‘lauten, purport’ (beside kelsāi) reflects Old Pr. *kalē < *kalsē with the -s- after -l- having a more or less affricate pronunciation -c-. It seems just as likely to me that Abel Will couldn’t distinguish well between the phonetic sequences -ls- and -lts-, or maybe that -tz- was merely another way of rendering -s-. In her grammar of Middle Low German L a s c h (1914, 172) writes that sometimes one encounters ss (sz tz) after consonant and quotes the example kerss where the ss stands for High German ss. For the rendering of the so-called ‘scharfes s’ tz, cz and c are common, thus the spellings Rus(s)en, Rusczen, Rutzzen, Ruczen, Ryceen ‘Russians’ are encountered in the Baltic provinces. Since the -s- in kelsāi was voiceless spirant it seems to me that Abel Will could well have interpreted it as a ‘scharfes s’. For me the English words false and faults are homonymous, so a colleague of mine posed a question about this on the linguists’ e-mail network. This yielded a number of interesting replies, some Americans having words as homonyms and others distinguishing the words. One native German replied that for him Hals rhymes with Malz. I queried two native speakers in our German department here at Penn State and found that for them the word Hals and Malz on the one hand and Fels and Peitz on the other hand were rhyming words.

I conclude then that the difference in orthography between -ls- and -lts- (with epenthetic -t-) is no more important than the difference between dessimts ‘tenth’ (T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 5, 22) and dessymts (T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 11, 21) with the epenthetic -p-.

With regard to the form kelsāi M. quotes the usual view that the orthography allows us to assume a reduction of a thematicized *-āja. I still cling to my earlier belief about this word, with regard to the Old Prussian orthographic sequence -ai, viz. that it reflects either (1) -ā or else (2) -a plus particle -ai. In the first case one could draw from examples where Middle Low German orthographic -ai-apparently renders -ā, thus raid ‘Rad, wheel’, jair ‘Jahr, year’ (L a s c h, 1, 914, 25). The second alternative in my view is that the form shows the addition of the particle -ai, cf. Lith. dial. sūkai ‘turns’ vs. standard sūka (Z i n k e v i č i u s, 1966, 431). Furthermore I doubt that -el- in kelsāi reflects a sound different from -al- in kaltā. Perhaps M. is right in his assumption that Old Prussian -al- was reduced to -el-, but I doubt that the orthographic -el- in kelsāi allows us to distinguish it phonologically from kaltā. In sum, then I see no reason to assume that the spelling kelsāi vs. kaltā represent a difference in pronunciation. I assume only a difference in spellings due to Abel Will’s inconsistency. I would stick with my earlier assumption of a phonemicization ikalsāi/ for both words.

Although I have been critical of the phonology M. has proposed I do think that his notion that there existed parallel verbs *kalsēvei vs. *kalsēve is a good thought. M. supports this by calling attention to the adjective kalsēingiskan ‘lauter, pure’ which seems to presuppose the existence of a verb *kalsēvei and to such pairs as Lith. linksōti ‘to be bent over’ and linksēti ‘to bow over and over again’.

From the cultural perspective one very interesting and important entry in the dictionary is the etymology of the name of famous astronomer Copericus, who gave his nationality as Prussian
when he matriculated at the University of Kraków. This was previously unknown to me and I would guess to most Americans who are accustomed to considering Copernicus as Polish. According to M. (p. 114) the name may eventually be derived from Old Pr. *kapurnâ, *kapernâ ‘pro-tuberance, small hill, rise’. Copernicus was born in Torun in 1473 to a family by the name of (German) Koppernigk. Apparently this family had moved there by way of Kraków from the small Silesian village of Köppenig the name of which M. surmises might derive from a Germanized Old Prussian personal name.

