

RECENZIJOS

Bohumil Vykypěl, **Studie k šlechtickým titulům v germánských, slovanských a baltických jazycích** [“A study on the aristocratic titles in the Germanic, Slavic and Baltic languages”], Brno, Masarykova univerzita, 2004 (Opera Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis, Facultatis Philosophicae, N. 353), pp. 237.

The book under review has its origin in the dissertation of the author, which represents a significantly expanded version of his master thesis. The book begins with a detailed *Introduction* (pp. 9–19), where the author explains his purposes and methodological approaches. The studied material is divided into three parts: *Tituli Germanici* (pp. 20–87), *Tituli Slavici* (pp. 88–180), *Tituli Baltici* (pp. 181–210). After the abbreviations the *Bibliography* (pp. 213–233) follows. It consists of more than 800 titles.

It will be practical to mention the lexical data (with exception of the most recent borrowings) and briefly the author’s results, plus some comments. The author organized his material according to functional criteria. For easier orientation, here it is arranged alphabetically, depending on the origin of the analyzed terms (inherited vs. borrowed).

GERMANIC TITLES

Common Germanic titles:

***apal-** “nobleman”. The serious problems with etymology (Benvenist: from **atta* “father” vs. Szemerényi: **at-al-o-* “beyond

nourishing”) are solved by Vykypěl, formulating the hypothesis of pre-Germanic origin of this etymon. Etymologically compatible are also Tocharian A *ātäl* “man”, Hieroglyphic Luwian *atala-* “brother”, maybe also the name of the heroine *Ἀταλάντη*, if their common semantic motivation can be based on the institution of fosterage, typical for the education of the children from the aristocratic families (see Blažek 2003–04, 3–5).

***druhtinaz:** **druhti-* “heap of people”: **dreugan^{am}* “carry out”, cf. Balto-Slavic **drauga-* “warrior”; cf. also the Celtic cognates, belonging to the same semantic field: Old Irish *drong* “groupe, bande, un certain nombre de personne”, Old Breton *drogn* gl. ‘c(o)etus’, *drog* gl. ‘factionem’, and latinized Gaulish *drungus* ‘globus hostium’ (Vendryes & Lambert 1996, D-201).

***er(i)laz-** **er-(i)lo-* “warrior”.

***fraujan-** – it is better to derive it from **prō-*, extended by **-uo-*, **-uio-*, not with Old Indic *pūrva-* etc. (see below). This solution allows to compare it with Slavic **pravъ* “right, proper”, implying so a specific semantic motivation (see Lehmann 1986, 126).

***harja-tuhan- /-tugan-** “leader of army”. The main question is solved in the book, if it is a genuine Germanic formation or a kalk of Greek *στρατηγός*, compounded from *στρατός* “army” & *ἄγω* “I lead”. He can only conclude that it is possible, but not necessary.

***kuningaz :** **kuni-* “kin” (reconstructed on the basis of Old Nordic *-konar*, probably the frozen gen., in compounds of the type

allskonar, *margskonar*, *besskonar*, and as the form hypothetically preceding Germanic **kunja-* > Gothic *kuni* “race, generation”); there are also North Germanic forms in *-ing-*, namely Old Swedish *koning*, *koningh*, besides more frequent *konunger*; *kununger*; *kunger*; *kunung* etc. (K y l s t r a et al. II, 122). For the semantic motivation “king” = “high-born” as the derivative of the root **ġenH₁-*, cf. Greek *γενικός* “edel” (Seebold, RGA XVII, 102f.). Formally the same motivation has been proposed (already by Sommer) for Hittite *hassu-* “king”: *has(s)-* “to beget, procreate, engender, produce, bear, give birth” (P u h v e l 1991, 240–46 with arguments interpreting *hassu-* as “best-born”). On the other hand, Seebold (RGA XVII 103) offers the alternative etymology, based on the root **ġneH₃-* “to know”, seeking a support in Lithuanian *žynys* “Zauberer, Wahrsager, Priester”.

