

boar”, Serbo-Croatian *vèpar*, gen. *vèpra* “wild boar”, while Slovenian *vêpar* id. is adapted from other Slavic languages;

West: Slovak *vepor*, *veper* “pig, wild pig”, Czech *vepř* “male swine”, Upper Sorbian *wjapř* (Schuster-Šewc 3, 1606: *Wörterbuchwort*, borrowed from some Low Sorbian dialect), Lower Sorbian (*w*)*japś* “junger Eber; verschnittenes männliches Mastschwein”, Polabian *vipěr* “pig, boar, castrated boar”, Slovincian *vjèpř*, Kašubian *v’epř*, Old Polish *wieprz* “wild boar”, Polish *wieprz* “castrated boar”, dial. “he-pig, boar (both castrated and uncastrated)”;

East: Belorussian *vepér*, Ukrainian *véper*, Old Russian *veprǔ*, frequently *dikii veprǔ*, Russian *vepr* “wild boar”, gen. *véprja* (Boryś 2005, 694; Derksen 2008, 515; Połański 1993, 988; Sadnik, Aitzetmüller 1955, 150, 328; Snoj 2003, 813; Trubačev 1960, 66; ZVSZ, 398; Orel 2007, 183); Russian > Finnish *viepra* “wild boar” (SKES 6, 1724).

2. The following brief survey of existing etymologies is not exhaustive; its purpose is to analyze them from the point of historical phonology, morphology and semantic typology, and so to find inspiration to a new etymological solution:

2.1. Berneker (1898, 284) reconstructed the primary semantics **“der Befruchter”*, comparing it with Vedic *vápati* “strews, bestrews, scatters (esp. seed), sows” [RV], also “throws, procreates, begets; heaps up, dams up” [AV]. This verb has an Iranian counterpart in Old Avestan *vīuuāpaṭ* “stretit auseinander, plündert, verheert”. There is also the nominal *r*-derivative in Indo-Iranian: Sanskrit *vapra-* m. “mound, hillock, river-bank, rampart, earthwork, mud wall; sown field” [MBh], “dust” [lex.], *vaprā-* f. “flat bank of earth, garden-bed; place for the fire”, *vaprī-* f. “hillock, ant-hill”; Young Avestan *vafra-* m. “snow”, Middle Persian *wafr*, Persian *barf*, Khotanese *borā-* id. (EWAI 2, 504), but all these forms, although so similar to Balto-Slavic, are too far in their semantics. The meaning “procreator, progenitor, father” [Dharmaśarmābhūdaya]; “sower” [Manu, MBh] bears the nomen agentis *vaptr-*.

2.2. Brandt (1891, 213) and Zubatý (1894, 414) etymologized the Balto-Slavic isogloss “boar” on the basis of Latin *vepris*, pl. *veprēs* “thorn-, brier, bramble-bush” as **“bristled”*. As a semantic parallel Zubatý quoted Slavic *(š)*četv*, *(š)*četina* “needle-leave; bristle” vs. Latvian *šķetra*, *šķetrs* “*Salix pentandra*”. The designation of “wild boar” motivated by “bristles” can

be illustrated on Lithuanian *šeřnas*, *řernùkas* “wild boar” vs. *řerys* “bristle”. But it is necessary also to admit an opposite development, from “boar” to “bush”, i.e. “boar’s [bush]”, cf. Greek $\acute{\upsilon}\acute{\omicron}\text{-}\sigma\epsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ “kind of endive”, lit. “swine’s chicory”, Old High German *ebur-wurz* “thistle”, lit. “boar’s root”, or Czech *sovinízal* “chicory / Hyoseris”, lit. “sow’s plant”, Polish *wieprzki* & *wieprzyny*, Ukrainian *veprýna* “Ribes”, called so according to little bristles, etc. In this case Latin *vepris* would mean *‘‘boar’s [bush]’’ and so confirm the initial * μ -.

2.2.1. řmieszek (1909, 404) offered a variant of this etymology based on Latin *vepris* “thorn-bush”, proposing a primary meaning “that with a penetrating penis”. This idea is still more problematic in semantic perspective.

