

R E C E N Z I J O S

Vytautas Mažiulis. Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. I. A-H.
(Altpreussisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bd. 1.) Vilnius: Moksias, 1988.

In the foreword the author writes that although the quantity of the Old Prussian textual material is small, still from a careful investigation of the material one can learn a good bit about this relative of Latvian and Lithuanian and understand that at the time of the creation of the textual material (XIII/XIV - XVI centuries) in many respects the Old Prussian language was more archaic than the other Baltic languages and all of the living Indo-European languages of that epoch. This is why Old Prussian studies and Old Prussian etymology has a particularly great significance for all of historical Baltic, Slavic and Indo-European. From the time of the origin of scientific etymology (the beginning of the 19th century) hundreds of linguists from many countries have specially investigated or else have made use of the origin of Old Prussian words in their investigations.

In his discussion of Old Prussian *abskande* 'Erle, alksnis, alder' (Elbing Vocabulary word 602) Mažiulis writes that Bezenberger and Trautmann had corrected the word to **aliskande* (i.e. with **ali-* instead of *ab-* suggesting an original writing of the letter *-j-* without a dot; pp. 44-45). Mažiulis would rather correct the word to **aliskands* where an incorrect final *-e* has been written for the correct final *-s* (of which there are other apparent examples, e.g. *arelie* for **arelis* 'Adler, erelis, eagle,' etc.) and then further to **aliskants* (in which the writing *-ds-* rather than *-ts-* is the fault of the German scribe) The form **aliskants* could reflect the actual Old Prussian pronunciation with an affricated **-s* after the sonant *-n-* (cf. Lith. dialect gen. sg. *akmeñts* = *akmeñs* '[of the] stone'). This means that there existed at one time Old Prussian **aliskans* which goes back to an earlier **aliksna-*. The change of **aliksna-* to **aliskans* was occasioned by the loss of the **o-* stem nom. sg. masc. stem vowel **-a-* which led to the creation of a form **aliksna-*. In this word the *-n-* was then vocalised to *-an-*. The metathesis of the *-k-* and *-s-* was occasioned by the general Baltic relationship of *-ks-* before a consonant vs. *-sk-* before a vowel (cf. e.g., Lith. infinitive *tviē-ks-ti* 'to flash' vs. 3rd preterite *tviē-sk-ė*). Mažiulis admits that from earlier **avinas* there developed **avins* which is represented in the Elbing Vocabulary (201) by *awins* 'Widder, avinas, ram' rather than **awints*. On the other hand this difference in the treatment of the sequence **-ns-* might be explained as a dialectism. More likely, however, is the suggestion that the final *-s* of the nominative singular of *awins* was restored by analogy with the pattern of other nouns such as nom. sg. **kauk-s*; acc. sg. **kauk-an*, etc.

With all of these hypotheses one can reconstruct a form which is close to its Lithuanian congeners *aliksnis*, *alksnis*. I find Mažiulis' explanation quite convincing, but it seems to me that such an explanation contradicts Mažiulis' own requirement that one should study the attested graphemics of the Prussian words with a jeweler's care (pp. 6, 9, 13). The reconstructed **aliskants* has four letters which are different from the original *abskande*. The explanation contains three assumptions about the orthography: (1) **-lj-* instead of *-b-*; (2) **-t-* instead of *-d-*; (3) **-s* instead of *-e* and four assumptions about phonological development: (1) **-ns* > **-nts*; (2) loss of word final **o-* stem vowel; (3) passage of **-n-* to *-an-*; (4) metathesis of *-k-* and *-s-*. One assumption about the morphological development is the assumed replacement of **-nts* by *-ns* in the word *awins*. For the hypothesis to work at least eight separate assumptions are necessary. I find none of these assumptions unlikely and in fact I would applaud Mažiulis for the theory. On the other hand it seems inconsistent to criticize the work of W. Smoczyński (pp. 6, 9, 13) for making assumptions about the orthography.

