

Beiträge zur Namenforschung

Band 40 · Heft 2 · 2005

Neue Folge

Begründet von
RUDOLF SCHÜTZEICHEL

Herausgegeben von
ROLF BERGMANN
DAMARIS NÜBLING
ULRICH OBST
HEINRICH TIEFENBACH
JÜRGEN UNTERMANN

Redaktion
ROLF BERGMANN



Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg
2005

Inhalt

BEITRÄGE

- 121 - 215 Hans-Werner Goetz - Wolfgang Haubrichs
(Hamburg/Saarbrücken)
Personennamen in Sprache und Gesellschaft. Zur sprach-
und geschichtswissenschaftlichen Auswertung frühmittel-
alterlicher Namenzeugnisse auf der Grundlage einer Daten-
bank (Teil 2)

BESPRECHUNGEN

- 217 - 218 Symposion-Ankündigung
219 - 230 Onomastik. Akten des 18. Internationalen Kongresses für Namenfor-
schung (Michael Prinz)
230 - 237 Handbuch des Friesischen (Steffen Krogh)
237 - 243 Jürgen Gerhards, Die Moderne und ihre Vornamen (Friedhelm Debus)
244 - 244 Kirstin Casemir - Uwe Ohainski - Jürgen Udolph, Die Ortsnamen des
Landkreises Göttingen (Friedhelm Debus)
246 - 251 Kirstin Casemir, Die Ortsnamen des Landkreises Wolfenbüttel und der
Stadt Salzgitter (Friedhelm Debus)
251 - 261 Grasilda Blažienė, Die baltischen Ortsnamen in Samland
(Mykolas Letas Palmaitis)
261 - 262 Duden. Der Kleine Duden. I. Deutsches Wörterbuch (Regine Froschauer)

SCHIERENSEE / KIEL

FRIEDHELM DEBUS

GRASILDA BLAŽIENĖ, Die baltischen Ortsnamen in Samland / *Hydronymia Europaea* herausgegeben von Wolfgang P. Schmid. Kommission für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Sonderband II, Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag 2000, 187 Seiten, 1 Karte

The publication of the second special volume of 'Hydronymia Europaea', devoted to the Baltic toponyms of Samland (a part of former northern East Prussia), is a great event for all researchers of the heritage of this tragic land. The event is more remarkable since the first special volume, Rozalia Przybytek (1993), was devoted to the Baltic toponyms of the southern (Polish) part of former East Prussia, and because the work of R. Przybytek was no doubt a success.

The advantage of G. Blažienė's book (abbreviated as B. in the rest of this review) is her contribution to the study of toponyms unknown to Georg Gerullis, the author of the so far unrivalled, classical study of Old Prussian place names (APON 1922). She has discovered this material in manuscript folios of the German Order and in other sources during her work in the so-called 'Secret State Archives of the „Prussian Cultural Property”' in Berlin. The book offers 215 such „new” names (marked with the sign „x”).

Such serious work demands adequate analysis. In the following, I will concentrate on a number of items that deserve a closer look at their etymology (§ 1) and on problems of data collection from a Soviet source of 1976 (§ 2).

§ 1. Let me begin with a remark on the grammatical prerequisites of reconstruction. In several instances G. Blažienė follows R. Przybytek in trying to reconstruct not only the stem of a toponym, but also its morphological inflection, including number and declensional class. Such an attempt is welcome, but it should be made clear that a reconstruction of this kind is based on conjecture. Since this reservation is not made explicit, the reader must believe that, for instance, the name

† *Ayszen* (a place that does no more exist) should be reconstructed as a masculine plural form **Aisai* (p. 9). It should be understood that the plausibility of a reconstructed feminine form **Aisēs* is at least as strong as that of a masculine form – cf. the Lithuanian hydronym *Aisė*, mentioned by G. Blažienė herself.

For the rest of this section I will simply follow the order of occurrence.

It is not clear why G. Blažienė does not point to V. Mažiulis when reconstructing the Prussian word for 'alder' as **aliksnaš* (p. 10). Maybe it was some misunderstanding of V. Mažiulis's reasoning that made her reconstruct *Alexwangen* as **Alks-vang-* instead of **Alikš-vang-* in spite of spellings like *Alexwange* 1514, *Alixwagin* 1589-1590.

For *Wirdigeyten* 1302, *Cupigeyten* 1310 the reconstruction of a suffix *-ait/-eit* after the *ja-*stem seems more credible than one with a sequence of suffixes *-ij-eit-* (G. Blažienė p. 14, 63; cf. *Kopieyten* 1624-25). The reconstruction of *Korieyten* 1396 as **Kār-eit-* (p. 67) is wrong already because of **ā* (not **ū*) after *K*.

