RECENZIJOS

Vytautas M a ž i u l i s, **Prūsų kalbos etimo-logijos žodynas**, II, I–K, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1993, pp. 331; III, L–P, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1996, pp. 365.

On opening to p. 2 of volume II one notes immediately a difference between this book and its predecessor, volume 1. On p. 2 of volume 1 one finds the title translated both into Russian and into German, but on p. 2 of volume 2, the title is translated only into German, the Russian version having mysteriously vanished. For general comments I would refer the reader to my review of volume 1 which appeared in Baltistica XXVII (1) 70–72. I will therefore proceed immediately to details.

On p. 16 Mažiulis (further M.) writes that the noun *īdai* 'Essen, food' nom. sg. fem. derives from **īda* < **īdā* < **ēdā* attested both in Baltic and Slavic (cf. Lith. dial. *éda,* Latv. *ę̄da,* Rus. *eda),* which has its origin in an **o/ā*-stem adjective. The Old Prussian form in question derives then from the addition of the definite pronoun *-i* < **-ịā* or **-ịī.* Similarly M. writes that *īstai* 'Essen, food' presupposes an earlier **ista* < **īstā* < **ēstā* with a morphological development of the final syllable similar to that of *īdai.* M. notes also that *īstai* occurs in the expression: *Kawīdai wirdai ast sirsdau stesmn* [for *stesmu*] *kērmeneniskan īstai bhe poūton* 'Welche Wort sind neben dem leiblichen Essen unnd Trincken, which words are beside the corporal food and drink.' The final is to be explained, in M's view, in the same way as is *īdai* above. M. then writes (p. 52) it seems to him that *īstai* is a nom. sg. fem. *ā*-stem form and he writes in brackets that in the Old Prussian catechisms the nominative form is rather frequently *(neretai)* used instead of the expected (correct) accusative or some other form. In 1974, 49, I followed T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 348, who analyzed this as a dat. sg. neuter of **īstan* derived from a proposed reconstruction **ēd-tom.* I am now prepared to agree with M. that this might be a nom. sg. fem. *ā*-stem form, primarily because I believe that there are many mistakes and misunderstandings in the Old Prussian catechisms.

On the other hand one might consider S m o c z y ń s k i' s (1992, 154–155) proposal that *īstai* derives from **īstan.* Smoczyński writes that the number of case forms ending in *-ai* and *-ei* is so great that the notion that final *-i* is a misprint for *-n* should be set aside, and that here we have to do with a phonological rather than a graphic matter. He suggests then a weakening of the final nasal resonance and an option change of the sequences *-an* and *-en* into the diphthongs *-ai* and *-ei* respectively. An argument in favor of this view is the existence of a somewhat similar phenomenon in some Lithuanian dialects. Thus Z i n k e v i č i u s, 1966, 137, reports in the area of Vilkaviškis an acc. pl. fem. *baltáis'es* for standard *baltą̄sias.* I would no longer defend very strongly my view (1974, 64) that *kanxtisku* 'Zucht, discipline' is a dative singular. It might well be as M. writes (p. 112–113) a nominative singular form. He writes that in the Old Prussian catechisms there is more than one translation error of that kind.

Of course, if one followed the dictum of L e v i n (1982) that the only determiner of correctness is to be found in the text itself one would be forced to the conclusion that there are either no very mistakes in the text (the few existing mistakes [if there are any at all] being established on the basis of some kind of statistical norm derived from the analysis of the text itself). I would be inclined here to agree with M. rather than Levin and to assume that on the basis of our knowledge of Lithuanian, Latvian and other Indo-European languages we might expect, for example, an accusative rather than a nominative as a direct object of a finite verb. If one relies solely on the evidence of the text and if it could be established in some way or other that the nominative case is more frequent as the direct object of a finite verb, then we would have to consider the nominative here as being correct. Or perhaps we would have to change our view of morphology and consider forms with apparent final *-a* < **-ā* as renderings of the accusative case. One might go even further and, for example, deny that Old Prussian is a Bal-

tic language at all, in which case the use of parallels from other Baltic and/or Indo-European languages would be irrelevant. Although one would be able to analyze the data without reference to criteria from outside, this would seem to me (and I think, to most specialists) to be odd.

