

RECENZIJOS

Vytautas Mažiulis, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, IV, R–Z, Vilnius, Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997, 324.

We greet with great pleasure the appearance of the fourth and final volume of the Old Prussian etymological dictionary by the brilliant and productive Lithuanian Balticist, Vytautas Mažiulis. This last volume is particularly important, because this is now the only complete modern etymological dictionary of Old Prussian. Naturally one regrets that V. N. Toporov has not seen fit to finish his *Prusskij jazyk*, the fifth and last volume of which reached only the letter L. Toporov's work will apparently find its place among many other great unfinished linguistic works.

Mažiulis' (M.) new volume is distinguished by the scrupulous care in preparation, erudition and innovative etymologies which characterize the first three volumes. As examples I give some of the interesting and new etymologies below.

M. (p. 12) writes that Elbing Vocabulary (EV) (2) *rapa* 'engel, angel' is to be corrected to **rapā* = **rapan* an accusative singular which presupposes an *o*-stem nominative singular **raps* < **rapas* implying in turn an expression **engels* **raps* (or **engelīs* **raps*) 'guardian angel', such that **rapas* would have been a substantive with *-o*-grade ablaut from a verb root **rep-* 'to protect' which would originally have had a meaning 'to surround, to take up', cf. Lith. *rėpti* 'to embrace, to include' and Old Prussian EV (520) *raples* 'czange, tongs'. For this latter word M. suggests (p. 14) a possible reconstruction **replēs* with a passage of **re* > **ra-*, cf. Lith. dial. *rāplēs*. I find what M. has to say about both these words completely convincing.

M. (pp. 20–21) derives *rickawie* 'regieret, rules' from a verbal root **rīk-*, **rik-*, **reik-* 'to slice, to cut' and then connects with Lith. *riėkti* 'to slice (bread)'. Similarly the noun *rīki* 'reich, kingdom' might be derived from the same root.

M. (p. 61) divides the word EV (200) *sando* 'balke, beam' into the elements *san-* 'with, together' and *-do* from the root **d(ē)-* 'dėti, to put' (cf. *senditans* 'folded together') and compares the formation to that of Lith. *sijà* 'beam' (Frankel 1955, 756), the first element of which may have been *sa-* 'with, together'.

M. (p. 15) suggests that EV (691) *raugus* 'lab, rennet' was originally an **o*-stem noun deriving from earlier **raugas*. I consider this quite possible and although in such cases as EV (529) *auwerus* 'sindir, metal dross', EV (716) *gandams* (read as **gandarus*) 'storch, stork', etc., it is difficult to see the reason for the ending *-us*, in the case of *raugus*, EV (633) *kalmus* 'stok, stump', EV (302) *kalpus* 'rungestoc, supporting cross block on a wagon', EV (120) *grauwus* 'seyte, side', EV (588) *wangus* 'dameraw, uncultivated cleared land', *asmus* 'eighth' one might see the influence of the preceding velar or labial in determining the German perception of the following vowel.

M. (p. 225) considers both EV (722) *warne* 'kro, crow' and EV (721) *warnis* 'rabe, raven' to be derivatives of an onomatopoeic interjection **var* 'kvar' with the suffix **-na-/-nā-*. Curiously enough I find no mention of what seems to me to be the best etymology, viz. a derivative of an adjective meaning 'black', cf. OCS *vranъ*, Pol. *wrony*, Russ. *voronoj* (Trautmann 1923, 343). This seems quite likely to me, although Machek (1951, 98–100) derives the adjective 'black' (which is only applied to horses) from the noun and rejects the usual connection with Sanskrit *varṇa-* 'color' since in his view the ad-

jective would then mean 'colored', a meaning which one would not expect from a bird which was completely black. It would seem to me, however, that a word with the general meaning 'colored' could easily come to denote a specific color. Webster's (1966, 449) gives as the third meaning of the adjective *colored*: 'of some other race than the white; often Negro or having some portion of Negro blood'. On the other hand the same dictionary (op. cit.) gives as meaning 7a of the verb *to color* 'to take on the color of ripeness (as of grapes)' and 7b 'blush, flush'. I would point out also that Latin *coloratus* which literally means 'colored', had as one of its secondary meanings 'red', a meaning which developed into Spanish *colorado* 'ruddy'. Thus I reject Machek's notion that a general word for 'color' or 'colored' could not develop into the designation of a specific color.