Speaking about the meaning of the Prussian prefix *per-* (p. 18, *Berbadien*), G. Blažienė repeats the meanings as given by R. Trautmann in his 'Die altpreuussischen Sprachdenkmäler'. These are meanings that are attested only in the monuments. As for toponymy, many examples speak in favour of a meaning 'beyond', 'the other side of', cf. Pruss. *Perapien* and Lith. *Užupiai*; Pruss. *Percappen* and Lith. *Užkapiai*; Pruss. *Perlauken* and Lith. *Užlaukiai*; Pruss. *Perwais* and Lith. *Užlankis*; Pruss. *Perwangen* and Lith. *Užgiriai*. Therefore, a name like *Perteltnicken* should be compared with Lith. *Užtilčiai*, not only with *Tiltininkai* (p. 110).

It seems reasonable to distinguish between the suffix *-it* with short *i*, and the diminutive suffix *-īt* with long *ī*. The Baltic derivational suffix *-it* with a short *i* is attested in Lith. *Alvitas*. So there is no need to posit a suffix with either short or long *i*. An example like *Biegiedthen* (p. 19) should be reconstructed as **Bigitai* or **Bigitas* only because of the spelling *Bigitten* in the earliest source (1472) and later.

I doubt it that Old Prussians could have borrowed a loanword like Lith. *bliūdas* 'bowl', even if it had been borrowed before the 12th c. According to Kazimieras Būga (1909, *Rinktiniai Raštai* I 130, 351) this word was borrowed into Lithuanian from Russian between 9th-12th c. (the Slavs in their turn got it from Gothic *biuþs* as **bjeuðo* > **bljudo*, cf. M. Vasmer and similar studies). G. Blažienė discusses the name of the place recorded as *Blodeve* in the middle of the 13th c. Could the Prussians borrow this eastern slavism from the Lithuanians and derive geographical names (even hydronyms!) from it in the course of ca. 200 years? It seems more likely that Pruss. *Blodeve* 1258, *Bludaw* 1332, *Bludaw flumen* 1341 go back to the IE root **bhleu-d-* 'to flow (over)', cf. Gk *phludaō* in Pokorny II 213. Nothing prevents us from assuming the same for corresponding Lithuanian hydronyms of unknown chronology which are referred to by G. Blažienė with a reference to Aleksandras Vanagas (1981), although the Lithuanians had much more time for innovations than the Old Prussians, of course. Anyway, G. Blažienė should have been more cautious with a possible connection of Lith. *bliūdas* with Pruss. *Bludaw* (p. 21).

In the case of O.Pruss. *Bohnau* (p. 22), a stressed fem. ending **-ō* (i.e. Balt. *-ā*) could have been considered: **Bōnavō* or (traditionally) **Bōnavā*. Only in this case Samlandian *bō* > *bū*, being shortened as *bu* in unstressed position, could be rendered as *Bo-* (cf. *Bonnaw* 1620).

Discussing the etymology of O.Pruss. *Boliten*, G. Blažienė considers the possibility of a long *ō* in the root (p. 22). In this case the suffix must have been stressed (and *i* was in all probability short, cf. the spelling *Bolitten* 1338). Otherwise stressed [labial (*b*) +] *ō* > *ū* should have been rendered as *u*, not as *o*.

It is not easy to imagine any people, including Old Prussians, naming their children 'loathsome guilt', as G. Blažienė conjectures in the case of the toponym < anthroponym **Dargvain-* (p. 27). The basis of this proposal is an erroneous analysis *Darg-vain-* instead of *Darg-ev-ain-* and the subsequent interpretation of *darg-* as Lith. *dargus* 'evil, bad, loathsome'. Nevertheless, the Prussian meaning of the root *darg-* can be found in Mažiulis' PEŽ I 179–180.

There are other examples of a somewhat strange onomastics: „preuß. Name **Dravinē* zu preuß. *drawine* „Bütte, hölzernes Bienenfaß“ ('block hive'). Unfortunately, a reference is given to G. Gerullis APON 31 (p. 31), although Gerullis only mentions a possible etymological link with Pruss. *drawine*, but does not reconstruct any name of a village **Dravinē*. On the other hand, „Apiaries' (Block Hives') District” = O.Pruss. *Drowinenmoter* 1258 seems more credible, of course. Anyway, G. Blažienė does not give a convincing explanation that connects this name with the village name *Drabnaw* 1277.