M. (p. 137) writes that a West Baltic nom. sg. fem. relative pronoun *kâ passed to Sambian *kâ, which, with the addition of *-ai from the definite form (cf. *[st]-ai < *-âi < *-aï [or *-aïi]), developed into the nom. sg. fem. *kvi (= nom. sg. fem. quai, quoi). With the substitution of the sequence *kv- into the accusative singular we have *kvan and then from this we have an acc. pl. fem. *kvans from which an acc. pl. masc. *kvans is derived analogically. On the basis of the acc. pl. masc. *kvans a new nom. pl. masc. *kvai is formed (= qui and quoi). I would, of course, be very surprised to find the initial qu- as the reflex of an Indo-European labio-velar in a satem language, but neither do I see the passage of *kâ to *kâ as M. supposes. It seems much more likely to me that the qu- is merely the orthographic representation of a labialized velar consonant before a non-front vowel, a phenomenon to be expected in languages which have phonemic palatalization of consonants. Cf., e.g., the words enkops ‘begragen, buried’ with the orthographic alternants encops and enquoptzt. André Martinet (1955, 356) has written that a Frenchman hearing the Russian words byl ‘was’ and most ‘bridge’ would be tempted to transcribe them respectively as bwil and mwost. In my view then the sequences quai and quoi sometimes represents the nom. pl. masc. /kai/ and perhaps sometime the nom. sg. fem. /kâ/.

In (1974, 64) I phonemized käupiskan ‘Handel, business’ as /kaupiskan/ for my first choice and suggested kúpiskan/ as a possible second choice, since I thought that the word might come from Slavic. I was at that time suspicious of the derivation from Gothic kaupôn ‘to buy’ which was suggested by Trautmann (1910, 354). I now would agree with M. (p. 146) that it is more likely that this word is a German dialect borrowing from the 13th to 15th centuries.

Following Trautmann (1910, 356) I wrote in (1974, 62) that the word kermenensikan in the expression noisson kermenensikan quâits ‘unsers fleischen wille, the will of our flesh’ was a substantive adjective. M. suggests, however (p. 166), that the word is not a noun, but rather an adjective which should have had the nom. sg. masc. form *kermeneniskas to agree with quâits. The final -s of *kermeneniskas was replaced by -n, however, under the influence of the preceding noisson. I think that M. is quite probably right, because it is well known that non-natives using an inflected foreign language which they do not know very well frequently fail make the appropriate adjective and noun agreement. In a hotel of one of the republics (not Lithuania) of the former Soviet Union I was told once that in the samovar there was gorjači voda [sic].

Following Berneker (1896, 193) M. (p. 93) writes that in the expression tu twiais kirkis ... islāiku ‘du deine Kirche ... erheltest, you uphold your church’ the word kirkis is not acc. pl. fem., but rather nom. pl. fem. form. He writes that here Abel Will heard the acc. sg. deine Kirche as an acc. pl. (= nom.) and having understood this as a nom. pl. translated it into the Old Prussian nom. pl. fem. twiaias kirkis ‘tâvos baźnyčios, your churches’. I suggest perhaps a genitive singular which might have been governed by the verb islāiku, cf. Lith. laikytis ‘to hold on to’ which requires a genitive complement, cf., e.g., aš laikâu senos tvarkos ‘I hold on to the old order’ (LKŽ VII 38).

In the marriage service one encounters the expression (Trautmann, 1910, 63): adder tuussise pansdau bhe etlāikusin deickton prei kitaivinduntisin ‘oder schweige dârnach und enthält sich etwas zuverhindernd, or may he be silent and refrain from saying anything against (it).’ Under the heading kitaivinduntisin ‘verhindern, to prevent’ M. writes (p. 205) that *kitaivinduntisin for (non-reflexive) *kitaivindunt did not mean ‘verhindern, to prevent’ but rather ‘verändern, to change’ and that here Abel Will was not responsible for the mistake, but rather his helper Paul Megott who misinterpreted spoken verhindernd for verändern. Hearing this he erroneously added the translation of sich (which correctly goes withenthalt ‘holds oneself’). It seems to me M. has proposed an excellent solution to the problem of this word which can then be easily etymologized as having the element kita- ‘other’ -vâid- ‘aspect’ -in- (causative verb suffix), -tun (infinitive or supine ending).
For the etymology of *klentē ‘Kū, cow’ M. (p. 217) proposes a Balto-Slavic root *klen- (*klin-)- ‘to bend, to bow’ such that the word *klentē ‘cow’ would have originally meant ‘the bent over one, the bowed one.’ This would allow us to draw a parallel with Russ. kljača ‘broken-down horse, old nag’, Slovenian kléka ‘lean, animal, particularly horse’, Ukrainian kljapa ‘old cow’.

