

nija išlaikoma; tuo tarpu dalyvių, tiesiogiai susijusių su pamatinėmis indikatyvo formomis, sistemyje balsių kaita yra eliminuojama (plg. p. 373); menkų jos relikvų pasitaiko tik senuosiuose raštuose.

Baltų kalbų faktai monografijoje yra pateikiami ir interpretuojami labai profesionaliai; apsirikimai, netgi korektūros klaidos itin retos. Antai autorius K. Sirvydo du žodynus traktuoja kaip vieno žodyno skirtingus leidimus (plg. bibliografijoje p. 431). Nuosekliai žymima latvių kalbos antrinių dvigarsių pagrindinio ir šalutinio kirčio krintančioji priegaidė (pvz.: *cēļš, dziļš, akmeņš, iesāls*), tačiau viename kitame pavyzdyje jos nėra (pvz.: *per* 'peria', p. 293 t., 391; *min* 'mina', p. 313<sup>23</sup>; *pin* 'pina', *tin* 'tina', p. 313, 391 t.; *stumj* 'stumia', p. 326, 391; *vemj* 'vemia', p. 319, 392), o *zivs* atveju (p. 27 t., 392) priegaidė pažymėta klaidingai. Apsirikta ir pateikiant vieną kitą lietuvių kalbos žodį, pvz.: *aštuoni* (= *aštuoni*), p. 94 (išn. 151), 378; *stipra* (= *stipras*), p. 386. Kiek daugiau korektūros klaidų ir nenuoseklumų aptikau bibliografijoje. Antai G. Akelaitienės darbų pavadinimuose turi būti ne *morfologinės*, o *morfonologinės* (kaitos), *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatikos* angliška versija yra *Lithuanian Grammar* (be artikelio), p. 413; R. Venckutės straipsnio pavadinime *neapofonija* taisytina į *neoapofonija* (p. 435); Stepanovo vardas yra Jurijus (J.), p. 433; anglų kalba parašytų darbų bibliografijoje vietoj vyraujančių didžiųjų raidžių kartais parašomos mažosios.

Apibendrinant tai, kas čia svarstyta, norisi pabrėžti, kad D. Petit'o tyrimas išryškino paveldėtosios gramatinės apofonijos baltų kalbose likimą sąlygojančius veiksniai: 1) formalųjį (šaknies struktūra); 2) morfologinį (polinkis į binarines priešpriešas, morfemų produktyvumas); 3) semantinį (formų semantinė nepriklausomybė). Baltų kalbų savitumą autorius suvokia kaip jų gebėjimą indoeuropietiškas balsių kaitas ne tiek išlaikyti (užkonservuoti), kiek

<sup>23</sup> Kitur šios formos priegaidė pažymėta, pvz., *min* (p. 255, 390). Kalbama atvejais priegaidė žymi, pvz., E. Kagainės- S. Ragės (KR) ir A. Rekenos (RV) žodynai; ME ji nežymima.

integruoti į savo sistemą, kurioje jos gali tapti netgi produktyvios.

Danielio Petit'o knyga yra ir brandus, akademiškas, ir drauge elegantiškas veikalas. Teiginiai pagrįsti, aiškūs, pateikti palyginti paprasta kalba. Žavi tai, kad autorius kruopščiai apžvelgia kitų mokslininkų nuomones, nesvarbu – pritaria joms ar ne.

*Bonifacas Stundžia*

Erdvilas Jakulis, **Lietuvių kalbos tekėti, teka tipo veiksmoždziai**, Vilnius, Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2004, 306. (Baltistica, XXXVIII (1–2) 2003).

Lithuanian has a large class of verbs characterized by a simple thematic present and a second stem in -ė- (e.g. *tekėti, tēka, tekėjo* "flow, run"). As the author (J.) records in the introduction, there is some indeterminacy in the way their synchronic properties and their prehistory are treated in the secondary literature, partly due to the lack of an exhaustive treatment of the data. This monograph (based on a 2002 Vilnius University dissertation) is a welcome attempt to fill this gap.

After a short introduction (pp. 8–11), the book is divided into two large chapters. The first one (pp. 12–83) is devoted to a synchronic description of the type. The second one focuses on diachrony on the following levels: comparison with Latvian (pp. 84–110), Old Prussian (pp. 110–116), Slavic (pp. 117–141) and, finally, Indo-European (pp. 142–159), and presents his own theory on the origin of this class of verbs (p. 115, 155ff.). The conclusions (pp. 160–164), and English summary (pp. 165–189), the bibliography and abbreviations (pp. 190–197), six appendices giving in tabular form a list of forms on some topics treated in the book (pp. 199–245), and a list of words (pp. 246–306) complete the volume.