Cut off from academic activities since 1998, I am possibly unaware of newer results of investigations into Prussian toponymy. G. Blažienė seems to attribute the reconstruction of some not-attested river (with the mark „?”) to Mažiulis, namely „**Skanevīs* (?)”, on the banks of which *Schonewik-Bischoveshusen-Fischh(a)usen* was situated (p. 36). This Prussian etymology of the name of this well-known town is entirely new to me. It faces a problem: what was the function of the final stem-element *-ik* of this name? There are many names with the suffix *-enik*, which are nominal derivations with the meaning “possessor of a feature”. There are also nomina agentis in *-ik* and diminutives in *-īk* / *-ik* in Prussian. Of all these categories only the latter may fit to the hypothetical name **Skan-ev-īk-* with the root **skan-* Pruss. 'to yelp, bark' < Balt. **sken-* 'to sound' (Mažiulis PEŽ IV 151). The suffix *-evl-av* indeed derives adjectives from verbs (cf. *mukin-ew-is* III 87 < adj. **mākin-ev-*, cf. Mažiulis PEŽ III 155). If the name of the river was Prussian (not Common Baltic), then it meant (approximately) 'yelping, barking river' (which is semantically strange). Since a diminutive of such a name would even be more surprising, I am not inclined to accept the hypothesis of a river **Skanevīs*. I can only repeat a known idea that the name *Schonewik* is of Norman origin¹.

¹ Cf. L. Palmaitis, Predloženie po nauchnoj russifikacii iskonnykh naimenovanij pereshedshej v sostav Rossii severnoj chasti byvshej Vostočnoj Prussii. / Institut Européen des Minorités Ethniques Dispersées, Vilnius 2003, p. 44.

The form *waygis* with the meaning 'thief' (p. 41), which is repeated from APON 40, is highly doubtful. It is not difficult to understand that this was simply a spelling error for **wagis* because a more correct version is attested: *Wagipelki* 'palus furum', cf. Gerullis APON 191. In this case the name *Gertwaygen* (if not misspelled itself) has nothing to do with the 'hens' thieves'.

The anthroponym **Gidaut-* (p. 42) seems to be **Gīdaut-*.

It is not clear what is meant by „Wechsel *oi* : *o* der Überlieferung” („Alternation in rendering”) (p. 43 on *Goithienen*). Here (as in the anthroponym *Goytit*) the usual lengthening of the first component of the circumflex diphthong with a facultative absorption of its second component seems more likely (cf. *Goteyn* 1398, *Gotin* 1493). The reconstruction may be **Gāiteinis*.

The toponym *Grauden* is derived from the anthroponym **Graud-* (p. 44). It is better to compare it, together with *Graude* (modern *Khusity Mate* near *Braniewol Braunsberg*), with the word *grauden* in Nesselmann's Thesaurus, p. 51/52. V. Mažiulis's etymology 'dense forest full of fallen trees' (PEŽ I 402) should not be ignored.

It is not easy to accept the reconstruction **Karsij-av-* of the name *Karschaw* (p. 56) because of the rule **sja* > **ša*, not **si(ja)* > **ša*.

Wolfgang P. Schmid's observation, that the name *Cranz* cannot be directly compared with Lith. *krantas*, Latv. *krants* because it cannot be a nominative singular form (p. 69), is questionable. The German fixation of Baltic toponyms in Prussia offers nominative forms up to the 16th c., cf. APON: *Auctacops* 1331, *Dewslauks* 1388, *Gildestabs* 1331, *Kirsnappe* 1339, *Lagegarbs* 1326, *Meruniska* 1326, *Ramgesalus* (i.e. **Ramjasalus*) 1314, *Schordey* 1419, *Skupaynns* 1424, *Stangusals* 1343, *Szeres* 1522, *Treonkaymynweysis* 1331, *Trops* 1447, *Waykaraykis* 1331, *Waysils* 1411, *Wangrappe* 1433, *Wosegowiskapynis* 1331 etc. On the other hand, as G. Blažienė notes, O. Schlicht mentions Curonian as spoken language for *Cranz* in 1732. All this makes the interpretation of *Cranz* as a nominative singular form quite credible. The German folk etymology Cur. **Krant-s* > Germ. **Kranz* then helped the nominative form to survive, although it apparently was not the original source of final *-z*.

