

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-009-0013-y

DAGMAR S. WODTKO, BRITTA IRSLINGER, CAROLIN SCHNEIDER. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, LXXX + 863 pp.

This voluminous book is published ten years after the publication of the first edition of the first specialized monograph of this type, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, edited by Helmut Rix in cooperation with Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. The second edition appeared already in 2001, again in Wiesbaden, Ludwig Reichert Verlag 2001. Both lexica, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben* (further LIV) and *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon* (further NIL), originated in the same academic centre, at the Indo-European seminar of Freiburg University in Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Let us mention that both the editor of LIV, Helmut Rix, and the initiator of NIL, Eva Tichy, are successors to Oswald Szemerényi at the chair of Indo-European studies in Freiburg.

The book is arranged as follows: **Vorwort** (pp. v–vi), **Inhalt** (pp. vii–xii), **Einleitende Bemerkungen** (pp. xiii–xxx), **Abkürzungen** (pp. xxxi–xxxvii), **Abgekürzt zitierte Literatur** (pp. xlii–Lxxx). The main part of the book is the **lexicon** proper (pp. 1–730), consisting of 207 lemmas. In the final part there are the **indexes** (pp. 733–863). The structure of the lemma reflects the word formation of the Indo-European noun. At the head of the lemma stands the verbal or nominal root. The nominal derivatives are classified as follows (pp. xx–xxv):

- Athematic formations

1. Root nouns.
2. *-r-/-n-*-heteroclitics, including the complex extensions **-uer/n-*, **-ter/n-*, **-mer/n-*;
3. *n*-stems, including the **-men-/*-mon-* extensions and possessive formations in **-H₃on-*;
4. *r*-stems, including the **-tér-/*-tor-* extensions;
5. *l*-stems, including such formations as Slavic *nomina agentis* in **-tel-*;
6. *i*-stems, including the productive abstract nouns in **-ti-*;
7. *u*-stems, including the productive extensions in **-tu-*;
8. *H*-stems, i.e. in **-iH₂* and **-(e)H₁*;
9. *s*-stems, plus the comparatives in **-jes-* and superlatives in **-istH₂o-*, including the Italo-Celtic innovation in **-isṃmo-*;
10. Perfect participles in *-ues/t-*, **-uos/t-*, **-us-*;
11. *t*-stems, i.e. **-et-/*-ot-/*-t-*;
12. *nt*-stems are included only, if they are not result of an inner development in the individual branches.

- Thematic formations

o-stems, with numerous extensions: **-ko-*, **-no-*, **-ro-*, **-lo-*, **-jo-*, **-uo-*, **-to-*;
Nomina instrumenti in **-tro-*, **-tlo-*, **-d^hro-*, **-d^hlo-*;
aH₂-stems (they are not included among *H*-stems).

- Secondary formations and compounds.

The resolve of the authors of NIL to analyze every studied etymon is maximalistic in the most positive sense. Besides the careful analysis of etymons from the point of view of word

formation, they also offer their valuable semantic discussions. Welcome is the inclusion of numerous proper names, anthroponyms, theonyms, and toponyms in their lemmas. The authors are not dogmatic: they frequently discuss various alternative solutions, cognizant of the most recent sources. In sum, one may conclude that the authors offer the highest possible level of contemporary Indo-European etymology. The following marginal supplements do not change this highest evaluation.

ADDENDA

Ad 38–41: **b^hráH₂ter-* ‘Bruder’ – There are even two candidates for a cognate in Anatolian, both in Lydian: (i) *brafrsi-* and (ii) *vrato-/vratu-* (GUSMANI 1980–1984: 129, 141).

Ad 46–58: **b^hueH₃-* ‘wachsen, entstehen, werden’ – Add the Anatolian cognates: Cuneiform Luwian *pūwa* ‘formerly’, *puwa-til* ‘the past’, *pūwalā* ‘past’, Hieroglyphic Luwian *pu-wa/i-ti* ‘formerly’, especially with respect to such parallels as *pūwalā* ‘past’ vs. Russian *byvalo* ‘used to be’ > ‘formerly’ (IVANOV 2001: 80–106).

