RECENZIJOS

Rick D e r k s e n, **Etymological dictionary of the Baltic inherited lexicon** (*Leiden Indo-European etymological dictionary series* 13), Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2015, xii + 684 p.

1. I will allow myself to begin with a personal note. The dictionary under review is the Baltic pendant of D e r k s e n's (D.) *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon* (2008). Both dictionaries have been produced following the same principles and, accordingly, the criticism that applies to one of them to a large degree applies to the other as well. My first impression of the Slavic dictionary was not good: missing material, missing evidence, extreme Leiden dogmatism, very poor representation of the secondary literature, almost non-existent discussion of the etymologies. Over the years my judgment has not become better, but at the same time I have consulted it continuously, for extended periods every day. What is the reason for this paradox? It cannot just be that D.'s dictionary filled a gap in the literature. The *Słownik prasłowiański* seems to have reached a dead end with the 8ᵗʰ volume (2001), having covered about one third of the material, but the publication of the *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov* continues at a steady pace and by

now (volume 39, 2014) covers about two thirds of the Slavic lexicon. The need for a "complete" etymological dictionary of Slavic was certainly there, but material missing in *ĖSSJ* could anyway be recovered from etymological dictionaries of the modern languages like V a s m e r (1953–1958, a widely used classic) or B e z l a j (1976–2007, more up to date from the viewpoint of Indo-European linguistics). I believe there are several reasons why D.'s Slavic dictionary is useful in spite of its shortcomings:

First, it is the only etymological dictionary of Slavic that takes accentology systematically into account. This is a most important achievement in view of the importance that Balto-Slavic accentology has acquired during the last decades. D.'s notation of the Proto-Slavic accents reflects the views of the Leiden school and is thus slightly idiosyncratic, but inasmuch as he regularly gives the Accentual Paradigm of most words Leiden's notations can be easily translated into the standard, Moscow-school ones (see F e c h t 2005–2006[2010], 106f. for the main differences). A more serious problem is that many words are given with accentual variants or are simply left unaccented. This is in part a consequence of the current state of the art of Slavic accentology, but it also includes

material for which an Accentual Paradigm is reconstructed in a reference book like D y b o (2000) or for which this could be done using different types of indirect evidence (as done, for instance, by K o c h 1990, a book absent from D.'s references).

Second, it is up to date from the point of view of Indo-European linguistics. True, D. follows very slavishly the views of Kortlandt and other Leiden scholars, but at least to the present reviewer it has proved easier (or, rather, more automatic) to translate Leiden reconstructions into more standard ones (or, for that matter, into my own ones) than to do the same with other Slavic dictionaries (something that often requires serious sifting of the data).

Third, the rigid and schematic structure of the entries makes D.'s dictionary very easy to use. Put it this way, the presentation strategy that has precluded a more detailed discussion of the evidence has strongly contributed to its clarity.

Finally, it is written in English. This may seem a trivial point, but it is not. Few Indo-Europeanists, I believe, are fluent enough in Polish or Slovenian as to make continuous use of *Słownik prasłowiański* or Bezlaj, but this is not the main point (on occasion you will make the effort). English has become the lingua franca of science and it is my impression that few non-native speakers do now write their articles in German or French – but they do write them in English. By own experience I can tell

that it is not always easy to come up with appropriate English translations of Baltic and Slavic words, especially when it comes down to dialectal or rare material. From this practical point of view D.'s dictionary is truly helpful.

2. Turning back to D.'s Baltic dictionary, the situation of Baltic etymology is now very different from that of, say, 20 years ago. F r a e n k e l's *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1962–1965) is completely out of date from an Indo-European perspective. Even the Baltic data have to be seriously resifted and, on occasion, corrected. It nevertheless remains unsurpassed as the main reference tool for Baltic etymology. In 2007 S m o c z y ń s k i's *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* appeared. It is better organized than Fraenkel's dictionary (the basic principle is ablaut, words are grouped in microfamilies), and it contains some methodological improvements: normal inclusion of the laryngeal theory, avoidance of root-enlargements, preference for inner-Baltic accounts over hazardous extra-Baltic comparisons. But Smoczyński's dictionary is not as comprehensive as Fraenkel's, non-Lithuanian material is very poorly represented (including Latvian!), there is very little etymological discussion, and even the handling of the Lithuanian data could have been better (the Accentual Paradigm is rarely given, very poorly represented dialectal material is mixed up with common forms, etc.). The main handicap, however, is that it contains no references

to the secondary literature and that it abounds in very personal, but frequently unsatisfactory proposals by Smoczyński. Put it otherwise, what we have is the "personal" dictionary of one of the leading authorities in the field. I'm sure most colleagues, like the present reviewer, are happy to have it, but it cannot be recommended as a reference book for non-specialists (I refer to P e t i t 2013 for a more detailed assessment). 2015 has turned out to be an *annus mirabilis* for Baltic etymology. In addition to D.'s dictionary, an *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* in 3 volumes by Wolfgang H o c k et al. should appear very soon. For obvious reasons they do not try to be exhaustive and will thus not replace Fraenkel.

The list of tools for Lithuanian can easily be extended with books like S a b a - l i a u s k a s (1990) or P a l i o n i s (2004), not to mention many other monographs, dialectal dictionaries, and works on old texts, but by far the major improvement has been the completion of the *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1941–2002, 20 vol.). This colossal work (also available in the internet: http://www.lkz.lt/) is well known for its exhaustiveness and faithfulness to the data and puts the study of the Lithuanian lexicon in unusually firm grounds. It contains mistakes, both in the lemmata and in the classification of the data, but these can usually be corrected with the information provided by the *LKŽ* itself.

The situation of the other Baltic languages is different. Old Prussian presents well known problems of its own. The etymological dictionaries of T o p o r o v (1975–1990, covering about one half of the lexicon) and M a ž i u l i s (1988– 1997) are out of date from an Indo-European perspective and, often, somewhat idiosyncratic. They nevertheless provide a good starting point. Mažiulis' dictionary has been recently reedited with some corrections and, more importantly, bibliographical additions (M a ž i u l i s 2013, also available in the internet: http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/). For Latvian we are basically stuck in Endzelin's epoch-making *ME* (1923–1932) and *EH* (1934–1946), which provide a wealth of secure data, but are not even remotely as exhaustive as the *LKŽ*. Endzelin's etymological notes in *ME* are the best we have for Latvian etymology. K a r u l i s' *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* (1992) is in many respects the work of an amateur and hardly meets normal scholarly standards. It does, however, supply some references, mostly to Eastern European sources that are likely to pass unnoticed to Western scholars. A good etymological dictionary of Latvian is probably the main desideratum of Baltic etymology today.