2.3. Already Palander (1899, 152) and Pedersen (1905, 311) connected this Balto-Slavic isogloss with Italic and Germanic designations of “wild boar”. It was accepted in the standard handbooks of IE etymology, e.g. Buck 1949, 162–63, §§3.32.1., 3.33.; Pokorny 1959, 323; EIEC, 425, usually with a notice about the enigmatic Balto-Slavic initial * μ -:

2.3.1. Italic **apro-* & **aprōno-*: Latin *aper* “wild boar” < **apros*, *aprugnus* “of the wild boar” (from Plautus), perhaps comparable with *caprigenus* “caprine”, Umbrian acc. sg. **abrunu** “boar (for sacrifice)” < **aprōnom*, acc. pl. **abruf**, *abrof*, *abrons* (corr. +*abronf*) < **aprons* (Nussbaum 1973, 356f) or < **aprōnons* (Meiser 1986, 117–18, 283; Untermann 2000, 44–45; de Vaan 2008, 46). The *n*-extensions also appear in Latin, namely in the cognomen *Aprō* and gentile name *Aprōnius*, both attested in inscriptions. With regard to the initial vowel **e-* in Germanic and the same **e* as the root vowel in Slavic, the initial **a-* in Italic seems rather enigmatic. Schrijver (1991, 29–30, 421–22, 487) explains **a-* from vocalization of the initial laryngeal before the cluster stop + consonant, concretely from ***H₁pros*. But he also admits the traditional explanation, namely the influence of *caper*, Umbrian acc. sg. **kaprum**. The form with the initial **e-* can be preserved in the Latin personal name *Eprius* (Pokorny 1959, 323) < **epriōs*, i.e. “belonging to **epros*” or “like **epros*”.

2.3.2. Germanic **eburaz*: Old High German *ebur* “boar”, plus compounds as *ebur-wurz* “Distelart”, *ebur-zand* “Eberzahn”, Middle High German *eber*, German *Eber* “boar”, Old Saxon *evur*, later *euer*, cf. *evurspiot* “Eberspiess”,

Middle Low German *ēver*, Middle & Modern Dutch *ever*, Old English *eofor*, *iofur*, Middle English *ēver* “boar”. Related is also Old Norse *jöfurr* “prince, leader”, Swedish Runic *iufur*, *iafur*, *iofur* id., besides numerous personal names of the type Old Norse *Jöfurr*, *Jórufr*, *Jöfurfastr*, *Jöfursteinn*, Old Swedish *Iuvur*, *Iughur*, *Iurulf*, Old English *Eoforwulf*, Franconian *Eberulfus*, *Ebregisilus*, Old High German *Ebarolf*, *Eburhard*, *Eburwîn*, Gothic *Euerwulfus*, *Everdingus*, *Everhardus*, *Evermud* (EWA 2, 941–43; Kluge, Seebold 1999, 203; Palander 1899, 152–53; Schönfeld 1911, 84; de Vries 1962, 294). If the starting point was **(H₁)epros*, the Germanic continuant would be **ebraz*. In reality there is the segment **-ur-* indicating **-r-*. The starting point preceding Germanic **eburaz* should be **(H₁)ep_r°*. Schrijver (1991, 30, 421) speaks directly about the *r*-stem.

2.3.3. Fick (1909, 85) added the gloss recorded by Hesychius: ἔβρος . τράγος βάτης · καὶ ποταμὸς, speculating about rather an Thracian origin. Blumenthal (1931, 174) preferred rather an Illyrian origin, explaining this gloss as a representative of the ‘Hylleish’ stratum in Hesychius’ lexicon, which belonged to Illyrian according to him. He separated the animal name from a homonymous name of the Thracian river *Ebros*. The zoonym should rather be explained from IE ***H₃ie^h-* “futuere” (LIV, 309) according to him. Independently of the determination of the concrete relic language and accepting the connection of this gloss with our etymon, it is possible to conclude the semantic difference is acceptable, cf. Greek *κάπρος* “(wild) boar” vs. Latin *caper* “he-goat”, Old Norse *hafr* id.