M. (p. 63) derives Old Prussian *kadan* 'when' from **kadán* which in turn derives from **kadā + n* which is compared to Slavic **koda* (later remodeled into **kogъda* > Russ. *kogda)*. I would agree with all of the steps here, except that it seems simpler to me to assume a proto-form **kadan* (short vowel plus nasal) which in word final sandhi position could become **kadā* (with loss of the nasal and lengthening of the preceding vowel) if the following word began with a consonant or the retention of the original vowel plus resonant sequence if the following word began with a vowel (S c h m a l s t i e g, 1980, 31–34). In making such assumptions one deals with forms which are actually attested, viz. *kadan* (cf. Lith. *kadángi* 'since') and Old Indic *kadā* 'when'. Furthermore such a development would seem to be quite consistent with the somewhat similar phenomenon in Lithuanian where short vowel plus resonant is retained in some positions, but passes to a long vowel with loss of the preceding resonant if there is a following spirant, cf., e.g., *sán-taka* 'confluence' vs. *są-skaita* 'bill'. Compare also Old Indic acc. sg. *devam* 'god' (short vowel plus resonant) with Lith. *Diẽv-ą.*

M. writes (p. 99) that the form *kaltzā* 'lauten, purport' (beside *kelsāi)* reflects Old Pr. **kalcā < *kalsā* with the *-s-* after *-l-* having a more or less affricate pronunciation *-c-*. It seems just as likely to me that Abel Will couldn't distinguish well between the phonetic sequences *-ls-* and *-lts-*, or maybe that *-tz-* was merely another way of rendering *-s-*. In her grammar of Middle Low German L a s c h (1914, 172) writes that sometimes one encounters *ss (sz tz)* after consonant and quotes the example *kersse* where the *ss* stands for High German *z.* For the rendering of the so-called 'scharfes *s*' *tz, cz* and *c* are common, thus the spellings *Rus(s)en, Ruscen, Rutzen, Rucen, Rycen* 'Russians' are encountered in the Baltic provinces. Since the *-s-* in *kelsāi* was voiceless spirant it seems to me that Abel Will could well have interpreted it as a 'scharfes *s.*' For me the English words *false* and *faults* are homonymous, so a colleague of mine posted a question about this on the linguists' e-mail network. This yielded a number of interesting replies, some Americans having words as homonyms and others distinguishing the words. One native German replied that for him *Hals* rhymes with *Malz.* I queried two native speakers in our German department here at Penn State and found that for them the word *Hals* and *Malz* on the one hand and *Fels* and *Pelz* on the other hand were rhyming words.

I conclude then that the difference in orthography between *-ls-* and *-ltz-* (with epenthetic *-t-*) is no more important than the difference between *dessimts* 'tenth' (T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 5, 22) and *dessympts* (T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 11, 21) with the epenthetic *-p-*.

With regard to the form *kelsāi* M. quotes the usual view that the orthography allows us to assume a reduction of a thematicized **-āja.* I still cling to my earlier belief about this word, with regard to the Old Prussian orthographic sequence *-ai,* viz. that it reflects either (1) *-ā* or else (2) *-a* plus particle *-ai.* In the first case one could draw from examples where Middle Low German orthographic *-ai-* apparently renders *-ā-*, thus *raid* 'Rad, wheel', *jair* 'Jahr, year' (L a s c h, 1 914, 25). The second alternative in my view is that the form shows the addition of the particle *-ai,* cf. Lith. dial. *sùkai* 'turns' vs. standard *sùka* (Z i n k e v i č i u s, 1 966, 431). Furthermore I doubt that *-el-* in *kelsāi* reflects a sound different from *-al-* in *kaltzā.* Perhaps M. is right in his assumption that Old Prussian *-al-* was reduced to *-əl-*, but I doubt that the orthographic *-el-* in *kelsāi* allows us to distinguish it phonologically from *kaltzā.* In sum, then I see no reason to assume that the spelling *kelsāi* vs. *kaltzā* represent a difference in pronunciation. I assume only a difference in spellings due to Abel Will's inconsistency. I would stick with my earlier assumption of a phonemicization /kalsā/ for both words.

Although I have been critical of the phonology M. has proposed I do think that his notion that there existed parallel verbs **kalsātvei* vs. **kalsētvei* is a good thought. M. supports this by calling attention to the adjective *kalsīwingiskan* 'lauter, pure' which seems to presuppose the existence of a verb **kalsē-tvei* and to such pairs as Lith. *linksóti* 'to be bent over' and *linksėti* 'to bow over and over again'.

From the cultural perspective one very interesting and important entry in the dictionary is the etymology of the name of famous astronomer *Copernicus,* who gave his nationality as Prussian

when he matriculated at the University of Kraków. This was previously unknown to me and I would guess to most Americans who are accustomed to considering Copernicus as Polish. According to M. (p.114) the name may eventually be derived from Old Pr. *kapurnā, *kapernā 'protuberance, small hill, rise'. Copernicus was born in Torun in 1473 to a family by the name of (German) *Koppernigk.* Apparently this family had moved there by way of Kraków from the small Silesian village of *Köppernig* the name of which M. surmises might derive from a Germanized Old Prussian personal name.