**kuniz* : **kuni-* (see above).

**peudanaz* : **peudō* “people, nation, kin”. Besides the Baltic, Celtic and Italic parallels reflecting IE **teutā* (plus the Illyrian onomastic data) quoted by the author, there are also important cognates in Hittite *tuzzi-* “Heer, Truppenmacht; Heerlager” (first Forrer 1924; details see Tischler, HEG III 10, 499–504) and maybe also in Sogdian *twδ`k*, *twdy*, *twδyh* /*tūδē*/ “heap, mass” (Gharib 1995, 392, #9705), Modern Persian *tōda* “heap, stack, tumulus” (Morgenstierne 1942, 266; accepted e.g. by Szemerényi 1977, 100–108). From various etymologies two seem most plausible: (1) **teuH-* “schwellen”: Old Indic *tavīti* “ist stark, vermag”; (2) **teu-*: Latin *tuēri* “to see, gaze upon, look, watch” (see e.g. Tischler, l.c., 502f.).

Individual Germanic titles:

Medieval Latin *baro* – originally “warrior”, derivable from such verbs as Old Nordic *berja* “to beat, kill”, Old High German *berien*, *berren* “to beat” etc. (LIV 80).

Old English *ealdorman* – from *ealdor* m. “parens, pater (familias); princeps, dominus”, while n. means “life, age”. In this meaning there are cognates, derivable from Germanic **aldra-* < **al-tró-*, cf. Old Irish *altru*, Latin *altor* “foster-father, nourisher”, all from the IE root **al-* “to grow; nourish”. The author is too sceptical concerning both the nomina agentis in *-ter-* (just in this case the examples from Germanic, Celtic and Latin compiled by him indicate at least a common West Indo-European level) and the meaning “to nourish”. It seems, this meaning could be primary for the Indo-European root **al-* in the proto-language.

Old High German *furisto* – the superlative formed from the adverb *furi* “forward”.

gardingus (Lex Visigothorum) “a nobleman”: Gothic *gards* “house, family, court”, plus the same suffix, which formed the word **kuningaz*.

Old English *gerēfa* – regarding the rare Northumbrian form *græfa*, it probably represents an adaptation of Medieval Latin *grafio* more probably than a continuation of hypothetical protoform **ga-rof-jan-*, based on semantically distant forms as Old English *rōf* “series”, Old High German *ruoba* “numerus, summa, indictio”.

Old English *gestip* < **ga-senpa-*, originally “companion”: **senpa-* “journey” (better than the direct derivation from **sandjón^{an}* “to send”).

Medieval Latin *grafio* – author prefers the adaptation of the Germanic source, represented by the Gothic form *ga-greiftai wisan* “be at hand”, allowing to reconstruct the verb **grefan* “to command” (Lehman 1986, 138), as more probable than Byzantian title *γοαφεύς*.

Burgundian *hendinos* (Ammianus Marcellinus XXVIII, 5.14 [not 6.14 – p. 37]: *apud hos generali nomine rex appellatur*

Hendinos). If *h-* was correctly recorded, the best solution is the first etymology quoted by the author, from Germanic **hindina-*, cf. Gothic superl. acc. sg. *hindumisto* “outer”. Especially attractive is the cognate in Gaulish *cintu-*, very productive in anthroponyms, e.g. *Cintu-gnatus* “first-born”, Welsh *kyntaf* “first” < **kintamo-*, etc. (Lehmann 1986, 184).

Old High German *hēriro* (with variants *hērro*, *hērōro*) & *hēristo* – the comparative and superlative to *hēr* “old” (only Hildebrandslied), later “excellent, noble, important”. The starting point has been reconstructed as Germanic **haira-* “grey-haired” < **koiro-* “grey” (see Wanczek 1999, 434f.).

Old Nordic *hersir* < **harisiaz* : **hari-* “army, troop”.