2.3.4. Meillet (1925, 9) thought that Aeolic ἔπεροι “ram” is also related. But this word is generally connected with Greek εἶρος n. “wool” < **φέροφος*, cf. Mycenaean WE-WE-E-A /*werwe(h)e(h)a/* n. pl. ntr. “of wool” (Bartoněk 2003, 267, 616), see Frisk 1, 468; Chantraine 1968–80, 324–25.

2.3.5. Ernout & Meillet (EM, 56) also added Greek *κάπρος* “boar”, explaining the initial velar as *une particule préposé*. Perhaps a better explanation could be a *sandhi* resegmentation **sūka+[e]pros* “swine-boar” > **sū+kapros*. The first component is reconstructible on the basis of Laconian *σίκα*, further Middle Persian *xūk* “swine, boar”; Welsh *hwch* “swine”; Old Saxon *suga* “sow” etc. (see Pokorny 1959, 1039). But the traditional comparison of *κάπρος* “(wild) boar” with Latin *caper* “he-goat”, Old Norse *hafr* id. seems much more probable.

3. If the etymology 2.3. is correct, and the present author favors this solution, it is necessary to explain the difference between Balto-Slavic * \underline{u} - and the vocalic anlaut in Italic, Germanic, and maybe other branches.

3.1. Pedersen (1905, 311) saw in Latvian *vepris* a Slavic loan and explained the Slavic initial * \underline{v} - as a prothesis. This solution would be easiest, but it is a question, if the examples quoted by him are also applicable for this etymon, namely (1) Slavic **vatra* “big fire” vs. *atar-* “fire”, (2) Slavic **vezati* “to bind” : Greek ἄγω “I bind” (cf. LIV, 264–65: ***H₂emġ^h-*), (3) Czech *vejce*, but Old Church Slavic *jajbce* “egg” < **āi-ko-*.

3.2. Kent (1926, 185) tried to explain Balto-Slavic * \underline{u} - from contamination of **epr^o* and **uers^o* “male animal”, attested in Latin *verrēs* “boar”, Lithuanian *veršis* “bull, ox, ox calf”, Latvian *vērsis* “ox”, further Vedic *vṛšan-* “male animal; manly”, *vṛṣaṇa-* etc. (Pokorný 1959, 78–81; de Vaan 2008, 666: ***H₂uers-*). Gottlieb (1931, 10, fn. 4) added that the *i-* or *io-* stem in the Balto-Slavic “boar” could also be a result of this contamination, cf. Baltic **veršis*.

3.3. Gamkrelidze & Ivanov (1984, 515) connect together Balto-Slavic **uepr̥io-*, Germanic **ebura-*, Italic **apro-* “boar” with Greek κάπρος “boar”, Latin *caper* “he-goat”, Umbrian *kaprum* ‘caprum’, Vedic *káprth-* “membrum virile” [RV] (*-th-* perhaps after *prath-* “to spread”?), plus *vápati* “strews, bestrews, scatters (esp. seed), sows” [RV], also “throws, procreates, begets; heaps up, dams up” [AV], Sanskrit *vapra-* “mound, rampart; sown field” [MBh], deriving all from the protoform **q^[h]uep^[h]-* with a hypothetical initial labiopostvelar.

4. Although none of these solutions are satisfactory enough to be acceptable without any doubts, they provide an impetus to seek new ways.