M. (p. 137) writes that a West Baltic nom. sg. fem. relative pronoun *kā passed to Sambian *kū, which, with the addition of *-ai from the definite form (cf. *[st]-ai < *-āi < *-ājā [or < *-ājī]), developed into the nom. sg. fem. *kvai (=nom. sg. fem. quai, quoi). With the substitution of the sequence *kv- into the accusative singular we have *kvan and then from this we have an acc. pl. fem. *kvans from which an acc. pl. masc. *kvans is derived analogically. On the basis of the acc. pl. masc. *kvans a new nom. pl. masc. *kvai is formed (= quai and quoi). I would, of course, be very surprised to find the initial qu- as the reflex of an Indo-European labio-velar in a satem language, but neither do I see the passage of *kā to *kū as M. supposes. It seems much more likely to me that the qu- is merely the orthographic representation of a labialized velar consonant before a non-front vowel, a phenomenon to be expected in languages which have phonemic palatalization of consonants. Cf., e.g., the words enkopts 'begraben, buried' with the orthographic alternants encops and enquoptzt. André Martinet (1955, 356) has written that a Frenchman hearing the Russian words byl 'was' and most 'bridge' would be tempted to transcribe them respectively as bwil and mwost. In my view then the sequences quai and quoi sometimes represents the nom. pl. masc. /kai/ and perhaps sometimes the nom. sg. fem. /kā/.

In (1974, 64) I phonemicized kāupiskan 'Handel, business' as /kaupiskan/ for my first choice and suggested /kūpiskan/ as a possible second choice, since I thought that the word might come from Slavic. I was at that time suspicious of the derivation from Gothic kaupōn 'to buy' which was suggested by Trautmann (1910, 354). I now would agree with M. (p. 146) that it is more likely that this word is a German dialect borrowing from the 13th to 15th centuries.

Following Trautmann (1910, 356) I wrote in (1974, 62) that the word kermeneniskan in the expression noūson kermeneniskan quāits 'unsers fleisches wille, the will of our flesh' was a substantivized adjective. M. suggests, however (p. 166), that the word is not a noun, but rather an adjective which should have had the nom. sg. masc. form *kermeneniskas to agree with quāits. The final -s of *kermeneniskas was replaced by -n, however, under the influence of the preceding noūson. I think that M. is quite probably right, because it is well known that non-natives using an inflected foreign language which they do not know very well frequently fail make the appropriate adjective and noun agreement. In a hotel of one of the republics (not Lithuania) of the former Soviet Union I was told once that in the samovar there was gorjačij voda [sic!].

Following Berneker (1896, 193) M. (p. 93) writes that in the expression tu twaias kīrkis ... islāiku 'du deine Kirche ... erheltest, you uphold your church' the word kīrkis is not acc. pl. fem., but rather nom. pl. fem. form. He writes that here Abel Will heard the acc. sg. deine Kirche as an acc. pl. (=nom.) and having understood this as a nom. pl. translated it into the Old Prussian nom. pl. fem. twaias kirkis 'tāvos bažnyčios, your churches'. I suggest perhaps a genitive singular which might have been governed by the verb islāiku, cf. Lith. laikytis 'to hold on to' which requires a genitive complement, cf., e.g., aš laikaūs senos tvarkos 'I hold on to the old order' (LKŽ VII 38).

In the marriage service one encounters the expression (Trautmann, 1910, 63): adder tussīse pansdau bhe etlāikusin deickton prei kitawidintunsin 'oder schweige darnach und enthalt sich etwas zuuerhindern, or may he be silent and refrain from saying anything against (it.)'. Under the heading kitawidintunsin 'uerhindern, to prevent' M. writes (p. 205) that *kitavīdintunsin for (non-reflexive) *kitawīdintun did not mean 'verhindern, to prevent' but rather 'verändern, to change' and that here Abel Will was not responsible for the mistake, but rather his helper Paul Megott who misinterpreted spoken verhindern for verändern. Hearing this he erroneously added the translation of sich (which correctly goes with enthalt 'holds oneself'). It seems to me M. has proposed an excellent solution to the problem of this word which can then be easily etymologized as having the element kita- 'other' -vīd- 'aspect' -in- (causative verb suffix), -tun (infinitive or supine ending).

For the etymology of *klente* 'Kū, cow' M. (p. 217) proposes a Balto-Slavic root **klen-* (**klin-*) 'to bend, to bow' such that the word **klentē* 'cow' would have originally meant 'the bent over one, the bowed one'. This would allow us to draw a parallel with Russ. *kljača* 'broken-down horse, old nag', Slovenian *kléka* 'lean, animal, particularly horse', Ukrainian *kljapa* 'old cow'.

