

UDC 811.1/.2: 81`44+37

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2026-42.1>

TYOLOGY IN LEXICAL SEMANTICS: SOURCES OF MEANING ‘IGNORANT’

Alexander I. Iliadi

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Full Professor at the Chair
of Translation, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics
State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky»,
Odessa, Ukraine
e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

SUMMARY

The paper aims to address the phenomenon of the typology of lexical meaning evolution in the Indo-European languages. Particularly, it is about a significant group of semantically monotypic lexemes (nouns and adjectives), which regularly develop the meaning ‘ignorant’, whereby demonstrating same semantic shift. The criterion of “sameness” implies that not only the secondary sememes ‘ignorant’, ‘uneducated person’ should be identical in the analyzed sum of synonyms, but also their original meanings ‘rude’, ‘rough’, ‘uncouth’, ‘unknown’, ‘unfamiliar’; and such correlation in the pair “original sememe” : “second sememe” must be traceable in all languages, used in the linguistic analysis. Thus, the results of this study testify about typicality of the above mentioned semantic shift, that can be modeled by determining (a) the initial and the final stages of the semantic change; (b) the same vector of the semantic evolution of the synonymous words; (c) diachronic reproducibility of the model of the semantic change in the different periods of the separate languages history.

Key words: semantics, model of the semantic development, caritive, privative, prefix.

I. Introductory remarks

1.1. Topicality. Characterization of human intellectual abilities often contains the emotional component. The emotional assessment is always exaggerated, which results in the emergence of the phrases with figurative semantics, cf.: Russ. adj. *дубоголовый*

‘stupid, mentally limited’ (i. e. дуб + голова = “woodenheaded”) along with Gr. μικρόμυαλος ‘narrow-minded, foolish’, literally – ‘small-headed’ or “small-minded”; Russ. ума палата ‘very smart’ and close to it in the inner form English equivalent to *have a fine store of wits*. Furthermore, the assessment can have a gradation, cf. on the one hand, Russ. светлая голова (literally – “bright head”), Gr. φωτεινό μυαλό = *clear head* (literally – *bright brain/mind, lucid brain/mind*), and on the other hand, Russ. ума палата, Eng. *to have a fine store of wits*, i. e. with the higher degree of assessment of the intellectual abilities (палата ‘chamber’ : *fine store*). However, the situation is somewhat different with the designations of not really foolish persons, but the ignorant. Their semantics certainly contains an implicit emotional-evaluative component, because they often have the privative or caritive prefix or else adverbial component with the meaning ‘little’ (for example, in Slavonic), that may give the names of persons a negative connotation, however, they also are often devoid of a figurativeness.

1.2. Let’s check this with the example of the Indo-European languages vocabulary. The cases of development of the semantics ‘ignorant’ in the lexemes denominating wild, rude, “uncouth” or just inexperienced person are attested here, cf. Lat. *rudis* ‘unprocessed’, ‘untilled’, ‘rough’ and secondary ‘**uneducated**’, ‘**ignorant**’ or *in-cultus* ‘untilled’, ‘unprocessed’, ‘wild’, ‘rough’ and ‘**uneducated**’, *im-perītus* ‘inexperienced, unversed’ and ‘**ignorant**’ < *perītus* ‘experienced’ and so on. That is, as one can see the presence of the morphologically expressed negation in these examples is not necessarily (cf. *rudis*), the very negation here relates not only to an intellectual feature, but also to any feature, that is not peculiar to human (*in-cultus*). This once again speaks about the *secondary* use of such forms with negation to characterize the intellectual properties of human.

So, similar cases of the changes in the lexical semantics of the different languages deserve a separate study. And it is this fact determines the **relevance** of the proposed investigation.

The **aim** of our research is to address all possible sources of the meaning ‘ignorant’ in the separate languages of Indo-European family in the typological terms. The aim involves

the solution of the following **tasks**:

a) The determination of the system of the primordial meanings of the words with semantics ‘ignorant’;

b) The description of the primary and secondary sememes correlation;

c) The description of the ways of the emergence of the meaning ‘ignorant’ in the lexemes which are under consideration (lexico-semantic, morphological derivation, word composition).