Following Ivanov, 1965, 31–32, under the heading dlokiš ‘ber, bear’ (p. 220–223) M. explicates the interesting notion that Balto-Slavic *tlakas ‘bear’ is to be considered a remodelling (taking into consideration tabu factors) from an older *tlakas, considering the segment *-ak- a suffix and replacing it with Balto-Slavic *-ak- which in turn reflects an Indo-European dialect *tloskos (in which there has been a metathesis of *il- < *̬l*) This latter reconstruction (with an alternation of r and l perhaps connected with the tabu form) derives from *tloskos which existed beside the form *tlos, the form usually reconstructed for Gk. árktos, Lat. ursus, etc.

M. (p. 231) disputes the usual view that Old Prussian knapios ‘hant, hemp’ and Lith. kanapė, etc. are borrowings from Slavic and rather considers them to be borrowings into proto-Baltic-Slavic from Scythian sometime in the first half of the first millennium B.C. Thus the traditional notion that the names for ‘hemp’ in the Baltic languages, Old Prussian knapios, Lith. kanapė derive from Slavic is not trustworthy in his view; these words are rather common Balto-Slavic words. If one accepts the view that the Baltic and Slavic languages shared a common history before splitting, then M.’s view seems quite plausible.

M. (p. 237) writes that Old Prussian (E 559) coestue ‘burste, brush’ reflects *ko:p(u)ve < *kast(u)ve < *kast(u)vė (with a lengthened a under the circumflex accent) and that (E 557) coysnis ‘cam, comb’ is *ko:snis, i.e., *kaisnis. Furthermore M. cites the Lithuanian cognate kaiš-ė ‘to stop up; to adorn’ with a circumflex root. I personally would surmise that the orthographic sequences coe- and coy- both reflect attempts to represent phonemic /kai-/ , the -o- denoting /a/ after a labial. Possibly the rendition coestue indicates that the scribe did not hear the second element of the circumflex diphthong. Although it would be impossible to prove the nationality of the author of the Elbing Vocabulary, it certainly seems more likely to me that he was a German relying on his incomplete knowledge of Old Prussian rather than an Old Prussian who had learned German.

In his discussion of (E 160) crāuyo ‘blut, blood’ (p. 262) M. writes that he considers it more probable that all of the forms of this word (including those in the catechisms) were feminine, reflecting an original nom sg. *kraujā, and in fact I said the same thing about the forms in the catechisms in (1974, 61). It is clear that there is a vacillation between the *-o and *-ā stem nouns in Baltic as Endzelins (1971, para. 93) has pointed out, so there is a definite possibility that this would be a *-ā stem in Old Prussian. M. discounts, I think correctly, the notion that the form crāuyo could be a neuter plural. But if the scribe was a German, there seems to be no reason why he should have limited his entries in the Elbing Vocabulary to the nominative case. If he knew some Old Prussian he may have heard other cases more commonly, thus perhaps he might have heard the word for ‘blood’ in the genitive singular, i.e., crāuyo (= Lith. kraūjo) which might have been used with partitive meaning to denote ‘some blood’.

Under the heading crixti lāiskas ‘tauffbühlein, baptismal booklet’ M. (p. 227) suggests that lāiskas is not a nom. sg. masc. (as one might expect on the basis of Lith. lāiskas ‘leaf’), but rather a nom. pl. fem. with the meaning of a singular, cf. Lith. (pl. tantum) knygos ‘book’. This is an interesting suggestion and I see no way of proving it wrong, although the comparison with Lith. lāiskas seems more likely to me.