3. The need for a dictionary like D.'s is self-evident from what has just been said. The last etymological dictionary focusing on the inherited Proto-Balt[o-Slav]ic lexicon was T r a u t m a n n (1923), which is excellent, but not very detailed and needless to say out of date. In a sense, D.'s etymological dictionaries of Slavic

and Baltic can be seen as a two-volume version of what Trautmann included in a single volume (Trautmann's policy to include securely inherited material attested only in one of both branches has often been criticized, but I find it entirely coherent with a serious approach to Balto-Slavic unity). The strong points of the Baltic dictionary are predictably the same as those of its Slavic companion: focus on accentology, systematic comparison with Slavic, clarity of presentation, and, finally, the fact that it is written in English (many of the primary reference tools are written in languages most Indo-Europeanists are unlikely to be fluent in).

The structure of the *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon* is more or less standard: Preface and Abbreviations (vii-xi), Introduction (1–39, mostly concerned with Balto-Slavic accentology within the framework of the Leiden school), the Dictionary (43–567), References (569–593), Word Indices (595–684). The Dictionary proper is divided into three parts: material found in Lithuanian plus minus Latvian and Old Prussian (43–525), material found in Latvian plus minus Old Prussian, but not in Lithuanian (526–554), material found only in Old Prussian (555–567). The lemmata are structured as follows:

1) Heading: a given Lithuanian (viz. Latvian, Old Prussian) word without accent marks and meaning;

2) Baltic evidence in this order: Lithuanian, Latvian, Old Prussian, with meaning, full paradigm (in the case of verbs), Accentual Paradigm, and dialectal variants (especially regarding intonations);

3) Balto-Slavic root or word reconstruction;

4) Proto-Slavic reconstruction;

5) Slavic evidence, organized as in (and obviously excerpted from) D.'s Slavic dictionary: (O)CS, East Slavic, West Slavic, South Slavic;

6) Proto-Indo-European root or word;

7) (short) list of cognates in other Indo-European languages;

8) commentary.

Any of points 3) to 8) may be missing depending on the word under consideration. In general terms, there is a little bit more of commentary in this dictionary than in the Slavic one. I haven't looked for typographic errors, but they certainly occur.

In what follows I will present some critical remarks following more or less the structure of the book and of the lemmata.

4. As already mentioned, the main body of the Introduction (5–28) is devoted to an exposition of Baltic and Balto-Slavic accentology as understood by the Leiden school, which in this field may equally well be called Kortlandt's school. Large portions of it are copied almost verbatim from earlier surveys by D. (e.g. D e r k s e n 2004). Work by other scholars is occasionally mentioned, but not discussed. Considering the difficulty of

the field and the fact that D.'s dictionary is mostly concerned with accentology, such an inordinate attention is perhaps defensible. I am not certain, however, whether non-specialists will actually obtain a clear picture. D. briefly informs the reader about some other Leiden positions (no PIE phoneme */a/, etc., 14), and devotes some more space to discuss the fate of the neuter *o*-stems (23f.) and the notion of substratum borrowings that he applies (27f.). All this is not without interest, but one gets the impression that D. has decided to discuss only those topics he is personally interested in. A sober exposition of the sound laws from PIE to the Baltic languages, for instance, would have been more useful.

The rest of the Introduction (1–4, 28–39) is precisely this: a brief presentation of the Baltic languages, of the main tools for the study of their lexicon, and of the structure of the lemmata (although, symptomatically, Slavic gets more space than Baltic and the rest of Indo-European taken together!). It is generally adequate. More attention could have been devoted to the Lithuanian and Latvian old texts, both in the Introduction and in the dictionary, but at least for Lithuanian this gap should be covered by the *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* of Hock et al. D.'s list of Old Prussian texts (39) does not yet include the last finding: a three-line trace from Crete edited by Kessler and Mossman (2013) and satisfactorily interpreted by Lemeškin (2014a; 2014b). Among

the many missing references I would mention Rinkevičius' comprehensive study of the Old Prussian accent (2009) and Šinkūnas' study of Old Lithuanian accent marking (2010), if only because they have a particular bearing on D.'s dictionary.

5. Turning now to the Dictionary proper, the notion of "Inherited Lexicon" is not self-evident and D.'s few observations in the Introduction (1) do not help clarifying how the material was selected. As far as I can see, it may be understood in two different ways: i) lexicon inherited from PIE, "Northern Indo-European", or Balto-Slavic, ii) Baltic lexicon that is not recent on internal grounds (i.e., excluding borrowings, onomatopoeias, and secondary derivatives), regardless of whether it has a known etymology or not.

Running through this dictionary my impression is that D. has gone for the first option, but that he has done this in an unsystematic way and that the amount of missing material is probably huge. In order to test this impression I checked the corpus of Lithuanian *ia*-presents with acute intonation and circumflex/acute tone variation that I studied in Villanueva Svensson 2014. This choice was dictated by the fact that in this case we have a corpus that is limited enough as to be controllable (some 300 verbs, more than half of which immediately fall out of consideration for one or another reason and thus leave us with some 130–140 items) and

at the same time large enough as to yield some generalizations. The following picture obtained.[1] Most of the evidence that does not have a traditional etymology is not found in D. I have counted some 25 examples: *číežti* "beat, peel, rub", *dáužti/daũžti* "strike; cleave", *érgti* "peel; beat", *gríežti/griẽžti* "grind, grit", *kléisti* "waste", *knéibti/kneĩbti* "pinch", *kniáusti(s)/kniaũsti(s)* "rummage", *króp-ti* "deceive", *lóšti/lõšti* "recline; play", *niáuktis/niaũktis* "grow cloudy", *skléis-ti/skleĩsti* "spread", *skr(i)ósti/skr(i)õsti* "cleave, dissect", *skúosti/skuõsti* "run", *skústis* "complain", *smáugti* "strangle", *smélkti/smeĩkti* "ache, sting", *stáugti/ staũgti* "howl", *svíesti/sviẽsti* "fling, throw", *šiáušti* "tousle, ruffle", *šméižti/ šmeĩžti* "calumniate, smear", *térpti/teȓpti* "put in, insert", *žniáugti/žniaũgti* "clutch, press, bind". At least part of this material is composed of well–established Baltic word families that do not look recent on internal grounds (e.g. *dáužti/daũžti*) and could thus have merited a place in the dictionary. One may suspect that D. has applied a strict understanding of "inherited lexicon", but this cannot be true because he includes some words without good extra-Baltic etymology: *bréžti* "draw, scratch", *dýžti* "flay, bark; beat", *dróžti* "plane, sharpen", *kéikti* "scold", *míegti/*