Old English *hlāford* “pater familias” < *hlāf* “bread” & *weard* “guard, keeper, lord”. Hence Middle English *laferd*, *laverd*, (*h*)*loverd*, *l(h)or* > Modern English *lord*. Similarly *hlāfdige* “mater familias” consists of the same first component. The second member corresponds to Old Norwegian *deigja* “servant maiden”, Middle Danish *deje* “concubine”, usually derived from the verb of the type Gothic *digan* “to knead”. The original meaning would be “loaf-kneader”. Through Middle English *lafdi*, *lefdi*, *lavdi*, etc. this word continues in modern *lady*.

Gothic *kindins* “governor” < **kendinaz* : **kendi-* > Old Nordic *kind* “race; child”.

thunginus (Lex Salica) < **þunginaz* : Old Saxon *githungan* “excellent” etc. Borrowings:

Gothic *reiks* “ruler” < **rīk-s* < Celtic **rīg-s*. The Iranian correspondent is attested in Khotanese *rrāysan-* “director” = Old Indic *rājan-* “king”. The primary verb has been reconstructed as **H₁reǵ-* with the initial laryngeal, regarding Greek ῥεῖγω “stretch out” etc. (Mayrhofer 1996, 425, 445).

Another solution is proposed by A. Sihler (1977) in his monographic article, who reconstructs **reH₁ǵ-*. This starting point allows him to include here Old Indic *ūrj-* “power, strength; nourishment” and Greek ἄρῆγω “I help”, both derivable from the initial sequence **rH^o*.

The part devoted to the titles used by speakers of the Germanic languages is terminated by discussion of the ways of adaptation of Latin *caesar* and *imperātor*.

SLAVIC TITLES

Original terms:

Old Russian *dvorjanin* “nobleman”, originally everybody serving at the sovereign’s court. The etymology is transparent, from Russian *dvor* “court, yard”. Very interesting is the formal counterpart in Gothic (in the Latin mediation; see above) *gardingus* vs. Gothic *gards* “house, court; family”.

**gospodъ* “dominus” < **g^host(i)-poti-* with the unclear voiced *-d-*, which is explained by analogy of **svobodъ* “free”, where *-d-* is also unexplained. The Pahlavi form *gōspanddār* does not exist, only **gōspand* in such compounds as *gōspand-čihrag* “holding the seed of cattle”, *apazār-gōspand* “whose cattle is powerful” (Oguibene 1982, 120f.). Let us also add Paelignian *hospus* “foreigner” < **g^hosti-pot-s* (Untermann 2000, 335f.).

**panъ* “lord” & **panъje* “lady”. It is very problematic to accept author’s favorite idea about a simplification of **gъpanъ* (Old Czech rare *hpan*) and futher **županъ*. Regarding the archaic morphological formation of the feminine, which is accepted by Vykypěl too, the solution of Machek, who had derived **panъje* from **pō(t)nī-*, while the masculine counterpart would be a late back-formation, seems more probable. Let us mention the idea of Pisani (PBB 58, 1934, 456f.) to interpret

the name of the Germanic goddess *Tamfana* (Tacitus, *Annals* 1.51) as **Tam-fa(p)njō* < **dom-potniā* (see Szemerényi 1977, 80).

Croatian *plēmić* “nobleman” – from Slavic **plemę* “race”.

**vojevoda* – a transparent compound consisting of **vojb* “army” & **vesti*, **voditi* “to lead”. The author tries to solve the question, if this compound is not the kalk of Germanic **harjatugan-* (so Meillet and Vaillant) or Greek *στρατηγός* (so Molnár). This question is rather too academical. Both the terms were hardly etymologically transparent for Slavs in the first millennium, if they are incomprehensible for the students of the philological disciplines in the 21st century. Simply, this pattern is logical and so can be used universally. Let us analyze several titles from other Indo-European languages:

Greek Doric *λαγέτας* (Pindaros), Mycenaean *ra-wa-ke-ta* < **lāwāgetās*, consisting of *λαός* “Volk, Völkerschaft, Kriegsvolk”, cf. Hittite *lahha-* “Feldzug”, and the derivative of *ἄγω* (Frisk II, 83f.; III, 144; Aura Jorro II, 230f.), further Phrygian dat. sg. *lavagtaei* “military chief” (Orel 1997, 11, 441 assumes the conjecture **lavagetai*).