It is methodologically unfortunate to mention the meaning 'Fenster, window' of Lith. *langas* when discussing the etymology of the name *Langehnen* (p. 76). This meaning is historically late and is unnecessary in the explanation of the origin of *Langehnen*.

Different explanations are given for names with a root spelled as *Layg-*, *Leyg-Leg-* (*Leghnen* 2x, *Legitten* 2x), cf. *Legitten* – *Mordovskoe* and *Legitten* – *Pobedino* (p. 81). Nevertheless the opinion of W. Mitzka, which G. Blažienė cites s.v. *Leghnen* – *Turgenevo*, may apply to all these instances.

The explanation of *Lethenen* as **Leit-en-* (p. 84) is based on a misreading of G. Gerullis's text (APON 86) who conjectures the suffix *-ēn* here, not *-en*! The spellings *Leythyn* 1258, *Latheyne*, *Lateinen* 1396 etc. against *Leythen* 1x 1258 provide no evidence for *-en*. The suffix seems to have been *-ein*. The idea that „Das Suff.

*-en- könnte die Besiedlung oder ihre Bewohner ausdrücken" is unfounded. The meaning given is rather that of the Prussian suffix *-in* (cf. *kaimīnan* III vs. *Caymis* E). It was the Lith. suffix *-ēn* with the said meaning (cf. *Kupiškėnas*) which probably led G. Gerulis to conjecture the same for *Lethenen*.

It is not clear why *Medenau* is reconstructed as **Meden-av-*, although the reference to the Lith. hydronym *Medinas* and the adj. *medinas* 'wild' is correct (p. 92). The reason might have been G. Gerullis's note (APON 96) „siehe *Meden-iken* + Suff. *-ōv-* oder *-av-*“. Gerullis refers to his reconstruction *median* + Suff. *-enik*. As for the ending *-an* in the word *median*, this is the nominative-accusative neuter inflection. There is no trace of a stem *meden*.

A correct reconstruction seems to be **Medin-av-ā*, derived from the hydronym **Medin-av-s*. The latter was a nominal form derived with the suffix *-av-* from adj. **med-in-s* (derived from the stem **medja-* by means of the suff. *-in* in its turn – cf. Lithuanian *Medinas*) – cf. „*terra Medenouwe*“, „*ad aquam, que Medenow dicitur*“ – which are documents cited by G. Blažienė.

Most researchers, including G. Blažienė and R. Przybytek, propose etymologies where the word is divided into its root and additional formal elements, and hypothesize corresponding roots and words from cognate languages. However V. Mažiulis in his recent study (PEŽ) shows what kind of etymological procedures are successful in Baltic studies. Etymology should be presented by determining the basis and the type of derivation, as well as the grammatical semantics of derivational elements, altogether resulting in meanings which develop separately in each of the discussed cognate languages. The remoter the language is from the language under study, the more it suits to back up the proposed etymology at the end of the etymological process, not to prove it at the beginning of this process. Other approaches are not convincing. For example: „**Wangen** (1240, 1291, 1350, 1785, 1802, 1844, [1893], 1906) Etym.: Auszugehen ist von **Vang-*, zu preuß. *wangus* /.../ vgl. lit. *vanga* 'Acker' /.../, lett. *vanga* 'feuchte Wiese' /.../. **Vang-* ist sehr verbreitet in der preuß. Toponymie,“ etc. (p. 168). What is the derivational relation of Lithuanian ('field') and Latvian ('water-meadow') *vanga* to each other and to Prussian **Vang-* ('forest area')? Given the specific Prussian system of derivation, what form shall we expect to express a meaning like 'eine mit jungen Eichen bestandene, halb ausgerodete Waldfläche'? The existence of similar words in cognate languages does not provide any valid etymology. For *Wangen* cf. PEŽ IV 219/220 s.v. **wangus**.

The note of G. Blažienė that the name *Oblitten* may be reconstructed as **Ābl-* (p. 105) contradicts the earliest attested spelling of this name with initial *u-*, i.e. *Ubolithen* 1312. The initial vowel of this name is alternatively spelt as *o-*, cf. *Obeliten* 1371. This alternative spelling of the initial vowel *u-/o-* points to a short *u*.

When discussing the name *Pobethen*, G. Blažienė states that the name „**Pa-bēt-ai* könnte auch eine Ableitung von *Bethen* sein“ (p. 113). If this is said about another toponym (*Bethen*) in the neighbourhood of *Pobethen*, the name of this village is derived from the same hydronym **Bētā* from which the name *Pobethen*

comes in its turn (PEŽ I 146). The derivational type of a toponym derived from another toponym by means of the prefix *pa-* should be corroborated with parallel examples.

