

Katsiaryna ACKERMANN

Universität Wien

**LINGUISTIC COMMENTARIES ON THE “VERZEICHNIS
VERALTETER ODER WENIG BEKANNTER LITAUISHER
WÖRTER” COLLECTED BY GOTTFRIED OSTERMEYER
IN LITHUANIA MINOR (KLEINLITAUEN)**

Abstract. The present article introduces a list of glosses to a collection of Lithuanian protestant spiritual hymns, compelled by Gottfried Ostermeyer, one of the prominent intellectuals and promoter of the Lithuanian culture and language of the 18th century in Lithuania Minor. The glossary was intended to facilitate the understanding of certain older or less known expressions, as Ostermeyer put it ‘*obsoleta und minus cognita*’, and due to political disputes among the intellectual community in East Prussian Lithuania Minor at the time of their publication fell into oblivion. The paper discusses a more or less random selection of twenty entries from the glossary, focusing on their dialectal features, semantic and morphological divergence from existing derivatives of the same root, and pays special attention to the derivational history and cross-IE cognates.

Judging by the material studied in the paper the Lithuanian spoken idiom of the 17th-18th c. appears to be very vivid in onomasiology, creative in the usage of morphological means and still in possession of certain roots already gone in the dictionaries of the late 19th century and scarcely perceivable in the modern paramount linguistic database of LKŽ.

Keywords: Lithuanian; East Prussia; Lithuania Minor; Gottfried Ostermeyer; glossary.

Introductory remarks

The following article is a small contribution to the discussion of the linguistic heritage of the Lithuanian dialectal diversity, and brings forward what happened to get lost due to political disputes in East Prussian Lithuania Minor at the end of the 18th century.¹ Our primary aim is to attract attention

¹ The topic discussed in the present article is not actually our primary field of expertise, and our linguistic commentaries do not offer exhaustive explanations. For certain, many specialists in Lithuanian dialectology would find a lot more peculiar features in

of linguists, diachronists and dialectologists to a collection of all in all 158 lemmas compelled, supplied with translations and commentaries by Gottfried Ostermeyer (1716–1800), a Protestant pastor, one of the prominent intellectuals and promoters of the Lithuanian culture and language of the 18th c. in Lithuania Minor, well-known as the author of “Neue Littauische Grammatik” (Ostermeyer 1791) as well as for his endeavours to systematize Lithuanian orthography.² The list, a handwritten copy of which, titled as above, I discovered by accident in the archive materials of Andreas Sjögren in the Archive of RAS (St. Petersburg)³, seemed to have remained unconsidered by established dictionaries, as well as in selected pages of the future ALEW, which were available online before the publication of the printed version. Dictionaries that were to cite, obviously, all existing derivatives and ablaut variations of roots (incl. the databases of LKŽ) lacked now and then those from the “Verzeichnis”.

The list of lemmas, as it turned out, had been attached to Gottfried Ostermeyer’s critical discussion of textbooks of protestant spiritual hymns – one of the basic forms of the survival of the Lithuanian vernacular in a complex situation of competing with the German (and Polish) and simultaneously one of the rather underestimated sources of linguistic data of Old Lithuanian. Published in 1793 as an appendix to “Erste Littauische Liedergeschichte ans Licht gestellt von Gottfried Ostermeyer...”, in which all hymnals, appeared by that time, had been introduced and analysed with usual scrutiny, the list was intended to facilitate the understanding of words, considered by that time as obsolete or, as Ostermeyer admits in the preface, to facilitate the understanding of the words, that should have belonged to very local dialects brought up by the translators of German protestant hymns in the 17th c. The glossary refers primarily to Ostermeyer’s own collection of Lithuanian spiritual hymns, the last one in his discussion, published in 1780/81 under the title “Giesmes

the lexicological material of G. Ostermeyer. Here I would like to thank both anonymous reviewers of the present article for their most valuable suggestions.

² Gelumbeckaitė 2009, 22; see also Biržiška 1963; Citavičiūtė 1996.

³ Judging by the handwriting, the copy could have been produced by Sjögren himself. The manner of writing definitely reveals a customary use of Lithuanian in the orthography contemporary to that of Ostermeyer. Its comparison with the printed version of 1793 (accessible now over the internet as a scanned copy of a very poor quality) facilitated in certain cases the decision about the proper diacritics.

βventos Bažnyczoje ir Namėj' giedojamos su nobažnomis Maldomis į wienas Knygas suglaustos nū G. Ostermeyerio Karalaučiuje". It is designed as an index and for each lemma there is a hymn number and a verse number.

Sociolinguistic and historical context

Despite its lexicological value, the glossary did not manage to attract proper attention, largely because of the methodological disputes among the intellectual community in Prussia of late 18th century upon Ostermeyer's publication of his book of "Giesmes βventos". Ostermeyer was never especially careful in criticism of his predecessors (neither contemporaries) and overlooked, as it seems, the fact, that Johann Behrendt⁴ whose collection of hymns (first edition completed in 1732⁵) he criticised heavily, had worked on his version of spiritual hymns together with Peter Gottlieb Mielcke, father of Christian Gottlieb Mielcke (Lith. Kristijonas Gotlibas Milkus) – another important intellectual figure of that time and Ostermeyer's chief opponent in public disputes. The latter felt himself challenged. Moreover, there were substantial differences between the two, what lexical material they considered relevant in their publications on Lithuanian language. Mielcke criticized Ostermeyer's 'too pragmatic' approach and finally succeeded in making the church authorities abolish his hymnal.⁶ Everything published was sold out as paper for household needs. In fact, *the far too new*⁷ in Ostermeyer's edition of hymns was not the lexical material itself, but primarily their arrangement (that is true, users could have been irritated by not finding the usual hymn on its proper place in the book, and it is comprehensible, that Mielcke could find support for his discontent among pastors of other communities in Lithuania Minor). Another actual novelty was his sorting out of occasional germanisms, that flooded the 'literary' Lithuanian language

⁴ Johann Behrendt (1667–1737) a Protestant pastor of Mehlkehmen (Lithuania Minor) together with Peter Gottlieb Mielcke (who succeeded him 1736 as pastor of Mehlkehmen) was engaged in the linguistic 'improvement' of the Lithuanian bible and translation of liturgical songs.

⁵ "İβ naujo perweizdetos ir pagerintos Giesmju-knygos" ('new and improved song book') had subsequently five editions within 15 years.

⁶ All that is reflected in numerous correspondence within the intellectual community in Lithuania Minor, see also Michelini 2008, 31, 43, as well as directly reported by Ostermeyer in his 'Liedergeschichte' (Ostermeyer 1793, 190–226).

⁷ Ostermeyer 1793, 176–186. Addressed also by Ostermeyer himself in *Bedenken über einen Entwurf zu einem Neuen Littauischen Gesangsbuch*, Königsberg, 1786.

through numerous translations of Protestant spiritual literature at that time. Ostermeyer did not remove original Lithuanian expressions, he affirmed it himself in his “Erste Littauische Liedergeschichte”, which is so to say his attempt of public acquittal. In a short introduction to his collection of “obsoleta und minus cognita” – that is our “Verzeichnis von veralteter und wenig bekannter lithauischer Wörter”⁸ – Ostermeyer underlines their dialectal value⁹ and regrets the removal or substitution of such expressions with more common ones in the collection of hymns by Johann Behrendt. On page 280 Ostermeyer observes that *Behrendt hat versucht in der Ausgabe seines Gesangbuchs viele solcher veralteten und wenig bekannten Wörter mit bekannten und gebräuchlichern zu vertauschen. Wie unvorsichtig er aber dabei zu Werke gegangen, haben wir oben § 79 bis 88 an so machen Exempeln gesehen.* Further on Ostermeyer gives his understanding of appropriate treatment of “obsoleta” and “minus cognita” and comments that he virtually had to replace Behrendt’s equivalents with original expressions in his own book of hymns. According to his own words, Ostermeyer removed much of the German loans and fashion words from the song texts and replaced them with the original expressions, still accessible in older Lithuanian songbooks (some of them reflecting thus the language of the 16th century) for which he also consulted the handwritten Lexicon by Jakob Brodowski¹⁰, and probably the anonymous handwritten Lexicon Lithuanicum.¹¹ Judging by the glossary he should have made an extensive use of the Lithuanian spoken idiom.

His main opponent in numerous ongoing public disputes over several decades, on the contrary, seemed to have another taste in selection of what he considered worth attention, driven by his own poetic aesthetics. The comparison with the Lithuanian dictionary by Philipp Ruhig revisited and enhanced by Ch. Mielcke, which appeared in Königsberg in 1800, that is shortly after Ostermeyer issued his “Liedergeschichte”, shows that it lacks

⁸ In the printed original: „Verzeichniß der in den Littauischen Kirchengesängen vorkommenden veralteten und nicht jedermann bekannten Wörter“.

⁹ Ostermeyer 1793, 278–279; as well as 1791, §154ff.