4.1. It is difficult to expect Balto-Slavic **uepr̥io-* as a result of contamination of **uers^o* & **epr^o* proposed by Kent. Perhaps only compounds of the type **ur+epr^o* or **uer+pr^o* could give a result **uepr^o* via dissimilation. But there is another possibility, a compound of the type **uorp(V)+epr^o*, shortened via haplology. The first component is reconstructed on the basis of Latin *verpa* f. “membrum virile” (Catullus), *verpus* m. “circumcized man”, both reflecting **uorpo/ā-* or **urpo/ā-* (WH 2, 761), and Baltic cognates: Lithuanian *vārpa* “ear of corn”, metaphorically “penis”, Latvian *vārpa* “Ähre, Schlegel am Dreschflegel, geflochtene Lederpeitsche; gekochter Schweineschwanz”, *vārpiņa* “penis”, all from the verb of the type Lithuanian *varpyti* “durchlöchern,

stochern, klauben, aushölen”. It has to be the frequentative from *veřpti* “spinnen; stochern, klauben”; further cf. Latvian *vēřpt* “spinnen, hin und her drehen”; Prussian *etwiēřpt* “vergeben”, *pawiēřpt* “verlassen” (Fraenkel 1962–65, 1227). If the meaning “to pierce” was original, there are interesting cognates in Slavic: Church Slavonic *navrapъ* “robbery”, Old Russian *navoropъ* & *voropъ* “robbery, attack”, Russian *vórop* id., besides Polish *nawropić* “to be angry”, Czech *vrápati* “to rail at”, all from the *o*-grade **vorp^o*. The zero-grade of the ablaut is attested e.g. in Serbo-Croatian *vřpoljiti se* “to be in fear”, Old Russian *vъrpu* : *vъrpsiti* “to tear, rob” (Vasmer 1, 354; Machek 1968, 698). Other continuants of the IE verb **uerp-* are discussed in LIV, 690.

If the meaning of the first component was “membrum virile”, the whole syntagm should mean “boar with membrum virile”, perhaps denoting that the boar was not castrated (cf. e.g. Old Irish *muc-cullach* “boar”, lit. “swine with testicles” – see Buck 1949, 162, §3.32.4.). Similarly Slavic **kъn-orzъ* “boar”, lit. “with testicle” (Kretov 1994, 202–03 with detailed discussion).

4.2. It is thinkable to identify in Balto-Slavic **u-* the prefix **au(ē)-* : **u(ē)-* “out, away, off” (Pokorny 1959, 72–73; cf. Blažek 2009, 27–28). The question is, what would be a meaning of this syntagm, maybe “boar of outside”, i.e. “wild boar”, or “boar without testicles”, i.e. “castrated boar”? The second weak point is that this solution is quite solitary, without any analogous case.

4.3. It is also possible to speculate about the compound **sū-* “swine” & **epriō-* “boar (belonging to)” > **s(u)uepriō-*, reanalyzed in **...s(u)* & **uepriō-*. Similar syntagms are known in several IE traditions: Greek *σῦς κάπριος* “boar” [Il. 11.293; 17.282], consisting of *σῦς* “wild swine” and *κάπριος* “(wild) boar; (like a) boar, of boar” (GEL, 743, 1646); in opposite order West Germanic **ebur(a)-swīnaⁿ* n. “wild swine” > Middle High German *eberswîn*, German *Eberschwein*, Middle Low German *ēverswîn*, Middle Dutch *ēverswîn*, Old English *eoforswīn* (EWA 2, 939). The zoonym **sū-* (nom. sg. ***suH-s*, gen. sg. ***suH-os* > **suōs*) or its derivatives are attested in most of IE branches: Vedic *sūkará-* m. “wild boar, wild swine”, cf. Middle Persian proper name *Hukar* < Iranian **hūkara-*; Young Avestan *hū-* “pig”, Middle & Modern Persian *xūg*, Ossetic Iron *x^wy*, Digor *xu* id.; Greek *ῥίς* & *σῦς* “(wild or domesticated) pig, boar”; Albanian *thi* “pig”; Latin *sūs* “pig, boar, sow”, Umbrian acc. sg. **sim**, acc. pl. **sif** id.; Old High German & Old English *sū*

“swine”, Old Norse *sýr* “sow”; Tocharian B *suwo* “pig” (EIEC, 425; EWAI 2, 738; NIL, 683–86).