Following I v a n o v, 1965, 31–32, under the heading *clokis* 'ber, bear' (p. 220–223) M. explicates the interesting notion that Balto-Slavic **tlākas* 'bear' is to be considered a remodeling (taking into consideration tabu factors) from an older **tlakas*, considering the segment **-ak-* a suffix and replacing it with Balto-Slavic **-āk-*, which in turn reflects an Indo-European dialect **l̥tokos* (in which there has been a metathesis of **tl- < *l̥t*). This latter reconstruction (with an alternation of *r* and *l* perhaps connected with the tabu form) derives from **r̥tokos* wich existed beside the form **r̥tkos*, the form usually reconstructed for Gk. *árktos*, Lat. *ursus*, etc.

M. (p. 231) disputes the usual view that Old Prussian *knapios* 'hanf, hemp' and Lith. *kanãpė*, etc. are borrowings from Slavic and rather considers them to be borrowings into proto-Baltic-Slavic from Scythian sometime in the first half of the first millennium B.C. Thus the traditional notion that the names for 'hemp' in the Baltic languages, Old Prussian *knapios*, Lith. *kanãpė* derive from Slavic is not trustworthy in his view; these words are rather common Balto-Slavic words. If one accepts the view that the Baltic and Slavic languages shared a common history before splitting, then M.'s view seems quite plausible.

M. (p. 237) writes that Old Prussian (E 559) *coestue* 'burste, brush' reflects **kɔ·st(u)u̯e < *kāst(u)vē < *kāist(u)vē* (with a lengthened *ā* under the circumflex accent) and that (E 557) *coysnis* 'kam, comb' is **kɔ·isnis*, i.e., **kāisnis*. Furthermore M. cites the Lithuanian cognate *kaiš-ýti* 'to stop up; to adorn' with a circumflex root. I personally would surmise that the orthographic sequences *coe-* and *coy-* both reflect attempts to represent phonemic /kai-/, the -o- denoting /a/ after a labial. Possibly the rendition *coestue* indicates that the scribe did not hear the second element of the circumflex diphthong. Although it would be impossible to prove the nationality of the author of the Elbing Vocabulary, it certainly seems more likely to me that he was a German relying on his incomplete knowledge of Old Prus-

sian rather than an Old Prussian who had learned German.

In his discussion of (E 160) *crauyo* 'blut, blood' (p. 262) M. writes that he considers it more probable that all of the forms of this word (including those in the catechisms) were feminine, reflecting an original nom. sg. **kraujā*, and in fact I said the same thing about the forms in the catechisms in (1974, 61). It is clear that there is vacillation between the **-o* and **-ā* stem nouns in Baltic as E n d z e l ī n s (1971, para. 93) has pointed out, so there is a definite possibility that this would be a **-jā* stem in Old Prussian. M. discounts, I think correctly, the notion that the form *crauyo* could be a neuter plural. But if the scribe was a German, there seems to be no reason why he should have limited his entries in the Elbing Vocabulary to the nominative case. If he knew some Old Prussian he may have heard other cases more commonly, thus perhaps he might have heard the word for 'blood' in the genitive singular, i.e., *crauyo* (= Lith. *kraũjo*) which might have been used with partitive meaning to denote 'some blood'.

Under the heading *crixti lāiskas* 'tauffbüchlein, baptismal booklet' M. (p. 227) suggests that *lāiskas* is not a nom. sg. masc. (as one might expect on the basis of Lith. *laiškas* 'leaf'), but rather a nom. pl. fem. with the meaning of a singular, cf. Lith. (pl. tantum) *knỹgos* 'book'. This is an interesting suggestion and I see no way of proving it wrong, although the comparison with Lith. *laiškas* seems more likely to me.

As have many others M. (p. 324–325) connects Old Prussian *quãits* 'Wille, will' with Lith. *kviẽsti* 'to invite' and supposes an Old Prussian -*i* stem proto-form **kvaitis*. The word is to be connected with *quoi* 'will, I wish' (p. 329), a modal form which underwent shortening because of frequency of use (a phenomenon which has been amply demonstrated by W. Mańczak), and the 3 pres. verb. *quoitē* 'will, wishes', the infinitive of which M. reconstructs as **kvaitī-tvei < *kvaitē-tvei* (p. 330). On p. 240 we find the entries *koyte, koyto* and *koytu* with a reference to II *quoi*, but the forms are not discussed under that entry, nor do we find them under the entries *quoitē* or *quãits*. Neither have I found any mention of Simon Grunau's *kayat thu* 'Wo wiltu hin' (listed in M., 1966, 251). It is a minor annoyance, but it is not a tremendous problem because the forms are discussed in works to which M. refers in the entry mentioned.