Greek *ἄναξ*, gen. *-πτος* “lord, ruler, leader” (Frisk I, 102; III, 31), Cypriote, Achaean, Lacon *φάναξ*, Boeotian *φάνακτι*, *φάναχς*, Corinthian, Argolide, Elean *φάνακτι* (Szemerényi 1979, 215), Mycenaean nom. *wa-na-ka*, gen. *wa-na-ka-to*, dat. *wa-na-ka-te* “king” (Aura Jorro II, 400f.), further Phrygian nom. *vanak*, dat. *vanaktei*, acc. *ovavaxtav* “lord, master” (Orel 1997, 11, 25f., 111, 466). Following Szemerényi (1979, 217 and Georgiev (1984[85], 125ff.), the term is derivable from **uṇH₁-H₂(e)ǵ-t-s*, i.e. “leader of a tribe”, where the second component is again a derivative of the verb *ἄγω* “I drive, lead, pull” < **aǵ-* < **H₂eǵ-*, and the first component represents the zero-grade of the root **uṇH₁-*

“to love, wish; be closely relative”, attested e.g. in Old Indic *vaniḥ* “wish, desire”, *vānas* “beauty” = Latin *Venus*, *-eris*, *venia* “grace”, Old Irish *fine* “relationship, tribe, family”, Old High German *wini* “friend” etc. Winter (1970, 53f.) added Tocharian A *nāiäk* “lord”, *nāsi* “lady” (his reconstruction **wnAtk-*, assuming the metathesis in Greek, is not obligatory). Concerning the use of the verb **ued^h* “to lead” to express the term “ruler, leader”, etc., Ivanov (2002, 238f.) mentions very suggestive Anatolian parallels: Cuneiform Luwian *handawates*, acc. *handawaten* “supreme authority, king” (Melchert 1993, 52), Hieroglyphic Luwian REX-*ti-* (Hawkins 2000, 62), Lycian *χῆtawat(i)-* “ruler, king”, *χῆtawata-* “rule, kingship” (Melchert 2004, 84), analyzable as **“front-leader”*.

**voldyka* “ruler” – derived from the verb **voldo*: **volsti* “to rule”.

**zemjan-inъ*, pl. **-jane* “yeoman, landowner” – from **zemja* “earth”.

Borrowings from Greek & Latin:

**cēsar’b* “βασιλεύς” < Gothic **kaisar*, cf. also Old Nordic *keisari*, Old English *cásere* < Latin *Caesar* (in the time of the probable borrowing the Latin title was pronounced \pm **cēsar*); the variant **cbsar’b* (< Balkan Romanian Latin **cēsáriu-*) could represent a starting point for Church Slavonic *car’b*, Russian *carъ*, etc. Finally, Old Church Slavonic *k’esarъ/b* reflects the adaptation of Byzantine Greek *καῖσαρ*.

**kъmetъ* “old man, farmer” – borrowed from Vulgar Latin *cumel^o* < *comes*, acc. *comitem* “official”.

Germanic borrowings:

Old Czech *hrabie*, Old Polish *grabia* “count” – borrowed from a source close to Old High German *grāvio* before the change **g > h* (12th c.).

**kor’b* “king” represents an adaptation of the name of the Franconian king *Carolus*

Magnus; originally it was the appellative attested e.g. in Old High German *karl* “man, husband”.

**кѡнеѣдъ* “ἄρχων; comes”, f. **кѡнеѣгунѣ* < West Germanic **kuning-* “king”.

Old Czech *rytieř* “knight” < Middle High German *riter* “knight”. Old Russian *риторъ* & *рыторъ* id. represents an independent borrowing from the same source. (Old) Polish *rycerz* was borrowed from Old Czech.

Old Polish *ślachta* “aristocracy”, Upper Sorbian *šlachta* “kin”, Lower Sorbian *šlachta* “relationship”, Old Czech *šlechta* “aristocracy” < Middle High German *slahte* f. & *slehte* n. “kin, origin, kind”.