miẽgti "ache, strike", *skélbti/skeȓbti* "announce, proclaim", *slégti/slẽgti* "press, weigh down", *sríegti/sriẽgti* "screw up; thread", *tríesti/triẽsti* "suffer from diarrhea". There seem to be various reasons for this. In the case of *bréžti* D. (102) gives an attractive comparison with Lat. *frangō, -ere*, Go. *brikan* "break" that I had not seen before (no references are provided). The semantic side of the equation, however, is problematic. In the case of *dýžti*, *kéikti*, *míegti/miẽgti*, *skélbti/skeȓbti*, *slégti/slẽgti*, *tríesti/triẽsti* D. discusses earlier etymological proposals, which in most cases seem to be viewed with (correct) skepticism (though D.'s discussion is usually inconclusive). The criterion that emerges is that D. has included items for which an etymology has been proposed, even in cases where he considers it dubious, but has excluded items without an etymology worth of discussion. Yet this cannot be the whole story. For *dróžti* and *sríegti/sriẽgti* (both traditionally opaque) no extra-Baltic discussion is provided, so that it is unclear why they have been included. Much more damaging is the fact that a large number of items are missing for which an etymology has been proposed and in many cases may confidently be qualified as traditional or standard: *číaupti/čiaũpti* "compress one's lips; press together; seize", *tũpti* "perch" (: Go. *þiufs* "thief"), *gniáužti* "clutch, compress" (: Germ. *Knocke* "bundle of flax"), *káisti* "scrape", OPr. *coestue* "brush" (: Sl. **cěsta* "road"), *kóšti* "strain, filter" (: Sl. **kä́ša* "grain; porridge"), *pléšti/plẽšti*

"tear" (: ON *flá* "flay"), *púošti/puõšti* "adorn, decorate" (: ON *fógja* "clean"), *réikšti* "mean, signify", *ráiškus* "clear" (: OCS *rěsnъ* "true"), *r(i)ū́kti* "roar" (: OCS *rykati*, OHG *ruhen* "roar"), *ruóšti/ruõšti* "prepare", *rŭšéti* "be active, agile" (: Sl. *rȳ́xlъ* "quick"), *spráusti* "squeeze" (: OE *sprēotan*, OHG *spriozan* "sprout"), *stiẽbti* "grow up, rise", *stíebas* AP 1/3 "stem, stalk" (: Gk. στείβω "tread"), *tráukti* "pull, draw" (: ON *þrúga* "press"), *véngti/veñgti* "avoid" (: OHG *winken* "blink"), *vóžti/võžti* "shut, close; cover" (: Lat. *uāgīna* "sheath, vagina"), *žáisti/žaĩsti* "play" (: Go. *gaits* "goat", Lat. *haedus* "young goat-buck"), *žébti/žẽbti* "eat" (: OCS *zobati*, *zobljǫ* "peck"). Part of this material is doubtful and most of it consists of comparisons between just two branches, but if items like *kéikti* or *míegti/miẽgti* where discussed it is difficult to understand why these have been excluded. Finally – and surprisingly – some well-established etymologies are missing as well: *pérsti* "fart" (**perd-*, LIV, 473f.), *rem̃ti/rémti* "support" (**h₁rem-*, LIV, 252f.), *répti/rẽpti* "take, embrace" (**(h₁)rep-*, LIV, 507), *réžti/rẽžti* "cut" (**u̯reh₁ĝ-*, LIV, 698).

The number of omissions can easily be enlarged. Every active Balticist will quickly make up a list by just reading across the dictionary (I will present below some of the ones I noted). The essential point is anyway clear. As far as the representation of the lexicon is concerned, D.'s dictionary is incomplete and inconsistent.

6. We can now turn to the evidence that actually made it into the dictionary. I will first deal with the Baltic evidence (without taking into consideration, for the moment, extra-Baltic etymology) to move later to the Slavic and Indo-European material and to etymology proper.

To begin with the Heading, it is just a Lithuanian, Latvian or Old Prussian word without accent marks and meaning, with the result that the dictionary is divided into three sections of unequal length. This seems an unhappy decision to me, as it wouldn't have been too difficult to unite the three parts in a single dictionary, eventually adding Latv. viz. OPr. in words not attested in Lithuanian. The lack of proper Proto-Baltic reconstructions is truly regrettable. In this case, however, it is not D. who is to be blamed for such a surprising omission, but the field itself. The reality is that concrete reconstructions of Proto-Baltic forms are hardly ever attempted in the literature. This, to be sure, is much more difficult for Proto-Baltic than for Proto-Slavic or Proto-Germanic. In addition to the strong disbalance between the West and East Baltic material, Proto-Baltic is a much older Proto-language and such an enterprise would have required difficult decisions on many issues (e.g. the development of *ĕu) and almost pioneering work on others (e.g. ablaut and accentual curves of the verb). In a sense, D.'s dictionary is a missed opportunity, as Kortlandt's detailed relative chronologies offered him a framework that other

scholars could later discuss. But, I insist, no scholar with some experience on this matter will blame D. for not undertaking such a painstaking task.

The dictionary is organized around words, not word-families. I suppose this is inescapable in dictionaries of Proto-languages. The main question, of course, is which words of a given word family to include and which to exclude. As in the case of the lexicon itself (§ 5), there is no easy answer and D.'s policy is nowhere made explicit. The result is that it is not clear why some items have been included while others are absent from the dictionary (in checking the acute and circumflex/acute *ia*-presents above I counted as included some primary *ia*-presents that were absent from the dictionary, but where at least some other word of the family was included – so that the primary verb can be easily retrieved if that word is checked in Fraenkel or Smoczyński). To give just a couple of examples, the inclusion of *barzdótas* "bearded" beside *barzdà* "beard" (82) is no doubt due to the perennial comparison with Sl. *bordátъ*, Lat. *barbātus*. This is reasonable enough, but one should have added that *barzdótas* is entirely predicted within Lithuanian and thus of almost no probative value (the fact that Latvian has *bàr(z)daîns* "bearded" only strengthens the skepticism). Beside *naktìs* "night" (327f.), however, *nakvóti* "spend the night" (< *naktvóti*) is not mentioned, in spite of the fact that the -*v*- of *nak-t-v-óti* cannot be generated within

Baltic and that *nakvóti* has an obvious interest when put in line with other evidence pointing to a *u*-stem *$nok^w t$-u-vel sim.* (dossier in W i d m e r 2008, 623f., without Lith. *nakvóti*). The list of inconsistencies of one or another sort can be enlarged almost *ad libitum*.