It seems to me that the color of the crow is at least one of its most outstanding characteristics and it would not be surprising to me to derive the name therefrom. Many years ago I was told by a more advanced fellow student at the University of Pennsylvania that when Prof. Antanas Salys was just beginning to learn English at one time he could not think of the English word for 'crow' so he said: 'the big black one that lives in the forest'. One can think of numerous examples of bird names derived from color in English, e.g., *blackbird*, *bluebird*, *blue jay*, *yellow finch*, *redbreast*, etc.

M. (p. 67) writes that EV (659) *sasnis* 'hase, hare' is to be read as **sasnīs* from a substantive meaning 'grey', which is in turn derived from an **o/ā*-stem adjective which in West Baltic was *śasna*- 'grey'. The feminine form of the adjective *śasnā*- is represented in the Lithuanian (from Jatvingian) river name *Sasnà* (in the Marijampolė region).

For EV (727) *salowis* 'nachtegal, nightingale', which could appear to be a Slavic borrowing, cf. Russian *solovej*, M. (p. 49) suggests, however a reading **salavīs* derived from a substantivum mobile West Baltic **śalav(i)ja*- 'that (bird) which is characteristically grey or yellowish'. He notes that the noun is masculine and compares Lith. dialect masculine *lakštinėgalas* (as op-

posed to the standard feminine *lakštinėgala*). The word for 'nightingale' then is eventually derived from a Balto-Slavic deadjectival neuter substantive **śalu* 'greyness, yellowness'. Lithuanian dialect forms of the word for trout (also based on the color) are also noted: *šalvas*, *šalva*, *šalvis*, *šalvė*, *šalvys*.

M. (p. 89) quotes with approval Endzeliņš' (1943, 244) comparison of EV (748) *sealtmeno* 'wedewal, oriole' with Latv. *zēlts* 'gold' and reconstructs an earlier **zēltmenā* (with a circumflex **-ēl-*).

For EV (738) *sineco* 'Meise, titmouse', which could be a borrowing from Polish *sinica*, M. (p. 111) suggests, however, the possibility of a reconstruction **sīnikā* and the derivation with an *-ik-* suffix from a West Baltic/Slavic adjective **sīna*- 'blue, bluish'.

I would certainly applaud the etymologies for *sasnis*, *salowis*, *sealtmeno* and *sineco*, which illustrate M.'s attention to morphology and at the same time show how animals (including birds) can come to be named for their color.

Regarding the accuracy (or lack thereof) in transcription I would quote Sever Pop (1950, 261) who has described the experience of three trained Swiss dialectologists, (Louis Gauchat, Jules Jeanjaquet and Ernest Tappolet) who transcribed the speech of the same individual differently even though all three were natives of the same country, had the same teacher, the same system of phonetic transcription and several years of experience in working with informants in their native place. Concerning dialect transcription Pop writes: 'La transcription ne se réalise pas mécaniquement et l'esprit différent des observateurs ne tarde pas à se refléter dans la manière d'interpréter les sons entendus, en les transcrivant par des signes divers de la liste fixée d'avance'. Of course, no two situations are ever exactly the same, so one could, naturally, claim that the transcription of Swiss dialects by trained phoneticians is vastly different from the transcription of Old Prussian, probably by Germans. It merely seems surprising to me that one could expect a higher degree of accuracy in phonetic rendition from a German scribe than from experts trained in dia-

lect transcription. Therefore I am suspicious of what seems to me to be an excessive reliance on the orthography.