As have many others M. (p. 324–325) connects Old Prussian quaïtis ‘Wille, will’ with Lith. kvėšti ‘to invite’ and supposes an Old Prussian -i stem proto-form *kvaitis. The word is to be connected with quoï ‘will, I wish’ (p. 329), a modal form which underwent shortening because of frequency of use (a phenomenon which has been amply demonstrated by W. Mańczak), and the 3 pres. verb quoït ‘will, wishes’, the infinitive of which M. reconstructs as *kvaitis-tvei < *kvaitë-tvei (p. 330). On p. 240 we find the entries koyte, koyto and koytu with a reference to II quoï, but the forms are not discussed under that entry, nor do we find them under the entries quoït or quaïtis. Neither have I found any mention of Simon Grana’s katay thu ‘Wo wiltu hin’ (listed in M., 1966, 251). It is a minor annoyance, but it is not a tremendous problem because the forms are discussed in works to which M. refers in the entry mentioned.
The form koyte ‘wish’ occurs in the Basel epigram and the related forms koytu and koyo come from Simon Grunau’s vocabulary. I consider the forms important, however, because koyte, koyo and koytu show the labialized initial k- but without any ы- element and the form kayat has the initial /kai-/ as I envision it. As in 1969, 164–165, I would reconstruct the root as *kait-, perhaps to be connected with Lith. kaitišti ‘to lack, to be wanting’ and Latv. kaiteti ‘to be harmful’ or, as B. Jeges has suggested, with Lith. kalsi ‘to heat’ such that the root could have the meaning ‘to have a burning desire for something, to burn for something’ (see also Schmalstieg 1976, 277, 342, fn. 96).

Probably the only methodological point on which I would disagree with M. is in the phonological interpretation of the orthography. As I have said many times in the past I believe the phonetically untrained German ears captured only in the most general way the Baltic phonology. I am pleased to see that M. does recognize possible grammatical errors, cf. the discussion of istai, kanxtisku and kermenensikan above. He has argued quite convincingly in my view that kitawidintusin is the result of hearing verändern rather than the intended verhindern. If Paul Megott could mishear Abel Will, doesn’t it seem likely that Abel Will could mishear Paul Megott? When my native English ears hear Lithuanian words, I frequently misinterpret them and it is only because I have had training in Baltic philology that I recognize what is happening. Unfortunately Abel Will certainly had no such teacher as Antanas Salys (as I did) to help him with the difficulties of Baltic phonology.

With volume III, the final entry of which is püton ‘to drink’ M. has now gone farther than V. N. Toporov, the fifth volume of whose dictionary had reached only the letter L.

In addition to presenting many previous etymologies of each word, M. supplies us with his own interesting etymologies. For example, in the entry on lapinis (p. 41; EV 359) ‘leffel, spoon’ M. rejects the earlier etymology according to which this is a borrowing from Germanic and K. O. Falk’s etymology which derives the word from lapas (= Lith. lāpas ‘leaf’, i.e. a spoon would be shaped like a leaf). M. would rather derive the Old Prussian word from an Indo-European root *lep- (I *lēp-), cf. Gk. lēpō ‘I peel, strip off the rind’. This Indo-European root is represented in Baltic by *lep- (I *lēp-) ‘to peel, to shave’ with lengthened ablaut grade *lep-* (I *lēp-*), the later form being at the base of Lith. lopėti ‘spade, shovel’.

Another example is the derivation by M. (p. 113) of Old Prussian massais ‘veniger, less’ from a Balto-Slavic root *maž- with the meaning ‘to smear’ (cf. Slavic mazati ‘to smear, to grease’). The Baltic adjective *maž- ‘small, slight, scantly, poor’ would have been derived from the semantic chain *having been made small, unsatisfactory’ from *having been made too thin’ from *having been smeared, i.e., having been too thinly smeared (with putty or clay). The Balto-Slavic root *maž- in turn is derived from the Indo-European root *maǵ- ‘to knead, to smear’ > Germanic *mak-on, cf. German machen ‘to do, to make’.

Probably M.’s approach has best been characterized by Toporov in the foreword to the first volume of his Old Prussian etymological dictionary (1975, 10) where he writes that the guiding light for many of the investigations by M. is scrupulous and filigreed work in the discovery of the regularities in the transfer of letter to sound (in reality, of course, just the opposite, from sound to letter, from speech to writing). With justification Toporov characterizes my approach as allowing for a multiplicity of variations in writing bordering on the arbitrary. Herein lies the kernel of most of my disagreements with M. about Old Prussian.