¹⁰ *Lexicon germanico-lithvanicum et lithvanico-germanicum, darinnen so wohl die Vocabula Biblica Veteris et Novi Testamenti, als auch Vocabula Domestica item Über zwey Tausend Proverbia und über ein Hundert Aenigmata Lithoanica und viele Phrases anzutreffen und also wo nicht ganz völlig doch ziemlich Complet ist.*

¹¹ See the tables below. The use of both dictionaries is reflected in his correspondence (cf. Gerulaitienė 2000; Drotvinas 2001).

certain lexemes we find in Ostermeyer's list and diverges in the translational equivalents of some other. Nor compilers of later dictionaries seem to have been familiar with Ostermeyer's material, although there is plenty of comparable expressions and derivatives of the same roots, i.a. collected in LKŽ. Later bi- or trilingual dictionaries as e.g. Lithuanian–German by Friedrich Nesselmann 1851, or Lithuanian–Russian–Polish by Anton Juškevič 1904 (the latter exploiting extensively traditional Lithuanian *Dainos*, that were unfortunately underestimated as to their linguistic merits by Ostermeyer himself¹²) on the one hand seemed to rely largely on the edition by Mielcke, on the other hand focused on the *literary* lexicon of Catechisms, and other devotional literature leaving thus certain uncomprehensive vernacular outboard.

The wordlist itself is of special interest both as to the etymology, and to dialectal affiliation of different lemmas. It contains words, the dialectal status of which, and often provenance as the whole, is not quite clear. Ostermeyer was perfectly aware of the fact, that the word stock of the spoken language was largely influenced by the variant of Low German spoken in East Prussia¹³ and sorted out carefully what he considered to be authentic Lithuanian. The task was not easy in view of the situation close to that of diglossia in Lithuania Minor, notably the Protestantism, the notions of Reformation and first spiritual hymns being introduced by the German-speaking neighbours.

The glossary covers lexical material firstly of Ostermeyer's own collection of Protestant hymns, and secondly of those, that he had incorporated from his predecessors, which he referred to as “die Männer, denen wir unsere Lieder zu verdanken haben” (‘the men whom we owe our songs’). And since we know exactly whom he meant thanks to his “Erste littausche Liedergeschichte”, it is possible to draw a time border. It goes as far as Martin Mosvidius’ (Lith. Martynas Mažvydas) “Gesmes Chriksczoniskas gedomas Baßnyczosu ...” issued 1566 and 1570, which means that Ostermeyer's lemmas could also reflect Old Lith. state of the art.

¹² Corresponding with abbot Jacob Penzel, Ostermeyer is sceptical about any special linguistic value of Lithuanian folklore, obviously, the pagan contents of *Dainos*, their ‘primitive’ versification and very simple composition failed to interest a protestant pastor (Gerulaitienė 2001, 73).

¹³ The evidence of his intensive work with the language of the hymns is directly reflected in his correspondence on the matter of the status and “purity” of the Lithuanian language with J. Penzel (cf. Gerulaitienė 2001, 73), as well as in numerous *scripta minora* of the author, cf. Bense 2000, 230.

Since the original collection of Ostermeyer's "Giesmes βventos" had been officially entirely destroyed¹⁴ there is unfortunately no possibility to consider the lexical and syntactic context of the words, though very carefully annotated. In fact, the compilation of the glossary as such and above all its publication not in the hymnal itself but attached to "Liedergeschichte", seem to speak for the fact, that Ostermeyer was driven here by the necessity to reconcile his readership with his far 'too Lithuanian' edition after it had been officially criticized.

Some observations on the dialectal variation¹⁵

In the phonetic representation of the lexemes of Ostermeyer's list quite visible is the absence of palatalization, one of the conspicuous phonological features occurring in Low Lithuanian dialects, which is comprehensible in the context of dominating German in East Prussia:¹⁶

e.g. *growa* for *griovà* here 'grave, crypt' (Ostermeyer 1793, 283)

Another significant feature is the replacement of diphthongs with monophthongs,¹⁷ which is, though also proven for some of the East Lithuanian dialects, as well as Latvian, here in terms of dialect continuum, reflects rather the variety spoken in the West Samogitian area, that is by *Donininkai*. Some illustrative parallels are:

¹⁴ At this place, I hope to attract the attention of historians of Lithuania Minor, to look for possible copies of the book that might have survived. Ostermeyer would never destroy his own copy, neither, supposedly, his numerous associates with whom he was in constant exchange of letters, books, and hand-written materials on Lithuanian language and culture.

¹⁵ Extensive analysis of lexical, morphological and phonological features of the words will be left for the dialectologists of Lithuanian.

¹⁶ The question, whether the absence of palatalization is to be considered an archaism of Samogitian dialects or rather a case of later de-palatalization depends on the viewpoint upon the genesis of Samogitian and its relation to Aukštaitian, as well as on the relative chronology of the developments in consonantal system of Lithuanian dialects and will not be addressed here.

¹⁷ Cf. Endzelīns 1971, 21, as well as 38–39 on the developments in word final vocalism, and Specht 1924, 626–630. In the context of the general vowel narrowing and shortening in Prussian Lithuanian, which is sometimes connected to either Prussian or Curonian substratum on the territory overlapping with the West Samogitian, cf. Zinkevičius 1998, 92, 206–208.

é for *ie* *artės* for *arties* ‘almost’ (Ostermeyer 1793, 281)

o for *uo* *arodas* for *aruodas* ‘burrow’ (Ostermeyer 1793, 281)

Lemmas of Ostermeyer’s glossary reflect with certainty phonological and lexical peculiarities of Prussian Lithuanian, genetically a West Aukštaitian subgroup, generally considered as the most archaic of all Lithuanian dialects.¹⁸ As its extensive discussion is not the primary aim of this paper, we refer at this point to detailed descriptions by Specht (1924, 626–647), Salys (1933, 22–26), Gerullis (1930, 10–28), Endzelīns (1971, 43) and Zinkevičius (1994, 27–28).

Linguistic commentaries on selected entries

Ostermeyer provided his list with translations, occasional (unfortunately very scarce) explanations, and corrections of what he considered to be inappropriate intonation marks, as well as other commentaries. He remarked (1793, 293) that a large number of the unusual words had come as the result of individual dialectal interference [obviously mostly lexicological] through previous translators of German protestant songs into Lithuanian.

From the point of view of lexis, by far not all of Ostermeyer’s lemmas are unique; a part of them occur in dictionaries (mostly those of the late 18th – beg. of the 19th c.), and especially in glossaries to Lithuanian folk songs, or *Dainos*. Such apparent cases we will omit here as a whole. Apart of that the list contains numerous mostly relatively late lexical borrowings from Slavic: Polish or Belarussian, as well as occasional germanisms, although the latter had been already largely identified and sorted out by Ostermeyer. They will make group 1. in our discussion below. Further on lemmas are grouped in those, that have elsewhere unattested derivatives (suffixal and prefixal) or unattested stem formations to otherwise known roots and elsewhere unattested root grades. These make up group 2. The latter would be more interesting from the diachronic viewpoint. Occasionally one comes across generally familiar lexemes with diverging semantics, they will be discussed in group 3. Pure occasionalisms as the result of folk etymology or creative word blending make up group 4. Finally, in group 5. there are certain unattested roots or those of unclear etymological affiliation. Apparently, most of the words are emphatic expressions, which speaks indirectly in favour of their vernacular provenience.

¹⁸ Advocated e.g. by Zinkevičius 1998, 206.

Not all of elsewhere unattested forms, especially those with previously unattested affixal derivatives are interesting from the IE perspective, but rather for the Inner–Baltic studies. Therefore, only exemplary cases have been picked out and treated below, the scope of the actual linguistic data on 158 lexemes of Ostermeyer’s list (the half of which comprises somewhat sixty pages) would surpass the framework of an article.

Lexemes are cited in the orthography of the original (the same applies to the parallel quotations from older dictionaries); quotations refer to the hymn and verse numbers in Ostermeyer’s collection of “Giesmes βventos” (1781) and are followed by his translation and commentaries. Under each lemma there are references to other dictionaries and glossaries, if there are any, followed by our commentaries. For our linguistic analysis we consulted dictionaries and glossaries covering a period of several centuries of lexicographic tradition of Lithuanian, and different dialectal settings: not only predominantly Samogitian and West Aukštaitian of East Prussia, but also Eastern Aukštaitian dialects (by Johannes Bretke [Lith. Jonas Bretkūnas] or Konstantinas Sirvydas [earlier also Širvydas]), as well as modern etymological dictionaries, citing all identified dialectal variants.

Dictionaries and glossaries in the tables below are abbreviated as follows:

^{1,3} Sirvydas	Sirvydas K. ¹ 1620, ³ 1642, <i>Dictionarium Trium Linguarum</i> .
LL	anonymous 1632–1658, ¹⁹ <i>Lexicon Lithuanicum</i> .
Haack	Haack W.F. 1730, <i>Vocabularium Litthuanico Germanicum et Germanico Litthuanicum</i> .
Brodowsky	Brodowsky J. mid-late 18th c., <i>Lexicon Germanico-Lithvanicum et Lithvanico-Germanicum</i> .
Ruhig / Mielcke	Ruhig Ph. / Mielcke Ch. G. 1800, <i>Littauisch-deutsches und deutsch-littauisches Wörterbuch</i> .
Nesselmann	Nesselmann G. H. F. 1851, <i>Wörterbuch der Littauischen Sprache</i> .
Schleicher 1857	Schleicher A. 1857, <i>Litauisches Lesebuch und Glossar</i> .
Schleicher 1865	Schleicher A. 1865, <i>Christian Donaleitis. Litauische Dichtungen</i> .
Kurschat	Kurschat F. 1883, <i>Wörterbuch der littauischen Sprache</i> .

¹⁹ The chronology is based on the analysis of the watermarks on the sheets used as pages in the handwritten book. The page numbers that we give in parenthesis refer to the original manuscript, and not to the published edition of 1987.