**vitędъ* “knight, warrior, hero” & Prussian *vitingi* – perhaps adapted from Old Nordic *vikingr*, Old English *wicing*, Old Frisian *wīsing*, *wīsing*, designating the sea pirates, well-known warriors. The substitution *k* → *t* has an analogy in Slavic **retędъ* “chain”, occurring also in Prussian *ratinsis* ‘Kette’ < Germanic **reking-*.

Borrowings from Altaic languages:

Croatian *bān* < Avar *βοάνος* (Constantin Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*), cf. Common Turkic **bajan* “rich”.

**bol’arinъ* “nobleman”, pl. **bol’are* perhaps adapted from proto-Bulgarian pl. **boilar* (cf. proto-Bulgarian *βοηλα(ς)*, acc. *βοιλα(ν)* “nobleman”, while Old Russian *bojarinъ*, pl. *bojare* is explained from the Turkic compound **baj är* “rich/mighty man”. Let us mention that X e l i m s k i j (2003, 144) sees in *bojar*^o the plural correlate to **bojan/ *bajan* (Avar *βοάνος* > Croatian *bān*), representing one of his arguments for the Tungusic origin of the language of Avars, cf. Evenki *bajan*, pl. *bajar* “rich man”.

**županъ* “administrator of district” – borrowed from a source of the type proto-Bulgarian *ζουπαν(ος)*, *ζωπαν* / Avar *ZΩAΠAN*. The other etymological solutions, discussed by the

author, are more problematic. Let us mention the idea of H e l i m s k i (2000, 49) who etymologizes this title on the basis of Tungusic **žuwān* “ten”, forming e.g. the Manchurian title *žuwanda* “foreman (in a group of ten units or persons)”.

BALTIC TITLES

Original terms:

Baltic **vaiš-pati-* m. / **-patnī-* f. > Old Lithuanian *višpatis* “lord”, *višpatni*, *višpati*, *višpati* “lady”; Prussian *waispattin* id.; similarly Old Indic *višpāti-* “lord of *viš*”, *višpātīm-* “lady”, Avestan *višpaiti-* “lord, ruler of a village”. The analogous compounds, consisting of the components **ueiġk-/ *uoġk-/ *uiġk-* “village” & **poti-* “lord” / **potniH₂* “lady”, has been identified in Albanian *zot* “lord, head of the house” < **uiġk-potis*, *zonjë* “lady, wife” < **uiġk-potniH₂* (so Hamp, although in the second component the root **pot-* was recognized already by Pedersen; see the discussion by H u l d 1984, 137, 136).

Prussian **valdnīk(a)s* “king” is reconstructed according to the dat. sg. *waldniku* (Ench III, 91.25) and acc. pl. *wāldnikans* (Ench III, 91.15). Formally at least partially is corresponding Latvian *valdnieks* “ruler”, both formed from the verb attested in Lithuanian *valdyti*, Latvian *valdīt* “to rule” by the suffix of *nomina agentis & professionis*.

Germanic borrowings:

Old Lithuanian *kūningas* “Priester” & *kūnnigas* “Pfarrer”, gen. *kuningo* “des Herrn”, voc. *kunninge*, acc. pl. *kunnigus*; Lithuanian *kūnigas* “priest, churchman”, in older language also “lord” (e.g. 1653: *kunigas* ‘dominus’), and *kūnigė* “princess”; dial. (Šiluva) *kūnīngs* & *kūnīgs*; Latvian *kūngs* “lord”, *kūndze* “lady”.

The author discusses various hypotheses about the trajectories of borrowing. He rejects Old High German *kuning* & *kunig* as a source

for semantic reasons. The ideal source would be Gothic **kuningz* (so e.g. Berneker), but for Vykypěl the fact, that this word is not attested in the preserved text corpus, represents an invincible obstacle. He prefers the solution of Ekblom and Otrębski, speculating about the Slavic mediation. But the Slavic starting point should precede the really attested Common Slavic **kǫnędzь*. There is another possible candidate in a neighbourhood of the (East) Baltic: the Germanic dialect which became a donor of numerous archaic borrowings in the Balto-Fennic languages, including Finnish & Estonian *kuningas* “king”, Karelian *kuninkas*, Lude & Vot *kuńigaz*, Veps *kuńigaz* etc. (Kylstra et al. II, 122f.).