M. (p. 10) writes that the enigmatic phrase *sen senditmai rānkān* is to be interpreted as an incorrectly translated singular construction meaning 'with [a] folded hand'. I rather prefer Smoczyński's (1989, 181; 1989a, 114–117) explanation that *sen senditmai rānkān* 'mit gefalten henden, with folded hands' should be read rather as **sen sendit-ami rānkami*, cf. Lith. *su sudėtomis raňkomis* 'id.'. With regard to *senditmai* we encounter the transposition of the last two letters, but in the case of the final *-ān* of *rānk-ān* the typesetter misunderstood the word-final written sequence of letters **-mi* (possibly without a dot on the final *-i*) as *-nn* and thus set up in type *ān* to represent what he perceived as *ann*.

M. (p. 11) argues that a spelling *ranguns* 'gestolen, stolen' assures us that the word could not be transcribed as **rankuns* (which I have done [1974, 171] and thereby connected it with Lith. *riňkti* 'to gather', etc.) yet he wrote (1988, 49) that the correction of EV (80) *agins* 'ouge, eye' into **akins* is quite possible since in Prussian writings there are cases of the confusion of voiced and voiceless consonants. One can compare also EV (629) *sagnis* 'wurcele, root' which M. (p. 36) reads as **saknis* and EV (125) *lagno* 'leber, liver' which M. (1996, 18) reconstructs as **jaknā*. The German confusion of voiced and voiceless consonants is well known, so it is unclear to me why it was possible in the case of *agins*, *sagnis* and *lagno* but not possible in the case of *ranguns*.

M. (p. 38) proposes that Simon Grunau's word *saika* (*sayka*) 'sack' is an incorrectly written Old Prussian acc. sg. masc. **zakan* and notes the Lithuanian dialect word *zākas*. The Middle Low German sequence *-ai-* (*-ay-*) could indeed merely denote an *ā* (see L a s c h [1914, 25] who quotes the examples *raid* 'Rad, wheel' and *jair* 'Jahr, year'). The word *saika* could conceivably be a neuter noun in *-a*, but the unusually poor transcriptions encountered in Simon Grunau's Vocabulary make it even more difficult to interpret than other Old Prussian documentation.

For EV (755) *warnaycopo* 'warkringel, shriek, butcher bird' M. (p. 225) suggests a metathesis of the second *-a-* and the *-y-*, such that the reading should be **warnyacopo* a form which should be phonemicized as **varnakapā*. The second element *-copo* reflecting **kap-* is to be connected with Lith. *kapóti* 'to hew, to chop' and denotes something like *várnu kapótoja* 'crow chopper'. While agreeing with the etymology, I wonder if the orthographic *-ay-* might not really reflect a long vowel and that the word should be transcribed as **varnākapā*. The stem vowel is sometimes retained in Lithuanian compounds, cf., e.g., *varnólėša* (beside *varnalėša*) 'kind of thistle plant'.

M. (p. 64) argues that EV (425) *sarxtes* 'schede, sheath' is a nominative plural feminine form to be read as **sarkstēs*. In his view this *ē*-stem form replaces an earlier *i*-stem nom. pl. fem. **sarkstīs* which is to be derived from the nom. sg. fem. **sarkstis* 'a means of keeping, watching over something'. This word has the suffix *-sti*, can be compared with the Enchiridion word *absergīsnan* 'Schutz, protection' and may derive from a verb **serg-* (with a different ablaut grade) or (without a change in ablaut grade) from a verb **sarg-*, cf. Lith. dialect *sárgioti* 'to watch over'. I would quote also from the Lithuanian Academy Dictionary (XII, 160) *sárgstis* 'security' and I propose that orthographic *sarxtes* merely reflects phonemic /sarkstis/ and that M.'s analysis of **sarkstis* is correct. Marchand (1970, 114) writes: "As a typical Middle German dialect, our document [i.e., the Elbing Vocabulary – WRS] confuses *i* and *e* of whatever provenience: ...3 *hemel* (*Himmel*) 'sky', 6 *sebengest'ne* (*Siebengestirn*) 'Pleiades', 246 *schene* (MHG *schîne*) 'plow iron'..."