The form *koyte* 'wish' occurs in the Basel epigram and the related forms *koytu* and *koyto* come from Simon Grunau's vocabulary. I consider the forms important, however, because *koyte, koyto* and *koytu* show the labialized initial *k-* but without any *-v-* element and the form *kayat* has the initial /kai-/ as I envision it. As in 1969, 164–165, I would reconstruct the root as **kait-*, perhaps to be connected with Lith. *káitēti* 'to lack, to be wanting' and Latv. *kaitēt* 'to be harmful' or, as B. Jēgers has suggested, with Lith. *kaisti* 'to heat' such that the root could have the meaning 'to have a burning desire for something, to burn for something' (see also S c h m a l s t i e g 1976, 277, 342, fn. 96).

Probably the only methodological point on which I would disagree with M. is in the phonological interpretation of the orthography. As I have said many times in the past I believe the phonetically untrained German ears captured only in the most general way the Baltic phonology. I am pleased to see that M. does recognize possible grammatical errors, cf. the discussion of *īstai, kanxtisku* and *kermeneniskan* above. He has argued quite convincingly in my view that *kitawidintunsin* is the result of hearing *verändern* rather than the intended *verhindern*. If Paul Megott could mishear Abel Will, doesn't it seem likely that Abel Will could mishear Paul Megott? When my native English ears hear Lithuanian words, I frequently misinterpret them and it is only because I have had training in Baltic philology that I recognize what is happening. Unfortunately Abel Will certainly had no such teacher as Antanas Salys (as I did) to help him with the difficulties of Baltic phonology.

With volume III, the final entry of which is *pūton* 'trincken, to drink' M. has now gone farther than V. N. Toporov, the fifth volume of whose dictionary had reached only the letter L.

In addition to presenting many previous etymologies of each word, M. supplies us with his own interesting etymologies. For example, in the entry on *lapinis* (p. 41; EV 359) 'leffel, spoon' M. rejects the earlier etymology according to which this is a borrowing from Germanic and K. O. Falk's etymology which derives the word from *lapas* (=Lith. *lãpas* 'leaf', i. e. a spoon would be shaped like a leaf). M. would rather derive the Old Prussian word from an Indo-European root **lep- (: *lŏp-)*, cf. Gk. *lépō* 'I peel, strip off the rind'. This Indo-European root is represented in Baltic by **lēp- (: *lăp-)* 'to peel, to shave' with length-

ened ablaut grade **lep- (: *lăp-)*, the later form being at the base of Lith. *lóp-età* 'spade, shovel'.

Another example is the derivation by M. (p. 113) of Old Prussian *massais* 'veniger, less' from a Balto-Slavic root **maź-* with the meaning 'to smear' (cf. Slavic *maz-ati* 'to smear, to grease'). The Baltic adjective **maź-* 'small, slight, scanty, poor' would have been derived from the semantic chain **'having been made small, unsatisfactory' from **'having been made too thin' from **'having been smeared, i. e., having been too thinly smeared (with putty or clay)'. The Balto-Slavic root **maź-* in turn is derived from the Indo-European root **maĝ-* 'to knead, to smear' > Germanic **mak-ōn,* cf. German *machen* 'to do, to make'.

Probably M.'s approach has best been characterized by Toporov in the foreword to the first volume of his Old Prussian etymological dictionary (1975, 10) where he writes that the guiding light for many of the investigations by M. is scrupulous and filigreed work in the discovery of the regularities in the transfer of letter to sound (in reality, of course, just the opposite, from sound to letter, from speech to writing). With justification Toporov characterizes my approach as allowing for a multiplicity of variations in writing bordering on the arbitrary. Herein lies the kernel of most of my disagreements with M. about Old Prussian.

For example, M. (p. 61–62) derives Old Prussian *likuts* 'small' (which he would assume to reflect **līkuta-*) from an adjective meaning **'thin, slender, delicate' and which is from the same root as Lith. *liēknas* 'slim'. The root is encountered in the Baltic verbal stem **līk-* 'to bow, to bend over (from slenderness, thinness)'. M. writes further that this is derived from an earlier Baltic verb **(s)leik- / *(s)līk-* meaning 'glaistant (tepant) molį įlenkti jo paviršių, smearing clay to bend in its surface'. It seems that M.'s etymology rests heavily on the assumption that the single consonant beginning the second syllable of (Enchiridion) *likuts* and (Grunau's Vocabulary) *licuti* can only denote that the preceding *-i-* of the initial syllable is long. Indeed, T r a u t m a n n (1910, 185) wrote that short accented vowels are marked by doubling the following consonant, although E n d z e l ī n s (1943, 19) doubted that the doubling of the consonant always meant that the preceding vowel was stressed. In general, of course, the doubling of consonants does denote that the preceding vowel is short (as, indeed, in English, at least etymologically), but the application of the rule is appar-