Prussian *konagis* ‘König’ (E 405) is explained as a late borrowing from a source of the type Middle High German *künec*, gen. *küneges*.

Prussian (?) *kongos* ‘ein furste’ (Grunau). Wenskus reconstructed the starting point **kungas* and saw here a counterpart of East Baltic **kuningas*, while Vykypěl presents a more probable solution: the adaptation of Latvian *kūngs*.

Archaic Latvian *kēniņš* “king” was most probably borrowed from Middle Low German *köninc* id.

Prussian *rikis* (E 404), *rikisj*, gen. sg. *rikijas*, acc. sg. *rikijan* (Ench) “lord” reflect East Germanic **rikijas* > Biblical Gothic **reikeis*, reconstructed on the basis of the gen. pl. m. *reikjane* ‘τῶν ἐντῶμων’, dat. sg. superl. *reikistin* ‘ἄρχων, ἀρχιερεύς’, besides *reiks* ‘ἄρχων’. Vykypěl thinks that this Gothic word replaced a continuant of Baltic **vais-pati-* in the first quarter of the first mill. AD.

Borrowings from Slavic or with the Slavic mediation:

Lithuanian *bajōras* “nobleman” (first already 1362) is borrowed from an East Slavic source.

Lithuanian *karālius* “king” and its Latvian adaptation *karalis* reflect the East Slavic continuant of Slavic **korl’ь* “(Franconian) king”.

Old Lithuanian *pōnas* “lord”, *poni* “lady” < Old Polish *pan* & *pani*.

Prussian *supūni* “lady” (III 67.4; 69.8), *Ein edle supana* (GrG 51)–borrowed from Old Polish **żupani*; Lithuanian *žiupōnė* “lady” is attested only from Prussian Lithuania and so its Prussian origin is probable. The masculine counterpart can be identified in the gen. pl. *supanen* in the chronicle of Simon Grunau.

Prussian *waldwico* ‘Ritter’ (E 406) has been cleared up as a borrowing from Old Polish *włodyka*, in contrary to the operated metathesis of liquids in Polish. This rather paradoxical situation, when the apparent Slavic loan in Prussian is closer to the Slavic protoform than the expected source, has usually been explained through the ‘Pruthenization’ of the Polish word. It is certainly possible. But there is another solution, namely the adaptation of this term from Pomerian Slavic, the ancestor of modern Pomerian Slovincian and Kašubian. The most archaic, still ‘pre-metathetical’ sequence TART is preserved in such Kašubian words as *parsq* “pig”, Slovincian *pārsq* id. vs. Polish *prosię* < **porsę*, or in such toponyms as *Stargard* or *Bialogard*, in the second component reflecting Slavic **gordь* “castle, fort”. Let us mention that the Pomerian Slavs and Prussians were neighbours in the second half of the first mill. AD. Niederle located their common border from Elbląg to the upper stream of the river Drwęca in the east from Vistula (see the map ‘West Slavs’ in Niederle 1953).

Prussian (Latinized) forms nom. pl. *witingi*, gen. pl. *witingorum*, acc. pl. *witingos* “noblemen” have the same origin as Slavic **vitędzь* (see above), but this borrowing must be older than Prussian *ratinsis* ‘Kette’ (E 368,

540), borrowed from early Polish **ratędzь* rather than from Slavic **retędzь*.