The most recent etymology of *Pokarwen* belongs to V. Mažiulis (PEŽ III 309–310) who associates this name with hypothetical hydronym fem. **Karvė* or masc. **Karvīs* and derives the latter from a substantivized adjective > a mobile (of instabile gender) substantive (l. c.), not from an appellative **karvė* („Vgl. den FIN. preuß. **Karvė*“, balt. Appel. **karvė*, p. 116).

The earliest spellings *Rositten* 1387 / *Russiten* 1395 show the usual rendering of short *u* as *o*. The name is a diminutive corresponding to **Rusā* which occurs in 1) a corresponding hydronym near Braniewo/Braunsberg (*Russa* 1284), as well as in hydronyms 2) Lith. *Rusnė* (*Russe* 1576) and 3) *Rusa* near Wehlau–Tapiiau. In all probability the settlement *Rossitten* was transferred from some regions of one of these rivers. I see no reason except folk etymology to derive *Rossitten* from **Ras-* (late Lith. *Rasytė*) (cf. p. 135) – there is neither a river name with the root *ras-* (Lith. *rasenti* ‘to purl’), nor a special dew (Lith. *rasa*) in this place that would justify hypothetical **Rasitė*.

It was G. Gerullis who conjectured a common origin of the names *Salkow*, *Selkenicken–Saltnicken* and *Solkin* from a root attested in Latvian *šalkt* ‘to rustle’ (APON 149, 155, 168). At the same time, such toponyms as *Šalkava*, *Šalkynė*, *Šalkiškės* in Lithuania are usually mentioned as parallels (cf. p. 137). However a phonetic correspondence between Prussian initial *s-*, Latv. *š* (the latter may be onomatopoeic) and Lith. *š* is a problem in this case.

The name *Sasslauken* is compared with Prussian *sasins* ‘hare’ (p. 140), with a reference to V. Mažiulis. Unfortunately, the reference is not correct because he reconstructs **sasnis*, not *sasins* (PEŽ IV 67).

The name *Selnicken* is derived from **Sel-enīk-* (p. 147), suggesting a connection with the anthroponyms Pruss. *Selune*, Lith. *Selenis*, *Selenas*, *Sėlenis*. But the Pruss. suff. *-enīk* derives nouns with the meaning “possessor of a feature”. In order to justify such a derivation of the name *Selnicken*, it would be necessary to show what kind of root-meaning is appropriate with the suffix *-enīk*. Since no such meaning is presented, a reconstruction **Sil-enīk-* with the well-known nominal root *sil-* (Pruss. *Sylo* E 589 ‘heath’) seems to be more credible (cf. Lith. *šilininkas* ‘one who lives in a pine-forest’ and the corresponding toponym *Šilininkai*).

No reference is made to V. Mažiulis (PEŽ 139) in connection with the name *Soben* – cf. p. 152, where the name *Sowekaw* is discussed.

It is hardly correct to mention the Lithuanian anthroponym *Sudeikis* or the toponym *Sudeikiai* when discussing the name *Sudau* with a long *ū* (not spelt *o*, i.e. as a short *u*, in any of 14 instances; p. 156).

G. Blažienė omitted a Soviet name *Beregovoe* for *Tenkitten* near Fischhausen on p. 160. Today it belongs to „Primorsk” (see lists of the toponyms of the district of Kaliningrad (*Naseljonnye punkty Kaliningradskoj oblasti*. 1976, *Razdel II* = 2nd

part, p. 370–371, 1st part, p. 12). The corresponding reference „**Beregovoe** s. Tenkitten” must be on p. 19 after „**Beregovoe** s. Eisseln”.

§ 2. The greatest shortcoming of the book is its unsuitability for the identification of toponyms.

An insufficient approach towards one of the sources – Soviet lists of the toponyms of the district of Kaliningrad, *Razdel II*, – has a misleading presentation of the facts as a consequence. It gives the wrong impression that all names listed in this source correspond to really existing towns and villages. Even the note *Ne byl pereimenovan* („the name not changed”), which occurs in the lists, seems to have been understood as evidence for the existence of such villages with Old Baltic or German names up to now. As a matter of fact the note *Ne byl pereimenovan* means only one thing: there have been no inhabitants at this place since 1945, only several ruined houses (presumably with one or two accidental inhabitants) remained, i.e. such a village has not existed since 1945 any more.