Ad 60–69: **deH₃-* ‘geben’ – Add the Anatolian cognates, the derivatives of Hittite *da-* ‘to take’, Cuneiform Luwian *da-/ta-/la-*, Hieroglyphic Luwian *ta-/la-* id., Lydian *dā-* ‘to give’, with infinitives in *-n-* in Hittite *dānna*, Hieroglyphic Luwian CAPERE(-)lá/i/u-na (TISCHLER, *HEG* II: 5–11).

Ad 69–81: **dej-* ‘hell sein, scheinen’ – Add Venetic acc. pl. **deivos** (LEJEUNE 1974: 332). The oldest known attestation of the Germanic stem **teiwa-* appears in the inscription B on the helmet from Negau/Ženjok (c. 55 B.C.): *Harigasti teiva* (MARKEY 2001: 118f.; on the older interpretations – see the monograph of NEDOMA 1995).

Ad 86–99: *d^hég^h-om-* ‘Erde’ – Interesting is that the attractive idea of VILLAR (1993: 469) on Celtiberian *tamai* ‘in the place’ < **g^hd^homai*, quoted by Wodtko in MLH V, 360, does not appear in NIL, although she (Wodtko) is the sole author of this lemma.

Ad 118–119: **d^heġ^h-* ‘bestreichen, kneten’ – Add Tocharian A *tsek-*, B *tsik-* ‘to fashion, shape, build’, cf. the compound in B *lwaksātsaika* ‘potter’, consisting of *lwāke* ‘pot, vessel’ and *tsaika* ‘shaper’ (ADAMS, *EIEC* 649; Id. 1999: 563, 738, 742).

Ad 139–153: **ġenH₁-* ‘erzeugen’ – BRUGMANN (1906: 512–513) identified the Balto-Slavic derivational suffix **-źni-/źnā-?*, which can represent a grammaticalization of the verbal root **ġenH₁-*: Latvian *pūznis* ‘Fauliges, Eiterndes, Lagerstätte eines Tieres’, pl. *pūznes* ‘Modererde’ : *pūt* ‘faulen, lange schlafen’, Lithuanian *pūti* ‘faulen, modern, verfallen’ (FRAENKEL 1962–1965: 680–681), and Old Church Slavonic *bojaznъ* ‘Furcht’ : *bojati se*, *bolěznъ* ‘Krankheit’ : *bolěti*, *žiznъ* ‘Leben’ : *žiti*, besides *ukorizna* ‘Verunglimpfung’ : *ukoriti*. Maybe such Prussian verbal abstract nouns as *au-mūsna* ‘Abwaschung’, *biāsna* ‘Furcht’, *et-skīsna* ‘Auferstehung’, *maitāsna* ‘Nahrung’, *teikūsna* ‘Ordnung’ belong here too, but the German orthography does not allow one to recognize **s* from expected **z* < Baltic **ž* < IE **ġ^(h)*. The velar starting point is confirmed by the corresponding Latin suffix *-Vgo*, gen. *-Vginis*, e.g. *plantāgo* ‘Wegerich’, *mellīgo* ‘Bienenharz’, *asperūgo* ‘Klebekraut’. Interesting is the correspondence of the preceding vowel between Old Church Slavonic **-aznъ/*-iznъ/*-ěznъ* and Latin *-āgo / -īgo / -ūgo*.

Ad 162–169: *ǵ^héj-*om-*, *ǵ^h(i)j-*ém-*, *ǵ^hi-*m-* ‘Winter, Schnee’ – Add Old Low Franco-
nian *ingimus* ‘porcus anniculus’ (*Lex Salica* 23.3, 24.2; cf. 23.6: *ingimus suaini*) < *oǵno-
ǵ^himo- ‘one-winter-old’ (POKORNY 1959: 426).