Summing up, the book represents an exhausting historical and etymological overview of the aristocratic terminology in the Germanic, Slavic and Baltic languages, based on the careful philological study of original texts. There are minimum of mistakes, e.g. on pp. 28-29 the author correctly uses the reconstructions with laryngeals, namely **ġenH₁-*, **ġenH-es-*, **ġenH-ti-*, **ġ_hH-ti-*, while on p. 72 not (the reconstructions with various laryngeals, depending on the scholar, are quoted on p. 41). Old Indic *pūrva-* “front, former”, Gatha Avestan *pouruuiia-*, Young Avestan *paoiriia-* “first, beginning, former” are derivable from **p_hH_{2/3}u-* (cf. e.g. Mayrhofer 1996, 157), while the author’s reconstruction **p_hu-* should continue in Old Indic **p_hva-* and Avestan **p_hraua-*.

In the study of this type it seems desirable to quote more parallels from the point of view of the semantic typology. Some of them occur in this review. Although the bibliography is more than rich, some important studies or etymologies are not taken in account (e.g. Winter 1970). But all these marginal reproofs represent only the arguments for a new version of this book, written in some of the West European languages, which should include all Indo-European branches and discuss new etymological solutions.

REFERENCES

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, edidit W. Seyfarth, Leipzig, Teubner, 1978.
- Aura Jorro F., 1985–93, *Diccionario micénico*, I–II, Madrid.
- Blázek V., 2003–04, *Lexica Anatolica*. Hieroglyphic Luwian contribution to the Indo-European lexicon, – *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, XLIII (1), 3–11.
- Frisk H., 1973–91–79, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–III, Heidelberg.
- Gharib B., 1995, *Sogdian dictionary*, Tehran.
- Hawkins J. D., 2000, *Corpus of hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions*, I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age, Berlin–New York.
- Helimski E., 2000, On probable Tungus-Manchurian origin of the Buyla inscription from Nagy-Szentmiklós, – *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*, V, 43–56.
- Huld M. E., 1984, *Basic Albanian etymologies*, Columbus.
- Ivanov V. V., 2002, Balto-južnoanatolijske izoglossy, – *Balto-slavjanske issledovanija*, XV, 215–250.
- Kylstra A. D., S.-L. Hahmo, T. Hofstra & O. Nikkilä, 1996, *Lexikon der älteren germanischen Lehnwörter in den Ostseefinnischen Sprachen*, II (K–O), Amsterdam–Atlanta.
- Lehmann W., 1986, *A Gothic etymological dictionary*, Leiden.
- LIV – *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, ed. by Helmut Rix et al., Wiesbaden, 2001².
- Mayrhofer M., 1996, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*, II, Heidelberg.
- Melchert H. C., 1993, *Cuneiform Luwian lexicon*, Chapel Hill (*Lexica Anatolica* 2).
- Melchert H. C., 2004, *A dictionary of the Lycian language*, Ann Arbor–New York.
- Morgenstierne G., 1942, *Iranica IV: Persian etymologies*, – *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, XII, 258–271.
- Niederle L., 1953, *Rukověť slovanských starožitností*, ed. Jan Eisner, Praha.
- Oguibénine B., 1982, *Un vestige indo-iranien en slave? Suggestions pour la solution de l’étymologie de *gospodь “maître suprême, dieu”*, – *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne*, II, Leiden (*Acta Iranica* 22), 119–129.
- Orel V., 1997, *The language of Phrygians*, Delmar.
- Puhvel J., 1991, *Hittite etymological dictionary*, III (H), Berlin–New York.
- RGA – *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. by H. Beck et al., Berlin–New York.
- Seebold E., 2001, *König und Königtum*, – *RGA XVII* 102f.
- Sihler A. L., 1977, *The etymology of PIE *rēǵ- “king”*, – *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, VII, 221–246.

Szemerényi O., 1977, Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages, Leiden–Téhéran (Acta Iranica 16).

Szemerényi O., 1979, Etyma Graeca IV (22–29): Homeric et Mycenaic (25. *ávaξ*). – Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici, XX, 207–226.

Szemerényi O., 1991, The agent nouns types *lāwāgetās* – *lāwāgos*, – Scripta Minora. Selected essays in Indo-European, Greek, and Latin, III. Greek, Innsbruck, 1392–1409.

Tischler J., 1994, Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar, III (10), Innsbruck, 20.

