

P. 8 – žemėlapiu legendoje pravartu būtų nurodyti, ką reiškia smėlio spalvos plotai.

P. 23 – netikslus teiginys, kad baltų kalbos anksčiau buvo paplitusios teritorijose į rytus nuo Maskvos (ne tik ten).

P. 24 – tarminė forma *zqsis* ‘žąsis’ vartojama ne vakarų, bet pietryčių Lietuvoje.

Lietuviškame tekste reikėtų rašyti ne Marija Gimbutas, bet Marija Gimbutienė (pora atvejų).

P. 45 – žodis *ašvā* ‘kumelė’ yra ne tarminis, bet tai senųjų raštų forma.

P. 75 – rašymas B. de Kurtenė yra netikslus, nes B. – ne vardo (šio kalbininko vardas buvo Janas), bet sutrum-pinta pavardės dalis.

P. 88 – netikslus teiginys, kad lietuvių kalbos viensiemeniai žodžiai neturi tvirtapradės priegaidės; iš tikrųjų jie neturi paveldėtos tvirtapradės priegaidės, naujai atsiradusi pasitaiko, pvz., dat. sg. f. *tái, jái* ir kt.

P. 169 – neaiškiai, dviprasmiškai nurodoma pavadinimo Italija kilmė: tvirtinama, kad taip pavadino romėnai, bet čia pat teigiama, kad tai padarė graikai.

P. 196–197 – reikėtų nurodyti, kad

Sergio Neri, *cadere e abbattere in indoeuropeo. Sull' etimologia di tedesco fallen, latino aboleo e greco ἀπόλλυμι*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck (*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 124), 2007, 134.

It has always been clear that the verbs “to fall” in Germanic, Baltic

and hunai buvo ne germanai (greičiausiai tiurkai), nes juos buvus germanais gali iš konteksto suprasti skaitytojas; be to, kodėl jie vadinami ir gunais?

Vietomis painiojami terminai Rusia ir Rusija (pvz., p. 227).

Knygoje yra vienas kitas korektūrinio pobūdžio netikslumas, iš kurių ypač nurodytini esantys p. 97 (kalbama apie 10 000 tūkstančių molio plytelių) ir p. 302 (Žalgirio mūšio pergalę nulėmė Lietuvos ir LDK sąjunga) puslapiuose.

Skaitytojas gali pasigesti asmenvardžių ir vietovardžių rodyklių.

Bet visa tai – neesminiai trūkumėliai. Svarbiausia, Olegas Poliakovas padovanojo baltistams ir lietuviškai skaitančiai visuomenei puikų enciklopedinio pobūdžio veikalą apie lietuvių kalbą, kurio ji nusipelno.

Zigmas ZINKEVIČIUS

Baltistikos katedra

Vilniaus universitetas

Universiteto g. 5

LT-01513 Vilnius, Lietuva

and Armenian (Gmc. **fallan*, Lith. *pùlti*, Arm. *p'lanim*) are related to each other, but even the reconstruction of the Indo-European root has proved an almost desperate problem. Pokorny's **phōl-* (IEW, 851) does not meet current standards, whereas LIV's **peh₃lH-* (LIV², 463f., following Lühr and Klingenschmitt) implies an aberrant root structure and is thus unsatisfactory.

In this little book Neri (N.) proposes a radically new approach: Gmc. **fallan*, Lith. *pùlti*, Arm. *p'lanim* continue a fossilized compound **po-h₃elh₁-* to a root **h₃elh₁-* found in Gk. ὄλλῦμι “destroy” and some other cognates.

