Recenzijos


In the foreword Palionis writes that with the coming of independence interest in the older Lithuanian writings has increased. But many words in these writings are no longer used and have not been included in the 20-volume “Lietuvių kalbos žodynas”. Since, up to the present, there is no complete dictionary containing all these words Palionis has considered it useful to create a work which would be helpful for language and literature teachers and students, and others interested in the older writings.

For the dictionary the author has used his lexical notes from old writings, dictionaries and lexical indexes as well as photo-copied reprints of old writings. The fundamental criterion for including words was their absence in the third edition of the “Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas” (1993). In other words archaisms of word formation and meaning are included (even borrowings) which are not widely used in contemporary Standard Lithuanian. In addition neologisms created by authors of that time and which did not survive into the present are included.

Words are given in the contemporary orthography, declined words in the nominative singular and verbs in the infinitive. If the orthography of the word is greatly different from the contemporary, first the original orthography is given and after that an equal sign, then the contemporary orthography.

Following the head word the part of speech is given in italics, and then in quotes the meaning of the word at that time. If the document is a translation and if the original or a copy was available to the author the corresponding word in the original is given in parentheses. Examples which best illustrate the meaning are then given with the source and then other sources are added.

A sample entry is: algoti v. tr. ‘vadinti’ (nazwač, zwać, nominare) Jus manę algatę Mištrų ir Wiešpatimi... DP 365166; ...bus wadintas/alba algòtas Jejuach... DP 56122; MT 97b21; SE 510; SD I 85 = algoti transitive verb ‘to call’ (nazwač, zwać, nominare) ‘you call me master and lord...’ DP 365166; ‘...will be named / or called Jejuach...’ DP 56122; MT 97b21; SE 510; SD I 85. The abbreviations for the names of the sources are standard, e.g., DP = Mikalojus Daukšos “Požiūriu CATHOLICKA...”, MT = Simono Vašnoro 1600 m. “MARGARITA THEOLOGICA...”; SE = “SUMMA Abá Trumpas įguldimas EWANIELIU SZWENTU...”, etc.

The meanings of the words are established by reference to the Academy Dictionary (“Lietuvių kalbos žodynas”) and Samuel Bogomil Linde’s “Słownik języka polskiego” (1809–1814) with reference also to other manuscript and printed Lithuanian dictionaries, especially those of K. Sirvydas and Fr. Prešorius.

The word abišalystė (p. 17) from Sirvydas’ “Dictionarium TRIVM LINGVARVM” (Vilnius, 1642, 233 [original Abišalifte] is defined here as abipusiškumas ‘mutuality, reciprocity’ and it is said to be a translation of Pol. obojętność ‘indifference’ obostroność. The LKŻ I 10 translates abišalystė as abeijingumas ‘indiffe-
rence'. For the English-speaking reader inclusion of Sirvydas' Latin *indifferentia, in contrarias partes facultas* would have been helpful. Sirvydas also includes *adiophoria* which is apparently a Latinization with accompanying misprint for Gk. ἀδιόφορία 'indifference, absence of difference'.

Mostly, however, the Latin is, indeed, given from Sirvydas' "Dictionarium". Thus under the entry *aðunykas* 'clock' (p. 18) we find (Pol.) Bije zgari (Lat.) Sonat horologium. (Lith.) muša adinkas 'the clock is striking'.

It is interesting for me to see common words with meanings which I did not expect, e.g., *akylas* with the meaning 'clear' rather than the expected 'sharp-eyed'. Note (p. 20) the quotation from Daukšas "Poštilla": ... *ir pa-maškitė kaip tikėjimas yra akinas* '... and see how faith is clear'.