Leskien	Leskien A. 1919, Litauisches Lesebuch mit Grammatik und Wörterbuch.
LEI	Bender H.D. 1921, A Lithuanian Etymological Index.
LEW	Fraenkel E. 1962, 1965, Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.
Karulis	Karulis K. 1992, Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca.
Smoczyński	Smoczyński W. 2007, Lietuvių kalbos etimologinis žodynas.
ALEW	Hock W. (ed.) 2015, Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.
LKŽ	Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, http://www.lkz.lt , 2008.

Group 1. Instances of lexical borrowing

(1)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
attėbit	214,4	besänftigen, begütigen, versöhnen	Praes. attėbiju

Cf.: ¹Sirvydas (15) *tiešiu*; Ruhig/Mielcke (292); Nesselmann (99); Kurschat (454, 456); LEW (550); ALEW (1103); LKŽ *tiėšyti*

An early borrowing from East Slavic, most likely Belarussian (*u-*)*tėšytb*, cf. ORuss. *-tėšiti*, *-u* ‘console, comfort, amuse’ alongside with the back-formed substantive *pa-*, *utexa* ‘amusement’. Root vocalism is either a dialectal monophthongal representation (cf. Endzelīns 1971, 43) of a Proto-Baltic long **-e-*, characteristic of West Samogitian dialects, or an earlier form corresponding exactly to the Slavic source: *tėβiju* (Ruhig / Mielcke 292), *tėsziju*, *tėszius* (Nesselmann 99), *tėβyju*, *-βyju*, *βystu* (Kurschat 454).²⁰ The prefix *at-* (the Slavic correspondence of which, *ot(v)-* is not attested with this root) could represent the first stage of adaptation in Lithuanian alongside with the prefix *pa-* likewise borrowed from East Slavic and attested in older Lithuanian dictionaries, cf. *pa-tėβiju* (Ruhig / Mielcke 292), *pa-tėsziju* (Nesselmann 99). Non-accented short word final vowel is dropped, as characteristic for some West Aukštaitain dialects, cf. Gerullis 1930, 24 on the spoken idiom of Vakariečiai Žiemiečiai.

(2)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
žladeja, os	349,5	Ein Dieb, Räuber	Vom poln. złodziey

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (547); LL (19); Kurschat (513); LEW (1279); LKŽ *zladiėjus*, *zladijas*

²⁰ By Kurschat set in block parenthesis, as very uncommon.

This is a clear borrowing from the neighbouring Polish or Belarussian, which in this case could be both. Unexpected from the point of view of dialectal context is here the alveo-palatal (coronal) pronunciation of the Slavic voiced alveo-dental (apical) fricative [z], according to our research only Ostermeyer gives here [ž].²¹

The word should have been unknown in East Lithuania, cf. in Sirvydas' Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary²² Pol. lemma *złodziey* (and derivatives) are translated with Lith. *wagis* 'thief', which is also the only translational equivalent for German 'Dieb' in the Lexicon of Brodowski (348). The latter, by the way, translates 'Böswicht' with another slavicism – *néprietelus* (Brodowski 282),²³ whereas the anonymous Lexicon Lithuanicum cites *zladej[us]* as a Lithuanian translation of the German 'Böswicht' ('villain') beside *piktadarys*. The form *zladejus* is attested already in Bretke's *Naujos Giesmju Knygos* of 1653²⁴ and treated by Skardžius (1931, 243) among other slavicisms, who gives *zladiėjus* as a parallel form.

Obvious influence of the neighbouring German dialects, resulting probably due to folk etymology in lexical blending, can be observed in the following case:

(3)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
gnaudžiu, iau	161,8	Ich nage, quäle	

Cf.: ¹Sirvydas (36) *gniauziu*; Schleicher 1865 (195); Kurschat (128–129); LEI (67); Karulis I (310); LEW (159); ALEW (347, 356); Smoczyński (195); LKŽ *gnausti*

²¹ Since the word is properly situated in the alphabetic order, the chance of a misprint can be ruled out just as little would we question Ostermeyer's competence in recording Lithuanian.

²² Sirvydas ³1642, 547.

²³ In fact, most of the synonyms given by Brodowski for this context are slavicisms: "(tu) *néprietelau*, (tu) *newidóne*, (tu) *nekrikβczone*..." correspond to Belarussian *nepryjacel* (Polish *nieprzyjaciel*) and further Belarussian or Polish past participles 'unseen', 'unbaptized'.

²⁴ Here cited acc. to LEW, as Michellini's edition of 2009 has no index. LKŽ gives several attestations of *zladiėjus* – mainly from J. Bretke's works. The form *zladijas* is found in today's Lithuanian linguistic enclave in Belarus, in the village of Dzatlovo (the data according to LKŽ).

Due to the interference with Germanic dialects, and when following Zinkevičius (1998, 204) because of the Curonian substratum on the territory of Lithuania Minor, the affricate [dʒ] parallel to High Lithuanian sibilant [ʒ] could be explained as a sub-development of the Samogitian sound law (or sequence of laws²⁵), regulating there the absence of sibilization in clusters of dentals with *-j-*, as well as before front vowels. However, in view of the meaning, noted by Ostermeyer (1793, 283) the attested form of the verb cannot be merely a non-palatalized (or “half-palatalized”) variant of the existent High Lithuanian *gniaužti* ‘press, squeeze’ cf. by Schleicher (1865, 195) and Kurschat (129) ‘in die Hand fassen, die Hand um etwas schließen’.²⁶ More likely *gnaudžiu* is the product of a semantic reanalysis involving Balto-Slavic continuants, as in Lith. *gráužti*²⁷, Latv. *grauzt* or OCS *gryzŏ* ‘gnaw’, of the PIE root **g^hreuHǵ^(h)-* ‘gnaw’²⁸ with synonymous MHG (as well as otherwise widespread in Germanic languages) *gnagen*²⁹ of a hypothetical PIE root **g^hno/eǵ(H)g^h-* which apart from a questionable YAv. cognate *-ɣnixta*³⁰ seems to have survived in Latv. *gņēgāt* ‘eat reluctantly’. The contact with German explains also why [n] in the root is non-palatal, whereas the stem preserves the usual in paradigmatic terms final *-i-*.

(4?)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
growa, os	438,5	Die Gruft	

Cf.: Kurschat (136); LEI (72); LEW (170–171) *griūva*; LKŽ *griovà*, ALEW (366)

²⁵ The sound law describes the regular opposition of Aukštian [dʒ] vs. Samogitian [d] both continuing Proto-Baltic **-dj-*. (S. also Zinkevičius 1998, 203–204 on different stages of this development.)

²⁶ In fact, the meaning, provided by Ostermeyer dismisses older disputes upon the etymological connection of both words: *gniaužti* and only sporadically appearing *gnausti*. Cf. Bezenberger (1880, 171, Fn. 1) and Froehde (1886, 299), who tried to link both forms and Germanic cognates of *gniaužti* by means of three different root extensions. (Modern dictionaries mostly leave the word out altogether, LKŽ refers to Bezenberger.)

²⁷ Cf. Nesselmann 85.

²⁸ Cross-IE evidence in ALEW (356), EDG (βρῶζω). - LIV has no mention of the root.

²⁹ EDPG (*gnagan-*) - LIV has no mention of the root.

³⁰ YAv. *aiβi-ɣnixta-* (past participle) ‘gnawed’ is found five times in the Book Vidēvdād and its Pahlavi version, however, precisely in this form. Its etymological connection to the Germanic and Baltic continuants is uncertain.

Fraenkel (LEW, 171) considers *griovà / griūva* a loan word from MLG *grave*, if this is true, the feminine gender should have been taken over from the semantically adjacent *dúoba, duobà* ‘hollow’, ‘cavity’.³¹ Sirvydas has no mention of any derivatives of the verb³² in either of the five editions of his dictionary (1620–1713). The distribution in the 18th c. should have been restricted to Western dialects, which would speak for the German procurement of an *-o*-grade substantive to *grēbiu / grēbiu*³³, *grēbti* ‘rake’³⁴ of the IE root **g^hreb^h-*³⁵ with a semantic specification ‘grasp, seize’ → ‘burrow’. From the point of view of derivational morphology, the suffixation with a pure *-v(a)* for a deverbal fem. resultative noun is not typical, if not unique in this case. Lithuanian produces regularly place names with *-ava/-uva*,³⁶ but neither phonologically, nor semantically we can group *griovà* here. ALEW (366) attributes *griovà* ‘trench’ to Lith. *griauti, griovė*, trans. ‘to collapse’ which though accounts for the palatalized anlaut, cannot provide a sound semantic bridge to Ostermeyer’s attested meaning of a “tomb, crypt”. Quite likely appears, therefore, the participation of both: original Lithuanian phonologically regular word for “trench” and the adjacent in meaning Middle Low German ‘grave, vault’.

**Group 2. Unattested derivatives or stem formations,
unattested root grades.**

(5)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
añtkaklė, ès	307,1	Last, Beschwerde, Joch	So auf dem halse liegt

Cf.: Ruhig/Mielcke (103); Kurschat (9, 10); LEI (89); Smoczyński (245-246); ALEW (433-434) *āp-kaklis* ‘Halsband’; LKŽ *añtkaklis, añtkaklė*

³¹ Cf. the meaning given by Kurschat (136): ‘eine enge Schlucht zwischen zwei Höhen’, ‘canyon’.

³² Cf. ³Sirvydas, 74: *grebiu* in the meaning of ‘congero, coacero, colligo’.