Such **methods** are used in the research: *typological* (for determination of typicality of the semantic changes in the different languages), *descriptive*, *comparative-historical*, and the method of *explanatory transformation of semantics*.

2. Sources of meaning ‘ignorant’

2.1. Semantic derivation. The semantics ‘ignorant’ arises in the words, denoting the result of the loss or weakening the intellectual qualities, as is the case with Classical Persian *farnās* ‘half sleep, drowsiness’, ‘insouciance’, ‘careless, carefree’, ‘inattentive’, ‘reckless’, ‘crazy pants’ and ‘unknowing’, ‘ignorance’; ‘ignorant’ (Edelman 2015: 496).

The above mentioned Lat. *rudis* ‘unprocessed’, ‘untilled’ → ‘uneducated’, ‘ignorant’, and also *in-cultus* ‘untilled’, ‘unprocessed’, ‘wild’, ‘rough’ → ‘uneducated’ also belong to the this class of examples. This is also Russ. colloquial *эх ты, темнота!* = *Oh, you, ignorant*, where the semantics ‘ignorant’ is a consequence of use of *темнота* in a figurative sense, cf. *тёмный* ‘dark’ and ‘unlearned’, ‘ignorant’.

2.2. Composita. There is one more type of nouns, where the semantics ‘ignorant’ also has figurative nature. However, here this meaning arose not as a result of the figurative use of the word, but as the primordial semantics for which the special word was formed. In particular, the semantics ‘ignorant’ evolves in the compounds with emotional-evaluative meaning ‘empty head’, cf. Dutch *leeghoofd* ‘ignorant’, literally – ‘emptyheaded’, because we have the compound of *leeg* ‘empty’ & *hoofd* ‘head’.

Another type of the composites is presented by the adjectives, where the first component is the reflex of PIE **dus-* ‘evil, bad’, ‘not’, ‘without’. Cf. Middle Pers. *duš-āgāh* [*dwš-’k’s*] ‘fool’,

‘witless’, ‘ignorant’ : *āgāh* [ʔkʰs | ʔgʰ(h)] ‘informed’, ‘knowledgeable’ (MacKenzie 1986: 6, 28). I. e. ‘ignorant’ = ‘ill-informed’ or ‘know-nothing’.

We shall point to two models with the pronominal component. It is about the negative pronoun, frequently used both before the verbal noun as well as after one.

2.2.1. Pron. negat. & adjectivum or nomen agentis deverbativum. The model “nothing knowing [person]” is represented in Ossetic and German, cf.:

Osset. *ницызонæг* ‘ignorant’, in fact – pron. negat. *ницы* ‘nothing’ & adj. *зонæг* ‘who knows’, i. e. ‘nothing knowing [person]’;

Germ. *Nichtswisser* ‘ignorant’, ‘unlearned’ = pron. negat. *nichts* ‘nothing’ & *wisser* < *wissen* ‘to know’, ‘be able to’ = ‘nothing knowing [person]’;

2.2.2. Nomen agentis deverbativum & pron. negat. Cf. Eng. *know-nothing* ‘ignorant’ = ‘knowing nothing’ with the reverse order of parts in relation to the components of German analogue (vide supra).

2.3. Morphological derivation (suffixation). Cf. Lith. *tamsuōlis* ‘ignorant’, ‘unlearned’, derived from *tamsūs* ‘dark’ (Smoczyński 2019: 1847).

2.4. Morphological derivation (prefixation). This type is presented with the combination of the variants of the one Indo-European “prefixed particle” **en-*, **n̥-*, **ne*, **nē* ‘not’, ‘without’ with the adjectives and substantives of different origin and semantics. The oldest stratum of these lexemes are formed from the derivatives of PIE **ǵneh₃-* ‘to know’, **ueid-/uoid-* ‘to see’, ‘to know’.

2.4.1. PIE **n̥-ǵn̥-né/n-h₃-* : **ne ǵnō-*

Middle Pers. *a-dān* ‘ignorant’ (*dān* – verb. base of praes. to *dānistan* ‘to know’ + caritive pref. *a-*; Rastorgueva 1966: 35). On the other hand, cf. Slavonic derivatives based on the construction with PIE **ne*, i. e. **ne znati* (inf.), *-jŕ* (praes.): Serb. *незнáша, незналица* ‘ignorant’ (Mičatek 1903: 325), *незналац* ‘ignorant’, *незналица* ‘the same’ (Tolstoj 1957: 473; PCJ 2007: 812), Sloven. *neználec* ‘ignorant’ (Kotnik 1967: 263).