ently not completely consistent. Thus, *newīnts* 'ninth' would not seem to have a long initial vowel. For the numerous words with a prefix *ni-* (*nikai* 'than', *nikanxsts* 'improper', *nipoklusmings* 'disobedient', and many others) M. reconstructs a short initial vowel, assuming a shortening in proclitic position of *nī* < *nē* (p. 181). But if there was such a shortening, why wasn't it represented by double spelling of the following consonant? Sometimes there seems to be vacillation in spelling: cf. *kitawidintunsin* 'to prevent' vs. *kittan* 'other'. Cf. also (Enchiridion) nom. sg. masc. *ketwirts* 'fourth' vs. nom. sg. fem. *ketwirta*. Note also *ismigē* 'fell asleep' vs. *enmigguns* 'asleep'; *turīlai* 'may he' vs. *turrīlai*; *-subans* 'selves' (T r a u t - m a n n, 1910, 27, line 34) vs. *-subbans*.

Similarly in Simon Grunau's Vocabulary a short preceding vowel may not always be marked by doubling of the following consonant. The word for 'great' is rendered in Grunau's Vocabulary by *debica* and in the Enchiridion variously by *debīkan, debijkan, debeīkan, debijkun*, but also by *debbīkan*. Apparently on the basis of this single occurrence M. (1988, 184) reconstructs an initial short vowel in *debīka-*. In fact I agree with M.'s reconstruction even though according to his own notions of Old Prussian orthography it is supported only by one occurrence of the word, the other occurrences presumably being misprints. Now M. himself writes that the Old Prussian personal names *Lickucz, Liccutigeyn*, etc. may reflect either *Lĭkut-* < *Līkut-* with Old Prussian *-ī- on occasion unstressed (perhaps even in German pronunciation) or the names may show that in Prussian dialects *-ī- passed to *-ĭ-. Another possibility in M.'s view would be that the Prussian personal name *Lĭkut-* could be cognate with the Lithuanian personal name *Lìkas* from the adjective *lìkas* 'unpaired'.

M. writes that it is not easy to believe (*nelengva tikėti*) in a connection with Lith. *likùtis* 'left-over, remnant' (see T r a u t m a n n, 1925, 143; To p o r o v, 1990, 249). Toporov, however, notes that the semantic structure of Lith. *likùtis* emphasizes a small quantity and quotes as an example from LKŽ VII 514: *Iš viso pulko tik likùčiai sugrįžo namo* 'From the entire regiment only the remnants returned home'. Toporov would rather derive the Old Prussian and Lithuanian words from the Indo-European root *leikʷ- / *loikʷ- and he also points to the Slovenian counterpart *lek* 'a few, a small quantity' (<*lěkъ). Toporov's pro-

posal seems to require only that one accept the brevity of the initial vowel of *likuts (licuti)*. In view of my perception of the inconsistency of Old Prussian orthography Toporov's suggestion doesn't seem to me difficult to believe. I might point out a semantic parallel in that the English word *remnants* also frequently has the connotation of 'small number, small quantity (left over)'.

I have proposed (1972, 7–9; 1974, 101; 1976, 171–172) that the apparent Old Prussian comparative suffix *-ais-* derives from the definite adjective and compared the ordinal *pirmois* /pirmais/ 'first' and the Latvian definite adjective form encountered, e.g., in *mazais* '(the) small'. As a semantic parallel for such a development I quoted from the LKG I 524) the sentence with the definite adjective: *O patys gerieji ir ilgieji rąstai už didelius pinigus parduodami laivams statyti* 'But their very best and longest beams are sold for large sums of money to build ships'. It is quite natural for the definite article in its emphatic function to get a kind of superlative meaning. Compare Latvian *pats labais* with the same meaning as *pats labākais* 'the very best' (E n d z e l ī n s, 1951, 480). Note that in English also the definite article *the* can be '... used as a function word to designate one of a class as the best, most typical, or most worth singling out (this is *the* life)...' (Webster's 1966, 2368). The phenomenon of hypostasis is also well known, i. e., the use of one case as the stem on which to build other cases, thus Z i n k e v i - č i u s (1966, 283) gives the example from a folk song: *šį pirmàsį jósim in karùžę, mėlynàsį pas jáuną mergùžę, mėlynàsį pas jáuną mergėlę, o margàsį in žãlią lankėlę* 'this first one we will ride into war, the blue one (we will ride) to the young damsel, the blue one to the young damsel, the varicolored (one) into the green meadow'. Note that here the nominative case of *pirmas* 'first', *mėlynas* 'blue' and *margas* 'varicolored' serves as a base to which the accusative case ending *-į* is added. For other examples of hypostasis see H a u d r y (1982, 41–51).