For example, M. (p. 61–62) derives Old Prussian likuts ‘small’ (which he would assume to reflect *likuta-) from an adjective meaning ‘thin, slender, delicate’ and which is from the same root as Lith. liėknuš ‘thin’. The root is encountered in the Baltic verbal stem *Lik- ‘to bow, to bend over (from slenderness, thinness)’. M. writes further that this is derived from an earlier Baltic verb *(s)leik-/*(s)lik- meaning ‘glaisant (tepant) molį jenktį jo paviršių smažęs clay to bend in its surface’. It seems that M.’s etymology rests heavily on the assumption that the single consonant beginning the second syllable of (Enchiridion) likuts and (Grunau’s Vocabulary) līcūti can only denote that the preceding -i- of the initial syllable is long. Indeed, Trautman (1910, 185) wrote that short accented vowels are marked by doubling the following consonant, although Endelins (1943, 19) doubted that the doubling of the consonant always meant that the preceding vowel was stressed. In general, of course, the doubling of consonants does denote that the preceding vowel is short (as, indeed, in English, at least etymologically), but the application of the rule is appar-
ently not completely consistent. Thus, *newi̇nts ‘ninth’ would not seem to have a long initial vowel. For the numerous words with a prefix ni- (nkai ‘than’, nikanxsts ‘improper’, nipoklumsings ‘disobedient’, and many others) M. reconstructs a short initial vowel, assuming a shortening in proclitic position of *nī < *nē (p. 181). But if there was such a shortening, why wasn’t it represented by double spelling of the following consonant? Sometimes there seems to be vacillation in spelling: cf. kitawidintusin ‘to prevent’ vs. kitan ‘other’. Cf. also (Enchiridion) nom. sg. masc. ketwīrts ‘fourth’ vs. nom. sg. fem. ketwierta. Note also ismīgē ‘fell asleep’ vs. enmigguns ‘asleep’; turilai ‘may he’ vs. turilai; -subans ‘selves’ (Trautmann, 1910, 27, line 34) vs. -subbans.

Similarly in Simon Grunau’s Vocabulary a short preceding vowel may not always be marked by doubling of the following consonant. The word for ‘great’ is rendered in Grunau’s Vocabulary by debica and in the Enchiridion variously by debikan, debijkan, debetikan, debikun, but also by debikian. Apparently on the basis of this single occurrence M. (1888, 184) reconstructs an initial short vowel in *debiaka-. In fact I agree with M.’s reconstruction even though according to his own notions of Old Prussian orthography it is supported only by one occurrence of the word, the other occurrences presumably being misprints. Now M. himself writes that the Old Prussian personal names Lickucz, Liccṽtieyn, etc. may reflect either *Likut < *Likut- with Old Prussian *iː- on occasion unstressed (perhaps even in German pronunciation) or the names may show that in Prussian dialects *iː- passed to *iː-. Another possibility in M.’s view would be that the Prussian personal name *Likut- could be cognate with the Lithuanian personal name Likas from the adjective likas ‘unpaired’.

M. writes that it is not easy to believe (nelengva tikėti) in a connection with Lith. likūtis ‘left-over, remnant’ (see Trautmann, 1925, 143; Toporov, 1990, 249). Toporov, however, notes that the semantic structure of Lith. likūtis emphasizes a small quantity and quotes as an example from LKŽ VII 514: Iš viso pulko tik likūtės sugrįzo namo ‘From the entire regiment only the remnants returned home’. Toporov would rather derive the Old Prussian and Lithuanian words from the Indo-European root *leik-/*loik- and he also points to the Slovenian counterpart lek ‘a few, a small quantity’ (<*lek̞). Toporov’s proposal seems to require only that one accept the brevity of the initial vowel of likūts (lieuti). In view of my perception of the inconsistency of Old Prussian orthography Toporov’s suggestion doesn’t seem to me difficult to believe. I might point out a semantic parallel in that the English word remnants also frequently has the connotation of ‘small number, small quantity (left over)’.

