

Lithuanian *žiaurùs* : *žvérìs*

STEVEN YOUNG

University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD

Lith. *žiaurùs* ‘grausam’ is linked by Fraenkel to the word *nest žiaudùs* ‘*žiaurus* [oft bei Daukantas]’, *žiudrùs* ‘rauh, uneben’, *žiudréti* ‘rauh, uneben werden’; these are associated in turn with either Lith. *žúti* ‘zugrunde gehen’, *žudýti* ‘umbringen’ or Russ. жудá ‘Entsetzen, Elend’. But Fraenkel’s comparison falls short both phonologically (the derivation of **žiaur-* from **žiaud(r)-* is not evident) and semantically (the basic meaning of **žiaur-* is ‘cruel’ rather than ‘rough, coarse’). A better-motivated solution is suggested by the semantic relation Lat. *ferus* : *ferox*: *žiaurùs* may be seen as a ‘state I’ formation (**g^héur-*) to the state II of *žvérìs* (**g^hvér-*). In this explanation, (**g^héur-*) would originally have represented a thematic adjective of appurtenance, refashioned in Lithuanian as a *u*-stem.

Lith. *žiaurùs*, *-i* (stem *žiaūr-*) ‘cruel, ferocious, brutal, savage’ is linked by Fraenkel (1965: 1303) to the word *nest žiaudùs* “= *žiaurùs* (oft bei Daukantas ...),” *žiaudrùs*, *žiudrùs* ‘rauh, uneben’, *žiudréti* ‘rauh, uneben werden’, all of which are said to belong either to the set of Lith. *žúti* ‘zugrunde gehen’, *žudýti* ‘umbringen’, Latv. *zāudēt* ‘vernichten, verlieren, verderben’, or to Russ. жудá ‘Entsetzen, Elend’ (which itself may be related to the *žúti* set: Vasmer, Trubačev 1987_{II}: 63). Under the entry *žiudrùs* (characterized as the “Tiefstufe zu *žiaurùs*”), Fraenkel expands this set of phonetically and semantically disparate items to include *žiubrùs* ‘rauh, uneben’, *žiübrinti* ‘rauh machen’, and under *nuzurdóti*, *nužurdóti* (1962: 514) ‘zu Tode quälen’ we read: “Nach meiner Ansicht sind die Wörter verw. mit lit. *žiaurùs* ‘grausam, erbarmungslos, wild, rauh’, *žiaudùs* dass[elbe]...”

Regarding the comparison of *žiaurùs* to *žiaudùs* and related forms, it is difficult to imagine how the *-d-* of the latter stem (to say nothing of the *-b-* of *žiubrùs*) could be reconciled with the *-r-* of *žiaurùs*, unless the source of both words is taken to be **žiaū-*, with an optional *-d-* enlargement (IEW 448 **gheu-*, **gheu-d-* ‘verschwinden, umkommen’, the source of *žúti*) together with the *-r-* suffix present in *žaudrùs* (to *žiaudùs*; cf. also dial. *skaudrùs* ‘aštrus, piktas’ alongside *skaudùs*, Skardžius 1941: 300).

But this direction need not be pursued, since *žiaurùs* and *žiaudùs* are not easily reconciled semantically. Būga (1959: 327, 688) presents this semantic sketch of *žiaudùs*: ‘суповый, шерховатый, негладкий; ... acerbus; ... chropawy’. The ‘суповый’ meaning seems to be typical in reference to the wind: *sziaurēs ar kitt̄ žiaud̄l wiej̄;* ‘ôr's yra ... *žiaudùs ir nepatogus*’ (Daukantas); NW Žem. *žiaudrùs* ‘суповый, пронизывающий, острый; шершавый, неровный; hirtus’; NW Žem. *žiudrùs* (reduced grade of *žiaudrùs*) ‘шершавый, негладкий (*šiurkštūs*)’, *žiudréti* ‘становиться шершавым: *nužiūdro rañkos nū bùlvìu rinkimo*’. To this we can add Vitkauskas (1976: 453, 458): *žiaudrùs*, *žiudrùs* ‘*šiurkštūs*, kietas’: (examples appear in dialect form in the original) *marškiniai*

žiaudri buvo ... kaip šepeciai; pakulinis žiaudrus: nugarą draskė; vikšris žudrus: pjausta liežuvį gyvulių; pakulinis labai žudrus audeklas.