The first chapter is divided into three sections: semantics (pp. 12–25), derivational status and relationship with other types of verbs or parts of speech (pp. 25–43), and morphological structure (pp. 43–83). From a functional point of view

*tekėti*-type verbs are typically intransitive (or at least ineffective). Well represented semantic classes include verbs of sound, emanating both from animate and from inanimate subjects (by far the largest group), other verbs of emission (specially of light), verbs of motion, processes of change of structure and some other minor semantic classes. There is frequent overlap between the semantic spheres, many verbs being used in more than one meaning. As a general feature, J. characterizes them as duratives, usually with what he terms a “vibrative” connotation. They are not typically stative or iterative, although in some cases they may approach these types of meaning.

Morphologically the type *tekėti, tēka* is a large class of primary (i.e., not derived) verbs, the overwhelming majority of which is of a clear onomatopoeic nature. They are not denominative, nor are they productively derived from other types of verbs. There is a certain amount of variation with other types of present (e.g. *smirda* “stinks” beside *smirdi, smirdžia, or smirsti*), partly because these are close in meaning, but mostly explainable as an effect of the elimination of Old Lithuanian athematic presents or due to individual phonetic processes of the dialects. In other cases we may be dealing with independent onomatopoeic coinages. Finally – and importantly – J. dismisses many of the examples found in the dictionaries as ghost forms and errors made by the lexicographers.

Verbs of the type *tekėti, tēka* are apophonically invariant, all type of root vocalism and groups of consonants being permitted. *-ė-* functions as a dominant suffix that almost always carries the accent, irrespective of the intonation of the root. The morphophonemics of this type of verbs are characteristic of onomatopoeic formations. Most of this section is devoted to its manifestation in root vocalism, consonantism (both bound to variation of every sort), and accent, that often serve an iconic function. An interesting feature is the frequency of partial reduplication (*dundėti, dūnda* “thunder”), specially frequent among roots ending in a sonant. Although J. doesn’t state it overtly, I suppose this can be explained through a tendency in Lithuanian to avoid suffixal verbs to roots

ending in a sonant, which is also to be made responsible for the expansion of *-d-* among causatives and other formations (*pildyti, pildo* “fill”, *mėrdėti, mērđi* “lie dying”, etc.), cf. Stang 1966, 325f. Very detailed tables through this chapter and in the appendices (pp. 200–216) make the results of this section of easy consultation.

I have little to comment on the first section, which is a very full study of the type *tekėti, tēka* as found in Lithuanian. Some of his conclusions, such as the durative value or the non-derived status of these verbs, are of some importance for a historical study. Readers should specially take due notice of the many corrections J. posits to the entries of the LKŽ and other lexical sources. On the second section, devoted to a historical analysis of the type, I have more reservations.

The Latvian facts basically accord with the Lithuanian ones and there is an appreciable number of direct cognates between both languages, given in an appendix (pp. 217–224). The mixing of paradigms with other types of presents is still more marked in Latvian, so it is sometimes difficult to establish the original inflection of a given verb. On the other hand, J. seems to have based his study on Latvian cognates of Lithuanian verbs only, so one is left in doubt of whether Latvian has not a couple of verbs not attested in Lithuanian that may claim some antiquity. In any case, it is clear that the type *tekėti, tēka* was already present in common East Baltic in full force.

The section on Old Prussian is more challenging, as J. denies the existence of the type *tekėti, tēka* in this language. He finds four “root verbs” with possible cognates in East Baltic *tekėti*-type verbs. Of these, however, three are clearly untenable: OPruss. *grīmons* “gesungen”, *unsey gūbans* “auffgefahren” and *etwiērpt* “vergehen” have closer cognates, both morphologically and semantically, in other classes of verbs (cf. Latv. *gremt, gremju, grēmu* “murmeln, im Affekte reden”; Lith. *góbtī, -ia* “cover; plunder”, *góbtis, gābias* “take up” in Daukša; Lith. *veřpti, -ia*, Latv. *vērpt, -ju* “spin”) than in the *tekėti*-types Lith. *gramėti, grāma* “flock, throng”, *gebėti, gēba* “have a habit, like; be able, can” and *virpėti, virpa* “tremble, shake”. His best example, *stenuns* I 7<sub>16</sub>, *styienuns*

II 7<sub>16</sub>, *stīnuns* III 41<sub>24</sub>, 127<sub>10</sub> “gelitten” shows a vocalism *\*stēn-* that hampers a direct equation with Lith. *stenėti*, *stēna* and Latv. *stenēt*, *-u* “moan, groan”.