In pp. 13–29 the evidence from Germanic, East Baltic and Armenian is presented. OPr. *aupallai* “finds” is dismissed as problematic on both semantic and formal grounds (*pāl-*). Baltic and Armenian unambiguously point to a root **pōl-*. Germanic **fallan* can be explained through Osthoff’s law (**pōl-nV^o* > **fōlnV^o* > **falnV^o* > **fallV^o*) and does not require a very dubious syllabification **pə₃l-n(é)-H-* > **paln-*. As N. correctly points out, a reconstruction like **peh₃lH-* would not only imply an entirely isolated root structure, but also runs into serious difficulties in order to account for some of the data. In pp. 29–41 the evidence for a verbal root **h₃elh₁-* is discussed: Gk. ὄλλῦμι “destroy”: ὄλλυμαι “perish”, aor. ὄλεσ(σ)α : ὄλετο, perf. ὄλωλα “be dead, undone”, Latin *ab-oleō*, *-ēre* “destroy”, Hitt. *ḫallanni^{hi}e-* “devastate, destroy” (*anni^{ie}e-*-derivative to an earlier **ḫalla-*). With good criteria, Hitt. *ḫalluyāi-* “brawl, quarrel”, *ḫali^{ie}e-* “kneel down”, and TB */ala-* “be sick” are excluded from the set. Hitt. *ḫalluyā-* “deep” (< **h₃olh₁-u-*io*-?*) is viewed more favorably, but in the end is considered insecure on semantic grounds. N. suggests that the rare Hitt. *pallanti(ia)-* “Notlage (?)” may continue **po-h₃elh₁-*, but admits that this is very uncertain. In pp. 41–58 N. discusses the verbal formations of **(po-)h₃elh₁-*. N. posits a

meaning act. “make fall”, mid. “fall”, preserved only in the continuants of **po-h₃elh₁-*. The meaning act. “destroy”, mid. “perish” of the simplex **h₃elh₁-* would rest on a secondary semantic development within the parent language. N. reconstructs a root aorist (Gk. ὄλεσ(σ)ε, remade from **olet*, ὄλετο, Arm. *p'law*), a “fientiv” *eh₁-*aorist (Lith. *púolé*, dial. *púolo*), a nasal present **(po) *h₃l-n(é)-h₁-* (?Hitt. **ḫalla-*, ?Hitt. **palla-*, Gk. ὄλλῦμι, Arm. *p'lanim*, ?Gmc. **fallan*, Lith. *Žem. pulniù*), a causative (Lat. *ab-oleō*, ?Gmc. **falliji/a-*), and a perfect (Gk. ὄλωλα). The possibility of a thematic present (Lith. *púola*, ?Gmc. **fallan*, ?Hitt. **ḫalla-*, ?**palla-*) is considered very uncertain. In pp. 61–80 the evidence for the preverb **po/*pe* is studied. With various degrees of productivity it is found in most Indo-European languages (Hitt. *pē-*, Ved. *pa-*, Sl. *po*, *pa-*, *po-*, Lith. *pō*, *pó-*, *pa-* etc.). N. argues that Indo-European possessed two types of verbal compounds, one “free” (well-known in the oldest Indo-European languages), the other “bound” (univerbated). Univerbated prefixes presented a reduced form of the local adverbs that served as free preverbs and prepositions (e.g. **ni-sed-* “sit down” in Ved. *ní-ṣad-*, Arm. *nstim*, **ni-zd-ó-* “nest” : **(h₁)én-i* “in(to)”). **po/*pe* would be a reduced form of **(h₂)áp-o* “away, far”. As parallels for **po-h₃elh₁-* N. provides examples like Hitt. *pē ḫark-* “hold” ~ Lat. *porcēō* “prevent, restrain” (**pe/o* + **h₂erk-*), or Hitt. *peššije-* “throw” ~ Lat. *pōnō* “place, put” < **po-sinō* (**pe/o* + **sh₂eⁱ-*). The book is completed with a

very rich bibliography (pp. 81–111), and a list of words (113–134).

N.'s etymology of Gmc. **fallan*, Lith. *pùlti*, Arm. *p'anim* is evidently superior to all other attempts to cope with this word-family and will probably meet with general acceptance. Besides solving a recalcitrant problem of Indo-European etymology (and enlarging the list of derivatives of **h₃elh₁-*), N. has also made an important contribution to the study of Indo-European preverbs. The numerous footnotes, in addition, include interesting discussions on a large number of formations and problems in most Indo-European languages. While fully accepting N.'s proposal, in the remainder of this review I will challenge some particular aspects of his reconstruction.

As Kloekhorst points out,¹ the usual gloss “destroy” for Hitt. *ḫallanniē-* has been conditioned by the desire to establish an etymological connection with Gk. ὄλλωμι. After studying the occurrences of *ḫallanniē-* (attested only three times) Kloekhorst posits a meaning “trample down, flatten (fields and plants)”, not easy to derive from “destroy” or “(make) fall”. Since Hitt. *ḫalluua-* “deep” and *pallanti(ia)-* “Notlage” are also very dubious, I believe all Hittite evidence studied by N. is best excluded from the list of derivatives of *(*po-*)*h₃elh₁-*.