Ad 174–175: *ǵ^ueH₂- ‘den Fuss aufsetzen, treten’ – Add Slavic *ǵatb / *ǵatb ‘dam’ <
*ǵ^uā-ti- / -tu- (ESSJ 6: 108–109).

Ad 175–177: *ǵ^uem- ‘(wohin) gehen, kommen’ – Add Avestan *aifigāma-* ‘winter’, also
‘year’, cf. with the prefix *ham- Old Persian *hangāma-, Middle Persian *hangām*, Persian
he/ingām ‘time’ (HORN 1893: 248, #1109; BENVENISTE 1956: 34), all from *ǵ^uomo- with the
lengthening in agreement with Brugmann’s law.

Ad 177–185: *ǵ^uen-, *ǵ^uon- ‘Frau’ – The inclusion of Tocharian *A k_uli*, *B kl(y)iye* ‘wom-
an’ is based on the *ad hoc* assumption of the dissimilation *n...n > l...n*. There is an easier
solution, deriving the Tocharian lexeme from < *ǵleH₂ui-H₁en- ‘daughter-in-law’ (BLAŽEK
2005: 92–100).

Ad 185–189: *ǵ^ujeH₃- ‘leben’ – Add Hittite *kuuitta-* ‘a kind of a bread’ (VAN WINDEKENS
1989: 334–335; PUHVEL IV: 315).

Ad 189–195: *ǵ^uóu- ‘Kuh, Rind’ – The regular Latin continuant may be identified in
vacca ‘cow’, as already STOKES (1894: 178) suggested, comparing it with Brittonic **boukkā*
‘cow’. The geminate *-kk- appears in other animal names as well: e.g. Welsh *hwch*, *moch*.
TESTEN (1999: 161–164) derives it from *ǵ^upk-, the zero-grade of *ǵ^upek(u)- ‘cattle’. The un-
trivial development in the Latin vocalism has probably an analogy in Latin *canis* ‘dog’ from
**kuan* < *ǵ^ukwǵnV. The loss of -u- is generally accepted in *cāseus* ‘cheese’ vs. Old Church
Slavonic *kvasъ* ‘leaven’. This solution eliminates the traditional comparison of *vacca* with
Sanskrit *vaśā-* ‘cow’.

Ad 208–220: *H₁ed- ‘essen’ – SMOCZYŃSKI (1992: 209–211) reconstructs Balto-Slavic
**au-ōd-os* ‘insect, mosquito’ as the ablaut variant formed from the complex **au-ēd-* with
the prefix **au-* ‘away, out’ and the root **ed-*, cf. Latin *uēscor*.

Ad 230–233: *H₁éǵuo- ‘Pferd’ – Add Albanian *sasë* ‘horsetail rush / Equisetum spp.’
< *ǵ^uǵ^uó-ǵ^hatǵ^uō or *-satǵ^uǵ^uō, where the second component is reconstructed after Greek *χαί-
τη* ‘hair, lock’ or Latin *saeta* ‘bristle’, in both cases with metathesis characteristic for
Albanian (HULD 2004: 193). With regard to this example and others of the type Lithua-
nian *ašvók(š)lė*, *-is*, *ašókliai*, *ešóklė* ‘Johannisbeere’: *ašvā*, also *ešvā* (Bretkun) ‘Stute’,
German *Rossbeere*, dial. also *perdsbier* (FRAENKEL 1962–1965: 19), Gothic *aiħva-tundi*
‘bramble, prickly bush’, lit. *‘horse-tooth’, i.e. ‘horse-thorn’ (LEHMANN 1986: 15), Latin
equi-saetum ‘Equisetum’ [PLINY XVIII: 259], lit. ‘mane of a horse’ (ANDRÉ 1985: 95), it
may also be promising to seek a Slavic equivalent among plant names. There are even two
hypothetical candidates:

(i) Slavic **sverěpъ* > Croatian *sverepek* ‘Festuca, Aegilops’, Czech *sveřep* ‘Bromus’,
Polish *świerzop* ‘Raphanus’, *świerzopa* ‘Sisymbrium’, *świerzepia róża* ‘dog-rose’, Russian
svirepa ‘Raphanus’, *svirėpka*, Ukrainian *svyripa* ‘Beta, Erysimum’; also in the function
of the adj. ‘wild growing’, hence ‘wild’: Old Church Slavonic *sverěpъ* ‘ἄγριος’ (Supr.),
Bulgarian *svirep*, Slovenian *sverěp*, Czech *sveřepý*, Old Russian *sverěpъ*, Russian *svirėpyj*.
MACHEK (1954: 286; 1968: 595) thought that Slavic **sverěpъ* consisted of the reflexive pos-

sessive **svo-* (with assimilation in *-e-* under influence of **-ě-*) and the root **rěp-*, which he also identifies in Bulgarian *repej*, Old Czech *řěpi* ‘burdock / Arctium’, Russian *repěj* ‘fruit of burdock, Agrimonia, Xanthium’, ukr. *repyk* ‘Agrimonia’ etc., all from Slavic **rěpěje* or its derivatives (MACHEK 1968: 530). The compound **svo-rěpъ* proposed by Machek can reflect original **(e)svo-rěpъ* ‘horse’s burdock’, which was after the replacement of the hypothetical Slavic **esvo-* reinterpreted according to a formally similar reflexive. The loss of the initial vowel has analogy e.g. in Prussian *sweikis* ‘Pflugpfer’ (EV 432), derivable from **asveikīs* (MAŽIULIS IV: 172). At the Salzburg idg. Tagung (September 2008) Michiel de Vaan elegantly explained Greek ἵππος / ἵκκος ‘horse’ as a continuant of the zero-grade **H₁kū-*, and the same formation is to be expected in compounds. A connection of the hypothetical component **(e)svo-* in the compound **sverěpъ* just with the meaning ‘horse’ can be documented, e.g. thanks to its Czech dial. equivalent *koňský řepiček* (South Bohemia) ‘horse’s Agrimonium’ = Russian *repij dikij*. Further it is necessary to mention Church Slavonic > Rumanian *sireáp*, arch. *svireáp* ‘rampant (on a horse)’ (BER 6: 554), Czech *sveřep(ec)* ‘breeding stallion’, Old Polish *świerzepic* ‘equus admissarius’, borrowed into Prussian *sweriapis* ‘Keynhēgeft’ (EV 431; SMO CZYŃSKI (2000: 104) deems that this meaning replaced the meaning of the entry EV 430 *sirgis* ‘Hengeft’), Old Polish *świerzopa* (1441), *świerzopa* (1494) ‘mare’, etc.

(ii) Czech *svízel* ‘Galium’ vs. *svinízel* ‘Hyoseris’ (MACHEK 1954: 219, 231 otherwise) allows one to separate the latter component forming both phytonyms: **zēlb* ‘grass, vegetation, plant’ (cf. Slovenian *zel*, Slovak *zel’*, Old Russian *zēlb* – see MACHEK 1968: 714). If *sviní* represents the possessive adj. from the word *svině* ‘sow’, it is attractive to think about an analogous motivation also in the case of the former component **sví-*. With regard to the preceding arguments it is legitimate to think about a hypothetical starting point **(e)svo-* ‘horse’.

Ad 245–246: **H₁leud^h-* ‘steigen, wachsen’ – Add Greek Ἐλευθία ‘goddess connected with a childbirth’ and further Gaulish *loudin* in the Calendar of Coligny, where it appears in the formulation *prinni lovdin* about the *matu*-months. The word *lovdin* has to correspond with Breton *luziañ* ‘emmêler’ (RIG III, 426; DELAMARRE 2001: 213–214), but if the determination of the function and etymology of *laget* in the parallel formulation *prinni laget* ‘diminishing tree’ is correct, for *lovdin* it is natural to expect the opposite meaning, i.e. ‘growing, rising’ (OLMSTED 2001: 37).