One of the truly positive aspects of this dictionary is that D. regularly gives the (dialectal) variants of most words, thus providing more information on accentology and morphology than is found in other etymological dictionaries. This, to be true, was an easy task, as all one had to do was to extract the relevant information from *LKŽ*, *ME* and *EH*. Professional Balticists that were used to routinely consult these sources will not get anything new, but Indo-Europeanists will. The next question, of course, is what to do with the wealth of variants provided in the dictionary. In some cases the variation still awaits a proper explanation, but in many others we positively know that a given variant is recent and can thus be safely ignored for etymological purposes. Unfortunately, D. does very little to inform the reader about which variants are potentially interesting in a historical perspective and which are known innovations. D.'s general policy for Lithuanian has been to put the form of the DLKŽ (the standard normative dictionary of contemporary Lithuanian) in the heading, adding variants from the LKŽ after it. This would be reasonable for an etymological dictionary of Lithuanian, but less so for a dictionary of the

Baltic inherited lexicon. To give an example, D. gives complete paradigms for almost all verbs. Since the preterit stem is predictable in Baltic, one may wonder whether this was actually necessary except in cases where the preterit stem is unexpected and thus potentially relevant from a historical perspective, but I suppose it is better to err on inclusion that on exclusion here. Now, there are several groups of verb in which the *ē*-preterit is known to be a comparatively recent development of part of the Lithuanian area (cf. S c h m i d 1966). In the case of verbs like *bárti* "scold", *kálti* "forge", *málti* "grind" the *ē*-preterit *bãrė*, *kãlė*, *mãlė* belongs in the standard language and is the one found in the dictionary. Dial. pret. *kãlo* is included as a variant of *kãlė*, but not (the older!) *bãro*, *mãlo*. The case of zero-grade verbs like *brùkti* "poke into", *lìpti* "climb", *lùpti* "peel", *mùšti* "beat", *rìsti* "roll", *rìšti* "tie" was easier, as here the *ē*-preterit is an East Lithuanian innovation that does not belong in the standard language. One thus finds the older *ā*-preterit *brùko*, *lìpo*, *lùpo*, *rìto*, *rìšo* in the first place in the dictionary. Dial. pret. *lùpė*, *rìšė* are mentioned, but not *brùkė*, *lìpė*. In the case of *rìsti* D. has mixed two separate dialectal innovations (pret. *rìtė*, rare pres. *reñta*) into a nonexistent paradigm *rìsti*, *reñta*, *rìtė* beside standard *rìsti*, *rìta*, *rìto*. Finally, in the case of *mùšti* the *ē*-preterit *mùšė* belongs in the standard language and is the one found in the dictionary, but the variant *mùšo* is not mentioned. Surprisingly, D.

does not quote *ē*-preterit variants in Latvian dialects, in spite of the fact that this information could be easily taken from E n d z e l i n 1923. The "new" verb "*rìsti, reñta, rìtė*" is not the only case in which D.'s arrangement of the data has given rise to a gross mistake. I give some other examples:

bijóti "fear": "Latv. *bijât*, 1sg pres. *bijãju*; *bîtiês*" (89) – inf. *bîtiês* (pres. *bîstuôs*) is of course not a variant, but a secondary inchoative of *bijât*;

ieškóti "look for": "Lith. *ieškóti* [*ie*, *íe*], 3 pres. *íeško*, 3 pret. *íeškojo*" (197) – what is meant is that we have *ieškóti*, *íeško*, *ieškójo* beside older *íeškoti*, *íeško*, *íeškojo*, not that *íeškojo* is the only preterit of this verb. Oddly, OLith. 1 sg. pres. *iešku* is not mentioned;

mélžti "milk": "Lith. *mélžti*, *mélžia*, *mélžė*; var. *mìlžti*, *mélžia*, *mìlžo*" (310) – the variant *mìlžti*, *mélžia*, *mìlžo* perhaps exists, but is vanishingly rare. The normal (and older) variant is *mìlžti*, *mélža*, *mìlžo* (D. has no doubt been led astray by the entry of the LKŽ, but a quick look at the actual text would have put him immediately in the right direction).

The list of variants that are recorded, but not addressed is very large. One sometimes finds some comments on tone variants and/or on variation of Accentual Paradigms (which are very common), but for the most part the interpretation of the Baltic facts is left to the reader alone. In brief, while recognizing that exhaustiveness in the presentation of the data is an important goal in and of itself, D.'s presentation strategy is

unlikely to help non-specialists and on occasion may actually misinform them. The end result would have been better if D. would have envisaged some type of notational system of a more explanatory nature, e.g. "Lith. *málti*, pres. *mãla*, pret. dial. *mãlo* (> standard *mãlė*)", "Lith. *brùkti*, *brùka*, *brùko* (> dial *brùkė*)", or "AP 2(>4)" in cases where we are dealing with the spread of mobility that characterizes most Lithuanian dialects.

7. As already observed, a positive aspect of D.'s dictionaries of Baltic and Slavic is the systematic attention to the facts of the other branch and, to a lesser degree, to the reconstruction of Balto-Slavic etyma. The coverage of the other branch is more exhaustive in the Baltic dictionary than in the Slavic one, as the Slavic material is copied almost verbatim from the Slavic dictionary. I'm not sure whether this was really necessary (a reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic form and a representative sample of continuants would have sufficed), especially considering the fact that the Slavic entries themselves have obviously not been subject to a major revision. As a result, the positive and negative aspects of D.'s handling of the Slavic evidence (most of them duly pointed out by the reviewers, e.g. H o l z e r 2010; F e c h t 2005–2006[2010]; B i c h l m e i e r 2011) remain the same in both dictionaries.

A different (and, for present purposes, more important) question is whether the Balto-Slavic comparisons themselves have been improved and the answer is that they have, but only very moderately. I have checked the letter *D* in both dictionaries and found the following picture. Most of the Balto-Slavic comparisons predictably remain. The comment (if any) is usually the same as in the Slavic dictionary (which sometimes focuses exclusively on inner-Slavic issues!), with a few additions and, more rarely, a new, inner-Baltic comment. There are a couple of additions (*dolba* "groove, etc." ~ *dálba* "lever", *dětъ* "doing" [OCS *blagodětъ* "benefaction"] ~ *détis* "egg laying", both to word families that were already present in the dictionary) and a couple of deleted items (*drokъ* "time when cattle are restless, etc." ~ *drākas* "noise, agitation", *dročiti* "stimulate, irritate" ~ Latv. *dracît* "scold", *durъ* "shy, wild" ~ OPr. nom. pl. *dūrai* "shy"). In other cases the Slavic *comparandum* has been dropped – usually for good reasons, as the Slavic and Baltic items are incompatible if the focus was on direct word equations (*duxáti*, *dvoxáti* ~ *dvě̃sti*, *dvẽsia* "breathe, blow", *duti* "blow" ~ *dujà* "drizzle, mist", *dъlti* "hollow, chisel" ~ *dil̃bti* "lower, cast down (intr.)", *dъrnǫti* "rub" ~ *dìrgti*, *-sta* "become weak", *dъrzati* "dare" ~ *dr̃̃zti*, *-sta* "id"). The reason behind these deletions is not commented upon. The etymology proper has been improved in *debelъ* "fat", *dobl'ъ* "strong" ~ Latv. *depsis* "small, fat boy", *dabļš* "luxuriant" (following K r o o n e n 2013, 89) and *dvorъ* "courtyard" ~ *dvãras* "estate" (quoting Lat. *forum* "market-place" instead of the root