Unfortunately, all these villages are not marked by G. Blažienė as not more existing, so that the reader must conclude that e.g. the village *Absintkeim*, mentioned on p. 152–153 of the lists, still exists! (cf. p. 9). It would have been sufficient to search for this „*Abzintkajm*” (this is the Russian spelling) in the 1st Russian part of the lists to understand that such villages are not mentioned at all and to come to the conclusion that there is nothing today. Cf. also „Russian” *Bigiten*, marked as “not changed” in the 2nd part (p. 173), but not mentioned in the 1st Russian part at all. This means that *Biegiethen* has not existed since 1945, although it does on p. 19 of the reviewed book. The same is true for (the 2nd spelling being Russian in the 2nd part): *Eisliethen* – *Ajsliten* on p. 34, *Fritschienen* – *Frichinen* on p. 36, *Garbseiden* – *Garbzajden* on p. 39, *Groß Mischen* – *Gross Mishen* on p. 95, *Kampken* on p. 53, *Kleinheide* on p. 61, *Koddien* – *Koddin* on p. 63, *Cojehnen* – *Kojenen* on p. 64, *Lauknicken* – *Laukniken* on p. 78/79, *Mandeln* – *Mandeljn* on p. 89, *Paggehnen* – *Paggenen* on p. 106, *Peldschen* (*Deimemünde*, renamed by the Nazis) – *Peldshen* (*Dajmemjunde*) on p. 108, *Rothenen* – *Rotenen* on p. 135, *Scharlack* – *Sharlak* on p. 143, *Schulkeim* – *Shuljkajm* on p. 145, *Syndau* – *Zindau* on p. 150, *Sorthenen* – *Zortenen* on p. 152, *Wischehnen* – *Vishenen* on p. 178, *Ziegelau* – *Cigeljau* on p. 182.

Moreover, the notes in the 2nd part are ignored. Many villages, renamed after 1945, either *disappeared* in later years or were *annexed* to other villages, and this is clearly pointed out in most instances in both parts: either *snjat s uchjota*, or *prisoedinjon k*.

Unfortunately these notes have not been taken into consideration. As a result the symbol „†” denoting non-existence has become pointless, because not only a few, but very many villages that do not exist any more are not marked with „†”. Cf. e.g. *Alkehnen*, which is not marked only because this name was found as *Morozovka* on p. 156–157 and 308–309 of the 2nd part. However there is a note on p. 157 that the village „*Morozovka*” is adjoined to the village „*Kuznetskoe*” (*Bakelfeld*), and the same is on p. 309. This means that the village „*Kuznetskoe*”

unites 3 former villages: *Bakelfeld*, *Ober Alkehnen* and *Unter Alkehnen*. Is it possible to say that each of them still exists?

In most instances however no village exists on the former place any more, where the reader will consider them to be still in existence:

- Cf. *Bakalino* (B.: *Kreislacken*, 70/71) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 271,
Bliznecovo (B.: *Powayen*, 122) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 325,
Bratskoe (B.: *Prilacken*, 125) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 325,
Bugrovo (B.: *Warglitten*, 171) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 381,
Volodino (B.: *Woytnicken*, 180) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 393,
Voronezhskoe (B.: *Ponaken*, 119) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 323,
Vjazovka (B.: *Trenk*, 163) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 375,
Glukhovo (B.: *Oblitten*, 104/105) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 309,
Golovenskoje (B.: *Willkühnen*, 176) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 389,
Gordovo (B.: *Bardau*, 15) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 167,
Grushino (B.: *Juoglauken*, 50) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 239,
Gusevo (B.: *Dorben*, 30) – *prisoedinjon k Karjernoe*, 2nd part, p. 189,
Daljneje (B.: *Bendiesen*, 18) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 171,
Dobroljubovo (B.: *Lieblacken*, 84) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 281,
Drozdovo (B.: *Klein Droosden*, *Drosden Klein*, 32, 61, 31) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 257,
Dubosekovo (B.: *Samitten*, 138) – *prisoedinjon k Sviridovo*, 2nd part, p. 339,
Dubrava (B.: *Correynen*, 67) – *prisoedinjon k Khrabrovo*, 2nd part, p. 269,
Eniseevo (B.: *Willkau–Jenisejevo*, 176) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 389,
Ermolovo (B.: *Klein Scharlack–Jermolovo*, 143) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 263,
Zakharovo (B.: *Rachsittenthal*, 127) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 329,
Zemljanichnoje (B.: *Bohnau*, 22) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 177 (erroneously 174 by B.),
Zverevo (B.: *Christoplacken*, 25, *Zanderlacken*, 181) – *prisoedinjon k Brigadnoe*, 2nd part, p. 183, 393,
Izobiljnoje (B.: *Klein Powayen*, 122) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 261,
Kamyshinka (B.: *Dallwehnen*, 26, *Nastrehnen*, 99) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 185, 299,
Karasino (B.: *Wittehnen*, 179) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 391,
Kolodcy (B.: *Pojerstieten*, 115/116) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 321,
Lipovka (B.: *Tarpienen*, 159) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 369,
Lomonosovo (B.: *Prawten*, 124) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 325,
Majkovo (B.: *Sudau*, 156, *Schakaulack*, 142) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 367, 341,
Malaja Lipovka (B.: *Needau*, 100) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 299,
Malinovka (B.: *Polepen*, 117, *Schorschehnen*, 144/145) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 321, 351,
Markovo (B.: *Thulpörschken*, 161) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 371,
Marjino (B.: *Arnau*, 13) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 77,