Ad 311–317: **H₂ep-* ‘Wasser, Fluss’ – Add Lusitanian **abnis*, attested as the theonym *Abne* in dat. sg. (PRÓSPER 1997: 274–277). The oronym *Abnoba / Abnova* can alternatively be interpreted as the case in **-b^h-* (cf. HAMP 1972: 35: **abn(o)b^{ho}*), probably the instr. pl., in the case of the Celtic origin perhaps **moni₂ios abnobi* ‘mountain [rich] by rivers’ (cf. Old Irish dat. pl. *aibnib* < **abenobi*, from *a(u)b* ‘river’), with regard to the fact that it is the area of the source of the Danube. In his writings *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* [VI, 662] Martianus Capella (5th cent. AD) informed us about 60 streams from the slopes of the Abnoba mountain whose confluence is called Danuvius: *Hister fluvius ortus in Germania de cacumine montis Abnobae sexaginta amnes absumens, etiam Danuvius vocitatur*.

Ad 317–322: **H₂erg-* ‘weiss, hellglänzend, (blitz-)schnell’ – Add Lithuanian *árškus*

‘clear, bright’, e.g. in *árškus rytas* ‘bright morning’ (LKŽ 1: 312) < **arž-k-* or **arž-s/šk-* (KARALIŪNAS 1994: 166–171; HAMP 1997: 24).

Ad 357–367: **H₂ues-* ‘(morgens) hell werden’ – Add the extension in *-l-* (see BLAŽEK 2006): Greek ἔωλος ‘of the morning, of the morrow’ < **H₂(e)uos-lo-*; Welsh *gwŷll* ‘twilight’ < **H₂uesl̥io-* (HAMP 1980: 213); ‘Sabine’ **ausel*, reconstructed by Kretschmer (*Glotta* 13, 1924, 111; *Glotta* 14, 1925, 310; see also BENVENISTE 1935: 43) on the basis of Hesychius’ gloss ἀνκίλωσ· ἕως ὑπὸ Τυρρηνηῶν, corrected in **αὐσηλο*^o, cf. Etruscan *usil(-s)* ‘sun’, *uslane* ‘at noon’, and the theonym *Usil(-s)*, *Usil(-s)* ‘God of Sun’ (BONFATE 1983: 146; D’AVERSA 1994: 57), probably of Osco-Umbrian origin, and the ethnonym *Auselii* = *Aurelii* by Paul. Fest. 23 (WALDE & HOFMANN 1938: 86) < **H₂eysel*^o. Further Albanian: North Geg (already Blanchus/Bardhi 1635) *hyll*, def. *-i*, pl. *hýje*, pl. of dim. *hulltj*, besides other early records as *uill* (Buzuku 1555) etc., further East Geg *uj*, *uvill*, *ydh*; South Geg *yll*, def. *-i*, pl. *yj* etc. ‘star’ (HAMP 1963: 62; HULD 1983: 132; DEMIRAJ 1997: 206).

Ad 436–440: **k̂(u)uón-*, **k̂un-*, **k̂uñ-* – According to Plato [Kratylos 410] Phrygians used almost the same word for τὰς κύνας, i.e. ‘dogs’ (cf. HAAS 1966: 166).

Ad 440–444: **kor-o-* ‘Krieg’, **kor-io-* ‘Männerbund’, **kor-io-H₃n-o-* ‘Herrscher’ – OREL (1997: 40, 191, 438) added Old Phrygian nom. sg. act. part. *kuryaneyon* (façade among rocks, West Phrygia; VII–VI cent. B.C.) and dat. pl. *χურიειοίς* (Gordion; V cent. B.C.)