It is therefore unclear to me why a scribe who didn't always distinguish between orthographic *e* and *i* in his native German would be inclined to do so in the foreign language which he is transcribing. M. himself writes (p. 114) that it is better to consider EV (554) *sirmes* 'louge, lye' as **sirmis*, since in the Elbing Vocabulary *i* (particularly when unstressed) is sometimes written with the letter *e*. Likewise M. (1996, 225) writes that EV (79) *passoles* 'nacke, neck' is an *i*-stem

nominative singular and he suggests a reading **pazulis*. It is not completely clear why M. would accept a reading with final */-is/ for these words, but would apparently reject it for *sarxtes*.

Similarly M. (p. 161) writes that EV (582) *stroysles* ‘halbfischz, flounder’ derives from a feminine nom. pl. **skrāislēs*. Why not reconstruct a nom. sg. masc. **skrāislis*?

M. (p. 120) writes that EV (626) *skerptus* ‘rüstere, elm’ should be transcribed as **skirptūs* which could have been the result of a dissimilation of Old Prussian **skirpstūs* (cf. Lithuanian dialect *skirpstūs* ‘beech [*Fagus silvatica*]’). Old Prussian **skirpstūs* is then a remodeling from **skirpstas* (= Lith. *skirpstas* ‘elm’). The words are eventually to be derived from Baltic **kirp-* / **kerp-* ‘to cut’. This seems to me to be a convincing etymology, but again we have to do apparently with the rendering of phonemic /i/ by orthographic *-e-*.

M. (p. 94) suggests for EV (124) *seyr* ‘hercze, heart’ a reading **sēr*, which would seem to make sense since orthographic *-ey-* could apparently render an *-ē-* in Middle Low German (see L a s c h 1914, 72–73) and the Old Prussian word would seem to correspond exactly to Gk. *kē:r*. For me, however, this presents a problem. In Greek such sequences with a long vowel plus resonant are quite normal, cf. *mētēr* ‘mother’, *kýōn* ‘dog’, but for Baltic they are quite unusual, cf. Lith. *mótė* ‘wife, woman’, *šuo* ‘dog’. A Lithuanian counterpart such as **šēr* ‘heart’, which would seem to correspond to Old Prussian **sēr*, is, however, hardly imaginable. A word such as Lith. *mēlti* ‘to become blue’, which contains a long vowel plus resonant is surely an innovation.

M. (p. 131) suggests that EV (740) *smicuto* ‘swalme, swallow’ is to be corrected to **smituco*, reflecting earlier **smitukā* (or **smītukā*) and that the word is onomatopoeic in origin. He assumes an Old Prussian interjection **smit* (or **smīt*) with a diminutive suffix **-ukā*. H i n z e (1996/7, 161) reads the same word as **snekuto* and connecting it with Lith. *šnekėti* ‘to talk’ also assumes an onomatopoeic formation.

T r a u t m a n n (1910, 431) suggests that EV (307) *slayo* ‘slete, sled’ is a neuter nominative

plural of EV (309) *slayan* ‘sletekuffe, runner (on a sled)’. M. (pp. 126–127) suggests that *slayo* is a collective feminine nominative singular denoting etymologically ‘the object with runners’. This could be compared directly with Lith. *šlajà* = (plurale tantum fem.) *šlajos* ‘sleigh’ (LKŽ XIV 997). One notes also the (plurale tantum masc.) *šlajai* with the same meaning (LKŽ XIV 996). Thus in my view *slayan* could easily be the accusative singular of **slayas* = Lith. **šlajas* and, as Mažiulis has suggested, *slayo* could be cognate with Lith. *šlajà*. Or would *slayan* merely be the accusative singular of *slayo* supplied with a different meaning to satisfy the German scribe?