³³ The cross-dialectal divergence in the root vocalism, which is observed in the present forms: *grēbiu* vs. *grēbiū*, is considered by Hock et al. (ALEW, 358) to be an Inner-Baltic metatony of earlier *grēbiū* to *grēbiu* under the influence of the preterit stem. Worth mentioning is, however, the fact, that Lith. *griēbti* ‘grasp, seize’ dialectally, and precisely in Samogitian, can also produce a monophthongal *-ė* in the root (cf. LL 44: ‘*grebti - greiffen*’ and 46: ‘*grebti - harken*’).

³⁴ Cf. Schleicher 1865, 195.

³⁵ Balto-Slavic and Germanic continuants of the root show traces of extensive derivation, i.a. possible extension with *-h₂*, as well as *-i*-infixation, producing ‘secondary roots’ (cf. ²LIV, 201, 203), which we will not comment here.

³⁶ Multiple examples in Endzelīns 1971, 95.

The word can be either considered a prefixal derivative on the basis of the Baltic word for ‘neck’: *kākl-as*, *kakl-s*, or rather (following Kurschat 1883, 9) the result of a univerbation of the prepositional phrase *aĩt kāklo*, in both cases its compositional meaning being metaphorically transferred. Apparently, this is an example of an exocentric (originally prepositionally governed) compound in the classical sense³⁷ and morphologically a feminine abstract noun in $-\bar{e} < \text{PIE } *eh_2$ in the substantivizing function. The circumflex of the ending is secondary.³⁸ *Aĩ(t)kaklė* with precisely this meaning is mentioned by Kurschat and twice in LKŽ: once localized in the area of Georgenburg (Lith. Jurbarkas), adjacent to the Samogitian speaking area, and once in Jonas Jablonskis works. A much more frequently used derivative of the same prefixed / composed stem³⁹ cites Smoczyński: *antkaklis* m. with a concrete meaning “obroža” (‘dog’s collar’), LKŽ gives alongside with the examples of different sorts of (neck) decorations, including the meaning of a ‘dog’s collar’, a secondary abstract formation as well, corresponding to the primary meaning of *aĩtkaklė*, that of ‘sunkumas, vargas’ (‘burden, misery’).

(6)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
želtis, ies	361,10	Die Blühzeit	

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (135, 182) *žielu, želunti*; LL (44a) *želti, žalti*; Schleicher 1865 (328, 327) *želiù, žėlti*, adj. *žalias*; Kurschat (518); LEI (301); LEW (1287, 1296-1297); ALEW (1296); LKŽ *žėlti*

In this case we have an elsewhere unattested *ti*-abstract noun of the root *žel-* ‘green’ (cf. ALEW *žėlti, žėlia* ‘grünen, sprießen’) of the PIE root $*g^h elh_3-$ ‘yellow-green’, with a full *e*-grade, instead of the usual for *ti*-abstracts zero-grade in the root, perhaps as a disambiguation from the zero-grade adjective *žilas* ‘grey’ from the same IE root: $*g^h lh_3-$. Besides, Lithuanian has a number of common *o*-grade derivatives, e.g. adj. *žalias* of the same meaning, cf. LEW (1287). *Želtis* makes part of a (morpho-)semantic group of abstract nouns, denoting special quality narrowed to different contexts; here would

³⁷ Cf. Hock 2006, 120.

³⁸ See Stang 1966, (201-)204 on the fate of long *e*-stems in Baltic.

³⁹ Since *ant(-)* exists in Lith. both as a preposition and as a prefix, and the word is morphologically characterized by a substantive suffix $-\acute{e}$, the decision between the two derivational developments: whether it is [prefix] + [root] + [suffix] or [preposition + noun]-suffix, could be made solely on diachronic grounds, if at all.

also belong, e.g., Lith. *rūdis* sf. ‘rust’ ← ‘red-brownish’ of PIE **(h₁)rud^h-* ‘redness’.⁴⁰

(7)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
žuwynos, ū	366,4	Die Fischzeit	

Cf.: LKŽ *žuvýnas*; ALEW (752)

The allusion is that to *fasting* not to *fishing*, so the root of the derivational base is clearly nominal. The unattested *-in*-derivative probably belongs to the group of abstract pluralia tantum of collective meaning (Endzelīns 1971, 104, § 124b), cf. a similar concept of time *pelenynos* (2) sf.pl. ‘Asch Wednesday’. LKŽ attests *žuvýnas* sm. with predictable for this derivational type collective meaning of ‘a big amount of fish’⁴¹ or ‘the place, where fish is to be in abundance’. The temporal notion (which seems to have no parallels in other hymnals) should have emerged in the context of the religious calendar: the time of fasting follows Asch Wednesday.

(8)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
balant, gerund.	355,6	erblaßen	Karo Briespauda mums ißgandin-tiems balant. <i>Wenn wir durch di Kriegsnoth erschreckt sterben.</i> Ist ziemlich dunkel.

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (18); Ruhig/Mielcke (19); Schleicher 1857 (260); Kurschat (38); LEI (15); LEW (32); ALEW (122); LKŽ *balti*

ALEW cites the meaning ‘erblassen’, ‘grow pale’ with a different derivative: *iš-blỹksti* (ALEW, 122) and puts an asterisk in front of **balti* (*bāla/bālsta/bal̃na, bālo*) ‘weiß, bleich werden’. According to ALEW *balkti* (*-sta, -o*) is the derivative used in the meaning ‘weiß werden’ in modern Lithuanian. A *-k*-extended root gives also Sirvydas (³1642, 18): *balkstu* equivalent to Pol. *blednieć* and Lat. *pallesco* ‘turn pale’. The simplex is given however in Schleicher’s glossary to his collection of *dainos* and *pásakos*:⁴² *bālù, bālaú, balti* ‘weiß werden’, with a *-sta* alongside with a *-na*-present; as well as in LKŽ with citations predominantly from Juškevič’s dictionary, who also

⁴⁰ Rau 2009, 73.

⁴¹ The same concrete meaning is attested in the songbook of Berent (1735, 317): *Mus Wandù pèn žuwinis*, as the translational equivalent of “das Wasser muss geben Fisch” in Joh. Hurtel’s version of the old German hymn “Singen wir aus Herzensgrund”.

⁴² Schleicher 1857, 260.

derived a great part of his vocabulary from *dainos* and other folklore forms.⁴³ The simplex is also given by Fraenkel (LEW, 32) with the meaning ‘to fade, to pale’ as well as by Kurschat (38) who obviously tries to connect it etymologically to Pol. *blady* ‘blass’, ‘pale’.

(9)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
apžinoti	365,2	Übersehen, kennen	

Cf.: Schleicher 1857 (256) *ap-žiuřéti* ‚besehen, übersehen‘; ALEW (1311); LKŽ *apžiurti*

If it is not a simple lapsus scribendi for *pa-žinoti* ‘know’, that Ostermeyer took for an unusual prefixal derivative, we have probably again to do with a creative blending of a regular *žinoti* ‘know’ with a prefixal derivative of *ap-žiurti* today only in the meaning of ‘dazzle’, but cf. the simplex *žiurti* ‘start to see’. This scenario is supported by the meaning cited with *ap-žiuřéti* in the glossary of Schleicher (1857, 256), matching exactly that of *apžinoti*.

(10)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
dargybe, -ės	366,5	Schlagge ⁴⁴ , häßlich Wetter	

Cf.: Haack (21); LL (494); Ruhig/Mielcke (49); Schleicher 1865 (182); Kurschat (79, 84); LEI (31); Smoczyński (127); ALEW (176)

The same as *dárg-ana* ‚Ungestüm, Unwetter‘ or simply *dargà* / *dárga* as an *o*-grade derivative to *dérgti* ‘feucht schneien’, built on the basis of the secondarily upgraded weak stem of the PIE root **d^hreh₂g^h-* ‘aufgewühlt werden’ (²LIV, 154).⁴⁵ Cf. regular ablaut in *drégnus*, and *drégnas*, *-nà*, ‘feucht’, ‘moist’. The dictionary of Ruhig / Mielcke gives a denominative verb *darganoja*, *darganojo*, *darganojoti*, ‘es ist etwas schlaggiges Wetter’. The *-yb-* suffix (cf. Slav. *-vb-*) is generally productive in Lith. for deriving abstract nouns, whereas in “Giesmes” we see the outcome of further concretisation. Cf. abstract ‘moisture’ on the basis of an adjective stem: *drégnummas*, *-mo*, as given by Ruhig / Mielcke. Obviously the *-ybe-* derivative has been dropped

⁴³ Juškevič A. 1867; Juškevič J. 1883.

⁴⁴ Ostermeyer uses a translational equivalent from an East Prussian dialect of German (cf. Frischbier, 280) – close to the modern Low Hessian – meaning ‘Schneeregen’, ‘sleet’.

⁴⁵ Alternatively, if old enough, it could be a regular continuation of a schwebe-ablaut variant of the root.

in favour of the one built with the suffix *-an-*, alternatively contemplable is a dialectal variation.

LKŽ has one attestation: *Ar bandą gauni išvartyt nelaboje dargybėj?* to be found in the same context by Kurschat.⁴⁶

In Ostermeyer's list there are two further derivatives (11) and (12) of the same root (PIE **d^hreh₂g^h-*, Proto-Baltic **drēg-*) with completely different Inner-Baltic semantic specification.

(11)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
dergėtojis, e	196,6	Ein Schänder, hier des Sabaths	Subst. mob.