Ad 450: **leg^h-* ‘leicht, gering, klein’ – Add Gaulish *laget* from the Calendar of Coligny, in the formulation *prinni laget* used about the *anmatu*-months, lit. perhaps ‘diminishing tree’ (RIG III: 426; DELAMARRE 2001: 213–214; OLMSTED 2001: 36).

Ad 482–485: **meld-* ‘weich werden’ – The bases of such personal names as Venetic *moldon*^o and Messapic *moldahia-/moldatbehia-* has been included here (LEJEUNE 1974: 163, §185).

Ad 496–497: **mois-* ‘Schaffell’ – WITCZAK (2003: 148) supplements Phrygian gloss μῶ· πρὸβατα· Φρύγιες (Hesych.), proposing as the starting point the nom. pl. ntr. **maisā*.

Ad 504–513: **neg^u-* ‘dunkel werden, dämmern’ – Latin *niger* ‘black’ (p. 506, fn. 1) has the closest counterpart in Tocharian B *ñakre* ‘darkness’ (ADAMS 1999: 264).

Ad 540–545: **péH₂uř-*, **p(e)H₂uer/n-* ‘Feuer’ – A continuant in Latin may be identified in Latin *sulphur* ‘sulphur’, if it is analyzed as a compound of the verbal root **suel-* ‘to burn, singe’ & **pūr* ‘fire’. The Germanic counterpart **swelblaz* (with two *l* after *schwelfel* attested in the modern High German dialect called Upper Palatinate) can reflect older **swel-f(V)l-*, dissimilated from **swel-fVr-*. The designation of ‘sulphur’ motivated by ‘fire’ occurs e.g. in Old English *cwic-fȳr* (cf. MANN 1984–1987: 1016, 1344). According to Plato [Kratylos 410] Phrygians used almost the same word for πῦρ, i.e. ‘fire’ (cf. HAAS 1966: 170, 229). WITCZAK (1991–1992: 157–162) thinks that it is possible to identify the real Phrygian designation of ‘fire’ (or ‘God of fire’) in the word *πουρ* in the New Phrygian inscription from Bağlıca in Western Phrygia, while e.g. HAAS (1966: 109) translated it as the preposition ‘for’.

Ad 586–590: **sal-* ‘Salz’ – WATKINS (1997: 34) identified the Anatolian cognate in the Hittite toponym *ḪURSAG Saliwana/i* ‘the mountain Salt rock’.

Ad 680–683: **sūesor-/sūesr-* ‘Schwester’ – Add Old Runic (Opedal stone, Hordaland, Norway; 350 A.D.) *swestar* ‘sister’ (ANTONSEN 1975: 40).

Ad 717–722: **ueid-* ‘erblicken’ or ad 707-15: **ued-* ‘Wasser’ – It is possible to add Latin *vitrum* ‘glass’ < **uidro-*, lit. ‘pellucid, translucent’, although SZEMERÉNYI (1989: 24f) offered an attractive alternative solution **uedro-* ‘water-like’, cf. Ossetic Iiron *avg*, Digor *avgæ* ‘glass’ < **āpaka-*, similarly Persian *ābgīna* ‘glass, crystal’ (also *āb-i xušk* ‘glass, crystal’, lit. ‘dry water’), Middle Persian *āpakēnak*, Sogdian **pkyn-*, **pkyn’k* ‘crystal’. This Iranian designation of ‘glass’ penetrated in non-Iranian languages: Armenian *ap’ak’i* ‘glass, crystal’, Kabardinian-Cherkessian *abg*, *yabg*, *apkə* ‘glass, cup’; Hungarian *üveg*, *éveg* ‘glass’ (ABAEV I: 84–85).

Ad 707–715: **ued-* ‘Wasser’ – According to Plato [Kratylos 410] Phrygians used almost the same word for ὕδωρ, i.e. ‘water’. The existence of the Phrygian word should be confirmed by the place-name Τὰ Ὑδρηλα on the Upper Maiandros (cf. HAAS 1966: 172, 229).