noun Av. *duuar-* "door"), but the many oddities that characterize the Slavic dictionary usually remain in the Baltic one. Some equations are hard to understand without some type of comment, which we usually do not find: **dęglъ* "healthy, strong" (only Ru. dial. *djáglyj*!) ~ Latv. *dęñkts* (morphology?), **diriti* "look for" (only Bulg. *dírja*!) ~ *dyréti*, *dỹri* "watch (for), stare" (morphology?), **dőlnь* "palm of the hand" ~ *délna(s)* "id." (root vocalism?), **dь́lgъ* "long" ~ *ìlgas* "id." (missing *d-*?), **dьrgati* "pull, etc." ~ *dìrginti* "irritate" (morphology?), **dъrzъ* "bold" ~ *drąsùs* "courageous" (root vocalism, nasal, Sl. *z*?). The accent position of **dě̋verь* ~ *díeveris* "husband's brother" and **dy̋mъ* ~ *dū̃mai* "smoke" is correctly attributed to Hirt's law in the Slavic dictionary, but this information is missing in the Baltic one. **dânь* "tribute" ~ *duõnis, donìs* "id.", **dělа* "because of" ~ *dẽl* "id." are present in both dictionaries, in spite of the fact that D. considers them Slavic borrowings in Baltic. Errors of the Slavic dictionary usually persist in this one: **daváti* "give (iter.)" ~ Latv. *dãvât* "id." (**daváti* is an inner-Slavic replacement of **dajáti*, thus implying that Latv. *dãvât* must have been built to the exclusively Baltic preterit stem **davē*), **derti, **dь̀rǫ* "tear" (AP *c*, not *b*, cf. D y b o 2000, 267) ~ Žem. *dérti, dẽra* "id." (a Žemaitian inf. "*dérti*" does not exist; the Northern Žem. pres. *dẽra* [inf. *dìrti*] is innovated), **dъrắti, **dèrǫ* "tear, flay" ~ *dìrti, -ia* (NŽem. *dẽra*) (D.'s inaccurate presentation of the data gives the

impression that the two Slavic primary verbs have direct correspondents in Baltic; this is false), **dőti, **dъmǫ̇* "blow" ~ *dùmti, -ia* "id." (not from Bl.-Sl. "**domʔ-*; **dumʔ-*" < PIE "**dʰ(o)mH-*"; the root is **dʰmeH-* [LIV, 153], so that only zero-grade **dum- < **dʰm̥H-* is possible).

The discussion of problematic reconstructions could be extended, but for present purposes it will be enough to note that the Slavic and Balto-Slavic sections have experienced only minimal changes in this dictionary. D.'s Balto-Slavic "reconstructions", incidentally, are no more than a projection of the material of the Baltic and/or Slavic daughter languages rewritten in the phonological system that the Leiden school attributes to Proto-Balto-Slavic. The main difference vis-à-vis more traditional reconstructions is the assumption of a glottal stop *ʔ* where other scholars would reconstruct an acute (glottalized?) long vowel (e.g. **golʔwáʔ* for **gől'u̯á vel sim.*). I will thus not comment on this section of the dictionary. The proper reconstruction of Proto-Balto-Slavic etyma and paradigms (as of Proto-Baltic forms!) remains an important task for the future.

8. Whereas the coverage of the Baltic and Slavic material is relatively exhaustive for the words included in the dictionary, the evidence from other Indo-European languages is of a purely illustrative nature and usually includes a very small number of items. For more information readers will thus have to consult the etymological dictionaries of

the different languages as well as standard tools like LIV or IEW. There is nothing particularly blameworthy with such a strategy, which I suspect is almost unavoidable if one tries to produce an etymological dictionary of a given language within a limited period of time. Perhaps more reprehensible is the fact that the PIE reconstructions, like the Balto-Slavic ones, are often just a projection of the Baltic and Slavic forms. I believe it would have been better to simply identify the root in the traditional way unless the reconstruction of the PIE word is fairly certain.

As for D.'s discussions at the end of the entries, it would have been reasonable to systematically separate three different levels (Baltic, Balto-Slavic, Indo-European), yet this is not what we find. In point of fact they constitute a rather heterogeneous lot focusing on two main areas: a) accentology (including intonations), b) words of problematic etymology. The result is that the commentary is strongly inner-Baltic (viz. inner-Balto-Slavic) oriented (thus paying less attention to the development from PIE to Baltic than one would expect in an etymological dictionary of the *inherited* lexicon), but even here tends to neglect entire areas like morphology or semantics.

Items with a standard PIE etymology require little treatment and this is what we usually find, but the fact that the PIE pedigree is clear doesn't mean that the Baltic and Slavic facts do not require some type of comment. Thus,

readers may be interested to know why the ablaut of dial. *mìlžti*, *mélža* "milk" (not *mìlžti*, *mélžia*, *pace* D., see above § 6) is exactly the opposite to that of Sl. *mélzti*, *mъlzǫ* (from the root athematic present *$h_2$mélǵ-ti/*$h_2$mlǵ-énti* "milk", LIV, 280f.), how does *kùlti*, *-ia* "thresh" relate to *kálti*, *kãla* "forge", Sl. *kőlti*, *koljǫ* "stab, sting" (to observe that *kùlti* "is in an apophonic relationship with *kálti*" [263] is not an explanation), or how do *sãpnas* "dream" and Sl. *sъnъ* "sleep, dream" relate to each other and to the extra-Balto-Slavic evidence (D.'s observation that "it is very difficult to reconstruct a Balto-Slavic proto-form" [389] simply states the obvious) and why was the *u̯* of *su̯op-no-* lost in *sãpnas*, but not in other words (a problem not even mentioned by D.). One cannot expect the author of an etymological dictionary to solve these problems, but one may reasonable demand that the issues are at least properly identified with, ideally, some comment and, most importantly, some references. The problem of the "missing literature" is particularly dramatic in this dictionary and will be treated separately (§ 9).

One of the recurrent problems with the whole series of Leiden etymological dictionaries is the (predictable) strong adherence to the doctrines of the Leiden school, something that predetermines the way they handle the evidence. This is in a sense unavoidable. What is really damaging is that alternative views are for the most part simply left unmentioned

and thus hidden from the reader. I refer to V i n e 2012, 21ff. for a clear discussion of this issue. All this will cause no serious difficulties to specialists, but it misinforms Balticists and Slavicists without a profound knowledge of Indo-European comparative linguistics. In addition, a good knowledge of Baltic historical grammar and Balto-Slavic accentology is rare among Indo-Europeanists. Since D.'s dictionary is mostly concerned with accentology and the commentary is strongly biased towards Kortlandt's views, Indo-Europeanists will also be misinformed on many issues (for instance, whether the Baltic internal evidence demands a laryngeal or not).