- Minskoe (B.: Posselau, 121) – *prisoedinjon k Araljskoe*, 2nd part, p. 323,
 Novoseljskoe (B.: Reiken, 131) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 331,
 Olegovo (B.: Senseln, 148) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 357,
 Olenino (B.: Gubehnen, 46) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 227,
 Orekhovo (B.: Schuditten, 145) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 351,
 Ostrikovoe (B.: Groß Fritschienen, 36) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 217,
 Parashjutnoe (B.: Saltnicken, 137/138) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 339,
 Pavlovo (B.: Ginthieden, 42) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 209,
 Podoljskoe (B.: Prassnicken, p. 123) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 325,
 Prostornoe (B.: Seefeld, 146/147) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 355,
 Rakushino (B.: Lesnicken, 82/83) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 281,
 Ramenskoe (B.: Klein Norgau, 103) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 261,
 Rovnoe (B.: Pollwitten, 118) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 323,
 Sinjavino (B.: Quanditten, 126) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 327,
 Sokolovka (B.: Stiegehnen, 155) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 365,
 Slavjanskoe (B.: Condehnen, 65) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 267,
 Talalikhino (B.: Klein Uderballen, 166) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 263,
 Ternovka (B.: Suppliethen, 157) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 369,
 Tolbukhino (B.: Alt Katzkeim, 57) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 159,
 Tuljskoe (B.: Kapstücken, 55) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 247,
 Turgenevo (B.: Legehnen, 81) – *prisoedinjon k Barsukovka*, 2nd part, p. 279,
 Tumanovka (B.: Kotzlaucken, 68/69) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 269,
 Uspeshnoe (B.: Kalkstein, 53) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 245,
 Shipovka (B.: Powayen, 122) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 325,
 Charjkovskoe (B.: Nепlecken, 101) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 299,
 Chmeljovka (B.: Sanglienen, 139) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 339,
 Chrystaljnoe (B.: Wiekau, 174) – *prisoedinjon k Kolosovka*, 2nd part, p. 387,
 Chekhovo (B.: Godnicken, 43) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 211,
 Jarovoe (B.: Wange, 168) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 381,
 Jasnovka (B.: Gross – inconsequently not Groß as in other instances – Ladikeim,
 76) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 219,
 Jastrebki (B.: Lischkau, 85, Mantau, 90) – *snjat s uchjota*, 2nd part, p. 285, 289

Since it was necessary to make reference to Soviet names, a more consistent transliteration system of Russian names was to be expected. The Russian *z* is transliterated sometimes as *z* (*Prizorovo* on p. 125, *Zaozerje* on p. 169), but sometimes it is transcribed as *s* before vowels in accordance with the German pronunciation (*Sabarje* on p. 136). The spelling „Ajstovo s. Kondehnen” is erroneous, because this Russian name is not 3-syllable *Ays-to-vo*, but 4-syllable *A-is-to-vo* (the word Russian *aist* meaning „a stork”), i.e. *Aistovo*, not *Ajstovo*.

As I said above, many Soviet names are distorted. Sometimes this is due to an inconsistent transliteration (often resembling Lithuanian transcription) and inattentiveness – cf. *Chorsovo*, p. 25, instead of *Shchorsovo*, *Rochino*, p. 121, instead of

*Roshchino*². Added to many not existing names, this makes the work unreliable as far as possible identification is concerned.