On the other hand, J. dismisses all potential examples of *tekėti*-type verbs in Old Prussian on several grounds, sometimes without any argumentation at all. He prefers to posit instead, following K a u k i e n ē (2004, 200–204), a (very doubtful, in my opinion) class of Old Prussian verbs with infinitive *\*-ī-* and present and preterit *\*-ā-* or *\*-ē-* (their distribution is not specified). It doesn’t become clear from J.’s treatment why this interpretation is to be preferred to the traditional one, taking at face comparative value examples like OPruss. *wīrst kabūns* “wird hangen” = Lith. *kabėti*, *kāba* “hang (intr.)”, *peldūns* “erworben” = Lith. *peldėti*, *pėlda* “save, spare”, *skellānts* “schuldig”, verbal noun *skallīsna* “Pflicht” = *skelėti*, *skēla* “owe”, etc. I miss a comment on *giwīt*, *giwa-* “live”, that has been often taken to be a further example of the *tekėti*-type in Old Prussian. While it must be recognized that the Old Prussian data are multiply ambiguous and liable to different interpretations, I find J.’s treatment somewhat aprioristic.

After denying the existence of the type *tekėti*, *tēka* in Old Prussian, J. goes on to assume that the type as a whole is an East Baltic innovation and reconstructs a Baltic paradigm *\*tekti*, *\*teka*, *\*tekē*. In East Baltic the preterit *\*tekē* was enlarged by *\*-jā* to give *\*tekējā*. Latter, the infinitive *\*tekti* was reshaped as *\*tekēti* after the preterit *\*tekējā*. There are several flaws in this scenario. First, it goes without saying that even if J. had succeeded in proving that the type *tekėti*, *tēka* is missing in Old Prussian (what he certainly has not), this wouldn’t prove automatically that the type was not present in Common Baltic and must be an East Baltic innovation. A West Baltic loss seems in principle equally possible. Second, J. simply takes the pivotal preterit *\*tekē* for granted, without further commentary. But *\*tekē* needs to be justified because it is by no means self-evident that the preterit of a paradigm *\*tekti*, *\*teka* should have been *\*tekē* rather than *\*tekā* (the preference of the *\*-ā-*preterit for intransitivity is a common place in Baltic studies).

As shown by S c h m i d (1966; 1967–1968), the preterit of simple thematic presents without a second stem is largely regulated by root vocalism and stem structure: alternating verbs of *CeRC*-roots and not alternating verbs with a root vowel other than *e* and *a* have *\*-ā-*preterits (e.g. *kiŗpti*, *keŗpa* : *kiŗpo* “cut”, *riŗsti*, *riŗša* : *riŗšo* “bind”, *dirbti*, *dirba* : *dirbo* “work”, *augti*, *auga* : *augo* “grow”). *CaC*-verbs have *-ē-*preterits in Lithuanian (*mālti*, *māla*, *mālė* “grind”), but this is known to be an innovation (dial. Lith. *mālo*, Latv. *mala*). *CeC*-verbs, finally, have regularly the *\*-ē-*preterit (*vėsti*, *vėda*, *vėdė* “lead”). Since all types of root structure and vocalism are permitted in the type *tekėti*, *tēka*, one is only left with the possibility that the type originated in a handful of *CeC*-verbs such as *tekėti*, *stenėti* “moan, groan”, *derėti* “be fit ; bargain”, or *tenėti* “thicken”. But even for these a preterit *\*tekē* will not find support in the *\*-ē-*preterit of verbs like *vėsti*, *mėsti* “throw”, *dėgti* “burn” or *nėsti* “carry, bear” because this class is composed of characteristically transitive, effective verbs, functionally very far from the *tekėti*-type, and even here E n d z e l i n (1910) was able to show that originally *kėpti* and *dėgti* had an intransitive *\*-ā-*preterit beside the transitive *\*-ē-*preterit (dial. Latv. tr. *cepē-*, *d’adza* : intr. *-cēpa*, *daga* < *\*degā-*). Old Lithuanian intransitive athematic presents without a second stem had *\*-ā-*preterits as well (*bėgti*, *bėgmi* : *bėgo* “run”, *likti*, *liekmi* : *liko* “leave; be left”). At best, one could find a parallel for the putative *\*tekē* in the synchronically irregular *gimti*, *gimsta* (OLith. *gēma*) : *gimė* “be born”, *miŗti*, *miŗsta* : *miŗė* “die”, (*pri-si-*)*miŗti*, *-mēna* : *-minė* “remember”, but these verbs are not durative and show a different morphological structure. In any case, they pose a problem by themselves and could not be used to support the putative *\*tekē*. All in all, everything suggests that if Baltic had had a paradigm *\*tekti*, *\*teka* rather than *\*tekēti*, *\*teka*, its preterit should have been *\*tekā* and not *\*tekē*.