To give just an example, the term *vr̥ddhi* is almost never used in this dictionary. I have looked for potential cases and found it only s.v. *várna* "crow" and *vìlkė* "she-wolf", being dismissed in both cases. There are two reasons behind this omission. First, the Leiden school does not believe in *vr̥ddhi* as a regular derivational process outside of Indo-Iranian and Germanic (cf. B e e k e s 2011, 181f.). Second, in Balto-Slavic studies *vr̥ddhi* has frequently (but not exclusively) been used to explain the acute intonation of some words, which stands in direct conflict with Kortlandt's theory that inherited long vowels regularly received circumflex intonation (K o r t l a n d t 1985; see V i l l a n u e v a S v e n s s o n 2011 and P r o n k 2012 for the modern terms of the debate). Yet the fact that D. does not mention *vr̥ddhi* does not mean that

it has not been used as an explanatory device in Baltic word-formation. It will be enough to mention here that *vr̥ddhi* is frequently applied in S m o c z y ń s k i's 2007 dictionary, e.g. s.v. *béras* "bay", *béržas* "birch", *daũsos* "breath", *dervà* "resin", *dienà* "day", *diẽvas* "god", *drevẽ* "hollow of a tree", *jáunas* "young", *jáura/jū́ra* "sea", *kárvė* "cow", *leñgvas* "light", *naũjas* "new", *pėdà* "foot", *stìrna* "roe", *tévas* "thin", *várna* "crow", *vìlkė* "she-wolf", *žéntas* "son-in-law", *žiemà* "winter". Material like this is explained in different ways by D.: *dienà* and *žiemà* are derived from hysterokinetic *n*- and *m*-stems, *pėdà* is explained via Winter's law, *kárvė* and *stìrna* by positing the root as $*\hat{k}erh_2$-. For the most part, however, we are not given a proper alternative explanation. This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion of these items or of *vr̥ddhi* in Balto-Slavic. The point to stress is that D.'s behavior simply conceals an interesting avenue of research from both Balticists and Indo-Europeanists.

9. The last point to be treated in some detail is strongly related to the previous one. The amount of missing references is extremely large, so large that I seriously doubt whether there has been any attempt to track secondary literature in a systematic way. This is a pity. Fraenkel's dictionary was quite exhaustive in this respect, but none of the more recent etymological dictionaries of Baltic has even tried to collect the vast etymological literature of the post-Fraenkel period. The result is that much of it (including

promising etymologies) will simply remain unknown to many scholars. The space devoted to work by Leiden scholars is disproportionly large. Among the missing monographs directly bearing on the lexicon one can mention Bammesberger 1973, Eckert 1988, Smoczyński 2005, or Larsson 2010. The amount of missing articles is difficult to calculate.

I give a list of words in which some important references are missing (some of them, to be fair, probably appeared too late to be incorporated into the dictionary). The selection is purely casual (items I noticed while reading) and does not even remotely try to be exhaustive:

ardýti, *aȓdo* "dismantle", *ìrti, ȳra/ìrsta* "disintegrate, fall to pieces", etc. – D. (205) correctly denies LIV's inclusion of the Balto-Slavic material under **h₂erH-* "disintegrate" (LIV, 271f.). I miss a reference to Vaillant's (1966, 416) alternative etymology: from **h₂er-* "fit" (Gk. ἀραρίσκω, etc.; LIV, 269f.). The meaning "disintegrate" would be decompositional from *iš-ìrti vel sim.*;

dienà "day" – the PIE *n*-stem meaning "day" probably goes back, in the last instance, to a locative **di̯-én* "during the day", cf. Rau 2010, 315f. The concept of "decasuative" derivation seems never to be applied in this dictionary;

gérvė "crane" – see now Gąsiorowski 2013 on the name for "crane";

irštvà AP 3 "bear's den" – the derivation from PIE **h₂r̥tko-* "bear" that several authors have proposed is

needless to say attractive, but not unproblematic. As for the acute intonation, one should have mentioned Young's (2006) and Pronk's (2011) idea that initial **Hi-*, **Hu-* yielded acute intonation in Balto-Slavic (on which I remain skeptic);

kélti, *-ia* "lift, raise" – see Seržant 2008 on the PIE root(s) of this verb;

lašišà "salmon" – the traditional inclusion of TB *laks* "fish" in the set (still accepted e.g. by Adams 2013, 590) is probably false, cf. Pinault 2009, 241. Since Osset. *læsæg* "brown trout" may be a loan word, the well-known word for "salmon" is now restricted to the Northern Indo-European languages alone;

liáuti, *-ja/-na* "stop" – probably from **leuH-* "loosen, untie" (Gk. λύω "loosen", etc.; LIV, 417), as per Smoczyński 2003, 72ff.; 2005, 36, not from **leh₁-* "leave" (LIV, 399);

maĩnas "exchange", *mainýti* – see Vine 1999 on the root **mei-*, with new Latin material;

OLith. *pa-níedėti* "mock", Latv. *nîdêt*, *-u* "hate" – D.'s list of cognates misses the most important one (for Baltic!): YAv. pres. *nāismi*, *nāist* "insult", cf. Tremblay 1999;

ot(r)ùs "hasty, fiery" – see Sommer 2012, 265ff. on the etymology of this word;

píeva "meadow" – see Nussbaum 2014, 235f. on its derivational history;

piētūs "dinner" – I miss a reference to Widmer 2004;

pláuti, *-ja/-na* "wash" – see Fecht 2007 for a solution partially similar to

the root "*pleh₃u-" with which D. operates (my own, very different solution will be presented elsewhere);

snáusti, *-džia* "doze" – D. follows the traditional connection with Gk. νυστάζω "slumber". See Kölligan 2007 for the possible inclusion of Arm. *mnǰem* "sleep" in the set (although Kölligan's root *(s)neudʰ-* is hard to reconcile with the Baltic acute);

tar̃pti, *-sta* "thrive", OPr. *enterpo* "is useful" – the Prussian verb does not exist; Lith. *tar̃pti* is denominative of *tarpà* "thrift", cf. Smoczyński 2002;

viẽšpats "lord" – see Larsson 2007 on the exact background of this title;

véldėti/veldéti, *véldi* "inherit; rule", *val̃dýti* "rule" – D. (486) follows the traditional derivation of this Northern IE family (Go. *waldan*, OCS *vlasti*, *vladǫ* "rule") from **u̯elH-* "be strong" (LIV, 676f.). See Kümmel 2000, 472f. for a superior connection with Ved. *várdhate* "grows" (LIV, 228).