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (202); Haack (21); Ruhig/Mielcke (87); Nesselmann (129); Kurschat (79); LEI (35); Smoczyński (102); ALEW (195–196).

In most of the modern dictionaries we find plenty of other agent nouns or substantivized adjectives with the same semantics of a 'scurrilous, bawdy person': *dergėjas*, *dergėtuvas*, *derklonas*, *dergėsis*, Baltic cognates: Latv. *dērglis*, OPr. past participle *erdērks* 'vergiftet', 'poisoned' (ALEW, 196), whereas older dictionaries written in Lithuania Minor attest this meaning only in the variant with the voiceless velar: *darkus*, alongside with the verb *derkiù*, *-iau* 'mache unrein'. Plenty of derivatives are given in Nesselmann, i.a. *derkėtojis* 'blasphemer'. Interestingly ALEW seems to regard *darkùs* as secondary to *dargùs*. Cf. Sirvydas (³1642, 202) brings semantically identical *dargiey* to translate Pol. *niecnotliwie* 'unvirtuous'.

(12)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
drungnum	242, 2	Ein laues Wesen, die Lauigkeit	

Cf.: LL (57a); Schleicher 1865 (188); Kurschat (96); Smoczyński (148); ALEW (220, 234); LKŽ *drungnùs*

Obviously *drungnum*'s displays the reduced nom.sg. ending, a typical feature of most of Prussian Lithuanian subdialects,⁴⁷ of what we find in Schleicher's glossary to Christian Donaleitis' verses as *drungnumas* 'Lauwärme'⁴⁸, and in idem also the corresponding adjective *drungnas* 'lauwarm', cf. by Smoczyński (2007, 148) and in LL (57a) *drungnas*

⁴⁶ *Pagerintos Giesmju Knygos. iš Naujo perweizdetos per F. Kurszatį*, Königsberg, 1888.

⁴⁷ The language of the so called *striūkiai*.

⁴⁸ Cf. id. by Kurschat (96).

‘ani ciepły, ani zimny, ciepławy, letni’ (‘neither warm, nor cold’), whereas according to ALEW zero-grade variants should be limited to East Aukštaitian (cf. here regular $aN > uN$).⁴⁹ The meaning ‘lauwarm’ is the outcome of semantic broadening of the verbal root Lith. *dreñgti*⁵⁰ ‘rain, snow’: ‘neither rain, nor snow’ → ‘neither warm, nor cold’.

(14)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
gũdziūs, aus	188,1; 476,1	Ich winsele, klage	

Ruhig/Mielcke (89); cf.: LEI (74); ALEW (301); LKŽ *gaũstis, -asi, -osi*.

The root vowel is either another example of dialectal monophthongal representation $ũ$ dial. for $au < *āu < *eh_2-u$; $gũdz-$ $<< *g^{(u)}eh_2-u-+d^{(h)}+jo-$ (cf. ²LIV, 183) alongside with Lith. *gĩedu, giedóti* ‘sing’,⁵¹ both built from a Proto-BSl. root extended with $-d^{(h)}$ -; or continues the zero grade directly, cf. Slavic cognates of the extended verbal root in ORuss. *gusti, gudu* ‘play gusli’ (a string instrument) or BSC *gũdeti* ‘sough’ (of the wind) both continuing the zero grade $*g^{(u)}h_2-u-+d^{(h)}$ -.⁵² ALEW (301) attests a non-reflexive form Lith. *gaũsti, gaũdžia* vs. Latv. *gaũsti, gàuisti / gaust* (also *gausties*) ‘moan, wail’. Monophthongal root vowel is found in a further Lithuanian secondary diminutive verb *gũdurioti* ‘klagen, jammern’ cf. by LEI (74) picked up from Brugmann (1897, 358) and cited besides by Leskien (1891, 450)⁵³ and in LKŽ *gũdurioti = gũduriũti* ‘moan’.

⁴⁹ However, the root vocalism $-un-$ in all these variants would be rather difficult to explain morphologically.

⁵⁰ This is a secondary n-infix formation of the basis of the weak stem of *dėrgti*. S. lemma (10) above.

⁵¹ Lith. *gĩe-*, with stressed $ĩe < *eĩ$ should result from the PIE laryngeal metathesis with the suffixal $-ĩ-$ in the weak stem, triggering a new syllabification in the strong stem, and is the case of the so called schwebe-ablaut. This happened for sure prior to the extension with $-d^{(h)}$ -, cf. here unextended *gĩesmė́* ‘song, hymnal’. Evidence of laryngeal metathesis bears also Skt. $-ĩ-$ in *gĩtá-* ‘sung, praised’ $< *g^{(u)}eĩh_2-to-$, cf. Mayrhofer 1992, 482–483 and ²LIV, 183n.1.

⁵² On parallel extension with $-i-$ and $-u-$ in context of the schwebe-ablaut in pre-Proto-BSl s. Ackermann, forthc.

⁵³ Leskien brings citations from *Mittheilungen der Litauischen literarischen Gesellschaft*, Heidelberg 1883–1890, the journal *Auszra*, Tilsit, anno 1883, as well as *Liėtūwiskos dájnos užrašýtos par A. Juškevičę*, Kasan, 1880–1882.

Group 3. Diverging semantics

(15)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
emmerai, û	338,16; 367,4	Eine Art großer Heuschrecken	

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (88, 151) *emala(s)* ‘viscum’; LL (61); Ruhig/Mielcke (66); Kurschat (107); LEI (3); ALEW (36–37); LKŽ *emeraĩ*

Lexicon Lithuanicum, as well as the dictionaries by Ruhig/Mielcke and Kurschat cite *emmerai* with the meaning ‘miltligē’, German ‘Mehltau’, (‘mildew’), which is a kind of fungal infestation of plants. The same meaning ALEW attributes to *āmaras* with an addition, that an infestation by insects could be also meant, and places it together with modern Lith. *āmala*s (cf. *emala(s)* by Sirvydas ³1642, 88, 151), ESL. *omela*, Pol. *jemjola*, etc. ‘white mistletoe’ (*viscum album*). As certain locusts are for sure parasites, the etymology of Ostermeyer’s lemma becomes pretty clear.

BSl. terms represent continuants of *lo-* and *ro-*derivatives of the PIE root **h₁em-* ‘take, seize’. From the point of view of phonology, the divergence in the word anlaut is striking: *emmerai*,⁵⁴ with the initial *e-*, continues a zero-grade stem form, cf. OPr. *emelno* ‘mistletoe’, parallel to Čech. *jmělí* or BSC *imela*, whereas today’s standard *ã-* (with a secondary lengthening), as well as East Slavic cognates hark back to a full *o-*grade of the root.

Group 4. Occasionalisms

(16)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
gryßkelis, io	199,11	Irweg, von dem man wieder umkehren muß	

LL (22, 74a) *grißkelis* ‘kryžkelė’, ‘crossroads’; Nesselmann *gryßkelis* (114, 190); cf.: Haack (32); Ruhig/Mielcke (86); Schleicher 1865 (196); Kurschat (136, 137); LEI (72, 73); Smoczyński (317); ALEW (369, 473, 501, 505–506); LKŽ 2. *kēlis*

A compound noun: *grys-* + *kēlis* (‘way’) could either have as the second root a substantivized adjective of *tómos*-type with the suffix *-l̥j-+-o-* or rather a causative *-o-*derivative continuing PIE root **k^helh₁-* originally ‘turn (around)’. Cf. *kēlis, io* sm. ‘Weg’, ‘way, path’ (Nesselmann 190). The translation is

⁵⁴ The appearance of double *-m-* is not quite clear here. Possible is pure orthographic germination to signalize a proceeding short vowel under the influence of the German orthographical tradition. (This case would not be unique in writings produced in Lithuania Minor of that period.)

most probably a folk etymology (recorded by Nesselmann⁵⁵ with the identical semantics: *gryßkelis, io m.* ‘ein Rückweg, da man umkehren muß’).⁵⁶

The first component of the verbal root *grīžti grīžtù, grįsziu* ‘turn around, turn back’,⁵⁷ combined with the second, got associated with the root *klėisti* ‘sich irren’ (‘loose one’s way, make a mistake’). The comparison with other dictionaries suggests, that the reanalysis of the semantic structure of the compound took off from or was influenced by the form *kryžkelė* ‘crossroads’ voiced regularly to *gryžkelė* (cf. LL, 22, 74a).⁵⁸ The first component of *kryžkelė* is actually a borrowing from Belarussian *kryž* ‘cross’,⁵⁹ cf. modern standard Lith. *krįžius* ‘id.’, which penetrated the language very rapidly and produced many derivatives with pure Lithuanian morphological means, cf. *krįž-mas* ‘crossing’ or *krįž-kaulis* (m.) ‘Kreuz-bein’, *os sacrum*, etc.

(17)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
iũkdarykauti	361,8	Ein Gelächter woraus machen	

Cf.: ³Sirvydas (17, 142, 529); LL (68a); Haack (46); ALEW (177, 178, 421); LKŽ *juokáuti, juokúoti, juokadaris*

This is another example of creative word blending, giving rise in this case to a so called *portmanteau* word, a combination of two originally different lexemes of very similar or adjacent semantics and sharing the first syllable: the compound *juok-daryti* – ‘make jokes’⁶⁰ (cf. *juokadaris* by ³Sirvydas 17, 142, 529 for Pol. *blażen, kunsztmistrz, żartownik* all equivalent to the Latin *ioculator* ‘fool, clown’; *jũka-[darys]* in LL, 68a ‘Poßenreißer’, ‘tomfool, clown’; LKŽ cites from an anonymous dictionary of the 17th c. ‘kas juokus daro’) and the denominal simplex *juokáuti* ‘id.’⁶¹ Apart from these two verbs, there is a number of other denominal derivatives of the root *juok-* all meaning ‘to joke,

⁵⁵ Nesselmann 1850, 114.