2.4.2. PIE * η - $\acute{g}neh_3$ -to- : Lat. **en-gnō-tus*

TochA *āknats* (adj.) ‘ignorant’, ‘foolish’ (Carling 2008: 36), TochB *aknātsa* (adj.) ‘fool’, (n.) going back to PIE * η - $\acute{g}neh_3$ -to- ‘unknown’ and ‘unknowing’ from * $\acute{g}neh_3$ - ‘know’ (Adams 2013: 3: **ā*- is a reflex of the negative prefix *(*e*)*n*-; see here J. Hilmarsson’s version about an inner-Tocharian derivational innovation from the Proto-Toch. verbal root **knā*- ‘know’). Cf. TochA “*kus-ne nu ṣñi (krañcām wkām tiri mättak pä)knāmo kotnaṣ āknats*” – “*the one who on purpose himself breaks his own good habits, being ignorant ...*”; “(*ā*)[*k*](*na*)*ts kuro mok*” – «*You ignorant feeble old man!*” (Carling 2008: 36).

Lat. *ignōtus* ‘unknown’ and ‘ignorant, uninformed’ (< **en-gnōtus*) ~ *ignōro*, -*āre* ‘to have no knowledge, be ignorant’ (**en-gnō-sā*- ‘not to know’ < **gnō-sā*- ‘to know’ (A. Nussbaum’s solution); de Vaan 2008: 297).

2.4.3. The reflex of PIE **en*- ‘not’ & * $\acute{g}nh_3$ -ro- ‘who knows’

Lat. *ignārus* ‘having no knowledge’, ‘ignorant’ and ‘unknown’, ‘unfamiliar’, ‘alien’ : *gnārus* ‘knowing’, ‘experienced’ and ‘familiar’. This latter is from Proto-Lat. **gnāro*- ‘knowing’ (de Vaan 2008: 267).

2.4.4. The reflex of PIE * η - ‘not’ & particip. praes. act., med.

(PIE **ḡen*-)

Khotan Saka *avaysāña* ‘ignorant’ : *paysāña* ‘knowing’ & *a*- ‘not’; *avaysānda*- ‘ignorant’ : *paysānda*- ‘knowing’ & *a*- ‘not’ ~ *paysān*- (< **pati-zan*-) ‘know’, ‘recognize’ (Bailey 1979: 1, 9, 214).

2.4.5. The reflex of PIE * η - ‘not’ & particip. praes. act. (PIE **ueid*-)

Norw. (along with Latinism *ignorant*, as in the Danish language) *uvitende persón* ‘ignorant’ (literally – ‘uninformed, unknowing person’), where *uvitende* is the old participle in -*ende* (partic. I) from *u-vit*- (Norw. *u*- ~ Old Iceland. *ú*-, Old Engl., Engl., Germ. *un*-). Cf. without the privative prefix *vitende* ‘knowing’, ‘knowledgeable’, ‘competent’ < *vite* ‘to know’.

2.4.6. The reflex of PIE **h*- ‘not’ & particip. pass. ‘learned’, ‘educated’ (from different stems)

Old Engl. *un-gelāred* adj. ‘untaught’, ‘unlearned’, ‘ignorant’, ‘unshilled’, cf. “[...] ceahetunge swa swa *ungelæredes* folces biosmriendes gehæftum heora feondum” – “[...] loud cackling laughter, as if of a rude mob mocking their captive foes” (Beda 1890: 426–427; however, in our opinion, *ungelæred folc* in equal possible can be translated as *ignorant rabble*) : *gelāred* part. p. ‘learned’ < *gelāran* ‘to teach, educate, instruct, advise, persuade, induce’ (Bosworth 1921: 406, 1108).