As already mentioned, the amount of missing material is huge (I suspect that about one third of the potentially interesting material is not found in this dictionary). I give some random examples (including not only recent proposals, but also old ones and fairly standard etymologies):

eigà "motion" – traditionally related to Gk. οἴχομαι "go", Arm. *iǰanem* "climb";

griẽbti, *-ia* "seize" < **gʰreibʰ-*, cf. Go. *greipan* "seize", Gk. χρίμπτομαι "approach", as per Kölligan 2011;

líepa "lime-tree" – clearly with Sl. *lípa* "id.", which is included in Derksen 2008, 279 and, *pace* D., is still best interpreted as a *vṛddhi* derivative of **leip-* "smear";

OLith. *pa-médėti*, *pa-mémi*, Latv. *mēdît* "imitate, ape", probably from **med-* "measure" (LIV, 423), as per Villanueva Svensson 2006;

núoma "lease, rent" – traditionally derived from PIE **nóm-eh₂-* (*vel sim.*), cf. denom. Gk. νωμάω "handle, wield" (see Villanueva Svensson 2012–13, 50f. for the morphology). Even if the connection with νωμάω is not accepted (see Pronk 2012, 218 for an alternative account), ORu. *namъ* "interest" (cf. Patri 2001, 291ff.) implies that *núoma* is at least of Balto-Slavic date;

pir̃šti, *per̃ša* "propose as wife/husband" – traditionally derived from **prek̂-* "ask" (Lith. *prašýti*, etc.; LIV, 490f.);

OLith. *póséti*, *pósa* "worship" < **peh₂-s-* (LIV, 460), cf. OCS *pasti*, *pasǫ* "pasture", Hitt. *paḫḫš-* "protect", as per Karaliūnas 1972;

pùsė "half" – probably with TB *poṣiya* "wall", as per Fraenkel 1932, 229; Adams 2013, 435 (thanks to Alexander Nikolaev for bringing this word to my attention);

skàsti, *skañta* "spring, hop" – traditionally related to Lat. *scatō*, *-ēre* "gush forth";

statùs "steep, upright", *stãčias* "upright, standing", *statýti* "build" – standardly derived from (pre-)Bl. **statas* < **sth₂-tó-* (: Ved. *sthitá-*, Lat. *status*). This example falsifies D.'s claim that laryngeals were not vocalized between consonants in Balto-Slavic (293);

tàpti, tam̃pa "become" – with tèp-
ti, tė̃pa "smear" (*tep-, LIV, 630), cf.
S t a n g 1952;

tuõkti, -ia "marry" < caus. *tṓkʷ-
éi̯e/o- (*tekʷ- "flow", LIV, 620f.), as
per K l i n g e n s c h m i t t 2008, 194ff.;

vóras "spider" < *u̯āro- (*(H)u̯eh₂-
ro-), cf. Lat. uārus "bent outwards,
bow-legged", as per W i t c z a k 2006.

10. The conclusion of this review
is clear. From every point of view one
may desire to judge it D.'s dictionary falls
very short from being a good *Etymo-
logical Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited
Lexicon*. Will it be useful in spite of its
shortcomings? I suppose it will – for the
same reasons as D.'s Slavic dictionary. In
a review it is difficult not to highlight
the problematic aspects of a book, but
some entries are up-to-date (e.g. *aukà*
"sacrifice, offering", *áuksas* "gold", *pùlti*
"fall", *úošvis* "father-in-law"), interest-
ing observations are not lacking (for
example, this is almost the only place
in which I have found [correct] doubts
regarding the standard, but problem-
atic inclusion of *dùrti*, -ia "stab, prick"
in the set of *dìrti*, Sl. *dertì "tear"), and
the metatonical character of the intona-
tion of many words is usually identified.
Nevertheless, readers are well advised to
use this dictionary with outmost caution
and, more importantly, they should be
aware of the fact that it contains huge
gaps in the representation of the data and
the secondary literature.

REFERENCES

Adams, Douglas Q. 2013, *A diction-
ary of Tocharian B: Revised and greatly en-
larged*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Bammesberger, Alfred 1973, *Abstrakt-
bildungen in den baltischen Sprachen*, Göt-
tingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Beekes, Robert S. P. 2011, *Compara-
tive Indo-European linguistics: an introduc-
tion*, second edition revised and corrected
by Michiel de Vaan, Amsterdam, Philadel-
phia: Benjamins.

Bezlaj, France 1977–2005, *Etimološki
slovar slovenskega jezika* 1–4, Ljubljana:
Mladinska knjiga.

Bichlmeier, Harald 2011 (rev.), Rick
Derksen, Etymological dictionary of the
Slavic inherited lexicon, 2008, *Das Alter-
tum* 56(1), 61–64.

Derksen, Rick 2004, Balto-Slavic ac-
centuation: an update, *Histoire Épistémolo-
gie Langage* 26(2), 81–92.

Derksen, Rick 2008, *Etymological dic-
tionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*, Lei-
den, Boston: Brill.

DLKŽ – Stasys Keinys (red.),
Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas, 4 leidi-
mas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų lei-
dybos institutas, 2000.

Dybo, Vladimir Antonovič 2000, *Mor-
fologizovannye paradigmatičeskie akcentnye
sistemy: Tipologija i genezis*, Moscow: Jazyki
russkoj kul'tury.

Eckert, Rainer 1983, *Die Nominal-
stämme auf -i im Baltischen unter besonder-
er Berücksichtigung des Slawischen*, Berlin:
Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR.

EH – Jānis Endzelīns, Edīte Hauzen-
berga, *Papildinājumi un labojumi K.
Mülenbacha latviešu valodas vārdnīcai.*

Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen zu K. Mühlenbachs Lettisch-deutschem Wörterbuch 1–2, Rīga: Kultūras fonda izdevums, 1934–1946.

Endzelin, Jānis 1923, *Lettische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Winter.

ÈSSJ – Oleg Nikolajevič Trubačev (ed.), *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*, Moskva: Nauka, 1974–.

Fecht, Rainer 2005–2006[2010] (rev.), Rick Derksen, Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon, 2008, *Philologia Fenno-Ugrica* 11–12, 99–104.

Fecht, Rainer 2007, Lit. *pláuti* : aksl. *pluti* – eine Frage der Morphonologie, in Hans Fix (ed.), *Beiträge zur Morphologie. Germanisch, Baltisch, Ostseefinnisch*, Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 383–393.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1932, Zur tocharischen Grammatik, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 50, 220–231.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg: C. Winter-Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Gąsiorowski, Piotr 2013, *Gruit grus*: The Indo-European names of the crane, *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 18, 51–68.

Holzer, Georg 2010 (rev.), Rick Derksen, Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon, 2008, *Kratylos* 55, 173–177.