I have proposed (1972, 7–9; 1974, 101; 1976, 171–172) that the apparent Old Prussian comparative suffix -ais- derives from the definite adjective and compared the ordinal pirmoīs/pirmais/ ’first’ and the Latvian definite adjective form encountered, e.g., in mazais ‘(the) small’. As a semantic parallel for such a development I quoted from the LKG I 524) the sentence with the definite adjective: O patys geriei ir ilgjei rastai už didelius piniguš parudomās laivams statyti ‘But their very best and longest beams are sold for large sums of money to build ships’. It is quite natural for the definite article in its emphatic function to get a kind of superlative meaning. Compare Latvian pats labais with the same meaning as pats labākais ‘the very best’ (Endzelins, 1951, 480). Note that in English also the definite article the can be ‘... used as a function word to designate one of a class as the best, most typical, or most worth singing out (this is the life)...’ (Webster’s 1966, 2368). The phenomenon of hypostasis is also well known, i.e., the use of one case as the stem on which to build other cases, thus Zinkevičius (1966, 283) gives the example from a folk song: šī pirmās jōsim in karūže, mēlnās pas jāunā mergēze, mēlnās pas jāunā mergēle o margās ēn zālā tankēle ‘this first one we will ride into war, the blue one (we will ride) to the young damsel, the blue one to the young damsel, the varicolored (one) into the green meadow’. Note that here the nominative case of pirmas ‘first’, mēlnas ‘blue’ and margas ‘varicolored’ serves as a base to which the accusative case ending -j is added. For other examples of hypostasis see Haudry (1982, 41–51).

On the basis of these parallels I have suggested that the Old Prussian stem maldais-is- is to be divided into the root mald- ‘young’ and the suffix -ais- deriving from the nominative singular masculine definite article (similar to the Latvian definite article -ais). Thus in such a sentence as (Trautmann, 1910, 49, line 7): dai swaimans maldaisimans ‘gabs seinen Jüngern, gave (it) to his disciples’ the dative plural ending -ims is added directly to the stem maldais-. This example
and the example urais- in the sense of parent seem to be merely the result of the nominalization of a definite adjective. But the two meanings of nominalization and superlative can both be derived from the single form. Thus in the phrases en maldaïsin deïnan 'am Jüngsten Tag, on the last (judgement) day', Stanis Uraïs 'Die Eltesten, the eldest' we encounter the superlative meaning of this suffix.

M. writes that it is not easy to believe that Old Prussian -ais- has its origin in a definite adjective as I have proposed. I realize that there must be limitations of space in such extensive work as an etymological dictionary of Old Prussian, but still it would be interesting to know why it is not easy to accept such a theory when there exist parallel developments in Baltic and other Indo-European languages.

M. finds that prestors (EV 707) 'konigelym, Zaunkönig, wren' has its origin as an onomatopoetic word based on the sound sequence *pr which developed into the verb *persk-, dialect *presk- which gave the substantive *preskaras. At the Colloquium Pruthenicum Secundum in Mogilany in October of 1996 Anatoliy Nepokunyj suggested a connection with the German word Prierster 'priest'. I think that Nepokunyj's etymology is excellent.

M. corrects praplos (EV 747) 'wedehoppe, hoopoe' to *paraplos and suggests a proto-form *parpalas which would correspond with Lith. parpalas 'a kind of bird' (p. 344). The Old Prussian word, the Lithuanian word and Latv. parpala 'grumbler' are all independent creations on the basis of an onomatopoetic verbal root *parp-, cf. Lith. parpiti 'to snore; to purr'. This is an excellent etymology in my view, but it does depend upon the assumption (in my opinion justified) that there was a mistake in the orthographic representation, an assumption which M. seems reluctant to make for other words.

M. reconstructs locuisis 'bresme, bream' (p. 78, 90; EV 562) as *lokuisis and connects it with an Old Prussian root *lok- 'to shine' which is connected with the rich Indo-European root *le(o)uk-, cf. Old Indic ruci- 'light', Slav. luč 'ray'. The basic meaning of the word would be then 'the (fish) that shines, sparkles'. I think that M.'s etymology is quite good, but it seems to conflict with the principle enunciated with regard to likuisis that a syllable ending in a single (orthographic) consonant should always be long. M. rejects Toporov's (1990, 340) etymology which in M.'s view would seem to presuppose *läkut-, since the Balto-Slavic verb *łak- 'lakti, to lap up' is not represented by *łak- in any Baltic or Slavic dialect. I have checked Toporov (1990, 340–346) and have been unable to locate a reconstruction *łak-, although I was able to find *łak- for which Toporov suggests an onomatopoetic origin.