5. Summing up, the solution 4.3. seems most promising. The attested forms allow us to reconstruct the minimal paradigm, corresponding to the hysterodynamic pattern reconstructed by Beekes (1995, 175): nom. sg. *CéC-ŕ* : gen. sg. **CC-r-ós*:

grammatical form	protoform	continuants	comments
nom. sg.	<i>**H₁epŕ</i>	Germanic <i>*eburaz</i>	leveled in the <i>o</i> -stem
gen.-abl. sg.	<i>**H₁pros</i>	Italic <i>*apros</i>	transformed in nom. sg.
poss. adj. nom. sg.	<i>**H₁epŕios</i>	Latin <i>Eprius</i>	
compound	<i>**suH^o + **H₁epŕio-</i> > <i>*suŕepŕio-</i> > <i>*su</i> & <i>*ŕepŕio-</i>	Balto-Slavic <i>*ŕepŕio-</i>	reanalyzed from the compound “swine” & “boar (belonging to)”

BALTŪ–SLAVŪ **ŕepŕio-* „KUILYS“

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aptariama baltų ir slavų kalbų izoglosos **ŕepŕio-* „kuilys“ etimologija. Pirmybė teikiama dažniausiai taikomam sprendimui lyginti su italikų **apro-* ir germanų **ebura-* „šernas“. Taip mąstant vis dėlto lieka nepaaiškinta sena bl.-sl. **ŕepŕio-* pradinio **ŕ-* kilmės problema. Aptarus ankstesnius bandymus išspręsti šią problemą, formuluojami nauji siūlymai. Iš jų perspektyviausia atrodo mintis apie sudurtinio žodžio reanalizę, t. y. ***suH^o + **H₁epŕio-* „kiaulė“ + „kuilys (priklausantis kuiliui)“ > **suŕepŕio-* > **su* + **ŕepŕio-*.

REFERENCES

AV – *Atharvaveda*.

Bartoněk, Antonín 2003, *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1995, *Comparative Indo-European linguistics. An introduction*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- Berneker, Erich 1898, *Etymologisches* (1. Deutsch 'Eber'), *IF* 8, 283–287.
- Blažek, Václav 2009, Balto-Slavic "smith"? *Baltistica* 44(1), 25–31.
- von Blumenthal, Albrecht 1931, Illyrisches und Makedonisches, *IF* 49, 169–183.
- Boryś, Wiesław 2005, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Brandt, Roman 1891, Dopolnitel'nyja zamečanija k razboru Ètimologičeskago slovarja Miklošiča, *RFV* 25, (Prodolženje) 27–40, (Okončanie) 213–247.
- Buck, Carl D. 1949, *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Būga RR – Kazimieras Būga, *Rinktiniai raštai* 1–3, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla, 1958–61.
- Chantraine, Pierre 1968–80, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Derksen, Rick 2008, *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- EIEC – James P. Mallory, Douglas Q. Adams (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*, London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1997.
- EM – Alfred Ernout, Antoine Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris: Klincksieck, 1932.
- EWA – Albert L. Lloyd et al. (eds.), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* 1–, Göttingen, Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988–.
- EWAI – Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter 1986–2001.
- Fick, August 1909, Ἐβρογ, *KZ* 42, 85–86.
- Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–65, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Göttingen: Vandhoeck & Ruprecht, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Frisk – Hjalmar Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter, 1973.
- Gamkrelidze, Tamas V., Vjačeslav V. Ivanov 1984, *Indoeuropejskij jazyk i indoeuropejcy*, Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo universiteta.
- GEL – Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *A Greek-English lexicon*⁸, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.
- Gerullis, Georg 1922, *Die altpreussischen Ortsnamen*, Berlin, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Gottlieb, Eugene 1931, *A systematic tabulation of Indo-European animal names*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania (= *Language Dissertations published by the Linguistic Society of America* 8).
- Karulis – Konstantins Karulis, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1–2, Rīga: Avots, 1992.
- Kent, Roland G. 1926, On some animal names in Italic, *Language* 2, 184–190.

Kluge, Friedrich, Elmar Seebold 1999, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Kretov, Aleksej A. 1994, Baltijskie i slavjanske prodolženija i.-e. *org^h-. Stat'ja I: lit. išarža i prasl. *kǫnorzǫ, *Linguistica Baltica* 3, 197–206.