S m o c z y ŋ s k i (1983, 175) has written that a glance at the photocopy of the Elbing Vocabulary in M a ž i u l i s (1966, 64) shows us that the macron on word EV (237) *samyē* ‘ack’r, (cultivated) field’ is a single stroke on the last two letters, viz. not just the final letter. Thus this word is to be read as *samy-ne* and to be phonemicized as *zemīnē*. From the orthographic point of view one can compare of EV (321) *malūākelā* ‘mill wheel’ which is to be read as *malunakelan*. From the point of view of word formation one can compare EV (304) *graw-yne* ‘tuncbret, side board of a wagon’ and EV (120) *grauwus* ‘seyte, side’. (M. [1988, 403–404] suggests a reading **gravus* or **grav’s* and writes that **gravinē* is an adjectival derivative of **grava-* ‘side’ [cf. *grauwus*].) Smoczyński compares his Old Prussian reconstruction *zemīnē* with Lith. *žēm-inė* ‘dug-out’. M., however, writes that Smoczyński’s reconstruction **samyne* is not justified from the semantic-word-formation point of view. Still I personally could imagine that the name for an agricultural field might be derived from an adjective meaning ‘earthen’. It would have been useful for me, at least, to have a fuller explanation as to exactly why Smoczyński’s explanation is not possible. What is obvious to one person is frequently not obvious to another. Otherwise presumably there would never be differences of opinion about anything or any need for teachers.

M. (p. 187) derives *tawischas* ‘nechsten, of one’s neighbor’ from an adjective **tava-* ‘near’

which in turn comes from an adverb **tau* (attested, e.g., in OCS *tu* 'here') which had also the ablaut grade **tu* attested in Latv. *tuva-* 'close'. I had previously connected this with the root **tav-* meaning 'your (sg.)', cf. also Lith. *taviškis* which as a noun can mean 'your husband'. I wonder now if the root **tav-* contained the seeds of both the meaning 'your' and 'here, close by'.

Other scholars (e.g., Trautmann 1910, 453) have derived EV (553) *twaxtan* 'queste, bath-switch' from an Indo-European root **tuak-* 'to bathe' (cf. Gothic *þwahan* 'to bathe'), but M. (p. 208) compares rather Lith. *tvaksėti* 'to beat (of the heart, etc.)' and *tvókti* 'to beat'. *Twaxtan* is then to be derived from a root **tvak-* plus a noun of instrument suffix **-sta-*. This seems somewhat similar to Nesselmann's (1873, 193) notion that the word should be connected with Lith. *tvóskinti* 'to hit hard; to slam', a causative of *tvoskėti* 'to thunder, to crack'. Fraenkel (1955, 1149) connects *tvaksėti* with *tvóti* 'to hit' and (1151) compares further *tvoskėti*.

I have suggested (1973, 153), however, that the word is to be read as **cwaxtan*, the confusion between the writing of *t* and *c* being well known, e.g., EV (509) *turpelis* 'leiste, shoemaker's last' usually corrected to *curpelis* and EV (780) *trupeyle* 'vrosch, frog' usually corrected to *crupeyle*. (M. [1994, 58] writes that in the Elbing Vocabulary *c* is very similar to *t*, thus to correct, if necessary [reikalui esant], *c* to *t* [and vice-versa] is very easy.) Therefore **cwaxtan* could be phonemicized as /kvakstan/, the second /k/ being epenthetic as with EV (333) *klexto* 'kerwisch, sweeping rag' beside Lith. *klastýklė* 'feather duster'. Thus the noun /kvakstan/ could be considered a borrowing from Slavic *xvost* which is well attested with the meaning 'bathing switch'. A borrowing from Slavic could not be ruled out because of gender considerations, the final *-an* of /kvakstan/ reflecting probably a masculine accusative singular ending. One can compare EV (792) *swetan* 'werld, world' which, according to M. (p. 173) has a masculine accusative singular ending and is a borrowing from proto-Polish, cf. Slavic *světъ*, a masculine noun (see Levin 1974, 53 and Trautmann 1910, 444).