Thus, for example, Smoczyński, 1989, 191, fn. 10, suggests that Old Prussian *wubri* 'eye-lash' be read as **wūbri* = **wunbri* an incorrect reading of **wimbr-i* which could be read either as /vimpri/ or /vimbri/ (thereby rendering it possibly a borrowing from Middle High German *winbrā* 'eye-lash'). As I see it Smoczyński's hypothesis requires three orthographic assumptions: the assumption of an original **ū* instead of *u*, and the assumption of **wunbri* replacing **wimbri* (where *u* replaces *i* and *m* replaces *n*). Perhaps one could say that there is a morphological assumption concealed in the fact that the German stem vowel *-ā* is rendered by an Old Prussian *-i*. Thus Smoczyński's explanation of Old Prussian *wubri* seems to me to require fewer assumptions than Mažiulis' explanation of Old Prussian *abskande*. (One should perhaps mention here that Smoczyński, 1985, 107, would now reconstruct *abskande* as *alksn-ade* which he would compare with Lith. *alksnótas* 'alder grove'.)

Maziulis (p. 62) writes that Old Prussian *accodis* 'rochloch (Rauchloch), smoke hole' is to be read as **atkadīs* or **atkadīs* < *-*das* (nom. sg. masc.). He says that the correction of -*cc*- to -*tc*- is not a conjecture and that the rendering of Old Prussian **a* by the letter *o* after gutturals (I prefer the term *velars*) and labials is not rare. I have difficulty in seeing why any correction of an original text is not a conjecture. On the other hand I do not see it as impossible and certainly it is correct to say that Old Prussian **a* is sometimes rendered by the latter *o*. Still I would count this as two assumptions about the orthography of this particular word. Maziulis writes further that an Old Prussian adjective **atkada*- presupposes a verbal stem **atked-*, i.e. with a root **ked-* meaning 'to split', cf. Lith. *kedėti* '(about knitted or woven material) to get worn out', *kedėti* 'to pull wool before carding'. Although Maziulis doesn't mention it, I have suggested, 1969, 166, that Old Prussian *accodis* is to be read as **akutis*, a diminutive of Old Prussian *ackis* 'eye'. The semantic development would be similar to that of Russian *okno* 'window' (cf. *oko* 'eye') and English *window* from Old Norse *vindauga* < *vindr* 'wind' + *auga* 'eye'. Concerning my etymology Toporov, 1975, 70, writes that although in Old Prussian texts there are examples of the rendering of *u* by *o*, and voiceless consonants by voiced consonants, and the like, their combination in a single word (where in addition *cc* = *k*) introduces an element of questionableness (*spornost'*). Maziulis, 1981, 304, reads Elbing Vocabulary word 181 *passons* 'Stifson, posūnis, stepson' as [pasuns], interpreting the double letter *ss* as a single *s*, and *o* as *u*, thereby introducing two assumptions into his interpretation (which I would not dispute). And as we have seen above in the case of *abskande* he interprets a *d* as a *t*. Maziulis has then in his previous work interpreted a double letter as a single letter, an orthographic *o* as a *u* and a *d* as a *t*. In other words he has made orthographic assumptions very similar to those which I have made in my explanation of *accodis*. It is undoubtedly true that no two events are exactly similar, or to put it in another way, one can always find a reason why an analogy is not appropriate. Still it is hard for me to see why my explanation (at least on phonological grounds) is not as acceptable as that of Maziulis.

