

WOLFGANG HOCK *et al.* *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3 vols.  
Hamburg: Baar, 2015, 1643 pp.  
ISBN 978-3-935536-74-5

Reviewed by RICK DERKSEN, Leiden.

The origins of the project titled *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (ALEW) date back to 2003. From 2007 to 2013 it was financially supported by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. Commendably, intermediate results were from time to time made available on the website of the project (<https://www2.hu-berlin.de/indogermanistik/alew.php>), which was based at the Humboldt University of Berlin. The supervisor of the ALEW was Wolfgang Hock, whose collaborators were Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė, Rainer Fecht, Anna Helene Feulner, Eugen Hill, Christiane Schiller, and Dagmar S. Wodtko.

The first two volumes of the ALEW contain the dictionary *stricto sensu*, preceded by a short introduction, while in the third, smaller volume we find abbreviations, references, and indices. The text of the main part of the dictionary is printed in two columns. The lemmas, in boldface, are provided with grammatical and semantic information, for which the ALEW basically relies on the *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (LKŽ). This is followed by the earliest attestation of the lemma in Old Lithuanian including its context, and, if available, the corresponding text in Latin, Polish, German, or yet another language. In addition, we often find quotations from other sources, in particular from Daukša's works, which contain accent marks. The same format applies to sublemmas, i.e. derivatives that have not been incorporated as a separate lemma (with respect to lemmatization, ablaut is a guiding principle: a different ablaut grade requires a separate lemma). Sublemmas are separated from one another by a semi-colon. Next, we find Latvian, Old Prussian, and Slavic cognates and, if possible, a Proto-Indo-European reconstruction, followed by more cognates. Of course, this only holds true for inherited etyma. The discussion of the etymology is printed in a smaller font. This section is concluded with references to selected scholarly literature and lemmas that derive from the same root.

The ALEW is one of three Lithuanian or Baltic etymological dictionaries published in the last decade. In 2007, Smoczyński's *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* appeared (supplements were published in 2008 and 2009). An English edition of this work is in preparation. The present au-

thor's *Etymological Dictionary of the Inherited Baltic Lexicon* (Derksen 2015) was published in the same year as the ALEW and could not be taken into account in the latter dictionary (ALEW 1, 13). This is compensated, so to speak, by the numerous references to the Slavic counterpart of the aforementioned dictionary (Derksen 2008), which has a sizable Baltic component. All in all, Baltic etymological studies seem to have entered a perhaps unexpected period of prosperity. This is a gratifying development, considering that Fraenkel's *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1962–1965) is in many respects outdated, which is not to suggest that the publication of Fraenkel's dictionary marked the beginning of an only recently concluded unproductive era. Here the Old Prussian etymological dictionaries by Toporov (1975–1990) and Mažiulis (1988–1997) come to mind.

Unlike the etymological dictionaries mentioned above, the scope of the ALEW is restricted to a particular time span, as it exclusively contains lemmas that are attested in Old Lithuanian, i.e. from the beginnings of the written tradition to 1700. In practice, the dictionary covers an impressive number of major and minor manuscripts and printed texts dating from the 16th and 17th centuries, which are listed in volume three (pp. 1345–1368). An inspection of the list makes one realize how much progress the digitization of Old Lithuanian texts has made. It is a wonderful feature of the ALEW that these tools have been employed to present the oldest attestations of the etyma within their context and, where possible, accompanied by the same text fragment in the original language. One should keep in mind, however, that in order to keep down the size of the dictionary it was not just onomastic material that was left out: we are dealing with etyma that were primarily selected because they were deemed interesting from a linguistic perspective, i.e. in view of their significance for comparative linguistics or our understanding of the Old Lithuanian period (ALEW 1, 7).

Another characteristic of the ALEW is the fact that, though its primary focus is on the inherited lexicon, it includes a significant number of comparatively recent borrowings, e.g. *abydà* 'insult, injustice' (ORu. *obida*), *ābroz(d)as* / *abrōz(d)as* 'icon, idol' (ORu. *obrazъ*, OPl. *obraz*), *bromà* 'gate' (OPl. *brama*), *cūdzalažyti* 'commit adultery' (OPl. *cudzołożyc*), *čystas* 'clean, pure' (ORu. *čisty*, OPl. *czysty*), *nendza* 'need, misery' (OPl. *nędza*), *seredà* / *seradà* 'Wednesday' (ORu. *sereda*, Byel. *seradà*), *stūndas* 'hour' (MoHG *Stunde*). To me it makes perfect sense to include these forms. The reader obtains a more complete view of the Old Lithuanian lexicon and is pro-

vided with information about foreign influences on the Lithuanian written language. Had these borrowings been omitted, the absence of inherited etyma that have not been recorded in Old Lithuanian, e.g. *káina* ‘price’, *irštvà* ‘bear’s den’ or *pūrai* ‘winter corn’, would have made itself felt.