⁵⁶ Cf. Kurschat 1883, 136: *grįþtkelis, io / gryþkelis, -io* 1) eine Sackgasse, Kehr wiederstrasse; 2) der Rückweg.

⁵⁷ Cf. Haack 32 *gryþtĩ, gryþtu*.

⁵⁸ Towards the relation of tenuous and media in this context cf. Specht 1924, 634 and Endzelĩns 1971, 75–76.

⁵⁹ Cf. Smoczyński 2007, 317.

⁶⁰ Cf. Lith. *juõkas* sm. ‘joke’, cf. Haack (1730, 46) *jũkas, ko* ‘Gelächter, Spott’ ‘laughter, scorn’, beside *jũktisi, jũkiũs, jũkiaus* ‘laugh’.

⁶¹ ALEW, 421; ³Sirvydas 529, cf. LEI, 87: *jũkũti, jũkũju* ‘Scherz treiben’.

to fool' etc.⁶² The Baltic root *juok-*⁶³ apparently harks back to PIE **(H)ǵekʰ-* 'amuse (oneself)'⁶⁴ and has secure cognates in Hom. Greek ἐψιάομαι 'id.' and Lat. *iocus* sm. 'joke, game' < **ǵokʰ-os* under assumption of the loss of labialisation (**kʰ* → **k*) triggered by the preceding *-o-*.

Group 5. Roots with unclear etymological affiliation

(18)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
branít	350,4	Berauben	Praes. braniju

Cf.: Brodowski (219); Ruhig/Mielcke (31); Nesselmann (343, 344); Schleicher 1865 (178); Kurschat (55); LKŽ *brányti*

The lexicon of Brodowski⁶⁵ cites the verb twice among other translational equivalents of German 'berauben': *ap-braniti* and *nu-braniti*. The dictionary of Ruhig / Mielcke gives *braniju*, *ap-braniju*, *išbranijo*, *jau* as well as an abstract noun *branijimas* 'das Rauben' ('robbery'), cf. Nesselmann *ap-branijimas*, *-o* and *isz-branijimas*, *-o*, 'id', alongside with the concrete noun 'the robbed things', and Schleicher in the glossary to Donelaitis' verses (1865, 168) *brányju*, *brányti* 'rauben plündern', where he ponders over the possibility of deriving it from Slav. *branie*. In fact, there is at least one attestation, where borrowing is obvious – Skardžius⁶⁶ cites *branyti* (without intonation marks) after Matthäus Prätorius (137₁₉)⁶⁷ as a loan from Pol. *bronić*, both with the meaning 'defend', which is the only semantics shared by all East and West Slavic phonologically regular *n*-derivatives of the root, verbal and nominal.⁶⁸ However, this meaning is in Lithuanian otherwise nowhere attested and should be therefore regarded a pure occasionalism. Other possible donor stems in Slavic, possessing comparable morphology:

⁶² ALEW, 421; LKŽ, *juokáuti*, *juokúoti*.

⁶³ Lith. and Latv. reflexes do not show coherent intonation of the root vowel, which is a problem in itself and cannot be addressed here.

⁶⁴ Schaffner (2001, 233–234) links here a Pre-PGerm. *lo*-abstract noun **ǵekʰ-la-* / *ǵegʰ-la-* 'Julfeast', still differently ²LIV, 311.

⁶⁵ Unfortunately, it was not possible to consult all thinkable translational equivalents of *braniti*, as the lexicon has not survived in its entirety.

⁶⁶ Skardžius 1931, 45.

⁶⁷ W. Pierson (ed.) 1871, *Matthäus Prätorius, Deliciae Prussicae*. Berlin: Duncker's Buch-Verlag. The original handwritten text dates back to 1698.

⁶⁸ Vasmer 1976, 110. Cf. immediate Slavic neighbours use a German loan for 'to rob' – Pol. *ob-rabować*, Bel. *ab-rabavać*.

BCS *brániti* ‘fight’ (with the South Slavic regular CRV syllabification), or ORuss. *branít* ‘rant, objurgate’ (in fact semantically closer to Lith. *bárti* ‘id.’) can be ruled out both on semantic and geographic grounds.

According to Kurschat (1883, 55) *branít* was no longer in use by the time of his compilation of the dictionary; he cites however a further semantic context of the verb, that of ‘lop off (branches of a tree)’: *ap-brānyju mēđí*, ‘den Baum beästeln’, *nu-brānyju mēđí* ‘den Baum abästeln’.⁶⁹ This usage makes any possibility of semantic borrowing from a neighbouring Slavic dialect extremely unlikely. On the contrary, the semantics of ‘to rob’ makes more sense, if secondary to that of ‘to lop off’, the other way round would be far too poetic. Etymologically *branít* is an *-n-* derivative of an *o*-grade continuant either of a PIE root: **b^herH-*, which according to ALEW (97) underwent in BSl., Latin and Germanic semantic generalization to ‘hit, fight’. Original semantics, yet, as proposed in ²LIV, 80 ‘mit scharfem Werkzeug bearbeiten’ (‘to work on sth. with a sharp tool’) deduced for PIE, accounts best for that of ‘chopping branches off the tree trunks’, as attested by Kurschat (55) and taken over in LKŽ. Alternatively, thinkable is also tracing the verb back to PIE **b^her-* ‘bear, bring’ (in numerous IE language branches also reanalysed as ‘take’, cf. ²LIV, 76-77) with the semantic narrowing of ‘taking off’ 1. ‘branches’ or 2. ‘belongings’ and the advantage of an *aṇit*-root (see below).

Phonologically there is no regular way to derive *branít* from any secure stem formation of the PIE root **b^herH-*. Whereas Lith. *bárti* (*bāra/barti*, *bārė/bāro*) ‘rant, objurgate, scorn’,⁷⁰ Latv. *bārt*, *baŗu* and numerous Slavic cognates,⁷¹ e.g. OCS *brati*, *borjǫ* ‘fight’ continue a de-reduplicated (intensive) *o*-grade stem, in case of *branít*, if we assume an independent development of the same PIE root, we have to suggest a schwebe-ablaut⁷² on the one hand and account for the absence of compensatory lengthening through the loss of *-H* on the other hand. Lengthened *-o-* would be in Baltic inevitably narrowed, producing Lith. *-uo-* with subsequent dialectal differentiation, but since the only attested root vowel in derivatives in question is *-a-*, any phonological

⁶⁹ Kurschat’s attestations, as well as prefixal derivatives given by R u h i g / M i l c k e are taken over in LKŽ: 2. *-brānyti*: ‘draskyti, skinti, apiplėšti’.

⁷⁰ ALEW, 96, cf. Lith. *barnys* (4) sm. ‘Streit, Feindschaft, Zwietracht’.

⁷¹ S. ALEW, 96.

⁷² Cf. Fn. 45.

explanation starting with a *seṭ*-root fails. Therefore, it seems more attractive to take off from the supposedly de-reduplicated *o*-grade present stem⁷³ of the root **b^her-* ‘take’ or from its iterative stem **b^hor-éie-*, like Gr. φορέω ‘carry’ (since the simplex verb is not attested, and the iterative suffix could have been substituted in other derivatives), and to assume further re-syllabification in the strong stem in course of the schwebe-*ablaut*⁷⁴ to pre-Baltic **bro-*. Further development is less controversial: the reflexes of *-n-ī-* recognizable both in verbal and nominal continuants of the root correspond to the Common Baltic nominal suffix *-ni-* /*-njo-*⁷⁵ which could have produced initially a verbal adjective and subsequently a masc. agentive noun, cf. *brannỹs*, *-nio* ‘Räuber’ (‘robber, looter’) discussed below.⁷⁶ The new nominal stem served the basis for the secondary transitive (causative) verb, fitting into a productive class of denominative transitives in *ī-ti*.⁷⁷ Acute *í* in the suffix of infinitive stems (instead of a regular circumflex) should have come, according to Stang, as the result of intraparadigmatic levelling of multiple suffixal secondary verbs.⁷⁸ So that *branít* should be actually a denominative verb of the same meaning as its hypothetical predecessor **brati*.

(19) & (20)	Quotation	Translation	Comm.
bradnas	413,4	Ein Räuber, Mörder	
ißbradnas	350,8	Ein Räuber	wie bradnas

LL (102a, 31); Ruhig / Mielcke (31); LKŽ *brādnas*, *-à* adj.

Except for one single citation from the dictionary of Juškevič (²1904) taken over in LKŽ, there is no mention of *bradnas* in the modern etymological dictionaries, yet in Ruhig / Mielcke (31) we find *brannỹs*, *-nio* ‘Räuber’

⁷³ A reduplicated present stem is indeed attested in Skt. *bibharti* ‘carries’.

⁷⁴ Cf. Slavic roots with CRVC syllable structure result from the phonologically regular Inner-Slavic liquid metathesis in course of ‘opening of syllables’ often with concomitant lengthening (on this point see further Ackermann 2014, 213 Fn. 713).

⁷⁵ Cf. plentiful examples of this type from Lith., Latv. and several from OPr. by Leskien 1891, 371–373; however, he neither differentiates the exact provenience of *-n-*, which could originate from different PIE suffixes, nor the gender: fem. *-i*-abstracts included.