Maziulis (p. 90) writes that Old Prussian *arglobīs* 'Scheitel, viršugalvis, crown of the head' (Elbing Vocabulary word 76) could be read as **arglubīs* (or *-*as*) deriving from **arklubīs* < **artlubīs* (with *-*t*- to *-*k*- before the lateral *-*l*- and the *-*k*- becoming a voiced *-*g*- between the two laterals *-*r*- and *-*l*-). This *artlubīs* in turn is to be derived from **antlubīs* (with passage of the *-*n*- to *-*r*- by assimilation to the *-*l*- later on in the word, cf. the Lith. dialect *áržuolas* compared to standard Lithuanian *ąžuolas* 'oak'). Therefore the second element is **lubīs* and can be compared directly with Slavic **lubo* 'skull, head' (cf. Polish *leb* 'head, pate, noddle', etc.). The initial element *ant-* is then cognate with the Lithuanian prefix *ant-* meaning 'on'. The word **antlubīs* is furthermore easily etymologized as meaning '(what is) on the head, viz. the crown of the head'. One notes that there is one assumption about the orthography (viz. that *-*u*- is represented by -*o*-) and three assumptions concerning phonological changes. (Smoczyński, 1985, 108, would now reconstruct *Arglobīs* as *An-galvis*, cf. *galbo* 'head' in Simon Grunau.)

Concerning Old Prussian *dmskins* (Elbing Vocabulary word 84) 'Ohrenschmalz, ausies siera, ear wax' Maziulis writes that of the various possible corrections the simplest (and therefore the most likely) is the correction to **druskins* from which we should extract the Old Prussian root **drus-* which is to be corrected to **trus-* (in Old Prussian writings frequently the voiced consonant is written instead of the voiceless), or more likely, **drus-* is to be considered a dialectal variant of the Old Prussian root **trus-*. (One can compare Lith. *klišti/glišti* 'to grow bandy-legged', *kriaūnos/griaūnos* 'handle', etc.) This Old Prussian **trus-* (or **trus-/ *drus-*) is to be connected with Latv. *trus-t* 'to rot, to putrefy', Lith. *traūšti* 'to break, to crumble', etc. The reconstructed form **truskins* is to be considered an acc. pl. and is to be derived further from **trustins* (**i* before **i* > **k*). Thus Old Prussian *dmskins* = **truskins* < **trustins* (acc. pl.) and originally denoted '(trupantys) puvėsiai, crumbling rot'. It is interesting to note here that when Maziulis asked a Lithuanian dialect representative of the older generation (his father) what ear wax was he got the answers: *puvėsiai* 'rot', *trąšos* 'fertilizers', *mėšlas* 'manure', *purvai* 'mud', *kuř žvirblių tupėta* 'where birds have perched, i.e. a place soiled by them' (p. 212). The etymology requires either two assumptions about the orthography and one assumption about the phonology or else one assumption about the orthography and two assumptions about the phonology.

For the same word Smoczyński, 1983, 173, would correct the reading to **drūskins*, i.e. **drumskins*, a reading differing from one of Maziulis' readings by only one letter (or sign above the *u*). He compares this in turn with Lith. *drumstai* 'dregs, sediment, unclean things'. Smoczyński assumes either a syncopated version of the suffix *-*inas*, or like Maziulis an accusative plural to explain the final *-*ins*. Smoczyński writes that etymological **ti* is rendered as *ki* as in Old Prussian *calt-estis* (*klokis*)- 'Zeidelbär, common bear' (Elbing Vocabulary word 656) with the suffix -*iskis* (cf. Lith. -*iškis*). The explanation of the change from **ti* to *ki* seems to be the same as that offered by Maziulis. One notes also the similarity of the semantic developments assumed by both authors.

In my opinion the views of both Maziulis and Smoczyński must be taken into consideration and that one can not *a priori* reject any theoretical stance. As Feyerabend writes, 1979, 35; 'Proliferation of theories is beneficial

for science, while uniformity impairs its critical power'.

One might ask perhaps: Why another dictionary of Old Prussian in view of the fact that Toporov is also producing one (Toporov, 1975, 1979, 1980a, 1980b)? In fact, however, Mažiulis frequently has different interpretations from those proposed in Toporov's book. For example, Mažiulis notes that it is customary to connect *Galindo* 'Galinda, one of the eleven Prussian regions' (p. 318-319) with Lith. *gālas* 'end' and to assume that this meant 'inhabitants living at the boundary'. Mažiulis proposes, however, that **Galindā* is rather from a hydronym **Galindā* which had long ago disappeared, a derivative of the Baltic verbal or nominal root **gal-* with the suffix *-*ind-*. This root **gal-* is found in Lith. *gāt-vis* 'a pond formed in the place of an old river channel or creek'. Cf. also *gel-mē* 'depth'. Toporov, 1979, 138-142, has a much more detailed account of the word *Galindo*, but we do not find there this new explanation by Mažiulis.