It seems clear from these glosses and samples that the central meaning of the *žiaud(r)-*, *žiudr-* root is ‘rough, coarse, harsh’, rather than ‘cruel, ferocious’, and thus there is no need to link *žiaud(r)us*, *žiudrūs* semantically (any more than phonologically) with *žiaurūs*. The occasional contexts in which the usages may coincide (for example, in reference to a harsh ~ raw ~ cruel wind) should not obscure this fact.

For Lith. *žiaurūs*, semantic parallels such as Lat. *ferus* : *ferōx*, Russ. *зверь* : *зверский* ‘brutal’, and Lith. *žvēris* : *žvériškas* suggest rather a comparison with Lith. *žvēris* ‘wild animal’. Consider also Žem. *žvēris* in the sense of ‘kas žiaurus’ (Vitkauskas 1976: 462) and the fact that Lith. *žvériškas*, a transparent derivative of *žvēris*, is defined by the ‘DŽ as ‘*žiaurūs*’¹.

Given the semantic rapprochement *žiaurūs* : *žvēris*, we turn next to the phonetic relationship between the two words. A Lithuanian sequence *š'V*, *ž'V* (represented orthographically as *šiV*, *žiV*), such as we have in *žiaurūs*, reflects in principle an ancestral **k̥iV*, **g̥iV*. One Balto-Slavic source for such sequences is found in tautosyllabic **(C)ēu-* > (in Baltic terms) *(C)jāu-*: IEW 597 **k̥ēu[e]jr-* ‘Nord, Nordwind’ > Lith. *šiáur-[é]* ‘north’, IEW 684 **leud*i*-* ‘Nachwuchs, Volk’ > Lith. *liáudis*, Sl. **ljud-*². Accordingly, the most likely antecedent for a Lithuanian root of the shape *žiaur-* would be **g̥(h)eur-*. The tone of the original (acute or circumflex) cannot be deduced from *žiaurūs*, since modern *u*-stem adjectives tend to generalize accent paradigm 4, i.e., impose circumflex metatony: *šiáurē* ‘north’ : *šiáurūs*, stem *šiáur-* ‘Siaurinis’ (Stundžia 1995: 94).

We arrive then at a comparison of a pre-Baltic **g̥heur-* (essentially ‘*žvériškas*’) and **g̥uēr-*, IEW 493 ‘wildes Tier’, the source of Lith. *žvēris* ‘id.’. Since this relationship is (to use Eric Hamp’s term) one of an ‘adjective of appurtenance’ **g̥heur-* to a nominal base **g̥uēr-*, and such adjectives are formed by thematic derivation and the addition of the “vocalism *e* in the first possible position” (Hamp 1978: 186, 193–94), and moreover are oxytonic (Hamp 1984: 141), we are dealing in fact with a thematic stem **g̥euró-*. Gołab (1967: 770) refers to the derivational process involved here as (a type of) *vřddhi*, and explains it at greater length: “*Vřddhi* can be defined as a type of secondary (denominative) adjective-generating derivation which combines two devices: a) suffixation (chiefly *-o/e-* and *-(i)o/e-*); b) gradation of the initial syllable of basic word (noun). The gradation of the vowel in the initial syllable ... can be interpreted as the result of the ‘addition’ or ‘insertion’ of *e* to the basic vocalism *Ø* ...”

¹ Yet another semantic parallel of this sort is provided by Slavic **свръпъ/sverěpъ* (e.g. Russ. *северный*), ultimately to IE **g̥uēr-* ‘animal’ (Holzer 1989: 78–81, in his provocative theory of a Slavic wordstock reflecting an adstrate [possibly Cimmerian] influence).

² On the development of **eu* in both Slavic and Baltic, see Arumaa (1964: 86 ff. and 96 ff.). Arumaa challenges Vaillant’s claim that the change took place only before a soft consonant: “Vaillant ... macht den Wechsel slav. *u* ~ *iu*, balt. *au* ~ *iau* vom harten oder weichen Charakter des folgenden Konsonanten abhängig, wofür aber eine sichere Beweisführung unmöglich ist, weil die lautliche Spaltung hier schon in den Urzustand dieser Sprachen zurückzuverlegen ist und wir einer sicheren Kontrolle dafür entbehren.” Shevelov (1965: 273) is more categorical: “Yet an examination of every instance shows that the only phonetic reflex of *eu* was [Slavic] *jü*, while all other forms are due to extra-phonetic factors and constitute deviations of a later date”.