As to the underlying theoretical framework, I am inclined to say that the ALEW is mainstream. In the etymological discussions it usually adopts a neutral stance. The long acute vowel of *bégti* ‘run’ (ALEW 1, 104), for instance, is said to originate either from a Narten-present or from Winter’s law, which in Balto-Slavic generated acute long vowels and diphthongs before a Proto-Indo-European unaspirated voiced stop. The same possibilities are mentioned in connection with *ésti* ‘eat’ (ALEW 1, 270). On the whole, the ALEW seems favourably disposed towards Winter’s law, cf. the lemmas *dúoti* ‘give’, 3pres. *dúoda* < *\*dodh<sub>3</sub>-* (1, 248), *núogas* ‘nude’ < *\*nog<sup>w</sup>-* (2, 716), *pėdà* ‘foot, footstep’ < *\*ped-* (2, 749, where the reconstruction of a lengthened grade is explicitly rejected), *rúgti* ‘grow sour, ferment’ < *\*h<sub>1</sub>rug-* (2, 878), *sėdėti* ‘sit’ < *\*sed-* (2, 896), *stėngti* ‘resist’ < *\*steng<sup>w</sup>-* (2, 975), *širdis* ‘heart’ < *\*k<sub>1</sub>rd-* (2, 1034), *úosti* ‘smell’ < *\*h<sub>3</sub>ed-* (2, 1154), and several others. In some cases the expected reference to Winter’s law is absent, e.g. *ražýtis* ‘stretch oneself’ < *\*h<sub>3</sub>rog-* (2, 853), *smirdėti* ‘stink’ < *\*sm<sub>1</sub>rd-* (2, 948–949). The discussion under *pãdas* ‘sole’ (2, 726), where the root vowel is historically short, refers to Matasović’s hypothesis that Winter’s law only applied to closed syllables, but there are no indications that this is the view preferred by the ALEW, which does not fail to mention the solution that I consider to be correct, viz. that *pãdas* is a compound containing PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-* ‘put’ (thus already Winter 1979).

With respect to the accentuation of *púodas* ‘pot’ (2, 827), another possible instance of Winter’s law, the ALEW points out that there is a discrepancy between the fixed stress of the Lithuanian noun and the broken tone of Latvian, which is said to reflect earlier final stress. The correspondence is regular, however, if we assume that we are dealing with an originally neuter *o*-stem, cf. OIc. *fat* n., OHG *faz* n. ‘vat’. As far as I know, the generalization of the Latvian broken tone in originally barytone neuter *o*-stems was first demonstrated by Illič-Svityč (1963, 82). In my view, the generalization of the broken tone was preceded by a retraction of the stress from word-final *\*-â*, which generated metatony (Derksen 1995, 166; 1996,

<sup>1</sup> Lith. *pūrai* and its Latvian cognates are mentioned s.v. *kvietyš* ‘wheat’ (1, 546), but there is no etymological discussion of these forms.

231–232). Original fixed stress is often supported by the Slavic evidence, e.g. *kréslas* 1/3 (ALEW 1, 523–524), Latv. *krēšls*, OPr. *creslan* vs. Ru. *kréslo* ‘(arm-)chair’, Lith. *lūnkas* 1 (not in the ALEW), Latv. *lūks*, OPr. *lunkan* vs. Ru. *lyko*, SCr. *līko* ‘bast’. Illič-Svityč (*loc. cit.*) also draws attention to Baltic loanwords in Finnic that seem to indicate an old neuter, e.g. Lith. *káušas* 1 ‘ladle, cup’ (ALEW 1, 469–470), Latv. *kaūss* ‘skull, cup’, Fi. *kauha* ‘ladle, scoop’. The case of *púodas* is atypical in the sense that in principle the type under discussion consists of neuter *o*-stems that became barytone as a result of the Late Balto-Slavic retraction that is usually referred to as Hirt’s law, the old barytone neuter *o*-stems having become masculine already. The noun may have entered Baltic at a later stage, however.