Founded on weak basis as it is, J.’s theory should probably be rejected. Scholars with a different conception of the Old Prussian verb or the Baltic preterit will perhaps find J.’s scenario more credible than I do, but it is important to emphasize that it has not been adequately argued

for in this book. I find it easier to start with a Common Baltic type *\*tekēti, \*teka, \*tekējā* (*vel sim.*), simply preserved (and certainly enlarged in its lexical composition) in Lithuanian, Latvian, and (probably) Old Prussian.

J.'s treatment of the Slavic and Indo-European comparanda is to some degree vitiated by his erroneous views on the internal history of these verbs in Baltic. He also seems to be much less familiar with the languages he is going to use, the principles of modern Indo-European linguistics, and the secondary literature (it is practically restricted to a couple of etymological dictionaries). As a result, the next two sections are much weaker and contribute but little to a historical elucidation of the type.

In the section devoted to Slavic J. studies about 80 verbs he has found equated with Lithuanian *tekėti*-type verbs in the etymological dictionaries, classified according to the type of verb in Slavic. J. rightly dismisses most possible equations as very doubtful or only etymologically related (i.e., not entailing a common prototype for the Baltic and Slavic verbs under consideration). He finds that the best direct equations are with "root verbs" (e.g. OCS *stenati, stenjo* = Lith. *stenėti, stēna* "moan, groan", *tešti, tekq* = Lith. *tekėti, tēka* "run, flow", *mošti, mogq* "be able, can" = Lith. *magėti, māga* "want, like", *pasti, pasq* "protect" = Lith. *pósėti, pósa* "honour, respect"), thus supporting his theory of a Baltic paradigm *\*tekti, \*teka*. While there is certainly some truth in it, this is not all the story.

It is well known that some *tekėti*-type verbs show clear cognates in Leskien's Class IV B. Verbs like Lith. *kūpėti, kūpa* = OCS *kypěti, kypi-* "boil", Lith. *švitėti, švita* = OCS *světěti, světi- se* "shine", Lith. *smirdėti, smirda* = OCS *smrěděti, smrědi-* "stink", Lith. *grumėti, grūta* = OCS *grǫměti, grǫmi-* "thunder" or Lith. *bezdėti, bēzda* = Russ. *bezdět'*, SCr. *bāzdjeti* "pedere" are not only derived from the same root, but look very much like exact word equations. To observe, with J., that a direct equation is not possible because Baltic and Slavic diverge in the present stem is a simple statement of the observable facts, not a historical explanation. Given their close formal and functional agreement, a common origin seems almost certain. I see no reason why the original paradigm could not have

been that of Baltic, at least in some verbs (a Baltic replacement of an earlier *-i*-present is of course also possible in other).

On the other hand, reasonable arguments have been offered to assume that a pattern of conjugation like that of Lith. *tekėti, tēka* was present in the prehistory of Slavic (a point, once again, not addressed by J.). Vaillant (1966, 400) for instance, argues that the transfer of verbs like OCS *letěti, leti-* "fly" < *\*lek-te-* (: Lith. *lėkti, lekiù* "fly") to Class IV B implies the earlier presence of a Class like that of Lith. *tekėti, tēka* in Slavic. The same perhaps holds for OCS *blǫštati, blǫšti- se* = Lith. *bliskėti, bliska* "shine, glitter" and other verbs in Slavic *-štati* and Lith. *-škėti, -skėti, -zgėti*, probably originated in some *\*-skelo*-presents.

There is probably even direct evidence showing that at least one verb preserved this type of inflection into historical times. Kölln (1977, 104–107) observes that a paradigm *\*květěti, \*květe-* "bloom" is surprisingly well attested in the Slavic languages (ORuss. *cvětěti, cvětu*, dial. Pol. *kścieć, kste*, Upper Sorbian *kčěć, ktu*, OCz. *ktivěti, ktvu*, Sloven. *cvetěti, cvetēm*), beside the familiar *\*kvisti, \*květe-* (OCS *cvisti, cvěto*, ORuss. *cvěsti, cvětu*, OPol. *kwiśc, kwę*, etc.) and *\*květěti, \*květi-* (SCr. *cvàtjeti, cvàtim*, etc.), which bear all the appearance of morphological renewals of an anomalous verb. Slavic *\*květěti, \*květe-* makes a perfect equation with Latv. *kvītēt, kvītu* "glänzen, flimmern" and virtually solves the question.