REFERENCES

- ABAEV Vasilij I. 1958–1989. *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar’ osetinskogo jazyka*, I–IV. Leningrad: Nauka.
- ADAMS Douglas Q. 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- ANDRÉ Jacques. 1985. *Les noms de plantes dans la Rome antique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- ANTONSEN Elmer H. 1975. *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- BENVENISTE Emile. 1935. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- BENVENISTE Émile. 1956. “‘Hiver’ et ‘neige’ en indo-européen.” In: *MNHMHΣ XAPIN: Gedankenschrift Paul Kretschmer*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz – Wien: Hollinek, 31–39.
- BER 6 = *Bälgarski etimologičen rečnik*, Tom VI. Sofija: Akademično izdatelstvo 2002.
- BLAŽEK Václav. 2005. “Tocharian A *k_ili*, B *klyiye* “woman” < **ǵ/gleH₂ui-H₁en-?*” *Historische Sprachforschung* 118, 92–100.
- BLAŽEK Václav. 2006. “Albanian (*h*)yll ‘star’”. *Linguistique Balkanique* 45(3), 347–352.
- BONFANTE Giuliano, BONFATE Larissa. 1983. *The Etruscan Language. An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- BRUGMANN Karl. 1906. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II.1. Strassburg: Trübner.
- D’AVERSA Arnaldo. 1994. *Dizionario della lingua etrusca*. Brescia: Paideia editrice.
- DELAMARRE Xavier. 2001. *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*. Paris: Errance.
- DEMIRAJ Bardhyl. 1997. *Albanische Etymologien (Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortschatz)*. Amsterdam–Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DISTERHEFT Dorothy et al. (eds.). 1997. *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel*, Part I. Washington D.C., 29–35.
- ESSJ = TRUBAČEV Oleg Nikolaevič et al. (eds.). 1974f. *Étimologičeskij slovar’ slavjanskix jazykov*, 1–33. Moskva: Nauka.
- FRAENKEL Ernst. 1962–1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I–II. Göttingen: Vandhoeck & Ruprecht – Heidelberg: Winter.
- GUSMANI Roberto. 1980–1984. *Lydisches Wörterbuch: Ergänzungsband* 1–3. Heidelberg: Winter.
- HAAS Otto. 1966. *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Sofia: Linguistique Balkanique X.
- HAMP Eric P. 1963. “An irregular-regularized Albanian noun.” *Annali dell’ Istituto Orientale di Napoli, Sezione Linguistica* 5, 61–62.
- HAMP Eric P. 1972. “Palaic *ḡa-a-ap-na-aš* ‘river’.” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 30, 35–37.
- HAMP Eric P. 1980. “Notulae Etymologicae Cymricae.” *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 28, 213–217.