Sometimes the definitions given in this dictionary differ from those in LKŽ even when apparently referring to the same source. Thus in Bretkūnas' "Bible" we encounter (I Samuel 26:19): *Jei tave aidin ponas prieš mane, tada teaseravo strvos afierą* 'If the Lord have stirred thee up against me, let him accept an offering' (King James "Bible"). The verb *aidinti* is defined as *erzinti* 'to annoy' by Palionis (p. 20), but (in this context) as *kurstytı, kelti* 'to incite, to raise' by LKŽ I 34. The verb *alčytı* is defined by LKŽ I 93 as l. *įkyriai ko prašyti* 'to beg for something in an annoying way', 2. *dereti* 'to bargain', but by Palionis (p. 22) as *burti, kereti* 'to bewitch, to charm'. The example cited by Palionis from the "Lexicon Lithuanicum": *zyne ał[c]zyna bižmogu* 'the witch bewitched this man' certainly justifies his old Lithuanian definition. The German counterpart of the preceding Lithuanian sentence is: *Hexe hat dieser Mensch behexet* (It seems to me, however, that an article or demonstrative pronoun should precede *Hexe* and that the nominative *dieser* is a mistake for the accusative *diesen*. I don't know whether this mistake is in the "Lexicon Lithuanicum" or whether it is just a misprint here.).

The word *avynienę* is defined as *teta* 'aunt' by Palionis (p. 50), who has it from the "Clavis Germanico-Lithvana" III 91, where it corresponds to German *Muhm*. The LKŽ I 528 defines *avynienę*, however, as *avynon pata* 'uncle's wife', a somewhat narrower definition than that of *teta* which, like English *aunt*, could be either the 'uncle's wife' (like *avynienę*) or the father or mother's sister. N. pokupnyj (2002, 39-40) quotes Grimms "Deutsches Wörterbuch" (VI 2645) to the effect that *muhme* originally denoted only the sister of the mother, but at least by the time of late Middle High German meant also the sister of the father, cousin or niece and also any female relative on the mother's side.

Sometimes the ingenuity of the early Lithuanian authors in creating neologisms is quite impressive. I was struck by the Lithuanian translation of German *Nachforschern* which Palionis modernizes (p. 86) to *tadosižinodinėti* (Clavis Germanico-Lithvana III 108) and Ergründen which Palionis modernizes (p. 148) to *tadosižinodinėti* (Clavis Germanico-Lithvana I 592), which would translate literally to something like 'to cause to get to know for oneself'. An attempt at preliminary morphemic cuts gives us at least *įs-da-si-žino-dinę-ti*, an impressive seven morphemes (three prefixes, one root and three suffixes). Another charming word is *akmuo geležiatraukis* 'magnet' which, of course, literally 'a stone attracting iron'.

The LKŽ II 210, gives two meanings for *daginėti*, viz. 'to burn somewhat' (cf. *deghti* 'to burn') and 'to gather thistles' (cf. *dągos* 'thistle'). Palionis (p. 83) offers the meaning 'to finish' for *daginėti* giving the following quotation from Jokūbas Morkūnas' "Poštilla LIE-TVWISZKA":... *o kada iau daginėti tą biedną pelgrinawoimą jąvo / tikrai išwipi Poną jąvo* 'and when you finish this poor pilgrimage of yours, you will surely see your Lord'. The LKŽ II 318, gives a form *dagynėti* with the meaning 'to finish'. In various other words Palionis has not hesitated to correct for vocalic length by writing contemporary -y- for earlier -i-, cf., e.g., *abišalytę* for *Abifaliflüte* mentioned above. Perhaps *daginėti* in Morkūnas' "Poštilla" also presupposes an original infinitive *dagynėti* rather than *daginėti*. The noun *pelgrinawoimą* mentioned in this quotation appears neither in this dictionary nor
in the LKŻ, although the meaning is obvious from the verb pelgrīnauti ‘to make a pilgrim-age’ recorded here on p. 332.

The head word lozorius is defined as ‘invalid’ and the example is given from Bretkūnas’ “Požilla”: Giwenimas Lasarauš schema Swiete which would seem to mean ‘the life of an invalid in this world’. Still the context given in the quotation here isn’t really sufficient to show whether this really denotes ‘invalid’ or ‘Lazarus’ (the archetypal invalid described in Luke 16:20 ff.).