My second objection concerns the averbo of *(*po-*)*h₃elh₁-* and the way N. handles part of the data (his discussion of Baltic is particularly uneven).

¹ Alwin Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008, 271f.

N.'s reconstruction of a root aorist (Gk. ὄλετο, Arm. *p'law*), a perfect (Gk. ὄλωλα), and, probably, a causative (Lat. *ab-oleō*) is almost certainly correct.

The reconstruction of a “fientiv” aorist *(*po-*)*(*e-*)*h₃h₁-eh₁-t* depends exclusively on Baltic. Surprisingly, N. assumes that pre-Baltic **pōlē(t)* was replaced by the *ā*-preterit (dial. Lith. *púolo*, Latv. *pulu*), which was then again replaced by *púolė* in some Lithuanian dialects (44ff.). An *ē*-preterit to an (originally) intransitive verb, however, is *lectio difficilior*, whereas its replacement by the expected *ā*-preterit is an easily understood innovation. Lith. *púolė* must then be regarded as ancient. The idea that some irregular intransitive Lithuanian *ē*-preterits continue Indo-European “*eh₁-aorists*” is not new, but it would certainly be preferable to have a common source for both the productive, typically transitive *ē*-preterit of *beṛti*, *bēria*, *bēre* “strew, scatter”, *sakýti*, *sāko*, *sākė* “say”, or *vēsti*, *vēda*, *vėdė* “lead” and for rare intransitive *ē*-preterits like *miṛti*, *mūršta*, *mūrė* “die”, *gimti*, *gimsta/gēma*, *gimė* “be born”, or *gulti*, *gūla*, *gūlė* “lie down”. Within the theory that the *ē*-preterit goes back to **-ijā* Lith. *mūrė*, *gimė*, *gūlė* or *púolė* are best taken as dependent on an earlier *ie/o*-present (assured on comparative grounds for **mer-* and **g^wem-*). This would imply a Baltic present **pōliā*. Its replacement by **pōla* would simply be expected, as *ia*-presents were characteristically transitive in Baltic.²

² See Miguel Villanueva Svensson, *The Baltic ē-preterit revisited*, *Baltistica* 6 priedas, 2005, 239–252, for a fuller discussion of the views adopted here.

Impressive as it may seem at first sight, the evidence for an Indo-European nasal present is equally weak. Dial. Lith. *pu̯na*, found in the same southern Žemaitian dialects that have metathesized *kī̯na*, *bi̯rna* for standard *kỹla*, *bỹra* (< **kinla-*, **binra-*, northern Žem. *kī̯sta*, *bi̯sta*, Latv. *cī̯st*, *bi̯st*), is evidently a fairly recent innovation (*pace* N., p. 46, Žemaitian is not, in general terms, an archaic dialect). When dealing with nasal presents in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic one should not forget that this was a highly productive formation for anticausative and inchoative verbs. As Gorbachov has recently shown, all three branches presuppose a common “northern Indo-European” prototype **li-n-k^w-é-ti*, **li-m-p-é-ti*. In Germanic there are clear traces of original strong inflection, with nasal infix restricted to the present stem, a pattern later replaced by the familiar paradigms Go. inf. *waknan*, pres. *wakniþ*, pret. *waknoda*, ON inf. *vakna*, pres. *vaknar*, pret. *vaknaði*.³ Accordingly, just like OCS *sěsti*, *sędq* “sit down” or *lešti*, *leggq* “lie down” represent an archaism from the Slavic viewpoint, but certainly not reaching beyond Balto-Slavic, the original nasal present of Gmc. **fallan* (< **pōl-ne/o-*) can easily be a specifically Germanic innovation. Given the productivity of the Armenian present stem

suffix *-anem*, *-anim* beside root aorist, Arm. *pʻlanim* can be trivially explained as a specifically Armenian coinage to the aorist *pʻlaw* (cf. *cnanim*, *cnaw* “give birth, be born”, *meʻanim*, *meʻaw* “die” etc.). Since *vu*-presents enjoyed a certain productivity in Greek, ὄλλυμι need not be considered an inherited formation either. It could easily have been secondarily built to the active sigmatic aorist ὄλεσ(σ)α.