2.4.7. The reflex of PIE **ne*, **h*- ‘not’ & nomen deverbativum (from different stems)

Old Engl. *nyten* adj. ‘ignorant’ (Bosworth 1921: 727), *nyten(de)* < *nytan* ‘not to know’ (< *ni witan*) (Holthausen 1963 239) VS Slav. **ne-vědja* (: OCSlav. *невѣжда*), which originally was a nomen actionis (cf. Pol. *niewiedza* ‘ignorance, non-acquaintance, unknown’), and then – nomen agentis (‘ignorance’, ‘unknowing’ → ‘uninformed person’, ‘ignorant person’) (ESSJ 1999: 65). Cf. also derivative Russ. *не-вѣжественный*. Germanic and Slavonic lexemes have a common etymon, namely – PIE **uoid-*, **ueid-*.

Old Engl. *un-lāred* ‘untaught, unlearned’, ‘ignorant’ ~ *lāran* ‘to teach, instruct, educate’, ‘to give religious teaching’, ‘to preach’, ‘to teach a particular tenet or dogma’, ‘to enjoin a rule’, ‘to exhort, admonish, advise, persuade, suggest’ (Bosworth 1921: 611, 1119).

Lat. *nescius* ‘unknown’, ‘not knowing’ : *ne-scīre* ‘not to know; some-’ (de Vaan 2008: 545).

Lat. *nesapius* ‘ignorant’, ‘ignoramus’ : *sapio*, *-ere* ‘to have a taste or relish’, ‘to savour or smell’ and ‘to know’, ‘to understand’, ‘to be wise’, ‘to be possessed of good sence’ (Forcellinus 1828: 478).

Latv. *nepraša* ‘ignorant’ as the compound of *ne-* with the privative semantics ‘not’ and the base of the verb *prašņāt* ‘to ask’, ‘catechize’.

2.4.8. The reflex of PIE **ne* ‘without’ & nomen substantivum ‘good’, ‘sense’

Latv. *nejēga* ‘ignorant’, ‘foolish’, ‘half-wit, pea brain’ as the compound of *ne-* in the caritive function ‘without’ with *jēga* ‘sense’, ‘benefit’, literally – ‘clueless’. The equivalent of Russ. *бѣс-толочь* (~ *толк* ‘sense’).

2.4.9. The reflex of PIE **h*₂- ‘without’ & nomen substantivum

Old Engl. *un-gerād* adj. ‘stupid’, ‘rude’, ‘unskilled’, ‘foolish’, ‘ignorant’ : *ge-rād* subst. ‘consideration’, ‘account’, ‘condition’, ‘reason’, ‘wisdom’, ‘prudence, manner’ (Bosworth 1921: 428, 1111). Literally – ‘who has no wisdom’, ‘reckless’.

Old Engl. *un-wita* subst. ‘a foolish, stupid, witless person’, ‘a fool’ : *wita* subst. ‘one who knows’, ‘a person of understanding or learning’, ‘a wise man’. Cf. Goth. *un-wita* ‘foolish’, ‘ignorant’, O.H.Germ. *un-wizzo* ‘inscius’, ‘ignavus’, Icel. *ū-víti* ‘an idiot’, ‘a witless person’, *ū-vita* ‘senseless’, ‘insane’ (Bosworth 1921: 1138, 1243).

2.4.10. The reflex of PIE **h*₂-, **nē* ‘not’ & nomen adjectivum

This model of nomination is widely represented in the vocabulary of the Old Germanic Languages (**h*₂-); the compounds with **nē* (> **nā*) are attested in Iranian vocabulary.

Old Engl. *un-cȳðig* adj. ‘ignorant’, ‘unacquainted’ : *-cȳðig* ‘-known?’ (According to J. Bosworth: “Only used in the compounds”; “In German, however, *kūndig* ‘known’, is used as a simple word, and as a compound”). Cf. Icel. *ū-kunnigr* ‘unacquainted’, Germ. *un-kundig* (Bosworth 1921: 191, 1095).

Old Engl. *un-frōd* adj. ‘not old’ and ‘not wise’, ‘ignorant’, ‘rude’ : *frōd* adj. ‘wise’, ‘prudent’, ‘sage’, ‘skilful’. Cf. Goth. *un-frōþs* ‘foolish’, Icel. *ū-frōðr* ‘ignorant’ (Bosworth 1921: 339, 1105).