⁷⁶ Geminated *-n-* here most probably due to the influence of German orthography as the indication of the short quality of the root vowel. Cf. Fn. 54.

⁷⁷ Analogous cases see by Stang 1942, 174–176.

⁷⁸ Stang 1942, 174.

with a comment ‘ziemlich obsolet’⁷⁹ and in Nesselmann (343–344): *branys*, *io*, incl. several derivatives: *branytojis*, *o*; *branininkas*, *-o*,⁸⁰ etc. all of them denoting the same and making part of the word family discussed under point (18) above. *Bradnas* belongs undoubtedly to the same root and carries on the same semantic specification. The formant *-d-* requires an explanation. There is no etymologically sound connection to a verbal root extended with a *-d-*formative (as e.g. an old *-d^h-*present).⁸¹ Quite possible, however, is the formation of a causative-iterative stem with the suffix *-d(y)-* to the root pre-Baltic **bro-* << PIE **b^her-* (see the derivation chain above), following a productive pattern of deriving secondary causatives in Baltic, as e.g. Lith. *girdyti*, Latv. *dzirdu* ‘(give) sth./sbd. water’ to primary *gerti* and *dzert* respectively, meaning ‘drink’, or Lith. *guldyti*, Latv. *guldu* ‘lay sth./sbd. (down)’ to *gulėti* and *gulēt* respectively, meaning ‘lie’. However, the primary stem is not necessarily intransitive, just as the secondary stem is sometimes merely iterative.⁸²

The resulting hypothetical stem **bradyti* ‘repeatedly take (sth.) away’ is homonymous with a well attested intr. verb *bradyti* (in modern Lith. *braidyti*) ‘wade, wander about’, also an iterative, but of the pre-BSl. age, to *bristi*, *bredù* ‘id.’ and of completely different origin, making part of a cognate cluster with CS *bredq*, *bresti*, specifically with its iterative form, cf. CS *broždq*, *broditi*, Russ. *brodit’* carrying on the pre-BSl. iterative formation **b^hrod^h-ēje/o-* of the root **b^hred^(h)-* ‘id.’⁸³ The occurrence of *bradnas* with the prefix *iβ-* (lemma 20) suggests that the original verbal stem had been rather causative, and at least transitive, than of simple motional semantics. This gives additional evidence to the fact, that *bradnas* ‘robber’ is not a mere semantic ‘jump’ from *bradyti* ‘wade, wander about’, but belongs to the word family continuing pre-Baltic **bro-* ‘take (away)’ as argued above.

Due to certain semantic and referential contiguity both verbs would have inevitably come to interaction, and even if there is no real ground for *-d-* in

⁷⁹ Cf. K ursorch at (55) gives *branys*, *-io* m. ‘Räuber’, following Mielcke, but comments ‘sonst unbekannt’ (‘otherwise unknown’); the same attestation is taken over to LKŽ (*branys* - *plėšikas*) suggesting by ‘(sl.)’ a Slavic borrowing, but in no way explained, which Slavic donor-lexeme is meant.

⁸⁰ Not here belong *bradinsys*, *brādninkas* sm, both denoting a ‘fishing drag net’ (LKŽ).

⁸¹ The only root with traces of a former *d^h-*present in Lith. is *virti* - *vērda* ‘cook’.

⁸² Examples of this type by Stang 1942, 141.

⁸³ No secure cognates outside BSl. and perhaps Albanian *breth* ‘jump’ (²LIV, 91).

bradnas as a remnant of a causative-iterative suffix of the corresponding root, it could have been easily interpreted as such / restituted by the speakers,⁸⁴ Moreover, it seems plausible, that secondary pejorative semantics of *bradyti* (as given in ALEW, 128)⁸⁵ ‘übertreten, sich versündigen’ tr. = ‘violate, abuse, sin against (sbd./sth.)’ alongside with its primary motional meaning, should have been adopted under the influence of the “other” unattested **bradyti* ‘be a robber’ ← ‘repeatedly take (sth.) away’.

Summarizing remarks

As pointed out above, our linguistic commentaries on rather randomly selected entries of Ostermeyer’s list, underlying primarily their dialectal and etymological originality, were chiefly aimed to reintroduce the glossary as a source of ‘promising’ linguistic material. Upon taking a closer look at attestations, meanings and available translational equivalents in oldest Lithuanian lexica, certain new insights in derivational history, semantic structure and etymological affiliation of words, that we discussed here, came to light. A rather high percentage of mainly fairly transparent occasionalisms speak for a conspicuous creativity in language usage and as a working material in a diachronistic investigation is a rarity. In these terms the discussion of what is possible in language change and what not, what is natural and what not, gains valuable inputs.

Judging by the material studied above the Lithuanian spoken idiom of the 17th-18th c. appears to be very vivid in onomasiology, creative in the usage of morphological means and still in possession of certain roots already gone in the dictionaries of the late 19th century and scarcely perceivable in the modern paramount linguistic database of LKŽ.

Ostermeyer’s material, collected for practical reasons, proved to be a valuable source of linguistic data and waits, so to say, to be discovered and intergraded in etymological and dialectological dictionaries in its entirety.

⁸⁴ Whereas simple contamination with *bradyti* (*brado*, *bradė*) or *bradžióti* (*-iója*, *-iójo*) cannot be excluded either.

⁸⁵ Cf. also Smoczyński 68.

GOTTFRIEDO OSTERMEYERIO „VERZEICHNIS VER- ALTETER ODER WENIG BEKANNTER LITAUISCHER WÖRTER“ LINGVISTINIS KOMENTARAS

Santrauka

Straipsnyje pristatomas žodžių sąrašas iš Gottfriedo Ostermeyerio – svarbaus XVIII a. Mažosios Lietuvos intelektualo ir lietuvių kalbos bei kultūros propaguotojo – lietuviškų protestantų giesmynų istorijos. Žodynėliu siekta palengvinti kai kurių senų ir mažiau žinomų – pasak Ostermeyerio, „obsoleta und minus cognita“ – žodžių supratimą, tačiau dėl publikavimo metu vykusių Mažosios Lietuvos intelektualų politinių ginčų jis buvęs primirštas. Žodynėlis apima tiek paties Ostermeyerio, tiek jo pirmtakų giesmynų leksiką. Kalboje atsispindi Mažosios Lietuvos lietuvių tarmių (visų pirma donininkų) fonetinės ir leksinės ypatybės.

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami daugiau ar mažiau atsitiktinai atrinkti dvidešimt žodžių, aptariamoms jų tarminės ypatybės, semantiniai ir morfologiniai skirtumai nuo egzistuojančių tos pat šaknies vedinių, ypatingas dėmesys skiriamas darybos istorijai ir atitikmenims kitose ide. kalbose. Pagal kalbines ypatybes lemos skirstomoms į 5 grupes: 1) vėlyvi leksiniai skoliniai; 2) lemos, turinčios kitur nepaliudytų vedinių (priesaginių ar priešdėlinių), kitur nepaliudytas žinomos šaknies kamieno formas ar kitur nepaliudytą šaknies balsių kaitos laipsnį; 3) žinomos leksemos su pakitusia reikšme; 4) okazionalizmai (apimą ir liaudies etimologijos atvejus); 5) kitur nepaliudytos ar neaiškiškos etimologinės priklausomybės šaknys.

Remiantis išanalizuota medžiaga, galima teigti, kad XVII–XVIII a. Prūsijos lietuvių šnekamoji kalba buvusi labai gyva onomasiologijos požiūriu, joje kūrybiškai naudotasi įvairiomis morfologinėmis priemonėmis, būta šaknų, neberandamų XIX a. pabaigos žodynuose ir menkai teliudijamų LKŽ – šių dienų svarbiausioje lietuvių kalbos duomenų bazėje.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackermann, Katsiaryna 2014, *Die Vorgeschichte des slavischen Aoristsystems mit der kommentierten Belegsammlung der Aoristformen und Formen des präteritalen passiven Partizipiums im Altkirchenslavischen*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Aitzetmüller, Rudolf, Linda Sadnik 1989, *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*, Heidelberg: Winter.

ALEW – Wolfgang Hock et al. (eds.), *Alllitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–3, Hamburg: Baar, 2015.

Bense, Gertrud 2000 (rev.), Gotfrydas Ostermejeris, Rinktiniai raštai, *ALt* 2, 227–238.
Bezenberger, Adalbert 1880, Zusätze zu A. Fick. Germanische Labiale aus Gutturalem, *KZ* 5, 170–176.

Biržiška, Vaclovas 1963, 36. Gotfridas Ostermejeris, in Idem, *Aleksandrynas: senųjų lietuvių rašytojų, rašiusių prieš 1865 m., biografijos, bibliografijos ir biobibliografijos 2: XVIII–XIX amž.*, Chicago: The Lithuanian-American Cultural Fund, Inc., 101–107.

Brugmann, Karl, Berthold Delbrück 1897, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Zweite Bearbeitung* 2(1), Strassburg: K.J.Trübner

Citavičiūtė, Liucija (ed.) 1996, *Gotfrydas Ostermejeris, Rinktiniai raštai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 24–46.

Drotvinas, Vincentas (ed.) 1987, *Lexicon Lithuanicum: rankraštinis XVII a. vokiečių-lietuvių kalbų žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Drotvinas, Vincentas 2001, Die Anfänge der litauischen Philologie an der Königsberger Universität (16.–18. Jahrhundert), in Klaus Garber, Manfred Komorowski, Axel E. Walter (eds.), *Kulturgeschichte Ostpreußens in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 405–420.