In the case of *áušti* ‘cool off’ (*áušta*, *áušo*), which is cognate with Latv. *aūksts* ‘cold’, the ALEW (1, 76) advocates a reconstruction *\*h<sub>3</sub>euǵ-*, cf. OIr. *úar* ‘cold, cool’, Arm. *oyc* ‘cold’, adding that the acute is due to Winter’s law. This etymology requires the assumption that *š* arose from *\*ž* in the infinitive and the *sta*-present and was subsequently generalized. Smoczyński (2007, 36) states that *áušti* has no etymology. He suggests *\*h<sub>2</sub>ous-éǵe-*, cf. Lat. *haurire* ‘draw, scoop up’, in which case the metatonic acute may be traced to the *sta*-present. It is indeed correct that the *sta*-present is a source of *métatonie rude*, as demonstrated by the pair *mīrti* ‘die’ : *mīršta*, but here root structure comes into play. I would not expect to find a secondary acute if the root has full grade, cf. *aūšti* (*aūšta*), Latv. *àust* (*àust*) ‘dawn’, which may derive from the noun *aušrà* 4, Latv. *àustra* ‘dawn’ (Derksen 2011, 34–35). In fact, this is one of the categories where in Lithuanian (but not in Latvian) *métatonie douce* has become productive (o.c., 32–37), e.g. *kařšti* (*kařšta*) ‘become hot’ : *kárštas* ‘hot’, often occurring alongside the original tone. Thus, the accentological evidence is in favour of an acute root. The origin of the Lithuanian *métatonie douce* in verbs with a *sta*-present lies in the circumstance that Winter’s law did not operate before *\*s*, as was argued by Dybo (2002, 496–497, cf. Derksen 1996, 167). Considering the importance of Winter’s law for Baltic etymology, it is worth noting that Dybo (2002), which is a fairly comprehensive study, appears to be absent from the ALEW’s bibliography.

A case in which I have made a different choice (cf. Derksen 2015, 489, 490) is *vařgas* ‘hardship, misery’, which the ALEW (2, 1189–1191) derives from *\*uerg<sup>h</sup>*. In my view, the acute of Latv. *vēřgs* ‘slave’ (not *vēřgs*, unless the ambiguous *vēřgs<sup>2</sup>* was intended) is much less likely to be secondary than the circumflex of *vařgas*, which may belong to the type of *aūkštas*

‘floor’ vs. *áukštas* ‘high’ (see Būga 1959, 670). The original acute is also found in Latv. *vārgs* ‘pining, miserable’ and Lith. *vārginimas gyvėnimas* (Kvėdarna) ‘a life in poverty’. Here the ALEW’s reference to the *sta*-present as a source of *métatonie rude* is misleading, for the same reasons that were mentioned in connection with *áušti*. The acute of Latv. *vārgt* (1sg. *vārgstu*) reflects the acute of the adjective *vārgs*, while Lith. *vařgti* (*vařgsta*) ‘live in poverty, suffer hardships’ is based on *vargùs* 4 ‘hard, difficult’. I would prefer to reconstruct the root as *\*(H)uerg-*, where the acute is generated by Winter’s law.

Apart from Winter’s law, I see no obvious candidates for a thematic discussion of the etymologies presented in the ALEW. I shall continue by having a closer look at a number of etyma that for one reason or another drew my attention. One such etymon is *drignas* (also *drignis*, *drignys*, *drignius*) ‘lunar corona’. Referring to the well-known development *gn* < *bn*, the ALEW (1, 228) connects this noun with *dribti* ‘drip’. I have posited the same development to link *drignė* ‘henbane’, Latv. *drigene* (< *\*drignene*) ‘henbane, thorn apple’ to Latv. *dirbināt* ‘quiver, shiver’ and Lith. *drebėti*, Latv. *drebēt* ‘quiver, tremble’, cf. Lith. *dribinis* ‘henbane’ (Derksen 2015, 140). The zero grade *drib-* must have arisen from the regular *dirb-* under the influence of the full grade. Semantically, this etymology corresponds with the one advocated by Petersson (1922, 57f., cf. Fraenkel 1962–1965, 258), which involves the formally problematic connection with *drugys* ‘fever’, Ru. *drógnut* ‘tremble’. The toxic properties of henbane may cause a delirium. The ALEW (1, 229) tries to connect *drignė* ‘henbane’ with *drignas* ‘lunar corona’ by drawing attention to the visual effects of pupil dilation caused by ingesting henbane.