On the basis of these parallels I have suggested that the Old Prussian stem *maldais-* is to be divided into the root *mald-* 'young' and the suffix *-ais-* deriving from the nominative singular masculine definite article (similar to the Latvian definite article *-ais*). Thus in such a sentence as (T r a u t m a n n, 1910, 49, line 7): *dai swaimans maldaisimans* 'gabs seinen Jüngern, gave (it) to his disciples' the dative plural ending *-imans* is added directly to the stem *maldais-*. This example

and the example *ur-ais-* in the sense of parent seem to be merely the result of the nominalization of a definite adjective. But the two meanings of nominalization and superlative can both be derived from the single form. Thus in the phrases *en maldaisin deinan* 'am Jüngsten Tag, on the last (judgement) day', *Stans Uraisans* 'Die Eltesten, the eldest' we encounter the superlative meaning of this suffix.

M. writes that it is not easy to believe that Old Prussian *-ais-* has its origin in a definite adjective as I have proposed. I realize that there must be limitations of space in such extensive work as an etymological dictionary of Old Prussian, but still it would be interesting to know why it is not easy to accept such a theory when there exist parallel developments in Baltic and other Indo-European languages.

M. finds that *prestors* (EV 707) 'konigelyn, Zaunkönig, wren' has its origin as an onomatopoetic word based on the sound sequence **pr* which developed into the verb **persk-*, dialect **presk-* which gave the substantive **preskaras*. At the Colloquium Pruthenicum Secundum in Mogilany in October of 1996 Anatolij Nepokupnyj suggested a connection with the German word *Priester* 'priest'. I think that Nepokupnyj's etymology is excellent.

M. corrects *prapolis* (EV 747) 'wedehoppe, hoopoe' to **parpolis* and suggests a proto-form **parpalas* which would correspond with Lith. *paȓpalas* 'a kind of bird' (p. 344). The Old Prussian word, the Lithuanian word and Latv. *parpala* 'grumbler' are all independent creations on the basis of an onomatopoetic verbal root *parp-*, cf. Lith. *paȓpti* 'to snore; to purr'. This is an excellent etymology in my view, but it does depend upon the assumption (in my opinion justified) that there was a mistake in the orthographic representation, an assumption which M. seems reluctant to make for other words.

M. reconstructs *locutis* 'bresme, bream' (p. 78, 90; EV 562) as **lŭkutīs* and connects it with an Old Prussian root **lŭk-* 'to shine' which is connected with the rich Indo-European root **l(e/o)uk-*, cf. Old Indic *rúci-* 'light', Slav. *lučь* 'ray'. The basic meaning of the word would be then 'the (fish) that shines, sparkles'. I think that M.'s etymology is quite good, but it seems to conflict with the principle enunciated with regard to *likutis* that a syllable ending in a single (orthographic) consonant should always be long. M. rejects Toporov's

(1990, 340) etymology which in M.'s view would seem to presuppose **lākut-*, since the Balto-Slavic verb **lăk-* 'lakti, to lap up' is not represented by **lāk-* in any Baltic or Slavic dialect. I have checked Toporov (1990, 340–346) and have been unable to locate a reconstruction **lāk-*, although I was able to find **lak-* for which Toporov suggests an onomatopoetic origin.

Thus it seems to me M. frequently presents etymologies which I find quite plausible, but that frequently in these etymologies he appears to disregard his own stated strict principles for the interpretation of Old Prussian orthography.

In conclusion, I would say that, similarly to all M.'s other publications, these two volumes present another tremendous achievement and impressive contribution to Old Prussian and Baltic studies in general. M. is to be congratulated on continuing with indispensable work in Old Prussian and Baltic etymology. M.'s etymological dictionary of Old Prussian is and will be for a long time to come an essential tool for specialists in Baltic and Indo-European linguistics and, as I wrote before, its erudite author is to be congratulated for such a fine work.

References

Endzelīns J., 1943, Senprūsu valoda, Rīga.
Endzelīns J., 1951, Latviešu valodas gramatika, Rīga.
Endzelīns J., 1971, Comparative phonology and morphology of the Baltic languages, The Hague (English translation of „Baltu valodu skaņas un formas", Rīga, 1948, by W. R. Schmalstieg and B. Jēgers).
Haudry J., 1982, Préhistoire de la flexion nominale indo-européenne, Lyons.
Ivanov V. V., 1965, Obščeindoevropejskaja, praslavjanskaja i anatolijskaja jazykovye sistemy, Moscow.
Lasch A., 1914, Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik, Halle.
Levin J., 1982, Graphology and sound change in Old Prussian, – Papers from the 5th International conference on historical linguistics. Current issues in linguistic theory, vol. 21, Amsterdam, etc., 201–210.
Martinet A., 1955, Économie des changements phonétiques, Berne.

Mažiulis V., 1966, Prūsų kalbos paminklai, Vilnius.

Mažiulis V., 1981, Prūsų kalbos paminklai, II, Vilnius.