Old Engl. *un-gewiss* adj. ‘of persons, not having knowledge’, ‘ignorant’ : *ge-wis*, *ge-wiss* adj. ‘certain, sure’, ‘knowing’, ‘foreknowing’. Cf. O.H.Germ. *un-giwiss* ‘incertus’, ‘inexpertus’, ‘fortuitus’ (Bosworth 1921: 468, 1116).

Old Engl. *un-gleáw* adj. (of persons) ‘without understanding’, ‘without skill’, ‘not sagacious’, ‘ignorant, blind’ : *gleáw* adj. ‘clear-sighted’, ‘wise’, ‘skilful’, ‘sagacious, prudent’, ‘good’. Cf. Icel. *ū-glöggr* ‘not clever’ (Bosworth 1921: 480, 1117).

Old Engl. *un-wīs* adj. ‘unwise, foolish, stupid’, ‘ignorant’ : *wis*, *wiss* adj. ‘certain’. Cf. Goth. *un-weis* ‘idiota’, *un-weis bi* ‘ignorant of’, O.H.Germ. *un-wīs* ‘insipiens, brutus’, ‘hebes’, ‘fatuus’, Icel. *ū-vīss* ‘foolish’ (Bosworth 1921: 1138, 1240, 1242).

Sogd. *L*’ *γρβγny* [nā-γapβēnē] ‘ignorant’ : *γρβ’yn’k* [γapβēnē] ‘wise’, ‘understandable’ (Gharib 1995: 168, 205).

In **conclusion**, we note one trait of the semantics of those lexemes, which contain the privative (negative) or caritive prefix. These words, besides the subject meaning ‘unlearned’, ‘ignorant’, ‘who knows nothing’, consistently realize the object meaning ‘unknown’, ‘unfamiliar’. Its development in some examples can be explained by negation of the semantics ‘famous’, ‘familiar’ in the base word, where these meanings coexist with ‘who knows’, ‘experienced’, ‘well-versed’ (cf. Old Engl. *un-cȳðig* ‘ignorant’, ‘unacquainted’ < *-cȳðig* ‘-known’ or Lat. *ignārus* ‘ignorant’ and ‘unknown’, ‘unfamiliar’ < *gnārus* ‘knowing’, ‘experienced’ and ‘familiar’ etc.). However, it is interesting not so much the expected fact of the development of negation as the very stable, tending towards the universality trend of the formation in the different languages of the complex of sememes ‘versed’, ‘familiar’, ‘famous’ VS ‘ignoramus’, ‘unknown’, ‘unfamiliar’.

REFERENCES

- Adams D. Q. (2013). A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged. Amsterdam ; New York, NY : Rodopi.
- Bailey H. W. (1979). Dictionary of Khotan Saka. Cambridge ; London etc. : Cambridge University Press.
- Beda (1890). The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People [Edited with a translation and introduction by Thomas Miller]. Part II. London : N. Trübner and Co.
- Bosworth J. D. D. (1921). An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (Based on the manuscript collections). Oxford : Clarendon press.
- Carling G. (2008). A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Vol. 1: Letters a-j (Manuscript). Wiesbaden : The authors and Otto Harrassowitz.
- de Vaan M. (2008). Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages. Leiden ; Boston : Brill.
- Edelman D. I. (2015). Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages. Volume 5.
- ESSJ (1999). Etymological Dictionary of the Slavonic Languages: Proto-Slavonic Lexical Fund / [edited by acad. O. N. Trubačev]. Nauka. Vol. 25 (**neroditi* – **novotъnъ(jь)*).
- Forcellinus Aegidius (1828). Totius Latinitatis lexicon. Volumen secundum, Londini: Baldwin et Cradock.
- Gharib Badr al-Zamān (1995). Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English, Tehran : Farhang Publications.
- Holthausen F. (1963). Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch [Zweite, bis auf das Literaturverzeichnis unveränderte Auflage]. Heidelberg : Carl Winter.
- Kotnik J. (1967). Slovensko-ruski slovar. Ljubljana : Državna založba Slovenije.
- MacKenzie David N. (1986). A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary. London ; New York ; Toronto : Oxford University Press.
- Mičatek L. A. (1903). Differential Serbian-Russian Dictionary and Brief Grammar of the Serbian Language (comp. P. A. Lavrov).