Under *\*jēgti*—the simple verb is not attested in Old Lithuanian—the ALEW (1, 413) reconstructs *\*Hjéh<sub>1</sub>g<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>-* as the proto-form of *jėgà* 4 ‘strength’, Latv. *jėga* ‘strength, sense’, Gk. ἦβη ‘youth, prime, vigour of youth, sexual maturity’. It is argued that *pace* Derksen (1996, 136f.)<sup>2</sup> Aeol. ἄβα does not refute the traditional etymology, as this form could be a hyperaeolism, cf. Dor. ἦβα. I did not intend to go quite as far as that, however.<sup>3</sup> My opinion was that in view of the existence of Aeolic and Doric forms with ἄ- (I also mentioned a form from *The Bath of Pallas* by Callimachus) the traditional etymology should be regarded with scepti-

<sup>2</sup> The reader is actually referred to Derksen 1966, which is obviously a misprint.

<sup>3</sup> Note that I quoted Chantraine’s addition “hyperéolisme?” (Derksen 1996, 137).

cism. In Derksen 2015 (210), I have now included a reference to Beekes (2010, 508), where the remark that there are also Aeolic and Doric forms with ῥ- and εΙ- is intended to mitigate that scepticism. To all appearances, the etymology that connects *jégā* and the Greek forms mentioned above is not buried yet.

The ALEW (1, 170) rejects the connection between *dal̃gis* ‘scythe’ and OIr. *dlongaid* ‘split’, OIc. *telgja* ‘cut, carve’, which may derive from *\*delgʰ-*, because the latter root is incompatible with Lat. *falx*, *-cis* ‘scythe, sickle’. Even if we accept that the Latin *c* is secondary, I fail to see why the connection with *falx* is unassailable. I would say that it is just a matter of preference.

The apparent loss of *\*d-* in *ilgas* ‘long’, cf. Ru. *dólgij*, Skt. *dīrghá-*, is the main topic of the etymological discussion of this adjective (1, 393). The ALEW speculates that *\*d-* was lost in comparative forms containing a full grade with initial *\*dl-*. Subsequently, a positive with zero grade of the root was created. I still find it hard to see why initial *\*d* was preserved in Slavic, which in other respects is in complete agreement with the Baltic evidence. For Balto-Slavic we may reconstruct a barytone proto-form *\*dl̥l̥go-* < *\*dl̥h̥₁gʰó-*, where the root stress must have resulted from Hirt’s law. The latter retraction, by the way, is not mentioned in connection with *ilgas*, but features in the discussions under the lemmas *dúmas* ‘smoke’ (1, 243) and *pītnas* ‘full’ (2, 773).

The noun *prōtas*, Latv. *prāts* ‘mind, intellect’, cf. Go. *froþs* ‘wise’, is regarded as a lexicalized τóμοϛ-formation belonging to the root *\*preh̥₁t-* ‘understand’ (ALEW 2, 821). I agree that the vocalism *o* (rather than *uo*) is not necessarily a problem and I am also willing to concede that *métatonie douce* cannot be excluded here, cf. *dōtas* 2 ‘gift’ from *dúoti* (l.c.). I am uncomfortable with a proto-form *\*próh̥₁t-o-*, however, as both the vocalism and the metatony are much more easily explained if the noun was originally end-stressed. Moreover, it seems somewhat contrived to regard forms such as *iprāsti* ‘get accustomed to’, *nesupratīmas* ‘foolishness’, and Go. *fraþjan* ‘understand’ as back-formations. As far as I am concerned, the traditional reconstruction of the root as *\*pret-* still holds. Unlike the ALEW, I see no reason why the Old Prussian forms with *pret-* should continue *\*prat-* (cf. Stang 1966, 345–346).

The consistent spelling *o* in OPr. *clokis* (E 655) ‘bear’ and *caltestisk-lok*’ (E 656) ‘common bear’ instead of *ā* is not remarkable at all (*pace* ALEW 1, 599). The spelling *o* for [ɔ:] < *\*ā*, cf. *mothe* (E 170) ‘mother’, is

exactly what we would expect to find in the Pomesanian dialect of the Elbing Vocabulary, which differs from the Samlandian dialect in which the catechisms were written. On the *u* of “Narevian” *tukaf* ‘bear’ I have no opinion. I appreciate the fact that the enigmatic Narevian (or Yotvingian) vocabulary has been incorporated, but it hardly lends itself to serious analysis. For one thing, the prayer book that contained the original vocabulary is missing, so we have to make do with a manual copy.