Drotvinas, Vincentas (ed.) 2009, 2010, *Jokūbas Brodovskis, Lexicon Germanico-Lithvanicum et Lithvanico-Germanicum: Rankraštinis XVIII amžiaus žodynas. Dokumentinis leidimas su faksimile, perrašu ir žodžių registru* 1–3, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

EDG – Robert S. P. Beekes, *Etymological dictionary of Greek*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010 (<http://dictionaries.brillonline.com/greek>).

EDPG – Guus Kroonen, *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2013 (<http://dictionaries.brillonline.com/proto-germanic>).

Endzelins, Jānis 1971, *Comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages*, The Hague, Paris: Mouton.

Frischbier, Hermann 1883, *Preussisches Wörterbuch. Ost- und Westpreussische Provinzialismen in alphabetischer Folge 2: L-Z. Nachträge und Berichtigungen*, Berlin: T. C. F. Enslin.

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

Froehde, Friedrich 1886, Etymologien, *BB* 10, 294–301.

Gelumbeckaitė, Jolanta 2009, Lietuvių kalbos ortografijos reformos (Mažoji ir Didžioji Lietuva), in Sergejus Temčinas, Galina Miškinienė, Marina Čistiakova, Nadiežda Morozova (eds.), *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės kalbos, kultūros ir rašties tradicijos* (= *Bibliotheca Archivi Lithuanici* 7), Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 17–27.

Gerulaitienė, Vilija 2000, Abraham Jakob Penzel und sein Interesse an der litauischen Literatur in Ostpreußen, *Annaberger Annalen. Jahrbuch über Litauen und deutsch-litauische Beziehungen* 8 (<http://annaberger-annalen.de/jahrbuch/2000/Ausgabe8.shtml>).

Gerullis, Georg 1930, *Litauische Dialektstudien*, Leipzig: Markert und Petters Verlag.
Haack, Friederich Wilhelm 1730, *Vocabularium Litthuanico Germanicum et Germanico Litthuanicum. Darin alle im Neuen Testament und Psalter befindliche Wörter nach dem Alphabeten enthalten sind; nebst einem Anhang einer kurzgefassten Litthauischen Grammatic*, Halle: Stephanus Orban, Univers. Buchdr.

Hock, Wolfgang 2006, Zum exozentrischen Kompositum im Litauischen, in Stephan Kessler, Christiane Schiller (eds.), *Navicula litterarum Balticarum. Philologische Balticum-Studien für Jochen D. Range zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 119–130.

Juškevič, Anton 1867, *Litovskija narodnja pėśni. S' perevodom' na russkij jazyk'*, Sanktpeterburg': Tipografija Imperatoskoj akademii nauk".

Juškevič, Anton 1904, *Litovskij slovar' A. Juškeviča s'v tolkovaniem' slov' na russkom'v i poľskom' jazykax"* 1(2), Sanktpeterburg': Izd. otdėlenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoj Akademii nauk".

Juškevičius, Jonas (ed.) 1883, *Liėtuviškos svotbines dainos, užrašytos par A. Juškevičę*. Petropjėlė: Spaustuvė Imperatoriškos Akademijos Moksla.

Karulis, Konstantīns 1992, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* 1–2, Rīga: Avots.

Kšanienė, Daiva 2008, Die Entwicklung der kleinlitauischen Evangelischen Kirchenlieder, *Annaberger Annalen. Jahrbuch über Litauen und deutsch-litauische Beziehungen* 16, 139–169.

Kurschat, Friedrich 1883, *Wörterbuch der littauischen Sprache 2: Litthauisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Halle a.S.: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

LEI – Harold H. Bender, *A Lithuanian etymological index, based upon Brugmann's Grundriss and the etymological dictionaries of Uhlenbec (Sanskrit), Kluge (German), Feist (Gothic), Berneker (Slavic), Walde (Latin), and Boisacq (Greek)*, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press, 1921.

Leskien, August 1891, *Die Bildung der Nomina im Litauischen*, Leipzig: S. Hirzel (= *Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Classe der Königlich Sachsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 12, 151–618).

Leskien, August 1919, *Litauisches Lesebuch mit Grammatik und Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

²LIV – Rix, Helmut et al. (eds.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstamm-bildungen*. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.

LKŽ – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius, Kaunas, 1941–2002 (<http://www.lkz.lt>).

Lyberis, Antanas et al. (eds.) 1979, *Pirmasis lietuvių kalbos žodynas: Konstantinas Širvydas. Dictionarium trium linguarum* (Facsimile-ed.), Vilnius: Mokslas.

Mayrhofer, Manfred 1992, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Michelini, Guido (ed.) 2001, *Jonas Breškūnas. Giesmes Duchauņas ir kitos 1589 metų lituriginės knygos. Tekstai ir jų šaltiniai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Michelini, Guido 2008, Milkaus 1806 m. Giesmynas istoriniame kontekste, *Lt* 54(2) (74), 30–43.

Michelini, Guido (ed.) 2009, *D. Kleino „Naujos giesmju knygos“*. *Tekstai ir jų šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Versus aureus.

Nesselmann, Ferdinand G. H. 1845, *Die Sprache der alten Preußen an ihren Ueberresten erläutert*, Berlin: Reimer (Repr. 2006, Ardagger: Damböck).

Nesselmann, Ferdinand G. H. 1851, *Wörterbuch der Littauischen Sprache*, Königsberg: Verlag der Gebrüder Bornträger.

Nieminen, Eino (ed.) 1949, *Litauische Volkslieder aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlass Prof. J. J. Mikkolas übersetzt und herausgegeben von Eino Nieminen*, Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia.

Ostermeyer, Gottfried 1786, *Bedenken über einen Entwurf zu einem Neuen Littauischen Gesangsbuch*, Königsberg: G. L. Hartung, Königl. Ostpreuß. Hof- und Academ. Buchdrucker.

Ostermeyer, Gottfried 1791, *Neue Littauische Grammatik ans Licht gestellt von Gottfried Ostermeyer, der Trempenschen Gemeinde Pastore Seniore und der Königlich-Deutschen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg Ehren-Mitglied*, Königsberg: G. L. Hartung. Königl. Preuß. Hofbuchdrucker und Buchhändler.

Ostermeyer, Gottfried 1793, *Erste Littauische Liedergeschichte ans Licht gestellt von Gottfried Ostermeyer*, Königsberg: Driestische Schriften.

Otrębski, Jan 1956, *Gramatyka języka litewskiego 3: Nauka o formach*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Rau, Jeremy 2009, *Indo-European nominal morphology: The decads and the Caland system*, Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachen u. Literaturen d. Univ. Innsbruck (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 132).

Ruhig, Philipp 1745, *Betrachtung der littauischen Sprache, in ihrem Ursprunge, Wesen und Eigenschaften; Aus vielen Scribenten, und eigener Erfahrung, mit Fleiß angestellt, und zu reiferer Beurtheilung der Gelehrten, zum Druck gegeben*, Königsberg: Johann Heinrich Hartung.

Ruhig, Philipp, Christian G. Mielcke 1800, *Littauisch-deutsches und deutsch-littauisches Wörter-Buch / worinn das wom Pfarrer Ruhig zu Walterkehmen ehemals heraus gegebene zwar zum Grunde gelegt, aber mit sehr vielen Wörtern, Redens-Arten und Sprüchwörtern zur Hälfte vermehret und verbessert worden von Christian Gottlieb Mielcke, Cantor in Pillkallen*, Königsberg: Verlag der Hartungschen Hofbuchdruckerey.

Salys, Antanas 1933, Kelios pastabos tarmių istorijai, *APH* 4, 21–34.

Schaffner, Stefan 2001, *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische gram-*

matische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachen u. Literaturen d. Univ. Innsbruck (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 103).

Schleicher, August 1857, *Litauisches Lesebuch und Glossar*, Prag: Calve'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Schleicher, August 1865, *Christian Donaleitis. Litauische Dichtungen. Erste vollständige Ausgabe mit Glossar*, St.Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Sirvydas, Konstantinas [Constantinus Szyrwid] 1642, *Dictionarium trium linguarum. In usum Studiosæ Iuventutis*. Tertia editio reg. et auct., Vilnae: Typis Academicis Societatis Jesu (Reprint: Lyberis et al. 1979).

Skardžius, Pranas 1931, *Die slawischen Lehnwörter im Alllitauischen*, Kaunas: Spindulys.

Skirsgilas, Bronislovas 2000, *Protėvių giesmės. Evangelikų liuteronų giesmių rinkinys*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos Universitetas.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2005, *Lexikon der altpreußischen Verben*, Innsbruck: Institut der Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 117).

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Wilno [Vilnius]: Uniwersytet Wileński.

Specht, Franz 1924, Baltische Sprachen, in Johannes Friedrich et al. (eds.), *Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für Wilhelm Streitberg*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 622–648.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1910, *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler. Einleitung, Texte, Grammatik, Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Vasmer, Max 1976, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 1: A – K*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Zinkevičius, Zigmąs 1994, *Lietuvių kalbos dialektologija*, 2. stereotipinis leid., Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Zinkevičius, Zigmąs 1998, *The history of the Lithuanian language*, 2nd Printing, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Katsiaryna ACKERMANN
Institut für Slawistik
Universität Wien
Spitalgasse 2, Hof 3
AT-1090 Wien
Austria
[katsiaryna.ackermann@univie.ac.at]