M. suggests (p. 174) that EV (736) *swibe* 'vincke, finch' is to be corrected to **swile* and read as **zvilē*, the origin of the name being in the color. This presupposes an Old Prussian root *zvil-* 'to shine' which would be cognate with Lith. *žvilti* 'id.' The semantics and the derivation are quite credible (i.e., the occurrence of a bird name based on color), but it seems to me that one must assume a scribal error, since to judge by the facsimile (Mažulis 1966, 74) the letter *b* in *swibe* differs at least somewhat from the letter *l* in other words with *l* on that page, e.g., the preceding EV (735) *czilix* 'cziske, siskin' where M. (p. 272) corrects the *l* to *s* and reads the word as **czisix* = **ciziks* < **cizikas* so that the relationship to Pol. *czyżyk*, from which it is borrowed, becomes more obvious. Hinze (1996/7, 159–160) suggests, however, that *swibe* is to be read as **zvibē* and is an onomatopoeic formation which he compares with the Serbo-Croatian onomatopoeic verbs *cvi-ju-k-a-ti*, *cvi-li-k-ov-a-ti*, *cvi-k-a-ti* and *cvi-lj-e-ti* 'to twitter; to squall'.

M. (p. 162) would read EV (595) *stuckis* 'leynböm, maple' as **scuckis* = **skukīs* and this latter in turn from **skutīs* in which the **-t-* before the front vowel **-i-* was turned into **-k-*, thus the **skutīs* would be that tree with clipped leaves, cf. Lith. *skūtas* 'scrap of rag, cloth', *skūsti* 'to shave', etc. This is in my view a good etymology, but in the reversal of the position of the dental and the velar, an etymology which requires some orthographic acrobatics.

For EV (432) *sweykis* 'pflugpfert, plough horse' M. (p. 172) suggests a reading **sveikīs* '(Lith.) ašvienis, hard-working horse' < **asveikis* with loss of the initial vowel. This seems also to be a very good and original etymology. One might suggest, however, a connection with Lith. *sveikas* 'healthy' followed by nominalization of the original adjective. The same reasoning could then be applied then to EV (585) *sweikis* 'dorsch, cod'. M. has shown how the root **salu* 'greyness, yellowness' could function both as the root for a fish and a bird name, so it seems quite possible that an adjective with a broad or very general meaning could be applied to both a horse and a fish. Fraenkel (1955, 950) suggests that Lith. *svei-*

kas derives from the prefix **su-* 'good' plus *-ei-* 'to go' such that **su-eikas* meant 'going, moving briskly'. Another possibility would be that the element *-eik-* is the second element of a compound. A notion of 'moving well' or 'being healthy' would seem to be desirable characteristics for any living being.

Like Trautmann (1910, 462) M. (p. 242) writes that EV (390) *winis* 'wyn, wine' is borrowed from German, but gives no reason for preferring the German to the Slavic source *vino* (neuter). Is it because the German word, ending in a consonant (and being masculine) would presumably have to become masculine in Old Prussian? On the other hand M. (1996, 289) writes that (383) *piwis* 'bier, beer' is from Pol. *piwo*. But why would the Old Prussians have gotten their beer from the Slavs, but their wine from the Germans? Certainly Germans are better known for their beer than the Slavs.