Other kind of misspellings are: *Dvorniki*, p. 28, 33, instead of *Dvoriki*; *Gvardijsk*, p. 46, 159, instead of *Gvardejsk*; *Jegorskoe*, p. 50, instead of *Jegorjevskoe*; *Prizorovo*, p. 40, 125 instead of *Prozorovo*; *Ravenskoe*, p. 103, 130, instead of *Ramenskoe*; *Sinjavkino*, p. 47, 150, instead of *Sinjavino*. Misspellings such as *Otsadnoe* 1x instead of *Otradnoe* on p. 105, or *Zarechjy* instead of *Zarechnyj* on p. 182, do not belong to this category and are accidental because *Otradnoe* and *Zarechnyj* are not misspelled on p. 55, 140, respectively.

Erroneous and inconsistent references are: „*Kalinino* s. *Labagienen*” on p. 52 with subsequent *Zalivino* instead of *Kalinino* at *Labagienen* on p. 74, and „*Zalivino* s. *Labogienen*” (with *o*) on p. 181; „*Karosino* s. *Wittehnen*” (with *o* in *Karosino*) on p. 56 and *Karasino* under *Wittehnen* on p. 179; „*Krylovka* s. *Wisritten*” on p. 71 = „*Kustovka* s. *Wisritten*” on p. 74, only the latter reference being correct; „*Tarpienen* /.../ 1976 *Lipovka* 398–399” on p. 159 when there are only 395 pages in 1976! „*Prawten* /.../ 1976 *Lomonosovo* 234–235” instead of 324–325 on p. 124;

Unfortunately I failed to find *Groß Kuhren* (and the reconstruction of *Kuhren* at all) following the reference „*S. Groß Kuhren*” under *Neukuhren* on p. 102.

There is a wrong reference „*Slavjanskoe* s. *Alt Katzkeim*” on p. 151, but no *Slavjanskoe* under *Alt Katzkeim* on p. 57.

No *Kalkstein* may be found under *Urozhajnoe*, and no *Lethenen* may be found under *Uspeshnoe* in spite of the references „*Urozhajnoe* s. *Kalkstein*”, *Uspeshnoe* s. *Lethenen*”. The reason is that corresponding references change places crosswise on p. 167: *Lethenen* should be referred to at *Urozhajnoe* but *Kalkstein* should be referred to at *Uspeshnoe*, not vice versa.

Volochaevskoe is referred to *Markehnen* instead of *Marschehnen* on p. 167.

A reference loses its sense when the initial vowel is not consistently transliterated. Cf. „*Sabarje* s. *Moterau*” on p. 136 and „*Zacharovo* s. *Racksittenthal*” on p. 181 with the same Russian initial *z*-!

As a result, very many places occur in the wrong position of the alphabetic order.

² Such mistakes, as *Redniki* instead of *Rodniki*, p. 13, or *Grushenka* instead of *Grushevka*, p. 17, seem to indicate that G. Blažiene used a hand-copy of a very bad xero of these miserable lists which are full of mistakes in their turn. These are namely the Russian letters *e* and *o*, *n* and *v*, which may be indistinguishable from each other in case of bad reproduction. This xero was later copied once again rewriting it with the hand. This would explain a nonsense form like *Pernovka* (p. 110) instead of *Ternovka* (no more existing *Pertelmücken*, *snjat s uchjota*, consistently represented as existing), or *Doposhnyj* (p. 138) instead of *Dorozhnyj*. The Russian capital letter *T* differs from the capital letter *P* by the third additional vertical stroke, but the Russian letter *r* is written similarly to Latin *p*. As for the small Russian letters *zh* and *sh*, the both are written with three vertical strokes so that their differentiation depends on the handwriting only.

Cf. e.g. „**Pernovka** s. Pertelnicken” on p. 110 instead of *Ternovka* which had to be on p. 160 beside „**Ternovka** s. Suppliethen”, or „**Redniki** s. Pr. Arnau” on p. 130 instead of Rodniki on p. 133 etc.

There are also many misspellings in references to Lithuanian works throughout the entire book, as e.g. LHEV instead of LUEV, or the mysterious italic circumflexed *i* instead of *i* + nasal Lithuanian *u* etc.

To sum up, the book has its undisputable merits, as far as the uncovering of valuable Old Prussian onomastic material is concerned (cf. *Abken*, *Ackell*, *Aswaylen*, *Kalk*, *Surkayme*, *Valken* etc.). However, there are some shortcomings, and it is to be hoped that the misleading mistakes will be corrected in a second edition as soon as possible.

KAUNAS

MYKOLAS LETAS PALMAITIS