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

Karaliūnas, Simas 1972, K baltijskomu sootvetstviju slavjanskogo *pasti*, in Vladimir Nikolaevič Toporov (ed.), *Balto-slavjanskij sbornik*, Moskva: Nauka, 281–288.

Karulis, Konstantīns 1992, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*, Riga: Avots.

Kessler, Stephan, Stephen Mossman 2013, Ein Fund aus dem Jahre 1440: Ein bisher unbekannter Text in einer baltischen Sprache, *Archivum Lithuanicum* 15, 511–534.

Klingenschmitt, Gert 2008, Erbe und Neuerung bei Akzent und Ablaut in der litauischen Morphologie, in Danguolė Mikulėnienė, Saulius Ambrazas (eds.), *Kalbos istorijos ir dialektologijos problemos* 2, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 180–215.

Koch, Christoph 1990, *Das morphologische System des altkirchenslavischen Verbums* 1–2, München: Fink.

Kölligan, Daniel 2007, Arm. *mnǰem* "to sleep", *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 4, 25–35.

Kölligan, Daniel 2011, Griechisch χρίμπτομαι, in Thomas Krisch, Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 279–288.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112–124.

Kroonen, Guus 2013, *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Kümmel, Martin Joachim 2000, *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Larsson, Jenny Helena 2007, The master of the house – Greek οἴκαδε and related issues, in Coulter George, Matthew McCullagh, Benedicte Nielsen, Antonia Ruppel, Olga Tribulato (eds.), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European perspective*,

Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 101–106.

Larsson, Jenny Helena 2010, *Old Prussian nominal compounds*, Stockholm, Rīga: Memento.

Lemeškin, Ilja 2014a, Petrus Wickerau vs. Petrus Turnau. Kretos pėdsako autorystės klausimu, *Baltistica* 49(1), 139–161.

Lemeškin, Ilja 2014b, Kretos pėdsako trečiosios eilutės interpretacijos klausimu, *Baltistica* 49(2), 357–364.

LIV – *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius, 1941–2002.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1988–1997, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* 1–4, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 2013, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, 2-asis pataisytas ir papildytas leidimas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras.

ME – Karl Mühlenbach, Jānis Endzelīns, *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Lettisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4, Rīga: Izglītības ministrija; Kultūras fonds, 1923–1932.

Nussbaum, Alan 2014, Greek τέκμαρ "sign" and τέκμωρ "sign": Why both?, in Norbert Oettinger, Thomas Steer (eds.), *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen: Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16.*

September 2011 in Erlangen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 215–260.

Palionis, Jonas 2004, *XVI–XVII a. lietuviškų raštų atrankinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Patri, Sylvain 2001, Une correspondance irano-slave en novgorodien, *Historische Sprachforschung* 114, 290–306.

Petit, Daniel 2013 (rev.), Wojciech Smoczyński, Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego, 2007, *Kratylos* 58, 74–84.

Pinault, Georges 2009, On the formation of the Tocharian demonstratives, in Elisabeth Rieken, Paul Widmer (eds.), *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 221–245.

Pronk, Tijmen 2011, On the development of initial **Hu*, **Hi* and the rise of initial acute diphthongs in Baltic and Slavic, in Tijmen Pronk, Rick Derksen (eds.), *Accent Matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology*, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 309–321.

Pronk, Tijmen 2012, Proto-Indo-European long vowels and Balto-Slavic accentuation, *Baltistica* 47(2), 205–247.

Rau, Jeremy 2010, The derivational history of PIE **di̯éu̯/*di̯u-´* "(god of the) day-lit sky; day", in Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, Michael Weiss (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 307–320.

Rinkevičius, Vytautas 2009, *Prūsų kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*, Dissertation, Vilnius University.

Sabaliauskas, Algirdas 1990, *Lietuvių kalbos leksika*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Schmid, Wolfgang P. 1966, Baltische Beiträge IV. Zur Bildung des litauischen Praeteritums, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 71, 286–296.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2008, Die idg. Wurzeln *kelh₁*- „etw. bewegen" und *kelh₃*- „sich erheben", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 113, 59–75.

Sławski, Franciszek (ed.) 1974–2001, *Słownik prasłowiański* 1–8 (A–G), Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2002, Zur Schreibung im apr. Enchiridion, III: *enterpo*, *Baltistica* 37(1), 45–50.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2003, *Hiat laryngalny w językach bałto-słowiańskich*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2005, *Lexikon der Altpreussischen Verben*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Sommer, Florian 2012, Etymologie und mythische Funktion: Zu Trita Āptya, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 66, 247–276.

Stang, Christian 1952, Litauisch *tàpti*, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 16, 259–262.

Šinkūnas, Mindaugas 2010, *XVI–XVII amžiaus Mažosios Lietuvos raštų akcentografija*, Dissertation, Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.

Toporov, Vladimir Nikolaevič 1975–1990, *Prusskij jazyk: slovar'* 1–5 (A–L), Moscow: Nauka.

Tremblay, Xavier 1999, Ist jungawestisch *nāismi*, *nāist* Präsens oder sigmatischer Aorist?, in Heiner Eichner, Christian Luschützky (eds.), *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, Prag: Enigma Corporation, 537–543.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1923, *Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Vaillant, André 1966, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves 3: Le verbe*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Vasmer, Max 1953–1958, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–3, Heidelberg: Winter.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2006, Old Lithuanian *pame(d)mi* "imitate", *Baltistica* 41(1), 95–97.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2011, Indo-European long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 46(1), 5–38.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2012–13, On the origin of the Greek type νωμάω, *Sprache* 50, 44–62.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel 2014, Tone variation in the Baltic *ia*-presents, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119, 227–249.

Vine, Brent 1999, A note on the Duenos inscription, *UCLA Indo-European Studies* 1, 293–305.

Vine, Brent 2012 (rev.), Michiel de Vaan, Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages, 2008, *Kratylos* 57, 1–40.

Widmer, Paul 2004, *Das Korn des weiten Feldes. Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie: Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Widmer, Paul 2008, Drei griechische

*ōu̯-Stämme, in Brigitte Huber, Marianne Volkart, Paul Widmer (eds.), *Chomalangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Halle (Saale): International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, 615–630.

Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz 2006, The East Baltic name for "spider", *Baltistica* 41(1), 101–102.

Young, Steven 2006, Laryngeal metathesis in initial position in Balto-Slavic, in Howard I. Aronson, Donald L. Dyer, Victor A. Friedman, Daniela S. Hristova, Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.), *The Bill question: contributions to the study of linguistics and languages in honor of Bill J. Darden on the occasion of his sixty-sixth birthday*, Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 231–245.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON
Vilniaus universitetas
Universiteto g. 5
LT-01513 Vilnius
Lithuania
[*miguel.villanueva@flf.vu.lt*]