M. (1994, 59–60) has rejected my (1969, 166) derivation of EV (214) *accodis* 'rochloch, hole in the wall for the elimination of smoke' as a diminutive **akutis* of **akis* 'eye' since the latter word is of feminine gender and the Old Prussian counterpart should then be **akutē*, cf. (fem.) Lith. *akis* 'eye' dim. *akūtė*, *kārvė*, dim. *karvūtė*, (masc.) *vaikas* 'child', dim. *vaikēlis*, etc. M. does not mention, however, Lith. (fem.) *ūpė* 'river' and its common diminutive (masc.) *upēlis*. In my view, if a phenomenon is observed even once in one language, the possibility of its occurrence in another language cannot be *ad hoc* excluded on statistical grounds. I would point out also that it is only an assumption that since *akis* is feminine in Lithuanian it must be feminine in Old Prussian also (cf. the neuter Slavic *oko*, Skt. *akṣi*, Goth. *augo*, masc. Lat. *oculus*). Shift of gender is well known even within Lithuanian dialects, as we have seen, e.g., in the etymology of EV (727) *salowis* discussed above.

M. (p. 267) considers EV (59) *wundan* 'wasser, water' a nom. (acc.) sg. neuter word, but since we encounter in the Enchiridion an apparent nom. sg. masc. *unds* 'water' he finds the Enchiridion word *undan* to be an accusative singular masculine. I suspect that *wundan* is also an accusative

singular form, but if M. considers that two dialects of Old Prussian might have the word for water in different genders, it seems to me to be inconsistent to expect that Old Prussian EV (80) *agins* would necessarily be feminine just on the basis of East Baltic cognates. My general comment on the field of etymology is that it is very difficult to limit the possibilities for shift of meaning or gender by some kind of automatic discovery procedure or assumed scientific method.

As I have written in my reviews of the previous three volumes M. is to be congratulated on completing an indispensable tool for Old Prussian and Baltic etymology. In this review, I have expressed primarily points where I disagree with M., leaving unmentioned many points where I am in full agreement. All Balticists are in debt to this one great Balticist and Prussianist for providing so many important insights into Baltic philology in the course of his life time.

REFERENCES

- Endzelīns J., 1943, *Senprūšu valoda*, Rīga.
- Fraenkel E., 1955, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- Hinze F., 1996/7, *Die altpreussischen Bezeichnungen der Wild-Avifauna und des Hausflügels*, – *Linguistica Baltica*, V/VI, 141–181.
- Lasch A., 1914, *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*, Halle.
- Levin J., 1974, *The Slavic element in the Old Prussian Elbing vocabulary*, Berkeley etc.
- Machek V., 1951, *Trois noms slaves de couleurs*, – *Lingua Posnaniensis*, III, 96–111.
- Magner Th. F. and W. R. Schmalstieg (eds.), 1970, *Baltic linguistics*, University Park etc.
- Marchand J., 1970, *Some remarks on the German side of the Elbing Vocabulary*, – *Magner and Schmalstieg*, 109–117.
- 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.
- Mažiulis V., 1993, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, II (I–K), Vilnius.

Mažiulis V., 1994, Dėl prūsų grafinių taisy-
mų, – Baltistica, XXVII (2), 57–60.

Mažiulis V., 1996, Prūsų kalbos etimologi-
jos žodynas, III (L–P), Vilnius.

Nesselmann G. H. F., 1873, Thesaurus lin-
guae prussicae, Berlin.

Pop S., 1950, La dialectologie, I. Dialectologie
Romane. Publications universitaires de Louvain.
Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 3e
série, Fascicule 38.

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

Schmalstieg W. R., 1973, Several studies
on Old Prussian, – Litanistikos darbai, III, 153–170.

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

Smoczyński W., 1983, Staropruskie lekcje i
etymologic, I, – Biuletyn polskiego towarzystwa
językoznawczego, XL, 167–183.

Smoczyński W., 1989, Zur Schreibung im En-
chiridion (I), – Baltistica, III 1 priedas, 179–195.

Smoczyński W., 1989a, Studia bałto-sło-
wiańskie, I (Prace komisji językoznawstwa, no. 57),
Kraków.