Thus it seems to me M. frequently presents etymologies which I find quite plausible, but that frequently in these etymologies he appears to disregard his own stated strict principles for the interpretation of Old Prussian orthography.

In conclusion, I would say that, similarly to all M.'s other publications, these two volumes present another tremendous achievement and impressive contribution to Old Prussian and Baltic studies in general. M. is to be congratulated on continuing with indispensable work in Old Prussian and Baltic etymology. M.'s etymological dictionary of Old Prussian is and will be for a long time to come an essential tool for specialists in Baltic and Indo-European linguistics and, as I wrote before, its erudite author is to be congratulated for such a fine work.
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William R. Schmalstieg

Terje Mathiassen, A short grammar of

1997 m. pasirodė žinomo slavisto ir baltisto,
Oslo universiteto profesoriaus Terje Mathiassse
no knyga A short grammar of Latvian. Turint gal
voje, kad 1996 m. buvo išleista jo A short gram
mar of Lithuanian (Slavica), latvių kalbos
gramatikos pasirodymas yra neeilinis įvyskis bal
tistikoj. Kaip rašoma pratarmėje, ši knyga pir
niausia yra synchroninė, nors vietomis nevengia
ma diachroninių pastabų ar intarpų, kurie skai
tytojui geriau padeda suvoks tik dėstomajį dalyką.
Antra, ši gramatika nėra deskriptyvinė, o preskri
ptyvinė, arba norminamoji. Didelis autoriuos lai
mėjimas yra tas, kad jis, remdamasis šiuolaikinė
calbytros istorija, labai glaustai ir suprantamai
paiškina gana gausią ir sudėtingą latvių kalbos
calbos gramatikos medžiąją, mokomai išsiga iš
latvių kalbos morfologijos ir sintakšės subtilybės.

Trumpame įvade (p. 19–21) autorius glaustai
aptaria latvių ir kitų baltų, taip pat slavų kalbų
santykį, ryšius su germanų ir finų-ugų kalbo
mis, trumpai primena Latvijos ir latvių kalbos is
torijos faktus, pamini latvių kalbos tarmes, paišk
kina latvių bendrinės kalbos raidos ypatumus.

Glaustai parašytame fonologijos skyriuje ap
rašoma priešais ažasių ir balsių sistema, paiškina
į jų tarimas ir kaita, latvių kalbos kirčiavimo ypa
tybės. Labai glaubi, bet informatyvūs yra vardaž
džių ir įvardžių skrytai. Juose kvalifikuo
taptai ar
taromas vardaždžių gramatinius kategorijos,
linktiavimas ir daryba, būdvardžių laipsniavimas,
būdvardžių daiktvardėjimas. Aptardamas link
problema T. Mathiassen savo gramatikoje laikosi
Fennello, Lötzsche ir kitų kalbininkų nuomonės,
kad dabartinė latvių kalba neturi instrumentalio,
t. y. kad latvių kalbos linktiavimo paradigmas su
daro šeši (įskaitant vokativų) linktai (p. 41). Dėl
to pakeistas ir prielinksnio ar valdymas: teigiamą,
kad kalbamojo prielinksnio konstrukciją sudaro
ar+ vienaskaitos akuzatyvas (p. 185), pvz.: mirt ar
vėži; runat ar kolėj; rastis ar zimut; braukt ar vil
cienu (p. 189). Ketinimu prielinksnį ar priskirti prie
akuzatyvą valdančių prielinksnų jau būta ir anks
ciau. Pavyzdžiui, 1959 latvių kalbos akademinė
gematikoje patogumo dėlei kalbamosis prielink
nis aptariamas kartu su akuzatyvą valdančiais prie
inksniais. Dėl instrumentalio egzistavimo latvių
calbos vardaždžių ir įvardžių linktiavimo para
digmos abejonių yra kėbles dar 1973 m. rusų
calbininkas Žaliznijakas.

---
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