N.’s reconstruction of the meaning of *(*po*) **h₃elh₁-* as act. “make fall”, mid. “fall” looks also suspicious to me. The bulk of the evidence points to an original middle paradigm meaning “to fall”, factitive “to make fall” being expressed with the causative. The only language that has a regular transitivity opposition is Greek. Since it is well known that the sigmatic aorist was used in Greek to build secondary factitives to intransitive aorists (ἔστησα : ἔστην, ἔδῦσα : ἔδῦν, ἐγείνατο : ἐγένετο etc.) ὄλεσ(σ)α can easily be taken as a specifically Greek factitive to ὄλετο. The present ὄλλυμι, as already observed, is very probably dependent on the active sigmatic aorist and may well have replaced the inherited causative (cf. ἔννυμι “clothe”, which takes the place of the inherited causative **mos-éje/o-*). The new regular middle present ὄλλυμαι may in its turn have replaced the original present associated to aor. ὄλετο and perf. ὄλωλα.

I thus propose the following alternative to N.’s reconstruction. *(*po*) **h₃elh₁-* had a primary meaning “to fall” and was inflected according to Jasanoff’s

³ Yaroslav Gorbachov, *Indo-European Origins of the Nasal Inchoative Class in Germanic, Baltic and Slavic*, Ph.D. Diss., Harvard University, 2007, specially 106ff.

“stative-intransitive system”:⁴ it made a middle root aorist (Gk. ὄλετο, Arm. *p’law*), a stative perfect (Gk. ὄλωλα), and a causative (Lat. *ab-oleō*, *-ēre*). The present stem(s) cannot be reconstructed with certainty, but *(*po*)

⁴ Jay H. Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, chapter 6.

Reciprocal constructions. 5 volumes, ed. by [Vladimir P. Nedjalkov] (with the assistance of Emma Š. Geniušienė and Zlatka Guentchéva), Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007.

Šių metų pavasarį Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakulteto Anglų filologijos katedra gavo ypatingą dovaną – 2007 m. *John Benjamins* leidykloje išleista 5 tomų veikalą *Reciprocal Constructions* („Reciprokinės konstrukcijos“). Jį atvežė viena iš šio fundamentalaus leidinio kūrėjų, buvusi katedros profesorė Ema Geniušienė. Rengiant šį titaniškų pastangų, darbo ir energijos pareikalavusį darbą ji daugelį metų visokeriopa talkino savo vyrui, Rusijos mokslų akademijos Kalbotyros instituto profesoriui Vladimirui P. Nedialkovui – šio veikalo redaktoriui, sudarytojui ir ideologui. Praėjus vos keliems mėnesiams po šio susitikimo mus pasiekė liūdna žinia, kad profesorius Nedialkovas mirė, todėl ši pasaulio kalbotyroje analogų neturinti kolektyvinė monografija tarsi apvainikavo visus profesoriaus anksčiau paskelbtus darbus ir tapo jo va-

**h₃lh₁-iē-tor* (?Lith. pret. *púolė*) is probably the best choice.

Miguel VILLANUEVA SVENSSON

Vytautas Magnus University

Vileišio g. 14–35,

LT–10306 Vilnius, Lietuva

[miguelvillanueva@yahoo.com]

lios, ištvėmės bei begalinio atsidavimo kalbotyros mokslui simboliu.

Vladimiras P. Nedialkovas – žymiausias Sankt Peterburgo (anksčiau Leningrado) kalbų tipologijos mokyklos atstovas. Ši mokykla jau beveik pusę šimtmečio garsėja savo projektais, pelniusiais pasaulinį kalbininkų pripažinimą. Profesoriaus Nedialkovo vadovaujami tyrėjai kalbų tipologijos studijoms sukūrė tvirtą pagrindą ir išskėlė jas į deramą vietą pačiame kalbotyros mokslo priešakyje. Skiriamasis šios mokyklos darbo bruožas – teorines išvadas grįsti gausia ir patikima empirine medžiaga.

„Reciprokinės konstrukcijos“ tęsia geriausias Sankt Peterburgo kalbų tipologijos mokyklos tradicijas. Devyniuose įvadiniuose veikalo skyriuose itin išsamiai aprašytos bendrosios teorinės nagrinėjamojo dalyko prielaidos, medžiagos pateikimo struktūra, išaiškintos sąvokos ir metodika, pagal kurią vėliau aprašomi reciprokai įvairiausiose pasaulio kalbose. Atskirų kalbų reciprokai aptariami 40 skyrių, kurių autoriai – garsūs pasaulio tipologai, ne vienerius metus paskyrę atitinkamų kalbų studijoms.