An interesting form is *nùmas* ‘house’ (ALEW 2, 714), which is attested in the Wolfenbüttel Postilla (1573), Bretke’s Bible translation (1590) and Slavočinskis’ Hymns (1695). The dialect material presented by the LKŽ indicates that we are dealing with a Žemaitian form. The ALEW accordingly concludes that we are probably dealing with a Žemaitian variant of *nāmas*, which has full grade. This point of view is implicit in Derksen (2015, 328). The ALEW, on the other hand, not only mentions the alternative hypothesis that *num-* represents an old zero grade (cf. Smoczyński 2007, 429), but also provides examples of *um* < *am* in a similar environment and suggests that *um* originated in unstressed syllables, for instance in the Npl. *namaĩ*, Žem. *numaĩ*, in view of the lengthening of *a* in non-final open syllables. I think that here we should take into account that in Žemaitian the lengthening is more restricted than elsewhere. It is not found, for example, if the final syllable was affected by apocope. I consider it possible that the change *am* > *um* also occurred in stressed syllables, which renders the proposed scenario more convincing.

As an etymological dictionary of the Lithuanian inherited lexicon, the ALEW is a solid and up-to-date companion to the existing literature. It is also a valuable reference work, providing factual information about Old Lithuanian forms and their attestations. In many cases, the factual information easily exceeds the etymological section in size, even if we take the difference in font size into consideration. The attestations in particular are not just informative, but can also be entertaining. I, for one, thoroughly enjoyed sampling them. There can be no doubt that the Old Lithuanian etymological dictionary project has resulted in a major contribution to Baltic and Indo-European Studies.

**Rick Derksen**

*Boerhaavelaan 100, NL-2334 ET Leiden*

*r.h.derksen@gmail.com*

## ABBREVIATIONS

Aeol. — Aeolic, Arm. — Armenian, Byel. — Byelorussian, Dor. — Doric, Fi. — Finnish, Gk. — Greek, Go. — Gothic, Lat. — Latin, Latv. — Latvian, Lith. — Lithuanian, MoHG — Modern High German, OHG — Old High German, OIc. — Old Icelandic, OIr. — Old Irish, OPl. — Old Polish, OPr. — Old Prussian, ORu. — Old Russian, PIE — Proto-Indo-European, Ru. — Russian, SCr. — Serbo-Croatian, Skt. — Sanskrit, Žem. — Žemaitian

## REFERENCES

- BEEKES, ROBERT. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 10). i–ii. Leiden–Boston: Brill.
- BŪGA, KAZIMIERAS. 1959. *Rinkiniai raštai*. ii tomas. Sudarė Z. Zinkevičius. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE. 1968–1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. i–iv. Paris: Klincksieck.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 1995. On the origin of the Latvian tones. *Linguistica Baltica* 4, 163–168.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 1996. *Metatony in Baltic* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 6). Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, 4). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2011. The accentuation of the East Baltic *sta*-present. In: Elena Stadnik-Holzer, ed., *Baltische und slavische Prosodie. International Workshop on Balto-Slavic Accentology iv, Scheibbs, 2.-4. Juli 2008* (Schriften über Sprachen und Texte, 11). Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 31–37.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2015. *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, 13). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR. A. 2002. Balto-Slavic accentology and Winter's law. *Studia Linguarum* 3.2, 295–515.
- FRAENKEL, ERNST. 1962–1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. i–ii. Heidelberg–Göttingen: Winter/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.



- ILLIČ-SVITYČ, VJAČESLAV M. 1963. *Imennaja akcentuacija v baltijskom i slavjanskom. Sud'ba akcentuacionnyx paradigm*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk.
- LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. 1968–2002. i-xx. Vilnius: Mokslas/Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas. [<http://www.lkz.lt>]
- MAŽIULIS, VYTAUTAS. 1988–1997. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*. i–iv. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- PETERSSON, HERBERT. 1922. *Vergleichende slavische Wortstudien*. Lund: Gleerup.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: Uniwersytet Wileński, Wydział Filologiczny.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2008. Uzupełnienia do “Słownika etymologicznego języka litewskiego”. Część I. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 53, 58–151.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2009. Uzupełnienia do “Słownika etymologicznego języka litewskiego”. Część II. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 60, 17–127.
- STANG, CHRISTIAN S. 1966. *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo–Bergen–Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- TOPOROV, VLADIMIR. N. 1975–1990. *Prusskij jazyk*. i-v. Moskva: Nauka.
- WINTER, WERNER. 1979. The distribution of short and long vowels in stems of the type Lith. *ésti* : *vèsti* : *mèsti* and OCS *jasti* : *vesti* : *mesti* in Baltic and Slavic languages. In: Jacek Fisiak, ed., *Recent developments in historical phonology*. The Hague: Mouton, 431–446.