Our thematic derivation **g^heuró-* < **g^huēr-*³ thus parallels that of the (substantivized) adjective **deiugó-* (Kuryłowicz 1968: 303: ‘himmlisch’ > ‘Gott’) to the original base **dieu-* (of OI *dyáuh*, *dyoh*) through the reduced grade **dju/diū*, except that the intermediate stage of a reduced-grade ***g^hur-* (to **g^huēr-*) is apparently unattested. Regarding such ‘Schwebeablaut’ relations (which continue the state I and II formations of Benveniste’s binomial roots), Szemerényi (1980: 126) says that the assumption of a reduced-grade stage is not necessary: “In einigen Fällen (z. B. bei mittlerem *R*) können Umstellungen stattgefunden haben, d. h. **terp-* direkt zu **trep-* geworden sein”.

With the phonetic development of **g^heuró-* to the recognizably Baltic shape **žiaurà*, we have a form with the appearance of an *o*-grade (Baltic *a*-grade) adjective. Such adjectives (chiefly deverbal) in Baltic were susceptible to a shift to the originally reduced-grade oxytonic *u*-stems: “the notable fact of Baltic is the appearance of *o*-grade bases in -ú-stems: *kartùs* ‘bitter’, *gajùs* ‘lively, vivacious’, etc.; or even of pseudo-*o*-grade: *saldùs* ‘sweet’” (Hamp 1984: 141; Vanags 1989: 118 suggests a motivation for this large-scale shift). Accordingly, the thematic oxytone **žiaurà-* was refashioned as the *u*-stem **žiauriù-*.

In summary, we have an oxytonic thematic adjective of appurtenance **g^heuró-*, essentially ‘žvériškas’, to the inherited base **g^huēr-* ‘žvérìs’, by a Schwebeablaut derivational process. This yielded, by regular phonetic change, a ‘pseudo-*o*-grade’ *žiauró-*,⁴ which together with other thematic *o*-grade adjectives was refashioned as a *u*-stem, giving the modern *žiaurùs* ‘cruel, ferocious’.

Having secured the antecedent **g^heuró-* of Lith. *žiaurùs*, we might ask if this base is reflected in Slavic as well; the expected formal development of the root **g^heur-* in Slavic would be **žur-*, through the intermediate stage **žiour-*, with a change of the *-eu-* diphthong analogous to that in Baltic (for Slavic ž from z of palato-velar origin plus i, note Russ. ёж ‘hedgehog’ < **eg^hio-* ≡ Lith. *ežys*). In fact, a verb *žuriti* (*se*) is widely attested in the Slavic languages, but in a bewildering array of meanings, summarized as follows.

Czech *zuřít* (intransitive only, replacing older Czech *zuřiti se*) presents a single unambiguous meaning: ‘rage, be furious’ (Poldauf 1971: 1213); ‘свирепствовать’ (Pavlovič 1989: 808), which appears again in the derived adjective *zuřívý* ‘raging [mad], ferocious, furious’ (Poldauf, loc. cit.).⁵

³ According to Dybo (1981: 40) Lith. *žvérìs* shows apophonic root length which was generalized in this root as early as Indo-European. Others posit a laryngeal base here. As noted above, the original situation is obscured in *žiaurùs* by a tendency to generalize circumflex stems.

⁴ I would tentatively suggest that an intermediate Baltic stage **žeura-* is reflected in Fi *hirvää* ‘dreadful, frightful, horrible, hideous’, which lacks an etymology in both SKES 78 and SSA 167. Finnish *h* is the expected reflex of a Baltic palatal; concerning the regular metathesis of *-ur-* > *-rv-* in Finnish, see Koivulehto (1991: 34). The pattern example is Fi. *karva* ‘hair’ < Baltic **gaura-* ‘id.’

⁵ Macheck is undoubtedly correct in treating Cz. *zuřít* (for **žuřit*) as the result of dissimilation: on the one hand, the Czech root *zur-* is isolated (Macheck suggests Slovak *zuríť*, *zúříť* is borrowed from Czech), and on the other hand there is no *žur-* in Czech. Old Czech *zeřiti*, brought into the equation by Holub (1952: 440), hardly belongs here.

In Polish the now archaic *żurzyć się* (reflexive only) has as its core meaning ‘be angry, indignant’, or, marking greater intensity, ‘rage, storm’ (Doroszewski 1968: 1458: ‘gniewać się na kogo, oburzać się, srożyć się’), as in Czech. Karłowicz (1927: 726) notes the additional senses *kwasić się* ‘become embittered’, *być markotnym* ‘be gloomy, sullen’, and also *chełpić się* ‘boast, brag’, *nadymać się* ‘put on airs’.