Mažiulis V., 1988, Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas, I, A–H, Vilnius.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1969, Four Old Prussian etymologies, – Baltistica, V, 163–166.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1971, Die Entwicklung der ā-Deklination im Slavischen, – Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, XXXVI, 130–146.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1972, Old Prussian comparatives in -ais-, – Baltistica, VIII, 7–10.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1974, An Old Prussian grammar. The phonology and morphology of the three catechisms, University Park and London.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1976, Studies in Old Prussian, University Park and London.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1980, Indo-European linguistics: A new synthesis, University Park and London.

Smoczyński W., 1992, Zur Problematik der altpreussischen Hapax legomena am Beispiel von dēigiskan, – Linguistica Baltica, I, 143–171.

Toporov V. N., 1975, Prusskij jazyk. Slovar', A–D, Moscow.

Toporov V. N., 1990, Prusskij jazyk. Slovar', L, Moscow.

Trautmann R., 1910, Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler, Göttingen.

Trautmann R., 1925, Die altpreussischen Personennamen, Göttingen.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary, ed. by Philip Babcock Gove et al, 1966, Springfield, Massachusetts.

Zinkevičius Z., 1966, Lietuvių dialektologija, Vilnius.

William R. Schmalstieg

Terje Mathiassen, **A short grammar of Latvian**, Slavica Publishers, INC, 1997, 236 p.

1997 m. pasirodė žinomo slavisto ir baltisto, Oslo universiteto profesoriaus Terje Mathiasseno knyga *A short grammar of Latvian*. Turint galvoje, kad 1996 m. buvo išleista jo *A short grammar of Lithuanian* (Slavica), latvių kalbos gramatikos pasirodymas yra neeilinis įvykis baltistikoje. Kaip rašoma pratarmėje, ši knyga pirmiausia yra sinchroninė, nors vietomis nevengiama diachroninių pastabų ar intarpų, kurie skaitytojui geriau padeda suvokti dėstomąjį dalyką. Antra, ši gramatika nėra deskriptyvinė, o preskriptyvinė, arba norminamoji. Didelis autoriaus laimėjimas yra tas, kad jis, remdamasis šiuolaikine kalbotyros istorija, labai glaustai ir suprantamai paaiškina gana gausią ir sudėtingą latvių kalbos gramatikos medžiagą, mokamai įsigilina į latvių kalbos morfologijos ir sintaksės subtilybes.

Trumpame įvade (p. 19–21) autorius glaustai aptaria latvių ir kitų baltų, taip pat slavų kalbų santykius, ryšius su germanų ir finų-ugrų kalbomis, trumpai primena Latvijos ir latvių kalbos istorijos faktus, pamini latvių kalbos tarmes, paaiškina latvių bendrinės kalbos raidos ypatumus.

Glaustai parašytame fonologijos skyriuje aprašoma priebalsių ir balsių sistema, paaiškinamas jų tarimas ir kaita, latvių kalbos kirčiavimo ypatybės. Labai glausti, bet informatyvūs yra vardažodžių ir įvardžių skyriai. Juose kvalifikuotai aptariamos vardažodžių gramatinės kategorijos, linksniavimas ir daryba, būdvardžių laipsniavimas, būdvardžių daiktavardėjimas. Aptardamas linksnio problemą T. Mathiassenas savo gramatikoje laikosi Fennello, Lötzscho ir kitų kalbininkų nuomonės, kad dabartinė latvių kalba neturi instrumentalio, t. y. kad latvių kalbos linksniavimo paradigmą sudaro šeši (įskaitant vokatyvą) linksniai (p. 41). Dėl to pakeistas ir prielinksnio *ar* valdymas: teigiama, kad kalbamojo prielinksnio konstrukciją sudaro *ar+* vienaskaitos akuzatyvas (p. 185), pvz.: *mirt ar vēzi; runāt ar kolēģi; rakstīt ar zīmuli; braukt ar vilcienu* (p. 189). Ketinimų prielinksnį *ar* priskirti prie akuzatyvą valdančių prielinksnių jau būta ir anksčiau. Pavyzdžiui, 1959 latvių kalbos akademinėje gramatikoje patogumo dėlei kalbamasis prielinksnis aptariamas kartu su akuzatyvą valdančiais prielinksniais[1]. Dėl instrumentalio egzistavimo latvių kalbos vardažodžių ir įvardžių linksniavimo paradigmose abejonių jau yra kėlęs dar 1973 m. rusų kalbininkas Zaliznjakas[2].

---

[1] Žr. Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika (toliau – LG), I, Rīga, 1959, 738–739.

[2] Žr. A. A. Zaliznjak, O ponimaniji termina „padež" v lingvističeskich opisanijach, – Problemy grammatičeskogo modelirovanija, Moskva, 1973, 55–87.