There is thus every reason to believe that the type *tekėti, tēka* is not only common Baltic, but Balto-Slavic in date. It is almost certainly not Indo-European, but a review is not the place to explore the way it came into existence or the verbs that may have followed this conjugation in Balto-Slavic. I will content myself with a couple of observations. First, Slavic *\*květěti, \*květe-* beside *\*kvisti, \*květe-* and *\*květěti, \*květi-* shows that the replacement of the thematic present by an *-i*-present was not the only way of handling these verbs in Slavic. Elimination of the second stem was another possibility. I would add – also in Baltic. From this point of view, neither can we take OCS *tešti, tekq* or *mošti, mogq* to show that the second stem of Lith. *tekėti, tēka* and *magėti, māga* is an innovation, nor can we assume that Lith. *pérsti, pėrdžia* (Latv. *pīrst*,

*peřdu* “pedere” or *bęgti, bęga* (OLith. *begmi*) “run” were not paired with a second stem in \*-ē- in earlier stages of the language (cf. Slavic *peřdęti, peřdi-* and *bęžati, bęzi-*). Second, J. is doubtless right in emphasizing that the oldest layer of *tekęti*-type verbs lies in “root verbs”. An original athematic present is still traceable for OCS *mořti* in the irregular 2 sg. *\*mořĩ* (cf. Vaillant 1966, 165), it is assured on comparative grounds for *tekętilteřti* or *pósętilpasti* (cf. Ved. *tak-ti*, Hitt. *pahhs-<sup>mi</sup>*), and it is possible in other cases. One could speculate on the *tekęti*-type as a whole as an offshoot of the gradual thematization of a class of Balto-Slavic athematic presents paired with a second stem in \*-ē- (a type still directly attested in Old and dialectal Lithuanian), but that would not account for all examples, including potentially ancient verbs. There is still much to do in this area of the Baltic and Slavic verb, but it is clear that the second stem in \*-ē- (as well as that in \*-ā-) played a major role in it.

I will not comment extensively on the chapter on Indo-European. It aims to establish the nucleus of Indo-European roots from which *tekęti*-type verbs are built, their morphological structure and their semantics (a list of forms supporting the reconstruction of every root is given in an appendix, pp. 225–245). Such an approach, however, is not likely to give any serious results: the Indo-European verbal system didn’t merely consist of roots, but had a rather complex morphology. A list of forms exemplifying the derivatives of a root will not yield *per se* the correct prehistory of a given verb. In addition, J. has obviously not exerted any independent control on the data he quotes, which apparently have been copied down from Pokorny’s and a few other etymological dictionaries. Errors and dubious assessments are very frequent. In a word, this section is an unreliable collection of data that have simply not been studied in any meaningful way.

The serious shortcomings of the historical side of this investigation renders it practically useless. Nevertheless, the first part remains a valuable contribution to the study of the Lithuanian and (partially) Baltic verb, that no doubt will serve as a solid basis for future research in this area.

## REFERENCES

Endzeliņ J., 1910, Zum lettischen Präteritum, – KZ XLIII 1–41 (= idem, Darbu izlase, II, 1974, 90–130).

Kaukienė A., 2004, Prūsų kalbos tyrinėjimai, Klaipėda.

Kølln H., 1977, Verben mit Infinitiv auf -ęti und Präsensstamm auf -e/o-, – ScSl XXIII 103–113.

Schmid W. P., 1966, Baltische Beiträge IV. Zur Bildung des litauischen Praeteritums, – IF LXXI 286–296.

Schmid W. P., 1967–1968, Baltische Beiträge V. Zur Praeteritalbildung im Lettischen, – IF LXXII 116–122.

Stang C. S., 1966, Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen, Oslo etc.

Vaillant A., 1966, Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, III. Le verbe, Paris.

Miguel Villanueva Svensson

Jay H. Jasanoff, **Hittite and the Indo-European verb**, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2003, XIV + 270.

In 1979 Jasanoff (J.) advanced a new theory on one of the most vexing problems of Indo-European linguistics: the Hittite (Anatolian) *hhi*-conjugation. This book incorporates J’s findings during the next two decades. Starting from the Hittite *hhi*-conjugation, it encompasses under a single coherent framework a large number of apparently independent formations in most Indo-European languages.

The first two chapters are of a preliminary character. Chapter 1 (pp. 1–29) introduces the basic facts and the problem of the *hhi*-conjugation: how do we account for a class of active verbs fully equivalent in function to those of the *mi*-conjugation, but displaying root ablaut and endings that essentially match those of the perfect? J. reviews critically most of the theories proposed to solve this riddle and rejects any possible direct derivation from the perfect or any other familiar