Lower Sorbian (Mucke 1928_{II}: 1161) has both a transitive *žuriš* ‘sauer machen; übertr. erbittern, сделать кислым, озлоблять, ожесточать’ and a reflexive with the meaning ‘sauer werden; übertr. sich erbittern; скисать, озлобляться, гневаться, ожесточаться’, hence essentially the ‘gniewać się’ and ‘kwasić się’ meanings found in Polish.

The East Slavic languages lack the ‘be angry/furious’ meaning. Belorussian and Ukrainian share a core sense of ‘grieve, be distressed’ (verb) and ‘grief-stricken, distressed’ (adjective): Belorussian *журіца* ‘грустить, печалиться; кручиниться’ (Atraxovič 1988_I: 414); *журіцьца* сов. *зажуріцьца* ‘скорбеть, предаваться печали’ (Nosovič 1870: 158); Ukrainian *журіти*, -*ю*, -*иши* ‘сокрушать, крашити, печалити’, *журітися*, -*юся*, -*ишися* ‘печалиться, грустить, горевать, кручиниться, крашиться; унывати’ (Kiričenko 1953: 505). In addition, Belorussian and Ukrainian show comparable deverbal nouns and corresponding adjectives: Br. *журбá*, *журбóта* (разг.) ‘грусть, печаль, кручина’, *журбóтны* ‘грустный, печальный; скорбный’ (Atraxovič 1988_I: 413); Ukr. *журбá* ‘печаль, грусть’, *журлíвий* ‘печальный, грустный’ (Kiričenko loc. cit.). Ukrainian, however, also provides the base from which the verbal *журíти(ся)* is derived: (Kiričenko 1953: 506, s.v. *журбá*) обл. *журá*, редк. *жур* ‘печаль, грусть’ and the corresponding denominal adjective *журníй* ‘печальный, грустный; сокрушенный’.

The central meaning of Russian *журíть*, -*рю*, -*ришь* (transitive only) is ‘scold’: ‘(разг.) делать лёгкий выговор; слегка бранить’ (Ozegov 1989: 199). The word seems to be attested no earlier than Avvakum’s *Жумие* (1673). The reflexive *журíться*, -*рюсь*, -*ришься* is known dialectally in the meanings of ‘горевать, печалиться’ (southern Russian) and ‘ворчать, браниться’, which reappears in the derived *журíло*, *журíла* ‘grumbler’ (SRNG_{IX}: 231). As in Ukrainian, dialectal Russian also has *журнýй*, *журнóй* ‘печальный, грустный’, although the base *жyp* seems to be absent in Russian.

South Slavic introduces the meaning ‘hurry’, in Slovene (archaic) *žúriti se*, -*im*, and SCr *жúриму се*, which alongside its core meaning also shows (dialectally) ‘complain’, which Petleva (1969: 178) connects with the ‘grieve’ and (for non-reflexives) ‘scold’ meanings found in East Slavic.

The above survey suggests a consistent distinction between a West Slavic **žuriti*, which is typically reflexive/intransitive, lacks a derived noun *žurbá*, and centers around the notion of ‘anger, rage’; and the rest of Slavic, where the range of meanings is more scattered, but ‘grieve, cause grief’ is typical, and the deverbal noun *žurbá* is found along with an apparently underived base *žur*, *žurá*.

Among the Slavic etymological dictionaries consulted, Brückner (1957: 668) is alone in linking the Polish *żurzyć się* with the East and South Slavic forms; curiously, the semantically identical Czech *zurít* is not mentioned. Machek (1968: 589 s.v. *zuríti*)

appropriately unites the Czech and Polish forms without mentioning East and South Slavic, while Vasmer, Trubačev (1987_{II}: 68 s.v. *журить*), Černyx (1993; 309 s.v. *журить*), and Mel'nyčuk (1985: 210 s.v. *журити*, *журитися*) make no reference to the West Slavic forms; the East and South Slavic forms are compared with OI *ghorás* ‘страшный, ужасный, стремительный’ and Gothic *gaurs* ‘возмущённый, опечаленный’ (IEW 453 **ghou-ro-s* ‘furchtbar’, ‘voller Furcht’). Černyx, while conceding that the root is etymologically unclear (Mel'nyčuk agrees) and that the meanings in the modern Slavic languages are quite divergent, ventures that the older meaning for the Russian term was ‘cause someone grief’, ‘upset someone’, whence also ‘rush’ and ‘worry’. Baltic **gur-*, with the general meaning of ‘impoverishment’, may also belong here (Toporov 1979: 346 ff., s.v. *gurīns* ‘бедный’). This leaves us with the question of the origin of the West Slavic forms.