Untermann J., 2000, Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen, Heidelberg.

Vendryes J. & P.-Y. Lambert, 1996 Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien, Dublin–Paris.

Wanczek Ch., 1999, Herr, – RGA XIV 434f.

Winter W., 1970, Some widespread Indo-European titles, – In: Indo-European and Indo-Europeans, ed. by G. Cardona, H. M. Hoenigswald & A. Senn, Philadelphia, 49–54.

Xelimskij E., 2000, Jazyk avarov: tunguzo-maňčurskij aspekt, – Folia Orientalia, XXXVI, 135–148.

Václav Blažek

Genovaitė Kačiuškienė, **Šiaurės panevėžiškių tarmės fonologijos bruožai**, Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2006, 184.

Genovaitės Kačiuškienės filologijos mokslų kandidato disertacija „Фонологическая система северопаневежского диалекта литовского языка“, arginta 1984 metais, lietuvių kalbotyroje buvo vienas iš pirmųjų tarmių fonologinių aprašų. Dėl smulkiai išdėstytų eksperimentavimo principų, tarmės garsinių vienetų nuodugnios analizės ir grakščios interpretacijos skiriamosios funkcijos atžvilgiu dažnam dialektologui ji tapo pavyzdine fonologine studija, – deja, nelengvai pasiekiamą. Todėl džiugu, kad disertacija, išversta į lietuvių kalbą, gerokai atnaujina

ta ir papildyta (per dvidešimtmetį pasirodė keliolika naujų G. Kačiuškienės straipsnių gimtosios tarmės tema), atgimė mokslinė monografija – „Šiaurės panevėžiškių tarmės fonologijos bruožai“. Knyga neabejojamai aktuali: kaip pratarmėje sako pati autorė, „tarmių niveliacija vis spartėja; iki šiol nėra kompleksinio šiaurės panevėžiškių (ypač jos prozodijos ir vokalizmo) aprašo“ (p. 6).

Recenzuojamąjį darbą sudaro penki skyriai: „Tarmės tyrimų apžvalga“ (p. 8–20), iš fonologinės ir eksperimentinės dalies susidedantys „Prozodija“ (p. 21–56) ir „Vokalizmas“ (p. 57–113), taip pat „Priedas: psichokustinė priebalsių klasifikacija“ (p. 114–123) ir „Baigiamosios išvados“ (p. 124–126). Pradžioje dar yra pratarmė (p. 5–7), o pabaigoje – išsami santrauka anglų kalba (p. 127–130), literatūros sąrašas (210 pozicijų; p. 131–140) ir labai smulkia transkripcija perrašyti tiriamosios tarmės tekstai su komentarais (p. 143–182). Eksperimentų rezultatai matyti iš 19 lentelių ir 33 brėžinių.

Pirmasis skyrius – apžvalginis: nurodomi šiaurės panevėžiškių tarmės tyrimo istorijos periodai ir supažindinama su tuo metu pasirodžiusiais darbais, kuriuose pateikta kokių nors fonetinių ypatumų. Darbuose iškeltus faktus monografijos autorė aptaria atsižvelgdama į tai, kiek jie pamatuoti, novatoriški ir aktualūs šių dienų dialektologijai. Pavyzdžiui, A. Salio nuopelnu pripažįstama tai, kad savo paskaitų cikle „Lietuvių kalbos tarmės“¹ jis pirmą kartą aprašė Mūšos upyno

¹ A. Salys, Lietuvių kalbos tarmės, Tübingenas, 1946 = T. p. a. u. t., Raštai, IV. Lietuvių kalbos tarmės, Roma, 1992, 3–140.

Čia derėtų papildyti, kad A. Salys, veikiausiai girdėjo nevienodas tarmės ilgųjų balsių ir *ie*, *uo* atitrauktinio kirčio priegaides – šių dienų terminais, neoakūtą ir neocirkumfleksą. Plg. dviejų jo teiginių iliustracinius pavyzdžius: „Jei Mūšos upyno šnektos kirtį atitraukia ant ilgųjų balsių