Rastorgueva V. S. (1966). Middle Persian Language. Science.

Smoczyński W. (2019). Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego / [Współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. Available at: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf).

Tolstoj I. I. (1957). Srpsko-hrvatsko-ruski rečnik. GIINS.

RSJ (2007). Rečnik srpskoga jezika / [redigovao i uredio Miroslav Nikolić]. Novi Sad : Matica srpska [in Serbian].

ТИПОЛОГІЯ У ЛЕКСИЧНІЙ СЕМАНТИЦІ: ДЖЕРЕЛА ЗНАЧЕННЯ ‘НЕВІГЛАС’

Олександр І. Іліаді

доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри перекладу
і теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики
Державний заклад «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний
університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»,
Одеса, Україна
e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Статтю присвячено розгляду феномена типології еволюції лексичного значення слова в індоєвропейських мовах. Зокрема, йдеться про значну групу семантично однотипних лексем (іменників і прикметників), які регулярно розвивають значення ‘невіглас’, таким чином демонструючи однаковий семантичний зсув. Критерій «однаковості» означає, що ідентичними в сумі лексем мають бути не лише вторинні семми ‘невіглас’, ‘неосвічена особа’, а й первинні значення ‘грубий’, ‘необроблений’, ‘незнайомий’, ‘невідомий’, і так у мовах різних груп. Отже, результати розвідки засвідчують типовість семантичного зсуву, який можна змодлювати, визначивши (а) початковий та кінцевий етапи семантичної зміни, (б) однаковий вектор еволюції семантики синонімічних лексем, (в) діахронічну відтворюваність моделі семантичної зміни у різні періоди історії окремих мов.

Ключові слова: семантика, модель розвитку значення, каритивний, привативний, префікс.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Adams D. Q. A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged. Amsterdam ; New York, NY : Rodopi, 2013. 964 p.

Bailey H. W. Dictionary of Khotan Saka. Cambridge ; London etc. : Cambridge University Press, 1979. 559 p.

Beda: The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People [Edited with a translation and introduction by Thomas Miller]. Part II. London : N. Trübner and Co, 1890. 488 p.

Bosworth J. D. D. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary (Based on the manuscript collections). Oxford : Clarendon press, 1921. 1302 p.

Carling G. A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Vol. 1: Letters a-j (Manuscript). Wiesbaden : The authors and Otto Harrassowitz, 2008. 256 p.

de Vaan M. Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2008. 825 p.

Edelman D. I. Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Languages. 2015. Volume 5. 566 p.

ESSJ: Etymological Dictionary of the Slavonic Languages: Proto-Slavonic Lexical Fund / [edited by acad. O. N. Trubačev]. Nauka, 1999. Vol. 25 (**neroditi* – **novotъnъ(jb)*). 238 p.

Forcellinus Aegidius. Totius Latinitatis lexicon. Volumen secundum, Londini: Baldwin et Cradock, 1828. 1164 p.

Gharib Badr al-Zamān. Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English. Tehran : Farhang Publications, 1995. 32; XLII; 517; 57 p.

Holthausen F. Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch [Zweite, bis auf das Literaturverzeichnis unveränderte Auflage]. Heidelberg : Carl Winter, 1963. XXXVI, 428 S.

Kotnik J. Slovensko-ruski slovar. Ljubljana : Državna založba Slovenije, 1967. 817 s.

MacKenzie David N. A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary. London ; New York ; Toronto : Oxford University Press, 1986. 236 p.

Mičatek L. A. Differential Serbian-Russian Dictionary and Brief Grammar of the Serbian Language (comp. P. A. Lavrov). 1903. 757 p.

Rastorgueva V. S. Middle Persian Language. Science, 1966. 164 p.

Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego / [Współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. 2019. Available at: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński_W._Słownik_etymologiczny_języka_litewskiego.pdf).

Tolstoj I. I. Srpsko-hrvatsko-ruski rečnik. GIINS, 1957. 1168 p.

PCJ: Речник српскога језика / [редиговао и уредио Мирослав Николић]. Нови Сад : Матица српска, 2007. 1561 с.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 11.03.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 02.04.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.05.2026



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0