- HAMP Eric P. 1997. "Lithuanian *árškus*." *Baltistica* 32(1), 24.
- HEG = TISCHLER Johann. 1983, 1990f. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* I, II. Innsbruck: IBS 20.
- HEIDERMANN Frank et al. (eds.). 1993. *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums. Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Innsbruck: IBS 78.
- HORN Paul. 1893. *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- HULD Martin E. 1983. *Basic Albanian Etymologies*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- HULD Martin. 2004. "An Albanian Reflex of Proto-Indo-European *E₁ékwo-s 'Horse'." In: JONES-BLEY et al. 2004: 186–195.
- HULD Martin et al. (eds.). 2001. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, May 2000*. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man (*Journal of Indo-European Monograph Series*, No. 40).
- IVANOV Vyacheslav V. 2001. "Indo-European *b^huH- in Luvian and the Prehistory of Past and Perfect." In: HULD et al. 2001: 80–106.
- JONES-BLEY Karlene et al. (eds.). 2004. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, Nov 2003*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man (*Journal of Indo-European Monograph Series*, No. 49).
- KARALIŪNAS Simas 1994. "Lie. *árškus* ir jo giminaičiai." *Baltistica* 29(2), 166–171.
- LAMBERT Pierre-Yves. 2001 [1998–2000]. "La tuile de Châteaubleau (Seine-et-Marne)." *Études celtiques* 34, 57–115.
- LAMBERT Pierre-Yves. 2003. *La langue gauloise. Description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*₂. Paris: Errance.
- LEHMANN Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- LEJEUNE Michel. 1974. *Manuel de la langue vénète*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, I (A–B). Vilnius: "Minties" Leidykla 1968.
- MACHEK Václav. 1954. *Česká a slovenská jména rostlin*. Praha: ČSAV.
- MACHEK Václav. 1968. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*₂. Praha: Academia.
- MANN Stuart E. 1984–1987. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg: Buske.
- MARKEY Tom. 2001. "A Tale of Two Helmets: The Negau A and B Inscriptions." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 29, 69–172.
- MAŽIULIS Vytautas. 1988–1997. *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* 1–4. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- MLH = WODTKO Dagmar S. 2000. *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*, Bd. V.1: *Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- NEDOMA Robert. 1995. *Die Inschrift auf dem Helm B von Negau*. Wien: Fassbaender.
- OLMSTED Garrett. 2001. *A Definitive Reconstructed Text of the Coligny Calendar*. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man (*Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Monograph 39).
- OREL Vladimir. 1997. *The Language of Phrygians. Description and Analysis*. Delmar: Caravan.
- POKORNY Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern–München: Francke.
- PRÓSPER Blanca. 1997. "Der althISPanische Göttername *abne* und idg. **ab-* 'Wasser'." *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* N.F. 32, 271–279.
- PUHVEL Jaan. 1984–1991–1997. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, 1–2 (A; E & I), 3 (H), 4 (K). Berlin–New York (–Amsterdam): Mouton (de Gruyter).
- RIG III = DUVAL Paul-Marie & PINAULT Georges. 1986. *Recueil des inscriptions Gauloises (R.I.G.)*, Vol. III: *Les Calendriers (Coligny, Villards d'Héria)*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- SMOCZYŃSKI Wojciech. 1992. "Slaw. *ovadъ* und lit. *uodas*." In: *Studia z dialektologii polskiej i słowiańskiej*. Warszawa (*Język na Pograniczach* 4, 209–212).
- SMOCZYŃSKI Wojciech. 2000. *Untersuchungen zum deutschen Lehngut im Altpreussischen*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- SZEMERÉNYI Oswald. 1989. *An den Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes*. Innsbruck: IBS.
- TESTEN David. 1999. "Stem-Final *-kk- in Celtic Terms for 'Pig'." *Ériu* 50, 161–164.
- VAN WINDEKENS Albert J. 1989. Études de phonétique et d'étymologie hittites. *Archiv orientální* 57, 333–342.
- VILLAR FRANCISCO. 1993. "Botorrita *soz auku arešta*[.][.] *tamai*." In: HEIDERMANN et al. 1993.
- WATKINS Calvert. 1997. "Luvo-Hittite :*lapan(a)-*." In: DISTERHEFT et al. 1997: 29–35.

- WITCZAK Krzysztof T. 1991–1992. “Some Remarks on the New Phrygian Inscription No. 88.” *Lingua Posnaniensis* 34, 157–162.
- WITCZAK Krzysztof T. 2003. “New Evidence for the Indo-European Terminology for ‘sheep’.” *Lingua Posnaniensis* 45, 143–150.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was prepared in cooperation with the Centre for the Interdisciplinary Research of Ancient Languages and Older Stages of Modern Languages (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University, Brno, and thanks to the grant No. IAA901640805. The reviewer would like to express his gratitude to John D. Bengtson for his revision of the text.

Allatum die 4 mensis Februarii anno 2009

*Václav Blažek
Masaryk University, Brno
Czech Republic
blazek@phil.muni.cz*