I have not been able to locate some words in any other Lithuanian dictionary at my disposal, e.g., likta ‘last hour, end of the life’ (p. 224) which is encountered in Vaišnoras’ Malda, ieškotiškintai numirtumbei ‘Prayer so that you should die in a state of grace’. The example cited is: Ne dūk mane Liktai umai ir nekenti-tnai ant manes užpult = Lass mich nicht plötzlich und unverwehren mit meinem letzten Stürze uberfallen werden ‘Do not let me be overtaken by my last hour suddenly and unexpectedly’. Perhaps the meaning of likta could have been determined by context without the German original, but that is not certain.

I noticed the misprint posterior for posterior (p. 314), but I don’t know whether this was in Sirvydas’ original dictionary or whether it was just a common mistake in East European Renaissance Latin.

I didn’t count the words, but I estimate that there must be between 8,000 and 10,000 words in this dictionary.

In conclusion, Palionis is to be thanked for creating an extremely useful and interesting dictionary, one from which I and many others interested in the history of the Lithuanian language will gain vast benefit as we have all benefited from his many other books and articles over the years of his extremely productive and fruitful academic life.
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2002 m. pasirodē stambi Latvijos universiteto Latvijā kalbos instituto mokslininku paredzēta monografija „Latviešu literārās valodas morfologiskās sistēmas attīstība”, apimanti kaitomācības kalbas dalīs. Monografijā sudaro Pratarmē, Īvadas (autorē – Aina Blinkena), penki dālīs: Daiktavādīs (Lietvārs, autore – Gunta Smiltniece), Būdvardīs (Īpašības vārd, autore – Aina Blinkena), Skaitvārdīs (Skaitļa vārds, autore – Silvija Mieze), Īvāris (Viciņevārds, autore – Dzidra Barbare), Veiksmažodis (Darbības vārds, autore – Ruta Vecidemane), didelis (nēt 21 puslapio) literatūros sārāsās, šaltini un sūtrumāmā sārāsās. Tai latvijā literatūrinās (rašomosīos) kalbos istorijā skirstas darbas, kuris parašotas iš esmes aprašo muju metodu. Įvaide atsiribojama nuo istorinės gramatikos ir teigiamai, kad „Literārās valodas vēsture aplūko tas valodas parādības, kas pieejamas analizei un vērtēšanai pēc noteiktiem kronoloģiski datētiem avotiem. Šim nolūkam visnoderīgākais ir tieši rakstos fiksētās mūsu valodas materiāls, kas saglabājies kopš 16. gs. beigām un tās līdz pat mūsu dienām” (p. 4). Visos dālīs, kaip mīnēta, parašotos aprašo muju metodu. Monografijā autorēs uzsuklāj iekšu kaitomuju kalbos dalīju fleksīnes formas nuo XVI a. pabaigos iki šiu dien. aptaria gramatinfīs minties rašām, ierēzēja turītās žodīju dārbo tēmēs priekone. „Šai monografijā morfologiskās struktūras un sistēmas ietvaros dalīji aplūkota arī vērdas rūši, kas ir cieši saistīta ar vārdformu liejojumu un to izpratni un nereti mijas un saska- rnes vienā vārdšķirās kategoriju apcērē” (p. 6).

Supranta, kad kiekviena kalba kinta pagal savu vidinēs raides dēsnius, tačiau jos rai- dė gali veikti ir išorinai (ekstrelingvistini) veiksniai, rašomai kalba dar ir norminama. Kalbos būsena yra nuolatinis jos kitimasis visuose posistemiiuse, tik ne visuose posistemiiuse jis vyksta vienu metu ir vienodu būdu ar laipsniu. Kalbos pakitimai plačiaja prasme yra substitucijų procesai – vieno elemento pakeitimas kitu. Vykstant kalbos pakitimams vienas jos elementas panaikina kito elemento vienalaikį