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

Trautmann R., 1923, Baltisch-Slavisches
Wörterbuch, Göttingen.

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

William R. Schmalstieg

Rūta Buivydienė, **Lietuvių kalbos
vedybų giminystės pavadinimai**, Vilnius, Moks-
lo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1997, 245.

Platesni lietuvių kalbos žodžių etimologijos
ir istorijos tyrimai – nedažnas, bet džiuginantis
faktas lietuvių kalbotyroje. Rūtos Buivydienės
monografija apie vedybų, iš dalies ir kraujo gi-
minystės pavadinimus – rimta, išsami ir nedau-
giažodė studija, kurios vertės visai nesumenkina
kiek pavėluotas publikavimas (disertacija, kurios
pagrindu parašytas aptariamasis darbas, apginta
dar 1992 metais). Tirti pasirinkta leksinė-seman-

tinė mūsų kalbos žodyno grupė – giminystės pa-
vadinimai – yra gana paranki istorinės leksikolo-
gijos analizei. Ši grupė archajiška, uždara ir sta-
bili. Dalis lietuvių giminystės pavadinimų savo
kilmės požiūriu jau buvo aptarti atskiruose eti-
mologijos darbuose, žodynuose. Tai suteikia ga-
limybę daryti platesnes išvadas, pavienių faktų
sintezę. Tokie ir yra pagrindiniai kalbamojo dar-
bo tikslai: pateikti išsamų vedybų giminystės pa-
vadinimų inventorius vaizdą, aptarti jų vartose-
ną, kilmę, sistemos raidos dėsniumus (p. 10),
t. y. užpildyti spragą, esančią lietuvių ir apskritai
baltų leksikologijoje – tokio pobūdžio darbo, skir-
to giminystės pavadinimams, nebūta. Galima tvir-
tinti, šie tikslai buvo pasiekti.

Gerą autorės literatūros apie ide. ir kitų kal-
bų giminystės pavadinimus išmanymą rodo kny-
gos įvadas bei bendrosios pastabos. Čia labai
koncentruotai nurodomi svarbiausi šios temos
darbai, pagrindiniai giminystės pavadinimų pro-
blematikos bruožai, metodika, klasifikacija, gi-
minystės pavadinimų bendrieji ypatumai. Kny-
gos skaitytoją stengiamasi kuo mažiau apkrauti
kitų mokslinių studijų perpasakojimu, pasako-
mi tik esminiai dalykai, susiję su būsima lietu-
vių kalbos faktų analize. Darbo sėkmę bus nu-
lėmusi ir vykusi tyrimo išeities pozicija. Įžval-
giai pasiremta B. Delbrücko teiginiu, jog reikia
atsižvelgti į istorinį socialinį giminystės pava-
dinimų pamatą, kuris, daugelio mokslininkų
nuomone, yra patriarchalinė ide. visuomenės są-
ranga. Be to, pačios autorės ryšium su tuo pos-
tuluojamos tyrimo prielaidos yra lankstesnės ir
leidžia neideologiškai, be *a priori* analizuoti ve-
dybos giminystės pavadinimų raidą: priklausom-
mybė tarp semantinės šių pavadinimų sistemos
struktūros ir socialinės tautos giminystės santy-
kių struktūros nesuabsoliutinama – pripažįsta-
ma, jog lingvistinė giminystės pavadinimų sis-
tema remiasi socialine (šiuo atveju – patriarcha-
line) giminystės santykių sistema, tačiau
akcentuojamas lingvistinės sistemos reliatyvus
savarankiškumas (plg. p. 12; 17).

Rūta Buivydienė surinktai lietuvių kalbos me-
džiagai grupuoti pamatuotai pasirinko amerikie-
čių antropologo, ide. bei rusų giminystės pava-
dinimų specialisto P. Friedricho klasifikaciją. Ši kla-