Mažiulis (pp. 380-381) proposes that Old Prussian *gl̄esum* 'amber' (Tacitus Germ. 45, Pliny Hist. natur. XXXVII 42), also represented in Latvian *gl̄isis*, probably a borrowing from Old Prussian (through Curonian) **gl̄īsīs* < (prior to the 15th century) **gl̄ēsīs*, might not be a Germanic, but rather a Baltic word derived from a root **gl̄esa-* 'shining' which in turn is from a verbal stem **gl̄ēs-* 'to shine'. Beside West Baltic **gintaras* 'amber' there might have been a dialect word **gl̄ēsīs* denoting a type of amber. With this in mind it would result that the name for amber, derived from an Indo-European dialect **ghl̄ēs-* 'to shine' is a shared Baltic and Germanic lexical item. Having been adapted to the native Germanic word, through Germanic sources it may have penetrated even to Rome. Although Toporov's account of *gl̄esum* (1979, 261-263) is much more detailed, the information and theoretical insight suggested by Mažiulis must also be taken into consideration. In fact, then the thorough scholar must consult both Mažiulis' and Toporov's books if he wishes to find the latest information on Old Prussian etymology.

I noticed very few misprints in Mažiulis' book. On p. 179, s.v. *dantis* the Latin *dentis* is labeled acc. sg. instead of gen. sg. An apparent etymological spelling gives us the name Zabrodzki instead of Zabrocki (p. 200). (Etymological spellings come naturally to those of us who deal with Old Prussian.)

One very useful feature is the referencing of the sources both according to Trautmann, 1910 and according to the original as presented by Mažiulis in 1966 and 1981. Frequently the entries of the catechism words are supplemented with comparisons from Vilentas' 1579 Lithuanian catechism. In sum then this is a very useful and informative new dictionary of Old Prussian and its erudite author is to be congratulated for producing one more work of permanent value to Baltic linguistics.

References:

- Feyerabend, Paul. 1978. *Against Method*. London, Verso.
- Mažiulis, V. 1966. *Prūsų kalbos paminklai*. Vilnius, Mokslas.
- - 1981. *Prūsų kalbos paminklai*. II. Vilnius, Mokslas.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1969. Four Old Prussian etymologies. *Baltistica* 5.163-166.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech. 1983. *Staropruskie lekcje i etymologie I*. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 40. 167-183.
- - 1985. *Altpreussisch: Neue Lesungen und Etymologien*. *Tarptautinė baltistų konferencija*. Vilniaus universitetas.
- - 1989. *Zur Schreibung im apr. Enchiridion (I)*. *Baltistica* III(1) Priedas. Vilnius.
- Toporov, V.N. 1975. *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' A-D*. Moscow, Nauka.
- - 1979. *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' E-H*. Moscow, Nauka.
- - 1980. *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' I-K*. Moscow, Nauka.
- - 1984. *Prusskij jazyk. Slovar' K-L*. Moscow, Nauka.

William R. Schmalstieg

S. K a r a l i ū n a s **Baltų kalbų struktūrų bendrybės ir jų kilmė.** - V.: Mokslas, 1987. - 258 p.

Prieš ketvertą metų pasirodžiusioje Simo Karaliūno reikšmingoje monografijoje "Baltų kalbų struktūrų bendrybės ir jų kilmė" (vairiapusiškai ir kompleksiskai tiriami baltų kalbų esminiai struktūriniai elementai ir jų istorija. Iš jų pažymėtini rytų baltų kalboms būdingi diftongai *ie* ir *uo*, apofoninės eilės *ie:ei* ir *uo:au* žodžio šaknyje,