Lex. – lexicologists.

LIV – Helmut Rix, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Machek, Václav 1968, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Academia.

MBh – *Mahābhāratam*.

Meillet, Antoine 1925, Les origines du vocabulaire slave: I. Le problème de l'unité baltoslave. II. De quelques noms de nombre, *Revue des Études Slaves* 5, 5–13, 177–182.

Meiser, Gerhard 1986, *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*, Innsbruck: IBS 51.

Monier-Williams, Monier 1899[1993], *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

ME – K. Mühlenbachs *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J. Endzelin 1–4, Riga: Lettisches Bildungsministerium, 1923–32.

NIL – Dagmar S. Wodtko, Britta Irlinger, Carolin Schneider, *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Nussbaum, Alan 1973, *benuso, couortuso*, and the archetype of *Tab. Ig.* I and VI-VIIa, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 356–369.

Orel, Vladimir 2007, *Russian etymological dictionary* 1, Calgary: Octavia.

Otkupščikov, Jurij V. 1988, Balto-slavjanskaja problema (leksičeskij material i metody issledovanija), *Baltistica* 24(1), 11–26.

Palander, Hugo 1899, *Die althochdeutschen Tiernamen 1: Die Namen der Säugetiere*, Darmstadt: Otto's Hof.

Pedersen, Holger 1905, Die Nasalpräsentia und der slavische Akzent, *KZ* 38, 297–421.

Połański, Kazimierz 1993, *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich* 2, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Energeia.

Pokorny, Julius 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern, München: Francke.

Przybytek, Rozalia 1993, *Ortsnamen baltischer Herkunft im südlichen Teil Ostpreussens*, Stuttgart: Steiner (*Hydronymia Europaea*).

RV – *R̥gveda*.

Sadnik, Linda, Rudolf Aitzetmüller 1955, *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslawischen Texten*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Schönfeld, Moritz 1911, *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Schrijver, Peter 1991, *The reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Latin*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Schuster-Šewc – Heinz Schuster-Šewc, *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache* 1–4, Bautzen: Domowina, 1978–1989.

SKES – Yrjö H. Toivonen et al., *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja* 1–7, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1955–1981.

Snoj, Marko 2003, *Slovenski etimološki slovar*², Ljubljana: Modrijan.

Śmieszek, Antoni 1909, *Etymologica, Materyały i prace Komisji językowej Akad. umiejętności w Krakowie* 4, 391–408.

Toporov, Vladimir N., Oleg N. Trubačev 1962, *Lingvističeskij analiz gidronimov Verhnego Podneprov'ja*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1923[70], *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Trubačev, Oleg N. 1960, *Proišhoždenie nazvanij domašnih životnyh v slavjanskikh jazykah*, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.

Udolph, Jürgen 1990, *Die Stellung der Gewässernamen Polens innerhalb der alteuropäischen Hydronymie*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Untermann, Jürgen 2000, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*, Heidelberg: Winter.

de Vaan, Michiel 2008, *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Vanagas, Aleksandras 1981, *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Vasmer – Maks Fasmer, *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* 1–4 (translated from German by Oleg N. Trubačev), Moskva: Progress, 1986–88.

WH – Alois Walde, Johann B. Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³, Heidelberg: Winter, 1938–53.

Zubaty, Josef 1894, *Slavische Etymologien, AslPh* 16, 385–425.

ZVSZ – František Kopecký et al. (eds.), *Základní všeslovenské slovní zásoba*, Praha: Academia, 1981.

Acknowledgment

This study originated in cooperation with the Centre for the Interdisciplinary Research of ancient Languages and Older Stages of Modern Languages (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University, Brno, and thanks to the grant No. IAA901640805. I would also express my deep gratitude to my colleagues Jana Villnow-Komárková and Bohumil Vykypěl for their substantial help with sources inaccessible for me.

Václav BLAŽEK

Department of Linguistics and Baltic Studies

Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University

A. Nováka 1

CZ-60200 Brno

Czech Republic

[blazek@phil.muni.cz]