For Lower Sorbian *žuriš* ‘sauer machen, übertr. erbittern’, *žuriš se* ‘sauer werden, übertr. sich erbittern’ and for the occasional meaning ‘kwasić się’ of the corresponding Polish verb, a solution is suggested by Mucke’s note accompanying the formally corresponding adjective *žuriwy* (comparable to Czech *zuřivý*) ‘widersetzlich; упрямый...’: “abg. v. *žur*”, that is, derived from the widespread West Slavic word for a sour mash used for soup or bread, the generally accepted source of which is MHG *sūr* ‘sour’⁶. The verb *žuriš* may either be a direct derivative of LSo. *žur*, or the original meaning of the verb may have been extended from ‘be angry’ to ‘be sour, bitter’ through a folk-etymological association with *žur*.

Brückner offers no etymology for *żurzyć się*. Machek sees Czech *zuřiti* (*se*) and Polish *żurzyć się* as deriving from an earlier **vz-juriti* (he adduces Pol. *jurzyć się* ‘fly into a rage’, ‘fume, storm’, Ukr. *наюритися* ‘get angry’) through a false break (**v*-*zjuriti*) and *ž*- from the sequence *zj*- . Although the semantics are suggestive, the comparison cannot be upheld: the word seems not to know a prefix *vz-* or *v-* (modern Czech uses only *na-*, *roz-*, *vy-*, *za-* with this root). More importantly, the palatalization of *z+j* across a prefix-root morpheme boundary is not expected at such a late stage in Slavic (although *t+j > č* is found in e.g. Russ. *очутиться < от+ютиться* : Lith. *jaūsti*, *jūsti*; Vasmer, Trubačev 1987_{III}: 179).

In fact, the etymology of the otherwise isolated West Slavic **žuriti* (*se*) is, from our newly-gained Baltic perspective, clear: it is a denominal verb from the same base as Lith. *žiaurùs* ‘cruel’, in Slavic terms **g^heur-* > **zj̥eur-* > **žur-*, the Schwaebalaut form to **g^hūer-* ‘wild animal’. Indeed this connection was precociously hit upon by Josef Jungmann in his 1839 *Slovník česko-německý* (1839: 793) under the lemma *zuřívý*, where he notes “cf. zwěř.” In its derivational semantics, West Slavic **žur-* (< **g^heur-*) : *žuriti* (*se*) is analogous to Russ. *свирепый* : *свирепствовать*, or, using a

⁶ Cf. Brückner (1957: 668): *žur* – niemiecka nazwa ‘kisielu’; od 15. wieku ogólnie, przejęte na całym Zachodzie słowiańskim (u nas, Słowieńców, Czechów, Łużyczan), a od nas na Rusi; z niem. *sūr* (dziś *sauer*) ‘kishy’. Grinaveckienė (1975: 174–5) treats Br. *жур* ‘овсяный кисель’ as a borrowing from the Baltic source of Lith. *žiūrē*, *žiūrā* and Latv. *žūra*, *žūre*, arguing that the Baltic forms have the broader semantic range and are therefore original. But this argument does not take into account the presence of *žur* in Polish, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Czech, and even Slovene, where it cannot possibly represent a borrowing from Baltic.

closer formal analogy (a reflexive *-уть* verb), Russ. *бес* : *беситься*. Alongside the verb *žuriti (*sę*), West Slavic has apparently lost the original base preserved in Lithuanian *žiaurūs*, a phenomenon not unknown in the history of Balto-Slavic (e.g., Sl. *r̥oka ‘hand’ : Lith. *rankā* : *riñkti* ‘gather’ : Sl. *r̥ygtъ [Russ. *rьгутъ*] ‘mercury’ : Lith. *r̥isti* : *ritant-* ‘roll’).

REFERENCES

- ARUMAA, P. 1964: *Uralische Grammatik* 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- ATRAXOVIĆ, K. K. 1988: *Белорусско-русский словарь* 1, Минск: Белорусская советская энциклопедия.
- BRÜCKNER, A. 1957: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- BŪGA, K. 1958, 1959, 1962: *Rinktiniai raštai* 1–3, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- ČERNYX, P. Ja. 1993: *Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка* 1, Москва: Русский язык.
- ⁴DŽ – *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, ed. S. Keinys et al., Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 2000.
- DOROSZEWSKI, W., ed. 1968: *Słownik języka polskiego* 10, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- DYBO, V. A. 1981: *Славянская акцентология*, Москва: Наука.
- FRAENKEL, E. 1962–1965: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- GOŁAB, Z. 1967: The Traces of *vṛddhi* in Slavic. In: Honor Roman Jakobson. *Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 770–784.
- GRINAIVEKIENĖ, E., et al. 1975: Бытовая лексика литовского происхождения в западной Белоруссии. *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 16, 163–195.
- HAMP, E. 1978: Sound change and the etymological lexicon. Farkas, D. et al., eds., *Chicago Linguistic Society*. Papers from the Parasession on the Lexicon, April 14–15, 1978, 184–195.
- HAMP, E. 1984: On the development of oxytone *o*-grade adjectives to *-ú*- stems. *Baltistica* 20 (2), 141–142.
- HOLUB, J., KOPEČNÝ, F. 1952: *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha: Státní Nakladatelství Učebnic.
- HOLZER, G. 1989: *Entlehnungen aus einer bisher unbekannten indogermanischen Sprache im Uralischen und Urbaltischen*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- IEW – *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, ed. J. Pokorný, Bern: Francke, 1959.
- JUNGMANN, J. 1839: *Slovník česko-německý* 5, Praha: V Knížecí Arcibiskupské Knihtiskárně.
- KARŁOWICZ, J., et al. 1927: *Słownik języka polskiego* 8, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Kasy im. Mianowskiego.
- KIRIČENKO, I. I. 1953: *Украинско-русский словарь* 1, Киев: Издательство Академии наук Украинской ССР.
- KOIVULEHTO, J. 1991: *Uralische Evidenz für die Laryngaltheorie*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- KURYLWICZ, J. 1968: *Indogermanische Grammatik* 2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- MACHEK, V. 1968: *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, ed. 2, Praha: Academia – Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd.
- MEL'NYČUK, O. S. 1985: *Етимологічний словник української мови* 2, Київ: Наукова думка.
- MUCKE, E. 1928: *Wörterbuch der nieder-wendischen Sprache und ihrer Dialekte* 2, Prag: Verlag der Böhmisches Akademie für Wissenschaften und Kunst.
- NOSOVIČ, I. I. 1870: *Словарь белорусского наречия*, Санкт-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук.
- OŽEGOV, S. I. 1989: *Словарь русского языка*, изд. 21-ое, Москва: Русский язык.
- PAVLOVIĆ, A. I. 1989: *Чешско-русский словарь*, изд. 8-ое, Москва: Русский язык.
- PETLEVA, I. P. 1969: Дополнительные ресурсы для реконструкции праславянской лексики (на материале сербохорватского языка). *Этимология* 1967, 173–179.

- POLDAUF, I., et al. 1971: *Anglicko-český a česko-anglický slovník*, Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- SHEVELOV, G. Y. 1965: *A Prehistory of Common Slavic*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- SKARDŽIUS, P. 1941: *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslo akademija.
- SKES – *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja*, ed. Y. Toivonen, Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen seura, 1955.
- SRNG – *Словарь русских народных говоров*, ред. Ф. П. Филин et al., Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1965–.
- SSA – *Suomen sanojen alkuperä* 1, ed. E. Itkonen, et al., Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden seura kotimaiosten kielten tutkimuskeskus, 1992.
- STUNDŽIA, B. 1995: *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos kirčiavimo sistema*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Baltų kalbų katedra.
- SZEMERENYI, O., 1980: *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 2nd ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- ТОРОРОВ, В. Н. 1979: *Прусский язык. Словарь Е-Н*, Москва: Наука.
- VANAGS, P. 1989: On the History of Baltic *u*-Stem Adjectives. *Baltistica* 25 (2), 113–122.
- VASMER [ФАСМЕР], М., TRUBACHEV, О. N. 1987: *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева, изд. 2-ое, Москва: Прогресс.
- VITKAUSKAS, V. 1976: *Šiaurės rytu dūnininkų šnekų žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Steven Young
Department of Modern Languages
University of Maryland Baltimore County
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21250, USA
young@umbc.edu

Gauta 2002 11 24